

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 29 July 2015

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

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

Personal Explanation

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE, POLICE PORTFOLIO

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:01): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr GARDNER: On Monday in estimates, having been given to understand in good faith, but incorrectly, that the government had increased the trafficable threshold for cannabis, I alluded to the same in questioning to the Minister for Police. I hereby correct the record; the government has not done so.

Ministerial Statement

COMMUNITY ROAD SAFETY FUND

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (11:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: On Monday, during the estimates committee hearing for South Australia Police, I was asked how much revenue from fines and expiations would go into general government revenue. I answered the question on the assumption that the member was focused on speeding expiations, and given that assumption, my answer is correct.

However, to clarify, the budget line that the member was interrogating relates to all expiation notice revenue and, as such, not all money goes into the Community Road Safety Fund. As I undertook to do and was foreshadowed in the line of questioning arising from the committee, I will provide the member for Mitchell with details about the amount of revenue designated to the general revenue.

Condolence

STRETTON, PROF. H.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:02): On indulgence, Mr Speaker, I rise today to speak on the passing of a remarkable South Australian, Professor Hugh Stretton AC. Hugh died on 18 July 2015, three days after he celebrated his 91st birthday. He was a polymath, social theorist, historian, public intellectual and, especially through his work at the Housing Trust, a man concerned about translating ideas into action. He had a long-lasting and constructive influence on policy in this country, both initiating and furthering debate about how our cities and suburbs should above all serve human needs.

He also had a profound and positive influence on people of all walks of life, including his students and parliamentarians like me. It is poignant that he passed away virtually on the eve of the opening of the Stretton Centre in Adelaide's northern suburbs that in many ways will reflect his style, honour his legacy and build on his fine work.

Hugh Stretton was born in Melbourne on 15 July 1924. After enrolling at Melbourne University, he served in the Navy during World War II. In 1946 he was awarded a Rhodes scholarship

to Oxford University, where after his studies he became a lecturer in history. He returned to Australia in 1954, taking up an Adelaide University chair in history at the age of just 30. He remained in our city for the rest of his rich life and from here contributed consistently to debate, research, policy-making and practice relating to urban planning.

For someone with such stellar academic and professional credentials, it is strange that probably Hugh Stretton's most quoted and most influential piece of writing had rather modest beginnings. His seminal work from 1970, *Ideas for Australian Cities*, was turned down by six publishers, so he decided to publish it himself. It quickly made an impact, however, attracting the attention of social scientists and policymakers, and taking debate out of the exclusive hands of architects and town planners.

The book made the point that cities are fundamentally social constructions and that urban planning should be guided not merely by the need for efficiency but by the desirability of social equity and neighbourhood amenity. These are ideas that are now commonplace and accepted, but they were a fundamental paradigm shift at the time he first mentioned them.

Ideas for Australian Cities was released during a period of rapid social change and often convulsive public debate. The then federal ALP leader, Gough Whitlam, was formulating an ambitious social reform program for government that included action on urban planning. Reflecting the debate that Hugh Stretton helped spark, Whitlam said in 1972:

A national government which has nothing to say about cities has nothing relevant or enduring to say about the nation or the nation's future.

One of Stretton's key legacies, I believe, is the proper inclusion of economic considerations in debate and decision-making about planning, and the now widespread acceptance that sound planning can significantly contribute to economic growth.

For me, one of the most admirable aspects of Hugh Stretton's life was his desire to serve the state, especially through his position as deputy chair of the Housing Trust of South Australia between 1973 and 1989. Such work is admirable, because it shows a willingness not merely to formulate and discuss ideas but to have them widely scrutinised and to test them through implementation.

Under the Dunstan government, in particular, the Housing Trust was at the forefront of various new proposals and measures. Among these was the plan for the new city of Monarto, the development of the Noarlunga Centre and the building of houses on redeveloped inner city land, akin to what we are doing in places now like Bowden.

One of Stretton's longstanding colleagues, Lionel Orchard, described Hughes work with the Housing Trust as: '...an illustration of the intersection between theory and praxis, which many other academics only talk about.' This word 'praxis' is an interesting word: it essentially means the act of engaging, applying, exercising, realising or practising ideas, and this was this academic's life. He was not merely a man who generated ideas but he sought to put them into place.

I think there is a worthy argument to suggest, as some theorists have suggested—famous theorists such as Hannah Arendt—that this is actually the good life. The pursuit of knowledge and the putting of knowledge into practice—this is the highest purpose. It gives your life a sense of purpose. It is also an incredibly exciting and rich way to pursue a life's work.

Hugh was not merely interested in the generating of ideas; he was interested in making them real: in talking to decision-makers and in getting involved in the life of the state. I have never seen a man more alive. I can remember once in his home, when I first met him, there was a group of young women there and he revelled in their enthusiasm for life, and he drew on their excitement and their vivacity. It excited him, and that is the way he saw the world as well.

He wanted to live life in its fullest, and that meant delving deeply into understanding every element of life, including just the conversations of these young women who were an entirely different generation to him, but he revelled in understanding what was exciting them, because that excited him. I found him to be one of the most profoundly interesting and inspiring men to be around.

Hugh Stretton made a profound impact on so many people in South Australia: on university students, many of whom went on to great success in public life. One of my predecessors, John Bannon, has written that Professor Stretton's lectures were:

...inspiring and impressive, particularly as they were given without notes. They were totally logical, with ideas and facts building on each other inexorably to a totally reasonable conclusion.

One of the great strengths of Hugh's writing was just the practicality of the things that he spoke about and the nimbleness of his mind. It is reflected in his extraordinary book, *Economics: A New Introduction*, which is just a fantastic primer on the intersection between politics and the economy, but written from a very scholarly perspective. John Bannon also wrote that the Stretton worldview came from 'a broad humanistic tradition which holds that the state exists to serve the people and not just to manage'.

Another of Hugh's Adelaide University students was the former Liberal senator and federal minister Amanda Vanstone, who wrote the following:

There are only a few lecturers that stand out in my mind. Hugh Stretton, without a doubt, stands above them all...For so many lecturers, doing their job seemed something of a nuisance, an aggravation. Others seemed sure the students were lucky to be receiving the benefit of their time. There was none of that with Hugh Stretton. He would walk quietly in the room, stand at the front for just a moment, not long enough for one to imagine he was seeking attention, and commence speaking. The tone was considered and gentle...With Stretton there was a complete absence of any sense of superiority. Not a condescending air to be found.

I had many dealings with Hugh Stretton over the years, especially when I held the ministerial portfolios of urban development and planning and housing. His advice to me on housing and social policy has had a formative influence on my thinking in these areas.

Although Hugh notionally retired in 1989, he actually did nothing of the sort. The passion still burned, and the books kept coming—I mentioned the 1999 *Economics: A New Introduction*. Arguing that orthodox economic theory was the wrong kind of theory for its purposes, the book was viewed as a rejection of unchecked and unquestioned economic rationalism. Rather than an ideological statement or simply an angry rebuff, it was a practitioner's methodical analysis of how the economy works in the real world. It was consistent with his long-standing view that the pursuit of economic growth needed to go hand in hand with other collective goals, such as a more sustainable environment and a fairer distribution of wealth. It is no surprise that, in 2005, Hugh was elected by a group of 200 Australian academics as one of the nation's top 10 public intellectuals.

As I said at the start, I am very sad that Professor Stretton has passed away just as we are preparing to launch, possibly next month, the Stretton Centre at Munno Para. The centre is a collaboration by the City of Playford, University of Adelaide and the state and federal governments. In simple terms, the centre will carry out research designed to foster the kind of sustainable industries, workforces and urban development that will create jobs and opportunities for northern Adelaide. Consistent with Professor Stretton's style of intellectual endeavour, the centre will concern itself with many and interesting topics. Also like Hugh, its unwavering focus will not be merely on theory but the practice of improving the lives of people.

Hugh Stretton was a towering figure, a leading social reformist working in a state well-known across the world for its social reform. His thoughtful and gracious demeanour made him a much loved and much admired South Australian. His passion for ideas—ideas that could bring about practical change and advance the common good—was undimmed through his long life. For me, he was a great man, because he combined intellectual rigour, pragmatism and moral purpose, the result being a life dedicated, as he said, to leaving 'Australia fairer than we found it'.

On behalf of the government of South Australia and members on this side of the house, I extend my sincere condolences to Hugh Stretton's wife Pat, his children Simon, Fabian, Tim and Sally, his four grandchildren and the extended Stretton family.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:13): On indulgence, Mr Speaker, I would also like to rise and acknowledge the recent passing of Professor Hugh Stretton AC and express sincere condolences to the family on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. As the Premier said, Professor Hugh Stretton was in fact not originally from South Australia. He was born on 15 July 1924 in Melbourne. He attended the Melbourne University and he

went on to serve Australia during the Second World War in the Royal Australian Navy. On concluding his service, he was awarded a Rhodes scholarship and studied in Oxford, but when he returned from the United Kingdom, he came to South Australia in 1954 and began his work at the University of Adelaide.

Given that the professor was formally educated across three continents—Australia, the United Kingdom and the United States—it is not surprising that he was to earn such a recognition as being voted as one of Australia's 10 most influential public intellectuals. Professor Stretton was regarded as a leading social theorist, historian and public intellectual, holding the positions of Emeritus Professor of History and as a Visiting Research Fellow in the School of Economics at the University of Adelaide right up until his death at the age of 91.

In his lifetime, he was awarded five honorary doctorates in recognition of his expertise in the field of social science and urban development. As the Premier outlined, not only was Professor Stretton a prolific social commentator but he was also a prolific author, with many publications throughout his life—one as recently as 2013 at the age of 89. He had an incredible following, and every word he wrote was meaningful and followed by an adoring public.

Professor Stretton's legacy now lives on in the north of our city, where the newly-established Stretton Centre opened its doors in May of this year hosting the Stretton collection, which is a showcase of his life's work. The centre itself aspires to become a self-sufficient institution, measuring its own successes by its impacts on jobs, innovation and, of course, much-needed industry in the north of South Australia. It is entirely appropriate that the Stretton Centre is situated in the City of Playford, given the working relationship between Professor Stretton and Sir Thomas Playford, a former premier of South Australia.

I would like to read a short extract from Stewart Cockburn's biography, *Playford: Benevolent Despot*, that references both Stretton and Playford and it really deals with something that we know was very much an issue for these two men. We know that Stretton served as the Deputy Chair of the South Australian Housing Trust for 17 years, and we know that he had a longstanding interest in public housing and improving the lives of people who were living in all sorts of accommodation. I think it was 1980 when he interviewed the premier regarding the legislation that Playford had moved to deal with the issue of slum landlords, and I quote directly from the biography:

'I sit, once a fortnight, administering that Act to this very day', said Stretton. 'Very effective, very wholesome. Can I ask you a question about that? The whole world is full of Professors of Economics who tell you why you must not have rent controls because they'll muck up landlord's incentives and so on. Were you conscious at the time that you were producing the only form of rent control in the world that is not open to any of those arguments about incentives? The only form of rent control that actually gives investors an incentive to produce an improved property?'

Playford hesitated.

'Well, I'm not sure', he said. 'But I had evidence about people who made a habit of buying up slum houses as a form of investment. And the second provision in the Bill was that the Trust, if it desired, could compulsorily acquire a big area to redevelop it.'

I emphasise that the trust has not used that provision to buy up a big area, but in some ways it just shows the pragmatic nature of the former premier of South Australia, Sir Thomas Playford, and it really is an interesting exchange between Stretton and Playford regarding how to deal practically with the issues of public housing and the provision of cost-effective housing in South Australia. As I said, Professor Stretton served the people of South Australia as the Deputy Chair of the Housing Trust for 17 years.

Professor Stretton's academic achievements have left a footprint that has seen the creation of a centre in South Australia that will continue his great work by supporting researchers, businesses and young entrepreneurs under one roof to pursue great social and economic outcomes. At the age of 79, Professor Stretton was awarded the AC, Companion in the General Division of the Order of Australia, for services as a historian, social commentator and writer profoundly influencing and shaping ideas in the community on urban policy, town planning and social and economic development. He was a most worthy recipient of this very high honour that our nation can bestow upon one of its citizens.

On behalf of all those on this side of the house, I join with the government in expressing our sincere condolences to Professor Stretton's wife, Pat; his children, Simon, Fabian, Tim and Sally; and his extended group of family and friends. Vale, Hugh Stretton.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:20): On indulgence, if I may briefly contribute to the recognition of the late Professor Hugh Stretton AC, whom we recognise today, and, in particular, his significant contribution in the academic world, which has been importantly outlined by the Premier and Leader of the Opposition, in politics and, indeed, public service and public life. May I also particularly extend my condolence to his widow, Pat, and his four children and family.

I had the pleasure in the 1970s of attending law school with His Honour Simon Stretton, who is now a member of the District Court of South Australia, and particularly recognise also, not to diminish the contribution of his other siblings, Professor Tim Stretton, who has in some ways followed in his father's footsteps as a professor of history in Halifax, Nova Scotia. I think the legacy we have in the public realm can be easily recognised in the legacy of his children and, doubtless, of others in the family who will take up this worthy contribution in public life and, in particular, the academic world. We also recognise and thank Professor Stretton for that legacy.

May I say of Professor Stretton's published position in respect of his support at the social democratic level that there would be, understandably, some significant difference in relation to the philosophies represented on this side of the house from those of Professor Stretton, but it is fair to say that his contribution to the academic world and, in particular, his advocacy in relation to social democratic principles is one to be recognised. I think the Premier's recognition of his stellar contribution at the academic level, his reasoned argument and presentation of that philosophical view, is to be respected. It helps to strengthen and provide depth in the debate of the political and pragmatic considerations that we need to make decisions on in this house and in other areas of public life.

Professor Stretton had a long career and many academic publications, as recognised in the *Journal of Economic and Social Policy* published on 7 January 2000. I think it is fair to say that one of his papers, titled 'Onwards, sideways or backwards: alternative responses to the shortcomings of social democracy', if ever read by prime ministers Hawke, Keating or Howard, would have elicited a touch of irritation in all three. Perhaps the value of the work of an academic is to ensure that there is a position presented that will cause those in leadership to make decisions.

His views, for example, on financial deregulation were well known. His views on foreign aid and its value are well known. From our side of politics, some of those areas may have made us blush, but others we welcomed. I consider his overall contribution to the enlightenment of the debates in this area to have been very significant.

I conclude by saying that I thank the government for its role in supporting the development of the Stretton Centre so that we recognise those who make a considerable contribution, as Professor Stretton has done in his lifetime, and I trust that that will go on to provide a valuable service to the people of South Australia.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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) (11:25): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable that government business has precedence over Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation for today and Private Members' Business, Bills and Other Motions on Thursday 30 July and that any private members business set down for those days be set down for consideration on Wednesday 9 and Thursday 10 September respectively.

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

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

Motion carried.

*Bills***APPROPRIATION BILL 2015***Estimates Committees*

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:28): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:
That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Ms BEDFORD: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:
That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:29): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr ODENWALDER: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

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) (11:29): I move:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:30): I rise to speak on the estimates committees in this place over the last week or so, and I also indicate that I am not the lead speaker for the opposition. I asked questions in my capacity as the shadow minister in the areas of employment, skills and training and also education, multicultural affairs, and also assisted my colleague the Hon. Mr Ridgway in the upper house, and handled questions for the opposition in the area of tourism as well.

What an introduction we had to the estimates process this year. Of course, the 8.2 per cent unemployment in South Australia is the highest unemployment in the nation and not just by a couple of points. The national unemployment level in South Australia is at 6 per cent and steady. It is now trending at a steady rate, and in some states it is reducing, for example, in Tasmania at 6.5 per cent. South Australia is at 8.2 per cent, the highest unemployment rate we have had in this state for 15 years. What is even more concerning about that figure, of course, is that over the last 12 months we have seen the disappearance of nearly 20,000 full-time jobs in South Australia and more than 66,000 South Australians unemployed. We have not had 66,000 South Australians unemployed for 20 years.

It is a shocking figure, and anybody who has children who are at the age when they might be looking for part-time or full-time work, will know just how difficult it is to even get past that first post, that interview, for any jobs advertised, or by putting in an application for a job or expressing an interest in a job by walking into a business and asking them if they have any jobs, or even having some interest from that business in calling them back a little bit later. They include those who are in the industries that are transitioning out of the South Australian economy, and have been transitioning for at least 10 to 15 years.

I know that certainly in the manufacturing area, an area where I got my start in life (in the furniture manufacturing area), we saw that transition start to happen more than 20 years ago, but it is news to this government that we have a transitioning economy. Apparently, this budget all of a sudden became a jobs budget after the May job figures were released showing another dramatic increase in the job numbers. We did not hear anything about jobs in the budget prior to the ABS figures that came out in May. Then, of course, when the figures came out in June, they showed

that the trajectory for unemployment was still heading in the wrong direction in South Australia, and we were told that the focus was all about jobs.

Remember that there was an election promise by the Labor Party in 2010 to create 100,000 jobs in six years. That six years is due in February next year, so we are really only seven months or so from that end date target. So far, this government has produced just 1,670 jobs—all part-time. The transition that this government has managed in jobs over the last five years in particular is transitioning the South Australian economy to part-time jobs and higher unemployment.

When I asked the Minister for Employment in the other place (Hon. Gail Gago) whether the government was still committed to the 100,000 jobs promise that it made in the lead-up to the 2010 election, she said it was only ever an aspiration. That is simply not true; it is not true. There were documents released by this government in 2010, during the discussion paper for Skills for All, that said it was a commitment; there was no mention of 'aspiration' in the papers that were part of the Skills for All program. That program, of course, was released as part of the plan to generate more jobs here in South Australia; Skills for All was part of the plan to generate more jobs here in this state. If members read the material that went out both in the consultation process and then at the launch of Skills for All in 2012, Skills for All was to play a major role in transitioning the South Australian economy to create 100,000 new jobs in this state.

Of course, the jobs creation has been an absolute failure, and Skills for All was an absolute failure. It blew hundreds of millions of dollars, and there was not even a measurement mechanism put in place to determine just how successful that program was in delivering jobs. There were no job outcomes tied to funding. The types of courses that were offered were determined by students, not by industry, and consequently people were choosing courses that did not necessarily lead to jobs and choosing types of training where there are fewer job opportunities now than there were even five years ago here in South Australia.

As I said earlier, I was in the furniture industry, and during the period when I was in that industry, the last 10 years in that industry, 5,000 jobs disappeared from South Australia. The furniture industry seemed to be a major focus of this Skills for All program, giving false hope to so many young people, in particular, that if they did the training—Certificate I or Certificate II in Furniture Construction—there would be a job for them at the end. Of course, if the government had taken advice from anyone in the industry at the time of launching Skills for All, that precious and finite amount of money that was wasted in the Skills for All program could have been put to much better use.

Let us not forget that this government also said, in the lead up to the 2010 election, that it was going to remove the burden of payroll tax for those who took on trainees and apprentices. That lasted for about six months—another broken promise. What were the consequences of that in an economy here in South Australia that has been struggling for an extended period of time (it has certainly been struggling since 2010, in particular)? There is no doubt that the South Australian economy has managed the increases in the Australian dollar against the US dollar and has managed the financial crisis the most poorly of all the states in Australia.

Only recently we have seen that Tasmania has started to manage that situation more effectively and has got some results for those who are looking for jobs in that state. It used to be that South Australia was the worst state for unemployment in mainland Australia; now there is no qualification, South Australia is the worst state.

I have to say that I agree with David Penberthy on the radio this morning, when the Premier tried to claim that the embarrassment for South Australia is the fact that we are half an hour behind the rest of the nation and people laugh at us. He was right when he said, 'Don't you think that perhaps the embarrassment for South Australia is that we are a basket case with employment, with 8.2 per cent the worst unemployment rate in the country?' I am paraphrasing there, of course, but that is certainly what he had observed as the reason; that if the South Australian government is embarrassed, it should be embarrassed about its record unemployment here in South Australia and not the fact that we have a time zone that is half an hour behind the Eastern States.

I think it was also interesting in the estimates process that we learnt about the cuts in TAFE. We know now that, from 2012 when TAFE was corporatised to 2018, that there will be more than

800 fewer staff in TAFE. We have got nearly 500 already gone and the budget papers are telling us, and we learnt in the estimates process and also in the Budget and Finance Committee, that there could be up to another 500 going by the 2018-19 year.

Of course, we cannot forget the fact that one of the jewels in the crown of TAFE in South Australia was the Tea Tree Gully TAFE. Just two years ago, there were 2,500 students registered and being trained at Tea Tree Gully. There is a report in the Messenger press today, based on FOI documents, that tells us that, at the beginning of this year, fewer than 500 students enrolled at Tea Tree Gully. That is on top of the news of the secret meeting, the meeting in camera, that the Tea Tree Gully council held in June to discuss the offer made by TAFE to the council to take possession, either by sale or lease, of more than two-thirds of the TAFE campus at Tea Tree Gully.

