

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 1 July 2015

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:03 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REVIEW

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:05): I move:

That the first report of the committee, entitled Public Integrity and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Annual Review, be noted.

As members would be aware, the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 came into operation on 1 September 2013 and the Office of the ICAC opened its doors the next day. At the same time, the Crime and Integrity Policy Committee was also established in September 2013 and the current members were appointed in May last year.

A key function of the committee is to consider the operations of South Australian integrity bodies, including the ICAC, whose roles include the investigation of corruption and oversight of the investigation of misconduct and maladministration in public administration; the Office for Public Integrity, which receives and assesses complaints and reports about potential matters of corruption, misconduct and maladministration in public administration; the Ombudsman SA whose office investigates complaints about SA government and local government agencies; the Office of the Police Ombudsman which provides independent oversight of SAPOL and its members; and the Anti-Corruption Branch of SAPOL which ensures that allegations of corruption in public administration referred to the police by the ICAC are appropriately investigated.

Between August 2014 and March 2015 the committee considered 10 annual and other reports tabled in parliament from the ICAC, the Ombudsman, the Police Ombudsman, the Commissioner of Police, and the independent reviewer of the ICAC. The committee is charged with examining these reports while also inquiring into and considering the operation and effectiveness of the ICAC act. In particular, the committee must consider the performance of functions and exercise of powers by the ICAC and the OPI, inquire into and consider the performance of functions and exercise of powers by the Ombudsman, and report to parliament on any matter arising of public policy.

In 2014 the committee received oral evidence from the ICAC Commissioner Bruce Lander, the independent reviewer of the ICAC the Hon. Mr Kevin Duggan, the Acting Ombudsman Ms Megan Philpot, and the then Police Ombudsman Ms Sarah Bolt. Then, in early 2015—and I think it should be noted what a hardworking committee this is—the committee also heard evidence from the newly appointed Ombudsman Mr Wayne Lines and the new Deputy Ombudsman Ms Emily Strickland, as well as South Australia Police, namely: the Commissioner of Police Mr Gary Burns; Assistant Commissioner of Crime Service Paul Dickson; Chief Superintendent Peter Harvey, Officer in Charge of the Ethical and Professional Standards Branch; Superintendent Christine Baulderstone, Officer in Charge of the Anti-Corruption Branch; and Superintendent Craig Patterson, Officer in Charge of the Internal Investigations Section.

As detailed in this report, the committee found that at this preliminary stage it appears that the ICAC and the OPI have made a positive impact upon the anticorruption framework in South Australia. However, I think we all agreed that a number of years would need to go by before the full impact can be seen of how these agencies are performing. Despite some of the complexities and recommendations for change, the committee commends all the agencies that are working together to try to make the new system work.

The committee has made 12 recommendations relating to matters of public policy detailed in this report. Overall the committee found that:

- a mechanism is needed to allow people to make complaints about how the commissioner exercises his powers, and we have recommended that a new set of responsibilities be added to the external reviewer to enable that to happen;
- external reviews of the FOI decisions regarding SAPOL documents should be undertaken by the Ombudsman, not the Police Ombudsman;
- action should be taken to address the uncertainties in the Local Government Act 1999, given that possible sanctions depend on whether reported breaches of the code of conduct are made to the Ombudsman or OPI;
- the legislative framework regarding complaints about police misconduct and corruption should be simplified;
- a review should be undertaken to determine if it is practical to legislate for the sharing of personal information to better protect children, young people and vulnerable adults;
- government documents should be more readily available under the FOI Act, with proactive disclosure of information; and
- further work needs to be done to achieve an integrated model of public integrity in South Australia which is accessible, efficient, effective and simple.

The committee in its report that was tabled yesterday notes that Commissioner Lander was also undertaking an evaluation of the practices, policies and procedures of the Police Ombudsman and reviewing the legislative schemes, and that would likely have some significant impacts upon the work that we are also looking at. As it so happens, the commissioner released his report into those matters yesterday. It recommends a significant shake-up of the way that police integrity matters are reviewed, namely, that the Police Ombudsman be removed as a body and that most matters of police integrity be reviewed internally by SAPOL, and that significant matters be reviewed by the ICAC.

I understand that that is going to be reviewed now by the Attorney-General, and he will make recommendations to parliament in coming months. We were lucky enough to be briefed by the commissioner of ICAC yesterday, as a committee, on the reports, and I think that the recommendations that he has made are in line with a lot of the evidence that we heard during the course of our inquiry.

On behalf of the committee, I thank all those who gave evidence. I also thank the members of the committee, particularly the members of this house—the member for Little Para and the member for Hartley—as well as the members of the other place, including the Presiding Member, the Hon. Mr Gerry Kandelaars MLC, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, and the Hon. Andrew McLachlan MLC, who replaced the Hon. Stephen Wade, who was a former member of the committee.

I also would like to particularly thank our executive research officer of the committee, Ms Katherine McLachlan, who I think did an absolutely outstanding job not only in the conduct of preparing members and organising meetings and witnesses but also in preparing the draft of this report, which is a fantastic read; I recommend it to everybody. If you are looking for something to read late at night, get a copy of this report. There are some very interesting issues detailed in here and Katherine did a fantastic job.

The only other point that I would like to add is that I heard ABC 7.45am radio this morning and almost choked on my Weet-Bix when I heard that it reported that the state opposition says a parliamentary committee has backed its push for an inspectorate to oversee the ICAC, that the committee says there needs to be a way for people to complain about the ICAC itself and that the shadow attorney-general, Vickie Chapman, says that the ICAC would be stronger if it was more open, transparent and accountable. Quoting Ms Chapman:

When things are done in such a covert way it is important to have someone else. The public have to have confidence in these institutions and that's why it's important to have the inspectorate.

I have to say that is not at all what is recommended in this report.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: How could she get it so wrong?

Mr PICTON: How could she get it so wrong?

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Again.

Mr PICTON: That's right—again. Just as Ray Martin once said about the member for Bragg: how could she get it so wrong? What we did recommend, as I mentioned, was that there is an independent reviewer of the ICAC that is already established, and that is the Hon. Mr Kevin Duggan. He, I think, is doing a fantastic job in reviewing the ICAC. What we have recommended is that his responsibilities in the act be amended, including a number of responsibilities to deal with any complaints made against ICAC or its officers in the discharge of their duties.

What we are not recommending is to establish a separate inspectorate, which I understand a number of other states have and which are quite large bureaucracies that oversee the ICAC in other states and will then conduct a further review of the independent review. We were very careful as we did not want to have a situation where you can just keep endlessly getting reviews because you are not happy that your complaint, however vexatious it might be, has not been looked into.

But we do think that there is a proper need for there to be someone to go to for a complaint about how the ICAC commissioner has discharged their duties, and that the appropriate person to do that is the Hon. Kevin Duggan, without some sort of inspectorate being created to support him, or perhaps her if it is not Mr Duggan in the future. I commend the report to the parliament and I commend the work of all the members of the committee and look forward to further deliberations.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2015-16

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:16): I move:

That the 101st to 105th reports of the committee, concerning the Natural Resources Management Board Levy Proposals 2015-16, be noted.

One of the Natural Resources Committee's statutory obligations is to consider and make recommendations on any annual levy proposed by a natural resources management board where the levy increase exceeds the annual CPI rise. Of the six proposed increases in division 1 land-based levies for 2015-16, there are only two higher than the 3.1 per cent CPI reference rate. The four remaining division 1 levy proposals were equal to or less than CPI. Of the five division 2 water levy proposals considered, only one was higher than CPI. The remaining four division 2 water levies were either equal to or less than CPI.

The committee is very pleased to see boards acting with restraint and generally keeping levy increases at or very close to CPI. Whilst committee members are always sympathetic to the desire of the NRM boards to increase their funding bases, the committee believes that the increases above CPI should be the exception rather than the rule.

The Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board sought a 24.3 per cent division 2 levy increase. Initially this sounded like a large increase; however, the committee accepted the board's explanation that the increase was due to the inclusion of levies of approximately 2,300 additional licensees in the Western Mount Lofty Ranges prescribed water resources area and the funds raised will be allocated towards properly managing this important resource. Furthermore, the committee heard that existing levies have been reduced for other licensees under the region's water allocation plan. Members also heard that without the inclusion of these additional licensees, the overall levy increase would have been limited to CPI.

The Kangaroo Island board has sought a 12 per cent division 1 increase. The committee accepted the board's reasoning that a proposed increase, while exceeding CPI, represented \$3.96 per assessment per annum due to its fixed rate and that the increase was needed in order to carry out the board's functions as required under the NRM Act and to meet community expectations. The South Australian Murray Darling Basin NRM Board sought a 5.1 per cent division 1 levy increase. In this instance, the committee accepted the board's reasoning that the levy proposal was amended following consultation with the affected community members. The board, in response to this feedback, chose to offset this increase by reducing its division 2 levy increase to 1.1 per cent below the year's CPI increase.

At its meeting on Friday 15 May 2015, the committee determined not to object to any of the proposed NRM levy increases for the 2015-16 financial year. Members were pleased to hear from various boards of the important role played by the NRM officers in South Australia's regional communities. For example, members heard of the important role natural resources management staff played in fighting the Sampson Flat fires back in January this year.

Professor Chris Daniels, Presiding Member of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board, estimated that 60 AMLR regional staff were among the DEWNR employees involved in fighting the Sampson Flat fires and that, following the fires, many of the DEWNR staff were also involved in working with individual landholders to help them regrow their farms and properties and doing such things as managing weeds, conserving soil, identifying bits of remnant vegetation that may have survived and even identifying individual trees that either needed to be removed or retained.

One point particularly concerning the committee regarding the future of NRM in the state was the future project funding for nearly all of the NRM boards. There is a rapidly approaching sharp fall in the overall NRM funding expected. The impact of this is particularly well illustrated in the Kangaroo Island NRM Board submission. The KI submission and the graphs in our reports that we tabled yesterday show that this indicates a sharp drop in the overall NRM funding over the next few years, particularly under the federal government's national Landcare program, formerly known as Caring for our Country, which has been cut across the board. Even with the modest increase in its division 1 levy, the KI NRM Board projects its income will contract from \$3.4 million in 2014-15 to \$1.1 million in 2017-18. In that very short time, two-thirds of the KI NRM Board funding will simply evaporate. This is very concerning to say the very least.

I would like to commend the members of our committee—the member for Napier, the member for Kaurana, the member for Flinders, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC, and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars MLC—for their contributions to this report. Can I say that I would also like to commend the members particularly in this chamber who support the NRC with their feedback and also with information to help us do our work. I am particularly indebted to that cooperation and also, when we go to regions, the support that is given by members to make sure that we understand the issues in their particular area.

I would also really like to thank the committee staff for their assistance. They have done a very good job. As members would know, we are also trying to undertake an extensive inquiry into fracking in the South-East. This is taking up a lot of time, time that we are all appreciating, particularly from the community and all the stakeholders in this area. Our staff have been under a lot of pressure, and to do all of our other jobs has been quite an effort, so particularly thank you to them. I commend the report to this house.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:23): I rise to make a few comments in response to the member for Ashford on the NRC report to do with the Kangaroo Island NRM area. The NRC runs only second to the Public Works Committee as the most active committee in the house—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I thought I might get that one in. I thank the member for Ashford. She is a diligent and good chair and a diligent and good member in relation to natural resources. I have had some discussions with the Presiding Member of the KI NRM Board, Mr Richard Trethewey, on various occasions. Although it seems a substantial increase, I am comfortable with what they propose and am supportive of it.

Mr Damian Miley, the manager over there, the CEO of the organisation, has not been in the job that long and he is putting his own stamp on things. We had a wonderful manager prior to him in Mr Bill Hadrill, who moved to Queensland. Mr Miley has a big task in front of him, and one of the problems he does have is some entrenched bureaucracy, particularly in national parks.

I find it totally ridiculous that the national parks side of it—the Seal Bay, Kelly Hill Caves, Flinders Chase and others, for example—is all run from Adelaide, and that the local manager has no input into that. I think it is something that is blatantly, completely ridiculous. All the decision-making is taken out of his hands and he merely runs the on-ground assets instead of running the business side of that, and that is something that the committee may pick up on.

I think that the NRM board is reasonably well accepted by most of the community. I think that, under his leadership over the last couple of years, Richard Trethewey has a very good handle on what goes on around the island. He is sensible and balanced and, in the main, they have some sensible and balanced members on the NRM board which works well. I do not get myriad complaints about it. I just do not hear that anymore. I do have some concerns (and I have spoken about this with Richard Trethewey as well) over water controls in a very high rainfall area—not this year particularly but in most years. Richard and I talked about that.

One thing that the farming landholders on the island will not be dictated to is on the issue of water. NRMs generally should have learnt a fairly valuable lesson out of the debacle on the Fleurieu with the Western Mount Lofty Ranges and the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges plans. I am hopeful that, in the future, the KI NRM will learn from the mistakes made on the mainland and move slowly.

I also think they need to be a little bit careful about where they distribute money on the maritime side of it. There is an outfit over there called KI Dolphin Watch, which started out just as a group of interested people who were interested in dolphins and whatnot. I had no problem with that; they picked up some sponsorship, etc. However, latterly they have grown into an over-zealous, eco—how do I term this—over-active group who seem to think they know everything about what goes on in the sea and nobody else does, to the extent that even yesterday I had an email from somebody who was most upset with some of the statements that have come out of that group, allegedly.

I think that the NRM needs to keep it in balance, needs to work with the community for the community but, under Mr Miley (while he is there), Mr Trethewey and the board members I am hopeful that we will get some good outcomes. With those few words I resume my seat.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:27): I thank the committee, including its Chair, for the work that has been done to review the fee increases for the natural resource management boards. I thank those who work on those boards, and I thank those who are employed by the NRMs across the state.

Certainly the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM is one which sits within my electorate, and I attend the board meetings as often as possible to discuss their projects, to give them compliment and recognition when they do good ones and to raise my concerns when I think they are failing in some area. Others around the state, including Kangaroo Island which the member has just spoken on, have certainly been performing well in my view, and we must thank those who are doing it. That is notwithstanding that the government has, since the inception of the NRM boards, cannibalised their income and the control of them.

That is another speech for another day, but let me say that I was utterly appalled to read in this year's budget that the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources is going to cannibalise the budgets of the NRM boards. They are going to be raising something like \$40 million over the next four years out of the money that is raised by the NRM boards through their levies.

Each year that they apply to come back to have an increase and justify whether it is more than CPI, and the like, they have to take into account the raise that occurs by the government. So, the new water planning and management fees and the new NRM land levies are all going to be massively increased in the amount that they are obliged to pay the government. This is just disgraceful. All it means is they are going to become a body to raise revenue for the department and I do not want to see that money swallowed up and removed from projects on the ground that are so worthy and so necessary.

Finally, this year's ultimate insult follows the time they raided the NRM board in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty region to provide works in the relocation of sand to Glenelg. It is an important project, but something like \$20 million for that project was taken out of the NRM budget to actually implement those capital works. That is disgraceful. It has nothing to do with the natural resources of the state. It is to do with ensuring that the people who visit Glenelg beach have sand when they are playing on the beach and it is for tourism and all those other things. It has nothing to do with the management of natural resources and it is scandalous that they took it out.

The budget this year says they are taking out money to operate and maintain the Patawalonga Lake system and the Glenelg gates, which are necessary to retain water for the marina

and for boats to go in and out and the like. It is all meritorious work but, again, to take millions of dollars out of the NRM budget over the next four years to maintain the operation of the Patawalonga Lake system is an absolute disgrace.

I say to the committee, when you hear the plight of the NRM boards who are putting a submission to you to necessarily increase their levies, understand one thing—it is coming in one pipe and being sucked out the other by this government. That is not acceptable. I thank you for the work you do, but understand that the ability of these boards to continue to do the work they were set up to do is under huge pressure because of the conduct, unconscionable as it is, of this government.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW HENLEY BEACH POLICE STATION

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 518th report of the committee, entitled New Henley Beach Police Station, be noted.

(Continued from 17 June 2015.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:32): I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak on the Public Works Committee report on the Henley Beach Police Station. I know that, in due course, some of my colleagues will no doubt have some interesting words to say about the matter. Obviously any new infrastructure in the police portfolio is of significant interest to me as the shadow police minister. In a year when the Labor Party has shut down eight police stations, it is nice to see that they are at least trying to open one up, given the rhetoric that we have had to deal with at every election campaign.

In fact, as recently as last year's election, the Labor Party was happy to castigate and criticise the former Liberal government for, in the wake of the State Bank fiasco, allowing the police to shut down eight police stations in the period from 1993 to 2002. In 2015, in the last six weeks, eight more police stations have closed, and I think that goes to the character of the government, frankly. At any rate, the Henley Beach Police Station is on its way and I am glad that the Public Works Committee has had a chance to consider some of the matters to do with it.

I note that when the budget came out last week, the due date for completion of the Henley Beach Police Station was listed as June 2017. This also comes as a surprise, I imagine, to the member for Colton's constituents, because when he took it to the election as an election promise, it was the biggest spending proposal that the government took to the election in March 2014. The people of Colton were promised a new police station when? June 2016. In last year's budget papers, it was June 2016.

I look forward to the government explaining why there has been, in fact, a year's delay on the delivery of the Henley Beach Police Station. I think governments should say what they mean and mean what they say and, when they go to an election saying that something is going to happen, they should make every endeavour to ensure that it happens. If they cannot, if it is in fact unreasonable or unachievable to expect that June 2016 was ever possible, then the government has a duty to explain to the people of Colton why it told them they would have a new police station 12 months from now, rather than in two years time (just before the next election).

This is going to be a significant police station in that there are some unusual and fairly significant security measures being undertaken in its construction that are going to be of interest to local residents and, potentially, very important for the security of the officers who are serving in this facility. We will note with interest how that develops in the years ahead and look forward to its construction.

I hope that when the Henley Beach station is delivered for the community in the western suburbs and the police officers who are serving there, it does not have the same face as the Newton Police Station, the Hallett Cove Police Station, the Malvern Police Station, the other five police stations that were promised to the people of local electorates (mostly in marginal seats, you would not be surprised to find out) where they were opened by this Labor government and then subsequently shut just seven or eight years later.

The Hallett Cove Police Station was promised ahead of the 2006 election, opened in 2008 and now is closed in 2015. It had a seven-year lifespan. So, I hope the people of the western suburbs and the South Australian police are not confronted by the prospect that it might be opened in June 2017 only to be closed by the Labor government several weeks later because that is, of course—hopefully, for the people of South Australia's sake—all this Labor government will have left between the construction of this police station and a new and better government that will deliver far better things for the people of South Australia. With that, I support the motion.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:36): The member for Morialta gave a very enlightening contribution. I think members on both sides of the house are now better educated about how an election campaign is one way to get a new police station. I want to speak about the 518th report of the committee regarding the upgrade of the Henley Beach Police Station, but it is not really an upgrade, it is a rebuild. I have quite a bit of familiarity with the Henley Beach Police Station because I used to frequent it as a lad, when I lived at Henley Beach. Yes, I did get my licence there; yes, I got my first defect there; and yes, I got my first defect off there.

The budget is \$5.3 million, excluding GST. The police station has had a presence on Military Road for many years. It was built in the early sixties and is now going to be replaced with this new facility. The member for Morialta has raised his concerns that the project will be built late. It has been well documented that the reason this police station is being built is it was an election promise. I am sure the member for Colton would be thanking his lucky stars that this election promise was probably the reason he got the extra 80 votes, I think, that he needed to get across the line. So, good on him.

Mr Pengilly: And then he got duded.

Mr WHETSTONE: And then he got slotted. That was the most disappointing part about it. He was a good minister. He got slotted but he got his police station and got re-elected. There are currently 52 staff working on the three-shift roster at the station. What the hearing did highlight were the concerns around the current station's functional efficiency, the out-of-date communications systems and the compromised secure car parking. I think what was realised in the hearing was that it has no car parking now and the new police station will have no car parking then, and that is obviously a concern.

Given the construction of the police station was a commitment to be completed by 2016 and is now going to be pushed back, as I believe, to 2017, I guess one would simply hope that to meet a government promise the deadline would have been completed on time and given the people of Colton that upgraded facility that it needs.

One of the disappointing aspects, as I have said, is the public car parking. It was very disappointing to note again that most often when people go to the police station it is under duress and to have to park your car around the corner and up the street is, in many ways, not a great outcome. But the upgrade is going ahead, albeit late, and it is a modern facility to address the issues that police are currently incurring in the operation of that station. Therefore, I commend the report to the house.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:40): I would like to thank everyone who has contributed to this debate: the member for Colton, the member for Morialta, and the member for Chaffey. I think there were a few similar themes presented in both the member for Colton and the member for Chaffey's presentations, so I thank you for that. I agree with the member for Chaffey, the excellent rendition we received from the member for Morialta was extensive, so thank you.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

Ms DIGANCE: I am stuttering! I would like to thank the hard work of the Public Works Committee and all of those associated with it: the executive officer, the administrative officer and all the witnesses who came before us. It was certainly an excellent project for the Public Works Committee to examine and we appreciated that opportunity. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: EVANSTON GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 519th report of the committee, entitled Evanston Gardens Primary School Redevelopment, be noted.

(Continued from 17 June 2015.)

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:41): I welcome the 519th report of the Public Works Committee. Obviously it is a hardworking committee, as the member for Finniss said, but I argue with him when he says that the Natural Resources Committee is the hardest working committee. I would like to lobby that the Public Works Committee is equally hard working. Hear, hear!

After conducting a number of site visits in recent months, the Evanston Gardens Primary School redevelopment has been heralded as a great achievement for those people out there who started off with a very humble beginning. The primary school redevelopment has been put forward by the Department for Education and Child Development at a cost of about \$6 million.

The school has a proud history in South Australia, opening in 1908 with a humble beginning. I noted the screams of joy when this redevelopment was announced and it really is accommodating the considerable boom in population out there. It is one of those areas that has been given the opportunity to grow—cheap land, good people. What we are seeing out there now is that the people who attended the original Evanston Gardens school are now attending as parents, attending as volunteers and that makes for a great standing in the community.

Currently the school has just under 140 students, but with the rezoning it is envisaged that there will be large growth, as I have said, and the Evanston Gardens Primary School is set to prosper and grow in its numbers to beyond 400. On that note, I commend the project to the house and hopefully it will benefit many generations to come.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:43): Thank you to the member for Chaffey for his contribution to this debate about the Evanston Gardens Primary School redevelopment. It certainly is an important piece of infrastructure for the local people in that area given the predictions in population. So thank you to the hardworking Public Works Committee, and I do think it is the hardest working committee—absolutely, yes.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms DIGANCE: Competition happening! And also to the executive officer and the administrative officer and all those who have prepared the information for us to consider. I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2015-16

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 87th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2015-16, be noted.

(Continued from 17 June 2015.)

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:45): I rise to speak to the Economic and Finance Committee 87th Report: Emergency Services Levy 2015-16. The increase to the emergency services levy, as outlined in this year's budget, is an absolute disgrace. South Australian households are again being slugged with an ESL increase for the second consecutive year, and the Treasurer is dipping into the South Australian householders and ripping money out of their pockets.

Last year, the ESL increased by about \$150 for people with an average \$400,000 home, and now in this year's budget the Treasurer has announced a further 9 per cent increase for most properties. Another 9 per cent—this is an increase of \$23 per annum for the average property price of \$426,400. That is an extra \$23 at a time when many South Australians are already in financial stress: financial stress caused by increasing electricity bills, increasing gas bills, increasing water bills, increasing council rates and increasing land taxes. Property rates and charges alone increased by 17.3 per cent in the year ending March 2015.

Let us not forget our deepening jobs crisis. South Australia's unemployment rate is 7.6 per cent—the highest in the nation. To increase the ESL at this time will push many families to the brink, and it demonstrates just how out of touch this Labor government is with the people of South Australia.

Unfortunately, the Treasurer is out of touch. Last year, he removed a general remission on the ESL sending bills soaring and generating anger: anger from residents, from landowners, from the CFS, SES and other volunteer organisations. So, in response to community disappointment, disenchantment and anger in terms of ESL increases last year, he increased the 2015-16 emergency services levy again this year.

Mr Gardner: You're saying what?

Mr DULUK: Increased—not decreased, but increased in this budget. The Treasurer once again is not listening to the people of South Australia. South Australians needs help, not further taxes. They need a government that will reverse the increasing ESL and put dollars back into householders' pockets.

The massive increase in the ESL tax does not just hit homeowners; it is also levied on sporting clubs, community organisations, churches and independent schools. The ESL has spiralled out of control and is being treated as an endless bucket of money. In total, property owners will funnel \$285.7 million into the Labor government through ESL bills in 2015-16—an increase of almost \$20 million on the previous financial year, and those on this side of the house say 'Enough!'.

The Treasurer claimed last year that the ESL increase was necessary to compensate for federal budget cuts. This year he claims the increase is necessary to pay for the January Sampson Flat bushfire. What will be the reason next year? Indeed, there is no justification for another ESL hike given the Labor government is set to receive an additional \$857 million in unbudgeted GST revenue from the federal government. There is no justification for another ESL hike to pay for the Sampson Flat bushfires. Successive governments have always funded unbudgeted catastrophic events from a general Treasury contingency fund, until now.

The emergency services levy was introduced by my predecessor for Davenport, the Hon. Iain Evans, and commenced on 1 July 1999. The ESL replaced the fire service levy introducing a fairer and broader levy that benefits fire services plus other emergency services agencies such as the SES, surf lifesaving, the State Rescue Helicopter, and many others. Mr Evans spoke in this chamber last year about his support for the ESL stating that he was glad he introduced it. I am also glad he introduced it, and I think most South Australians are in favour of ensuring our emergency services are appropriately funded. But Mr Evans also noted his astonishment that the government had cancelled all the remissions. He was shocked that the government would remove its contribution to the ESL, essentially doubling the cost of ESL for households.

This massive and unfair increase to the emergency services levy was a shock to many South Australians, especially to many CFS and SES volunteers. The Sturt CFS group, which is my local CFS group, and local SES units act as the fire service for a large part of my electorate and they play a crucial role in protecting many thousands of homes. It is important to ensure they are always well funded, respected and supported.

The announcement that the levy will increase again in 2015-16 adds further insult to injury. South Australians are not happy with the year-on-year increases to the ESL. They are not happy with a Treasurer who will not rule out further increases. It is time to put a brake on the Labor government's abuse of the ESL. The increase in the ESL is no more than a tax grab—a tax on the family home—needed to prop up this government's poor budget choices and spiralling debt levels. It is time for the government to support the opposition's policy and restore the remissions and put more dollars back into the households of South Australians.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:50): I commend the new member for Davenport for putting so many issues so succinctly and so accurately into his speech. As a member of the Economic and Finance Committee, of course I played quite a role in this, as did my colleagues on the committee. I would like to start by thanking all the chief officers who came to present to our

committee. They are all very capable and highly regarded people and I appreciate the information they provided to us.

I would also like to note that the report that the committee has put forward is almost exactly the same as the report that was provided by the government department to the committee. While I agree with everything that is in the report, I think it is a bit unfortunate that there is so little difference between those two reports, because there was actually a great deal of information that was gained by the chief officers, their support staff and SAFECOM representatives coming to present to the committee and answer our questions. I encourage anybody who is interested in this issue to read the transcript of that inquiry, because it was quite informative.

I, like all members of this house, appreciate the very good work that all the emergency services workers out there, both professionals and volunteers, do for us, but none of us are happy with the increase in the emergency services levy. Last year the government increased the ESL by removing the remissions, and that was essentially just a transfer of money straight from the taxpayer to Treasury. The emergency services sector did not get any extra funding whatsoever, it was just purely removing the remissions, charging the public more money and that additional money going straight to Treasury, because the government has got itself in all sorts of bother trying to balance the books.

We are told that the reason for the second increase in the emergency services levy, which is an increased charge to the taxpayer which will go on to the emergency services sector, is that the Sampson Flat bushfire effort, which of course was necessary and of course was valiantly fought as efficiently as possible, requires approximately a \$10 million shortfall to be recovered. We were also told that there is a budget of approximately \$800,000 set aside in the emergency services sector for such events, yet we have had a significant bushfire every year for the last five years, and in some years we have had more than one significant bushfire.

So I suggest that the money set aside needs to be significantly greater, since it seems that the average amount of money required is about \$10 million per year—it certainly was at Sampson Flat and it certainly was at Bangor. If that is the reason for the increase in the emergency services levy then we will have to expect more of them, because unfortunately we have to expect more disasters of this type that the emergency services sector has to pursue.

It was also interesting to find out during the questioning of witnesses that the rate on the dollar has gone up in the emergency services charge because property values have not increased as much as they were expected to. I can understand that the government, in this sector, needs to target a certain total amount of money that it needs to gain from the taxpayer to provide the service. but I would certainly hope that, when we get into flusher economic times and property values increase quicker than expected, the government will remember this and then reduce the rate on the dollar and not just sneakily accept windfall gains, as they have over many years in the past 12 years with regard to stamp duties on properties, for example.

When properties were increasing in value very significantly, without changing the rate on stamp duty, the stamp duty dollar take to the government increased very significantly. So, if the government is saying that at the moment they have increased the rate on the dollar because property values are not increasing at the predicted rate, I certainly hope that, when they do increase greater than the predicted rate, the government will decrease the rate on the dollar.

One of the most instructive pieces of information which came out of the hearing with witnesses was that in the past year the government has spent approximately \$550,000 of taxpayer money to fund the failed attempt by the Minister for Emergency Services to restructure the emergency services sector. The minister and the government were told loud and clear by the overwhelming majority of people within the emergency services sector—whether they be volunteers, all the way through to senior leaders—that what the minister was trying to do was not going to work, was going to be ineffective and inefficient and would waste money.

I suppose better late than never, the minister did, after approximately a year, decide that he would abandon his effort to restructure the sector in the way that he wanted to, but along the way he spent over half a million dollars. We are told that this is just the money that he spent in the past year,

and that there will actually be more money added to that total in the current year. We are also told that, unfortunately, some of that money is going to be spent because of the review of the review.

The minister established a review to restructure the emergency services sector. He abandoned that, having spent, we are told, approximately \$550,000, but now there is going to be more money spent by the minister and the government in reviewing the failed review. It is so incredibly frustrating because the minister was told, loud and clear, not to even embark upon this process. He was told loud and clear that, yes, of course there is room for efficiency improvements, and that, yes, of course there is a willingness across the sector to try to look for better ways—more effective and potentially cost-saving ways—of doing what they do, but that combining the services under one overall leadership model was not going to be the solution. They were right; they were absolutely right.

To be spending however many multiple hundreds of thousands of dollars it is going to end up being, only to end up agreeing with what the emergency services participants at all levels told the minister up-front, is a terrible shame, particularly when we are told that another reason for having to increase the emergency services levy is that it is necessary to train new volunteers and that it costs approximately \$1,500 per volunteer to train new volunteers.

So, \$550,000 plus whatever else is still to come would go an enormous way to training new volunteers and could have in fact led to the emergency services levy not having to be increased nearly as steeply as it has been. There was a lot of important information that was provided honestly by witnesses which is not included in this report, and I encourage anybody who is interested to go and read the transcript of the committee hearing.

In conclusion, I would just like to put on the record my very personal thanks to all the volunteers and full-time and part-time professionals who contribute to keeping us safe through the emergency services sector. I would also like to thank Mr David Place for his tremendous work as the head of SAFECOM over the last several years. I wish him very well in his move to heading up the SA Ambulance Service, which is where he came from before going to SAFECOM, and I wish Mr Malcolm Jackman all the very best as the new head of SAFECOM and his move away from Defence SA.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

Bills

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ACCOUNTABILITY AND GOVERNANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:01): Obtained leave and introduced a bill to amend the Local Government Act 1999; to make a related amendment to the City of Adelaide Act 1998; and to repeal the Local Government Act 1934. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to amend the local government legislation to improve local government accountability and governance, implement recommendations made by the Ombudsman and to make miscellaneous amendments to achieve a more consistent and contemporary legislative framework for the local government sector. The bill includes measures to provide more clarity around the issue of council members appropriately managing conflicts of interest.