What is shocking about that, of course, is that this decline in TAFE services at Tea Tree Gully started at almost the same time as the local member was the minister responsible for TAFE (the member for Newland). We saw that he implemented the changes to TAFE and, also, that is when we started to see the dramatic changes in what was happening to TAFE at Tea Tree Gully.

Tea Tree Gully TAFE has provided enormous support for middle Australia, those aspirational South Australians who want to get a good start in life by getting some vocational qualifications, whether that be through a trade such as hairdressing, for example, or whether it goes beyond that. I know that my wife, when she was a hairdresser, took on the course that they were delivering there called Train the Trainer so she could learn how to train hairdressing apprentices. It has a long history of getting very good outcomes.

Under this government, we have seen it virtually to the stage of being on the verge of closure—so much so that the report in the Messenger today also says that TAFE refused to give any further details of the future of the Tea Tree Gully TAFE, other than to say that they were not going to close it, but we know that this government also said they were not going to close the Repat Hospital and that is exactly what is happening.

I spoke earlier about the Skills for All program which has been thrown out because it did not work. It was replaced with the WorkReady program. I mentioned to the house that there was a consultation process for the Skills for All changes that was implemented two years after the consultation paper, but we saw that with WorkReady there was no consultation, that the non-government sector was immediately pulled out of the vocational training program (the program that supports vocational training with state government and federal government funding in South Australia) with one week's notice. There was no consultation whatsoever.

It is interesting now that TAFE is going out to consultation basically asking employers and stakeholders, 'What do we do now? We want to talk to you. We want you to tell us how we should be delivering our services.' I put it to the minister that that should have been sorted out before she pulled the rug on the non-government sector. And even the government's own report into Skills for All identified that the competition aspect that was introduced into funded vocational training, or supported vocational training, as it is known, delivered a direct outcome, and that was a reduction in the hourly rate of the cost of vocational training in South Australia.

Now the Premier is telling us that by going back to a TAFE monopoly it is going to help TAFE to become more competitive. I do not think that there is anybody outside the former Soviet Union who would believe a comment like that. It is just extraordinary that an organisation would get more competitive by eliminating its opposition.

Of course, we all know that services, whether they be schools—primary schools, high schools—or whether they be medical services work best for the community when there is a balance of the public and the private sector. We have non-government schools, and about 33 per cent, 34 per cent of our families choose non-government schools; and then in the medical sector you have private hospitals and you have public hospitals.

Again, it is that mix that enables services to be delivered in the best possible way in Australia. It is a system that works well—the balance of public and private schools, the balance of public and private hospitals; and, of course, that same theory was working well with the balance of non-government and government training providers in the vocational area.

I think that many of us sitting in the committee at the time and those listening were also shocked to hear that the public servant who was exposed as running her business in the Department of State Development from her desk had been suspended with full pay after the media report in June, but eight weeks later was still receiving full pay because the investigation was still ongoing. It is an extraordinary situation. I just think that it is a bit ironic that the investigation was happening on this issue at the same time that the head of public employment released a new code of ethics for public servants. It is pretty clear that eight weeks is just far too long for an investigation into a serious matter like that to be completed.

Then, of course, we also learnt that, despite the rhetoric from the government, we are still seeing people being brought in from interstate and possibly even overseas for the sorts of jobs that we need here for our engineering graduates for the South Road project. I have been told that over 100 engineers in various fields will be required to complete this project over the four or five years that it will take for the Darlington and the Torrens to Torrens project.

One local engineer and an Australian citizen was brought to South Australia several years ago, sponsored by the state government (because we had a shortage of engineers) to come to South Australia, worked on the Superway project as a South Australian and applied for an advertised position (advertised by Leighton) to be an engineer on this Torrens to Torrens project. When he applied for the position he was told, 'Look, we're not really looking for anybody because we have decided to bring our existing staff down from Queensland.' So, quite a shocking outcome. It appears to me that Leighton is going through the motions and the government is turning a blind eye to that.

It is extraordinary that the government would be borrowing so much money only to see that work being outsourced to others rather than to South Australians in that work. Of course, I also was involved in the education area. Not many things change in education other than the fact that, unfortunately, South Australia's education results are now, when it comes to the NAPLAN, the worst performing state in mainland Australia. We have seen that we were up there in 2008 with the rest of the nation—Victoria, New South Wales and the ACT—and now we are down there bouncing on the bottom, and every year the government simply gives us excuses for that.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:50): I rise today also to speak on the estimates. It was another interesting experience, the estimates experience. I will talk specifically about my portfolio areas in transport and road safety shortly, but in an overarching view of this budget, and from what people are saying to me when I am doorknocking, at the supermarket, at local sporting events or just out in the community, there is a common theme to the questions I am asked, and it is: where are the jobs? They all know South Australia's unemployment figure—they tell me that it is 8.2 per cent, the worst in any state in the nation, they say. 'We're below Tasmania,' is another quote, and they ask me—and again I quote: 'What's going on?'

According to the Treasurer, this year's budget was supposed to be a jobs budget. Well, what a failure. By the Treasurer's own admission in the budget papers, he predicts employment growth of 1 per cent in 2015-16. Last year, in the budget he predicted employment growth of 1.25 per cent for 2015-16. So, the supposed jobs budget is actually predicting lower employment growth for 2015-16! It is quite amazing, and South Australians are feeling the pinch.

I mentioned the state's unemployment figure put out by the ABS in June—8.2 per cent; again, the worst in the nation. Slowly over the years, we have slipped down to the bottom of the ranking of this measure, but we are normally above Tasmania. Not this time, though: Tasmania's unemployment figure is 6.5 per cent. South Australia is 8.2 per cent unemployment; Tasmania, 6.5 per cent; Queensland, 6.1; Victoria, 6.0; and Western Australia and New South Wales are both 5.8 per cent.

Sadly, we are the standout state at the bottom of the table. As was pointed out by the member for Unley earlier, this is South Australia's highest figure in 15 years: 66,000 South Australian people are unemployed. The government sitting opposite did commit back in 2010 to provide 100,000 jobs in six years and, at the moment, they have created only 16,070 part-time jobs. Now they are calling this commitment of 100,000 an aspiration. That is shirking the issue if I have ever seen or heard it and, again, South Australians have had enough.

It is alarming and it has been coming for quite a while, and the Weatherill government has been sitting on its hands watching it happen and, to make matters worse, what does Premier Weatherill say about the matter when questioned in the media? He tells South Australians that it is going to get worse. After 13 years of setting a plan and direction for this state, this government has us on a downward spiral compared with every other state in the nation. This is a dire situation for South Australia. We all know that in government there are good times and hard times but, when you have a government which has been in power for 13 years and they have the state going backwards while other states are holding their own or moving ahead, you know that there is trouble.

As a state, we are in that trouble, and South Australians are deeply concerned. Let's return to what I like to call the people meter: what is our community saying? Everyone I speak with knows someone who is unemployed: a young person unable to get an opportunity; a middle-aged person who is having to look interstate because their industry has closed down or downsized in South Australia; a family struggling to stay together because one person has had to move interstate to earn a wage while the other is here with the children; grandparents forced to leave South Australia because their children cannot get work in South Australia. So, grandparents are leaving to support their family and to be closer to their children and their grandchildren. The stories are endless and, after 13 years, the Premier's only response is, 'It will get worse.'

As I mentioned earlier, the Treasurer, by his own admission, has no solution. His plan has always been to tax South Australians harder when times are tough. He tried very hard with the car park tax, and it has been suggested to me that he will have another attempt at this in another guise, and we should all be keeping a close eye on that to see what he does there.

He has also doubled the ESL by taking away the remissions that were in place: some ESL bills have increased by 400 per cent. The Treasurer tried for a land tax, but he could not get it over the line, so increasing the ESL twice in 12 months has been the next best option to get more money out of South Australians to prop up his mismanaged finances—and now the Premier is talking about raising the GST. On FIVEaa radio, he admitted to the entire state that his plan was for just another cash grab to take money from the pockets of hardworking South Australians.

On FIVEaa's breakfast radio, David Penberthy handed the line of questioning over to Lisa, a listener from Seaview Park. Lisa said, and I quote, 'My question for the Premier would have been along the lines, what other taxes will be reduced if the GST was going to be raised by 15 per cent?' A great question in the context of the proposed tax reform the Premier and Treasurer had been spruiking. The response was astonishing. Premier Weatherill was terse in his response. He said, and I quote, 'Well, none, it's about raising money, it's not about shifting.' It is about raising money. There it is, straight from the Premier's mouth. This is how this government fixes its mismanagement of our state's finances after 13 years in charge.

It is clear we have a jobs crisis, and from our side we say there needs to be an emergency response to stop South Australia slipping further behind the rest of the nation. Our suggestions include: bringing forward planned stamp duty relief to take effect this year to help business and to grow jobs; commit to reducing payroll tax, again to stimulate business and create jobs; reverse the \$90 million hike to the emergency services levy that is hitting families and businesses so hard; commit to building the northern connector road, creating construction jobs immediately on a productive infrastructure project; finalise investigation into the Strzelecki Track upgrade; and create a state-based productivity commission. They are our suggestions.

Instead, what does the government want to talk about? Time zones. Remember, we are in a jobs crisis in South Australia. We need jobs now. So, whenever the government makes an announcement, I ask on behalf of the people who live and work in my community and across South Australia: where are the jobs now, Mr Weatherill? I have had a number of calls to my office on that same point, pointing out that time zones are a distraction. Interestingly, the government raised it when it was pushing its Transforming Health plan.

As the backlash came around issues such as closing the Repat Hospital, the government looked for a distraction and it talked about moving time zones to take the attention away from its poor policy. Now it has a jobs crisis in South Australia that is being felt across the entire state. Is it talking about that? No. Is it talking about generating jobs now? No. It has gone back to its diversion strategy and the Premier has put time zones on the agenda again. Premier, South Australians are smart, they

can see the pattern, they can see through what you are doing. Premier, South Australians deserve better.

The estimates process does allow us to ask questions, but that does not mean you will always get answers. It does put the ministers under pressure and their responses are always interesting to watch. I noted on the TV news last night that Treasurer Koutsantonis got very testy and short when he was questioned on the state's poor performance and its high unemployment rate, as I have just outlined.

I have come to learn in this place that he and several of his colleagues are very easy to read when they are under pressure in questioning. They attack, they attack the person asking the question as a form of defence. It was highly amusing and even more predictable to see the Treasurer turn to personal attacks when he had no answers, and I know that is what a number of his colleagues do as well.

With that, I will look at some of the points raised in estimates and I will start with transport and public transport in particular because we know this government has spent over half a billion dollars in particular on the rail revitalisation program. A lot of people are coming to me asking questions about the value of this spend, and other issues arising from that spend, on our train system that is not fixed and is not complete.

The running of the trains: just yesterday, the figures put out by the government show that on-time running for trains is down to 91 per cent, not much more than when they were doing the works and the lines were being severely disrupted as the upgrade of the Seaford line was taking place. As I said, \$500 million has been spent on this program, but it is the lack of maintenance to upkeep this investment that is causing concern to a lot of South Australians. It is having a big impact on on-time running, which has a big impact on the reliability of the train system, and that is impacting people's use of the train system. If we can guarantee reliability and on-time running then more people will use the system and we will get better return on the investment.

A number of the issues that were brought up with the minister—and, sadly, we did not always get an answer—were around the train system and things that needed to be done and upgraded as far as the train system is concerned. We talked about on-time running, and I asked the minister about the measures for on-time running because it was pointed out in the budget papers that these had been changed recently.

It has been brought to my attention, in relation to on-time running for trains, that trains can be five minutes 59 seconds late and still be deemed to be on time. However, I did ask the minister a question and he could not answer it. It has come to my attention that when a train runs five minutes 59 late coming into the Adelaide Railway Station, you would think the timing and the clock would stop when the train pulls up at the platform in the city, but I am led to believe that is not the case; in fact, the clock stops when the train enters the Adelaide rail yard.

Trains that are left in a holding pattern for four or five minutes, or even longer out in the rail yard trying to get into a station, are still deemed on-time running even though they might have got in inside the five minutes 59—five minutes 58, let's say—then they wait out in the holding yard for another five minutes before they can actually get to the station. They are still calculated as on-time running, which is a great concern. The minister would not answer the question when it was put to him. He did have a couple of advisers alongside, but he did not ask them directly; he did say that instead he would get back to us with an answer. We are very much anticipating that.

Some other things were brought to my attention. The minister pointed out that the new electric trains we have in service are 75 metres in length, and at times they are coupled together and run at 150 metres in length. I asked him how many stations along the Seaford line and southern lines (including the Tonsley line) were not actually 150 metres in length. Again, he would not answer that question. I am led to believe that it is seven or eight. So, there are seven or eight stations that cannot accommodate the double-length electric trains (EMUs) as they are.

A number of these issues were put to the minister but not answered. The budget papers talked about the 22nd electric train coming online a little bit later this year. It is well behind schedule, but the 22nd train is coming online. They were ordered at a time when the plan was to electrify the

Gawler line. We all know that has not gone ahead, and it has been on-again off-again more times than you can count; still, 22 trains were purchased in the contract.

I am led to believe it only takes 16 and a spare to service the southern lines with the electric trains, so that is five extra trains at about \$10 million a pop and we have an oversupply of what we need. That is \$50 million just sitting there that is not needed because of the mismanagement of this project. Also tied into that is a 10-year maintenance contract, which again I am led to believe is in place to service all 22 trains as if they were working at capacity. Given that we have an oversupply of five trains, these trains are going to be serviced as if they were working in full operation and they will be very much underutilised—so, again, an overspend on the maintenance contract.

They were the questions I asked the minister. Again, he would not ask the advisers and senior department members who were sitting alongside him; he did say he would take those questions on notice. Equally, the diesel railcars are supposed to be coming off the Seaford line and moving across to the Gawler line. I have come to learn a lot about trains in recent times: we have the 4000 series class, which are the electric trains; we have the 3000 series class, which are the newer diesel trains; and we have the 2000 diesel class, also known as the 'jumbos' because of their cockpit, if you like, where the drivers sit up high on those cars.

They are well and truly over 30 years old; in fact, they are coming up to 36 years of age, I think, very soon. They were supposed to be taken out of service late last year, and then it was revised to March, but they are still running on the Gawler line because it has not been electrified. We have an oversupply of electric trains, as I pointed out just a minute ago, but we cannot use them on the Gawler line because it is not electrified. Therefore, these old diesel trains are still in service, even though they should have been retired some time ago. Not only are the people on the Gawler line missing out on the electric trains but they also have to use these 2000 series trains. I did ask when the 2000 series trains would be taken out service, and again the minister is getting back to us on that one.

One of a number of other issues that were talked about because they were outlined in the budget was the CCTV lighting on some of the stations. What happens with the new electric trains is that they have cameras on the side that shoot down the side and there is a monitor in the cabin for the driver to see. Unfortunately, some of the stations are actually on a little bit of a curve, which makes it alarmingly worrying for safety purposes, in that, as the train pulls up on a curve, the line of sight for the camera down the side of the train is obscured because the middle carriage sticks out a little bit. The driver cannot always see who is getting on and getting off.

Also, the poor lighting, along with glare, at some of the stations makes it hard for some of the drivers to see the monitor, and there have been some issues associated with that. I asked about a few of those, and again the minister is going to get back to us, so it will be interesting to see what the outcome is.

Another thing we talked about was maintenance—and maintenance is not sexy. Cutting a ribbon and opening a new train or doing something like that is always sexy, but maintenance is not sexy. We talked about a couple of things that were brought to my attention, such as the wheel lathe to align the wheels and make them run better on the tracks and to make sure that the investment you have put into a train has the most value by servicing it. As you do with your car, you service a train and make sure it runs well, and you have to lathe the wheels to make sure it runs smoothly on the track.

I found out recently that we do not have a wheel lathe that can accommodate our trams, so the tram bogies are actually put on a truck, shipped across to Melbourne, lathed in Victoria and then the bogies are sent back. We do have a very old wheel lathe out near Dry Creek that is on its last legs, according to some reports I have seen from the department, and it has been suggested that we get a new wheel lathe. As it is, the new electric trains are lathed there. If this lathe breaks down, the only option we have is to put our new trains on a truck, ship them to Melbourne and get the wheels lathed there.

You can see the inefficiencies and the cost blowouts in that, so it has been suggested that we get a wheel lathe. I asked if that was in any of the budget costings and the minister said pretty much, no, it was not. I know these things are capital investments, but they need to be looked at in

relation to the efficiencies of running these systems because if it is not done there will be damage to the trains, and a lot of money has been invested in them, as we said, and it could be very expensive.

I also asked some questions about the Adelaide rail yard and the resleepering project, which the Premier has talked about in this house, saying that we are getting rid of the old 'wooden toothpicks', referring to the wooden sleepers, and replacing them with concrete sleepers. That is all well and good, but a lot of sections of the track have still not been done. I am led to believe that the Adelaide rail yard is one such part. Again, I asked the minister if that was going to be done and to the best of his knowledge he said, no, that would not be done.

Other sections of the track still have wooden sleepers, and that means that the trains are actually slowed down and speed restrictions are put on the track, which again impacts on on-time running and service delivery. That is not what we want for a project we have spent so much money on trying to get it right and make it efficient so that we can transport more people around the network. It really is quite disturbing.

We did ask about a couple of other things. A couple of years ago in the budget there were automatic train protections as a signalling issue. We do note that the government has put some money towards signalling, and we asked if that money (\$6 million over two years) would fix the signalling problems. The minister did respond that this money really is just to help maintain the system and that it is not going to fix all of the problems.

If you look back over the history of the trains, even over the last couple of years since the rail revitalisation project has been completed and more than \$500 million has been spent on this line, a number of trains have been delayed and there have been service disruptions because of the signalling system and the project that has been rolled out. Again, a signalling system is nowhere near as sexy as having extra trains—and we have extra trains, as I pointed out—but a signalling system means the trains will move smoothly.

We have three signalling systems, as far as I am aware. I asked the minister this question as well, but he still would not refer to the people alongside him and get a response. I am led to believe there are three, but I am waiting for the minister to get back with confirmation of that. There is one on the southern line, a different signalling system on the northern line and a different signalling system again in the Dry Creek depot. By not having these all working in unison does make for some real issues. We had a situation a few months ago when trains could not get out of the Dry Creek depot and into the city for peak hour because this signalling system was in a mess.

Tied in with this is the ATP (Automatic Train Protection) system which the government had in its budget papers a couple of years ago, stating that this system was complete. This was a multimillion dollar investment, and in estimates we asked the minister how it was going and he said that it should be switched on in another couple of months. It was complete two years ago, but it is still not up and operating now, which is also a little alarming.

The other thing to be pointed out, and it was discussed in estimates as well, is the stabling at Dry Creek, the servicing of cars there and having this extra number of trains. To service the trains, of course, now you have to take them out to Dry Creek, so they are towed out there by the diesel trains. The brand-new electric trains cannot get out to the servicing station and have to be towed by diesel trains.

There are a number of other issues I really could go on about, and I am sure I will discuss them in this house in time, but a lot of questions were asked in estimates but not a lot of answers were given.

Time expired.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:10): In my budget estimates response I first of all want to thank the CEOs, the senior advisers, the staff and of course the ministers who prepared pretty in-depth correspondence through that period which shone somewhat of a light on some of the issues, but of course there is never enough time to fully explore all of them. I also thank the Chairs—yourself, member for Florey, and the member for Little Para, who I must admit probably sat through all of it, but some of it scratching their head, and some of the behaviour of senior personnel left a little bit to be desired, in my opinion.

Budget estimates is a good time for us to ask the government questions, and of course the government is asking us to approve under the appropriation the moneys for the various portfolio responsibilities they have. But of course the purpose is for the parliament to convene a committee which is representative here in the House of Assembly by members of the house to ask questions.

I would like to put on the record that I think that there are some improvements that can be made in the budget estimates process. I think we could do ourselves a great service by looking at the federal system and how they do their estimates in the Senate. For those who do not know, it is presented to the Senate estimates and members of the department and senior personnel from Treasury attend and answer detailed questions about the expenditure or proposed expenditure. It is quite a forensic and long-term examination, whereas, of course, here it has become sanitised and, in some cases, a chore to get through, depending on the level of competence of the minister in question.

When it was introduced first by premier Tonkin, it was meant to be an opportunity to examine in depth the expenditure of the government going forward. With that, I commend many of the ministers I sat in on who did not throw to Dorothy Dixers and actually answered questions as honestly as they could, and I give great credit to those ministers who do that. Unfortunately, I did experience the other side of it, where I think we got about three questions in and, in all honesty, it was a waste of time.

I would like to touch on an area of great concern to me, that is, education. If we are serious about education—and the minister is certainly trying to grapple with this very large department—I think some concerning aspects are around our NAPLAN results. I acknowledge that NAPLAN is just one marker or indicator of performance but, nonetheless, you cannot dismiss it when results do not go your way. You need to examine them and try to work out where areas of improvement can be made and why certain indicators are perhaps where they are.

I will refer in particular to the percentage of year 3 students achieving the national minimum—and I emphasise that word 'minimum'—standard in reading. If you look at the budget papers, Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 25, for those strange enough to perhaps read this *Hansard* and want to refer to it, my great concern is Indigenous students.

In 2013 the number of year 3s achieving the minimum standard in reading was 76.7 per cent. Now, in 2013, if you compare that with all students, all students were tracking at about 94.3 per cent, which is where you would think we would be. However, go forward 12 months and that figure dropped from 76.7 per cent to 69.6 per cent. That is a massive drop for our Indigenous students in achieving the minimum standard in reading at year 3 levels.

I certainly had plenty of questions around that type of statistic. If you follow that group through, the percentage of year 5 students achieving at national minimum standard in reading for Indigenous students was only 65.6 per cent. That is quite alarming and, in fact, I think it is a disgrace in the state of South Australia and something that needs serious focus, bipartisan support and strategies to increase the level of Indigenous students up to where all students seem to be tracking in the 90 per cent range. I am assured by the minister that strategies are in place and I will be very interested in looking at these budget figures next year to see what improvements and early intervention has occurred.

Of course, our school system is quite complex. I do not believe it is about more money being poured into the system. I strongly believe that there are efficiencies that need to be made, efficiencies that can be made and we certainly need to alleviate principals and senior leaders within the school system of the bureaucratic red tape that seems to be swallowing their work day and drawing their focus away from core principles, which are reading, writing and arithmetic—to quote some bygone eras.

People who spend time in schools—and that is the area I come from—are finding less and less capable younger teachers aspiring to be school leaders. It is a major concern for me, particularly in country areas, where we have this stagnation. They get to a point in their career, normally around a senior leader position (which was the old coordinator level position) and many capable people who I have talked to have absolutely no intention of progressing further.

There are probably two or three underlying issues which they raise with me time and time again, but the main one is the time spent on red tape and bureaucratic processes, and the inability to manage their workforce in an effective manner. That is, when a principal has a poor-performing teacher (which is actually not as common as most people think; it is quite rare), the process to work with that teacher becomes agitated and it becomes quite personal and it takes a very strong toll on a principal's wellbeing in managing that situation. Many throw up their hands and say, 'Well, it's not a process once you have been through it once that you want to go through again.'

Of course, I see a number of principals entering retirement age and I think there is a wonderful opportunity for our school system and departmental system to support those principals who are targeted as high-performing principals to mentor and give back to future generations. There does not seem to be an easy way for that to occur, yet the benefits for our younger people, particularly our most at-risk people, would be tremendous.

In terms of the schooling sector, I would just like to explain to people that our NAPLAN results have deteriorated consistently over the last 10 years. It is a shame on our state that we do not have one primary school ranked in the top 100 schools in the nation for NAPLAN results. In fact, we only have one high school ranked in the top 100 secondary schools in South Australia. If this does not sound alarm bells, and we need to be intervening into these performance standards, I really do not know what will trigger that type of response. Of course budget estimates is not just about education, as perhaps I would like it to be.

I was also involved in the areas of forestry, where I led that questioning, and pretty soon there will be no need for a minister for forests. We could also term it now the minister for no forests—

Mr Gardner: And no minister for employment.

Mr BELL: That is right, or small business. I digress. Quite alarming was the fact that the day before estimates was an announcement in the South-East that the management rights for the forest would be handed over to OneFortyOne. This is despite having a five-year agreement, which was negotiated by the previous Treasurer, who is here at the moment, and many people give credit to that minister in handling that process as best as can be done.

One of the key parts to provide confidence for the South-East was this five-year agreement that ForestrySA would provide the management role for OneFortyOne to give five years' worth of security and then have the option of renewal. Of course 12 months ago we were hoodwinked into believing that 70-odd jobs needed to be cut from ForestrySA so they could become efficient, become leaner and more competitive and stand the best possible chance in 2017, when those management rights were up, of retendering. Here we are, nearly three years that into that agreement, and the government has caved in to OneFortyOne's wishes and handed over all management rights to OneFortyOne.

The real shame in this is the amount of intellectual property, the stuff that has been the built up of 100-plus years of modelling, forecasting, growth rates, mapping, thinnings and rotations. All of that data and computer-generated spreadsheets were just handed over. If we were in a totally commercial world, and the management of a forest organisation was told that on 1 October your contract will cease and we will take it over ourselves, then those computer programs, office staff, everything would be locked up and the organisation that owns the forest would have to retender to have somebody manage that forest.

If we just think about the mapping involved, where are these forests and what they actually entail. That would be millions of dollars worth of work. We totally underplayed our hand as a state government, seriously underplayed it, and now the management sits with OneFortyOne, with some looming questions to which I did not get too many answers in the budget estimates around what happens if the 60 staff of ForestrySA do not take up the positions of OneFortyOne. Will we see another round of forced redundancies; will they sit at ForestrySA and play computer games while some work is dreamed up for them? There is not much point having ForestrySA in the South-East if you have no forests to run or manage. So, it is a major concern.

Of course my greater concern is for my fellow South Australians, my family and kids. I am deeply concerned that this jobs crisis will turn into a jobs catastrophe. We are at 8.2 per cent

unemployment at the moment, that is without Holden and the allied industries closing down, without Port Augusta, Leigh Creek—and ForestrySA jobs, dare I say it, are going. If some rumours are true, some other industries, I am reliably informed, may be shedding their workforce. I can quite easily see our state's unemployment rate hitting double digits, and that would be a tragedy for South Australia.

What we are going to see in South Australia is exactly what has happened in country areas for the last 13 years; that is, it will become an older demographic. It will become a demographic where younger people will leave to find opportunities elsewhere. Of course, when you have the whole state doing that, it will be interstate or overseas. The real tragedy there, like in country areas, is that it is normally the ones who have higher education qualifications who leave and in many cases take a long time to come back, if indeed they do come back. So there is a natural brain drain—is the term coined—leaving the state, which then puts the state in a more perilous condition.

One just has to look at country areas to see what the outcome of this is going to be. This will basically become an area with an ageing population, with fewer people paying taxes because more people will be retired, less innovation and less industry, which becomes a downward spiral. Believe it or not, I read something from Kevin Foley—and I never thought I would be up here quoting Kevin Foley—who essentially said that when a government abandons the target of having a AAA credit rating you are on a downward spiral of debt. That is exactly where we are headed right now. In fact, one of the great fallacies portrayed in this house was that the sale of the South-East forests was to keep our AAA credit rating. Quite interestingly, the day after the sale was announced, the renovation of the Adelaide Oval was also announced. Who knows whether or not that was a coincidence.

I always try to come to this place with some positives, some ideas to move forward, some bipartisan approach. I will just table a few areas where I think we can drive growth, and hopefully I will flesh these out in this place over the coming years. The one thing we have to understand is how businesses operate. What would it take for a person to start a business in South Australia? You have to get the fundamentals right. One of the things is the cost of borrowing. If you want to start a business, the cost of borrowing, particularly if you are a young entrepreneur, is quite prohibitive. I would like to see a start-up fund, with the vision that we would become like the silicon valley of California, where it becomes an area of innovation and entrepreneurship. To do that, people need access to cheaper finance.

One thing we could do is have the government set aside a portion of money, to have a lower interest rate on a start-up fund. It would still need to be approved by banks and it would still need to go through all the commercial-in-confidence and due diligence that we do, but instead of borrowing money at 6.5 per cent, which many people need to do for a business loan, you might be able to borrow money at 2 per cent, capped at a certain amount, of course. It might be \$200,000. That would give younger people a reason to start that entrepreneurial journey.

Of course, there would be caveats around that. You would need to be a South Australian resident—so we would slug you with every other tax that we have here—and you would need to employ a majority of South Australian people, say 51 per cent. That would give an incentive for people to relocate to South Australia to start a business. They would still need to put their own capital on the line, but we could get a cheaper interest rate for them.

A local one would cost about \$25 million; we need to relocate Finger Point. Finger Point is our sewage treatment plant. At the moment it is right near the coast, so what happens is that we pump the effluent out, treat it and then pump it into the sea. If we had that plant stationed close to Mount Gambier, we could treat the effluent like Bolivar and then put it to the market for cheap irrigation so that people could irrigate with that treated water, particularly during the summer months. The amount of water that just flows out to sea through our drainage system is quite mind-boggling, and if we had a system of capturing and re-using it, that would again go towards better productivity.

Deregulation is one topic on which we need to have a mature and sensible debate—not hyperbole, innuendo and misinformation—particularly in relation to deregulating Sundays and public holidays. Establishing a tourism precinct in the South-East or Mount Gambier with Sunday penalty rates not at their current prohibitive level, but at a level where people would open their business, employ more people and attract tourism, has some real merit.

I have spoken before about the Blue Card and I will speak more about that. There are other issues such as supporting our racing industry, and the big one that I picked up from Texas is partnering with Indigenous communities with tax breaks—a very innovative way of encouraging co-investment with Indigenous communities.

Time expired.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (12:30): I also rise today to respond to the estimates committee reports. I would actually like to commend the member for Mount Gambier for one of his latest ideas in regard to the start-up community. It goes without saying that this is an area that the government should definitely be doing more in. The start-up community in Adelaide is a very positive and energetic one, but they are calling and screaming and crying out for more assistance from the government. When you look at the amount of office space that is vacant in this state and when you look at the amount of money that is being wasted in this state, we could be putting it to much more productive use if some of that funding and some of that space was given to the start-up community.

The government does have a micro fund available to businesses. However, it was disappointing to hear, during the estimates period, that not very many companies actually took up the funding. It leads to many questions. Why are they not tapping into this funding? Is it because there is too much red tape to get to the funding? Is it because the government is making it too hard? I think we need to have a debate about what we can do to promote South Australian businesses and especially those in the start-up community.

This is at a time in South Australia's history—not just this year, I note, but also the year before—when there are more businesses leaving South Australia than are actually commencing business in South Australia. This is a massive concern. This exodus of small businesses is a huge issue and we cannot recover without an improvement from the small business sector. Let us not kid ourselves: the government can never tax a state to prosperity. This is going to be a small business-led improvement, if it is going to happen, and we need to get out of small business's way, so I commend the member for Mount Gambier for raising his idea.

I would like to thank all the public servants who took the time to come in and appear before the committees and who generally provided details regarding expenditure to be approved. It is a very important process, obviously. Unfortunately, because of the sometimes adversarial nature of what we do here, some people tend to lose focus on what they are here to do. We are here to represent the best interests of the people we represent in our seats and also the best interests of the people of South Australia. It was good to get to know some of these public servants a lot better—good hardworking people who are in it for the right reasons and in it for the greater good of the state. Estimates provides a good opportunity to get to know them.

Estimates is obviously very important for several reasons, but I wish to talk about just a couple. This was my second estimates. Estimates provides a good opportunity to allow Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and, also, the government to be satisfied, when they approve and support the government's Appropriation Bill, that money that needs to be spent is actually being spent well and is actually being spent competently. It is an important process in holding the government to account on those issues. It is also a very good opportunity to engage with various government departments about the future programs that the government will install in the future.

For me as a younger member of this place, I am always interested to see the difference between the more competent ministers and the ones who still struggle. I was extremely disappointed. I always come to estimates with high hopes, but it is disappointing that, given the army of public servants and advisers present, some ministers actually did not take many questions at all and had to take questions on notice. It makes you think; you would think that these ministers would be all over their portfolios, but some of them, I am afraid, were not.

As we have heard this morning, and time and time again, South Australia has the highest unemployment rate in all of Australia—8.2 per cent. It is well above the national unemployment rate, which is about 6 per cent at the moment. We heard this morning from the gallant member for Unley that there have been 20,000 full-time jobs lost in South Australia alone. I see many young people, as I am sure you do as well, Deputy Speaker, who cannot find jobs at the moment, and many of these young people are qualified, either in their trade or their profession. It is extremely concerning.

There is market failure at the moment in our economy, it goes without saying. I look at the recent events of Tagara Builders, for example, in my own electorate. There is a lot of pain out there at the moment.

This government was called on to provide some answers for this dire jobs crisis, this dire job situation. Unfortunately—and it was evident in the estimates process—there was not enough talk from the government about jobs, and specifically about the detail of where those jobs will come from. We obviously all remember the 100,000 jobs promise that the former premier made. In the future this will prove to be but a distant memory. This will be proved to be completely false, and the government probably knew that the whole time.

We heard last week that we might actually have half a new Royal Adelaide Hospital at its opening. I really do want to embrace the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. However, we were told last week that when the new Royal Adelaide Hospital opens its doors it may have only half the number of beds that are currently available at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We were also told that paper patient records will still be needed, due to the failure of the electronic patient system.

This is a bit concerning, given the amount of funds required to build this and given that when it does come onto the government books it is going to be quite a large asset and liability. Not only that, but the health minister believes that the 18 April opening date might even be called into question. These are real concerns and they affect not only the patients but also the workers.

Talk to the nurses out there, talk to the public servants who work at the Royal Adelaide, talk to the cleaners. There is much angst in the community at the moment and the least the government can do is stick to these timelines and say with confidence that things will be done when they were promised to be done, and on budget, and that competent IT systems will be available and working when the opening occurs, with an adequate level of bedding at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It is extremely disappointing.

Unfortunately, the government negative headlines dominated much of the week's media. I look at flights and travel that was undertaken. I note that the following ministers had undeclared travel: the Treasurer and the Minister for Health. It really poses some questions, notwithstanding all the might of their departments and the number of full-time employees they have with their own ministerial staffers. Seriously, how many staffers and how many public servants does it take to post one or two pages of details about each item of travel? Were they expecting the opposition not to pick up these things? It is extremely disappointing that the government comes through to estimates and, at the eleventh hour, has to discover that these things are not put on. It goes to the heart of transparency and it goes to the heart of the arrogance of this government that they cannot even post their travel details online.

The worst item of travel was the revelation of the member for Mawson—whom they are calling Boeing Bignell in some circles. He spent over an hour concocting far-fetched and ridiculous explanations as to why his travel was necessary, and why certain receipts about hotel rooms were paid for and bottles of wine were paid for.

You have to ask yourself: does the minister honestly think that the average South Australian believes that all this expenditure was needed for his portfolio? It is an absolute disgrace and it is arrogant. It reflects poorly not only on him and his government but also on all of us in this house, because the people of South Australia who pay their taxes and pay for us to do a good job and to represent the interests of our electorates and our area expect more. They expect more and it is extremely disappointing.

In regard to the budget overall, where was the new capital investment for my electorate? The government has certainly disappointed the constituents of my area. People in my area have real concerns about cost of living, about job security and about how they and their children are going to keep working in local jobs here in South Australia when there is such an exodus of jobs and work leaving South Australia and going interstate. There was no budget allocation for parking at Paradise Interchange. There was no budget allocation for the relocation of the Glynde substation to an industrial site, despite the Labor Party before the 2014 election making a written promise that the substation in Glynde would be relocated to an alternative site and that the government would provide alternative land.

There was a lot said about stamp duty and various fees and charges and how, for example, stamp duty will be abolished on non-residential real property transfers by 1 July 2018. There would be a phased abolition of conveyance duty on non-residential real property transfers between 1 July 2016 and 1 July 2018. Duty rates will be reduced by a third from 1 July 2016, a further third from 1 July 2017, before the duty is abolished from 1 July 2018. The government estimates that more than 5,500 transfers each year will benefit from this abolition of duty. There was talk about the abolition of stamp duty on genuine corporate restructures, as well as other stamp duty matters.

The point I would like to make is that the people of South Australia and especially the small businesses of South Australia are experiencing problems now. They are calling for the government to get out of their way now. The only way to do that is to make South Australia a more competitive place to do business. That is why some of these measures need to be brought into place now. The noose is, unfortunately, already around the necks of so many small businesses out there. They want to do well, they want to employ more people and they want to grow. However, it has been proven time and time again that it is expensive to do business in South Australia. We are the highest taxed state in all of Australia, so the least the government could do is to move some of these provisions forward to at least give business a go so that they can grow and so that they can go out and employ more South Australians.

We then moved to the Attorney-General's Department. It was again evident that the government is all talk when it comes to the courts and upgrading the courts precinct. The courts have yet to receive the several hundred million dollars that was spoken about many years ago in regard to an upgrade. Instead, what did we hear? We heard a pie-in-the-sky idea that the District and Supreme courts might be merged and that a single court of appeal could be established. This has been proposed many times over the last 15 years. The government has always talked about it but never actually done it, I note.

We know that the District and Supreme courts already have the same criminal registry, which is the busiest division of the superior courts, and this is hardly going to cut costs. All it is is a simple rearranging of the deck chairs. It is nothing more than a distraction, and the Attorney should know better. It is nothing more than a distraction from the real problems confronting the justice system. If you talk to lawyers and people who use the legal system or attend court, they will tell you the same thing: there is a lack of facility. Look at the issues concerning the sale of Sturt Street, the IT system and the ballooning case lists.

The government and the Chief Justice, to my satisfaction, did not give answers as to how these issues would be addressed. They need to say more than that they want just a new court building because it is about more than just that. We know that they are not going to get one any time soon under this government, so I suggest that the CAA get on with improving their services with what they have, rather than just hoping for a new building which the government is not giving any money to. I would like to remind the government about the commonwealth courts option and the fact that the former chief justice, I understand, knocked back a proposal from the former attorney-general to use the then newly built SA Water building.

The Attorney-General has let down the people of South Australia as far as the courts precinct goes. He knows better and he should be doing much more. I am actually curious as to the Attorney's answer to a question from the deputy leader, when she asked him if he was thinking about appointing himself a judge. I noticed that he did not rule it out explicitly. It would not surprise me if he did become a judge in the future. If you look at most of his mates, Deputy Speaker, most of his mates from Murray Chambers have done very well over the years, and it would not surprise me at all if he became a judge.

Mr Gardner: He has wig envy.

Mr TARZIA: He has wig envy, the member for Morialta says. Then there was the Treasurer. The Treasurer has been a long time in this place; he should know better. Certainly, when he wants to, he can provide answers to questions, but it was not his best day yesterday. He resorted to attacking our leader, and it was in a puerile and immature fashion at some points, and it is not good enough.

We are here to do a job. People wonder why the public sometimes switch off from what we do. It is just not on. We generally want to work where we can with the government to provide long-term economic improvement in South Australia. It does not help when members on both sides, and members on the government side especially, resort to personal attacks on members of the opposition. If only they put as much effort into attacking people on our side personally as they did to actually fixing the jobs crisis that they have created on their watch. It is very disappointing.

Overall, what we have seen is that the government wants to talk about everything under the sun except jobs and except the economy. Beware of the weapons of mass distraction this government constantly uses time and time again to distract the people of South Australia from the real issues out there. They want to talk about driverless cars. They want to talk about time zones. Deputy Speaker, wait for it: I bet you that in the future this government will try to change the message on registration plates on those driverless cars, too. You wait for it. They will talk about anything and everything except the economy and the dire state of our economy at the moment.

We need to be doing more to create jobs for South Australians. At 8.2 per cent, we have the worst unemployment in all the nation. Stop the mucking around, get with the program, and let's try to at least get this economy moving once more. South Australia can be great; however, it is being let down by a poor, tired and incompetent government.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:48): I must say that I love listening to the words of others in this chamber sometimes. For the member for Hartley indeed, not just can South Australia be great, indeed it must be great. That is the thing we all have to strive for, and it is. Within this chamber, we have some level of control over what we talk about. It gets distracted from time to time, but estimates is a five-day period that I enjoy. Not having yet had the opportunity to be on the government side and cram for every potential question that may be asked of you, or to ensure that the staff members around you prepare an answer to every potential question that may be asked of you, I desire the opportunity tremendously one day and I hope that I live long enough for it to occur, because it has to be a system that will work well.

I come into this place, though, respecting some who actually walk into the chamber without the need to make rather lengthy opening statements or without the need to put questions from their own side before themselves to give them the chance to provide more information. I respect those people. Indeed, the member for Newland has just walked in, and I have vivid recollections of him in the other chamber in his first estimates session as Minister for Recreation and Sport. I was asking questions on behalf of another shadow minister at the time, and the member for Newland walked in without an opening statement and did not have any questions from his own side. The period went for two hours, and he was prepared to provide an answer to every question that was posed to him by the opposition.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: No wonder I got into so much trouble.