The reform of the conflict of interest provisions of the Local Government Act 1999 is considered necessary because of significant confusion amongst council members in interpreting the current provisions of the act, the existence of different legal opinions on the interpretation of this part of the act, calls by the South Australian Ombudsman for the act to be amended to improve transparency and greater disclosure of actual and potential conflicts of interest, and there is a need

to keep these provisions in line with contemporary public policy and community expectations of public integrity.

In December 2014, the Council Members' Personal Interests Discussion Paper, which was prepared by the Office of Local Government and the Local Government Association, was released for the purpose of promoting discussions about the reform of the conflict of interest provisions of the act, based on equivalent provisions in the Queensland Local Government Act 2009. This consultation attracted significant support for amending the conflict of interest provisions, notably by providing clarity in relation to routine matters and the difference between actual and perceived conflicts of interest.

The comprehensive responses received from the Ombudsman, the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Crown Solicitor, the Local Government Association and councils have informed the proposals contained within this bill. Consequently, it is proposed that chapter 5, part 4, division 3 of the act be repealed and replaced with a new division 3. This part of the bill is based on the fundamental principle that council members must always consider the public interest in any decisions or actions taken in their role as a council member. The private interests of the member must never prevail over the public interest in that context.

The current act requires reform as it only has one category of conflict of interest that captures all potential conflicts along the continuum from minor through to very serious. It only provides a council member with one course of action when dealing with a conflict of interest, that is, to declare the interest and leave the meeting, and it does not explicitly provide for the declaration of perceived conflicts of interest.

This bill establishes material conflicts of interest, which include those situations where a council member (or a person or entity closely associated with the member) stands to gain a benefit or suffer a loss depending on the outcome of the consideration of the matter at the council meeting. The government's intention is to capture the most serious conflicts of interest in this category, especially those matters that would result in a financial gain or loss for the council member or associate. The bill requires a member who has a material conflict of interest to declare that interest and to leave the meeting while the matter is discussed and voted on.

The bill also provides for serious penalties for a breach of a material conflict of interest. If a member deliberately votes on a matter, with the intention of gaining a benefit or avoiding a loss, the maximum penalty proposed is \$15,000 or four years' imprisonment. The government's intention is to send a very clear message to the local government sector that material conflicts of interest are serious matters and must be treated accordingly.

The bill also recognises that members must be able to participate in discussion and vote on matters that are 'matters of ordinary business' for the council, even if they could technically have a material interest in the matter. Therefore, the bill provides that a material conflict of interest does not arise for a matter of ordinary business of the council. An example is the council decision to declare council rates for the year where council members are also ratepayers and would gain a benefit or suffer a loss as a result of the decision. It is essential for council members to fully participate in the discussion and decision on this matter, as it is fundamental to the operation of councils. It is the government's intention to set out the approved 'matters of ordinary business' of councils in regulations upon the passing of this bill and in consultation with the Local Government Association.

A second category of conflict of interests, actual and perceived conflicts of interests, is also established by this bill. This includes matters considered to be less serious than material conflicts of interest, but nevertheless interests that must be disclosed and documented. Importantly, management of this category of conflicts of interests does not automatically require a council member to leave a meeting. An actual conflict of interest can be distinguished from a material conflict of interest because the potential gain or loss to the council member is less significant; for example, it may be a non-financial or minor gain or loss. Most importantly, an actual conflict of interest, while needing to be declared, is less likely to influence the judgement of the member on the matter to be decided before the council.

The bill provides some grounds for qualified exclusions from a conflict of interest where a council member has association with organisations such as community groups and sporting clubs,

is a member of a political party, has involvement with a school or has been nominated by the council as a member of a board. It should be emphasised, however, that this exclusion is not absolute. A council member will still be required to carefully consider whether she or he has an actual or perceived conflict of interest depending on the facts and circumstances on the specific matter being discussed by council. A perceived conflict of interest is defined as arising where a council member could reasonably be taken, from the perspective of an impartial, fair-minded person, to have a conflict of interest in the matter.

This is a new concept for South Australian councils and council members and it has been recommended by the Ombudsman and supported by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Local Government Association. While it may be a new concept to some councillors in South Australia, it is a well-known and accepted principle in administrative law. It is also necessary to provide confidence to the community that council members, individually and collectively, are accountable for their decision-making process.

Unlike material conflicts of interest, where there is only one course of action available to the council member, provision is made for a range of actions for the council member with an actual or perceived conflict of interest. The fundamental principle is that the council member must deal with the actual or perceived conflict of interest in a transparent and accountable way. There is no automatic requirement for the council member to leave the meeting and refrain from voting on the matter.

In these situations, the council member is required to disclose the interest to the meeting and advise the meeting how the interest will be managed if the member chooses to stay in the meeting and vote on the matter. These details must also be recorded in the minutes of the meeting, including how the council member voted on the matter.

In order to support council members to adapt to these new provisions, it will be necessary that detailed guidance materials for councils and council members are prepared, together with training sessions to explain the new provisions and their application in practice. This government welcomes the offer from the Local Government Association to undertake this work and staff from the Office of Local Government will provide assistance as required.

This bill also contains reforms in relation to the confidentiality provisions. The Ombudsman has previously found several breaches of the act concerning the basis of resolutions for moving council meetings into confidence; evidence of invalid orders made to keep documents confidential; and perceptions that councils were improperly making important and sensitive decisions at meetings behind closed doors. The Ombudsman's concerns were discussed in the November 2012 audit of the use of meeting confidentiality provisions of the act in South Australian councils. In response to the concerns of the Ombudsman, this bill:

- contains a clarification that controversial or sensitive matters are matters that are irrelevant when considering making a confidential meeting order;
- mandates a requirement for an explanation of grounds for which a confidentiality order is being made, why a matter falls within those grounds and, if relevant, why discussion of a matter in an open meeting would be contrary to the public interest;
- provides a clarification that if a council or council committee seeks to extend the duration of a confidentiality order over documents, it must resolve to do so before the date of the expiry of the preceding order, and that it must be the council or council committee that resolves to do so and this power cannot be delegated to an employee of the council; and
- mandates a requirement for documents released from confidentiality to be included as documents to be made available for inspection on the internet, in conformity with this entire bill's focus on improving transparency and making the legislative framework more contemporary.

In accord with the government's commitment to improve the confidentiality provisions of the legislative framework, this bill contains a provision requiring all councils to have a policy in relation to informal gatherings and for such policy to comply with any requirements in the regulations. It is

the government's intention that such policies will include a requirement for councils to decide, on a case-by-case basis, whether informal gatherings and workshops should not be open to the public.

This bill also contains further reforms based on recommendations of the Ombudsman, such as removing the written request requirement for a member of the public to access certain parts of a council's Register of Interests and requires that this information be made available on the council website, as well as a mandatory requirement that the register be updated regularly.

This bill aims to improve certain prudential requirements, so that where a project involves the selling or exchanging of land, other than where the land is sold for unpaid rates or is transferred without consideration, a land valuation or valuations must be provided by a certified valuer. It is important to note that this bill seeks to repeal the Local Government Act 1934, parts of which were retained pending the development of other legislation. This bill proposes to transfer a small number of provisions to the 1999 act to enable the 1934 act to be repealed.

The bill also contains a number of miscellaneous amendments, many of these reflecting community progression to use the internet for accessing information and contemporary community expectations for increased transparency. There are also other technical amendments, such as correcting inconsistencies, clarifying matters and removing redundant provisions.

In closing, I thank all staff and organisations who have provided feedback and helped to prepare this bill. I now seek leave to insert the remainder of my second reading explanation into *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

Miscellaneous Provisions in the *Local Government Act 1999*

Section 4—Interpretation

It is considered that the current definition of 'relative' is too narrow in relation to conflicts of interest that are required to be declared. Accordingly, this amendment expands the definition of 'relative' to include stepson, stepdaughter, stepfather, stepmother or any member of the person's family who resides in the member's household. The intention is to update the Act to reflect contemporary definitions of a 'relative'.

Section 4 – Interpretation

Currently, 'public notice' only refers to that published in print. It is considered that this is outdated and that publication should include a relevant website, to reflect society's progression to the internet. This amendment also amends the requirement for publication in a newspaper circulating in the State to that circulating within the area of the relevant council, in order to balance the high costs of advertising in State-wide newspapers with the need to provide the requisite notice.

Section 12(11c)(b)(iii) – Composition and wards

This is a minor, technical amendment, deleting the words 'the Internet' and substituting 'a website determined by the chief executive officer' in order to keep the wording consistent with the rest of the Act.

Section 44(3)(f)—Delegations

This is a minor, technical amendment that deletes the provision as it is superfluous. It is the Remuneration Tribunal, not a council, that determines the relevant allowances.

Section 44(3)(ja)

Some councils have delegated the decision to revoke the status of community land, after receiving the approval of the Minister. The intention of this amendment is to clarify that the decision to revoke the status of community should be made in full council as it is a significant decision affecting the status of community assets.

Section 48(1)(b)(i)—Prudential requirements for certain activities

Due to some confusion due to 'expenditure' being interpreted in a variety of ways, this amendment replaces the word 'expenditure' with 'operating expenses calculated on an accrual basis' in order to achieve greater clarity.

Section 50(4) – Public consultation policies

In line with this Bill's intention to update the Act to reflect society's progression to the internet, this amendment requires publication of a council's public consultation policy on a website determined by the chief executive officer.

Section 50(6)(d)—Public consultation policies

In line with this Bill's intention to balance the high costs of advertising in State newspapers with the need to provide the requisite notice, this amendment removes the requirement for publishing changes to a council's public consultation policy in a State-wide newspaper.

Section 54(d)—Casual vacancies

In response to submissions that the current wording is unclear, this amendment clarifies the period of time after which a council member will be removed from office by the council on the ground that he or she has been absent from three or more consecutive ordinary council meetings, without leave of the council.

Section 62—General duties

The amendment to this provision is in relation to council members disclosing confidential information to external parties. This amendment clarifies that it is an offence for a council member and/or employee to knowingly disclose information or documents ordered to be kept confidential at a council or committee meeting, unless the release of such information is required or authorised by law, such as the provision of information to the Office of Public Integrity, the Ombudsman, a Minister or the Police.

The maximum penalty is \$10,000 or 2 years imprisonment.

Section 68—Register of Interests

There is currently no mechanism available in the Act for withholding the address of a person from the public if circumstances warrant it. While accountability and transparency is integral to good governance, there are situations where someone may fear having their personal address disclosed; for example, a police officer. Accordingly, this amendment amends the provision so that a similar mechanism applies as that in relation to the Assessment Record, in that the chief executive officer may suppress the address if requested, or must if it's suppressed on the electoral roll. The intention is that this enables any personal safety concerns to be met.

Section 75B—Application of Division to members and meetings of committees and subsidiaries

This provision ensures that the conflict of interest provisions extend to committees and subsidiaries and members of committees and subsidiaries.

Section 76—Allowances

This amendment clarifies that council members who serve the full 4 year term are entitled to the full annual allowance in the last year before the election, despite different poll dates and different council meeting dates.

Section 85 – Quorum

This is a minor technical amendment to prevent duplication with equivalent provisions in the new Division 3—Conflicts of Interests section.

Section 92(5)(a)—Access to meetings and documents – code of practice

Currently, the adoption, alteration or substitution of a code of practice is required to only be in print. In line with this Bill's intention to update the Act to reflect society's progression to the internet, this amendment amends this provision to require publication of the adoption, alteration or substitution of a code of practice on a website determined by the chief executive officer.

Section 97—Vacancy in office

The current provision does not provide clarity for a council to deal with the withdrawal of a resignation of a chief executive officer. This amendment clarifies that the chief executive officer may withdraw a written resignation notice and that the council has the power to accept the withdrawal, if it so decides.

Section 110A—Duty to protect confidential information

This amendment is a recommendation of the former Ombudsman in his 2012 Confidentiality Audit. This amendment clarifies that a council employee or former employee must not disclose information or a document in relation to which there is an order requiring that it be treated confidentially, unless the release of such information is required or authorised by law, such as the provision of information to the Office of Public Integrity, the Ombudsman, a Minister or the Police. The maximum penalty is \$10,000 or 2 years imprisonment. This provision mirrors the amendment to section 62 in relation to council members.

Section 122—Strategic management plans

This amendment clarifies that the forward projections in a council's long-term financial plan and its infrastructure and asset management plan must be consistent with each other.

Section 123(4)(a)—Annual business plans and budgets

This amendment requires publication of the notice on a website determined by the chief executive officer, consistent with other similar provisions in the Bill.

Section 123(5)—Annual business plans and budgets

This amendment requires that the draft annual business plan be made available on a website determined by the chief executive officer, consistent with other similar provisions in the Bill.

Section 123(9)(b)—Annual business plans and budgets

This amendment requires that the annual business plan and budget are also required to be made available on a website determined by the chief executive officer, consistent with other similar provisions in the Bill.

Section 126(4)(ad)—Audit committee

This is a minor technical amendment that deletes the provision, as Schedule 2, Part 1, Clause 13(2) clearly states that a subsidiary must establish an audit committee.

Section 169(1)—Objections to valuations made by council

This amendment intends to avoid the situation where an appeal is taken straight to SACAT without the Council having the opportunity to rectify the matter or get sufficient information to enable a correction if necessary. This only applies to valuations provided by valuers directly engaged by councils. Most councils use the services of the Valuer-General for this purpose. This amendment clarifies that a person is to first lodge an objection with the Council and only go to SACAT if it is unresolved. The intention is to achieve due process and a better resolution of complaints.

Section 174(2)—Inspection of assessment record

This amendment intends to meet privacy concerns and clarifies that the information accessed from the assessment record is not to be used for commercial purposes, with a maximum penalty of \$10,000. It aims to protect property owners from real estate agents or other commercial entities accessing such information for commercial purposes.

Section 202(4)—Alienation of community land by lease or licence

This amendment aims to provide for leases of community land by community groups that involve significant infrastructure investment by increasing the term of the lease from 21 years to 42 years. It is intended that this will provide greater certainty for those community groups such as sporting clubs.

Section 219(7)—Power to assign a name, or change the name, of a or

This amendment achieves consistency by changing the publication requirements to that in the proposed amended public notice requirements in Section 4.

Section 237(3a)—Removal of vehicles

This amendment clarifies that a vehicle that is legally parked on a public road will not be taken to have been left on the road for the purposes of this section, unless an authorised person considers that it has been abandoned. The intention is that it be made clear that a car that is legally parked cannot be towed, impounded or sold by council unless it has been properly determined that it has been abandoned.

Section 237(4) – Removal of vehicles

This amendment arose from safety concerns due to vehicle owners attempting to access their impounded vehicles without contacting the council. Accordingly, this amendment removes the requirement to give notice of the place to which the vehicle was removed. The intent is that the prescribed form clearly provides a council contact name/number so the owner can contact that person for retrieval of the vehicle.

Section 270(a1)—Procedures for review of decisions and requests for services

This amendment is a minor technical amendment. The original intent was that the provision address procedures for review of decisions and requests for services, not 'or' as it currently states.

Section 271(5)-(8)—Mediation, conciliation and neutral evaluation

These amendments are minor technical amendments. The current provisions (in error) make no reference to conciliation/conciliator. The amendments correct the provisions to add 'conciliator' and 'conciliation' to be consistent with the title of the section.

Section 294(6)(a)—Power to enter and occupy land

This amendment clarifies the provision by removing the words 'of the curtilage' to avoid confusion about its definition and now states 'land that is within 500 metres of a house or dwelling'.

Section 299—Vegetation clearance on private land

This amendment repeals this provision as councils are reluctant to use this power to act on a request from a land owner for removal of vegetation on adjoining private land, due to liability concerns, and it is considered more appropriate that it be a private, civil matter. It brings private tree disputes in line with other private disputes, such as fences.

Schedule 2—Publication of charters of subsidiaries

Currently, a minor amendment to a charter of a subsidiary still requires that the charter be published in its entirety in the Gazette, which can involve high costs that are considered to be onerous, especially for small subsidiaries. This amendment amends the relevant clauses to require that a subsidiary must ensure that a notice of the charter is published in the Gazette and that a website address to the copy of the charter should be included in the notice. The intention is to achieve a balance between the high costs of publishing with the need to provide public notice.

Repeal of the *Local Government Act 1934*

Part XXV – Sewerage and drainage—Sections 528-531

It is proposed that these provisions be repealed as they are redundant due to the operation of the *South Australian Public Health (Wastewater) Regulations 2013*.

Part XXXIX—By-laws, model by-laws and regulations

It is proposed that these provision be repealed as they are obsolete due to *Residential Tenancies (Rooming Houses) Regulations 1999, Residential Tenancies Act 1995, Fair Trading Act 1987, Development Act 1993, Passenger Transport Regulations 2009*.

S667(1)(3)(XVI) Lodging Houses: repeal these provisions—obsolete.

S667(1)(3) (XX)-(LIV) Taxis: repeal these provisions—obsolete.

S667(1)(4) Nuisances: repeal these provisions—obsolete.

S667(1)(5) and (7) Animals in streets and roads: repeal these provisions—obsolete.

S667(2): repeal this provision—obsolete.

S668 *Local Government Act 1999* applies: repeal.

Division III – s691 Regulations

Repeal as obsolete upon repeal of this Act.

Part XL – Legal Procedure

Repeal as obsolete due to section 144 of the 99 Act.

S692 – Recovery of amounts due to council: repeal.

S696 – Authentication of certain documents by the council: repeal upon repeal of the Act.

S698 – Representation of council before courts: repeal.

S699 – Reimbursement of officer: repeal.

S717 – Payment of fees etc to council: repeal.

Part XLI—Evidence

Inadvertently not included in the *Local Government (Implementation)(Repeal of Certain Provisions) Proclamation 2007*.

S743A – Evidentiary presumption: repeal.

Part XLII – Penalties

Obsolete upon repeal of the Act.

Ss789A-D: repeal.

S790 – Non-performance of provisions of this Act: repeal.

S791 – Penalty for Offence against this Act: repeal.

S794A – Expiation fees may be fixed: repeal.

Part XLVI – Miscellaneous Matters

S880 – Crown land under management of council for certain purposes: repeal.

S886BB – Coast protection at West Beach: repeal.

S888 – Application to Crown: repeal.

S889 – Delegation by Ministers: repeal.

S890 – Incorporation of standards etc: repeal.

City of Adelaide Act 1998: miscellaneous amendment

Section 24(9)—Elected Member Allowances

Currently, the *City of Adelaide Act* uses a different method for adjusting the relevant elected member allowances than the one in the *Local Government Act*. It is desirable that the method for adjusting allowances in the *City of Adelaide Act* be consistent with the *Local Government Act*.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Local Government Act 1999*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Definitions are inserted for the purposes of the measure.

5—Amendment of section 12—Composition and wards

The Electoral Commissioner's certificate for the purposes of the provision is to be published on a website determined by the chief executive officer of the relevant council (rather than on 'the Internet').

6—Amendment of section 44—Delegations

The power to determine allowances under Chapter 5 of the Act is deleted from the list of matters that a council may not delegate. The power to revoke the classification of land as community land under section 194 is added to the list.

7—Amendment of section 48—Prudential requirements for certain activities

Minor amendments are made to the provisions relating to prudential requirements for certain activities.

8—Amendment of section 50—Public consultation policies

In addition to the existing requirements, a council's public consultation policy must also provide for publication of notices on a website determined by the chief executive officer.

9—Amendment of section 54—Casual vacancies

A council member's office becomes vacant if the member is removed from office by the council on the ground that he or she has been absent, without leave of the council, from 3 or more consecutive ordinary meetings of the council.

10—Amendment of section 62—General duties

New subsection (4a) makes it an offence for a member or former member of a council to disclose information or a document, in relation to which there is an order of a council or council committee in effect under section 90 requiring the information or document to be treated confidentially. The maximum penalty is a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years. New subsection (4b) provides for an exception if the disclosure of information or the document is required or authorised by law.

11—Substitution of section 67

Section 67 is substituted:

67—Form and content of returns

The substituted section makes it an offence to fail to notify the chief executive officer of a change or variation in the information appearing on the Register in respect of a council member or a person related to the member (within the meaning of Schedule 3) within 1 month of the change or variation. The maximum penalty is a fine of \$10,000. Subsection (2) provides for a defence to a charge of the offence.

12—Amendment of section 68—Register of Interests

New subsection (4) authorises the chief executive officer to suppress certain addresses from publication on the Register.

13—Amendment of section 70—Inspection of Register

Certain details on the Register must be published on a website determined by the chief executive officer of a council.

The deletion of subsection (3) would enable members of the public to inspect or obtain a copy of the Register without having to submit a written application. The deletion of subsection (4) is consequential.

14—Substitution of Chapter 5 Part 4 Division 3

The provisions relating to conflicts of interest of council members in Chapter 5 Part 4 Division 3 are substituted:

Division 3—Conflicts of interest

Subdivision 1—Material conflicts of interest

73—Material conflicts of interest

This section sets out where a member has a *material conflict of interest*.

74—Dealing with material conflicts of interest

This section provides for how members must deal with material conflicts of interest. Relevantly, the member must declare the interest and leave (and stay out of) the meeting room while the matter involving the interest is being discussed and voted on. Provision is made for the Minister to grant approvals for members to be involved in matters where they have a material conflicts of interest in certain circumstances.

Subdivision 2—Actual and perceived conflicts of interest

75—Actual and perceived conflicts of interest

This section sets out the meaning of conflicts of interest for the purposes of the Subdivision.

75A—Dealing with actual and perceived conflicts of interest

This section provides that members must deal with actual and perceived conflicts of interest in a transparent and accountable way.

Subdivision 3—Other matters

75B—Application of Division to members and meetings of committees and subsidiaries

Section 75B replicates existing section 75 for the purposes of extending the application of the Division to members and meetings of committees and subsidiaries.

15—Amendment of section 76—Allowances

Subsection (8) is amended to provide that allowances will be payable for a period that aligns with the term of a member of a council (as provided for in section 53 of the Act). The other amendment is a related amendment.

16—Amendment of section 85—Quorum

This amendment is consequential on the substitution of Chapter 5 Part 4 Division 3.

17—Amendment of section 90—Meetings to be held in public except in special circumstances

Subsection (4) is amended to specify that, in considering whether to make an order under subsection (2) (being an order that a matter be discussed in confidence), it is irrelevant that discussion of a matter in public may involve discussion of a matter that is controversial within the council area or the State or make the council susceptible to adverse criticism.

Further details are required to be noted in the minutes of a meeting relating to any order made under subsection (2).

The other amendments require a council to adopt a policy setting out requirements relating to the holding of informal gatherings and discussions.

18—Amendment of section 91—Minutes and release of documents

Limitations are placed on the power of a council to extend the duration of an order to keep council minutes and other documents (or parts of minutes or documents) confidential.

19—Amendment of section 92—Access to meetings and documents—code of practice

A code and any alterations must be published on a website determined by the chief executive officer.

20—Amendment of section 97—Vacancy in office

The amendments allow a chief executive officer of a council who resigns to withdraw the resignation by notice in writing to the council, provided that the withdrawal occurs before the date that the resignation takes effect and the council accepts the withdrawal.

21—Insertion of section 110A

Section 110A is inserted:

110A—Duty to protect confidential information

New section 110A makes it an offence for an employee or former employee of a council to disclose information or a document in relation to which there is an order of a council or council committee in effect under section 90 requiring the information or document to be treated confidentially. The maximum penalty is a fine of \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years. An exception is provided for where the disclosure of information or the document is required or authorised by law.

22—Amendment of section 122—Strategic management plans

The first amendment provides that financial projections in a long-term financial plan adopted by a council must be consistent with those in the infrastructure and asset management plan adopted by the council. Another amendment clarifies that the requirement to adopt processes to ensure that members of the public are given a reasonable opportunity to be involved in the development and review of a council's strategic management plans does not limit the general power of a council to amend its strategic plans or adopt new plans.

23—Amendment of section 123—Annual business plans and budgets

These amendments relate to the publication of plans and budgets on a website determined by the chief executive officer (including electronic copies of the annual business plan).

24—Amendment of section 126—Audit committee

One of the functions of a council audit committee (performing the functions that would have been required to be performed by a subsidiary's audit committee if the subsidiary had not obtained an exemption from the requirement to have an audit committee) is repealed.

25—Amendment of section 132—Access to documents

The first amendment provides that certain documents must be published on a website determined by the chief executive officer of the relevant council (rather than on 'the Internet'). The other amendment clarifies that subsection (3) requires that documents no longer subject to a confidentiality order under section 91 of the Act (which, as a result, automatically become available for inspection under section 91) also be published on the website by the council.

26—Amendment of section 155—Service rates and service charges

Section 155(5a) is amended for technical reasons so that the reference to ESCOSA fixing a price for a prescribed service under another Act is altered to be a reference to ESCOSA regulating prices, conditions relating to prices, and price-fixing factors for a prescribed service.

27—Amendment of section 169—Objections to valuations made by council

In 2014, Parliament passed legislation to give certain review functions under the section previously performed by the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT). The section is now amended to align the review provisions with those in the *Valuation of Land Act 1971*.

28—Amendment of section 174—Inspection of assessment record

The amendment makes it an offence for a person who inspects the assessment record or obtains a copy of an entry made in the assessment record under the section to use the information so obtained for advertising or marketing activities for commercial purposes. The maximum penalty is a fine of \$10,000.

29—Amendment of section 202—Alienation of community land by lease or licence

The term of a lease or licence is amended to 42 years (from 21 years).

30—Amendment of section 219—Power to assign a name, or change the name, of a road or public place

Notice of the adoption or alteration of a policy must be published in the Gazette, a newspaper circulating within the area of the relevant council and on a website determined by the chief executive officer.

31—Insertion of section 234A

The power to prohibit traffic or close streets or roads, currently in the *Local Government Act 1934 (the 1934 Act)* is inserted into the Act with certain variations:

234A—Prohibition of traffic or closure of streets or roads

New section 234A is similar to section 359 of the 1934 Act. However, new section 234A includes limitations on the power to prohibit traffic or close streets or roads. In particular, a prohibition or closure relating to a road under new section 234A may only operate for a 30 day period.

32—Amendment of section 237—Removal of vehicles

Subsection (3) is amended to allow the regulations to prescribe variations to the application of subsections (1) and (2) in prescribed circumstances.

New subsection (3a) is inserted to clarify that the authorised person proposing to place a notice under subsection (1) on a vehicle that is lawfully parked or left standing on a public road cannot do so unless the vehicle has, in his or her opinion, been abandoned.

33—Amendment of section 246—Power to make by-laws

Section 246 is amended to insert the general power (currently in the 1934 Act) of a council to make by-laws for the good rule and government of the area, and for the convenience, comfort and safety of the community.

34—Amendment of section 264—Complaint lodged in District Court

One amendment limits the ability to lodge a complaint against a member of the council in the District Court to a person authorised in writing by the Minister or the council, or the chief executive officer of a council (currently, complaints may be lodged by a public official (after an investigation of the matter by the Ombudsman) or by a person in receipt of an approval to do so). Another amendment reflects the fact that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption is authorised to investigate complaints against council members. The other amendments are consequential.

35—Amendment of section 265—Hearing by District Court

This amendment reflects the fact that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption is authorised to investigate complaints against council members.

36—Amendment of section 270—Procedures for review of decisions and requests for services

This is a technical amendment.

37—Amendment of section 271—Mediation, conciliation and neutral evaluation

These are technical amendments.

38—Amendment of section 294—Power to enter and occupy land in connection with an activity

A minor amendment is made to the power to enter and occupy land in connection with an activity.

39—Repeal of section 299

The provision relating to the powers of a council to clear vegetation under section 299 is repealed.

40—Amendment of Schedule 2—Provisions applicable to subsidiaries

Minor amendments relating to the publication of certain matters by subsidiaries are made.

Schedule 1—Related amendment, repeal and transitional provisions

Part 1—Related amendment to *City of Adelaide Act 1998*

1—Amendment of section 24—Allowances

The section is amended to retain consistency with section 76 of the *Local Government Act 1999*.

Part 2—Repeal of *Local Government Act 1934*

The *Local Government Act 1934* is repealed.

Part 3—Transitional provisions

Division 1—Transitional provisions related to repeal of *Local Government Act 1934*

Transitional provisions connected to the repeal of the *Local Government Act 1934* are provided for.

Division 2—Transitional provision related to objections to valuations

The clause provides for transitional matters related to the amendments to section 169 of the principal Act connected with the jurisdiction given to SACAT.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 June 2015.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:15): I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill 2015. We have this opportunity subsequent to the government presenting its budget for the forthcoming three financial years, but in particular the forthcoming financial year. I think we are now day one into it. One matter which must be identified first up is that South Australia's economy is in difficulty and probably it will get worse. Our economic indicators are desperate, in particular in respect of youth unemployment.

What is concerning to me is that at a time when the government needs to act responsibly, to be careful about how it spends other people's money, taxpayers' money, and to ensure that it is applied for the best benefit of South Australia, it utterly fails in the jobs area. Many other speakers have spoken about the jobs that we have lost, the jobs that we will lose, many thousands of them over the next few years, and the financial predicament that that will place so many South Australian families in, particularly for those who stay and do not escape by migrating to another area.

The government had that opportunity and they have missed it. They claim in this budget that they will plan for and predict an economic growth of 1 per cent in this forthcoming year. That is even less than they proposed last year which is concerning in itself. The position is that we are at a 7.6 per cent unemployment rate as at May this year which is the highest in the nation. Our unemployment of young people is scandalous.

My view is that the government has given up. In fact, in 2003 when former premier Rann announced that he would have a strategic plan in South Australia, he had a number of population targets to deal with the future prosperity of South Australia. The first was that we would have a population target to increase South Australia's population to 2 million by 2050 with an interim target of 1.6 million by 2014. We have kept the former, that is still continuing. We are a long way off, and I think that it is going to be impossible to achieve but nevertheless that is still there.

We had other targets in respect of overseas migration and the population fertility rate. I would have to say the former is keeping us going and the latter is alarmingly low still. It is still less than two children per couple in South Australia, which means that in South Australia we would have to expect that for most young women they are still likely to have more husbands than children in their lifetime. Furthermore, the target that we had for interstate migration—that is when the net amount coming to our state is less than the amount going—had a target at reducing annual net interstate migration loss to zero by 2010 with a net inflow thereafter to be sustained through to 2014. Guess what? We are in 2015, we still have not reached that target and, in fact, on the material published by the government last year as at March 2014, the net loss from the state was still at 3,384 people. That is how serious that situation is.

As for the regional population target, that was also aspirational, I would have to say—that is, that there would be a maintenance of the regional population of the state's share of population at 18 per cent. That was abandoned in 2011, although it had no hope of reaching that. It was then converted to increasing regional population outside of greater Adelaide by 20,000 to 320,000 or more by 2020. That target under the review last year remains. Let me tell you: if you look at the graph, it is off the graph as to where we would ever possibly achieve that for South Australia's regional population. The Pedericks would have to have at least 15 more children and that is a worry in itself. I have to tell you that it is a serious situation, yet the government—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: That is alarming in itself, as I said. However, that is an aspirational target which even the government cannot possibly expect to achieve. So what do they do about it? What is their proposal this year? The government's proposal this year, to help population in South Australia, is to have a new WorkReady program. If this is one of the iconic pieces of policy and budgeting proposals of this government it tells you how hopelessly irresponsible they are and how out of touch they are. To introduce a policy that says 90 per cent of the placements have to go through the public

education sector, and that we will rip those out of the independent RTOs and leave those families facing bankruptcy and organisations facing liquidation, is so stupid.