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Newland notes that it is no wonder he got into so much trouble. I must say that from my side there was an instant level of respect for the willingness to come in and actually face the questioning. It did create a bit of a scrambling need for us to ensure that we had enough questions to last through the whole two-hour session, but that is part of the challenge for a parliamentarian. It was a good tactic because we presumed—incorrectly, as it turned out—that there would be a different focus, that there would be questions and an opening statement, but it did not transpire. So, I commend you, member for Newland, and I hope that those who follow behind you have the same ideas on how they should perform.

The member for Enfield did well in Planning estimates, the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority and the Consumer and Business Services on liquor licensing. He actually had the same principles that he adopted last Wednesday, and that was for a 90-minute session. There were only a few questions about the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority, which has a relatively smaller budget of \$4.8 million, which was the only reference I could find, and that was about capital works. We only had a couple of questions on Consumer and Business Services. The Hon. Rob Lucas is the shadow minister, and it is interesting that, in relation to liquor licensing, there has been publicity only today about some recommendations on a review to be undertaken. It will be interesting on where the final point rests, but it is important that questions are asked in that area too.

The main focus of my 90-minute session was planning matters, which I consider to be absolutely critical to the future of South Australia. When planning is done well, it puts in train an opportunity for some surety to be attached to development and for some surety to be attached to the community, where part of its challenge is to be involved very significantly in developing the future vision of a local government area, a suburb, or a regional township and, by association, the whole state. To get that right is absolutely key for the parliament to ensure that it has the opportunity to occur.

The minister has spoken quite openly many times about the fact that within the next two days, I believe, a development bill will be presented before the parliament, not to be debated until September, and the mechanisms around that will be key. It is a complete rewrite of the act. The current act has been in place since 1993 and amended close to 50 times in that 22-year period, so it is appropriate for it to be reviewed.

There will not be total agreement: there will be an enormous number of questions and an enormous number of different positions put by relevant industry and community groups from across the state. In this chamber particularly, there will be some lengthy debate. We will talk about it for quite a few days, and we will talk about all the challenges it represents, and the opportunities and scenarios around it, and we will ask why a particular stance has been taken and an alternative position put and then come to some form of resolution.

I was interested, in asking questions of the minister on just a few things, when we talked about the existing RAH site and the future planning and zoning requirements of that, given that the government has sought expressions of interest for alternative uses for some of those sites. We asked questions about the Adelaide Parklands zone DPA that is currently out. At the time of questioning the minister, I believe something like 167 submissions had been put in about that DPA. It is a rather high number, but it shows that no matter where people are from, and because there are so many different suburbs that front onto the Parklands areas, there are people who are interested in it. So, from a community engagement point of view, I am very pleased that people are becoming involved.

An interesting aspect of that DPA is that for infrastructure development the government wishes to pursue it suddenly becomes 'complying development', certainly from a public notification viewpoint, and an opportunity for further consideration of it. That was an interesting change from previously having been noncompliant. It is a change of only a few words, but the implications are quite significant, so that is why we spent some time asking questions on that.

We also had questions about the Adelaide CBD high school, which is currently and has been known as the Reid Building. Primarily, it is the responsibility of the Minister for Education as to the infrastructure challenges that represents and what modifications are going to be required for it. I asked the Minister for Planning about what level of involvement the Minister for Education or her predecessors had had in earlier discussions on that. That will also require some zoning issues to be considered, depending on what occurs there.

We asked questions about the planning reforms, particularly down to things such as the urban growth boundary. Again, this is not a situation or question area that excites a lot of people, but it actually has quite significant implications. There has been a version of an urban growth boundary in place since the mid-1990s. The Hon. Diana Laidlaw, as a previous minister from the other place, put that in place, and minister Rau confirmed that, in his time as minister, he has not made any changes to it. I took, though, some of his words to be concerns about previous changes that had been made and the fact that he wants to legislate for it instead of it being a ministerial responsibility, as it has been for over 20 years. He does so from the basis of a lack of belief in future ministers for planning and what they might do. I find intriguing what is going to occur there.

We asked some questions about it, and the minister provided some comments to me. I am not sure if they were particularly reasons for the desire to legislate for it, but there will be a lot more that occurs about that. I asked some questions about things like interactions between adjoining land and the challenges when change of land use applications are considered and supported. I quoted some examples, particularly in a broadacre sense, about mining, where it adjoins agricultural land and the challenges from not just the production of broadacre farming adjoining it but the marketing of it.

I think there is a lot to consider there, particularly as resources are located in the more settled areas where long-term agricultural operations have been occurring and mining applications are being either developed, put before the government or have been approved and what the implications of that are. That is an issue that divides regional communities very strongly: one side wants to see the regional economy grow through diversification of the economy and others want to ensure that respect is paid to the traditional use of it, a broadly European settlement sense, with agriculture occurring there.

The last area of questioning for the Minister for Planning was the Kangaroo Island commissioner role, which was subject to legislative debate last year and which was implemented in May, I think, when the commissioner was appointed, so it has been in place for a two-month period. A strong emphasis of the legislation that went through this place and the Legislative Council was on the appointment of the community reference groups. I was rather frustrated that after two months there has been seemingly no movement upon that.

I believe that is a rather tardy follow-up of what needs to occur. There were seemingly no pronounced examples of where the commissioner has been working on developing what the strategic vision of the role would be or what level of improvements have been created within the first two months through the interaction between community, local government and state government departments to get some achievable outcomes there. I still look forward to that information flowing through.

I know the person who has been appointed commissioner, I have respect for that person, and I have no doubt that it is a challenging role to ensure that the outcomes are there. I am frustrated to some degree because I believe that ministerial accountability should ensure that that level of cooperation exists between government departments, local government and the community already without the need for a commissioner to be appointed, and I put all that on the record last year. It is an interesting scenario, where the outcomes have to be very strong, but I am not quite sure if they are there yet.

My next question area was for minister Gago about Consumer and Business Services and the licensing requirements. We had a 30-minute session only. Frustratingly for me, in that time the minister chose to make an opening statement and take questions from her own side. It provided very little scope for questions to be posed by the opposition. Interestingly, one question was posed by the government about free-range eggs, which was to be my next question area, and about the codes that have been put in place for those. That is where uniform support does exist for what is occurring, and there has been debate within both chambers on that. We asked a question about things such as noncompliance and letters that had been sent to people who have not quite done the right thing. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (GAWLER PARK LANDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL LAW (FORENSIC PROCEDURES) (BLOOD TESTING FOR DISEASES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

NATURAL GAS AUTHORITY (NOTICE OF WORKS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

INTERVENTION ORDERS (PREVENTION OF ABUSE) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (SURROGACY) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***KANGAROO ISLAND COUNCIL**

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition signed by 12 residents of Kangaroo Island and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to institute a parliamentary inquiry into the administration of the Kangaroo Island Council including its financial management.

LAND REZONING

Ms REDMOND (Heysen): Presented a petition signed by 1,014 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take action to prevent the Minister for Planning from imposing a ministerial DPA which would allow the commercial development of the land currently zoned primary production.

BICYCLE HELMETS

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): Presented a petition signed by 63 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to change the South Australian road rules, section 256—Bicycle helmets to either permanently or for a trial period remove section 256, so the scope of the law at least be limited to on-road areas only, and to those under the age of 17, allowing adults the right to make their own choice.

BIOSECURITY FEE

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Presented a petition signed by 217 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to halt the implementation of the biosecurity fee so as not to adversely impact on the welfare and keeping of livestock and horses in our community.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 1,427 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to ensure that critical care services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital are maintained and not to implement proposed changes to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital emergency department under the Transforming Health plan.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Mutual Recognition (South Australia)—
Controlled Substances
Environment Protection
Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (South Australia)—Temporary exemptions—
synthetic drugs

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

Suppression Orders—Annual Report 2014-15

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

Review of Codes established under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997—Final Report by the
Internal Consultancy Services Group to the Minister for Planning Report

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Work Health and Safety—Meaning of construction project

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances—Controlled Drugs, Precursors and Plants

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

Third Party Premiums Committee Determination

By the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Stony Point Environmental Consultative Group—Annual Report 2013-14

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

Torrens University Australia—Annual Report 2014
University of South Australia—Annual Report 2014

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Aquaculture—
Fees
Oyster—Fees
Fisheries Management—Transitional—Fees

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

Local Council By-Laws—
City of Port Adelaide Enfield—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Local Government Land
No. 4—Roads
No. 5—Dogs
No. 6—Lodging Houses
No. 7—Waste Management

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

Direction to the South Australian Water Corporation pursuant to the Public Corporations Act 1993

Environment Protection (Solid Fuel Heaters) Policy 2015 under the Environment Protection Act 1993

Government Response to the Natural Resources Committee Report: Kangaroo Island NRM Region Fact-Finding Visit, 5-7 November 2014

Ministerial Statement

LEADERS' RETREAT

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: On 22 and 23 July I attended the historic first Leaders' Retreat in Sydney. The event involved all state and territory leaders, the President of the Australian Local Government Association and the Prime Minister. Our discussions involved an honest assessment of the challenges and opportunities facing Australia. Foremost among these is the imperative facing all governments in 2015—that services Australians want and need cannot be provided with the level of funds we currently raise.

Leaders put on the table reform proposals that were every bit as bold and ambitious as they needed to be if Australia is to deal with the challenges it is facing today. The leaders discussed with open minds ways in which we might bridge that gap. We looked at revenue raising. We agreed to keep commonwealth and state tax changes on the table, including the goods and services tax and the Medicare levy.

I made it clear that the principle which will guide me in the discussion will be ensuring the burden of raising additional revenue should not fall on those who can least afford it. As an encouraging first step there was an in-principle agreement to broaden the GST to cover overseas online transactions under \$1,000. We also examined ways in which our federation might work better and so improve Australia's overall fiscal position and our national productivity.

In particular, as outlined in the communiqué, the leaders unanimously agreed to focus reform efforts on health, education, infrastructure and housing. This was a good result for South Australia because these are the four areas I nominated in my 8 July National Press Club speech as requiring attention and substantial reform.

We will reconvene before the end of the year to consider more developed options for reform and to this end individual leaders have been allocated responsibility for each of these reforms with the support of the expert panel. I will be developing options relating to early childhood learning in consultation with the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory and the President of the Australian Local Government Association.

There were many other important topics discussed at the retreat, not all of which I have time to fully examine today. They are set out in the communiqué, which can be found at www.coag.gov.au. However, I do wish to put on the record that the issue of violence against women was discussed, and the Prime Minister made a powerful statement that what fundamentally is at stake is a change of heart, a change of attitudes and action by men.

Although there is plenty more work to be done, I was pleased with what we achieved at the retreat and impressed with the desire of everyone to set aside political and parochial interests in the national interest.

LATE NIGHT TRADING CODE OF PRACTICE

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) (14:10): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There are currently two codes of practice in force under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. The General Code of Practice came into operation on 18 January 2013 and the Late Night Trading Code of Practice came into operation on 1 October 2013. Section 11B of the act requires a review of the operation of both codes following the first anniversary of the commencement of section 11B, being 14 November 2014. Further, section 11B requires that a report on the results of the review be provided to me as minister responsible for the act within six months following the anniversary of the commencement of section 11B, being 14 May 2015.

This review was conducted by the Internal Consultancy Services Group within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The purpose of the review was to assess the impacts of the codes of practice and, in particular, to assess the effectiveness of the late night code in reducing alcohol-related violence and antisocial behaviour in the Adelaide CBD. The report of the Internal Consultancy Services Group has been tabled today.

The report makes a total of 18 recommendations, all relating to the late night code. The late night code currently applies to venues that trade past 3am, requiring licensees to implement a range of measures at various times. Members may recall that legislative limitations at the time that the code was introduced meant that a number of measures could only be imposed from 4am. Thanks to amendments passed in 2013, these limitations no longer exist.

Amongst other things, the recommendations outlined in the report suggest earlier commencement times for a number of the measures, including restrictions on glassware, the use of metal detectors and the supply of beverages promoting rapid or excessive consumption of alcohol. The report also recommends retaining the late night restricted entry, or 'lockout' provision, in its current form from 3am.

The government agrees with most, but not all, of the recommendations made in this report, noting that some require further consultation and consideration. It is agreed at this stage that the 'lockout' should remain in force from 3am and apply to all venues, excluding the Adelaide Casino, as is currently the case. The government also agrees that it is appropriate to bring forward some of the measures to commence at an earlier time and that the measures contained in the late night code ought to apply to more venues, not just those trading past 3am.

A revised late night code has been drafted based on the government's response to the recommendations. The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner will undertake consultation in relation to the proposed amendments before formally publishing and introducing the revised late night code. The revised code provides for measures to apply to venues that trade past 2am (rather than the existing 3am), with some measures brought forward to commence at an earlier time (for example, the restrictions that currently apply from 4am will apply from 2am). Other recommendations in the report are either not supported due to lack of convincing evidence or are supported in principle and will be the subject of further consultation.

Subject to the outcome of the commissioner's consultation process on the revised late night code and the recommendations in the report that require further work, it is proposed to introduce the revised late night code later this year. The government also intends to undertake a comprehensive review of all liquor licensing policy and legislation in South Australia later this year to identify what improvements and efficiencies can be made. This will include broad public consultation over a number of months and will consider issues such red tape reduction, harm minimisation, impediments to live music in venues and city vibrancy. I look forward to informing the house further in relation to this work.

BOLTON, MS E.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I was saddened to be informed of Chief Magistrate Elizabeth Bolton's pending retirement. The Chief Magistrate has had a distinguished career in the law, including her early roles as a prosecutor in the South Australian Attorney-General's Department from 1987 to 1991 and as assistant deputy director of the Adelaide Office of the Commonwealth DPP from 1991 to 1995.

Chief Magistrate Bolton was appointed as a stipendiary magistrate in 1999, and as a regional manager of Christies Beach court in 2004. In 2007, as you would be aware, Mr Speaker, she was appointed as South Australia's Chief Magistrate. As Attorney-General I have worked closely with the Chief Magistrate. In my personal experience, the Chief Magistrate has been a pleasure to work with, and I have always welcomed her advice and counsel.

I consider the Magistrates Court jurisdiction to be one that is extremely important and complicated. From the criminal justice point of view, the Magistrates Court is where the 'tyres hit the ground'. The Chief Magistrate's leadership has exemplified the qualities the South Australian people expect from their judicial officers. I wish to thank the Chief Magistrate on behalf of the government for her contribution to the courts and to the South Australian community.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

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

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:18): I bring up the 11th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. In light of the recent ABS employment figures showing South Australia's unemployment rate has risen to 8.2 per cent, is the Premier still confident in the state budget's forecast of 1 per cent employment growth in the 2015-16 year?

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Necessarily, the budget forecasts are put together in a conservative fashion. They are done having regard to experts within the agency, independently assessed. We do not interfere with those assessments; they are not government numbers. They reflect the assessments of the paid professional independent Public Service, and so they are incorporated into the budget papers on that basis. They do not represent our targets, or our promises, or our commitments: they represent the assessment of what is likely to happen.

We hope to do better than the assessment that is contained in the budget papers. We hope to grow more jobs than have been forecast by the Treasury officials. But we also need to be mindful of the fact that we are heading into incredibly strong headwinds. We have a manufacturing sector which is crumbling at an accelerating rate. We have, of course, the closure of Holden to consume. If we can indeed continue to grow employment, if in net terms we are growing employment, this will be a substantial achievement, remembering that we still have to grow by an extra 1 per cent per annum just to soak up the additional growth in our workforce each year for us to even make any mileage on our unemployment rate.

This is a massive challenge for South Australia. It is a massive challenge, not just for the government but it is a massive challenge for those sitting on the other side as well because they play a role in supporting or making it more difficult for us to make the necessary changes which the South Australian economy needs to transform so that it can make this adjustment from an old economy to a new economy.

Over the last period of time, I think you can track back the transformation of the South Australian economy from a sleepy agrarian economy. You can track it all the way back to the Playford era, when he sought to industrialise the South Australian economy. That old economic model was blown away through the internationalisation of the South Australian economy with the bringing down of the tariff wall.

Since that time, every government of every persuasion has been seeking to broaden the base of the South Australian economy, whether it is the defence sector, the mining sector, the tourism sector, the health industries sector, or our food and wine sector—adding value to food and fibre. All of those initiatives are about governments of all persuasions seeking to broaden the South Australian economy, and I think all of us should be proud of what we have achieved here in South Australia. It is a broad—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is a broad-based economy which does have the capacity for us to meet this challenge, and it is a challenge which is a particular challenge for South Australia. It is true that we haven't been assisted by the slowdown of the Australian economy generally; we haven't been assisted by the withdrawal of \$500 million by the commonwealth government in relation to the closure of Holden; we haven't been assisted by the uncertainty of the federal government that is being created around both the defence industry (in particular, future submarines), or indeed our renewable energy sector.

Of course, we haven't been assisted by the \$5.5 billion worth of cuts that have been put into the South Australian economy over the next 10 years, and we have been particularly affected by the collapsing commodity prices. Notwithstanding all of those challenges, I believe that this state has the capacity to change, to adjust and be prosperous and successful in the future—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: For those opposite, if they could just offer a positive idea and get on board.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Mount Gambier, Unley and Adelaide, and the leader. Because of repeated interjection, I warn the member for Unley for the first time and I warn the member for Morphett for the first time. Supplementary?

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Yes, thank you, sir. How can the Premier say with a straight face to this house that he believes the employment growth figure is prudent when last year's employment growth figure received multiple downgrades and proved to be wildly optimistic?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:24): What never ceases to amaze me from the Leader of the Opposition is how utterly empty his contributions are to this massive challenge. It is as though, in political terms, he is a spectator; he just simply watches. He is the Chauncey Gardner of Australian politics: he just likes to watch.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: thankfully, the Premier is not responsible for the Leader of the Opposition. This is making an attempt at debate, and I seek that you rule it is irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader may be right but for the leader's question being so combative in its terms, and so the Premier is merely responding to the tone of the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have outlined the basis on which that material is contained in the budget papers. I don't think there is very much more I can offer about that. It is not seeking to be a government target or indeed an expression of the opinion of this government about where we

are likely to land in relation to employment. It is simply offered as expert advice, a best estimate in our budget papers, which is precisely what our budget papers are about: they are about trying to forecast the future having regard to the past.

If you want to know what our plan for South Australia is, our economic plan is laid out in the 10 economic priorities for South Australia. They have not been seriously challenged by anybody in this community, including the Leader of the Opposition. They represent a clear and cogent plan for the future of South Australia. There is plenty of scope for the Leader of the Opposition to make his own contribution to initiatives to advance the targets that are set out in that plan—plenty of scope.

We are hoping to see some more ambitious initiatives from the Leader of the Opposition than emerged in the last state election campaign, when the high watermark for new ideas seemed to be the reintroduction of car rego stickers.

Mr MARSHALL: A supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: The Premier's contribution was largely debate, but I allowed the opposition to interject on him without warning.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. You are most benevolent on some occasions.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Given the collapse in—

The SPEAKER: Is this a separate question or a—

Mr MARSHALL: It can be however you wish to take it, sir. I am in your hands, figuratively speaking. Given the collapse in business confidence in the latest surveys from both the National Australia Bank and Business SA, is the Premier concerned that the economic forecasts used in this year's state budget will still be achieved?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:27): Let's just have a look at the factual basis underpinning that question. The NAB quarterly business survey, released on 24 July, said that business confidence rose in South Australia in the June quarter 2015, up seven index points to plus four. South Australia had the equal highest improvement in confidence with New South Wales in the quarter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: So, the proposition on which this question is based is simply false, and I invite the Leader of the Opposition to perhaps undertake a little more research before he comes into this house making false assertions as the basis for his question. The truth is that it depends who you ask. These surveys are conducted across a range of different business groups: different surveys produce different results.

But I don't seek to hide from the fact that there has been a massive hit to confidence associated with shocks to the South Australian economy—of course there are. Anybody who has eyes and ears would be aware that there are challenges to the South Australian economy. What I have been heartened by is not that people's confidence hasn't been shaken, it's that people are defiant in the face of that and want to actually work together to make the changes necessary to succeed in this state. That is what I have been heartened by.

Of course people know that there are challenges in the South Australian economy, but they also love this state, they want to work together to make sure it is successful and prosperous in the future, and we simply invite those opposite to join with us in that endeavour.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the Minister for Health, the member for Newland, the Treasurer and the member for Mitchell.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament members of the Blackwood Probus Club, who are guests of the member for Davenport. I also welcome the sire of the member for Newland, Mr Neville Kenyon, who is here with Janine Gebert.

*Question Time***MINING EMPLOYMENT**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that the forecast growth of 5,000 mining jobs that the government released last October is on track to be achieved?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:30): As with all of the targets that we have set out in the 10 economic priorities—in particular, the near-term targets and the targets we have set out for three years' time—we will be reviewing each of those targets. In relation to the mining targets, there are assumptions that underpin each of the targets and, when the assumptions—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I don't know how funny that is.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. It's not meant to be a joke; that was just meant to be a statement of fact. Each of the targets has underpinning them a set of assumptions. If the assumptions change, like dramatic changes in commodity prices, then we may have to revisit some of the targets.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It's a pretty good excuse, actually. If the facts change, you should change the basis upon which you make decisions on those facts. That is a fairly prudent approach in relation to sensible decision-making in government. So we will be reviewing a number of those targets. Some of them actually will be revised upwards.