It is without foresight, and it is so destructive in terms not only of being able to keep those businesses going but also of the necessity to actually keep our performing young people, our educated young people, in South Australia to develop expertise and opportunity in this state rather than moving interstate. This government introduces a policy that slams those small businesses, adds to the jobs unemployment in the state, and puts industries out in the regional parts of South Australia—which are keeping this economy going—in a difficult position because they do not have the workforce to go with it.

Just this week the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies published a very interesting report in respect of the structural changes in South Australia in respect of its economic history. It makes the point of the necessity of having highly educated young people in our employment areas, particularly in agriculture, mining and manufacturing, because it is this high level of experience and specialist knowledge and skills that is required for us to get out of this mess. They also report (and it is interesting) on interstate migration. They say this:

Of those who were resident in South Australia in 2006, 12 per cent of those who have a post graduate degree were resident in a different state/territory in 2011, as were 8 per cent of those who have a bachelor's degree. This is a significantly greater rate of interstate migration than in Victoria, where the equivalent figures were 6 per cent and 4.5 per cent respectively. If South Australia had had the same rate of outward skilled migration as Victoria, in 2011 it would have had 1,800 more residents with a postgraduate degree, and 4,700 more residents with a bachelor's degree.

That is an alarming statistic, and the government needs to wake up and realise what is happening here. This is not just the bleeding of our best and brightest, these are the people we are going to need to actually kickstart the economy, whether it is in manufacturing or in the advancement of our already important agricultural and manufacturing industries, as well, of course, as in the area of mining. Whilst that might come and go it is still a very, very important part of the opportunities for South Australia.

I do not know whether the government has given up completely or whether they are still flying in the dark, in some sort of Peter Pan and Wendy story where they are hoping Tinkerbell is just going to turn dust into millions of dollars and drop it onto them to keep them going. I do not know what sort of fantasyland they are living in, but we are in a difficult position and it is going to get worse in the immediate future. Our best and brightest have abandoned us; they are still going over the border. Clearly we are not about to enter into a breeding program, and this state is going to get worse before it gets better. So wake up, minister Koutsantonis, and get out of your Peter Pan headspace.

In relation to the WorkReady program, I would only ask the government to stop peddling this drivel about having consulted the industry and having an understanding about what is happening. I read the transcript of the Hon. Gail Gago and her answers to questions on this yesterday, and it made me sick. This government is so out of touch. It is important that she understands—because she is answering the questions up there and peddling this drivel—and that her government understands that this is a very damaging policy, and that if they continue in this vein there will be no good, smart, young people left in this state. We will be like Greece. We will be looking to have bank accounts in other countries to survive. That is how sick the situation is.

When I look at this year's budget, instead of just the usual rip-off that we have, they have a new steal, slash and sell policy. I have said in this parliament year after year that the government is just selling off assets blindly. Well, they are still going ahead in this year's budget. But let's start their new policy. Their new policy is to steal from each other.

Firstly, I pick up the Attorney-General's budget this year, which is minuscule—0.02 per cent of the state budget. It is tiny, in respect of what we spend on our courts and on the Attorney-General's portfolios. What do I find? I find in there that the \$6 million cost for the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission is being booked up in the Attorney-General's Department. Unless we are going to have nuclear powered courts in South Australia, it is completely unacceptable that that money, which is needed for courts, which would have kept open the courts out at—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Holden Hill—

Ms CHAPMAN: At Holden Hill, indeed—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: —and Mount Barker; I'm helping you.

Ms CHAPMAN: —the Deputy Speaker would be very familiar with the Holden Hill court. It would have kept judges in the Youth Court and stopped the slashing of expenditure in very important areas for the administration of justice. It would have meant that we could have had the Victims of Crime funding much earlier. These are all things that have been just slashed across as a result of government budget pressures, and yet that area, that small part of the budget, is having to pick up the \$6 million bill for the Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission. That is outrageous! Where was the Deputy Premier; where was the Attorney-General? Was he asleep during the budget acceptance, during the cabinet meetings? This is a disgrace.

What is more, the Treasurer publishes in his budget that he is going to be asking the federal government to share the cost of this. It is already happening! The terms of reference have been written; Mr Scarce has already been appointed; it is underway. That is like Kevin Foley going to Mr Demetriou five years ago and saying, 'How about kicking into the Adelaide Oval, after I have already announced I am paying for the lot?', and he says, 'Nick off.' I mean, hello, good luck, that the Treasurer is going to get \$3 million or \$4 million out of the federal government to contribute to this when it is already underway. That's a joke!

Start understanding, Deputy Premier, that with the small budget we have for justice, reform, courts, the administration of protection of people in this state, you have to stay awake in those cabinet meetings and not let \$6 million just slip off your budget and accept that, when it is so necessary in other areas. Deputy Speaker, your local electors are going to miss out. They are not going to have a court to go to. The \$2 million or \$3 million that it cost to run that court—axed! It is not acceptable, and the Attorney-General needs to be condemned for that.

I turn to NRM boards. As I mentioned earlier in this parliament today, they have been stripped of millions of dollars in this year's budget and over the next forward estimates, to prop up the budget of the Department of Environment. They have to pay for the cost of the management fees of the government out of their water planning and management fees and the NRM land levies; millions of dollars a year out of water planning alone. It gets up to \$6 million after four years, starting at \$2.5 million this year. Then, what is more, they have been sent across to pay for the cost of operating and maintaining the Patowalonga lake system and Glenelg gates. The Department of Environment has run out of money, so what do they do? They just steal it out of the NRM boards.

We had this morning the ridiculous situation where we were being asked to approve levy increases on the recommendation of the committee responsible for that for boards, in a circumstance where they are simply not responsible to undertake that capital work, but the government is expecting them, by ministerial direction. Mr Hunter comes in and says, 'I'm taking out these millions of dollars.' That is just disgraceful.

Another example, of course, which is a bit of a precedent now, is raiding the MAC money. Raid the Motor Accident Commission. When you run out of money, just take their money. Now they are going to take the rest of it and they are going to flog off the right to be able to actually access and provide insurance in this space, as a means, they say, to make provision for a king hit to the budget. They have done it before. They are getting a practice run on it now. Apart from that, of course, they have dumped debt and asset provision through SA Water. So, they just raid the instrumentalities. They just steal it from somewhere else.

Then we come to the slashing of infrastructure. This is the announced claim of the government that they are going to create jobs by spending \$1.3 billion and \$1.45 billion per year over the forward estimate on capital works in the general government sector—hello! I do not know where the Treasurer has been, but we have been spending \$1.9 billion per year in average capital works over the last five years. It is not acceptable for the government to come in and say, 'We are going to slash that expenditure'—most of which is left in the budget is from the commonwealth—'and we are going to use that as our means of stimulating the economy.' He needs to again add up where that is occurring.

Secondly, when they had an opportunity to build a courts precinct, while they are busily paying for a nuclear fuel cycle royal commission they have suddenly got no money to do the 'not value for money' courts precinct which the government has been working on for years, and it has

allocated hundreds of thousands of dollars, probably millions, in the total cost of preparing for the courts precinct project to date (we have not got the direct figure on that yet). But what happens? They just cancel that. It is 'not value for money' anymore. That is their answer to dealing with the predicament that we are in.

Finally, there is the stupidity of continuing to perpetuate the idea of selling off assets without even proper process. Gillman is a classic example. Do not put it out to public tender. We will sell it to one group. We will lock up \$122 million, but we get it over the next 12 years. Who knows where that is going to go. I expect the first tranche when they finally settle on that, which goes into Renewal SA, will be used to prop up their budget because there is another underperforming constantly in deficit entity which is still not making any money. This was going to be the great panacea of opportunity of money making for the government. It has been given a new job to flog off a whole lot of Housing Trust houses which were transferred earlier this year, but it is still in an economic mess and the money that is coming in from Gillman that they are selling off will be sucked into that black hole.

They are selling off all of the rest of the significant buildings. They have flogged off just about everything else. The State Administration Centre, which includes the home of government, is going to be sold. Now it is to include the Torrens Building, which they promised was not to be included initially. Who knows whether in fact we are about to even lose other historic assets of the state. We know that a 70-year lease has been sold off at the back of this Parliament House in the plaza. We know that the MAC insurance money is to come in. They have Glenside Hospital up for sale and Fort Largs. I am told that Edmund Wright House is ready to go on the market. But who knows? Is whatever they have left going on the market?

The tragedy here is that the government does not seem to wake up with the experience they had with the lotteries and the forests in that they are selling off these assets under pressure—and we can say, 'Well, it's your own silly fault for being in that position'—and what happens? We are selling off public assets for far less than what they are worth, and how many times do we have to hear that?

When the forest rotations were sold we had eminent people come out and say, 'They sold it off for \$500 million. It was worth \$1 billion.' This is the sort of situation we find ourselves in. What the Leader of the Opposition has said is that, if you are going to do some stimulating investment into the state by stamp duty relief or other things, do not do it in three years' time, do it now. If you are going to sell assets, even if they are under par, do not spend it on recurrent expenditure. Put it into the Asset Recycling Fund, which is on the table by Deputy Prime Minister Truss, which can be used to leverage out more capital funds for South Australia.

That is the smart thing to do, not sell under pressure. But, if you have already signed the contract and the money is coming in, do not throw it up against the wall. Do not use it to prop up an irresponsible budget. Put it in a fund which will give a chance for South Australians to have a job in infrastructure redevelopment. That is the smart thing to do. I am very disappointed in hearing contributions from the government to date and would only hope that they listen more carefully.

Time expired.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (12:35): I rise to speak in support of the Appropriation Bill 2015. My community, the beautiful seat of Fisher, is residential in the main. Some of the most important things to the people of my community are jobs, access to those jobs, and access to health care and equity in education. They want honesty, choice and quality of life. This is an honest budget that ensures my community has choice and quality in all of their priority needs.

This budget is about jobs. It is about investing in our community. This budget is about looking after our community and, in particular, it is about protecting the vulnerable. The innovation and transformation of the tax structure directly targets business and is incredibly positive. The reduction and removal of these burdensome taxes serves to encourage investment in new and ongoing business concerns. It will reduce the burden that transferring ownership of plant and property can generate, which in fact can deter investment in business.

By encouraging the investment in business and continuance of our local concerns, we generate a sense of positivity in our community. We encourage investment and we create jobs. These are jobs for our children, our grandchildren, our family members, our neighbours, and importantly this attracts people to our state. This budget is about nurturing and supporting an economy that sits within a very fragile global economy. This fragile economy could so easily make us as a government afraid to invest and afraid to spend. We could have stopped moving forward many years ago, but no: the built environment is so vital to investment and reputation. This is vital in order to keep job losses to a minimum within this fragile global economy.

This government went to the state election of March last year with a promise to keep building. I have heard over and over again the negativity from those opposite. This government has delivered. As I walk out of football games or I take time to walk along the beautiful river precinct with my family, I take in the sights of some of the many wonderful pieces of infrastructure promised by this government alone and delivered by this government alone. SAHMRI, the new RAH, the Convention Centre, Adelaide Oval, the footbridge and tram extension are all wonderful and to be celebrated both day and night. We have undone the enormous errors of judgment owned by the previous Liberal state government and provided access to the now dual Southern Expressway, the gateway to our fabulous Fleurieu.

I have toured also the fully operational and world-class desalination plant. No, Deputy Speaker, this incredible piece of infrastructure is not in mothballs; it is operational. People forget very quickly what drought is, but they will be quickly reminded, I am sure, if and when we do experience this environmental act of cruelty, and I am positive that we will experience it again, unfortunately. This amazing facility can actually produce half of Adelaide's water supply with approximately 30 people working on site. It is quite incredible.

In the past month, I have also had the great pleasure of being shown around the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. As a clinician, I am so excited about the prospects of health care in this great state and so excited about the prospect of this facility creating benchmarks for health delivery and health outcomes. I understand a positive culture and the positive culture that working in a facility like that will foster. I have worked alongside these incredible people who have been involved in the planning and delivery of not just this amazing project but also Transforming Health, and I trust them. I trust them to deliver and plan health care into the future in our great state.

We must move forward with our health system into this century and build facilities that allow for the delivery of modalities of care which have not even been thought of yet. We need to streamline our services now and use the knowledge that we have to reduce our length of stay in a way that is safe and using best practice. The less time spent in hospital the less risk for falls, infections and other complications. This is why we must manage patients using this economy of scale.

We must do specialised procedures in fewer locations. We must hone our skills and refine our practice. We must move our patients into earlier rehabilitation beds to prevent these complications and then transition them to home in a safe and timely fashion using allied health, medical and nursing staff in a cooperative and multidisciplinary manner. We must do all this while fighting the cruellest of cuts to our health system from a federal government that simply does not care and will not deliver. This state government is investing in all our local health networks and it will not let South Australians down. We do care.

Our children deserve to be invested in. The families of the south of Adelaide are so happy to see that tens of millions of dollars are being invested in schools that provide specialist services by way of their dedicated disability units. In fact, the biggest investment also to the five schools across South Australia that we are supporting the work in are the schools of the very lowest category that serve our most vulnerable children and young people. Again, this investment in infrastructure is part of caring for our community and providing services in a fragile global economy when the Abbott federal government has simply abandoned us.

I am a very proud foster parent. My son's journey has been an incredible challenge. He lived in more than 20 residences over a period of four years. Coming to live in our home at the age of 11, he was at a point in his care where he was facing a lifetime of recidivism or worse, with numeracy and literacy that would place his likelihood of gaining employment at virtually zero. He was frail, both

physically and emotionally, and had very limited capacity to moderate his behaviour. This is not his fault and this is not the fault of the government.

We advocated for him with the support of the team of Families SA. We have in place a tailored life plan that ensures that he has every chance of success in life. Foster carers like us—thousands of them across South Australia—take on this very important role in the lives of the most vulnerable, the most damaged and the highest risk children in this state. We provide stability, love and respect. We become a constant in the lives of children where they have never seen this before. We provide an adult to trust. These children have been treated so badly by adults before in their lives that they have no reason to trust. Developing a relationship where the child in your care does not push you away is an art, a skill and a lifetime commitment. This government has made a clear commitment in this budget to recognise and improve this essential loving and nurturing system of foster care.

More than \$50 million over the next four years is being invested. We will see more wonderful foster carers recruited, educated and supported. We will see an increase in the great team of Families SA and Other Person Guardianship orders. Foster carers parent these vulnerable children—not the government, not the minister but foster parents. The work and dedication not just by the parent but by the child in these relationships must be recognised and rewarded. This government is committed to ensuring that guardianship can be transferred to carers or family members if this is an appropriate situation in order to assist the development of a secure attachment and trust in a stable and loving home.

Another key initiative—an investment within this particular area of the budget—is the plan to assist adolescents residing in residential care who may wish to transition from this out-of-home residential care back to living with birth families at this later point in their life. These families would be able to provide appropriate care due to additional support offered by this program (the teenagers, I promise members, are already very resilient), and they will get additional supports that will ensure that they have a capacity to make safe choices and use their protective behaviours once they return to their parent or their parents. Having met and worked with and loved many young people like this in care, I know that this is a very important and much-needed initiative. Unlike the federal Abbott government, we are not stripping billions of dollars from our community services. We are investing in our community, and I look forward to seeing the benefits of this positive vision for many years to come.

This Labor government is positive and it is visionary. In a fragile global economy, we have a Premier and a Treasurer who have laid out a budget to nurture, protect and build our community. On a national stage, where we are unable to get the support of the federal Abbott government in respect of our motor industry transformation and the building of our ships or our submarines, this government is going to stay positive and do everything it can to attract investment and build an economy conducive to the creation of jobs. We have not forgotten our pensioners, our vulnerable or our at-risk citizens. We care, and it is my absolute pleasure to say that I commend this bill to the house.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:45): I rise to give my contribution in reply to the state budget brought down on 18 June. I would like to start with what is happening in my portfolio areas, beginning with social housing. Firstly, the headline figure of \$36.6 million to continue services provided under the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH) is a fifty-fifty split with the federal government. It actually reflects a cost to the South Australian budget of \$8.87 million in the 2015-16 year and \$8.87 million in the 2016-17 year, totalling \$17.7 million, so you could say it is a bit of an overegging of the announcement.

However, I would like to thank all the NGOs and service providers in the sector who, when I first became the shadow minister, made me very aware of how important the NPAH funding was to South Australia. Many went to great lengths to detail what the money was used for, how important it was that it continue and the amazing results that have been achieved not only for the people they helped but in terms of how the sector had really started working together and had made significant efficiency improvements through collaboration. This was music to my ears. Armed with this information, which was backed up with statistical data from the office of the Minister for Social Housing, for which I thank her very much, I was able to present a strong case to the federal minister,

Scott Morrison, which I am certain helped secure the further two years of funding from the federal government.

There is also another headline figure in the budget of \$65 million for public housing. Grant funding of \$65 million will be provided to the South Australian Housing Trust in the 2014-15 year for refurbishment and construction of public housing stock. Given that the 2014-15 year finished yesterday, I hope perhaps some money went in but will still be available over time. This investment includes \$20 million of additional funds as well as bringing forward funding totalling \$45 million from the next two years.

Noting that this is highlighted under 'Building key infrastructure' and 'Creating jobs through refurbishment and construction of public housing stock', this is possible. However, if you bring forward investment from the future two years, resulting in three times the amount of work in one year with no future commitment, you basically create your own valley of death situation. This sets up a boom and bust scenario with no job security for the workers, who are most likely to be contractors or casuals, as it is only short term. Many will probably come from interstate to fill the short-term demand.

What should happen is a long-term measured approach that builds confidence in the sector and builds jobs—a four or five-year investment would mean apprentices could be taken on and extra staff given permanent jobs that are from South Australia. We already have the highest unemployment rate in the nation. When will the government learn how to actually create jobs and not just spend money?

This budget shows as a highlight the transfer of functions to Renewal SA for community housing. However, in Budget and Finance Committee questioning, it was revealed that the transfer results in losses every year, with the highest being a loss of \$1.69 million in the 2018-19 year. Who negotiates a deal to transfer stock and loses \$1.69 million? No wonder we continue to be in deficit. Comparing the 2014-15 year targets for social housing with the 2015-16 highlights, of the nine targets, six have not been completed. Three projects are partially completed and three are not even mentioned at all, which is quite worrying.

Regarding the care and protection budget, none of the six targets listed for the 2014-15 year has been achieved. All of these have been relisted as targets in the 2015-16 year, and many have changed or diminished in scope. The big announcement of the \$9.4 million for a royal commission into the state's child protection system includes \$3.365 million for the 2014-15 year (i.e. it has already been spent), with \$5.64 million in the 2015-16 year and \$3.57 million in the 2016-17 year. Given the government is waiting on this royal commission to report to make decisions and recommendations regarding things such as a children's commissioner, it is worrying that the budget extends out to 2016-17.

This is also the 10th inquiry or select committee since Labor came to power, yet the system is in total disarray and we still do not have a long-awaited children's commissioner. The government still plans to employ an extra 360 residential care workers, despite the Guardian for Children and Young People calling on a reduction of children living in residential care. Recent research conducted by the University of Adelaide found 'that being placed in residential state care as opposed to foster care was associated with almost 12 times greater likelihood of offending'.

The number of children in non-home based residential care in South Australia is 12.7 per cent. This is 131 per cent higher than the national average, yet the government is locking in residential care staff in permanent positions, whilst also funding an extra 100 foster carers (which I welcome). Thus, this leaves no flexibility to reduce numbers when more children move into foster care, which is definitely the preferred option. I guess they will later pay huge separation payments, as this government's history would suggest: it is only taxpayers' money, what does it matter?

There has been a huge increase of 22.6 per cent of investigations and an increase in substantiations of 23.2 per cent, which I welcome. Given the Productivity Commission's RoGS show that in the 2012-13 year 19.9 per cent of substantiations were made within 12 months of a decision not to substantiate, this is a very poor result and demonstrates that children are being left in potentially dangerous situations with all the impacts of cumulative harm. This is 25 per cent above the national rate and potentially shows a lack of or ineffective investigations.

Regarding international and higher education budget figures, international education is South Australia's number one service export and was worth \$972 million in the 2013-14 year and provided around 8,000 jobs. The Weatherill government reduced funding to this important industry, despite it already falling behind in its targets and despite how important it is to our economy. The government has now increased funding by \$5.662 million over the next four years. This is still below the Liberal promise at the 2014 election of \$2.2 million per annum, which equates to \$8.8 million over the same time period or \$3.138 million more than the Labor policy.

The Liberal policy recognises both the importance of the industry and the fact that we continue to fall behind other states in our percentage share of the market and fail to meet our targets. The percentage of South Australia's share of the overseas student market dropped from (in 2011-12) 5.5 per cent and we now have a target of only 5.3 per cent in 2015-16, which is far from the Labor promise of achieving a 9 per cent share by 2013.

Whilst enrolments and commencements continue to rise slightly, we continue to lose our share compared to increases around Australia. Our percentage share cannot be blamed on the Australian dollar, the global financial crisis or the federal government, as all states in Australia have had the same conditions. This shows a lack of commitment by this Labor government to fund this sector properly.

The volunteers budget shows that screening costs have again risen this year, making it a 35 per cent increase over the last 13 months. Nine hundred thousand individuals volunteer each year in South Australia, which is valued at \$5 billion per year in the 2013-14 annual report. These are not the people the government should be hitting up for money. This government needs to improve the efficiency of its own screening processes and pass on the savings to consumers, not charge them for its own incompetencies.

Regarding local issues, the Adelaide Festival Centre shows a budget of \$197 million in the forward estimates. Whilst I welcome the upgrade of the Festival Centre, I do not agree with public money being used to help fund the development of a highly profitable car park with a private owner, nor do I support the high-rise development on Hyatt Plaza which is part of the Parklands.

I also note that \$215.6 million will be spent over the forward estimates on education projects, including a new city high school which is listed as \$85 million; however, we already know that this has blown out by \$30 million for the purchase of a second-hand building. This all started as Adelaide High School was oversubscribed with a huge waiting list and calls every day by parents wanting to enrol their children. My belief is that people were wanting Adelaide High School not just a high school and this was not only due to the city being easily accessible by public transport but Adelaide High School's great academic excellence, its range of subjects, its languages as well as its rowing and cricket programs. Adelaide High School has a great reputation and history that cannot just be replicated in a new school.

All prior lobbying by schools and calls from the community was about gaining entry to Adelaide High School not just any city high school. A second campus of Adelaide High School is preferred with a campus in close proximity on West Terrace. Why build a health-science specialty school in the East End when the universities are moving health sciences to the west to be near the NRAH and the SAHMRI buildings?

Another concern is the government's announcement that both year 8 and year 9 will start in 2019, thus nearby schools and in particular the current Adelaide High School will lose students after one year meaning scheduling, teacher numbers, timetabling and budgeting will be affected and very difficult to manage for that year. Why not take the opportunity to have year 7 in high school as they do in every other state?

That leads me to the O-Bahn. There is \$160 million budgeted for the O-Bahn. Instead of delivering the desperately needed park-and-ride stations along the O-Bahn, Labor has revealed version 4 of the O-Bahn. I acknowledge the changes to reinstate parking and the slight improvement of the impact on Rymill Park; however, it does not go far enough and I question whether it should go ahead at all. Budgeting \$160 million to save 2½ minutes in the morning is outrageous. Passenger surveys show that most people would prefer more parking or an extension of the service rather than saving 2½ minutes.

If more people catch the bus, the 2½ minutes saved will most likely be taken up by walking further from their car park in order to gain access to the O-Bahn. What is the cost-benefit analysis? Is this really the most beneficial public transport project in the state, or is this as it appears: just about pork-barrelling marginal seats in the north-east using public money for political gain? What about fulfilling the twice broken promise of electrifying the Gawler line? Given this is version 4, does the government even have a statewide or citywide plan? Do they even really know what they are doing or will they continue street by street to ruin traffic flows through the city?

Let me start with the tram, a great Labor idea. Everyone loves the tram because it is free and we like trams. However, bear in mind this replaced the 99B that ran every five minutes in two directions and went further, had minimal cost and did not require any extra infrastructure. Being a business owner on North Terrace at the time, I can tell you that the loss of amenity to my business and the serious impacts on my business was one of the contributing factors that led me to run for parliament, so you can thank the tram, in part, for me being here today.

Unlike a tram in Melbourne where you can actually drive on the lanes, we lost two lanes along King William Street, we lost two lanes along North Terrace, we lost all right-hand turns north of Victoria Square and we made access very difficult to get across. My business on North Terrace was basically inaccessible from nearly every direction. We lost all of our loading zones and car parking in front of the building because of extra lights that had to go in and the amenity was severely reduced. Adelaide High School students also lost the 99B stop that would have dropped them right near their school. I think there were a lot of losses even though everyone loves new facilities and new trams. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today year 11 pupils from Cummins Area School, who are guests of an old scholar, the member for Flinders.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Summary Offences Act 1953—

Dangerous Area Declarations pursuant to Section 83B, Report for Period
1 October 2014 to 31 March 2015

Road Block Establishment Authorisations pursuant to Section 74B, Report for
Period 1 October 2014 to 31 March 2015

Ministerial Statement

RETURN TO WORKSA

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Today marks the commencement of the return-to-work scheme in South Australia. The return-to-work scheme is designed to deliver better health outcomes for people who have suffered an injury at work by providing them with more focused, timely and tailored recovery and return-to-work services.

Through the use of early intervention and personalised face-to-face services, workers and their employers will be supported in achieving a fast and sustainable recovery and return to work.

Seriously injured workers will receive lifetime care and income support to retirement age and return-to-work assistance, if requested. Claimants who are currently receiving medical and income support have been engaged in intensive discussions to identify and work through their options, including redemption of their claim.

Some long-term claimants have chosen to remove themselves altogether from the scheme. Others with existing claims will transition to intensive, personalised case management and access to return-to-work services. The new return-to-work scheme provides an opportunity for those workers to maximise the opportunities provided by the new scheme and to get the help needed to achieve a return to work.

The active management approach by ReturnToWorkSA has already produced positive results, notably, that it is fully funded at 100.7 per cent, and that the average premium rate for 2015-16 will be 1.95 per cent plus the work health and safety fee—the lowest rate in the scheme's history.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: But there is more; it will get better, don't worry. It is supported by a new insurance model that is easier for employers to understand and allows them to directly influence the amount of premium they pay through effective return-to-work strategies and facilitating the provision of suitable employment to injured workers. For example, a large employer providing residential aged-care services who was previously paying an industry premium rate of 5.075 per cent in the 2014-15 year has had their premium rate reduced to 4.821 per cent. Together with the introduction of the new premium system, this employer will have an overall premium reduction of approximately \$894,000.

Another example is of a medium-sized employer operating in the concreting industry. This employer had no lost time work injury claims to impact on their premium, which means they have not been required to pay any income support costs. Taking into account their annual remuneration, this employer's base premium will reduce by approximately \$12,600 and the employer may be eligible for a discount of 15 per cent, meaning a further saving of \$7,700.

It is anticipated that 99.2 per cent of registered employers will pay a lower premium in the 2015-16 financial year on their remuneration, resulting from a combination of the new premium system and the lower average premium rate. We have every reason to be confident that the significant changes made to the scheme herald a new era in work injury insurance in this state and will deliver lasting, long-term benefits to all South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer and the deputy leader are called to order.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the leader is called to order also.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a first time.

Members interjecting:

Mr Gardner: He is undermining your authority, sir.

The SPEAKER: Not like the member for Hammond undermines it with his quest for summary judgement.

AGED DRIVER SELF-ASSESSMENT

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: From today, people aged 75 and older who do not already have a pre-existing medical condition recorded against their driving licence and who only hold a car driver's licence will receive a self-assessment form to complete. This form is introduced following the removal of mandatory medical testing requirements for drivers aged 70 and over from 1 September 2014 and honours the state government's election commitment. This means older drivers are now able to self-assess their fitness to drive and help ensure the safety of all road users.

The form has been developed to align with the Assessing Fitness to Drive guidelines, and during that process the Australian Medical Association and the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, along with older driver focus groups, were consulted. This new process helps older drivers to enhance their safety on the roads by making educated decisions about their own fitness to drive. The form requires the driver to answer 11 questions to demonstrate their fitness to drive.

If a driver has any other licence class—for example, a heavy vehicle or motorcycle licence—they will not be sent a self-assessment but will be required to complete an annual certificate of fitness with their doctor from the age of 70 years. Similarly, any licence holder with a pre-existing medical condition will continue to be sent a certificate of fitness, which will need to be completed by their doctor. The self-assessment forms will be sent to drivers around eight weeks before their 75th birthday and annually thereafter.

The return of a completed self-assessment form is a requirement to maintain a driver's licence. The new self-assessment form will also be incorporated into the Moving Right Along program, which outlines the obligations and opportunities for older drivers, and encourages safer and more active travel for older South Australians, with the resources being able to be used in conjunction with advice from health professionals.

The self-assessment may be lodged in person or posted to any Service SA customer service centre. It may be lodged online via the internet at the EzyReg Account service. The link to access the online version is: sa.gov.au/ezyreg/selfassessment. If anybody has any questions about the self-assessment form, I would encourage them to call Service SA on 13 10 84.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:09): I bring up the 10th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Following the health minister's answer to the house yesterday that it is the government's intention to reduce the number of acute beds in the health system from 2.6 to 2.1 beds per 1,000 population, can the Deputy Premier confirm that this would represent a loss of more than 800 acute hospital beds in South Australia?

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) (14:09): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I also listened carefully yesterday to the health minister's answer, and I think what he actually said was that the average around the country was something like 2.1, and that in South Australia the average number was about 2.6, and that he thought in the ideal world we should be moving closer to the national average.

He also made the point, I think, that the innovation that is going on presently in the health system (the Transforming Health initiative, which is clinician driven, not driven by bureaucracy) is looking at producing better health outcomes. Better health outcomes, I am advised—and I think members who have paid any attention to this would be advised—are often consistent with individuals spending less time in hospital and more time outside of hospital.

If better clinical practice means that there is a reduction in the number of bed days within the system, a corollary of that is that at any given point in time the system has a lower average level of demand. I think the minister also said yesterday that this is a demand-driven system; in other words, it is capable of scaling up in order to meet requirements as and when they might come upon them. Again, I am harking back to what I recall of his comments yesterday, but I think he did make the point that if we have an unusually bad flu season, for instance—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned a first time.

Ms Chapman: The Alaskan flu.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned a first time.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mr Speaker, I am merely attempting to assist the parliament—

Ms Chapman: You're wasting time.

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am attempting to assist the parliament in relation to what I gather to be a genuine question from the Leader of the Opposition, and I am trying to explain—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am trying to explain what the answer that was offered by the minister yesterday meant. What it didn't mean, as I understand it, is that you could subtract 2.1 from 2.6, multiply that by a factor to give you a population equivalent, extrapolate from that a certain number of beds, and then come in here and say, 'Well, that's what we're losing.'

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): As a matter of clarity, can the Deputy Premier—

The SPEAKER: Is this—

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is a supplementary; thank you.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the government provide the parliament with any indication of the number of hospital beds that will be cut?

Dr McFetridge: 240 at the Repat.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett is warned. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:13): I think the only useful thing I can say to the parliament is to repeat what I have just said.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I'm sorry it is not helpful from the Leader of the Opposition's point of view, but it is what I understand to be the truth and so that is why I am offering that as an answer. But, if it is of any comfort, I will take that question away, and if the Minister for Health, when he returns from his duties, is able to add anything by way of additional comment, I am sure he will do so.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): Supplementary, sir: can the Deputy Premier in fact rule out bed closures in South Australia over and above what has already been identified in Transforming Health?

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) (14:13): In the 23 hours or so that I have come to have the opportunity of mastering the health portfolio, I don't believe I have got to the position where I can confidently answer that question, and I will take it on notice.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer stand by his statement that job reductions in the 2015-16 budget to the health department will not involve the loss of front-line staff?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:14): That's the advice I have received from the health department, so yes.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): A supplementary: can the Treasurer assure the house that the loss of 800 acute beds over and above next year's budget will not involve the loss of front-line staff in South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:14): We will honour our enterprise agreements with the relevant front-line staff. There are ratios in place. They will be honoured and they will be met. There are no budget saving measures to take away, from what I can tell, front-line staff, but the Deputy Premier is outlining to the house a process of the health minister attempting to make a more efficient health system.

If members opposite are advocating a larger spend on health, they should detail to the house how they would pay for it and what they would cut to substitute that funding. Instead, we are in this position where they want us to bring forward tax cuts—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: And it is?

Mr PISONI: The minister is obviously entering debate.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We are in the position where the government is being confronted with questions by the opposition. They are asking us to increase health spending, bring forward tax cuts, balance the budget, reopen hospitals. They don't want to privatise the Motor Accident Commission. They want to spend more, balance the budget and cut taxes.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Even the Greens are more responsible than the Liberal Party.

Mr PISONI: The minister is not responsible for any alleged comments made by the opposition.

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

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): A supplementary, sir: given that the Treasurer has said that he has relied on other people's advice to make his statement to the people of South Australia last week that there will not be cuts to front-line staff in the health department, can he outline who provided that advice and whether or not he can provide an assurance that there will not be any front-line staff cuts in SA Health?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:16): I give an assurance that we will abide by all arrangements within enterprise agreements for ratios and for nurses to beds. We will always have—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We will always have more investment in health and education than members opposite. It's something we have always done. We have never privatised a hospital. Members opposite have privatised a hospital. Members opposite have traditionally, when they have come to office, cut very deeply into health and education. We have seen it at the commonwealth level; we won't do the same.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Treasurer is debating the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: He is. Point of order upheld.

HEALTH BUDGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Is the Treasurer now modifying his promise to the people of South Australia made last week, that there will be no cuts to front-line staff, to a modification now that there will be no cut to the ratio?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:17): When I was asked at a press conference on Sunday when I was standing outside a development site which was being invested in because of—

Mr Marshall: Yes, good background. Cut to the chase.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I will. I will just give you a bit of background about the budget.

Mr Tarzia: Didn't ban those donations, did you, John?

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I find his remark offensive, sir, and I would ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: And what was the remark?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That I was drumming up donations from developers.

The SPEAKER: Did the member for Hartley say that the Treasurer was drumming up donations from developers?

Mr TARZIA: No, sir. I did say, 'John, you didn't ban those developments, did you?' but I will withdraw if it offends the Treasurer, sir.

Members interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: 'Donations from developers'. I will withdraw, sir.

The SPEAKER: You will apologise and withdraw unreservedly.

Mr TARZIA: I apologise and withdraw unreservedly.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. When I was asked a question about the opposition's health shadow spokesperson saying that he had found in the budget that we were sacking front-line staff as savings measures in the budget, I responded that there were no measures in the budget that were taking front-line staff off our health system. We will abide and honour all enterprise agreements that have ratio mixes for acute beds, making sure that the nursing ratios remain, but we are making efficiencies.

Transforming Health is about providing a better service for the people of this state, and the health minister is doing an amazing job of transforming our health system. It's not about saving money, it's not about saving dollars: it's about saving lives. It's about giving people better health outcomes with the best care, first time. I am more than happy to compare our track record on health with members opposite any day of the week and twice on Sundays.

HEALTH BUDGET

The SPEAKER: A final supplementary. Actually, just make it a new question.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Just for clarity, sir, the Treasurer has just given the house a commitment that there will be no cuts to Health SA's front-line—

The SPEAKER: No. We did not ask for clarity: we were expecting a question.

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, we asked the Treasurer to clarify for the house that he is giving a commitment in the house today—

The SPEAKER: Is he giving a commitment?

Mr MARSHALL: —that there will be no cuts to front-line services for Health SA in the forward estimates.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:19): Mr Speaker, we will honour all agreements we have within the enterprise agreements.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr Marshall: You can't answer this. You can't give a straight answer because you've got it wrong.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned a first time and the leader is warned a second time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What were you singing with the Greens, *Never Tear Us Apart? Was it Never Tear Us Apart?* Close? We will always honour our arrangements where we have enterprise agreements. We have no plans to cut front-line staff. We want to make sure that we give people the very best health care that they deserve. And what we are going to be doing is abiding by all of our enterprise agreements and making sure of those ratios of nurses and ratios of doctors, and we have more nurses and more doctors per capita than any other jurisdiction in the country and we are proud of that.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the Mid-Year Budget Review is predicated on commercial acceptance of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital occurring in the 2016-17 financial year, can the Treasurer advise whether there are any financial impacts of the delay other than the \$176 million identified in the Mid-Year Budget Review?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:21): Other than moving this time limit from when it is calculated in the fiscal outlook

when it hits net lending, I am not aware of any others. If there are I will get back to the house and give you an answer in estimates.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Supplementary: can the Treasurer outline to the house whether the state needs to pay anything to the public-private partnership for the delay in taking occupancy of the new hospital from the agreed start date of April next year until the second half next year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:21): My advice is that the delay is not ours. It is not us who are seeking or will not be delivering the project as agreed. We understand that the slippage is due to the developers. Now, we would like to deliver it when they said that they could but, obviously, weather and other important —

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —issues can cause delay, but if there are any implications for the state, obviously, they will be detailed in the Mid-Year Budget Review. To my knowledge there is nothing I have seen, but if there is anything I will bring it forward to the house.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: can the Treasurer provide an update to the house as to when the government will take occupancy of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:22): Well, currently, the Mid-Year Budget Review and the budget is forecasting it for the slippage in the financial year, so it moves into a different period. So, in terms of the actual transfer, we will have to wait to see where the developers are with their time lines, but the state is making sure that we are ready to transfer as soon as possible.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Why is it that the health minister insists that we will take occupancy in April next year when your own budget papers provide for the second half of next year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:23): That is the advice I have received from Treasury about when they think the project will be complete. They do not think—

Mr Marshall: Are you talking to the health minister?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The health minister and the government and the cabinet all signed off on the budget. We believe that the contractors will not be ready in that financial year, hence the moving forward. We did this in the Mid-Year Budget Review. We have had subsequent question times between the Mid-Year Budget Review and now.

Mr Marshall: And the health minister keeps saying they will be moving in April.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Calm down, comrade. What is happening is that we do not believe that the developers will be ready in April of that year and that there will be some slippage. We hope that they catch up some time and we hope that they make it on time; and, if they do, we will adjust the budget accordingly.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary: has the health minister misled the people of South Australia telling them that we will be moving in in April next year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:23): The health minister has never misled this house or the people, and if the Leader of the Opposition wants to make a substantive motion, do so now.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Sorry, sir, but I need to seek clarification here.

The SPEAKER: Just ask a question.

Mr MARSHALL: When will the South Australian government take possession of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:24): As I said, the developers, according to the independent analysis by Treasury, we do not believe will be ready, so we have made the adjustments in the Mid-Year Budget Review and in the budget. The opposition has been privy to this since the Mid-Year Budget Review. That is over six months ago and these are the first questions that they have asked.

The truth is that there have been delays due to weather and there have been delays due to incidents on the site. We hope that they finish at the time that they said they would. We will see. But with any project being constructed, there is always going to be some slippage and we are talking about a few months. Let's hope that the contractors can make up the time, get good weather, have good practices, have no more incidents on site with any cranes touching or any fatalities on site, and that they are able to deliver the project as promised.

ENTERPRISE PATIENT ADMINISTRATION SYSTEM

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Are there risks associated with taking occupancy of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital posed by the failure of the government to deliver the EPAS project on time?

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) (14:25): I just want to say in respect of EPAS that I think that is a question that needs to be taken on notice. The reason I say that is that there is a lot of detailed information around the whole EPAS story. My understanding is that it is anticipated EPAS will be part and parcel of the functional operation of the new place when the doors open, but we will take that one on notice and provide a fuller answer.

AMBULANCE EMPLOYEES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:26): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer agree with the Ambulance Employees Association in their claim that they should at least be getting the same 3 per cent wage rise as has been granted to nurses and MFS firefighters?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:26): It is not for me to debate within this place the wages and conditions of the enterprise agreement on the floor of the chamber. The government has a policy of 2.5 per cent and I expect all agencies to deliver that.

RAIL SIGNAL FAILURES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Given that there have been at least 12 signal failures in the past two months on the train network that I know of,

and given that last night's failure caused more turmoil for commuters during the peak hour, plus the associated safety concerns, can the minister tell the house when the signal failures will be fixed?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:27): I thank the member for Mitchell for that Dorothy Dixier. I would like to advise the house of the \$12 million which the Treasurer has provided in his most recent state budget to address ongoing signalling issues across the rail network. (We had better check with the Whip about that DD.) While it has been an ongoing priority for the Labor government since 2008 to invest in a significant improvement, electrification and extension of the rail network, that work is not yet complete.

While there have been significant upgrades across the network, we will continue to improve not just the number and quality of services, as we have done on the Seaford line, but the infrastructure which supports those services. It is, as the member for Mitchell highlights, deeply concerning, not just to the government but most of all to the commuters, that there are from time to time interruptions to services caused by equipment failures and that is why \$12 million (\$6 million a year for the next two years) is being provided in the Treasurer's most recent budget to address these issues.

RAIL SIGNAL FAILURES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:28): Given that half a billion dollars was spent on the rail revitalisation program, why did the government feel that signalling issues were not a key component of that as a safety factor to keep public transport users safe?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:28): The content of the answer from the previous question would go some way to answering this current question. As I said, we are part way through a significant upgrade program of our rail network, and while some parts of the network have been improved, there are other parts of the network which have not yet been improved. Providing this additional money means that we can minimise the risk and chances of these sorts of service interruptions from occurring in the future.

RAIL SIGNAL FAILURES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:29): Given that another \$12 million needs to be spent to fix the signalling system, when will it all be finished? When will it all be fixed? How much more needs to be spent? How unsafe will it be over the two years that that work is being done?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:29): There are a couple of different ways to answer that question. When will it all be finished?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader and the deputy leader will be leaving the house shortly under the sessional orders if they utter a word. Minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Perhaps in a holistic sense, it will be unfortunately some time until the entire upgrade of the rail network is achieved because, currently, we have a federal government that has made it clear to all states that they won't partner in public transport projects. States like South Australia, Victoria and the ACT—all states with significant rail improvement programs that have been promulgated and endorsed by the community, not by some political parties, but by the community—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —will take longer to achieve—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In lieu of being able to roll out those broad improvements—the electrification of the remaining train lines—we have taken a decision in this most recent state budget to bring forward some investment to address those parts of the network that have not yet been upgraded—in particular, the sorts of equipment that is, unfortunately, from time to time, failing—so that we can minimise the risk of the sorts of outages and service interruptions and make sure we are doing our best to give commuters confidence in the public transport network.

RAIL SIGNAL FAILURES

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (14:31): Supplementary, sir: have train drivers been informed of these continuing signal failures, and are they concerned, as they negotiate their enterprise bargaining agreement, over these signal failures?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:31): Train drivers are certainly aware of the signal failures because they are the ones operating the carriages that are unable to move caused by the signalling failures; so, yes, they're aware of them. Have they raised them as part of the enterprise bargaining negotiations? No, they haven't.

The SPEAKER: Twenty questions in the first 22 minutes. The member for Fisher.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Ms COOK (Fisher) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. What initiatives has the Office of the Industry Advocate—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is defying my ruling.

Ms COOK: Thank you. I will start again. My question is to the Minister for Small Business. What initiatives has the Office of the Industry Advocate developed to assist small business to benefit from recent changes to procurement policy?

Members interjecting:

Ms COOK: Thank you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:32): Since establishing the industry participation—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned for the second and final time. He no longer has 'benefit of clergy'.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Since establishing the Industry Participation Advocate in 2013, the state government has approved a wide range of reforms and is supporting local businesses and improving their chances of winning government work. I know the member for Fisher was very keen on seeing local businesses in her electorate, and she was successful in winning in the most recent by-election in large part due to her advocacy and the good work of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Marshall: She got 26 per cent of the vote.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. From 1 January this year, changes to procurement policy require that when agencies of the government intend to purchase any goods or services above \$22,000—that will probably rule out Wokinabox—they must first determine whether the goods or services they are purchasing—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, sir. Both changes or reforms that I think the Treasurer is about to refer to are detailed in the email which you have in your inbox, unless—

Ms Vlahos: You can't guess in advance.

The SPEAKER: I agree with the member for Taylor's interjection that you can't have an anticipatory point of order. However, I do have the published statement in front of me and I will check it against delivery.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. From 1 January this year, changes to procurement policy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer has the floor.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir—require that when agencies of the government intend to purchase any good or service above \$22,000, they must first determine whether the goods or services they are purchasing can be sourced from within the state or a region of the state.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, sir. The \$22,000 threshold is not new news. It is Office of the Industry Advocate information that I have read six to 12 months ago.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As is the published fiscal outlook, but you ask questions about that. This is a first positive step for local suppliers to ensure that their products are being considered first and foremost in local projects. In addition, on advice from the industry advocate a number of the government's major projects have recently included a 15 per cent industry participation weighting, which means tenderers who can deliver more local jobs (like in Fisher), local investment or local supply inputs will boost their chances of winning work.

Another important initiative established by the Industry Participation Advocate is the Meet the Buyer program, which provides opportunities for local businesses to meet with key staff of agencies to promote their particular business. I understand that the Office of the Industry Advocate has partnered with the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association to conduct a very successful regional Meet the Buyer event on Eyre Peninsula. This event was the first of its kind to combine state and local government, with approximately 140 local businesses attending, giving local businesses a better understanding of public sector procurement and projects proposed for the region.

In addition to Meet the Buyer events, the industry advocate has conducted 15 tender-ready workshops which assist small businesses to better understand the government procurement process. It is important to note that not only does the work of the Industry Participation Advocate assist our local businesses to win work in our own state, but it also has been able to assist South Australian businesses to successfully compete for work interstate.

RPC Pipe Systems is a South Australian advanced manufacturing company that specialises in water supply solutions, employing more than 60 skilled staff at its Lonsdale plant. Following representation by the industry advocate, RPC has recently been awarded the contract for the glass reinforced plastic piping for the Sunraysia modernisation project in Victoria, with a contract value of \$3.5 million to \$4 million.

The advocate has also been actively looking at ways to reduce the regulatory burden on businesses when dealing with the government. A single prequalifying process for the whole of government reduces the need for multiple prequalifying efforts, thereby reducing form filling and red tape while also saving businesses more than \$60,000 in 2014-15.

The government has also reviewed the limitations of liability for low-risk contracts of up to \$1 million, and as of February this year, liability on low-risk contracts up to \$1 million has been capped at five times the contract value.

The SPEAKER: Time has expired.

Mr TARZIA: Supplementary, sir, if I may?

The SPEAKER: You may, yes, of course.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is wrong.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (14:37): As often is the case, sir. What role did the minister's office have in awarding over \$70 million in government contracts interstate and overseas since the start of 2015?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:37): I assume what the Liberal Party is saying is that all procurement should be done within the state and that we should not do any procurement at all. I can assure members opposite that that \$70 million figure is not the entire amount that we procure, so for example—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is on the precipice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What we are attempting to do is to make sure that we get the balance right. South Australia has always been an exporting state; we will always export. We export our wheat, our barley, our grains, our food, our manufactured goods. If we only produced enough to service ourselves—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —there would be a lot less farmers, a lot less manufacturers, a lot less small businesses. We have always exported and we have to be very careful we don't get retaliation from the other states, because our biggest trading partners are of course the eastern seaboard. They are our biggest trading partners and of course we are a trading nation. Australia has always traded. So if members opposite are actually saying we should put up the walls and be a protectionist state, they are wrong.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr GARDNER: Attempting to characterise what he believes the opposition is saying, the minister is clearly debating, sir.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold the point of order because the Treasurer is allowed to explore certain obvious implications of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a second and final time. Would he continue, please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As of February—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker, as of February—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have upset the comrades; I am very sorry. These initiatives are a practical example of how the government's procurement reforms are giving a real and direct benefit to small to medium-sized businesses in South Australia, and actively contributing to the government's priority of making South Australia the best place to do business—on top of our tax reforms, on top of our WorkCover reforms, on top of abolishing eight state taxes.

This government has done more for business, more for reforming our tax system, than the comrades opposite ever have. Members opposite have more in common with Mark Parnell and Tammy Franks than they do with Sir Thomas Playford. He looks down so disapprovingly at all of them. When will the younger members rise up and retake their party?

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A point of order, but everyone is having such a good time—if I may channel Captain Louis—

Mr GARDNER: But standing order 98 does not account for your entertainment, sir.

TAXES AND CHARGES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:40): A supplementary, sir: given the Treasurer's comments, does he agree with the Victorian businessman who employs South Australians in South Australia, who says, 'I pay payroll tax in four states. The South Australian RevNet system is without doubt the most awkward, the most complex of all the systems in Australia we deal with. They're hopeless and they're always falling over'?

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will withdraw, under the sessional order, for half an hour.

The honourable member for Dunstan having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:41): He is our best asset, sir. Running RevNet and RISTEC is a lot more complicated than a cash register at Wokinabox—

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a very complicated system. I accept that there are problems with RevNet. However, Mr Speaker, I will tell you what competitive advantage we have over Victoria: Victorians are charged conveyance duty on commercial business properties. As of 1 July next year we will have cut, by one-third, our conveyance duty on business and commercial properties, a competitive advantage that the Victorian government will not give its citizens. The following year we are going to halve it and the year after that it will be abolished altogether. So business people in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia will be at a disadvantage compared to businesses here in South Australia.

While the opposition focuses on accounting measures within an internal process of computer programs, we are out there cutting taxes. We are out there getting out of the way of business, helping them to go out and compete, and giving them competitive advantages that members opposite never even imagined at the last election campaign. All they talked about were tax cuts for the richest South Australians. Not once did they talk about tax cuts to ordinary South Australian small businesses.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is now debating the question.

BUSINESS AND SKILLED MIGRATION

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. What outcomes have been achieved for South Australia under the state's business and skilled migration nomination program for 2014-15?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:43): I thank the member for Elder for her question. She comes from a very multicultural electorate big in small business. Apart from cutting taxes and reducing WorkCover fees, the government is also looking to improve outcomes for businesses through skilled migration. The state's migration program contributes to the establishment of new enterprises, providing links to our international investment and trade partners and meeting short-term skill shortages across key sectors.

Last year the government set key objectives to promote South Australia's international connections and engagement. Specifically, we aimed to deliver 2,400 skilled and 250 business nominations per annum by 2017, the two key migration programs the state government participates in, and I am pleased to advise the house today that the government has seen results improve across both major migration streams. The government has already exceeded its 2017 skilled migration target to the year ending 30 June, nominating 2,405 skilled migrants, up from 2,226 the previous year. These migrants bring valuable skills and some will use their bold entrepreneurial spirit to start business ventures across the state.

Our business migration program has also grown substantially off the back of six major in-country promotional activities in China and Malaysia, active engagement of our local migrant community, account management for high net-worth migrants and continual improvements to our online application processes. There were 187 business migrants, including 46 significant investors and 67 Business Talent visa applicants, nominated by the state this year, up from 130 in 2013-14. That is 44 per cent growth in a single year. The team at Immigration SA should be commended, but there is more to be done.

The Department of State Development estimates the outcomes from immediate investments made by these business migrants will be \$167 million in investments and the creation of 369 jobs, and a better business environment they will be going into with the tax cuts announced by the Treasurer and the WorkCover reforms announced by the Deputy Premier. On the current trajectory, we are well placed to achieve 250 business migrant nominations by 2017, despite the recent changes to the Significant Investor Visa program which we expect will be less attractive to migrants.

We have, however, seen strong growth across the broader business visa stream, particularly in the 132 visa (Business Talent) category, which supports migrants with a significant business history. Through these and other measures, the state government plans to build on our recent success to deepen our linkages with the global economy and create more jobs in this state.

Mr WHETSTONE: Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Chaffey.

BUSINESS AND SKILLED MIGRATION

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:46): Could the minister explain why it costs about \$30,000 for an employer to employ a visa holder here in South Australia?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:46): I'm not sure if that information put forward in that question is accurate. I will check to see if it is, and if it is I will come back to the house with a reply.

SCHOOL MAINTENANCE GRANT PROGRAM

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What outcomes will the state government's maintenance grant program deliver to schools and the community?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (14:47): I am very pleased to answer this question for a number of reasons, and one is that when we spend money on schools naturally we are spending money simply on the fabric of the school, making sure that it is in reasonable shape. But we are actually spending money also in the local community in the smaller works to create jobs, to allow people to have some work to do for the government. But, even more than that, what we are doing is sending signals to the teachers and to the students in those institutions that they are worth spending money on.

Whether it is maintenance works or more substantial building works, one of the features I have noticed in going around to schools is that the community inside that school takes enormous pride in work that is done to make their school look and function better. At a time when we really want students to pay attention to their schooling, we need them to attend and we need them to complete school and we need them to do their best, and to demonstrate an investment in their infrastructure is tremendously powerful.

The specific of the question that the member has asked is about the maintenance grant program, and some members will already be aware, if the postal system has worked sufficiently quickly, that I have written to them to inform them of grants that have gone out in the last week or so to schools for their maintenance, and I won't exhaustively go through them. I can give an example for the member for Giles: the Coober Pedy Area School is receiving \$200,000 for air-conditioning and dust extraction upgrades; Fisk Street and Long Street primary schools are receiving \$140,000 and \$215,000, respectively, for bitumen upgrades; Stuart High School is receiving bitumen upgrades to the value of \$205,000; and Whyalla High School is receiving \$280,000 for asbestos removal.

Altogether, we have been able to allocate \$12 million under the maintenance grant program. The variety of works will include not only the air conditioning but also repairing gutters, roofs, play areas, sewerage—all of the things that we as homeowners have to pay attention to. It is excellent that we are able to also provide that for some of these schools.

GREENWAYS PROGRAM

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister provide any updates to the house about improvements to cycling infrastructure in South Australia?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:50): I thank the member for Little Para for his question and his interest in this area. The state government wants to see more people using their bikes, both for transport and for recreation. We know the whole community benefits when more people cycle. There are benefits to our road infrastructure: cyclists can ease traffic congestion on our roads and they have very little impact, of course, on the road network's wear and tear. There are, of course, the benefits to the individual's health and, of course, to the public health system from more people engaging in physical exercise, and there are also environmental benefits.

As well as installing more dedicated cycle lanes on our roads, we have been investing in our greenways. Greenways are cycling routes devoted to cycling and walking and usually occur alongside public transport corridors or linear open space, such as the River Torrens. I am pleased to update the house on two projects which form part of the state government's \$12 million Greenways Program, a program which is part of this government's commitment to improving cycling infrastructure in the city and outer suburbs. The \$260,000 upgrade to part of the Mike Turtur Bikeway, undertaken—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: You might give me a chance to look at it, member for Schubert.

Mr KNOLL: If you click on the little blue hyperlink you get everything that you need under www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/major_projects/greenways_and_bike_boulevards/current_projects. It includes the Mike Turtur Bikeway upgrades.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will roll the dice. The \$260,000 upgrade to part of the Mike Turtur Bikeway, undertaken in conjunction with the City of Holdfast Bay, has recently been finished. The bikeway follows the tramline from Glenelg to the city. The upgrade includes safety improvements to cycling and walking facilities at Glenelg's Brighton Road, Jetty Road and Maxwell Terrace. The works include a new off-road path, bike shelter and repair station and will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists in and around Glenelg. The upgrade also improves access to the Mike Turtur Bikeway route, creating better access to public transport stops and stations.

In addition to this project, as recently as a couple of weeks ago works were completed on the Grange Greenway. The works lengthened and widened the path adjacent to the rail corridor, and lighting was added to increase safety for those people who are walking and riding at night. This work links the Woodville West development to Woodville Road and provides another option for those wanting to walk, run or cycle along existing public transport corridors and Linear Park open space. The Grange Greenway provides a convenient and safe alternative to main roads for people cycling towards the city from the western suburbs.

Of course, this also links up with the Outer Harbor Greenway, a project we have undertaken in collaboration with the City of Port Adelaide Enfield, which is now close to completion. I know we have many members, like the Speaker, the member for Little Para, the Minister for Manufacturing and also the Minister for Tourism, who cycle regularly. With these new tracks, I would encourage all members to get on their bikes and test out the new infrastructure. It is not just the government that thinks Greenway Program investment is important. Ian Radbone from the Bicycle Institute of South Australia has said:

Our organisation has been advocating for greenways since the 1990s, and we're very pleased to see that since this idea was embraced by the Government there has been a growing network of better connected bicycle routes in our suburban areas.

The Amy Gillett Foundation CEO, Belinda Clark, also commented that the government has been investing in these greenways and said, 'Any investment in cycling infrastructure that provides a safe suburban route for cyclists is certainly welcomed.' On the Amy Gillett Foundation, we have spent \$4½ million on the Amy Gillett Bikeway. It is the only project where no funding assistance has been received from the local council, and we would hope that the Adelaide Hills Council fully acknowledges the benefits of coinvestment. I know it is a project strongly supported by the member for Kavel.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Morphett for the second and final time, I warn the member for Schubert for the first time, and I congratulate the minister's staff on their elegant variation.

AGRIBUSINESS FUNDING

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, what is the state government doing to assist regional food and wine businesses to improve their competitiveness?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:54): I thank the member for Taylor, and acknowledge her genuine interest in the food production in her local area. I think the nub of the question is: what is the state government doing to assist regional food and wine businesses to improve their competitiveness? Nothing could have changed the face of the agriculture, fishery and aquaculture sectors more than the budget last month.

I have had a lot of great feedback from people right throughout South Australia. The Treasurer, the Premier and I have been out and about, talking to people in the regions—and I must say we have had—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Before the budget—which has largely led to the way the Treasurer framed his budget. Farmers, fishers and aquaculture owners can now restructure their business without the huge impost that would previously hit them through stamp duty and other measures. So, I think that is a great result for regional South Australia, and I commend the Treasurer for doing that great work in the sectors that I am lucky enough to have responsibility for in my portfolios.

Another measure that we have taken is working with primary producers and trying to help them come up with clusters. We have a \$2.7 million, five-year pilot program which is helping to establish cluster groups in the Murraylands, Riverland and Limestone Coast. We have had some success on that already in its first year of operation. Around six weeks ago, I was in Guangzhou with some Coonawarra winemakers. Coonawarra is one of the most outstanding wine regions in Australia. We have 18 wine regions here in South Australia—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: According to James Halliday, it is the most successful in terms of his five-star rating. So, it might be a very small wine region, at just 27 kilometres long and three kilometres wide. It's not huge, but they have more five-star wineries compared to the amount of wineries in their region than any other wine region in Australia. So, I think Coonawarra deserves that accolade of being—

The SPEAKER: Surely the 'number' of wineries.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you very much; you remind me of Mr Pearce, my old English teacher. Thank you, Mr Speaker, for correcting my grammar. It was great to be in Guangzhou with the Coonawarra winemakers because they were out there selling their premium wines to a brand-new audience, because they had never before come together in a way where they could actually gather up the group to get away, but they could through the funding that we provided.

I am pleased to announce today that six projects will receive a total \$440,000 in funding from the program. They include the MacKillop Farm Management Group, where funding will assist an industry-led steering committee to develop a better understanding of the current cropping industry and the opportunities available. Dairy SA, working with Dairy Innovation Australia Limited, received funding to help progress the project called 'A small dairy processor cluster: connecting, coordinating and cooperating', which will see a strong collaboration to deliver benefits across the value chain.

Naracoorte Lucindale Council, working with the University of Adelaide, received funding for red meat collaboration and innovation in the Limestone Coast to enhance profitability across the value chain. For Ricca Terra Pty Ltd, funding will deliver two results: it will help develop a cluster of Riverland wine grape growers, winemakers and supporting partners directly linked to a unique range of premium wines and services sold in domestic and international markets.

The RDA Murraylands and Riverland have received funding. The Murraylands Food Alliance is a group of 12 large agribusinesses from the Murray Bridge area, and will use the funding to support the cluster's administration. South Australia Murray Irrigators funding will allow project leaders to draft a plan for the water stewardship pilot project, in partnership with the Renmark Irrigation Trust. There is a lot of good news for people in those regions and, as a government, we will continue to work with the agribusiness sector.

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

REFUGEE WEEK

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Minister, how is the state government supporting communities to celebrate the positive and multifaceted contribution made by refugees here in South Australia?

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) (14:59): I thank the member for Florey for this question, because I know that she shares the state government's commitment to supporting refugees who have arrived in South Australia from countries that have experienced conflict.

Recently, the Migrant Resource Centre of South Australia, in partnership with the Local Government Association of South Australia, hosted a civic reception in recognition of World Refugee Day and to mark the beginning of Refugee Week. It was at this event that we had two young refugees who shared with us their journey to Australia. It really does stay with you when you hear about a young man who, though very much supported by the United Nations, had spent six years in a tent. Coming to Australia has given him stability and opportunity for the future.

I was pleased to attend this event which encouraged communities across South Australia to celebrate Refugee Week under the themes 'With courage let us all combine' and 'A place to call home'. For those of us who regularly sing the national anthem, we will be familiar with 'With courage let us all combine', which is part of the second verse. These themes serve as a call for all of us to work together to make our community one where refugees feel welcome because it takes great strength to leave behind all that you have known and start life anew in a faraway land. Their stories are all different but share common experiences of courage and of people who speak out against persecution and injustice.

The Migrant Resource Centre of South Australia staged a number of events in and around Adelaide during Refugee Week, offering the community an opportunity to learn more about South Australians who arrived as refugees. The state government was pleased to pledge \$10,250 towards the delivery of these events which celebrate their courage and resilience. Fleeing war and

persecution, many refugees have gone on to make significant contributions in business, education, sport, politics and the arts. Among them is our Governor, His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le AO, who has served our community with distinction since arriving in the aftermath of the Vietnam War.

He hosted a function to acknowledge the beginning of Refugee Week, and it was amazing to hear people who attended that event. I think the member for Bragg was there, also. For many, it was their first time at Government House, and it was the first time Refugee Week was acknowledged by a Governor of South Australia. I also had the opportunity to attend a first community dinner, which will happen every month, held in the Salisbury council region by Welcome to Australia and Salisbury council—a dinner that will be held for the wider community to attend and support refugees as—

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland and Taylor will cease masticating in the chamber, now—and the member for Kaurua. Member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: I would like to be able to hear the answer to my question. I have had nothing but cackle from the other side. I am trying to hear the answer to the question.

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: No, I am sorry. Refugee information should be important to you.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: I don't care about that. I am trying to hear the answer to my question.

The SPEAKER: I also would like to hear the minister's answer. Minister.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Since World War II, more than 800,000 refugees have arrived in Australia. Many have settled here in our thriving state. People come to South Australia for many reasons: some want a better life, some are fleeing persecution and some want to give their families the best opportunities possible. The state government has a vision of a connected and integrated community, a place of equality where cultural and religious diversity is respected and valued, and that is why the state government is investing \$12 million over four years to support our multicultural communities.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired. I see the member for Unley.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:04): I feel like I have just been through a marathon, sir; thank you. My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister advise the house of the outcome of the school bus review announced by him in his capacity as Minister for Regional Development via a press release on 26 June last year?

The SPEAKER: The minister.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:04): Thank you, sir. Given that the review is a school bus review and has been undertaken within my department, I think that I am best placed to answer that question.

I have been reviewing the draft of the review recently and I have asked for some more consideration to be done so that we make sure that it is indeed the nature of the review that was requested. I acknowledge that it has taken time, but I am very keen for it to be a useful document, and so, while I apologise for the length of time, it is being delayed, if that is the correct term, in order to be diligent about the quality of the work.