Mr Marshall: You only published it less than 12 months ago.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right, and when the assumptions change the targets ought to change. Some of the assumptions have changed favourably to the government and in some cases we will be revising upwards.

Mr Tarzia: The Australian dollar has come down.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Are you interested in listening or do you just like to interrupt every five seconds? Some of the assumptions have moved favourably to us and we will be making adjustments to make some of those targets even harder to achieve, because we believe that circumstances have changed which permit us to do that. So, yes, I do accept that it will be difficult to achieve our targeted increase in mining jobs as a consequence of very rapid and recent changes to the way in which commodity prices have moved against us in South Australia. We will be making those changes public once they have been settled upon.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Chaffey, Stuart, the Minister for Agriculture and the member for Schubert, and I warn for the first time the members for Hartley and Newland. The leader.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the Minister for Employment, who told budget estimates that Labor's 2010 promise to deliver 100,000 additional jobs over six years was only aspirational, as opposed to a commitment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:32): Yes, I think I said the very same thing myself in this house and it seems unlikely that that commitment will be achieved. There was also a corresponding commitment that went alongside that commitment, which was to create 100,000 training places, which we dramatically exceeded and did it ahead of time. But it is true that the aftermath of the global financial crisis overwhelmed our capacity to achieve that objective. That was a commitment that was made in the lead-up to the 2010 election and the reality is that the aftermath of the global financial crisis, the slowdown in the South Australian economy and, in particular, the spectacular effect that it had on at least two very substantial—

Mr Marshall: So we should just be wary about any commitments from the government then?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We should be wary about unforeseeable international events, unless you predicted the global financial crisis, in which case—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Let's perhaps do this the longer way: nobody believed that, despite the very successful and far-sighted response that Australian governments and indeed this government took in this country to responding to the global financial crisis, we would get in a sense the second wave—the secondary effects which flowed through the international economy, and that is essentially what hit us post 2010.

While we were very successful here in South Australia in weathering the effects of the global financial crisis when it first hit, through a combination of stimulus from the federal government and our own investing program, what obviously overwhelmed governments around the world and, in particular, in South Australia was the slowdown that occurred off the back of it, in particular, the massive retreat of global capital from investing in large projects. We saw that with the Olympic Dam project.

Mr Marshall: So, this hit South Australia and not the other states?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This hit South Australia harder than most. More recently, we have been hit harder than most as a consequence of a high and sustained exchange rate. So, we didn't get the benefit—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Those opposite think that decision-making is made within an instant associated with a currency that sits at parity for almost two years.

Mr Marshall: Is that the same currency used in other states in Australia which are reducing unemployment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Here is a bit of a primer about the South Australian economy: it is a very exchange rate-sensitive economy, and most commentators would acknowledge that the high and sustained Australian dollar had a massive impact on manufacturing in this country. I must say, if the Leader of the Opposition doesn't understand the nature of the problem, how on earth would you trust him with being in charge of the solution? How on earth would you be in charge of trusting him with a solution?

This of course is the same leader that actually was lecturing us about our infrastructure spend as being a false economy, but the people of South Australia saw through that at the last state election. They chose a government that decided to keep on building South Australia.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Sit down.

The SPEAKER: Point of order?

Mr PISONI: It's clearly debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold the point of order. I call to order the leader, and warn for the first time the deputy leader, the member for Chaffey, the member for Mount Gambier, the member

for Schubert, the Treasurer, the member for Adelaide and the member for Stuart. I warn for the second and final time the members for Unley and Newland, who has been doing it all day. The leader.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's public comments on 22 June this year about the prospect of broadening the base of the goods and services tax, when did he first contemplate changes to our GST arrangements?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:37): All of my remarks are on the public record. I made a speech to the National Press Club where I contemplated a broadening of the GST base. We published a NATSEM report which looked at all the elements of broadening the base.

The only element of broadening the base that's not regressive is to broaden the base and include for the first time the GST on financial services. That would raise in the order of \$3.6 billion across the nation, which would be an important contribution to the funding gap that exists between the revenue that we raise and the services that we need to spend our money on. So, it certainly was canvassed publicly at that time.

The second principal event that occurred was that the Premier of New South Wales made a substantial intervention in the debate and suggested that we should contemplate lifting the rate of the GST by 15 per cent. I met that suggestion with the suggestion that I couldn't contemplate such a thing unless there was some attention to those on low incomes who would be adversely affected by such a change, but I did say that we needed to have this debate.

It was a valuable debate where a conservative leader in this country has contradicted all the nonsense that we have heard from the other side of politics that there has not actually been a cut in the federal healthcare budget. The truth is he belled the cat on the fact there has been a massive cut in healthcare funding from the commonwealth to the states, and he went further.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: given your excellent earlier ruling today that allows for interjections when debate is ensuing, is this now the time that we can interject?

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time for a bogus interjection. If you want to interject, take your chances. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The context in which I responded to Premier Baird's intervention in the debate was this very important question of him identifying that there is a gap between what we raise as a nation and what we spend in particular on healthcare services. He went further. Not only did he say that that is caused by the cut that came from the commonwealth, he said that the problem is even bigger than that. He went further again to analyse the other contention that is usually put against the states and territories on healthcare spending to show in all the international data Australia has one of the most efficient healthcare systems in the world. That is not to say that there cannot be improvements but on any measure we have one of the most efficient healthcare systems in the world, so what that means is, even with additional efficiencies, we are not going to make up the difference between what we raise for health expenditure and what we spend on our healthcare system.

That drives you in the direction of a revenue measure and it is to the credit of a conservative leader that he was prepared to be honest enough to say that because this goes against Liberal orthodoxy. It goes against Liberal Party orthodoxy; that is why when the man said that I was not going to allow him to be chopped off at the knees in the national debate which usually starts with somebody saying something controversial and then they get piled on by everybody in the gotcha moment, 'He has made this faux pas, let's all kick the person who raises the issue to death so that it never gets raised again.'

I wanted to support him and have his voice heard so that we could have this important national debate, and what it did I am pleased to say is that all state and territory leaders joined in with that spirit and actually we had a sensible and honest debate about the challenges that are facing this nation, and it includes a revenue problem that requires something to fix it, and that is an increase

in some form of taxation. I favour an increase in taxation that does not hit those who can least afford it the hardest.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): A supplementary, sir, to the Treasurer. When the Treasurer said in the house on 2 July 2015, 'The only people who are advocating changes to the GST are our political opponents, not us,' had the Premier raised with him the prospects of broadening the GST?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:42): The Premier and I, and indeed his entire cabinet, are at one with him. I know it is a unique concept for members opposite, the concept of unity and solidarity, but I think it is fair to say that we are exceptionally proud of the work our Premier is doing on the national stage—punching above our weight, arguing for the reforms that our federation needs. I think the *Australian Financial Review* put it best today:

A familiar quip when landing in Adelaide from the eastern states may become a thing of the past. 'Ladies and gentlemen, wind your watches back 30 minutes,' say the flight attendants to the response of '...and your mind back 20 years,' from the passengers. Jay Weatherill has favoured moving South Australian time to Eastern States Time as he pushes forward on another front left vacant for many years. With a royal commission—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is digressing from the substance of the question—time zones. Really, sir?

The SPEAKER: Yes, on the face of it, the member for Unley would appear to be correct. I am waiting for the Treasurer to join up his remarks to be germane to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. The article continues:

With a royal commission destined to favour embracing the nuclear industry and Adelaide seeking to be the testing bed for driverless cars, Weatherill has not been quiet on the decision-making front. It does, however, make you wonder about the state Liberals; perhaps singularly the most unsuccessful Liberal or Labor party around the country over the past 40 years?

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Is the point of order that this is debate?

Mr GARDNER: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Getting to the GST, the article says:

It has said no to privatisation, no to the closure of obsolete hospitals—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I will anticipate the member for Unley's point of order and ask the Treasurer to move on from the subject of the parliamentary Liberal Party and address the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. The party, the cabinet, the caucus are at one with the Premier, and we are at one with the Premier because Mike Baird has dared to raise difficult questions. The Premier did the right thing, he did the right thing. What he did was he wouldn't allow another state Premier who raised very difficult questions about a difficult situation. There are real cuts being made to health and education by the commonwealth. How do we deal with these cuts? How do we structure our finances to deal with the needs that South Australians and those living across the federation require to fund an effective hospital and education system?

The truth is this: our Premier is prepared to tackle difficult questions and we support him in that endeavour. The only person not consulted—the most successful Liberal leader in the country, the only person Mike Baird did not consult was the most unsuccessful Liberal leader in the country, the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the Treasurer is defying your ruling and there are steps you are allowed to take under standing orders.

The SPEAKER: I agree, the Treasurer is defying my ruling, so I warn him for the second and final time, as I also do the members for Stuart and Mount Gambier. Member for Chaffey.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Given that China is South Australia's largest trading partner, does the minister support a motion passed at the 2015 Labor National Conference to oppose the China-Australia Free Trade Agreement?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:46): The government is doing more than any government in recent decades to promote trade with China. We have been very supportive of efforts by the current federal government to promote trade with Japan, South Korea and China, including support for free trade agreements. However, you have to wait and see how these free trade agreements are going to unfold. I am optimistic that they will be very good for the state because they have already delivered billions of dollars worth of benefits to the state. So, we made it very clear that we support any measure which promotes further trading engagement with China. China is our biggest trading partner and we look forward to seeing further growth in our trade outcomes with China.

CHINA-AUSTRALIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:47): Supplementary: given the Treasurer has said that 'we are at one', Premier, can you advise whether you supported the motion and how many of South Australia's Labor MPs supported the motion?

The SPEAKER: I am not sure that any minister is responsible for any member other than himself or herself supporting a motion, but is the Minister for Health going to answer?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I was going to say, sir, that neither the Premier nor is any minister responsible for the way he or she votes at an ALP event, ALP function, not responsible to the house.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: it is very relevant how cabinet members vote at the ALP conference because ALP members of parliament are bound by decisions of the conference.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will be seated. I take the view that it is part of a minister's public conduct and therefore the minister is responsible for his utterances and vote or her utterances and vote, but not responsible for any other minister or member. So, is the question of the member for Chaffey directed to the Premier?

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes, it is, sir.

The SPEAKER: Alright. Premier?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:48): I participated in the first two days of the ALP National Conference and made a contribution in relation to a very important issue for South Australia, which is the question of the Future Submarines project and promoted—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I wasn't at the national conference—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I had other commitments.

The SPEAKER: Premier, will you be seated. If the deputy leader moves her lips out of order again in the next 30 minutes she will be ejected under the standing order. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I was asked a question directly about my contribution to the debate and I was not at the national conference for the purposes of that debate. My contributions were made at the debate concerning the Future Submarines project where I advocated for a 30-year continuous shipbuilding program and a 30-year continuous submarine building program for the Labor Party should they form a government. It is my intention, whoever happens to form a government and whoever is seeking to form a government in the lead-up to the next election, to advocate strongly for

both of those propositions in the lead-up to the election. I will also be powerfully advocating, whatever the position of federal Labor or the federal Liberal Party is, for a strong position in relation to local jobs.

Mr Marshall: What about the free trade agreement?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, that's what I'm talking about. I will advocate strongly for projects that are built here in South Australia to have a workforce which is working on those projects to be an Australian workforce. That will be my position. I will be strongly advocating for that. There are ample—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Let me tell you: there are ample state safeguards to ensure that the South Australian workforce and South Australian standards are applied to any project that is built here in South Australia. So, whatever the commonwealth government's ambitions are, whatever the federal Labor Party view might be about this, my position in South Australia is that we will use state-based regulatory processes and ensure that we maintain standards. That includes—

Mr Marshall: Do you support the free trade agreement with China?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Of course I do, but that includes protecting—

Mr Marshall: So you support the free trade agreement with China?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We have been here with a ministerial statement supporting the free trade agreement. What we do not support is the bringing in of overseas labour to South Australia to work on projects here in South Australia in contradiction of the standards and occupational licensing arrangements which are governed by the state and territory governments. That's something we will insist on, and there will be no federal regulation or federal strictures that will prevent us from doing anything other than insisting on those obligations. I support the free trade agreement because it is a positive for South Australia and is consistent with the approach that we have taken in relation to internationalising the South Australian economy, but it won't be about compromising Labor standards or jobs for South Australians here on South Australian projects.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I would like to congratulate the member for Schubert on his excellent interjection, which probably wasn't captured by *Hansard*, and I call the member for Schubert.

MINISTERIAL TRAVEL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Given that during estimates last week the minister said, 'I'm quite prepared to give you a copy of that receipt,' in relation to costs of accommodation in Edinburgh last year, is the minister now in a position to provide a copy of that receipt?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Standing order 97: the question is disorderly.

The SPEAKER: The question is disorderly because?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Because the member for Schubert proposes facts and argument prior to getting the leave of the house.

The SPEAKER: I think he had an initial clause saying 'given that'. He could have sought leave for it, but he has put the explanation as the initial clause of what I think is a one sentence question, so I will allow it. Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:53): I thank the member for the question. I gave that answer last week; it's the same

answer this week. I'm happy for the opposition to have that receipt. I think they might already have it from an FOI from before—I don't know—but I'm happy for them to have the receipt.

MINISTERIAL TRAVEL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (14:53): Supplementary: can I ask the minister, then, when that receipt will be disclosed and also why that information wasn't proactively disclosed on the website as opposed to proactive disclosure in the DPC circular, as is the normal practice?

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 the question. That's incorrect that statement, to say that it wasn't publicly disclosed. Everything that we spend in our office is put up as soon as possible, usually at the end of the month when the expenditure has taken place, and the total cost of that trip was put up as part of the public disclosure that we do each month. So, once again, they're coming from a false assumption and trying to say something that didn't happen.

URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY BOARD

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Planning and Urban Development. When did the Urban Renewal Authority Board meet to recommend that no dividend for the 2014-15 year be paid to government, and when did the minister write to the Treasurer to seek a release of that payment?

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) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her question. As to the date of the first of those matters, I am not entirely sure and I will have to check that matter up. As to the second of those matters, I think it was a few days ago, and the matter is now a matter that is the subject of consideration.

URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY BOARD

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Supplementary: may I inquire as to whether the minister will provide that information to the house?

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) (14:55): Well, yes. As I said, I will endeavour to find out for the house when the board meeting that is referred to occurred, and I will get back.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. As I said, that is only a day or so ago; it is not very long. But the board meeting, I do not have the vaguest idea other than it was in the last six, eight weeks, whenever it was. I do not even know when it was, so I am not even going to hazard a guess at that.

URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY BOARD

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): Final supplementary: is the Attorney able to confirm as minister whether he forwarded that letter before or after he gave evidence to Estimates Committee A?

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) (14:56): I believe that it would have been after.

RENEW ADELAIDE SCHEME

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:56): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Deputy Premier, what is Renew Adelaide doing to promote vibrancy in the city?

The SPEAKER: We didn't know that the government was responsible for gemütlichkeit in the entertainment precinct, but, 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) (14:56): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker; and it is lovely to know that there is a linguist in the chair. He is talking about hospitality for those of you who did not pick up on what he said; and for you, too, Hansard—and it's got an umlaut over the ü.

In any event, vibrancy in the city—well, Renew Adelaide seeks to connect creative entrepreneurs who are mostly made up of our talented young South Australians with vacant commercial properties through the use of 30-day rent-free rolling licences. This approach is used as a vehicle to build capacity of creative entrepreneurs and to promote innovation.

Renew Adelaide is a not-for-profit organisation with support from the state government through Renewal SA and the Adelaide City Council, and can I add at this point also the fantastic work being done by the case management team at Renewal SA and before the present time that same team working out of Planning SA. They have done an extraordinary amount of great work in case management and assisting particularly young entrepreneurs to get into the space where they can actually get a business going, especially some of the small venues in the city.

Nevertheless, despite Renew Adelaide's admirable and welcome aims, which in my opinion the city needs a great deal more of, it has come to my attention that recently some members of the Adelaide City Council prefer to take a very narrow view indeed, and recently have described the work, as I understand it, of this group as 'cancer' and 'flesh-eating bacteria'.

Recently, for example, Renew Adelaide added vibrancy to Regent Arcade through connecting the Ginos Group (owners of the arcade) with the young entrepreneurs, and there have been a number of businesses that have been connected in this way with opportunities for accommodation. Such opportunities afforded to young entrepreneurs add life to what would otherwise be vacant tenancies in one of our well-known shopping arcades.

It also provides young entrepreneurs a relatively low-risk environment for them to trial their creative and innovative businesses which opens the potential for such enterprises to grow and to mature. The model of offering 30-day rent-free rolling licences to these innovative businesses also benefits the owners of such vacant tenancies by assisting them with having an attractive active property to market to prospective longer-term commercial tenants.

Renew Adelaide continues to provide vibrancy in other parts of the city, such as Topham Mall and, indeed, Port Adelaide. The challenge which they are aware of is, of course, how to ensure that such great work by Renew Adelaide can be more sustainable and does, in fact, continue despite unhelpful comments by some members of the City Council.

Can I say again that they have worked very well with the case management team and group within Renewal SA, and this same group previously resided in planning, and the work that they have done in terms of providing case management assistance for people wishing to establish businesses has been extremely helpful and some of the flourishing small venue scene in our city would not have been possible without their great work.

REGIONAL EVENTS AND FESTIVALS PROGRAM

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What assistance is the state government providing to help attract tourists to regional events and festivals?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:00): I thank the member for Kaurna for the question and acknowledge his interest in events in his part of the world—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader will withdraw under the standing order for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Bragg having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Once again, I thank the member for Kaurua for the question and acknowledge his strong interest in events in his part of the world down there and along the coastline and metropolitan part of the Fleurieu Peninsula and, in particular, the Beachside Food and Wine Festival at Christies Beach, which the government is very proud and happy to support.

The state government knows the importance of attracting tourists to regional communities, and events are a huge driving force for tourists in their decision-making and have long played an important role in our state's tourism industry. Today, I am pleased to announce South Australian events have been given a major financial boost through a program designed to drive more visitors to the state's regions.

A total of 30 events and festivals from across South Australia have received a share of \$300,000 as recipients of funding through the state government's 2015-16 Regional Events and Festivals Program. Events help to celebrate the vibrancy and creativity of South Australia and are significant to the sense of pride in our state. As the demand for Adelaide and South Australia as tourism destinations grow, we need to ensure we are driving this demand and continuing to move forward with the foundations we have already laid.

Events and festivals inject millions of dollars into local economies and, on the larger scale, I guess we can look back at last week's match with Liverpool, with 10,000 visitors from interstate and overseas injecting about \$10 million into our economy. It is the reason we have injected a further \$35 million into tourism in our recent state budget, and we want to continue to spend more money on attracting festivals and events and also to market South Australia interstate and, of course, internationally.

The Regional Events and Festivals Program assists events which generate a significant increase in visitors to South Australia. Support is provided for marketing activities to increase each event's profile and help generate an increase in tourism activity. The program includes the Community Events Development Fund, which provides grants of up to \$5,000 to smaller community-based events which have the potential to grow into a larger regional tourism event.

I know, looking at some of the recipients from previous years, groups have done a tremendous job. I remember the rose festival at Renmark. They used the money last year to do some advertising across the border in Victoria, to bring people across the border into our state and spend money in our economy. A little bit of money goes a long way sometimes with these events and really helps the events and, often, the volunteers who run those events to get a foothold and to grow visitation.

The events and festivals to receive funding in this financial year are the 18-hour Melrose mountain bike event in the Flinders Ranges, the Kangaroo Island marathon (Kangaroo Island has done pretty well) and the Lower Lakes Stockman's Challenge on the Fleurieu Peninsula. That is for anyone who wants to get down there and see a bit of whip work, bareback riding and stuff like that. I am sure Gunny is probably going to be down there.

The Bay to Birdwood, of course, is from the metropolitan area up into the Adelaide Hills. The Ceduna Oysterfest is a terrific event, usually held at the end of September each year. The Coonawarra Cabernet Celebrations are held on the Limestone Coast, and I know the member for Mount Gambier dropped in and we had a cabernet sauvignon down there during last year's celebrations. The Renmark Rose Festival—

An honourable member: What about a malbec?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No, it was a cab sav. The Renmark Rose Festival is up again for some more money, so the member for Chaffey will be happy with that. The Gorgeous Festival down at McLaren Vale and the Bay Sheffield, of course, are fantastic events; last year that young Tasmanian athlete participated and that drew a lot of attention as well. There is also Crush in the

Adelaide Hills, the Tunarama Festival over in Port Lincoln, the Glenelg Triathlon, the Kangaroo Island Cup Carnival, the Queen of the Desert up in the Flinders Ranges, in the outback again, and the Blenheimfest in the Clare Valley.