SCHOOL BUSES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:05): Supplementary, sir: has the Minister for Regional Development received a copy of the report?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:05): There is no final report for him to have received a copy of.

COUNCIL RATE REMISSIONS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Local Government. Can the minister confirm his position on the requirement of local government authorities to provide a remission of 75 per cent on council rates when sought by eligible groups? John, don't.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:06): Mr Speaker, can you protect me from the member for Kavel, please?

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: May I answer the question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will cease his posture of provocative silence.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Very well, thank you.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Outrageous!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, time me out, for goodness sake. If I were the member for Kavel, I would actually give the answer via ventriloquism using somebody next to me to deliver the words, but I am not, so I don't.

The situation with this is that, as the responsible minister in respect of social housing, or at least the property aspect of that, there are a number of considerations that apply here, and the situation is this: first of all, there are a number of not-for-profit operators who are presently in the market. Those people have been there for a range of periods of time, and the most recent group of those really only in a tranche that has gone out in very little time really, and there is about 1,100 in that group.

That group, incidentally, was a group about which we spent some time negotiating with the local government authorities who were concerned, and those local government authorities as a result of coming to the table and negotiating with the state government actually achieved their purpose, which was to be relieved of the obligations cast upon them by reason of the rebate in section 161 of the Local Government Act.

We believe that is the best way forward because, over the months and years ahead, there will be a larger number of these currently publicly owned properties which will be transferred into the management of not-for-profits; and, in the context of doing that, obviously, we must have regard to the effect that might have on the communities in which those properties exist. I have had conversations with the Minister for Local Government who has raised with me in particular issues about—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, he has spoken to me about this matter, and he has spoken to me on more than one occasion about this matter, and he has particularly advocated for those regional communities where there are significant public housing stocks. He has shared with me his concerns about places like Whyalla, Port Augusta and other places where there are substantial public housing stocks, and he has raised with me the issue, 'Are you aware of what it might mean for the municipal government there if this rule was applied as a blanket rule and they lost rate bases?' He has taken that up with me and I have said to him that, as we go forward with this, I intend to continue to have dialogue with him about these matters because he is absolutely right to be as concerned as I am. We will take that on a case-by-case basis, sit down around the table and talk with local government.

If you want to know our bona fides about this, have a look at the last round of 1,200, or whatever it was, that we went through. They got exactly what they asked for out of that. We do not want to be in a position where those that have been out there in the marketplace for many years are going to be retrospectively caught up in a net that never existed in the first place.

Grievance Debate

WAHOME, MR SOLOMON

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:10): I rise today to talk about someone I was fortunate to spend some time with at the 53rd handover dinner for the Lions Club of Marion. I was seated next to the outgoing president, Solomon Wahome. Solomon migrated from Kenya with his family back in March 2010 on a skilled migration visa and joined Westpac Bank in May 2010 as a collection officer. One of the first things he did after arriving in Australia was join the Marion Lions and his energy and enthusiasm were harnessed by the group and he quickly rose to the presidency.

Added to this, Solomon served on the board of the Kenyan Swahili School of Adelaide and was vice president of the Kenyan community living in Australia. He is married to Grace, who I also had a long conversation with at the handover dinner, where we discussed many of the differences between growing up in Kenya compared to Australia. Grace and Solomon have two daughters, Beth and Charity, who consumed a fair portion of the conversation, as children often do, but they sound like lovely, grounded young women who, like their parents, give back to the community.

The handover dinner was a chance to welcome in the new officers of the Marion Lions: the new president, Bill Jolley, who has been prior president at Seacombe; first vice president, Rosemary Peacock; second vice president, Carol Holt; secretary, Graham Turner, who is a good servant of the club; treasurer, Bob Korotcoff; past president, Solomon Wahome; and also the tail twister, Bob Coulthard, who has done wonderful things in the Lions community right across the board. Kel Waters, former president, was the MC for the night too, so it was a great fun evening and great to be there.

The dinner was also an opportunity for the group to hand over some cheques to community groups from money they had raised through the year, primarily from a sausage sizzle they hold outside Harvey Norman on the second and fourth weekend of every month. A total of \$17,000 was handed out, which is a brilliant effort from a smaller club.

I will mention some of the charities that were supported with the money that was handed over: the Lions Prostate Cancer Awareness Program and the Lions Prostate Cancer Research and Treatment Program received \$250 in total; Angel Flight Australia, which is a great service (Erica Korotcoff received the money) received \$750; the Royal Flying Doctor Service is always supported by the Marion Lions and they received \$500; St Vincent de Paul Brighton for community relief, St Vincent de Paul Seacombe Gardens for community relief, Church of Christ Brighton for community relief, and Salvation Army Marion for community relief all received \$250 each, which was outstanding; the Lions Eye Health program received \$500; Operation Flinders (it was great to have John van Ruth, the CEO, there) received \$500; the Daw House Hospice Foundation received \$500; the Lions Hearing Dogs received \$500; and \$2,587 went towards the Trees Program at Braeside Reserve.

Solomon has been a key player behind the Marion Lions tree planting project at Braeside Reserve. Their goal is to plant 10,000 trees by 2017, and so far they have planted 4,500 since 2012. In fact, they planted 2,000 just last week. Solomon has harnessed the generosity of his employer, Westpac, which grants leave for its workers to do charity work, and he convinced 20 of his colleagues to join him and the team for this worthy cause. They were supported by nine green commandos and they delivered the project with ease.

It is this initiative that saw Solomon also awarded the Melvin Jones Fellowship Award, along with the hardworking Graham Turner, who also tirelessly devotes his time to the club. Melvin Jones is considered the most influential person in the history of Lions Club International for his guidance of the club through its formative years in the early to mid-1900s. I was told that this award was built around Melvin's motto: 'You can't get very far until you start doing something for somebody else.'

This is a motto that the Marion Lions and Solomon Wahome have well and truly adopted. I highly recommend anyone to get down and support the Marion Lions if they can. They will be at

Harvey Norman on the second and fourth weekend of any month selling sausages, and they are mighty damn fine sausages as well.

PERFORMABILITY SHOWCASE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:15): It was my honour to attend, representing the Premier, the SCOSA Performability 2015 showcase at the Golden Grove Arts Centre on Wednesday 24 June in the company of the Mayor of the City of Tea Tree Gully, Kevin Knight, and Lisa Nugent, the ANZ Service Quality Manager for the South Australian and Western Australian Branch Network. Lisa represented the ANZ Staff Foundation, which was sponsoring the event.

The foundation was established in 1988, and more than 647 charities have benefited from donations in excess of \$3.8 million. Grants are around \$5,000 and support a variety of projects, from disadvantaged youth to the environment. A national advisory board and state committees, comprising ANZ employees, decide the granting rounds each year. In the financial year 2014, the ANZ Staff Foundation provided 69 grants totalling over \$315,000 to community organisations across Australia.

All regular staff donations are matched dollar for dollar by ANZ, thereby doubling the staff support. Applications are accepted twice a year in January and July, so groups should check the website for further information. The ANZ Staff Foundation aims to support small projects in the areas of skills and independence, environment, local initiatives and capacity building. Thanks go to ANZ staff for making this exciting event happen.

As it happened, I was actually going to attend that event in my own right, as SCOSA has a hub in Gilles Plains, which is part of the Florey electorate, and I wanted to support them. Performability is a program derived from drama and art groups that each of SCOSA's 12 hubs facilitate throughout the year. Clients from each hub across metropolitan Adelaide and regional South Australia come together to stage a range of theatrical performances, plays, dance routines and music spots in front of a large audience.

Thanks go to Jess Rodda and Wendy Rowell for organising the day. I must also mention Fiona Merritt who was MC for the day in the role of Hyacinth Bucket and she really was absolutely spectacular. Each of the hubs had an item. Wynn Vale did *In Summer* from *Frozen*; Gilles Plains did *Do You Want to be My Girl?*; and Newton did *Mamma Mia* by ABBA, which was a crowd stopper. Thebarton did *Walking on Sunshine*, and West Croydon did a *Grease* medley, *You're the One that I Want/Summer Love*.

Lunch was served by Les Brazier's special Rotary Club barbecue truck and, my goodness me, he did a fabulous job and everybody really enjoyed lunch. After lunch, we saw *The Blues Brothers* by Hackham; *Uptown Funk* by Port Pirie Hub; and Clare, who also travelled a very long distance, came down and did *I Want to Live*. Mitcham did *Rock and Roll All Nite* by KISS, with amazing costumes. Elizabeth Park was supported by the Elizabeth Downs Primary School and they did *Shake It Off* by Taylor Swift. Plympton did an amazing rendition of *Waltzing Matilda*, while Willaston did *5,6,7,8 (Boot Scootin' Baby)* and Woodville did an amazing rendition of the *Chicken Dance*.

Everyone was a winner on the day; all participants tried their hearts out. It was a great job by everyone and the audience had a ball. We have to acknowledge all the fabulous SCOSA workers who not only helped their clients choose the musical numbers but also did a great deal of work on the costumes, sets and the choreography. If you have ever seen six wheelchairs dancing *Mamma Mia* on a small stage, you would really realise the work that went into it. The families and supporters were there, rallying around their loved ones, and it was just the best feeling in the whole day.

Rick Neagle, President of Dignity for Disability, attended for the ceremonial closure of the day, which was officiated by the CEO of SCOSA, Josie Kitch, in her outfit as a painter. I am not sure what that had to do with the *Chicken Dance*, but she was heavily involved in the final number. I cannot tell you how much effort everybody put into the day. I must admit that, at the beginning, I thought four hours of Performability would be too long, but the day flew and I have nothing but admiration for everyone involved.

Next year, SCOSA will be doing Performability again and it is really worth going along to support your people. People with profound disabilities get very few days out like this, and I just think it is an amazing thing to do. Well done to the ANZ Staff Foundation, all the staff at SCOSA and everyone who supported them.

CHILD PROTECTION SCREENING

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:19): I rise today to talk about an issue that I have spoken about before, and unfortunately it does not seem to be getting any better, that is, police screenings or DCSI clearances. I talk on this matter because there is a continual stream of people coming into my electoral office and we are reaching a point where people have been stood down and people are now out of work just because of a bureaucratic delay in screenings.

I am the first to admit, and I come from an education background, that we do need to keep people safe and I am fully supportive of that, but it is at a point where people are losing income. These are good community members, and as far as I know they have had no problems in the past, and delays are causing stress to their families and they are not able to pay bills. Do not forget that we are in a state that now has the highest unemployment rate in Australia—not just mainland Australia, which we could always say beforehand—and I find this totally unacceptable.

Today, I am going to put on record four people who have either lost their jobs or are waiting for police screenings and hoping that the minister will actually take some action. These are four people who have come into my office. Matthew Denholm submitted his DCSI clearance on 17 December last year for approval. He visited my office on 22 April this year for assistance, and through some negotiation with the minister's office we found a name match, but we are still, two months down the track, waiting for approval, so this is over six months since the initial application. Again, if there is a problem, let the person know, but do not just leave them in limbo.

Matthew Canario lodged his DCSI clearance on 17 November, so a month earlier last year. Matthew is not currently working, but he has a job driving a taxi waiting for him as soon as this clearance comes through. So, seven months after submitting his application there is still no approval. Again, if we are serious about getting people into work and not just talking and paying lip service like many do in this place, we need to get off our butts and actually get on with this.

Allan Hagggar's clearance was lodged on 11 November 2014. Allan's initial form was sent back to him with no explanation, so he put the form in and a couple of months later it was sent back to him with no explanation. He resubmitted it with the help of my office and he is still waiting for approval. As a result of this, Allan is now unemployed. He cannot drive a taxi, which he was doing beforehand. He has three children, a mortgage, bills to pay and yet no income. I find this situation unacceptable and, if there is a reason, tell Allan, tell him so that he can adjust it or at least know what is going on. He had been working for 12 years with no previous issues, and to the best of his knowledge no screening issues have popped up, but of course he cannot drive a taxi because he does not have this DCSI clearance.

Then we have Nigel White. Nigel put in his form in January this year. He had been washing taxis for his employer, his employer wanted to give him a job back in January, but here we are, start of July, and no clearance. Again, he has been denied the opportunity to get off Centrelink, which is supposedly what we are meant to be doing, but he cannot due to DCSI clearances. Again, I am not vouching for these people; I do not know them personally. All I am saying is that if there is a problem, for God's sake let them know so that we can get on with this; if there is no problem, give them a clearance.

My office has been in continual contact with the member for Ramsay, and it is getting to a point where I will be starting to send her a bill for office time because the number of hours my staff are spending helping people with DCSI clearances is ridiculous. We have a system that we could implement. It is called the blue card system, and it has been in Queensland since 2001 and I do not understand why it is not in here.

Time expired.

LYELL MCEWIN REGIONAL VOLUNTEER ASSOCIATION

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:24): Today I would like to speak about a visit I made a few weeks ago, with members of my team, to the Lyell McEwin Regional Volunteer Association at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Maxine Henke, the association president, and Caroline Letchford, manager of Northern Respite Care Services, accompanied me for the time I was at the hospital.

Maxine and I had a chat when we first met each other at the 2015 Northern Volunteering Awards, and she kindly offered me a tour around the Lyell McEwin and to introduce me to many of the volunteers. I thought it was a great opportunity to get to know more about the association and their activities in the North, as they certainly service many constituents in the electorate of Taylor.

Originally from the Ladies Auxiliary, the Lyell McEwin Regional Volunteer Association can date its roots back to 1959. Over the years volunteers continued to join the auxiliary, and it became involved with other volunteer groups. In fact, I believe it is one of only two of its kind left in the world. In 1987 the leadership group of the auxiliary started investigating how to bring all these different groups and people together under one umbrella body, and in July 1988 the association, as we know it today, was officially registered.

Maxine informed me that the association now has more than 800 volunteers registered on its database, and volunteers work in more than 30 key positions around the hospital on a day-to-day basis. All this equates to approximately 100,000 hours of volunteer time being given by the association on an annual basis.

Volunteers have been dedicated and passionate towards serving their community in the North for many years, and to servicing the clients of the hospital. You can never miss one of the volunteers, as they have a very recognisable orange uniform. As we were walking through the hospital I could see volunteers either showing patients where they should go or helping with inquiries at a desk near the front door, which is one of the very first things you see when you arrive at the hospital.

I also visited the childcare centre run by the association. It can look after children for up to two hours at a time, and has a very dedicated team of volunteers in place. In fact, one lady I spoke to had been a volunteer there for 10 years. From what I could see it was certainly a welcome relief to many families, as they visited loved ones at the hospital, that a child could be looked after without disrupting a sick relative.

A highlight of the tour was the gift shop. There was a wide variety of items on sale that were targeted towards people in hospital, with flowers, soft toys, gifts and handmade greeting cards made by volunteers. Funds from the gift shop contribute towards the running of the association. Another business operation arm is the Thrifty V op shops. The association has four stores, with its operation centre in Salisbury South. Like the gift shop, all profits generated through Thrifty V operations go towards the work of the Lyell McEwin Regional Volunteer Association and the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

One of the key mission objectives of the association, to establish and maintain the best volunteer management practices in order to provide community development, was clearly a testament to the people I spoke to the other day, who have contributed to the community and who are learning new skills on a day-to-day basis with the association. It is an impressive story, and the spirit of volunteering in the North is alive and well and in great hands. I commend them for their work and for the work they do for the local community. Valuing the North is a good and worthy cause. Well done.

THINKING, LINKING, LEVERAGING AND MAXIMISING REPORT

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:27): 'Thinking, Linking, Leveraging and Maximising': that is the roundtable discussion I attended on Friday through my local RDA for the Riverland and Murraylands. It was a co-innovation cluster program put together as part of the state government's premium food and wine and clean environment approach.

I should put on the record my initial scepticism of this program, and I note that there were significant delays by the state government on getting any movement on the co-innovation cluster program, but I look forward to seeing what this program will achieve. I note that the minister has

made an announcement today that the recipients have been the Murraylands and Riverland, and the South Australian Murray Irrigators—and I am very proud to say that I was once chair of that group.

I will come back to those groups, but I found this report raised some interesting points through the work of UniSA's David Ness, Ke Xing, Sam Huang and Jantanee Dumrak, who were present at the launch. Also in attendance at the launch were myself, Brendan Sidhu from Jubilee Almonds, Scerina Rasheed from the Riverland Division of General Practice, Berri Barmera Council CEO David Beaton, Travis Heaft from Accolade Wines, Tim Smythe from PIRSA, and Mark Bell from the Murraylands and Riverland RDA. I note that both Steve White from 5RM and Chloe Hart from the ABC were also at the round table.

The report seeks to identify and analyse the potential for industry or market-based clusters in the Riverland proposing to link the food and beverage sector with other key sectors including tourism, education, health, sport and recreation and, of course, the environmental conservation and business services. The report states that this would leverage and maximise the benefits of predicted business growth in that sector and, indeed, for the whole region. I note that there are already some fantastic food and wine initiatives happening in the region—look at the likes of 919 Wines, and to put on the record, Eric Semmler was the 2014 Australasian Winemaker of the Year. So, great work by he and his good wife, Jenny.

Other initiatives include Caudo Vineyard, Banrock Station, Wilkadene Brewery, Venus Eco-Citrus program; and the list goes on. I would love to see more events being held in the regions showcasing the fantastic premium food and wine products that the Riverland has. We also have, of course, the famous Riverland Wine and Food Festival that many people travel from far away to attend; albeit a 2½ hour drive from Adelaide. It is a great initiative for them to be able to experience the Riverland's hospitality and also have a look around while they are up there, because they normally have to make it a two-day event.

Given the Riverland's unemployment rate is above South Australia's overall unemployment rate, there is an urgent need to focus on our agricultural export sector to create jobs, noting that more than 50 per cent of South Australia's exports come from regional South Australia. The Riverland's clean, green image and our very important fruit fly free and phylloxera-free status is, of course, critically important to our branding. So, there is much scope to increase trade with our key partners, particularly our Asian neighbours.

Of the findings and recommendations of the report, I found most interesting the comments based around the region's identity and branding. To me, it raises the question of whether the Riverland needs to have its own individual branding, its own logo, or a logo within the already prominent South Australian logo. Is there an opportunity to have the region's own branding incorporating some of that Brand SA? I think we need to look at that.

There are many areas we need to explore around branding, particularly with international markets as opposed to domestic markets. I note that the wine industry is looking at a different branding schedule to our food sector. The funding recipients announced today were Ricca Terra from the Murraylands and Riverland, and that is about developing clusters of the Riverland wine grape growers, winemakers and supporting partners, and, of course, the South Australian Murray Irrigators. That funding will allow those project leaders to draft a plan for water stewardship pilot projects in partnership with the Renmark Irrigation Trust.

UNITED FIREFIGHTERS UNION ELECTIONS

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:33): Recently, the member for Morphett spoke on the Supply Bill, which is not unusual, but during this particular diatribe and the sorry contribution he made, he asserted many things that were incorrect. This, in itself, is not unusual.

It is not uncommon for the member for Morphett to make statements that have very little semblance to the facts. What made this particular contribution outrageous and totally inappropriate was the member for Morphett's blatant attempts to interfere in a union election. In my years here, I have never witnessed an interference of this sort by any member. The member for Morphett's sorry contribution was aimed at nothing less than to influence the outcome of the democratic process in place to allow members of the United Firefighters Union to elect their secretary.

I want to detail to the house a few of the comments made by the member for Morphett. The member for Morphett stated that the UFU elections are on at the moment and that he is very much pro supporting the fire services union to make sure that they vote in the current elections. There is not much wrong with that, you might think; simply encouraging participation. But if anyone here (or elsewhere) holds that perception, you are wrong. The member for Morphett went on to say:

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.

Just as an aside, I have been reliably informed that this is simply not true, that there was a response to the member for Morphett of an open invitation to meet. This is better than I would have done. I mean, why would you provide an open invitation to a person who has proven to be so utterly ineffectual, but who also has a record of being antagonistic to the United Firefighters Union? He needs to understand that, if you are antagonistic to the union, you are in essence attacking all MFS firefighters. The member for Morphett then goes on to say about Mr Northcott:

I understand that 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 or do they want to stand up, get up there and vote.

This, of course, is the member for Morphett's not-so-subtle code for, 'Don't vote for Greg Northcott.' The member for Morphett goes on to mention the other candidate in this election and finishes off his contribution on the subject of the former chief officer by stating that 'Greg Northcott has no idea about this and MFS members had better think very carefully about who they vote for'.

The member for Morphett's outrageously inappropriate political foray into the UFU election is unprecedented. From my memory, this has never happened, at least since I have been here. Incidentally, Greg Northcott was returned as secretary. The member for Morphett should immediately apologise to all MFS firefighters. He will not, of course, but if he were to do so he should also apologise for listening to and then fuelling rumours that there is soon to be a mass resignation of members from the UFU, which is nonsense, and questioning the union's affiliation to the ALP. He should also stop repeating and stating that the UFU is driving emergency services sector reform, when the truth is, and appropriately so, the union is responding to it.

While the member for Morphett will continue to assert that he supports our firefighters, firefighters understand this: that actions speak louder than words, and his actions make his words in this instance nothing but a ruse. The union and its members see through this ruse and will, of course, continue to do what it has always done: applying itself to advancing the interests of its members and, in doing so, that of the service, the sector and, by extension, the people of South Australia whom firefighters magnificently serve and protect.

I did say earlier that the member for Morphett had some form in this particular area and I will relay a story to the house. Sometime I think in 2004, give or take a year either side, following a very serious accident in the member for Morphett's electorate, Camden fire station was required to respond to an incident. It was a vehicle fire where, unfortunately, a young man died. He pulled me aside and said, 'I have heard whispers about there not being enough water available at that incident and I just want to check with you, Paul, whether that's the case.'

I responded to him by saying, 'Look, an appliance attending a car fire could put out three or four car fires using the water that they have on board through high pressure. The second thing is why on earth would you raise this when parents are grieving about a son who they have lost, and you are going to advance that this could have been prevented had water been available.' I said, 'You're wrong.' Little did I know that, while I was talking to him, a press release had already gone out. It was just outrageous.

I know there is a large cloud hanging over the member for Morphett, and that cloud, of course, is the next preselection. We know there is talk about Matt Williams being parachuted into that seat, but the reality is that the member for Morphett has to think before he speaks.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is out of his spot and is warned for the first time.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (FIREARMS OFFENCES) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:38): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill implements a promise given to those affected by the tragic consequences of the Humbles case, particularly the father of the victim of the fatality, Mr Mark McPherson. It is a promise easy to keep, for it also complements the government's already tough approach to illegal firearms and gun crime. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

There are two central measures.

First, the bill designates the trafficking offences contained in s14 and s10C(10) of the *Firearms Act 1977* as 'serious firearm offences' in fulfilment of a commitment made by the Government in July 2014.

The bill also provides for a new extended statutory complicity offence, to ensure those offenders who commit serious firearms offences are held fully responsible for the consequences flowing from their offending.

The Bill**Serious Firearm Offences**

In September 2012, Parliament passed the *Statutes Amendment (Serious Firearm Offences) Bill 2012* which was assented to on 27 September 2012. This Act is a series of interlocking measures that are aimed at attacking lawless firearms crime at the more serious end of the scale, with a view to the protection of the public and the deterrence of those who attack public integrity and wilfully ignore the message that gun crime will not be tolerated in South Australia.

A central feature of the Act is the imposition of a very severe approach to the sentencing of serious firearm offenders. The *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* was amended to include in that category those offenders who commit a firearms offence involving the use or carriage of a firearm against the *Firearms Act 1977* and the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*:

- that involves in any way a firearm that is illegal under all circumstances;
- that involves in any way a fully automatic firearm; and
- that involves in any way a handgun that is unregistered and the person is unlicensed.

The consequence of falling within that category of offenders is that there will be a presumption that a sentence of immediate imprisonment will be imposed, and that the only reason for not imposing a sentence of immediate imprisonment will be 'exceptional circumstances'; and 'exceptional circumstances' cannot be found unless the sentencing court is satisfied by evidence on oath that the personal circumstances of the offender are sufficiently exceptional to outweigh the presumed primacy of public safety, and personal and general deterrence.

On 16 July 2014, the Government announced that it would change the law so that an offence of trafficking in a firearm would qualify as a 'serious firearms offence', with the result that a serious firearm offender must be sentenced to a term of imprisonment, and that sentence cannot be suspended unless the offender can demonstrate to the court exceptional personal circumstances of mitigation such that the statutory policy of the criminal law to deter serious firearm offenders is outweighed.

This Bill implements that promise. The Bill amends the current provisions to add to the categories of serious firearm offender referring to the use or carriage of a firearm offences of trafficking in a firearm contrary to sections 10C(10) and 14 of the *Firearms Act 1977*. In particular, that involves amending the definition of 'serious firearm offence' in s 20AA(1) of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*.

Derivative Liability Offence

The liability of a person who is complicit in the criminal offences committed by another is governed by the law of complicity. It is partly statutory and partly common law. The statutory part is contained in s 267 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. That says:

267—Aiding and abetting

A person who aids, abets, counsels or procures the commission of an offence is liable to be prosecuted and punished as a principal offender.

But that is not the only source of derivative liability. At common law, a person may be found guilty of a crime committed by another if it was committed under a common purpose (sometimes known as 'joint enterprise') or, further, via a doctrine known as 'extended common purpose' (or 'extended joint enterprise'). The differences between these forms of liability rest on what the offender contemplates might follow from the joint enterprise. This is most simply illustrated by example.

The most obvious example is the Humbles case. The defendant gives the principal offender a gun and the principal offender commits murder with it. Under what circumstances will the defendant be guilty of a homicide offence?

The leading case on this particular question is *R v Bainbridge* [1960] 1 QB 129. The defendant in that case supplied oxy-acetylene torches to the principal offender who, in turn, used them to rob a bank. He was convicted of aiding the commission of the bank robbery (and hence was convicted of bank robbery). On appeal, he agreed that he suspected that the torches would be used to commit a crime, but did not know which one. The court on appeal held that it was sufficient that he knew the general type of crime in contemplation—in this case a theft type of crime and upheld the conviction.

The law on point was recently explained by Kourakis CJ in *R v B, FG; R v S, BD* [2012] SASC 157. He said:

It is the state of mind of the alleged accessory at the time that the assistance is given that determines his or her liability. The degree of knowledge or belief of what the principal is doing or might do that is necessary for liability will depend on the facts of each case. For example, a garden and hardware salesperson who merely suspects that a customer intends to use the purchased items for an unlawful purpose is unlikely to be culpable. On the other hand, a salesperson who believes that the purpose is unlawful, perhaps on the basis of an overheard conversation, may be culpable even if his belief is not sufficiently certain to be characterised as knowledge. Much will depend on the degree of certainty, the existence of a lawful excuse or reason for providing the assistance and whether or not the alleged accessory desires the commission of the offence.

The law requiring proof of the state of mind of the accessory for liability in complicity is complicated and hard to explain to a jury. Moreover, it has a tendency to limit extended complicity liability to cases in which there is temporal immediacy between the joint venture or common enterprise and the criminal outcome. The closer the link in time, the easier it is to draw the inference of foresight of the possibility of the type of crime actually committed.

But it is arguable that the commission of a firearms offence is a special case. A firearm is a uniquely lethal weapon of spectacular danger. Laws surround its use and possession in great detail for that reason.

The policy of the law should be that, if you put a gun in the hands of an irresponsible person, and you do so illegally, then you wear the consequences of that action. Cullen should be guilty, not just of the weapons offences, but of murder or manslaughter. Firearms are uniquely and directly dangerous to life and limb and should be a special case.

The Government therefore proposes that the law should be changed so that, if a person commits a firearm trafficking or supply offence, and the commission of that offence results (in fact), directly or indirectly, in a firearm coming into the possession of an unlicensed person, the first person is liable for any offence committed by the second person with that firearm.

The derivative offence has been designed to be a stand-alone offence, with a maximum penalty of a term of imprisonment no longer than the maximum term of the subsequent offence, being the offence committed by the person who has received the gun from the supplier.

The emphasis has been placed on the conduct of the person supplying the firearm, rather than the outcome of the actions of the second (principal) offender.

The new derivative liability offence is not unfair or unreasonable. It has its own maximum penalty, the supplier can be sentenced and the individual circumstances of their offending are then taken into consideration. The penalty is still related to the subsequent offence, to ensure that the supplier is still responsible for the consequences of their actions in supplying the firearm.

The extended liability provision will apply to juveniles. So it should. That is the case responded to. By correct analogy with complicity, the juvenile caught by extended liability will be treated as a principal offender. The Bill says so. That means that the juvenile caught for homicide will be treated as a young offender. The critical age is the age of the offender at the time that the supply offence was committed.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

4—Insertion of Part 7C

This clause inserts new Part 7C into the principal Act. Part 7C inserts section 267AA.

New section 267AA creates an offence where a person who, in the course of committing a prescribed firearms offence, unlawfully supplies a firearm to another and that firearm is subsequently used in the commission of an offence against the principal Act.

A prescribed firearms offence is an offence against section 10C(10) or 14(1)(b) of the *Firearms Act 1977*.

The maximum penalty for the new offence is imprisonment for a term not exceeding the maximum term that may be imposed for the subsequent offence.

Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*

5—Amendment of section 20AA—Interpretation

This clause amends section 20AA of the principal Act to include an offence against section 10C(10) or 14 of the *Firearms Act 1977* in the definition of serious firearm offence.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION (CHANGE OF NAME) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Births, Deaths and Marriages Act 1996; and to make a related amendment to the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (15:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

At the 2014 state election, the government committed to stopping serious sex offenders and violent serious offenders from changing their name without permission. The Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration (Change of Name) Amendment Bill 2015 implements this election commitment by strengthening the change of name provision in the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

At present in South Australia, an adult person who is domiciled or ordinarily resident in this State or whose birth is registered in this State can apply to the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages for the registration of a change of name. Before registering a change of name the Registrar may require the applicant to provide evidence to establish to the Registrar's satisfaction the identity and age of the person whose name is to be changed and that the change of name is not sought for an improper or fraudulent purpose. The Registrar may also refuse to register a change of name if, as a result of the change, the name would become a prohibited name. Prohibited names include names that are offensive or obscene or that are contrary to the public interest for some other reason.

Unfortunately, the system is open to abuse and a change of name may be sought by criminals in order to further an unlawful activity or purpose, such as evading supervision whilst on parole or obtaining a firearms licence in

another jurisdiction. Although the Registrar has the ability to refuse an application for a change of name if it is sought for an improper or fraudulent purpose, in practice, without knowledge of the criminal history of the applicant and the circumstances of the offending, it will be difficult for the Registrar to determine whether the name change is being sought for an improper purpose or for a legitimate reason.

To minimise abuse of the change of name system and potential fraud, the Bill makes two major changes to the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act*. Firstly, the Bill amends section 24 of the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act* so that a person may only apply for a change of name in South Australia if the person is born in South Australia or if the person was born overseas and has been residing in South Australia for the past 12 months. This will ensure that an applicant has a connection to the jurisdiction in which they wish to change their name. Of course there may be situations where it is appropriate for the Registrar to waive the residency requirement for a person who was born outside of Australia, for example, in the case of a domestic violence victim. The amendment therefore gives the Registrar discretion to waive the residency requirements and approve a change of name if it is sought for the protection of the applicant or a child of the applicant or is related to a marriage or divorce of the applicant.

Secondly, the Bill inserts a new division into the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act* to require certain categories of offenders to obtain the permission of their supervising authority before they can apply for a change of name.

The only category of offender that currently requires permission to change their name is registrable offenders under the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*. Changes of name by this category of offenders can give rise to serious concerns that would not arise in the case of a change of name by other members of the community, particularly regarding matters of safety and security when attempting to monitor such offenders in the community. A registrable offender must therefore obtain the written approval of the Commissioner of Police before changing, or applying to change, his or her name under the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act*. Similar concerns arise in relation to other categories of offenders, particularly those who have been imprisoned for a serious offence, such as a serious violent offence or a serious sex offence. To provide greater oversight of changes of name by these offenders, the Bill amends the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act* to make it an offence for a restricted person to apply to the Registrar to register a change of name without the approval of their supervising authority with a maximum penalty of \$10,000 or 2 years imprisonment. The supervising authority is in the best position to determine whether a change of name is appropriate as it will be fully aware of the applicant's criminal history and the circumstances of the offending.

A restricted person is defined in the Bill as a prisoner, a parolee, a person released on licence under section 24 of the *Criminal Law Sentencing Act 1988* or a person or a class of persons declared by the regulations to be a restricted person. Unless otherwise provided for by regulation, the supervising authority is the Chief Executive of the Department of Correctional Services. A supervising authority must not approve a change of name application unless satisfied that the change of name is necessary or reasonable. For example, a change of name may be sought for religious reasons or because the offender is also a victim of crime and is seeking to escape a perpetrator. In determining whether to give approval a supervising authority will also be required to consider certain factors, including the safety of the offender and other persons, the rehabilitation, care or treatment of the offender and whether the change of name is being sought to further an unlawful activity or purpose, such as attempting to avoid supervision whilst on parole, causing offense to a victim, or circumventing security checks in order to obtain a firearms licence.

It is already an offence to knowingly make a false or misleading representation in an application or document under the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act* with a maximum penalty of \$1,250. To assist the Registrar to identify a restricted person, the Bill amends the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act* to require an applicant for a change of name to declare on his or her application form whether he or she is a restricted person or a registrable offender within the meaning of the *Child Sex Offender Registration Act*. In addition, new section 29G provides for the provision or exchange of information between the Registrar and the supervising authority.

To ensure that the change of name requirements for restricted persons and registrable offenders are consistent, the Bill makes consequential amendments to the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act* to provide that the Registrar must not register a change of name of a registrable offender unless she or she has received a copy of the Commissioner's written permission and must notify the Commissioner of a change of name of a registrable offender.

The new requirements for the change of name of restricted persons will be supported by administrative arrangements. An alert list of serious offenders will be sent to Births, Deaths and Marriages by the Department of Correctional Services. If one of these offenders applies for a change of name whilst in prison, on parole or released on licence under section 24 of the *Criminal Law Sentencing Act*, an alert will be raised and the Department of Correctional Services notified. The application can then be put on hold until the Registrar has received confirmation from the Department of Correctional Services that the applicant has the requisite approval.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996*

4—Insertion of heading

This clause inserts a division heading into Part 4 of the Act.

5—Substitution of section 24

This clause substitutes section 24 of the Act as follows:

24—Application to register change of adult's name

Subsection (1) provides that an adult person may apply to the Registrar, in a form approved by the Registrar, for a change of a person's name if—

- the person's birth is registered in the State; or
- the person was born outside Australia, the person's birth is not registered in another State or Territory and the person has been resident in the State for at least 12 consecutive months immediately before the date of the application.

Subsection (2) provides that the Registrar may waive the requirement for the person to have resided in the State for at least 12 consecutive months, if satisfied that the change of name is sought for the purpose of the protection of the applicant, a child of the applicant, or is related to a marriage or divorce of the applicant.

Subsection (3) provides that an application for a change of name of an adult person must contain a declaration indicating whether the person is, at the time of making the application, a restricted person as defined in proposed section 29B, or a registrable offender within the meaning of the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*.

6—Amendment of section 25—Application to register change of child's name

The clause substitutes current subsection (1) to provide that the parents of a child may apply, in a form approved by the Registrar, to the Registrar for a change of a child's name if—

- the child's birth is registered in the State; or
- the child was born outside Australia, the child's birth is not registered in another State or Territory and the child has been resident in the State for at least 12 consecutive months immediately before the date of the application.

Proposed subsection (1a) provides that the Registrar may waive the requirement for the child to have resided in the State for at least 12 consecutive months, if satisfied that the change of name is sought for the purpose of the protection of the child or the applicants, or if the applicants have legally married and wish the child to change to the married name of both applicants.

Proposed subsection (1b) provides that the requirement for the child to have been resident in the State for at least 12 consecutive months immediately before the date of the application does not apply if the Court has approved the proposed change of a child's name under existing section 25(2)(c).

7—Insertion of Division 2

This clause inserts a new Division:

Division 2—Requirements for change of name of restricted persons

29B—Interpretation

This section defines key terms used in the Division, including:

- a definition of *restricted person* meaning a prisoner, a prisoner released on parole or home detention under the *Correctional Services Act 1982*, a person subject to an extended supervision order under the *Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015*, a person released on licence under section 24 of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*, or a person or a class of persons declared by the regulations to be a restricted person;
- a definition of *supervising authority* meaning the person holding or acting in the position of Chief Executive of the administrative unit of the Public Service that is, under a Minister, responsible for the administration of the *Correctional Services Act 1982*, or a person declared by the regulations to be a supervising authority in respect of a restricted person or a class of restricted person.

29C—Application of Division

Subsection (1) provides that the provisions in proposed Division 2 are in addition to the requirements and restrictions contained in Part 4 Division 1. Subsection (2) states that the provisions of the proposed Division do not apply to the change of name of a restricted person who is a registrable offender within the meaning of the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*.

29D—Application for change of name by or on behalf of restricted person

The section makes it an offence for a restricted person, or a person on behalf of a restricted person, to apply to the Registrar or a registering authority to register a change of name of a restricted person without the written approval of the supervising authority, with a maximum penalty of \$10,000 or imprisonment for 2 years. If the court convicts a person of an offence, subsection (3) gives the court power to declare void, on application by the prosecution, a change of name registered in relation to the person, and the Registrar must, on being notified of that declaration, correct the Register.

29E—Approval by supervising authority for change of name of restricted person

The section provides that a supervising authority may approve the making of an application to the Registrar or a registering authority for registration for a change of name of a restricted person. In determining whether to grant the approval, the supervising authority must have regard to the following:

- the safety of the restricted person and other persons;
- the rehabilitation, care or treatment of the restricted person;
- whether the proposed change of name could be used to further an unlawful activity or purpose, to evade or hinder the supervision of the restricted person, or could be considered offensive to a victim of crime or the immediate family of a deceased victim of crime.

The supervising authority must not approve the making of an application unless satisfied that the change of name is necessary or reasonable. If approval is given, the supervising authority must, as soon as practicable, give written notice of the approval to the applicant and the Registrar or registering authority. The section also provides that the supervising authority may delegate any of his or her powers under the proposed section.

29F—Additional requirements for registration of change of name of restricted person

The section provides that the Registrar—

- must not register a change of name of a restricted person unless the Registrar has received a copy of the notice of approval of the supervising authority to the application for registration of a change of name;
- must notify the supervising authority once the change of name has been made;
- may correct the Register if a change of name has been registered in contravention of the Division.

29G—Information exchange between Registrar and supervising authority

The section provides for an arrangement to be entered into between the Registrar and the supervising authority for the exchange of information for the purposes of the proposed Division.

Schedule 1—Related amendment

Part 1—Amendment of *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*

1—Amendment of section 66K—Change of name of registrable offender

The clause inserts a new subsection (2a) which provides that the Registrar must not register a change of name of a registrable offender unless he or she has received a copy of the Commissioner of Police's written permission for the change of name, and that the Registrar must notify the Commissioner of a change of name of a registrable offender.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

CRIMINAL LAW (EXTENDED SUPERVISION ORDERS) BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 30 June 2015.)

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

Amendment Nos 1 to 13—

That the House of Assembly agrees with the amendments made by the Legislative Council.

Consequential amendment—

That the House of Assembly makes the following consequential amendment:

Clause 5, page 4, lines 17 to 19 [clause 5(d)]—Delete paragraph (d)

I will just explain where I am going. Clause 5(d) includes, in the meaning of 'high-risk offender', 'a person in prison for an offence of breaching a supervision order'. That offence, which was in clause 17 of the bill before it was deleted by the amendments, does not exist, as a result of the government amendments. Hence, clause 5(d) should have been deleted as part of the amendments. This amendment rectifies that.

The CHAIR: Is that understood? Everyone understands that?

Mr GARDNER: Yes, it is. It is my understanding that this is probably the only chance I will have to speak on this again before we send it back to the Legislative Council for their consequential consideration of—

The CHAIR: And you are going to take that opportunity?

Mr GARDNER: I am doing so right now—or, I was.

The CHAIR: Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: —what the Attorney-General has described as a consequential amendment, and what might more accurately, I submit, be described as a drafting error. Which brings me to my point: when the government seeks, in these critically important bills that deal with legal matters and the nature of freedom, and whether people can run around doing their business or not, it sometimes pays to take a little bit of time and get it right.

When the government comes to the parliament with bills that it says have to be through both houses this afternoon otherwise the opposition is stalling the course of justice, then I counsel the government to stop doing that, because it does no-one any credit at all. This is another example.

There are two sets of amendments: one of them is the course of suggested amendments by the opposition in this place during the first consideration in the House of Assembly—amendments which we brought forward, having consulted widely, having spoken to the chair of the Parole Board, amongst others, who was one of the people the government assured us was dead supportive of their original bill. So, you can understand that we might have been somewhat surprised to find that she had some concerns, that we brought forward in amendments. I believe that, in the debate in this house, I made the point at the time that it was inevitable that the government would have to take those serious concerns that we had into account.

Members may recall that the bill seeks to provide a parole-like supervision framework for serious and high-risk offenders who have committed crimes of violence or of a sexual nature leading to gaol terms potentially of five years or more. At the end of their sentence, had they not undertaken rehabilitation, had they not undertaken the necessary work to show that they were going to potentially contribute to society and not pose an ongoing and serious risk to the community and to community safety, then those offenders needed to be subject to an ongoing what is called extended supervision order.

That would require the Parole Board to undertake that supervision, but what it did not do, if an order was breached by an offender, was give the Parole Board the opportunity to bring that person in. It created an offence of a breach of an extended supervision order which would have led to a potential punishment of five further years in prison.

We know that the courts are backlogged for six months at a time, we know that it is going to take a long time from somebody breaching an order for them to go to trial for that breach. The opposition submitted that, if somebody did breach an extended supervision order, bearing in mind that these are the most high-risk offenders imaginable—people who have committed serious crimes

of sexual violence and violence—it was important that that person be brought in straightaway; otherwise, what is the point of having the order at all? What is the point of calling it a parole-like environment unless somebody is going to be brought in?

The opposition made that submission. The Attorney said that it was unnecessary. We pointed out that it was inevitable that he would have to change his mind because the proposition as put originally just did not make sense. The Attorney, to his credit, confirmed that, between the houses, we could have a discussion, and that discussion went back and forth for a while.

I thank the Attorney's staff for their work in this matter. I know that they worked hard. I acknowledge also the very constructive contribution by the Hon. Terry Stephens in the Legislative Council, who assisted, and of course the Parole Board chair, Frances Nelson, who in the end, I think, had a significant role in suggesting the form of words that have been described as 'continuing detention orders' in the bill as we now seek to pass it.

These continuing detention orders provided an alternative. Rather than just being a straight breach leading to presumption against bail and the person going back into prison, it provides in effect the same thing but without the Attorney having to identify that the opposition's amendments were exactly correct in the first place. In effect, it creates a process whereby somebody who is subject to a supervision order, and breaches that order, can be arrested and detained, and the Parole Board gives consideration as to whether that detention should be continuing or, if it is a minor or technical breach, that person can be then allowed to proceed.

The Legislative Council duly passed the amendments with the support of the opposition. Of course, even in these circumstances, drafting errors can happen and that is, in fact, the nature of the Attorney's subsequent amendment. It is not a consequential amendment: it is a drafting error. Drafting errors happen, but I think that it is salient for members to consider that, when the government comes to this house with bills that they want passed immediately without debate, without thinking about it, without public consultation and without so much as having a chance to run a ruler over the bill itself and ensure that there have not been errors, errors can be made.

The government has made one on this occasion. It is easily fixed, but I caution and I counsel the government, and I counsel anyone listening, anyone interested in these debates about justice issues, that there are serious consequences when the parliament makes mistakes of a technical and drafting nature or, indeed, when consultation is skipped, and when consideration by people such as, in this case, Frances Nelson, is seen as too inconvenient to deal with.

What is more critical is that we get it right because what might take an extra week or two in this place can have serious consequences for lives. A week or two to get it right is more than worthwhile. In this case, with this bill, I think we have got it right. I congratulate the government for getting there in the end. I know that it took a lot of hard work to get there from some members within the department and the minister's office, so I thank them and congratulate them for that work. I support the amendments, the opposition supports the amendments and we look forward to the passage of the bill.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Madam Chair, I thank opposition members for their support and for their comments.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:50): I was part way through describing how the Labor government is continuing to ruin traffic flows throughout the city, having just described the tram. I also want to discuss the bus lanes that were brought in to compensate for a failed new contractor, where new timetables were printed allowing extra time and bus lanes were created because the new contractor could not achieve the previous contractor's times and an apparent cost saving ended up in chaos and a huge loss in patronage on buses throughout the city.

We also have the new Convention Centre which the Liberal Party is in strong support of. However, I do not think that anyone realised that one lane would be permanently removed from Morphett Street with a further lane, on occasion, being coned off when there are large events. King William Street also gets blocked off during events at the Adelaide Oval, which should not be happening, with wise decisions not being made.

War Memorial Drive is also blocked off to traffic every time there is a game or large sporting event even though we were promised within the budget of \$450 million that a footbridge over the top of War Memorial Drive was to be built. However, alas, that did not happen and we ended up spending another \$40 million plus on a bridge that takes you to War Memorial Drive, which again blocks off more traffic trying to access the city.

We certainly have issues, and I tie that back to the \$160 million budget line for the O-Bahn, which I am certain will cause many and severe traffic consequences, particularly along Grenfell Street between East Terrace and Frome Street where many of my residents live. There are 10 driveways and they will be severely impacted if the tunnel comes up where it is supposed to, or as pictured coming up in version 4.

If there are any water mains that break on Grenfell Street, or any traffic jams or accidents, it does leave a big problem when you are funnelling every single bus into the one street. Currently the buses can take alternate routes down North Terrace, down Grenfell Street and down Rundle Street. Luckily, the government has decided not to now block off Rundle Street, which would have caused more traffic hazards and chaos throughout the city.

Another issue that has also arisen in this budget is the removal of the North Adelaide police station. That is a big shame and a big loss to the people of North Adelaide and Prospect, and the many people in the local area who would use that police station because it provides convenient parking and it is easily accessible. North Adelaide has a lot of older people, as well as students, who do not all drive, so it was very convenient for people who walk. It is quite difficult to get a park in Hindley Street, and for people who walk everywhere it is also difficult to access. That was a great shame and a loss to people on the street; and, as part of the community, the local police officer was well known and respected by the local community.

As I mentioned earlier, the tram was one of the reasons that I was compelled to do something in terms of running for parliament; in fact, there were many reasons. As an accountant and being a small business owner at the time of 15 years, I felt that I could no longer sit back and watch my beautiful state of South Australia be destroyed by what I found was a very incompetent Labor government—economically incompetent, making a series of very bad decisions that I could no longer tolerate. Alas, I am still in opposition; however, I am here, and while I am here there is hope.

This government continues to make what I would see as reckless and poor financial decisions on behalf of all the people of South Australia. If you spent a week in my office and saw how many people came in in tears because they cannot afford to live in their homes anymore because of the cost of electricity, water, gas, council rates, land taxes and the emergency services levy, you would hang your head in shame at what this government sees as useful spending and wise spending.

Spending \$160 million on an O-Bahn to save 2½ minutes when there are people who still have the emergency services levy, which the Liberal Party supports removing, helps me get out of bed every day and fight harder to make sure that one day we are in government because this government continues to prove how incompetent they are with the economy and with business. With that, I end my remarks.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:55): My voice is fading fast, so I will not detain the house for the full 20 minutes on the Appropriation Bill. I could provide you with some prepared remarks, but that would require me to write it in advance and that is against, of course, Westminster practice and procedure, as Erskine May tells us; instead, I offer just a few remarks on the Appropriation Bill *ex tempore*.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: That would be good.

Mr GARDNER: I am glad that the minister is looking forward to them because they affect him as much as anybody. The first point I wish to make about the Appropriation Bill is that it is another one in a long line of Labor budgets that is disappointing for the future of South Australia. It is disappointing, particularly given that I, and I think many other members of this house, came into this place because we wanted to see South Australia provide employment opportunities for our next generation so that those who have children or those of us who do not, but when we do have children, will be able to see them grow up in this state, find jobs they want to do in this state and stay in this state.

When I am old and unable to work and look after myself, they will be able to look after me in my dotage in this state without inconvenience because they will still be here; that is terribly important for me. Yet this budget we have been presented with by the Treasurer, this budget described as a 'jobs budget' supposedly, contains a suggestion that employment in South Australia is going to grow by 1 per cent over the next 12 months—less, in fact, by 0.25 per cent than the prior budget forecasts before this budget were handed down and 0.75 per cent lower than when the first forecast for this financial year was being presented.

As we are on the first day of the 2015-16 financial year with 1 per cent employment growth ahead of us, I would just make the point that if this were a jobs budget according to this Labor government, I would hate to see what a non-jobs budget would be like. If this is a jobs budget with 1 per cent employment growth, what would they be serving up if they had been focusing on something else, I ask you, Deputy Speaker? That is very disappointing, but, as my voice unfortunately fades, I do wish to make a couple of comments on the portfolio areas which I have the privilege of serving Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition as its spokesperson.

In the police area, I note that there is nothing in the budget papers to suggest that the government is going to be able to meet its Target 300 promises. Once you take into account those sworn officer positions which have been reassigned out of sworn officer positions—custodial, management, solicitors and so forth—the net jobs increase of sworn officers from when the promise of the Target 300 was made until the revised and rephased second-time promise of 2018 is not going to be met. They are going to fall well short.

We have had the redescription of the target to include cadets. We have had the redescription of the target to be net above attrition as long as you take out all of those jobs that are no longer sworn officer jobs. But the government and previous ministers are clearly on the record on numerous occasions saying that we had 4,400 sworn officers at the beginning of the promise and at the end of the promise we would have 4,700 sworn officers. This is the evidence that was given to the Budget and Finance Committee. This is the evidence given by former minister Foley, by former minister O'Brien and others.

When we get to that delayed promise date—originally, it was supposed to be by 2013; now it is by 2018, after the next election—I am afraid that, under the government's budget settings, reconfirmed in this budget, they will still fall short of their election promise, taken to two elections, of 300 extra sworn officers on the beat, on the streets (and all the other words they used) over and above attrition.

That is deeply disappointing, but I do certainly appreciate that South Australian police have had some extra equipment in this budget and I congratulate the government for that. I particularly congratulate the government for finally committing the necessary funds, after six years of trials, so that South Australian police can have the body-worn cameras. That will enable ease of evidence gathering, reduce the likelihood of vexatious litigation and claims against police and assist in the daily progress of so much of their work.

I think the money committed is enough for 1,000 cameras, which is, one would hope, enough to make that facility available to those officers on active duty. There is obviously a little bit of work to do in relation to the regulations of how they are to be used, when they are to be switched on, when they are to be switched off and so forth. The opposition is happy to work with and assist the government in any way we can to ensure that this piece of kit is available for use by police officers.

Of course, the opposition is pleased to support that, as it was, in fact, the centrepiece of the Leader of the Opposition's speech to the Police Association last year—an early commitment that,

3½ years from an election, the Leader of the Opposition is willing to commit the opposition, 'a future Marshall Liberal government', to the purchase of body-worn cameras for police officers in South Australia. I identify that, at the time, of course, we also very much encouraged the government to take up this prospect, so I congratulate them for doing so now.

Just to finish on the matter of the police, there will obviously be some changes in the administration of South Australia Police in the next couple of weeks. Commissioner Gary Burns has a couple of weeks left. I note that his wife, whom I had the pleasure of sitting next to on Friday night at the Police Association dinner for retiring members, is particularly excited about this fact and well she might be.

Commissioner Burns, as has been stated previously, has decades of good service to the people of South Australia and we look forward to working with Deputy Commissioner Grant Stevens as he takes on the new role of police commissioner, as we do with Assistant Commissioner Linda Williams in her new role as deputy commissioner—South Australia's first female deputy commissioner of police in the 100th year of women in South Australia Police.

I note the appointment of two new assistant commissioners in recent days and we look forward to working with them in their new roles. One of them will fill the role left vacant by Linda Williams and one will replace Assistant Commissioner Madeleine Glynn, who is retiring after decades of incredible service to the South Australian public and the South Australian police force.

Madeleine Glynn was of course the acting deputy commissioner at one time in her career. She was, I think, South Australia's first female assistant police commissioner, so I would be surprised if she had not, in fact, at least in that acting capacity, been South Australia's first deputy commissioner. She has had a long and distinguished career herself, serving in a range of different areas within the police force. She is from a policing family and I know that she will continue to be a significant part of the South Australian policing community and the South Australian community in retirement. We certainly wish her well from the opposition benches, and I am sure the minister does as well.

Just in the last couple of minutes, I wish to pay a little bit of attention to Corrections. I was interested to hear on the radio this morning Mr David Brown say, as I have heard the minister say on too many occasions to remember, that we have had an 'unprecedented growth in prisoner numbers' over the past 18 months. I promise you that that phrase has been drilled into my mind—'an unprecedented growth in prisoner numbers'.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: It's true.

Mr GARDNER: The minister interjects that it is true, so I suppose all I am left with is to cast some suggestions about the nature of the definition of the word 'unprecedented' because, over the last 12 months, the increase in—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: 8.4 per cent.

Mr GARDNER: The minister says '8.4 per cent' which is interesting because in the budget papers it suggests 11 per cent in prisoner numbers, but the budget papers may well be slightly off. The budget papers present an estimated result and the minister may well know the figure as it was yesterday. So let me just stick to the figures in the budget papers because it is comparing apples with apples. As the minister knows, if you take a point in time comparison—and we had this discussion in estimates last year—and there is a certain number of prisoners on 30 June every year that is one figure, but the figure in the budget papers is average daily prisoner numbers, and the average daily prisoner numbers over the last 12 months—and while I do not have the figures in front of me, I promise you that it is 12 per cent, maybe 11 per cent, it is over 10 per cent and less than 13 per cent.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: This is unprecedented.

Mr GARDNER: Well, the minister keeps saying, 'It is unprecedented.' The year before it was 10 per cent and in 2008 it was 11 per cent.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: In 2007-08, and the minister might care to go back, it was actually the same. Do you know what the Hon. Carmel Zollo, the minister for corrections at the time, said? You will never guess. Check out what was in parentheses before, and I checked one of her press releases, 'There's been an unprecedented growth in prisoner numbers over the last 12 months.' It was 10 per cent and 10 per cent and 8 per cent. 'An unprecedented growth in prisoner numbers.' Over the last two years, 10 per cent and 10 per cent, 'An unprecedented growth in prisoner numbers.' The department had this growth of between 0.5 per cent one year and 5 per cent for many of the others, and then they have had two years of 10 per cent plus.

Over the last 12 months the growth is exactly the same, if not slightly more, but only by a margin of error as the year before, and it is a similar growth in the year leading up to when we were talking about building a new prison at Mobilong. I understand that 10 per cent over the last two years is higher than the three years before, but the minister suggesting that this has never happened before in the history of the South Australian community is dead wrong based on the numbers just seven years ago. The fact that it is unprecedented does not actually also abscond the minister from responsibility and his government from responsibility—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Absolve.

Mr GARDNER: Absolve, sorry, thank you.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: The minister can abscond all he likes but it does not absolve him from responsibility.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: The minister will have to forgive me as I am speaking without notes and with a serious cold at the moment, so I ask for that wave of forgiveness for absconding rather than absolving. It does not absolve the minister and his government from the fact that they have put into place the very settings, and they have understood the different approach by police to, for example, domestic violence offences, whereby far more are being locked up than before for similar offences, and that is quite important work that is being done. But all of these things, whether it is the bail breaches which are now hundreds that have been increasing prisoner numbers or whether it is the capture of historical sex offenders which also led to an increase—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Domestic violence.

Mr GARDNER: Domestic violence was the first one I identified, sir.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Sorry.

Mr GARDNER: That's alright. All of these things are results of either policy decisions or trends in society that are readily identifiable, or in fact approaches within the corrections department, for example, in the way in which people who are released on parole might be returned into custody for bail breaches. It is also as a result of decisions within government to do with funding of courts, for example, which is contributing significantly to the extraordinary delay in matters being held before the District Court, and the extraordinary six, seven, eight month waiting lists for cases to be heard, to the point that we have this farcical situation where significant numbers of prisoners are now spending more time on remand awaiting trial than they end up getting sentenced to.

The minister might care to have a look at the length of time served in police watchhouse cells by prisoners sentenced to serve terms of more than 15 days—which is actually an offence under the act but no penalty is applied to the government of course as it does not in these things. There are prisoners who end up serving more time in prison than they are sentenced to because of delays in the court system. So the government cannot absolve themselves of responsibility for prison overcrowding when not only is it a failure of planning but it is a failure to even think about planning for the situation they find themselves in.

Over the next 12 months the budget papers identify that the number of the average daily prisoner population is a total of three prisoners less than the approved capacity in the prisons; the budget papers identify that over the next 12 months there is an approved daily prisoner capacity that

is only three beds more than average daily prisoner numbers. Given that on your average weekend people being picked up for various offences causes the population to spike significantly, I do not need to tell any member here that three above the average daily prisoner population means that there will be a significant number of days where the population spikes above that approved capacity.

That means we will continue to have this situation where prisoners are being housed in the City Watchhouse and in the Holden Hill police cells. In fact, it used to be the Sturt police cells as well, but the police are so sick of this situation that they have said that the corrections department can no longer use the police cells at Sturt to hold their overflow prisoners. They have also said, in correspondence that we have received through FOI recently, that the basement of the watchhouse is now also out of action for Corrections overflow use.

So with all of the increase in spending on new cells that has come into effect since last year's budget, over and above last year's budget, with all the extra shipping containers they have plonked on the sides of the existing prisons, with all the current overflow into Holden Hill and the City Watchhouse that is happening at unprecedented levels despite the not quite unprecedented growth in prisoner numbers, despite all of that there is still going to be this situation continuing. If prisoner numbers remain static—and I know the department has predicted a 2 or 3 per cent growth in prisoner numbers over the next 12 months, despite the fact that for the last two years it has been over 10 per cent—if all that remains static, we are still going to have this overflow into the Watchhouse that is unbudgeted.

Last year the blowout was \$9 million just on the unbudgeted overflow into the watchhouse. In addition to that there were tens of millions of dollars worth of extra cells put in; the total in the budget, over the last few years, of ongoing construction work on new infrastructure is \$200 million plus on new cells. This is the cost of the government's rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em policy of the last six years. This is the financial cost; forget the human cost, this is just the financial cost to taxpayers. This is \$200 million in infrastructure.

The prisons budget from year to year has blown out by 20 per cent in the last two years, from under \$180 million to over \$220 million a year just in custodial management. That does not include rehab, that does not include Community Corrections. There is a 20 per cent blowout in just the staff costs of keeping people locked up in cells before you even spend a cent on rehab; that is a 20 per cent increase there, \$40 million a year there. Deputy Speaker, I am sure you will be interested to know how much extra the government has correspondingly put into rehab: CPI, barely CPI. It may be less than CPI; we will check. It has gone from about \$23 million to about \$24 million, and we are spending from \$180 million to \$220 million a year alone in keeping people locked up.

It is \$40 million extra a year in financial costs and \$200 million in infrastructure costs just for keeping people locked up, because the government did not do the work prior to the 2010 election to ensure new facilities. All these things could have been managed so much more easily in a custom-made facility; instead, we have paid out \$10 million to the PPP partner not to build that new prison and we are left with a situation where we have these rapidly expanding costs that the South Australian taxpayer is burdened with.

That is money that cannot be spent on things we want to spend it on. That is money that is not available for the Repat Hospital, that is money that is not available for improved services at Modbury Hospital, that is money that is not available, according to the government, to install better park-and-ride facilities at Paradise Interchange. There is not a project that the government could imagine that could not be paid for had the government not mismanaged the prison system so badly over 13 years; mismanagement, poorly guided policy and absolutely no interest in improving the situation.

Members may ask what we could do better, and I have alluded to it before. It is a matter of priorities and forward planning. As far as infrastructure goes, we need to get ahead of the game because otherwise we will be constantly spending extra money on the overflow capacity in the City Watchhouse and the Holden Hill police cells and everything else. That is far more expensive than actually managing somebody in a prison. If you get the infrastructure right ahead of the game, if you spend the money ahead of the game, then you do not have all those overflow costs, which are extraordinarily futile and a stupid waste of money.

The second (and perhaps more important) question is: are the right people in prison? I know there is some work being done on this; but we have a high remand rate that is 10 per cent higher than the national average. No other state in Australia has anywhere near as many people on remand as we do; no other state in Australia has anywhere near as many people serving more time on remand than they end up being sentenced to. It just does not happen anywhere else. Thirty-five per cent of South Australia's prisoners are on remand—it is extraordinary. Get the remand rate down and you might actually find that there are some people who end up needing to serve fewer days in prison because they have not been sentenced to so many days.

The third point I make is in relation to rehabilitation. Eighty-seven prisoners will receive rehabilitation programs this year, according to the budget papers—87 out of a daily prison population of over 2,700. Eighty-seven out of 4,000 prisoners who will be in the system over the course of this year—87. That is why we have the recidivism rate that we do—the number of people reoffending—because they do not have a job to go to, they do not have anywhere to live, and they do not have their cognitive behavioural defects fixed while they are in the prison system, while they are locked up. It is the government's fault, and I urge them to rethink their policies in this area.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (16:16): I rise to speak in support of the Appropriation Bill 2015, and I will not speak for very long, but I want to put it on record that I support this bill and applaud the Treasurer and his dedicated staff on their focused and determined work given the challenges faced by South Australia.

I think it is worthy to note that South Australia does not exist in isolation; it is not an island. Indeed, it is part of the country called Australia, and affecting us is what the commonwealth government has bestowed upon us, and that is the resolute determination to tear up the funding grants and their governing structure which is quite blinkered and single-minded. We see this strategy playing out in the way they have not supported the auto manufacturing industry and also now how they are handling the Navy shipbuilding industry. Within these confines, I believe that we, as a state government, have delivered a very solid state budget. Compounding this, we also see the collapse of commodities and also impacts from the rest of the world on how we are acting as an economy. The government has risen above all these issues and delivered a budget plan, and this plan has significant sun on the horizon, I am pleased to say.

The Hon. S.W. Key: How poetic; lovely.

Ms DIGANCE: Do you like that?

The Hon. S.W. Key: Yes.

Ms DIGANCE: Good. I would like to speak on behalf of my electorate of Elder, and I do represent the good people of that electorate, which is filled with amazing, energetic and committed people who, on a daily basis, believe in their community and demonstrate this through their positive contribution every day knowing that they live in a very great place called South Australia. I have already spoken about some of these groups in this house over the time I have been here.

To highlight a few projects that we have already seen happen in Elder, I think it is noteworthy that the world-leading, innovative and collaborative Tonsley redevelopment site is a hub of business, research, education and community that comes together in a very unique, vibrant sharing of ideas, and a very unique ecosystem. Created on the 61-hectare Mitsubishi site, it has been redeveloped in sympathy with the rural and industrial history of the area.

For anyone who has not been to there to have a look, I suggest you do that. Connecting this site with the rest of Adelaide is the Tonsley line which has been upgraded, with new trains and a frequent service of new trains on a daily basis bar weekends. As demand grows, I am sure we will see those train services growing. That is also noteworthy. In the near future, we will also see the Darlington upgrade project. I had a briefing on that project again this week, and a lot of work is going into facilitating the north-south corridor.