There is the Cadell Harvest Festival in the Riverland, and the member for Stuart is a big fan of the Cadell community and a strong advocate for them of course, and we have announced the Beachside Food and Wine Festival at Christies Beach. There is the Yorke Peninsula Saltwater Classic, so well done, member for Goyder; the South Australian Masters Games in the Murray River Lakes and Coorong area; the FloatFest in the Murray River Lakes and Coorong again, and the GREAT Breakaways Marathon in the Flinders Ranges and outback.

There is also the Kangaroo Island FEASTival, the Clare Valley Gourmet Festival, the Penola Coonawarra Arts, the Melrose Fat Tyre Festival, Port Augusta Cup Day, and the Adelaide Beer & BBQ Festival, which was a huge success just a few weeks ago. In the Adelaide Hills, there is the Winter Reds festival, and the South Australian Living Artists Festival, which is a statewide one so everyone is a winner on that one—I feel like Oprah Winfrey: you get a car, you get a car, you get a car—and the Barossa Gourmet Weekend, so very good news for the member for Schubert.

ART GALLERY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:06): My question is for the Minister for the Arts. What influenced the attendance numbers at the Art Gallery in the last financial year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:06): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. I am pleased to inform the house that attendances at the Art Gallery of South Australia have increased significantly this year. A staggering 779,670 visitors attended our state's premier gallery in the 2014-15 financial year, including our Treasurer. This is the highest attendance in the gallery's history and is a remarkable 12 per cent increase on the previous year.

The significant increase was underpinned by strong attendance from children and their families at free public programs that support them, as well as the newly introduced First Fridays, which allow the gallery to stay up late on the first Friday of each month. Supported by Santos, First Fridays are proving successful in drawing in an after-work crowd for music, drinks and special talks and tours.

The START program, supported by the Balnaves Foundation, runs on the first Sunday of the month and aims to introduce children to the Art Gallery and foster a love of the collection. Similarly, The Studio is a free hands-on activity space supported by the James and Diana Ramsay Foundation. School visits also rose last financial year to almost 35,000, taking the total number of attendances at child-friendly programs to 77,500. Another increase in attendance came from tourism, with 26 per cent of the 60,000 visitors to *Fashion Icons*, masterpieces from the collection of the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris, hailing from outside South Australia.

These notable achievements by one of our most important cultural institutions confirm the public appetite for accessible and innovative arts. Of course, none of these great results would have been possible without the hard work and dedication of our wonderful director, Nick Mitzevich, who, since taking the reins in 2010, has seen our gallery transformed from a cultural asset to an economic necessity backed by a strong board, now chaired by Tracy Whiting, and a generous foundation.

I would like to acknowledge all of the staff, volunteers and supporters of the gallery. It is because of their enthusiasm and generous support that we can continue to reinvigorate the artistic experience and make it accessible to more and more members of the community. Finally, the Art Gallery's current exhibition, *Treasure Ships: Art in the Age of Spices*, is on display until 30 August. It is a collection of artworks and pieces that reflect the cultural interaction between Europe and Asia from the 16th to the 19th centuries. I encourage all members to get along to see this stunning exhibition and support our fantastic cultural institution.

NATURAL DISASTER RESILIENCE PROGRAM GRANTS

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. What Natural Disaster Resilience Program grants will be made available for South Australians to assist in protecting their communities from natural disasters?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in keeping our community safe. The National Partnership Agreement for Natural Disaster Resilience, which was signed by the Premier and the Prime Minister in early 2014, is an important funding source enabling South Australia to progress the National Strategy for Disaster Resilience. This strategy helps to reduce the impact of emergencies, develop appropriate emergency management capability and capacity, and provide support for volunteers.

Natural disasters are a fact of life in Australia; you only have to look back seven months to the devastating Sampson Flat bushfire. Natural disasters have an enormous impact on our economy and can cripple businesses and communities. However, communities across South Australia are stepping up efforts to manage natural disaster risks. Today, the commonwealth Minister for Justice (Hon. Michael Keenan) and I have announced more than \$5.5 million worth of projects to assist communities across South Australia to build resilience to natural disasters.

These projects, led by state agencies, local councils, non-government organisations and volunteer organisations are all designed to help communities better prepare for and respond to natural disasters. The funding, which is provided by the federal and state governments, will deliver a variety of projects to support the community in their efforts. Funding will go to 33 projects, including:

- \$40,000 to directly support the social recovery of Sampson Flat and surrounding communities impacted by the significant bushfire events in January 2015;
- \$88,000 will go to the District Council of Mallala for the Parham Foreshore Levee Upgrades project and the Middle Beach Community Emergency Plan;
- \$74,000 will go to the Australian Red Cross to build resilience in culturally and linguistically diverse communities—

Mr KNOLL: Point of order, Mr Speaker: unfortunately, the state government does not control the federal government and all of this information is in a release dated 29 July, which is on the Hon. Michael Keenan's website, detailing the cost and the projects that that money will go to.

The SPEAKER: Well, that it is on the website of a minister of another jurisdiction albeit publicly available, is to apply the rule, in my view, too rigorously. If the member for Schubert can establish that the minister is reading one of his own news releases, I will pull him up.

Mr KNOLL: It actually says 'Joint media release' on here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Can the minister assure me that nothing he is advising the house has been issued as a news release in his name?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: No, it hasn't.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Sorry; I can assure you it hasn't.

The SPEAKER: You can assure me?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you. \$11,300—

Mr Knoll: '—to establish a mobile large animal rescue capability and conduct associated volunteer training.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Okay. Mr Speaker, \$11,300 for the Horse Federation of South Australia to establish a mobile large animal rescue capability and conduct associated volunteer training, and \$315,000—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, given—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I can continue?

The SPEAKER: Is the minister telling us something we do not already know?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Your question, Mr Speaker, was: is this a result of a press release I have put out myself in this state, and the answer is no.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, the information was clearly provided—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, I am not taking a point of order; I am listening to the minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you. Mr Speaker, the information obviously was provided by my agencies to the federal minister, because it is a joint activity, so I think it is quite appropriate that we announce it—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, \$315,000 for the Country Fire Service for bushfire management planning; \$200,000 for the SES for several projects, including extreme weather and heatwave, and \$63,000 for Surf Live Saving SA. Mr Speaker, I congratulate all the recipients.

Mr KNOLL: Point of order: the bottom of the press release states, 'A complete list of projects can be found at safecom.sa.gov.au', which is a state government website.

The SPEAKER: Is the minister finished?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the government's announcement to move the Women's and Children's Hospital in approximately 10 years, what will the government do to increase parking around the hospital to ensure the safety and access of staff and families using the hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:15): I am very happy to take this question. I have to say, the problems that we have had with parking around the Women's

and Children's Hospital are entirely the result of parking restrictions that have been imposed for the last number of years by the Adelaide City Council. I find it somewhat galling to see Councillor Anne Moran all pompous protecting certain residents in the suburb of North Adelaide from being inconvenienced by hardworking nurses and families wanting to visit sick children, and getting all pompous about it as if this was somehow the result of some failing by the state government, when she knows full well it is her nimbyism, which is her whole approach to public life, that has resulted in this problem.

We have done a number of things to try to reduce the inconvenience, particularly to our nursing staff after hours, with making sure that, if they are having to walk to a car, they are escorted by security and that procedures are put in place to try to reduce the inconvenience. But Anne Moran and the Adelaide City Council cannot get off the hook on this one, because there is no doubt that all the problems we have had with parking around the Women's and Children's Hospital have been entirely imposed by the Adelaide City Council.

The Adelaide City Council is willing to provide exemptions for some particular areas, for various sporting clubs and so on, and yet when it comes to the families of sick children, the Adelaide City Council would rather stand up for their mates in North Adelaide. Councillor Moran is looking after her constituency in North Adelaide and would always put those people ahead of the families of sick children, and I find it particularly galling but—

Ms Sanderson: What are you doing about it?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —we will do everything we can to reduce—

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —as much as we can the inconvenience to the relatives of sick children and to our hardworking nursing staff who work there. No, we won't be investing in increasing the size of the car park there because it would not make sense to, because our intention is to move the Women's and Children's Hospital in around a 10-year time frame. It would simply not be a good use of taxpayers' money to invest in expanding that car park when, in the medium term, our objective is to—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If the Leader of the Opposition took a greater interest in the families of sick children rather than siding with the Adelaide City Council and Councillor Moran—

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. The member for Unley?

Mr PISONI: I take you to 127: making personal reflections and also imputing improper motives on another member.

The SPEAKER: Yes, that may be so, but the leader was shouting at the top of his voice at the minister, which—

Mr Williams: He can get louder than that.

The SPEAKER: 'Louder than that'—the minister was responding to the interjection. He shouldn't do that, but I am not going to call him out of order, because he responded to a hollered interjection.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: the minister said that the Leader of the Opposition put the interests of others before that of children and that is imputing improper motives. I ask that it be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley has raised his second point of order as bogus and he will leave the house under the sessional order for the next hour. The minister.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Of course, we will not be investing in expanding the car park there simply because our long-term or medium-term ambition is to move the Women's and Children's

Hospital. I have no doubt that we will make sure that, when we do that, we will ensure that there is plenty of parking space for both staff at the hospital and especially for the families of sick children who are seeking to visit patients in the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Ministerial Statement

SOUTH EAST DRAINAGE NETWORK COMMUNITY PANEL

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:19): I table a ministerial statement made by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation in the other place.

Grievance Debate

CITY OF MARION UNSUNG HERO AWARDS

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:19): I want to take the opportunity today to place on the public record my congratulations to a number of residents who live in my electorate or who are associated with my electorate who received City of Marion Unsung Hero Awards on Thursday 23 July. The City of Marion has been holding its Unsung Hero Award ceremonies for many years, using them as an opportunity to provide some much-needed recognition to people who are quietly serving our community.

It was interesting to note on the night that, of the 35 award recipients, half of them are associated with or live in Hallett Cove, Sheidow Park and Trott Park in the council's south. Given that this area makes up less than one-fifth of the council's population, there is no doubt that the sense of community in the south is exceptional.

I want to spend some time running through the recipients and sharing with the parliament some of their achievements. Firstly, we have Creina Dawson of Seacliff Park, who was recognised in the category of sport for her role in the Brighton Croquet Club and in developing croquet nationally and internationally. Recently, Creina became one of only 40 people to be inducted into the World Croquet Hall of Fame.

In the category of business, Hallett Cove businesswoman Marie Soliman was recognised as the driving force behind the new Hallett Cove Business Association, of which she is inaugural chair. In this role, Marie is volunteering her time to boost the economy in the southern suburbs. She was instrumental in forming the association to encourage small to medium-sized businesses to work with each other to grow and increase the economic profile of the region.

In the category of environment, we have a name that will be familiar to many in South Australia. Rae Campbell is from Trott Park and is the force behind the Adelaide Koala and Wildlife Hospital. Rae has raised and rescued native animals for 40 years. She works in a volunteer capacity as director of the Plympton-based centre, which is the first and only hospital of its kind in South Australia. The centre is not for profit, runs educational activities and participates in research into koala diseases. Rae has boundless energy and her passion is infectious.

In the category of role model, Owen Smith, aged only 15, has used his passion for soccer to collect soccer tops, shorts and equipment and donate them to underprivileged children overseas. Owen lives in Hallett Cove, where he has built a reputation for leadership and commitment in his school and at the Cove FC where he plays soccer.

Also in the category of role model, pastor Carolyn Atkinson of the Hallett Cove Baptist Church balances her role as wife and mother while providing a unique brand of support for young women. She has initiated a number of important mentoring and support groups for women. Carolyn has also helped to start up Drug ARM in Hallett Cove to reduce the impact of drug and alcohol abuse in the area.

In the category of community spirit, we have Trevor Wigg, president of the Hallett Cove BMX club. Trevor is a leading light in South Australia's BMX community. He serves as an advocate for the sport and, as president of the Hallett Cove BMX club, he has recently been working to develop a long-term plan for BMX facilities in Adelaide's south.

A whole range of people connected with the Lions Club of Hallett Cove were recognised in the awards. Monica Woods, while not an official member of the Lions Club, is an ever present volunteer at their events and was recently awarded a Helen Keller Fellowship for her inspirational contribution to society. Another Lion, Graham Cocks, received an award under the community spirit category. Graham, from Hallett Cove, has served the Lions Club for many years.

Two other members of the Lions Club who were recognised are Malcolm and Margaret Sparrow. These long-term members of the club play a significant role in the local community. Their commitment to the club is second to none. Malcolm and Margaret are wonderful examples of people who go beyond what is expected to help others. Another member of the Lions Club who was recognised is someone who has actually had their fair share of mentions in this place, that is Hallett Cove hero Graham Botting, the driving force behind Hallett Cove's inaugural community ANZAC Day dawn service. I congratulate him again for his efforts, though I am disappointed to let the chamber know that he is leaving my representation behind for greener pastures in the member for Mitchell's jurisdiction.

I would like to mention Eric Ebelthite, who received his award under the community spirit category for ongoing service to the Hallett Cove Meals on Wheels. I would also like to mention Meredith Beaston, who received an award, along with Mark and Alison Rogers for their service within Rotary and, in particular, to the Rotary Club of Brighton.

Finally, we have Linda Batten, a passionate Hallett Cove-ite of Scottish heritage, who has received an award under Role Model. Her selflessness was summed up by an awe-inspiring act of generosity when she registered her bone marrow on an international donor database and was able to save someone's life who she did not know—a final example of a brilliant unsung hero.

NATIONAL CALISTHENICS CHAMPIONSHIPS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:25): I have recently returned from supporting the South Australian state team at the Australian Calisthenics Federation 27th National Calisthenic Championships in Queensland. Held at the Gold Coast Arts Centre from Thursday 9 to Saturday 11 July, this is the elite competition for calisthenics exponents from all over Australia.

Total participation numbers ebb and flow and, at the moment, South Australia has a vast number of tinies and sub-juniors, which augurs well for our sport in the coming years. As state and national patron, I have a very difficult role but, as with all lovers of calisthenics, a great performance will always be encouraged and applauded.

Teams from Victoria, Western Australia, ACT and South Australia were competing with soloists from all of those states as well as New South Wales, Northern Territory and Queensland. Despite there being no senior team this year, there was nevertheless intense and close competition. Adjudicators Cheryle Ablett, Rhonda Just, Barbara Nickless and Gaye Parker, with the help of their trusty writers, worked diligently to separate the teams in a very even competition.

Each year, the inventiveness and creativity of coaches seems to reach new heights. Great attention is paid to sets, props and lighting and the artistic components of choreography that go into each discipline: figure march, rods, clubs, free exercises, aesthetics and cali revue, with song and dance and character and folk part of the sub-junior and junior competitions this year.

I am able to report to the house that Victoria won both the sub-junior and junior areas. The Victorian coach for sub-juniors was Stefanie Bond, assisted by Kylie German, and the junior coach was Sammi Lukey, ably assisted by Genine McCorkell.

South Australia came second in both categories. The South Australian sub-juniors were coached by Nikki Ianunzio with assistant coach, Robyn Middleton. The juniors section was coached by Keron White with assistant coach, Phillipa White.

South Australia was able to win the intermediate section from Western Australia in a very close competition, with Victoria third. We were coached by Melissa Daysh with assistant coach, Sarah Stephenson. The Western Australian coach, who did a fantastic job, was Andrea Phillips assisted by Nerida Smith, and the Victorians' intermediate coach was Jodie Russell assisted by Jessica Mellor.

Our congratulations go to all teams and competitors. It is a big logistical task to move each team of about 20 girls interstate with all the props and costumes made by the great mums and teams of seamstresses. We could not put on a competition at this elite level without the wonderful backstage help of the mostly dads. The South Australian helpers were led by Calisthenic Association of South Australia president John Maguire, ably assisted by George, Paul and Chris. Each team is helped by chaperones, and many family and extended family members and friends travel to the comps to support their loved ones and have a feast of all that is celebrated by our sport.

The Australian Calisthenics Federation is ably led by Liz Kratzel and executive officer Kerry Fullarton, with Kerryn Waddell, Anita Roser, Meredith Phillis, Diane Winterling, Michelle Turner, Lynne Hayward and Tara Sullivan filling out the committee of management. Our thanks go to the Calisthenics Association of Queensland president Michelle Humphreys and her committee for giving us such a well-run and enjoyable nationals. I am grateful for the warm welcome that I always receive there, and the assistance of Carolyn Fortune.

Part of the calisthenics nationals are the recognition of service awards. This year, we saw 10-year awards given to Bev Daysh, Melissa Daysh, Joy Putman, George Ianunzio, Lisa Barnes and Kayla Kearney, along with some amazing awards, I think one was for 25 years, to some of the people in Victoria. It just goes to show you how many valued people are involved in our wonderful sport.

The exciting thing for all of us is that calisthenics people from all over Australia will gather here in Adelaide for the 28th national competitions which will be held in the Festival Theatre in Adelaide between 6 and 9 July next year 2016. I ask all members to put that date in your calendars now, and to come along and see why calisthenics is such a beloved sport and has been part of South Australia's tradition for so many years for people of all ages.

Masters calisthenics is now a fast-growing part of our activities on the calisthenics calendar, with women of very senior ages staying fit and dynamic while providing great entertainment. I urge all members to connect with the calisthenic clubs in their electorates—there are dozens and dozens of clubs all over the state in regional and city areas—and visit the Royalty Theatre in Angas Street, the home of calisthenics here in South Australia, to watch this amazing sport and items on show.

At the end of every year, the calisthenics year is rounded out in September/October with the competitions at the state level, and it is something not to be missed. If you have not seen calisthenics for a long time, do yourself a favour, go along and watch the competition.

CAMPBELLTOWN UNITING CHURCH

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:29): Today I rise to speak about the Campbelltown Uniting Church Adult Fellowship Group, a wonderful group of people, and I commend them for the fantastic and valuable work they do in the community in giving many people not only more meaning in their life but also fellowship and a sense of community and company. The group does selfless things in the community in several walks of life and they have several activities. Tonight, in fact, I have the pleasure of hosting the Adult Fellowship Group in parliament, and I look forward to catching up with them and seeing what the latest is from their organisation tonight.

I would like to thank for their contribution many members of the group, including but not limited to, Dianne Figg, Elizabeth Maier, Michael Moran, Bev O'Shaughnessy, Warren Pengilly (I do not think he is any relation to the member for Finniss, but who knows?), Eunice Uren, Phil Warren, David Figg, Lynn McEwing, David Munro, Michelle Page, Ian Reddy, Alison Warren, Veronica Hellams, Janice Marshall, Janet Munro, Gail Pengilly, Dianne Strike, Margaret Warren, as well as all the others who participate in the group. It is a fantastic organisation, the Campbelltown Uniting Church, which the Adult Fellowship Group derives from.

The Campbelltown Uniting Church is more than just a church. They engage in a lot of mission work. The Adult Fellowship Group meets, I believe, on the first Wednesday of the month and in the evening on the fourth Wednesday of the month. They have many activities, including guest speakers and several outings. The church itself does an array of activities. For example, they have a Tuesday evening walking program. I believe they walk on Tuesday evenings in the summer. Obviously that provides a fantastic opportunity for their members to keep fit and active and also to have a chat in informal fashion. There is also Quilters Uniting, a group of very talented people, mainly ladies, who

get together and make quilts. Every year I have the pleasure of attending one of the fetes at the church to see the magnificent work that they do, and I commend them for it.

Furthermore, they have a type of drop-in centre called a drop-in place where everyone is welcome. They have it on Thursdays and I believe they have a morning tea at 10:30 and then a lunch at 12, and basically you go there, give a donation of an amount you can afford, and then you are able to join in the craft, indoor bowls and make new friends. It is a wonderful activity. People from all walks of life are welcome to go there, and it is fantastic that so many in our community do.

It is not only our older citizens who are drawn into this community at the church because they also have a youth group, which is part of Eastern Youth. I believe that young people from five eastern suburb churches meet together for social activities, food and worship. Obviously when a lot of young people are experiencing troubles in their life, this youth group certainly provides an avenue for them to talk to an adult, to talk to someone they trust, and voice any concerns that they may have.

They also conduct a range of other activities, including a garage sale. They also have a craft fair which is held in November, from memory, usually over a couple of days. You see many stalls, crafts, cakes, plants, bric-a-brac, afternoon teas, a sausage sizzle, face painting and more. It is also a great opportunity to do your Christmas shopping, and there is also the quilt display as I mentioned. Usually the proceeds of this activity do not only assist the church but they also assist many great causes. Whenever there has been a natural disaster appeal or a domestic violence appeal, this church and this fellowship group is one of the first in the community to put its hand in its pocket to make sure that they assist people in need. So, I commend the Adult Fellowship Group. I look forward to meeting them again tonight, and I also commend the church for the wonderful community work that it does.

Time expired.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:34): I rise today to talk about employment. Another round of job losses have been announced at Arrium's mining operations in the Middleback Ranges, 50 kilometres to the west of Whyalla. The main mining contractor, BGC, has announced that, commencing in October, 65 jobs will go at Iron Knob and 60 jobs in the Southern Middleback mines.

The job losses come on top of the previously announced cutbacks. The combined impact of job losses in the electorate of Giles, taking into account lay-offs at Olympic Dam, Hawks Nest, the Middleback mine sites, the steelworks and the region's smaller contractors, is somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 jobs. Some of the direct impact on the region has been diluted by the fly-in fly-out nature of mine sites such as Hawks Nest. The mine sites at the Middleback Ranges, however, depend on a local workforce largely resident in Whyalla but also in some of the smaller communities in the region, such as Cowell.

It is worth bearing in mind, based on figures given to me last week by Arrium, that the iron operations in the Middleback Ranges provide up to 1,500 jobs. I have some reasons to doubt that figure, but it is at least 1,000 jobs. That is why I wake up every morning and look at the iron ore price. The softening of Chinese demand and the ramping up of supply by the three major iron ore companies is deeply worrying.

What is a bad situation has been made worse by the major mining contractor at the Middleback sites, BGC. Each round of lay-offs have been preceded by weeks of rumour and speculation, with the rumour invariably accurate. BGC has been publicly criticised for its approach to redundancies: its lack of communication, consultation and the provision of timely information. Scott Martin, organiser with the AWU in Whyalla, has pointed out that BGC is the only major company in Whyalla and the region that makes little attempt to involve parties that will be affected by redundancies. He went on to say that workers are left in the dark and constantly looking over their shoulders.

The AWU points out that Arrium and OneSteel, when faced with redundancies, as a first step, bring stakeholders together to discuss and work through the options. Other unions, such as the AMWU and the CFMEU, with members at the mine sites, voice the same criticism of BGC, as do individual workers I have spoken to.

Everyone understands the pressure the iron export industry is under and everyone understands, painful though it is, that jobs will be lost in order to address very challenging times. For the junior iron ore miners it is a case of battening down the hatches in the hope of weathering the storm and getting through with a viable business. Despite the efforts to reduce costs there are no guarantees.

The last thing we need when going through a very difficult period for the workers involved, their families and Whyalla, is a company that communicates and consults poorly. Even when it comes to providing basic information on what programs might be available to assist workers who are made redundant, BGC has not been helpful. There are a number of state government programs, such as the WorkReady worker transition program, to assist with training and advice that workers made redundant can access. BGC has been less than helpful in taking up on the offer to directly provide that information to workers who will be laid off.

Over 30 per cent of the employment base in Whyalla is made up of manufacturing and mining, with manufacturing still the largest employer. Most of the jobs in other industry sectors are dependent in one way or another on those jobs. It is not the benefits spruiked by Business SA when it comes to a half-hour shift in our time zone that is exercising the minds of the people in the communities that I represent. In Whyalla and in Roxby Downs it is jobs, the jobs that have been lost and the jobs that will be lost. That is what is exercising people's minds.

CRYSTAL METHAMPHETAMINE FORUM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:39): I rise today to speak about a very important event I attended in the Riverland last week, entitled 'Knowing the facts about ICE'. The forum was attended by over 700 people, and it was held at the Chaffey Theatre in Renmark. About 500 people listened to a live stream from the ABC Riverland and heard about the extent of the issue in the region. For most of the people who came along to the forum it was about listening and learning about this destructive drug that is posing a threat to many communities right across South Australia.

During the forum, we heard from a local man, Riley, who at the age of 14 was given a bag of crystal methamphetamine by his father and told, 'Here, have that. I don't need it. I've had too much.' It really was a sad story to listen to. Riley is a survivor of this scourge, but he took a downward spiral into crime and gaol before he was able to get his life back on track. Sadly, it is an all too familiar tale for many people across South Australia.

The forum had some very good speakers. The guest panel was made up of SAPOL Inspector Tony Cramer, SAPOL's Detective David Fahy, local GP George Dalamagas, and Riverland Domestic Violence Service manager, Ele Wilde, who sees the cut and thrust and is at the coalface of this ice epidemic in dealing with domestic violence. Murray Mallee Superintendent James Blandford was also there, as was Dr Sarath Attanayake, who is a psychiatrist from the Riverland Regional Hospital and who spoke about what this drug does to the brain, the behaviour patterns and the aftermath.

I learnt that there are huge highs followed by huge lows, and that is why ice is so destructive. Once people hit that huge low, obviously they have to go again, and there is a trail of destruction when they are experiencing the huge low. Community members raised concerns about the region being under-resourced to tackle the issue, with inadequate drug treatments and inadequate support services. I note that DASA (Drugs and Alcohol South Australia), the Life Without Barriers Group, the Aboriginal Connection Program, and headspace are groups that are dealing with the increased presence of crystal methamphetamine in the region.

While those groups deal with that issue, there is a decrease in funding and government programs are being stripped away. We are seeing under-resourced and understaffed programs, which governments need to address, and I did some media about this after the forum. It is about governments tackling this issue head on; they cannot skirt around the edges. State and federal governments and, to an extent, local governments, all need to be on board and make a commitment. It is not just about governments making a fuzzy commitment around the edges; they have to go in there and hit this hard. It is about dealing with addiction, and it is about rehabilitation and education and prevention schemes that need to be a part of it.

Detective Sergeant Fahy, from the Drug and Organised Crime Division of SAPOL, said that the use of ice has been increasing in South Australia, with organised crime gangs often focusing on rural South Australia, where it is much easier, and harder to detect the manufacture. The local psychiatrist from the Riverland regional hospital said that he has seen a number of patients on ice, that it was impacting on their mental state and that it is a huge challenge for our health system. In many cases, it is putting so much pressure on health systems that we have long waiting times and it is putting a strain on resources.

The drug is also impacting on domestic violence, as I said, with Ele Wilde telling the forum that there has been a huge growth in the number of clients on ice over the past year. A fifth of all her clients who come to the domestic violence centre are on ice, and their families are affected by ice, and it is just very sad. She said that often children are going around with no shoes or jumpers in winter, and they go to school with no food because their parents cannot look after them because they do not have the resources or cash because they are using that money on drugs. Anyone in trouble, anyone needing help can call Lifeline on 13 11 14 or Family Drug Support Australia on 1300 368 186.

LISTENING POST

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:44): I would like to speak about my regular listening post that I often hold in my electorate. The most recent one I had was last week at the Burton Community Centre, and it is always a great opportunity to meet with local community members and to hear them express their views and concerns to me. At this particular meeting at the Burton Community Centre, I was glad to have a local ward councillor Chad Buchanan, from the Salisbury council, attend with me and to assist with a wide number of topics that arose.

More often than not when you go out to the community people come to you as an advocate on their behalf but do not understand the three levels of government that the Australian system works under, and so many of the inquiries I often get in my office are council based, which we do endeavour to assist with, but it is always helpful to have someone from council on hand.

As I conducted a mail-out to the local area of Burton and Direk (which is still a very new and growing area despite being established for several decades now), it was great to be able to be accommodated at the Burton Community Centre and to use the crèche room as a meeting space. It is right next door to the quilting guild's regular meet-up that was happening while we were there, and the ladies were completing some lovely, vibrant projects.

It was a good turn-up considering that it was a chilly day and that it had rained intermittently. There were many people waiting there even before the appointed time to have a chat to me, and literally it was nonstop the whole time we were there. Topics that were covered included information and inquiries about the northern connector and whether that was coming and inquiries about the new Cost of Living Concession arrangements by the state government. Many people wanted to know about how it would work, and it was a pleasure to be able to inform them about that good news.

There were people waiting to find out about immigration and hoon driving, and there were inquiries about a potential rise in the GST. There were inquiries about mandatory pet desexing and whether concessions would be given to people on low incomes if mandatory pet desexing came into place. There were also people who wanted to talk about solar energy, wind energy and the royal commission into nuclear power in our state and the potential for economic growth in those areas.

It was very interesting to talk to many people about the complex DPAs that are going on in the Northern Adelaide Plains with the growth of suburban houses and the adjacent employment lands in those areas, and we had quite a few people wanting to chat to us about that. Quite a few people had an interest in the St Kilda precinct, and they were very happy to hear about the new SA recreational fishing grant of \$20,000 for a new fish cleaning station at St Kilda, as I know many, many people in the local area use that the boat ramp as well as the St Kilda playground and the facilities nearby for their families to have good recreational time away from their work life.

One of the people who is passionate about St Kilda is Jo Scott. She is a volunteer at the St Kilda Boat Club, and Jo also helps with disadvantaged children in Elizabeth. We were talking of how best to improve our community. She has a strong passion for St Kilda and the tourist precinct

and is involved in associations there as well as in her local Burton area. She is a true treasure, and I am always happy to see Jo when I am on the hustings in my electorate.

One person who popped in who is also a pleasure to see, and who is a remarkable man at that, is a local celebrity in the Salisbury area. He volunteers working with children who have a disability at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Since 2003, Ian has been known as Santa Ian. He visits hospitals, kindergartens, primary schools and community centres during the Christmas season doing his best to produce Christmas magic for the community. I also understand that in 2014 he spent a month as a highlight at the Winterfest at Ferrari World in Abu Dhabi in the United Arab Emirates as Santa. Santa Ian is truly an international Santa and very committed to our area, and he has been involved in many community projects over the years.

As a local MP, it is always a privilege to listen and connect with the wonderful characters who contribute to the community in the north—particularly in Taylor—and those who care so deeply for their surrounding neighbours and neighbourhoods. I would like to thank Councillor Buchanan and the staff of the Burton Community Centre, Christina and Bridget from my electorate office who attended their first listening post and who assisted me on the day, and all the residents who came along and made the effort to work together to improve the north. I look forward to telling the house about more listening posts in the near future.

Ministerial Statement

STRETTON, PROF. H.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:49): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to Professor H. Stretton made earlier today by the Hon. Gail Gago in the other place.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (VULNERABLE WITNESSES) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 4, page 3, after line 20—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 50B(2), definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (e) insert:
 - (ea) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

No. 2. Clause 5, page 4, after line 15—After subclause (2) insert:

- (2a) Section 4, definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (da) insert:
 - (db) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

No. 3. Clause 21, page 17, after line 6—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 48B(2), definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (e) insert:
 - (ea) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

No. 4. Clause 26, page 19, after line 28 [clause 26, inserted section 74EA(2), definition of *sexual offence*]—
Insert:

- (fa) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

No. 5. Clause 32, page 23, after line 3—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 126A(2), definition of *sexual offence*—after paragraph (e) insert:

- (ea) an offence of sexual exploitation of a person with a cognitive impairment under section 51 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*; or

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The amendments from the Legislative Council are agreed to, and I would like to thank the parliament and all of those people who have participated over some period of time in the conversation about this matter and the very hard work that has gone into finding the very difficult balance between improving the access that people with disabilities have to the justice system on the one hand and providing for the basic fair trial expectations that all of us have, particularly in criminal matters.

This is a very important day, I think, for South Australia. I think this actually marks an occasion where, as used often to be the case in the past, we are at the forefront of national thinking and national reform in this area. I would particularly like to thank, from the Attorney-General's Department, Ruth Ambler and her team (although, unfortunately, she has moved to another place, nowhere near as good at the Attorney-General's Department but still in government). Can I say that she and her team did a fantastic job.

Can I also thank all of the disability sector people who participated in all the extensive consultations about this matter. I think at the beginning they might have thought this was something that should have been treated with some scepticism but I think, over time, they came to accept that this was a genuine and sincere effort by the government to make sure that, to the extent legislation is capable of doing so, some of the horrors of the past are never repeated.

Can I thank the opposition, by and large, for their assistance and agreement with this matter. I think it has been very helpful. Of course, I thank Kelly Vincent, from the other place (who appears to be much closer than usual just at the present time), for her involvement in and engagement with this process and her support in getting this through.

I think it is really important that people in the disability area appreciate that the parliament is genuinely trying to be of assistance and genuinely trying to do its best to give those who have perhaps not had a voice in the justice system, a voice that they should have. Let us hope that we have struck the right balance. Let us hope that we get it right. Ultimately, this will be a matter that we will be all monitoring with some interest over the months and years to come, but I think it shows every sign of being a very ground-breaking initiative by the Parliament of South Australia and I think it is one of which we should all be very proud.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that the opposition also welcomes the return of this bill, with some minor amendments which have been incorporated to deal with the definition of 'sexual offence'. Whilst they are minor, it is the passage of this legislation generally that is momentous. Certainly, it is a result of the work done on the Disability Justice Plan, which was implemented back in 2011, through the initiative and drive of the Hon. Kelly Vincent who, I think, should be recognised today for her continuous advocacy for some reform in this area.

There is much yet to be done, but in respect of the novel aspect of this legislation, in the introduction of a new definition of dealing with vulnerable witnesses in respect of a cognitive impairment and the approach for the allowance of admission into evidence of audiovisual records and most significantly the provision of parties who can be a representative for the person with a cognitive disability, and the general provision for having a communication assistant.

All of that is yet to be determined. It does require, for it to be enduring, that there will be a responsible application of this by the courts. There is absolutely no reason to doubt that that will not be the case but, unquestionably, when such breadth of discretion is allowed in these circumstances, and it is more novel in respect of the usual rules of evidence, it will require that, and I have every confidence that the judiciary will act in that manner.

It should not be forgotten that this legislation also deals with amendments to the Evidence Act in the repeal of section 34CA, which it is fair to say has been problematic in dealing with the hearsay rule, and we certainly hope that the passage of this bill will bring an end to some of the frustration that has been endured as a result of the interpretation of that section. So we commend

the passage of the bill and thank those in another place for their assessment and improvement with the minor amendments.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SUPERANNUATION) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2015.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:57): I confirm that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill, which should not take all that long, Treasurer, to go through. I am aware that this piece of legislation has been driven by the association representing police officers and there has been some considerable negotiation about it. It is based around superannuation benefits that will at the time of retirement be available to police officers, and with the taxation liability that comes into place at the time of a payment being made, efforts are being made now, while they are contributing to the scheme, to ensure that that tax liability is minimised and there is no disadvantage to the members. As I understand it, is a cost that is being borne by the police officers themselves and not taxpayers, but the changes are important and it is appropriate that, in support of our very much hardworking police officers, both sides of the parliament support it.

The Hon. Rob Lucas, shadow treasurer, has primary carriage of the legislation. He has certainly put on the record in the other place the support of the Liberal Party. It is not my intention to hold up the house but just to confirm our support for it, and the fact that we look forward to its swift passage so that it becomes an act which ensures that benefits are available to our police officers so that their future tax liability can be minimised; and that it has been paid for up-front, and compensation then, instead of it occurring at the end where it might actually cost them some benefits. With those very few brief words, I look forward to the swift passage of the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:59): I thank the member for his support and that of the Liberal Party and I hope that this legislation passes swiftly to give those officers who do so much to keep us safe the very best advantage possible.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (16:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015

Estimates Committees

Adjourned debate on motion:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:00): After talking about planning and Consumer and Business Services, it is now time to talk about local government and regional development estimates committee hearing held in the other place.

Mr Speirs: Hear, hear!

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Bright says, 'Hear, hear!' It was rather interesting, at the commencement of both of those sessions, the Chair flagged the fact that there was an expectation of an opening statement taking up to 10 minutes. It was necessary for me—as is my wont, I like to

keep particular time frames—to write down the time that the minister actually started his speech. When it got to around 10½ minutes, I thought, 'Okay, well, we have gone a bit long here,' so I took a point of order. The minister looked at the remainder of his notes and he was only about halfway through, which concerned me.

It goes back to my initial statement about ensuring that, yes, the information flow exists, and I respect the fact that an opening statement is likely to be made in most cases, but you have to control that and fit within the time frames to ensure there is an opportunity for questions to be posed too. So, that disappointed me, but we got through that.

In regional development, my initial question was about the level of unspent funds. It was amazing to me that, in a budget allocation in 2014-15 of \$32 million in grants and subsidies, only about \$10 million was actually spent. The level of frustration that I felt was that, yes, some is carried forward; I understand that. Some is a matter of timing in when grants are provided: the work has to be undertaken, the accruals have to come in, and we have to ensure that the obligations are being met. But, as I tried to enforce to the minister, in a time when grant funding is available—and I commend him on the fact that it is there—let's actually get it out there.

The example that I used in some of the questions was the Job Accelerator Fund. That was a one-year, \$10 million fund which the minister divided up to four separate programs, from being appointed as the minister in March of last year until late November 2014. No-one was able to apply for the money because the guidelines had not been finalised, and therefore no-one actually knew what it was intended to be spent on. You had to start the process after that, apply for it, try to fit it in with what you wanted to do, apply for the funds, get approval, and then start to work.

From my point of view, the frustration is that so much opportunity is lost. People have visions in their minds about what they want to try to do, and they know that dollars are going to be available, but they have to wait for such a lengthy time. At a time when regional unemployment is a frustration for all of us—in the minister's own community it is 8.8 per cent on average across 2014, and it varies in regional areas, but it is still exceptionally higher than what we would all like it to be—why not make the dollars available?

I am trying to convey that frustration that I felt. The minister made the point that he wanted to ensure that the money is spent appropriately. I do not debate that point. I want to make sure that KPIs are there, that the contractual requirements would be met, and that the outcomes create opportunities that benefit the community at large. But, do not take months to make decisions on how to spend it: make the decisions quickly and as best as absolutely possible, and get the dollars happening.

I did ask some questions about the Regional South Australia Cabinet Committee, which is made up of five members, as I understand it. The minister tells me that he has a regular appointment in his diary for that to occur, but while there are something like two pages in the budget papers devoted to it, I was not able to ask any questions about it. The ruling, based on a point of order from another government member, was that, because it is defined as being cabinet, it is not available for any level of scrutiny to occur when it comes to questions. Others, looking around me, have their eyes crossed wondering what the hell is going on with that, but it was what was put to me and it was frustrating, because the information in the budget papers outlines probably 10 different areas in which it works. Given that, one would assume that the opportunity is there to ask questions about it, but we were unable to. Again, that is frustrating.

I did ask a question about regional impact assessment statements, as I did last year. He re-enforced to me then, 12 months ago, the importance that he saw in it. I re-enforced to him in estimates this year the frustration that there have only been three additions to the list of regional impact assessment statements. Two of those were based around the guidelines of the report and one was based around the Stirling police station.

Surely, when it comes to decisions being made that impact on regional communities, there are many issues that would have been worthy of a regional impact assessment statement. In recent weeks, we have had the WorkReady training program, which significantly disadvantages private registered training organisations in regional areas and which could lead to hundreds and hundreds

of job losses, but it was not worthy of a regional impact assessment statement to ensure that cabinet had a full understanding of what the implications were.

The obvious question to be posed is: are all departments ensuring that the obligations are being met? I doubt that. Are ministers ensuring that their staff are ensuring that those trigger points, when they are being reached, are being complied with? I doubt that also. But it means, though, that information flow, which I and many others think is important regarding the decisions that are eventually made, is being missed out and then potentially the wrong decision is being made. I urge the government and the minister to ensure that this improves, because it has to. It has been a government policy since 2003. There is only, I believe, about 25 on the list of regional impact assessment statements. It needs to be far more than that.

I asked the minister also a question about the previously called Skills for Jobs in Regions program, which was under the auspices of the Regional Development Australia boards. The Minister for Regional Development was not sure on what my question was based, and the answer eventually came back to me that it was not that minister's portfolio responsibility, it was someone else's. I would have thought that a program coordinated by an area that the minister has direct responsibility for (that is, based around regional development, regional skills and therefore regional jobs) would have been one about which the minister would have had details, but, even with all the advisers he had around him, there was still no information flow.

I also asked a question about the northern Adelaide irrigation scheme, which other members in this place would be aware of. It is expensive, I understand that, but the benefits that come from the re-use of an increased amount of treated water from Bolivar are immense. With the pressure that is going to be on feeding our state and our nation and the need for employment opportunities to be created in the north in particular, this would appear to me to be an absolute monty for support. The Liberal Party in opposition put out a policy for a masterplan to be developed. We had also committed, if we had been successful last year, a \$6 million fund to go towards the work to be undertaken there. There is a real commitment from this side of the parliament. I hope that the commitment from the government's side actually translates into actions and we get that investment occurring.