Part of this Darlington upgrade project sees some of the most concentrated traffic moving along parts of it, between Flinders Medical Centre and South Road near the Tonsley turnoff, which I was quite astounded to hear. Interestingly, this part of the north-south corridor will then join up to the worthy project that other members have already mentioned, the Southern Expressway duplication.

It is a fine project, which I think we could all support and agree with, and it does signify that there is a population growing past the Darlington interchange and past the suburb of Marion, as we see the traffic increasing on that dual highway.

The other project that I think is noteworthy, which is happening just outside my electorate, will be the state-of-the-art rehabilitation centre and centre for older persons at the Flinders Medical Centre as a result of the Transforming Health program. The Transforming Health program is by no means a program that we can put aside. It is actually a very brave program. It is a program that recognises that how we deliver health needs to change as we move into the future, to ensure that our health system not only is a sustainable health system but also delivers the high quality that we have come to appreciate. I am certainly a great supporter of the Transforming Health program.

There are issues that still need to be ironed out, and I think we are all aware of those. Along with other members, I spend quite a bit of time speaking to various people who are affected by the Transforming Health program, and the issues that they raise with me I certainly do feed back into the program. As a result of feedback, we have seen the retention of the neonatal intensive care level 6 unit at the Flinders Medical Centre. I am really passionate about this unit, and I did campaign for it during the state campaign not so long ago. I campaigned to ensure that we not only retain that unit but also see funding heading in that direction to ensure we can upgrade it to cater for those little babies and those critical situations we see arise in that unit.

I will touch on two other areas, and I think our state government and our Treasurer have addressed these areas very well. The first is the recognition that business is important and critical. Stimulation and supporting of business to our economy is critical to the development of our state, so we have seen measures being put in place and rolled out over time, but some have actually been put in place immediately. I commend the Treasurer on his foresight.

The other group I think that is worthy of note, which we as a party hold dear to our core, is those people who are vulnerable in our community. To this end, I commend the Treasurer on his support of the pensioners who will so deservedly be awarded their funding. Instead of it being put through as council rebates, they will have the choice to spend that money as they see fit, so they are empowered and enabled to choose how they will spend that money.

Mr Tarzia: But one is missing out.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is reminded he is on two warnings.

Ms DIGANCE: Would you like to join in?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No more interjections or responding to interjections. The member for Elder can continue her speech.

Ms DIGANCE: Sorry, Deputy Speaker. I think it is really important to note that not only are we supporting those pensioners who traditionally have been supported through council rebates but we will also be offering that support to those eligible people in rental properties. This is a really important distinction and progression of our policy. We recognise the importance of older people in our community.

The other group I would like to mention is one that I hear from constantly, and it is to do with those who are disabled and, in particular, the ageing parent with the ageing disabled child. The ageing parent is very concerned about what might happen to their ageing child once they are not around to care for them. To this end, I commend our Treasurer for addressing the issue of special disability trusts. From today, it is noteworthy that there is an exemption for stamp duty and land tax on the principal place of residence when there is a transfer under such a trust.

That is a really important step, I would suggest. These trusts are put in place to meet the reasonable care and accommodation of the principal beneficiary. I am sure all of us have had contact with these particular families, where the ageing parents are very concerned about their disabled child and how they will be cared for as time goes on.

I also want to talk about what our state government has done to address the stimulation of business. The list of taxes that are being abolished in the tax reform package is absolutely remarkable, and I think that we really do need to applaud our Treasurer for what he has done. I for

one understand, having been a small business owner, how important these types of supports are in business. Business does not always travel smoothly; business has its ups and downs, and any—

Ms Chapman: I thought you sold it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is reminded that she is on two warnings as well.

Ms DIGANCE: I'm happy to discuss—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No more comments. Just get on with it.

Ms DIGANCE: I applaud these and any support we can give to business, not just existing business to help them through those ups and downs but also businesses that wish to expand, and also those new businesses wishing to come in to trade in our spaces. In Elder, I have a significant number of businesses in the backstreets and along the main roads—so many that it is going to take me some time to get across to speak to all of them, and I am cognisant of that.

Business is actually what really makes our economy tick, particularly small business because they can employ one, two, three or half a dozen people. If we can support them, we will keep the economy ticking along. The more we have of those smaller and medium-size businesses the better, so I applaud what the Treasurer has done in this particular budget and look forward to the fruits of those policies.

Central to all of this—and this will be my last point—I would just like to highlight the use of language. The use of language is extremely important, and I think we would all agree that, central to any progressive and credible leadership program, is always the underpinning and foundation of positive speak, positive language, flipping problems on their head, looking for solutions, not looking for problems but moving issues ahead with solutions, and looking for a way forward.

With the budget the Treasurer has delivered, in our government we do not choose to use words such as 'stupid', 'fail', 'crisis', 'slash', 'outrageous', 'disgrace', 'nonsense', 'silly' and so on and so forth, which we have heard over the last day or so. Instead, when we speak about our budget, the people of South Australia hear words from this government such as 'create', 'reward', 'grow' and 'invest', and we talk about 'stimulating' the economy and 'building' the infrastructure because we know the power of words is something that directs people's imagination; it calls them to arms and it enables and empowers them. We use those words with this budget.

Members interjecting:

Ms DIGANCE: I am glad to see that it caused some humour because from humour and laughter grow positivity, and from there—

The Hon. S.W. Key: Alright, alright.

Ms DIGANCE: Too far? No more, okay. In conclusion, we know that to keep on building a great South Australia we need a plan, we need a blueprint based on a foundation of can-do and positive enabling dialogue. We have that plan in the budget, and we have delivered on that plan in this house, and we will continue to deliver.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (16:29): Sorry, I have to compose myself. I rise to present what will be the opposition's final statement on the Appropriation Bill, the final budget reply, and I hope that I am—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: All good things come to an end.

Mr SPEIRS: All good things—anyway I am still completely distracted by thinking about all the positive words I have got to put into this speech now. I hope that I can add a little bit more to the debate because much as been said over the past couple of days, so hopefully I can just add a little bit more from my own perspective.

This bill, which is before the house, obviously enables the government to appropriate funding, but it is an opportunity for us on this side of the house to provide a commentary on the state of South Australia's economy and to place on record my personal concerns and the concerns of many of my constituents about the significant economic challenges facing our state. In the lead-up

to the 2015 state budget, we were informed that this budget was to be all about business. Government would be backing business to trigger a business and jobs-led recovery.

In fact, the Treasurer praised the federal government's small business focused budget, and he has publicly stated that he was inspired by the small business package put together by federal small business minister, Bruce Billson. With such rhetoric, I have to admit that I awaited the state budget with genuine anticipation because I believe that it is only through reinvigorating our business sector that South Australia's moribund economy can have an opportunity for real and sustained recovery—a recovery which can create jobs and lift the quality of life of thousands of South Australians who are unemployed or underemployed or who have the uncertainty of losing their employment in the coming years.

My eagerness for this budget may have been somewhat misplaced, but I do acknowledge that there are good elements in this budget and they must be celebrated and supported. Yet, dig below the headlines, and I am not sure if this could be described as a reformist budget. It has good elements, granted, but much of it appears quite pedestrian.

I congratulate the government on its determination to reform stamp duty on commercial transactions. The abolition of stamp duty on commercial transactions by 2018-19 is a good move, but I would have to worry that the slow phasing down of stamp duty may actually create a hesitancy among many businesses to invest this financial year or in the next as they wait for the tax to be entirely removed. As the Leader of the Opposition stated in his contribution to this bill, if the government believes that this will stimulate the economy and deliver confidence which will in turn create much-needed jobs, it must happen in full now, not at a distant point in the forward estimates.

This budget to me seems like a half-hearted punt. It looks to the business sector, gives a shrug and says to it, 'Do what you can with this.' It is not terrible, but it is not great either, and it is far from inspirational. It is not going to reinvigorate business in the short term, and that is what business in South Australia needs. It needs a real, solid boost to get our entrepreneurs and business leaders out there confidently growing their businesses.

I tentatively welcome the stamp duty reform, but it has always been my belief that the government's real focus should be on payroll tax relief. Payroll tax is the most nonsensical tax in this state, and it has some competition to retain that title. The Treasurer tells us that only 10 per cent of businesses pay payroll tax in South Australia—10 per cent too many, in my opinion. Payroll tax is a misnomer. This is simply a jobs tax: a tax on job creation, a tax on business growth and a tax on investment in human capital. It discourages employers from employing.

Let's not underestimate the power of a job. Huge life change comes with having a job. A secure job with a guaranteed source of income forges a pathway of opportunity which allows people to buy a home, invest in their further education and invest in their children's education. Studies show that people involved in regular work are more likely to be involved in their communities and engaged in charitable works. Full employment has health benefits and social outcomes, particularly lowering crime rates and the incidence of violence. The availability of jobs is transformational at both the individual and the societal level. Let's not forget that those who have jobs are taxed and generally able to give more to the economy so, by having more people in work, the government is more likely to derive other sources of income from them.

The unemployment crisis gripping South Australia is a statewide disaster, but it is at its very worst amongst our young people. Youth unemployment is a catastrophe which is stealing the futures of thousands of young South Australians but, more than that, it is stealing our state's future. It is denying us the potential which flows from our young people's energy and ideas—elements that can only be harnessed when they are present. Today too many of our young people are leaving for interstate and overseas, or they are getting trapped in a cycle of poverty and missed opportunities rendering them increasingly vulnerable to the generational unemployment which takes hold in too many parts of our city and state. Let me tell you, Deputy Speaker, turning up in Leigh Creek in a duffle coat and T-shirt will not get people in South Australia back to work. Real tax reform will, and that starts with payroll tax.

But I do take the member for Elder's advice and I do want to move to the positive, because, although there are great challenges facing our state's economy and there are major problems with

employment in this state, we must not get distracted by the negatives. As an opposition we must highlight them because that is our job, but we must also cast an alternative vision.

Our state is in desperate need of a positive brand of leadership which is not obsessed with the culture of blame and distracted by clinging on to the spoils of office at all costs. Our state is crying out for a government which believes in our geographical and climatic advantages, who understands the strength and character of our people, who love this place and who are prepared to fight for our survival and who will take the risks that are needed to stimulate, grow and prosper South Australia.

South Australia has an incredible history of innovation and creativity. So often we hear government ministers say this in the introductions they write in glossy government documents. We hear it in ministerial statements delivered in this place and we hear it in hifalutin public speeches. Yes, we do have a history of innovation, and our state can look back on a heritage built on pioneering governance, but just because we have a history of such behaviour does not mean that we are immune from losing it.

Is it really part of our state's DNA? It is part of our heritage, yes, but I do not believe that it is here forever. In fact, I would be bold enough to say that it is slipping away. This environment of innovation must be maintained, nurtured and enhanced. Government's role in creating this environment can be achieved through a number of approaches. The most significant is through deregulation and government getting out of the way of good business ideas, government investing in research and development initiatives, government supporting incubation and entrepreneurial projects, such as the Flinders University's New Venture Institute, which plays an exciting role in supporting, mentoring and growing new business ideas.

I have had quite a bit to do in recent years with the New Venture Institute, which is now based at the Tonsley site at Clovelly Park, and I am particularly impressed with the work of Matt Salier and Ben Flink in supporting and mentoring businesses to get off the ground to survive and to thrive. Government has a role in creating a business environment which has a significant emphasis on small business start-ups and which ensures that South Australia becomes renowned as a start-up state—the place where small business is given a fighting chance to survive. Support programs, tax breaks and mentoring—this sort of thing is incredibly exciting and can get start-ups off the ground. South Australia should be right there in the thick of it.

That heritage and culture of innovation and entrepreneurial spirit must be fought for, it must be invested in and it must be brought to life. We have the heritage and it is a proud heritage but heritage alone is not enough. There needs to be an ongoing focus of government of maintaining and driving innovation in South Australia.

Economic recovery is often led by concentrating on an economy's strengths. In South Australia our great economic powerhouse remains our regions. Despite regional populations declining our agricultural sector remains buoyant, despite operating under the jurisdiction of a sometimes unsympathetic government, but with the right support it can further prosper. Although I represent a metropolitan electorate, I understand the need to learn more about what our state's regions are capable of. A 2014 study called 'Positioning Prosperity, Building the Lucky Country' by Deloitte highlighted the critical importance of agribusiness as one of a 'fantastic five' wealth creation industries in Australia's future economy.

Here in South Australia agribusiness has the potential to lead our state's economic recovery as the demand for food, and in particular high-quality food, grows dramatically as middle classes expand and develop in countries in our region. As Asia emerges into a series of middle-class economies, diets switch from cereals and grains towards meats, dairy products, fruits and vegetables. Similarly, growing middle classes correspond with a greater demand for foods which are characterised as green, clean, organic and healthy. While many traditional industries find their bases declining, agribusiness has the certainty of increasing demand with increasing population and as a consequence demands huge government support.

The same report by Deloitte indicated that tourism was another of the 'fantastic five' and, again, this industry's potential is laden in our regions. While 23 per cent of South Australia's population is located in our regions, 44 per cent of all tourism expenditure occurs in the regions. Our regional tourism destinations are unique across the world, and as I said here before we must aim to

become the playground of South-East Asia. Destinations such as Kangaroo Island, the Fleurieu Peninsula, our outback, and the Barossa and Clare valleys are right here in South Australia. They need to be promoted. They need to be supported. This is an industry which has huge potential and must be a great pillar of our economic recovery.

We need initiatives to grow our regional populations, recognising that while our regions are the workhorse of our economy and while Adelaide's geography places limitations on the ability of our city's footprint to grow, our regional towns and cities are crying out for population growth. Regional population initiatives, combined with investment and productive infrastructure such as a deep water port, the sealing of the Strzelecki Track and investment in regional road maintenance, are all important nation-building activities which we can base in our regions.

From backing our regions, I would like to move on to planning reform. Planning reform is something that does not necessarily cost the government money but can deliver significant economic benefits, and that is what we need to be looking at in difficult economic times—projects and initiatives which the government can look at which can grow and drive our economy, but which do not necessarily need a lot of government investment.

I see continual planning reform as a key economic driver and I am awaiting with some anticipation the arrival of the government's planning legislation in this place in the coming months. I see examples all the time where planning laws are strangling economic development and an efficient, agile system which drives economic growth must be the ultimate aim of any new planning reforms. This is not something I am pointing the finger at the state government about. I think there is a willingness to change this and I am certain that the opposition will be right behind them in creating a planning system which effectively backs economic development and economic growth.

Today, development plan amendments take far too long to initiate and work through. Often those instituted by the private sector take far too long to be completed and by the time they are, the economic opportunities first predicted have faded away. There needs to be a much more agile approach to rezoning where uncontroversial rezoning opportunities can be moved through the system in a matter of months rather than years.

In my own electorate, a long-awaited redevelopment of a brownfield site at Seacliff Park, known as the Lorenzin site or Cement Hill, is a prime site for medium-density residential development with the opportunity for a small commercial centre. Marino train station is within comfortable walking distance and the site perfectly fits within the government's 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

Granted, this is a fairly complex site, but it has taken up to three years to work through the development plan amendment. This is three years during which interest rates have been at historic lows and three years during which the developer has been ready to develop a state-of-the-art medium-density housing development in the inner south with up to 700 dwellings planned in the development. With such a cumbersome process and one characterised by so much uncertainty, often a result of local government inefficiencies and lack of capacity, you can see why those looking to invest in South Australia often take their money elsewhere.

On another rezoning matter, main arterial roads which pass through multiple council areas find themselves moving in and out of commercial and residential zones. Our planning legislation should allow rapid rezoning of these roads to allow mixed use development. These corridors should be identified, highlighted on a map and rezoned across the city, in an instant.

The City of Marion has recently prioritised a long list of rezoning opportunities but does not have the capacity to progress these all at once so, over the coming couple of years, it will slowly but surely tackle them one by one. Many are simple and uncontroversial, but they will take years to consult on due to the capacity and resources of the council. It is the same picture all across our city, and it is time for serious and detailed planning law reform. I look forward to the government bringing that updated legislation into this house and I look forward to working closely with the government to ensure that that sort of economic development role can be placed at the heart of our planning laws.

Moving on to another matter, I was pleased that recently the Economic and Finance Committee, which I am part of, offered bipartisan support for an inquiry that the Liberal members proposed into rate capping. While this has been Liberal Party policy in the past, I can speak for my colleagues when I say that we enter that inquiry with an open mind. We are keen to look at the way

in which local government asserts significant cost of living pressures on South Australian households and businesses and explore ways to curb this. Rate capping is one of these methods that has been used effectively in New South Wales and Victoria, and I am interested to see how it could be used here.

I am also interested to explore other ways that local government raises revenue, including the differential rates that it places on commercial interests. I know, from my own experience, that the City of Marion places an 80 per cent differential rate on commercial premises within that local government area, and that has a significant impact on business—a negative impact. I believe we need to look at local government's use of these differential rates, particularly when they impact business in this difficult economic time. Some local governments choose not to have differential rates for commercial premises, but far too many of them do.

The cost pressures placed by local government on South Australian households are not my only interest in reforming the sector. This is something I have spoken on time and time again in this place. I have many concerns about the capacity of elected members, the need for compulsory voting in local government (something I firmly believe would weed out the more eccentric folks who are controlling budgets of tens of millions of dollars), the need for us to take a serious look at strategic boundary reviews to maximise economic development opportunities and, perhaps most importantly, the need for us to re-engineer the culture within councils, so they see themselves as drivers of economic development, rather than inhibitors.

Some councils do this quite well; many do not. The Minister for Local Government's second reading explanation this morning, concerning amendments to the Local Government Act, outlined a range of process-focused reforms to local government but did not reach into the heart of local government and outline a new vision to reform this often tired and stale sector. I would be delighted if the government would look at that in a serious way.

Elected public office is a great privilege, a substantial blessing that can be used to create great good. Even from opposition, ideas can be driven and good things achieved for the communities we represent, but with such privilege comes a huge amount of responsibility. That responsibility must be executed in an authentic and informed way and that can only be done by engaging with our communities, finding out what drives them, what their concerns are and how we can help.

There is no doubt in my mind that, after a lengthy period in office, a government can run out of ideas and become out of touch and arrogant. The challenges facing South Australia are substantial, and a reformist agenda around taxation, governance and economic development is vital. The state government must recognise that there is a jobs crisis in South Australia and that those of us who are blessed to be elected to this place are expected by our constituents to put forward the ideas and advance these to lead a recovery. We must shun complacency and recognise that these reforms are urgent.

Time expired.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (16:49): I am pleased to stand following the member for Bright, and I commend him for his address to the house. I think it was one of the more intelligent contributions, and I want to strike to one of the points that he raised during his address, which was the need for vision and ideas in all that we do. If there is a characteristic of parliaments in Australia—and our parliament is no exception, and over the last 17 to 18 years I have watched with interest—it is becoming increasingly partisan as the fight between the two major parties seems to take priority over the battle of ideas that we all should be having, and that I think the people of South Australia would like to see us deliver.

That is why I welcome many of the points that the member for Bright raises in his address that point to the need for that vision going forward, because it is really the substance of the budget that I want to talk about during my short address, because I think it is a budget of substance; it is not a populist budget. A populist budget from this Labor government would have been one that put out bushfires all over the place and quietened angry interest groups. For example, a populist budget might have sought to turn back some of what has been commenced with Transforming Health. A populist budget might have sought to turn back some of the revenue measures that have been

opposed by so many. A populist budget would have simply looked around, probably in government seats, and sought to extinguish opposition so as to curry favour going forward towards the next election.

This budget does not do that and that is why I say that it is a budget of substance. I absolutely commend the Treasurer and his caucus colleagues for having agreed to it, because I think this Labor government, of which I am one of the two cranky Independent conservatives around the table, has demonstrated that it is a government that is thinking forward with vision and purpose and trying to actually address some of the core structural problems that exist within our state, and they are trying to fix things in a meaningful and substantial way.

I want to start with the issue of tax reform because tax reform is not easy. It is not easy to increase taxes but the default position for most governments is to increase taxes not cut them. But what this budget has done is offered the most significant package of tax reforms that this state has seen in the time I have been here. I have seen plenty of tax increases since I have been here and can I say the one that worried me first and foremost was the emergency services levy, which was introduced by the Olsen government of which I was a member, and which resulted in a queue of people outside my office winding around Mitcham Shopping Centre and down the street.

The protest was so loud, so forceful and so angry, I remember when the premier of the day asked all of us how we thought the budget was going, I had to tell him that if an election was held the next day, I thought I would lose the seat of Waite. That is how angry people were about the emergency services levy. I remember Labor members then in opposition getting up and opposing the measure but saying, 'What you have unleashed here is a rapier that will cut for years to come,' because by introducing a new tax they said, 'The Liberals themselves have introduced a device that future governments will use to broaden the tax base,' and of course that is exactly what has happened. I think that diminishes to some extent criticisms of the emergency services levy from members opposite because, after all it was the Liberals, and I admit to being one of them at the time, who introduced it. So be careful what one wishes for.

Having said that, can I say that the budget does reduce, according to the Commonwealth Grants Commission, South Australia's tax effort, which is already below the national average, down to minus 2.8 and there is a significant decline in tax per person. The budget, through the most extraordinary range of tax savings, actually lifts South Australia from being ranked seventh in terms of tax—that is the seventh worst performer—to being the second best performer once all these tax cuts are in place, second only to the Northern Territory, which I remind members receives enormous cash handouts from the commonwealth.

It really does turn things around: \$670 million worth of tax cuts is a lot; \$135 million worth of cuts to non-real stamp duty; \$388 million worth of cuts to non-residential real stamp duty; and of course share duties and a raft of other taxes, some of which have been completely thrown out like the River Murray levy and others. It is really the best I have seen in the time I have been here when it comes to tax cuts.

Of course, they are tax cuts that the opposition could easily have called for, they are tax cuts that the opposition could have championed, but it did not. This government has actually championed those tax cuts. It is one thing to get up and say that we need less taxes—that is a cheap shot; everyone can say that, everyone will agree with that, you will not find a single person who says they do not agree with that—but it is another thing to get up and say that these are the taxes you should cut, these are the quantum to which they should be cut, and here are the savings to offset those cuts. That is where the courage comes into it, that is where the political courage is required. That is what this government has done with its tax offerings.

Of course, there is \$148 million worth of concessions to pensioners that should not have been required, as a result of cuts made by the commonwealth, there is \$350 million into stimulating the economy across tourism and a raft of other measures, and substantial investments in infrastructure to schools, to roads and to public housing—really, when you look at infrastructure, it is \$10.8 million worth of investment.

I look around the city of Adelaide now and compare it to the 1990s, and I remember how desperate things were in the 1990s. You have \$3.3 billion worth of health facilities being built, you

have cranes up all over the city, there is \$1.4 billion worth of road projects, \$353 million worth of public transport projects, \$216 million in education facilities, nearly \$200 million down here at the Adelaide Festival Centre Precinct—and it will be a billion-dollar development by the time the Casino and the Lang Corporation chip in their contributions. It really is quite substantial and, without ratcheting up state debt, I am not sure how members opposite would have us travel. Do they want us to go and crank up billions and billions of dollars worth of debt simply to build infrastructure to create jobs, or do they want us to stimulate the economy? The message from those opposite was to cut taxes. That is what the government has done, but apparently that is not good enough.

I think it is a structural budget. It is a budget that makes significant changes and it is a budget that I think should be commended. It is not enough on its own, more needs to be done—and, indeed, more is being done. I point to the government's WorkCover reforms that, I must say, are simply amazing. I wrestled with this when I was a member of the Liberal Party, through iteration after iteration, where the parliament tried to deliver reform to WorkCover. This is the first time I have seen it; in effect, it is \$180 million worth of tax cuts to business. Getting that levy rate down with a one in front of it instead of a three in front of it is an extraordinary thing.

I think it is actually something that only a Labor government could have delivered. Again, I give great credit to the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Planning and his caucus for having agreed to it, because this particular one was a tough decision for a Labor caucus, a very tough decision—but it was the right decision for small business in particular. I think that if a Liberal government had been in office the stars here would have aligned differently; and to be frank, I think that a Labor opposition and a labour movement and a union movement may well have felt inclined not to support the measures had they been proposed by a conservative government. That is just the way politics plays out.

However, I must say that it is a reason to reach the view that this government is working on behalf of small business and that the people got it right at the last election. In my view they would not have got some of these things had the Weatherill government not been in office. They may have got other things, there might have been a lot of shock and pain, and that moves me on to the question of health reform and some of the cuts the government is making—and quite rightly.

I will also add—along the theme of this being a budget of substance—the observation that Transforming Health, painful and difficult though it is, again demonstrates that this government is prepared to make some tough decisions. They are difficult decisions for a Labor government but they are decisions that are being made because they are the right decisions. Here is one-third of budget outlays, here is a portfolio that employs nearly 35,000 people. The entire Australian Army is 30,000 people. That is the size of our health workforce. Costs are going up by 7 per cent to 8 per cent a year. We have nine hospitals in a city where, if you were starting with a blank sheet of paper and laying out the city in the middle of Dubai or somewhere you would probably have three or four large hospitals, really well equipped ones. We have nine. The government comes along and makes the tough decisions to reform, to run things more efficiently so that we can deliver better healthcare outcomes, and all we hear is strident opposition from members opposite.

I was the shadow minister for health; I handed over to the current Leader of the Opposition. The words I gave to him when I handed over the portfolio were, 'If we get into government, we're going to have to make some tough decisions on hospitals because the system is falling apart; it is cracking apart at the hinges. It needs reform.' Everyone opposite knows that. Everyone on this side of the house knows that. The government is doing something about it, and all we have is endless opposition.

I was part of the Liberal government that sold Modbury Hospital and flogged it off. At the time, I supported that decision. I felt we had too many hospitals. But I just say to members opposite that if you oppose the relocation of services from the Repat, if you oppose the closure of the Hampstead, which hospital will you close? Will it be Modbury? Will it be The Queen Elizabeth?

Mr Tarzia: No.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Or will you keep them all? Well, how will you pay for that I say to the member for Hartley? How will you pay for that with costs rising at 6 to 8 per cent a year and deliver the tax cuts—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for Hartley.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —and do all the things that you want to do? The thing about government is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is out for 10 minutes if he moves his lips again.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: It is a funny thing: I have been a minister twice for two separate governments of two political persuasions. The one thing they have in common is that being in government sobers you up real bloody quick because you realise that you have to pay for your promises and pay your bills.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Hartley, under sessional orders, will leave for 15 minutes.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: I can tell you it really is quite so sobering sitting in a cabinet and realising that, at the end of the day, the budget has to balance. That is what this government is doing.

In that department, can I also say that now that I have had the opportunity to work with the Treasurer for about a year, what a good job I think he is doing in getting that balance right. It is not a good balance to get. I have seen treasurers who are terribly unpopular with their colleagues; I do not think that is the case with this Treasurer. He gets along pretty well with everybody, and somehow or other he manages to do you over, take your money away and leave you with nothing but beer money, and you still like him. I do not know how it works really, but every time I try to get money out of him it is like getting money out of a stone—as it should be with the Treasurer because it is the taxpayers' money he is guarding, and every penny of it is precious. Again, I simply cut to the point that it is a budget of substance.

I sincerely wish that the member for Bright's budget response was the Leader of the Opposition's budget response because I think he touched on some very important issues. I want to go through a few points raised by the Leader of the Opposition, some of which were good ideas, but some of which, I think, needed further work. The idea of a Productivity Commission, I must say, is quite a good idea since I was the person who thought it up in opposition. It is a good idea. I am not quite sure about scrapping the EDB, although I think I understand that and I know that was discussed and I see the point he is making.

Some of the ideas that were mentioned in the reply were repeats of what was promised during the election: a Productivity Commission, sealing the Strzelecki Track and a host of other issues that were just a repackaging of what was put forward at the election, all of which is fine, but I just cut to: where is the money going to come from? Without the commonwealth also contributing, it makes it very difficult.

I agree with the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the success of the New Zealand government; I think they have done a particularly good job at stimulating trade and investment. I do, however, take exception on the issue of investment and trade. Where he talks down the performance of our exporters, I would talk up the performance of our exporters. We have seen extraordinary growth in this area, and it is true that in recent months, along with the trend across the country, there has been a decline, particularly in certain areas: metal ores and scrap, wheat, road vehicles, of course, with Holden and other confidential items. There has been a 36 per cent increase in meat exports, wine up 5.8 per cent, fruit and vegetables and copper up. So some things are up and some things are down, but generally I must say that I think our exporters are doing a fantastic job.

Since I have been the minister, I have done my best to build on the good work of my predecessors in the investment and trade area. We have led the biggest trade mission in our history to China. Next month we will go to India with probably the biggest group of businesspeople we have ever taken to India, similarly to South-East Asia. Deals have been done and millions of dollars of products have been sold—wine, meat, seafood—all on the back of new and reinvigorated energy

going from this government into our trade and investment portfolio. The Premier, myself and everyone on this side are keen to see our farmers, our manufacturers and our small businesses grow their businesses through improving their exports. I think this will be a very good, strong jobs story over the next few years.

Can I also say how important it is that we win the submarine and frigate work and projects like LAND 400. On this issue, I want to make this point to members opposite: we have had the debate about Holden and, sadly, the Coalition decided not to support a further model of Holden. I think there was general recognition that the automotive industry was going to struggle to survive in the long term in its current form, but what we could have seen was a longer period for the South Australian and Victorian economies to transition through a further model. However, the Coalition pulled the rug out, and I must express my utter disappointment that the state Liberal Party did not take that up with them. They went along with it. They could have taken action to stop it, but they did not. As a result, Holden will be closing and it will have dramatic consequences.

The next challenge is to fight this fight about submarines and frigates. We need to convince the Coalition that not only do the frigates and the surface ships need to be built here but also the submarines. We need both. Two hundred and fifty billion dollars worth of work is a gobsmacking amount of jobs and enterprise and it must happen here. The deliberate talking down of our industry, rubbishing our workers and our businesses in the defence sector, emanating from the Coalition, is simply wrong and destructive. If there is continuous deal flow, there will be a highly productive and efficient workforce and industry.

The challenge for the federal government and the Liberal Party is to put that continuous ship build of both surface ships and submarines in place for the advancement of this great nation because \$250 billion of defence spending is not only about defending the nation it is also about building the nation. If there is something constructive in budgetary terms that the opposition could do, it would be to take these issues up with their Coalition colleagues and make sure that the federal MPs with whom they deal get the message that that work must simply come to South Australia, end of story.

In summary, I want to point back to where I started, and that is to observe to the house that this budget is a budget of substance, not of populism. It is a budget that gets the balance right, I think, between investing in infrastructure and cutting taxes. It gets the balance right between making the hard decisions on the expenses side and the right decision on the investment side. Can I say that it also demonstrates to business that the Weatherill government—and under this Premier and under this Treasurer—is open for business, and it recognises that small business is at the core of our economy and that this is not a hostile antibusiness government: quite the reverse.

At the same time, I think the message from this government to those in the community most in need and those most vulnerable, and those who depend on our health and education sectors, is that in very difficult times we are trying to get the balance right. We have not forgotten about the vulnerable, but we do realise that we need to create jobs and stimulate small business. Getting that balance right is what politics is all about. We have had a go. It would be nice to hear from the opposition what their ideas are; that is what is missing from the debate.

Bill read a second time.

Estimates Committees

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) (17:09): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

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) (17:09): By leave, I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. G.E. Gago), the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter), and the

Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. K.J. Maher), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

Appropriation Grievances

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) (17:10): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (17:10): I rise to give my budget reply grieve speech. From a local perspective, it was remiss of me not to talk about the Oaklands crossing yesterday in my budget reply speech, but I was glad to hear the Minister for Transport did reference it in his speech. Sadly, as the person in charge of the department, and with thousands of staff at his disposal, he did not offer any insight into plans that he and the department have been working on, nor did he outline any extra modelling or scoping work that he had done on the project. He did, however, reference a community meeting I had in Oaklands Park earlier this year to listen to and speak with people in the area who are impacted by the crossing.

The meeting was open to all to discuss the history of this crossing and to find a way forward to help fix the problem in the area. The minister did not attend, but it was noted that he sent along a couple of 'spies' who sat up the back taking notes but did not contribute anything to the discussion. His suggestion that I was trying to 'whip up some discontent' was way off the mark, and I would even doubt those words were used in the report his 'spies' would have given him after the meeting.

I was disappointed to be attacked by him over the issue in this house. I thought that he, more than anyone else on the other side of the chamber, would be supportive of engaging with the community. I thought he would want to listen to their concerns and work hard to find a solution to problems that have hindered this community for more than a decade.

I have outlined many times in this house the delays and inconvenience this intersection has caused for years to all people in the south. People in the southern part of Adelaide, and people right across the city for that matter, know and understand that this persistent problem around a growing retail hub full of shops and health and community services, as well as home of the state aquatic centre, the Marion Cultural Centre, has been going on for a long time.

I have written to the minister and invited him down to Oaklands to have a firsthand look at the intersection and the congestion it causes. I have invited him to come and speak with and listen to the people in my community. In that letter, I explained that I held a forum where more than 100 people registered and attended the meeting. I explained that everyone was keen to know where the project was on the government's radar.

In my conversation with the community, I also explained a few facts that had some people quite surprised—even the ardent Labor supporters who came along in good faith, knowing this was genuine community consultation. A large proportion of the gathering were surprised to learn that, as shadow minister, I have two staff and a trainee in my office to look after my electorate matters and shadow portfolio inquiries. The minister, on the other hand, gets the same two staff for his electorate office in Lee, down in Port Adelaide, but he gets another 12 or 15 staff working for him in his ministerial office. Added to that, he also gets the 3,000-plus Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) staff all at his disposal.

Given the imbalance of resources and given that, after speaking with people who have worked in senior positions at DPTI who told me that a number of pieces of work have been done on the Oaklands intersection over the years, I think it would be only right that this work and the findings of the hours of research done by DPTI be made available to the public.

I articulated this in my letter to the minister, requesting an update on any plans for this intersection, a specific time line for the solution and estimated costs involved, so that I could pass it on to my interested community group. Sadly, it has been nearly two months and I am yet to get a response, but I am happy to talk with the minister about this at any time.

I also explained to the people at my community meeting that this work, which has been done by the engineers and planners in DPTI over the years, is owned by all South Australians. It is done by public servants and, as such, belongs to everyone in the state. With that in mind, I hope the minister will make all the information available to me so that I can share it with my fellow taxpaying members of the community to make an assessment on what might be the best plan to fix this problem at the Oaklands intersection in the future.

It would be a waste of taxpayers' money for me to have to hire an engineer or planner to do some work when the experienced people in DPTI have already done the research and analysis around the intersection. I stress the point that the minister has access to 3,000-plus public servants in the department. They have the capability to do this work and they are funded by the taxpayer. It is only right and fair that the taxpayer gets to see the results of this work so they can make a judgement call on the project.

Can I also say that, if the minister has not done any work over the past decade on this intersection, then let us know about that as well. We know they have a plan for rail over road. We have seen the pretty pictures, they have been displayed around, but what other solutions have been considered? Has road over or under rail been proposed, rail under road, or just one road being grade separated? What is on the table for consideration, is the question I ask?

Seeing the research and forecast costings will help clear up any question on price for this project. Initial reports and the only reporting I have seen to date from the former minister for transport, minister Pat Conlon, suggested the overpass option for rail over road and the raising of the station was going to cost upward of \$120 million. These numbers were a bit rubbery, but it was a start.

Interestingly, when asked in this house a few weeks ago, the current Minister for Transport gave a new number of \$210 million for the cost of the project, although he did give a disclaimer that the figure was, again I quote, 'off the top of his head'. I respect that he cannot have every figure for every project at his fingertips but, again, it points to why the people of South Australia and the south of Adelaide who use the Marion shopping complex and its surrounding services would like a more solid understanding of what the options are and what costings DPTI have come up with so they can formulate an opinion.

In closing, I trust the Minister for Transport is not playing politics with this issue. I call on him to come forward with all the plans that have been modelled and scoped by DPTI. Next time I have a community meeting to discuss the matter, do not send your spies along to sit at the back of the room and take notes. Come yourself and listen to the concerns of the people in my community, and let us keep moving forward towards finding a solution to fix Oaklands crossing.

While I have the time, I would also like to take the opportunity to mention Mostyn Matters and Diana Stevens—two great members of my community who have worked very hard for many years and have given all they can to make our state the best it can be. Mostyn would not mind me saying that he is not getting any younger. Let us put it this way, he is not in his 20s anymore, he is a little bit older than that, but he is still a very treasured member of our community. Mostyn goes about his business quietly but, when you scratch the surface as I have, you learn about some of the great work he has done.

He was integral in helping raise funds to build the Brighton Football Club which has produced thousands and thousands of junior footballers over the years, most notably Collingwood's Ben Kennedy, who played his junior football with the Bombers. More recently, Alex Martini was named in the state under 16 squad just a few days ago, and Tynan Carney is in the state under 15 side as vice captain, I am led to believe. These are just some of the footy careers owed to the foundation work done by Mostyn Matters. I truly commend him for everything he has done for our community, but it does not end there.

He has supported his partner, Diana Stevens, who set up Stumpy's Club. Stumpy's was designed to raise funds and support people who have lost a limb. Diana and Mostyn worked tirelessly at this as well over the years and their efforts were appreciated by many. I went to one of their lunch functions and it was a blast. There were many great people and many great stories. It was highly entertaining. Sadly, they have had to wind up Stumpy's with the demands becoming too great, but I

am happy to say that Diana and Mostyn are getting married later this year which is great news, but I can confirm that Diana does not want the reception to be held at the Brighton Football Club!

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:19): I rise today to welcome a number of the initiatives in the state budget which will directly benefit the electorate of Giles, initiatives which build on other worthwhile projects that have been delivered since the last election and preceding the last election. As we all know, our regions contribute \$25 billion towards the state's economy and do so with 29 per cent of the state's population. Importantly for the state, the regions drive over half of our merchandise exports. The electorate of Giles makes an important economic contribution through mining, manufacturing, farming and tourism. Iron ore, copper, uranium, gold, silver and opal are all mined in the electorate and add wealth to our state.

There is very significant untapped potential in the electorate when it comes to additional mineral wealth. There is also massive untapped potential when it comes to renewable energy resources, and especially our solar resource and the use of that resource for more than just the export of electricity to the grid.

Despite the current difficulties the longer term potential in our resource sector is very positive. I do not want to downplay the current difficulties and the job losses that have occurred and will occur over the next year or two. The fall in iron ore prices has had a major impact, with the mothballing of two iron ore mines in the north of our state and additional job losses at the Middleback operation near Whyalla. Approximately 90 jobs have also gone from the steelworks, not to mention the jobs that have been lost amongst the fabrication and engineering contractors.

The job losses over the last two years at Olympic Dam and the ongoing job losses have had a devastating impact on Roxby Downs. It is not a straightforward task to estimate the number of mining-related jobs that have been lost in the electorate, but it would exceed 1,500 jobs. The neighbouring electorate of Stuart also faces the loss of jobs at Alinta in Port Augusta and Leigh Creek.

The budget did not directly address the job losses in the north of the state and that is partly a timing issue. There are a number of initiatives in the budget which will, in a general way, be of help, but at this stage we do not have a targeted assistance package designed to address the challenges in the north. I am very confident that one will be developed and that the assistance will be commensurate with what we have seen in parts of the metropolitan area that are also facing, or have faced, difficult economic circumstances.

I will take this opportunity to re-emphasise the top two priorities I have put on the table for Whyalla, and they are changes to state procurement policy to maximise the use of Australian produced steel and a far fuller utilisation of the Whyalla/Arrium harbour. The latter has long term implications for the north of the state, and it is the infrastructure key which will help to unlock our mineral wealth.

There are a number of specific commitments in the budget that I will touch on. I welcome the greatly improved pensioner concession scheme in the form of the Cost of Living Concession. We looked after our pensioners and made sure that there was assistance for tenants in addition to homeowners. The \$148 million Cost of Living Concession forms part of the overall package of \$275 million in pensioner concession support. The Abbott government's cuts to concessions were a disgrace.

The abolition of non-real stamp duty, non-residential real stamp duty and share duty are all welcome initiatives which will be of assistance to the business sector. The \$2.7 million commitment to municipal and remote services on Aboriginal lands was desperately needed.

A very important piece of economic infrastructure in the form of the Port Bonython jetty near Whyalla on the Point Lowly Peninsula receives \$11.9 million in this budget as part of an overall refurbishment to enable ongoing hydrocarbon exports and support jobs. I was very pleased to see the \$350,000 allocation to carry out a Whyalla secondary schools feasibility study.

Whyalla has the only junior-senior high school model in the state. The configuration is made up of two junior high schools on different sites which feed into a senior high school on yet another site. There are fewer than 1,000 students over three sites, with the three sites all being within short

distance of each other. I have been involved in two school reviews, both as a parent of children in the public education system in Whyalla and as a city councillor. The two previous proposals for amalgamation were rightly rejected, in my view. The first review was purely a cost-cutting exercise which came at a very difficult time for Whyalla in the late 1990s. The second review proposed an amalgamation involving primary and secondary schools—a super school model. The model was rejected by the community largely because it involved primary schools.

Amalgamation of the secondary schools makes sense to me and will improve educational outcomes for students in Whyalla by removing the transition point and facilitating access to greater resources at a larger school. I have indicated my strong preference for a new build on a new site next to the Whyalla campus of UniSA and TAFE to create a major education hub. The site is also directly across the road from Whyalla's largest primary school and the special school with childcare facilities nearby. The site is also next to the Middleback Theatre and close to the Whyalla recreation and leisure centre.

The feasibility study may indicate other options as the process will be guided by engagement with the Whyalla community and school communities. If a new site is the outcome, very careful consideration will need to be given to the use of vacated sites. This all assumes a future financial commitment, but the allocation of money for a feasibility study indicates serious intent.

The new children's centre for Roxby Downs is a real plus for the community. Half a million dollars will be invested in the centre so that the kindergarten will be able to deliver health and family services and also community development activities. As minister Close said, it is important that young children and their families have access to modern infrastructure facilities and programs to give them a jumpstart into their school years. The centre is good news and a measure of the state's commitment to the community of Roxby Downs.

I also want to mention regional roads and the importance of shoulder widening, especially the importance of shoulder widening with audio-tactile marking. Approximately 50 per cent of the fatalities on regional roads are single vehicle accidents. The state government has already sealed 1,200 kilometres of road shoulders. The important thing about shoulder widening and audio-tactile marking is that it does save lives. The work that has been carried out to date will, based on the evidence, save 30 lives over the coming five years. I welcome the additional money in the budget to further improve the safety of our regional roads.

To finish, the \$4.3 million for regional arts theatres is a welcome addition, and I especially welcome the \$1.7 million for Whyalla's Middleback Theatre.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:27): Today I wish to speak about the Sovereign Hospitaller Order of St John of Jerusalem, the Knights of Malta, Grand Priory of Australia, Adelaide Commandery, and the recent investiture ball that I attended at the weekend. I want to talk about the event, the men and women who were appointed as knights and dames, and about the fundraising activities that they have done as well.

We were welcomed to the function after an earlier church ceremony by the master of ceremonies, Lady Rosaria Cusumano OSJ, as well as Father Lauro Rufo who did grace that day. I congratulate and warmly extend my best wishes to the newly appointed knights and dames who shared in the special occasion at the investiture: Chevalier Joseph Borrelli OSJ, Chevalier Charles Figallo OSJ, Chevalier Steve Maras OSJ, Chevalier Mario Romaldi OSJ, Lady Michelle Wallis OSJ, Chevalier Mark Bouchier OSJ, Chevalier Dr Creston Magasdi OSJ, Lady Rosalie Rotolo-Masson OSJ and Chevalier Pat Scalzi OSJ (or Pasquale as he is otherwise known).

Obviously, all of these people have now made certain vows to wear the Christian Maltese Cross of eight points to constantly remind them of the vows that they have agreed to. In terms of the history of the order, obviously it is an ancient order in some respects and certainly, if you look way back, the politics of the eastern Mediterranean region during the eras in and around that of the Crusades was quite complicated. With the Byzantine Empire in decline, there were few major countries and many minor principalities at the time.

Power was not necessarily linked to location, and one of the most powerful political organisations in the late Middle Ages was the order of St John of Jerusalem, Knights Hospitallers,

whose ranks were filled by scions of the richest aristocratic families of Europe. Today, however, although the Knights, like the Christian church in some respects, are split into many orders, this particular order is certainly true to the original tradition and operates under the royal protection of HIRH Sandor Habsburg-Lothringen, as well as many others.

I commend them for the beneficial works and current charity projects that this order undertakes and I draw the attention of the house to some of these. The Order of St John has certainly been made aware of the extraordinary work that has been done before and they continue to do wonderful things in the community; one is their appeal to help in the Nepal disaster relief project. I am pleased to say the proceeds of Saturday night's ceremony were donated to this very worthy cause, and many in the community also chipped in.

It is fantastic to see this philanthropy in the community. Many people, especially successful business people, are doing good things with their profits. They are putting them back into the community and into good causes like this, and the order certainly has an ongoing commitment to good charitable causes, some of them in Australia and some of them overseas. I thought I would touch on some of the things they are still doing to this day; one of them is contributing to the fight to help uncover the genetic cause of childhood leukaemia—a fantastic cause for which this group is certainly doing much fundraising.

As well as that, there have been a number of charitable beneficiaries in the past—the Australian Red Cross, the Armenian Refuge Appeal, Australian Heart & Lung Transplant Association, Boys Town, CareFlight, Camp Quality, Cerebral Palsy Alliance, Child Abuse Prevention Services, Children's Leukaemia & Cancer Institute of Australia, Dianne Camilleri Appeal, Epilepsy Association, and the Exodus Foundation, Ashfield.

They have also supported the Giant Steps school for autistic children, Helping Hand Adelaide, Father Chris Riley's Youth off the Streets, the Healthcare Outreach Reconstructive Program in Nepal, International Red Cross, Lifeline, Life for Africa Foundation, Maltese Elderly Association, Matilda Rose Early Intervention Centre, the Missionaries of the Poor in the Philippines, and the Nagrizia Missionary Sisters in Central Africa.

Other charitable beneficiaries include: Overseas Specialist Surgeons of Australia Inc., Professor David Morris Liver Cancer Research Fund, Republic of Honduras (medicines), the Royal Alexandria Hospital for Children Neuro Surgery Department, Royal North Shore Hospital Physiotherapy Department, Royal South Sydney Community Health Complex (bladder scan instruments), the Salvation Army, Scalabrini Village Nursing Homes (four laser therapy units) and also the Snow family for their son's cancer treatment, and so forth.

I want in particular to talk about three gentlemen who were newly appointed as Knights at the weekend. The first, Mr Charles Figallo, is a very successful entrepreneur who is very passionate about the oil, gas and mining industry. He has done great things for South Australia. I commend him for his past work bringing business into South Australia. He is a strong advocate and champion who wants to see South Australia do well in this area. It is really good to see that Charles is a man who is doing well and making money but who is also putting it to good use by contributing to the wonderful causes that these Knights engage in.

The second gentleman I wish to talk about is Mr Mario Romaldi, who is obviously known to many in the house. He is the general manager of Romaldi Constructions, one of South Australia's top 100 companies, which has been operating in South Australia since 1959 in many sectors, including the commercial and industrial sectors. It has grown slowly but surely and steadily. It is certainly managed by a professional and enthusiastic team, and it has become an industry leader.

His company's foremost position in the construction sector has certainly led to the development of an array of industry alliances. It is fantastic to see that Mr Mario Romaldi, whose team has been involved in a number of recent projects, I note, all across the state: The Heights middle school, Glengowrie tram depot, Henley Surf Life Saving Club, Port Noarlunga Primary School, Marryatville High School, Riverland Special School and Ashford Special School.

I note that Mr Romaldi is also a gentleman who is not afraid to put his hand in his pocket and support good philanthropic charitable causes. I think we, as members of parliament, and successful business people should be doing that as well to make sure that they make this world a bit better as

they come through it; especially if they have been given the gift of being able to put their intelligence to good use and to make a profit legally, they should certainly be putting it back into the community, and Mr Mario Romaldi is certainly doing that as well.

Thirdly, I would like to talk about Mr Steve Maras, the managing director and CEO of Maras Group. Many would be aware that Steve Maras is also a gentleman who engages in many philanthropic and charitable causes. I first met Steve in my earlier work as a councillor, and it is good to see that Steve has also been able to put his hand in his pocket and support many of these causes over the years.

In closing, I want to bring the house's attention to this function I attended. The order is a fantastic one, and it is fantastic that this tradition has continued and that they continue to support a number of charitable causes. When pulled together, if you look at what they have achieved over the years, and when you look at what they are still trying to achieve in the future, the world is definitely a better place because this order got together, and I commend them for their good charitable work in the community.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (17:36): There has been a lot of debate recently about housing affordability, especially in the Eastern States, and in recent days we have spent a lot of time in this house debating the state budget. One issue not readily addressed in this year's budget is the issue of housing affordability. Housing affordability is not just an issue for the Eastern States but it is also a big issue in South Australia.

I rise today to speak on behalf of many South Australians, young and old, who wish to purchase their first home but are being priced out of the market. I would like to begin by explaining where we have come from. South Australia used to be one of the most affordable places in the western world to buy a home. This was in no small part due to the good work of the Liberal and Country League government establishing the South Australian Housing Trust in 1936.

In the Playford era, affordable homes and plentiful jobs were one of the main reasons thousands of immigrants chose to come to South Australia. By contrast, today we have the highest unemployment in the nation and very expensive housing stock. Over 20 years ago in two of Labor's long list of economic calamities—namely, the State Bank collapse and Paul Keating's recession 'that we had to have'—mortgage rates were at double-digit percentages and were approximately 17 per cent at the height of the Keating recession.

Now we have the reverse situation, where interest rates are at record lows but house prices are so high so that they are affecting affordability and making it worse than it has ever been. The situation we have today is one in which many young Australians will only ever own their own home through inheritance or assistance from their parents. Australia is now ranked as the third worst country for housing affordability in the OECD on the measure of house prices to incomes. House prices to average income is one of the fairest ways to determine how much a house costs to the everyday person on the average income. Being the third worst country for housing affordability in the OECD is a shameful statistic for a nation which, according to the second verse of our national anthem, has 'boundless plains to share'.

We all know that the underlying cost of land is one of the biggest factors in house prices, as land is one of the few things that they are not ever going to create any more of. As a consequence, the release of land for housing construction is an important responsibility for state governments, and we have seen time after time the wrong decisions being made in this area, often in favour of special interests rather than first home buyers.

My vision for South Australia is one of a great property-owning democracy where everyone who wants to own their own home can and reasonably hope to do so. The role of government in the housing field is not solely confined to being the 'landlord of last resort', as Housing SA is at the moment, or alternatively to do nothing and hope for the best, which often seems to be the government's modus operandi. The role of government, through appropriate and farsighted planning, is to make sure that housing policy makes home ownership an achievable dream for any South Australian prepared to work hard and save for a place of their own.

The great Australian dream of owning your own home is becoming increasingly out of reach for many young people in our state. The median house price in Adelaide today is \$405,000, a 4.5 per cent rise on last year. The median house price has been rising rapidly for a number of years at a rate much faster than that of inflation. In real terms this has meant that housing has become more and more unaffordable for first home buyers who, in many cases, have only their own income and meagre savings to put towards buying their first home.

Sales volumes in the Adelaide housing market have been declining; however, prices have continued to increase. Many young people—especially 'the working poor'—are currently trapped by having most of their weekly income going into overpriced rents, and are unable to save a significant deposit to break into the Adelaide housing market. The jobs crisis that this state is facing will only make the situation worse.

While releasing more land in the Adelaide metropolitan area via urban renewal and infill will help more first home buyers break into the market, there are other policies which must be adopted. Higher density housing along major public transport corridors is critical to providing affordable housing and reducing congestion in the city. Far too often we have witnessed new developments being built without any public transport to service those new areas. By allowing higher density housing alongside railway stations or our train lines there is the double benefit of lowering the cost of housing in metropolitan Adelaide as well as boosting public transport usage. The Belair line, which travels through my electorate, would be a prime candidate for high density living around the railway stations.

A further way to reduce the cost of housing is to encourage retired couples and empty nesters to downsize their homes. I propose that this should be done by providing incentives, or the carrot rather than the stick approach. Many older people I know have been reluctant, in the first instance, to consider the idea of moving into a retirement village, but once they have many have loved that decision. Retirement villages provide a wide range of services and activities to promote healthy and active ageing. However, we need living arrangements for older South Australians to be in the same residential areas that many of them have lived in for 20, 30 or 40 years.

Strong policies that develop South Australia's rural and regional areas, especially by increasing economic activity and thereby attracting more people to these regions, is a critical part of making housing more affordable. We are all well aware that this Labor government treats rural and regional South Australia with contempt, to the great detriment of our entire state. Regional areas need to be attractive for young professional people to want to live there. To be attractive to young people there must be jobs in those locations. Having more people move into regional areas would place significant downward pressure on today's housing affordability issues in suburban Adelaide as well as increasing the economic and human potential of our regional areas.

Affordable social housing is an important part of the solution. The government's moves to encourage more NGOs into the social housing field is one welcomed by me. The announcement this week that the government is demolishing 65 properties and replacing them with 80 to 90 new properties is a good start, but this increases the social housing stock by a net total of only about 30. This is nowhere near enough. The government must build more social housing in its own right as well as encouraging NGOs and other agencies to play a role in this field.

The state government's general response to escalating house prices has been worse than doing nothing. We know, from the Under Treasurer, Mr Brett Rowse, that there have been secret discussions within the state government on considering the sale of HomeStart Finance. This is despite Labor's promise of no privatisation of significant state government assets at the last election. We know that Labor simply cannot be trusted to keep its word.

HomeStart Finance has a lot to teach this government about finance and balancing the books. For example, HomeStart Finance has been profitable in every year of its operation since its creation in 1989. It has also helped more than 63,500 South Australians into home ownership and has filled a gap in the market for around 82 per cent of their borrowers, who were unable to secure finance from the private sector. To sell this asset would not only amount to economic vandalism of the highest degree but would also badly hurt those who need our help the most.

Increasing standards of living, and life getting better for each generation that follows, are important guiding principles for our society. Housing affordability is the issue which will define whether or not our young South Australians get a better deal than their parents and grandparents. It is our responsibility as parliamentarians not to ignore this issue and to make sure that all these young first homebuyers who are prepared to work hard, save and start a family, have a decent house to call their own.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (17:44): I rise to speak on the budget that delivers the impetus for economic growth and confidence in our future, whilst also ensuring fairness for all South Australians. Tax reform, job promotion, a balanced budget, infrastructure spending, protection of the vulnerable—these are the pillars of a budget that allow South Australia to look to the future with confidence.

Speaking with members of the Torrens community at shopping centres, community gatherings, street corner meetings and doorknocking, my constituents tell me about the things that are important to them: jobs for them and their children, education and health all rate highly, and all have been addressed in this budget. As the Treasurer has made clear, protecting and creating jobs is our government's main priority.

It is clear that the objective of protecting and creating jobs is not assisted by the withdrawal of federal government support from our auto manufacturing and naval and shipbuilding industries, nor the \$1.4 billion in federal government cuts to health and education over the next four years. While those opposite spend their time talking down our state while closing their eyes to the decisions being made by their Liberal colleagues in Canberra, the government is committed to creating optimism across the state—from country regions that cannot and should not be ignored, to metropolitan areas facing their own economic concerns.

This budget delivers almost \$985 million over four years, supporting job creation through reforming our tax system and investing in new and growth industries. It delivers the most comprehensive tax reform package in the state's history, creating a system that rewards effort and encourages businesses to grow and create new jobs. It abolishes taxes that limit business investment and expansion and helps people who want to create new businesses or expand existing ones so that, once fully implemented, a business could save more than \$360,000 in its first year of operation.

The tax reform package will be a significant boost for business and industry in the north. It will be particularly important to businesses in the automotive sector. Through necessity in a changing landscape, they are looking to expand and diversify. Importantly, over the next four years, almost \$670 million in tax reductions will be returned to South Australian businesses and families, significantly reducing the cost of doing business here. This budget continues the government's historically high commitment to transport, health and education infrastructure by committing \$10.8 billion over four years.

Since 2009, we have redeveloped many metropolitan and country hospitals, and this budget continues that commitment. I have had the opportunity, as a member of the Public Works Committee, to visit some of those country hospitals and seen the work that has gone on there. The health and wellbeing of all South Australians are major considerations in this budget, with more than \$260 million going towards upgrading our metropolitan hospitals. This includes \$32 million for the Modbury Hospital which will see more rehabilitation services, a new hydrotherapy pool and gymnasium, and a new dedicated eye clinic.

In addition, there is \$15.3 million towards completion of the \$176.7 million stage C redevelopment of the Lyell McEwin Hospital. I have recently had cause to visit the hospital as both my father and mother-in-law received treatment there. I have seen the upgrade, and it serves our community well. The \$9.7 million towards the \$23.3 million for the Women's and Children's Hospital upgrade is also welcomed.

South Australia spends more per capita than the national average on mental health services, and we are continuing to invest in and upgrade mental health facilities, spending \$12.9 million this year. This is part of a commitment to make unacceptably long waiting times in our emergency

departments for those needing mental health care a thing of the past. This latest funding will help us significantly reduce waiting times in the emergency department for mental health care, too.

Further to that, we are committed to improving country mental health services, with dedicated psychiatrists available at the Whyalla, Riverland and Mount Gambier hospitals. This supports the four-year commitment made in the last budget to fund almost a million dollars a year for suicide prevention initiatives and groups in country South Australia. All of this is being delivered in the face of \$1.4 billion of commonwealth budget cuts, including nearly a billion dollars less in health funding.

In addition, the government has committed \$1.4 billion to road projects, improving travel time and safety; \$1.7 billion to water infrastructure; \$353 million to public transport; and \$216 million to education facilities. We have introduced the cost of living concession for pensioners and low-income earners, protecting the most vulnerable in our community, and that is welcomed. We have also abolished the Save the River Murray levy.

In my electorate of Torrens we are seeing growth, with the continued development of Northgate and Lightview, and the ongoing regeneration of suburbs like Klemzig, Gilles Plains and Windsor Gardens, as well as the recently announced release of land for 900 houses to be built on the old Hillcrest hospital site.

Where there are areas of concern, though, we are addressing them with real assistance. We understand the need to support the northern suburbs, which have been severely impacted by General Motors' decision to pull out of Elizabeth. We have set aside \$93 million on initiatives that will help ensure a sustainable future for northern Adelaide. Better housing, better schooling, the development of an economic plan that looks at sustaining business in the north for years to come—that is what this budget delivers.

We are standing up for the north, because clearly we cannot depend on the federal government and those opposite, who could not find their voice when it came to standing up for South Australia and protecting our manufacturing industries. It is up to us to create opportunities and support new growth industries, because a strong and flourishing northern Adelaide is important to the economic growth not just of the area but of the state as a whole.

So the government has added another million dollars towards the development of the northern economic plan, for a total of \$5.4 million. It is a plan that will focus on jobs creation and skills enhancement to create greater confidence and enthusiasm in the area, and to make businesses want to invest and operate there. A further \$2 million has been put towards developing a northern Adelaide industrial food park, and we are investing \$25 million in housing renewal in the north and \$10 million for the upgrading of schools and children's centres across the region. We have channelled \$9 million into initiatives to both increase the number of foster carers and to reunite adolescents in out-of-home residential care with their families. We know this is always the preferred outcome and we are looking at opportunities to make this happen wherever possible.

Emergency services play a vital role in keeping us all safe, and funding in this budget includes \$9 million for protective clothing for South Australia Country Fire Service volunteers, and a further \$5.4 million towards recruitment, training and support within the CFS, SES and Volunteer Marine Rescue, as well as \$3.7 million to replace the emergency services communication centre's telecommunication system.

Whether it is the heart of the outback or the heart of the city, this budget addresses both essential services and the need to generate optimism and enthusiasm for a bright future. It supports efforts to bring new people into South Australia as visitors, tourists and investors. That new-found enthusiasm for enjoying the best this city and state have to offer has not been ignored either, with the tourism budget increased by 30 per cent to \$75.5 million. We have just put \$15 million towards new major events and conventions, \$14 million into growing tourism from international markets, \$6 million into Adelaide and regional tourism, \$6 million into maintaining arts activity and \$2 million towards the Adelaide Fashion Festival.

This is a budget that is proactive while at the same time addressing current areas of need. From improved infrastructure to support for the most vulnerable, to the generation of new opportunities for the future, this is a budget that ensures South Australia has a healthy outlook for years to come.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:54): I too seek to continue my remarks on the 2015 state budget, particularly what trade is presenting and how it is situated currently, and looking at the trend of how our exporters have been supported and the numbers of exporters in this state. It is a worrying trend in all sectors. The number of goods exporters in South Australia over a nine-year period has decreased by 100.

While we hear the government's trade minister preaching his wisdom and feeling pretty good about himself, the numbers tell the story. It is not about him telling the story of just how popular the member for Bright's trustworthy Scottish accent has been with his contribution today. Whether it is the member for Waite's wisdom in this chamber, talking about what was good and what was bad, and what he would or would not do—well, we know what he has done. The numbers are telling us what he has done, and he is not doing enough.

He is definitely not casting his wisdom, whether his policy settings or his policy papers are going to make a difference, the numbers that I hold are telling the true story. The budget is telling a true story of exactly where trade in particular is headed. While it is all very nice to get the headline act, taking delegations over to China and promising to reintroduce annual delegation trips—the minister and the government are hell-bent on getting the headline media stories—the fact of the matter is that we have lost 100 goods exporter since 2006-07, so let's have a look at exactly where they are being lost.

The resources sector is in trouble. Obviously, the devaluation of the dollar and commodity prices are having an impact. We have lost five in eight years while the government has been in power. Where we are looking for the real saviour of this exporting economy, in agriculture, forestry and fishing, we have lost 42. We have lost 40 in construction. If we look at wider areas of what this state has historically relied on with exports, we have seen a decline in the number of exporters being able to generate the numbers that the government continues to bang their chests about.

If we look at the value of export goods—and I will not go on there—we see a diminishing dollar. Commodity prices have dropped through the floor and are heading south, and no-one knows exactly what it is going to mean, particularly in the mining sector. If we look at agriculture, we have seen an increase. For over 120 years, the agriculture sector has been propping up this state's economy. We see copper and some of the precious metals that are valuable to our economy's bottom line, but the agriculture, forestry and fishing sector is hugely important.

South Australia was one of only two states with fewer exporters in 2013-14 than in, as I said, 2006-07. With those 100 exporters that we have lost, it begs the question: how are they going to keep up with their priority promise to increase exporters by 50 per annum? Again, that is another number that has been in the budget papers and one which the Minister for Trade will need to address. Whether his wisdom will get him out of trouble, one will see.

At a time when South Australia is needing to boost its engagement with the world in order to create jobs and that economic activity, at home here, the state's prosperity is in decline. It is raising alarm bells, not only within the business sector but within a sector that is potentially—

The SPEAKER: Intrigued as I am by the member for Chaffey's contribution, could he seek leave to continue his remarks?

Mr WHETSTONE: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 July 2015 at 10:30.