In the local government area, an obvious question at the very start was about the Housing SA transfer to private non-government organisations and the potential that exists for the rate rebate on the council rates charging those properties to be sought, which has to be provided by local government authorities, based at around 75 per cent. That was in an original draft of legislation before this place. It was removed, though, from the bill that was presented to the parliament, supposedly at the request of the Minister for Planning. From the local government perspective, it frustrates me that we are subject to further negotiations and ongoing contract discussions about it all where indeed there was, I thought, a position taken on supporting that.

Another budget announcement for local government was the extracted minerals royalty—and the member for MacKillop behind me has a particular interest in this also and might go into some further detail. This was a decision made by the state, in announcing its budget, after all 68 councils had determined what their own budgets for 2015-16 were. It is a \$1 million cost, but it is a \$1 million cost being borne entirely by regional local government authorities. The minister tells me that he had not been contacted about it. I know the LGA has spoken to the Treasurer about it and I know the LGA is still working on it, so I would urge all local governments to ensure that their responsible minister has some further understanding of it, because it is a key. By taking out that \$1 million you either reduce the amount of work that can be undertaken or you increase costs and, therefore, charge property owners more through their council rates.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (16:10): It would not be a response to the budget and estimates without my saying something about the process and something about the distinct lack of accountability of the executive government to the parliament, particularly through the estimates process. It never ceases to beggar my imagination how we ended up with a system that is so designed to frustrate the desire of the parliament to have an understanding of what the executive government is doing.

The estimates committee should indeed be one of the chief opportunities for the parliament to become very well informed on how taxpayers' money is being expended in this state. To give an

example, I sat with our leader when he was questioning the Treasurer about the proposed privatisation of the Motor Accident Commission. The Leader of the Opposition asked what I thought was a series of very sensible questions of the Treasurer to try to elicit from him the advice to the executive government and the fundamental reasons behind the decision to wind up MAC.

The opposition and the community at large can do nothing but assume that the chief reason behind the winding-up of the Motor Accident Commission as we know it and bringing the private sector in is so that the government can grab—and we do not even know how much money—as much as \$2 billion and transfer it into the Consolidated Account to bolster a budget that has been in serious trouble for many, many years.

The Leader of the Opposition gave the Treasurer ample opportunity to explain the rationale behind the decision. He invited the Treasurer to place before the parliament and before the estimates committee some of the advice the government had received, and the Treasurer consistently refused to do so. No wonder the opposition and the community of South Australia do not trust the government. If there were any evidence held by the government to support their decision, surely the government would table the evidence.

I hark back to an earlier experience when, as the shadow minister for water resources, I remember arguing at length about the decision of this government to double the size of that white elephant, otherwise known as the desal plant, at great cost to the taxpayers of South Australia. After a long period of pressure from me, some of my colleagues and the media, the government tabled two documents supposedly to support their decision. The problem was that both documents—they were reports to the government—were produced after the date the decision was taken to double the size of the desal plant.

I suspect that the reason the Treasurer will not table any of the advice the government has with regard to the winding-up of the Motor Accident Commission and the raiding its coffers is that it does not have any good advice to back up its decision. All the government has is advice to say how much money the Treasurer can raid from the Motor Accident Commission. I can only assume that the government, the Treasurer and his cabinet colleagues do not want the public of South Australia to know the quantum of that money they are going to raid from the Motor Accident Commission.

The estimates committee process is a flawed process inasmuch as it does not in any way give the parliament access to the information that I believe it should have access to. Whether in government or opposition, I think our democratic system demands that the parliament, full of the representatives of the people, should have access to that sort of information. I have to say that the budget, the way it is presented, gives a very scant overview of what is going on. I will not dwell on that particular issue any longer, other than to say it is a great pity.

There are a couple of things I want to spend a little bit of time canvassing, and again these were raised in the estimates process; one of them in particular was raised in a committee I was not in, but I have read the transcript and expressed some disappointment, that is, a question to the minister for water resources and the environment concerning the funding of the drainage system in the South-East of the state.

The house may recall, as I have raised this a number of times before, that some time ago the minister established a citizens' jury to look into the question of additional funding to support the operation and maintenance of the South-East drainage network. The minister, in doing so, promised to report back to the parliament, to the other place, to table the report of the citizens' jury and to give the government's response.

The citizens' jury handed its report to the minister and made it public on 15 March this year. We have been waiting and waiting and, as I understand it, the minister finally gave a response this very day in the other place. I was waiting for the budget to come out because the citizens' jury basically said to the minister, 'No, we don't agree with what you are trying to do. We don't agree with imposing a new tax on the people of the South-East because we think that the drainage system in the South-East provides benefit to the whole of the state.'

Indeed, one of the ways it provides benefit to the whole of the state is by providing, on an annual basis, a significant amount of water which makes up part of South Australia's contribution under the whole of the Murray-Darling Basin agreement which was signed a couple years ago by

this government. A significant amount of that contribution will come from the South-East, and the value of that water is way in excess of the additional money it will require to adequately fund the operation and maintenance of the drainage system in the South-East.

On top of that, the region of the South-East is part of the economic powerhouse of regional South Australia, providing a lot of food and fibre that not only feeds many South Australians but also provides many jobs in the food processing sector, and the government continues to ignore that. Notwithstanding that, quite recently, after most of the other economic sectors in this state have gone into serious decline, the government has recognised that we do have an agricultural sector and that it still remains and will remain a very important part of the economy of the South-East.

Notwithstanding that belated recognition, the government refuses to adequately fund the operation and maintenance of the drainage system in the South-East that supports a lot of the agricultural production of this state, both through enabling land to actually be put into productive use and enabling transport across what would otherwise be a very wet landscape. I am very disappointed that there was nothing in the budget to say that the government had had a change of heart in line with the report of that citizens' jury, and I am equally disappointed by the minister's response.

To highlight the government's attitude, the minister, in answer to a question in the estimates committee, used these words, 'That is why I engaged the community through a citizens' jury process,' whereas the press release he tabled in the other place this day starts off by saying, 'The South East Natural Resources Management (SENRM) Board established a Community Panel.' Well, you cannot have it both ways. His press release says that someone else established a community panel, yet he answered that he established it. In any case, the minister established a community panel, it came down with what I thought was a very well balanced and sensible report and the government has chosen to turn its back on it, yet this same government would have us believe that it is interested in the economic activity of all industries in the state and that it is refocusing its attention on the creation of jobs.

With the unemployment figures going through the roof, more South Australians are finding that they are out of work. I would have thought that the government would have done everything it could to underpin economic activity, irrespective of where it occurred in the state. But this government has decided that that is not important, all it has to do is pork-barrel in a handful of marginal seats to maintain itself in government, and that is more important than looking out for the whole of the economy of South Australia.

That brings me to another issue that I want to talk about relatively briefly which is the emergency services levy. I asked the Minister for Finance a question concerning this—well, firstly, I asked the Minister for Emergency Services about the discrepancy in the budget papers with the information given by the Treasurer to the Economic and Finance Committee of this parliament concerning the expenditure of the emergency services levy in various parts of the state. The information given to the Economic and Finance Committee would have us believe that there is a substantial increase in the amount of money spent on emergency services in non-metropolitan South Australia. Indeed, the difference between the previous financial year just ended and the current financial year (2015-16 financial year) is about a 60 per cent increase according to the data provided to the Economic and Finance Committee.

When I asked the Minister for Emergency Services why that was not reflected in any of the budget papers for the CFS, the SES in particular, but also in SAFECOM and the MFS, he was unable to give any explanation as to the discrepancy in those figures. So, I had one of my colleagues ask the Treasurer the same question because the Minister for Emergency Services suggested that I should ask that question of the Treasurer because it was Treasury that provided the numbers to the Economic and Finance Committee. When the Treasurer was asked the same question, he was unable to give an explanation. Indeed, all he did was go to a paper from which he read which was basically the paper that he gave to the Economic and Finance Committee.

There was no explanation or justification. First of all, there was no explanation for the discrepancy between the numbers given to the Economic and Finance Committee and the numbers that appear in the budget. The numbers that appear in the budget certainly do not show us any

significant increase in the amount of emergency services expenditure in the regions, certainly not the \$18-odd million which was reflected in the figures given to the Economic and Finance Committee.

I will say this quite happily in the absence of any evidence to the contrary: I think the information given to the Economic and Finance Committee was misleading, and I think it was misleading because the emergency services levy is a levy on property and it falls much more heavily on rural and regional South Australia because the value of farming land means that the levy—when the minister says we have a 9 per cent increase in the levy across rural and regional South Australia—because it falls on farming land, it runs to many hundreds of a per cent in percentage terms as an increase. In some cases, we have seen increases over the last two years of over 1,000 per cent. I think that the Treasurer was so embarrassed when this was pointed out to him that he provided figures which suggested that the amount of expenditure in the regions had increased by some 60 per cent to try to balance up the expenditure with the revenue being gained. I asked two ministers to give an explanation for this and neither of them were able to give me an explanation.

Certainly, the budget papers, as I have been saying, do not reflect such a significant increase. There is a small increase for training and that will only happen if volunteer numbers increase substantially, and that is yet to be seen. So, even though there is a budgeted figure for an increase in training it may not be realised. There is a situation where I think the parliament and the people of South Australia deserve answers but they are not getting them from this government, which is a great pity. We are here representing our constituency, the people of South Australia, yet we cannot get answers from the executive of this government.

The member for Goyder mentioned—and he named me—the imposition of a new royalty on councils for extracting material out of borrow pits. This question was also asked of the Minister for Finance. The Minister for Finance rattled on about some philosophical position where he wanted to see full competition between councils and the private sector supplying extracted materials for road making.

I asked the minister whether he understood what a borrow pit was because a borrow pit is where you take material absolutely adjacent to where you are building a road and use that material to build the road. It is not where you have a council quarry somewhere within the council area and use your quarry in preference to using a commercial quarry, either in your council area or close by. It is nothing to do with that at all. It is where you are building a road, and it is used particularly in remote locations where the requirement for quarried material is less, so there are less operating quarries around and by necessity you get the material close to where you are going to use it. It has historically been that you create a borrow pit where you create a very temporary quarry whilst you are constructing the road and use the material to put on it.

The minister is suggesting that this is anti-competitive. I would suggest that is a nonsense and is being driven by a total lack of understanding by both the minister and his government and his cabinet colleagues who have adopted this policy. As I pointed out to the minister, any council quarry which is currently operating under the Mining Act, and has been for some years now—councils used to get away with operating quarries without paying royalties on extractives taken out of the quarries, but that is not the case. Any council quarry which is operated under the Mining Act, and they all should be, apart from borrow pits, are liable to be paying royalties.

So, \$1 million, and we believe it could be well in excess of \$1 million, which is going to be imposed by this very measure on largely remote rural councils is not going to give any benefit to the commercial quarrying industries at all. All it is going to do is drive up the cost of building remote roads, which are usually minor roads. Some of them are not, some of them are quite major, and I quoted in the committee the road between Bordertown, in the north of my electorate, and Pinnaroo, which is now in Chaffey, further north, a road that runs pretty well parallel to the Victorian border and, indeed, runs through the Ngarkat Conservation Park.

When it was constructed, which I think was back in the seventies, extensive borrow pits were created along the verges of that road to help create the road with materials taken from those borrow pits. If a royalty was put onto that sort of construction in the case of that road it would probably add, at today's dollars, another million dollars or more to the cost of constructing that road. All that is doing is mitigating against councils being able to provide decent roads, particularly in remote locations,

which, again, mitigates against economic activity in those locations and undermines the state's opportunity to create more and more economic activity.

I see that my time is about to expire so I will conclude my comments there and say that we are yet in the grip of another budget which is doing even greater harm to the future of this state.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (16:30): Where do I begin with estimates? First, we waste our Public Service's time preparing for estimates, then we waste our own time going through the estimates process, and then we waste the parliament's time by talking about what we wasted our time doing. Some of my colleagues like the estimates process. They see it as a bit of an audit, an opportunity to be inquisitive when it comes to the expenditure of the government.

I see it from the perspective of someone who used to work in the Public Service as well as someone who is now a member of parliament. I see the cottage industry, which occurs behind-the-scenes for many months in the lead-up to estimates in this place, preparing for estimates, preparing ministers for estimates, and the huge effort that goes into forming Dorothy Dixers, the huge effort that goes into briefing ministers on the questions that they might be asked, and the resources that are directed from front-line services, policy development, and the normal administration of departments in order to be able to lead up and then launch the estimates process.

I find it a process which I do not think works. I do not think we get particularly significant insights into the business of government as a result of estimates. It is a process which I just do not have much faith in at all. Last year, when I spoke about estimates for the first time, I outlined some changes, some reforms, to the estimates process which I think the whole parliament would benefit from taking a look at. The ideas that I put out there were by no means comprehensive.

I know there are plenty of people in government—ministers, backbenchers and servants of this parliament—who would like to look at this process, but it just seems that we have not been able to get decision-makers together and get enough people to have a discussion about what estimates could look like and what estimates could be. When they are compared to the federal parliament's estimates, there is no doubt we are a poor cousin in terms of the analysis and insight we can glean from ministers and senior public servants through the process.

Last year, I canvassed a few reforms that I would like to see, particularly the idea of having standardised budget papers year in and year out not only to make it easier for members of the opposition to compare the budget papers but also to make budget papers more accessible to members of the general public as well, because they are certainly not accessible at the moment. I also put on the record last year the possibility of estimates being opened up (I think this might be a bit controversial) to the wider public, so there could be representatives from NGOs and the like coming into parliament and being a part of the process.

I think it is odd, to say the least, that members of the upper house are not able to be involved in the process, so shadow ministers cannot be involved in the scrutiny of their counterparts. However, government ministers across both the upper and lower houses can be scrutinised, but that has to be by members of the lower house. That makes completely no sense to me at all, and I think a lot of people shake their heads about that.

Finally, the process by which members are discharged, and we have to sign all these pieces of paper to get in and out of estimates prior to it actually occurring, is just bizarre, and, really, all members from both houses should be able to participate freely in this process, in my opinion. I think it would make it much more valuable. There are definitely better ways that estimates can be administered, and I would really like to see the government work with the opposition and come up with a suite of reforms for the estimates process. I have to say, though, I am not confident that that will occur, and no doubt I will be having a whinge here in 2016 as well about the ineffectiveness of the estimates process.

One thing the estimates process does is actually show you the calibre of ministers because you get to see the ministers who deal with it in a very open manner and then you get to see those who are not actually able to do that, and that is very telling. The first estimates hearing that I went to was the one where we were speaking to the Deputy Premier about industrial relations, and it was really interesting to see how he dealt with that with a level of sophistication.

He did not have any public sector advisers with him on the floor apart from the chief executive of the workers compensation scheme. He dealt with his questions without an opening statement; he did not require to delay or waste time doing that. He was able to take all the questions. There was a bit of back and forth between him and his chief executive. It was, I think, a fairly valuable process. No-one was trying to catch each other out, and there was no avoidance. It was an example of a minister supported by a chief executive and both clearly very over their briefs, who understood the portfolio they were administering and who were able to use that to advance the process, I suppose.

That was the upper end of the spectrum. I do want to reflect on the lower end of the spectrum, and I do not mean to do this in an offensive way, but, clearly, when you are talking about ministers of the Crown, and when you look back at the *Hansard*, instead of seeing sentences and paragraphs and structured speeches, you see a sort of Scrabble board of absolute rubbish when it is down on paper.

There were a couple of ministers whose estimates that I participated in resembled that—just as if you got a Scrabble board and you threw it up in the air and whatever landed on the floor was what the minister actually decided to say. I, in particular, was exceptionally disappointed with the Minister for Local Government in estimates. I found the quality of—I will not say quality of answers because there were no answers. The statements made by the minister rarely made sense. I would say that they verged on incoherent and were actually offensive to this parliament and to this state.

They showed a complete undermining of the processes of this parliament. They made me fear for democracy and made me feel exceptionally saddened for governance in this state. To see the Minister for Local Government and the way in which he conducted himself in the estimates process was to see someone who had zero grip on his portfolio; and the local government portfolio, as members would know, is an area of governance which I have a great interest in. I think it is a great area which is currently open for significant reform, and there is a lot of reforms that could occur in the local government portfolio which could trigger some really interesting economic development opportunities for this state, especially when paired with planning reform.

I know there are members of the government who are very interested in this, and to be able to facilitate reform in the local government space, combined with the planning space, would enable some significant economic benefits and my belief for South Australia, which would actually not necessarily have a significant financial cost to state government. There is a whole tier of bureaucracy there which is absolutely desperate for reform.

When I sat for an hour with the Minister for Local Government and saw the level of competence on display, when setting that beside the desperate need for reform in the area that he is administering, my heart sank. South Australia is a state which has economic problems at the moment. We are in need of extra money. A way of raising extra money would be to open future estimates hearings with the Minister for Local Government during Mad March as a Fringe show. Charge people to come in and make the state government a bit of money by selling it as a comedy, because that is what it was.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order.

Mr SPEIRS: It was a comedy of errors and it was—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Wright has a point of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The member for Bright was reflecting inappropriately on the Minister for Local Government, and I would ask him to retract his comments.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think you were dangerously close to being out of order.

Mr SPEIRS: I will retract my comments but I would stand by my comments that the—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not the same as retracting.

Mr SPEIRS: —estimates hearing was a comedy of errors.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr SPEIRS: Very few of the questions were answered during that process and it did make me fear for an area of administration which requires significant reform.

I move on to one of the other hearings that I was involved in, that is, the Premier's estimates. The Premier, like the Deputy Premier, is someone who is very well practised at delivering estimates in this parliament and he was able to dispense with the opening statement, which I think was appreciated because it allowed two hours and 15 minutes of fairly rigorous questioning. There was not a lot of debate within the range of portfolios. It was more about getting information about how the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is administered.

One thing that interested me during the estimates process for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was the discussion around South Australia's Strategic Plan. I think, no matter what people think of the former premier, Mike Rann, he was someone who understood what he was here for in terms of having a very clear vision of what he wanted for South Australia, and he could point to a whole range of structures that he put in place from a policy perspective to be able to advance that. As someone who worked in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet at that time, and also in the time of Premier Weatherill but particularly under premier Rann, it was very interesting to see that long-term vision that he tried to put into the policy arena and be able to structure the entire work of the public sector around South Australia's Strategic Plan.

In questioning on the 2014 budget process, and it was followed up again this year, it was very clear that the government's emphasis on the South Australian Strategic Plan has certainly ebbed away. I think that is a shame because strategic planning is necessary at all levels of government and we could have a situation where we disagree with the particular elements within strategic planning but I think both sides of parliament would acknowledge the real importance of having a strategic plan in place for South Australia. I think when former premier Rann launched that in 2004, South Australia was the first state in the nation to do that and we led the way.

I remember talking to the representative from Oregon, Jeff Tryens, I think, it was, who came out here to assist with that, and he said the key to success for strategic planning at the provincial or state government level is to be able to ensure that the plan survives successive terms of government, changes of premier and changes of political persuasion on the government benches. That was something that stuck with me and he said that they had put that in place in Oregon by translating their Oregon strategic plan into legislation and making it much harder to veer away from it with the change of premier or state leader, or a change of administration in the political sense.

What has happened in South Australia since the Weatherill government has come into power has been a move away from strategic planning and that long termism has been replaced, I believe, with short-term political fixes and a real lack of focus on strategic objectives for the state. We saw the Strategic Plan superseded by the state government's seven strategic priorities, which came in in December 2011, and they have really gone by the wayside as well now to be replaced by 10 economic objectives, and those 10 economic objectives are worthy in many ways, and should certainly be pursued; and so I am not criticising those, but I am criticising that backwards and forwards and movement away from strategic vision, that if put in place in the long term, can actually change the direction of the state.

If there is lots of chopping and changing, and if we go from South Australia's Strategic Plan to the seven strategic priorities to the 10 economic priorities (and, no doubt, something else is being cooked up to enable a glossy report or a 24-hour media cycle media release) we lose that long-term goal, and I do not feel that South Australia really has that direction anymore that was put in place by Premier Rann in 2004. It was something that I did personally respect and I think that a lot of the government's success in the 2006 election was that it was able to clearly articulate what it saw as South Australia's strengths, and was able to demonstrate the direction in which they wanted to take South Australia.

I do not feel that that is present anymore, and it was interesting that, when the Premier was questioned on this, he certainly did not want to commit to something which I think he believes is very Rann-esque—of the Rann era—and not something that he wants to pursue anymore. I think that while South Australia's Strategic Plan remains live on its website at saplan.org.au, it is not something that this government has any real interest in anymore, and I think we are poorer for it because we may not necessarily agree with the targets and objectives within the plan but I think we are poorer for not having emphasis on the plan.

When the Strategic Plan was set up, there was actually a program called the Alliance program which was set up around it. It connected up to 100 businesses, NGOs and community organisations to the Strategic Plan to try to push it beyond government. I was able to ask the Premier during estimates what had happened to the Alliance program, and it appeared that he was not even aware of what it was. I do not believe that the Alliance members have been told that there is no longer an emphasis on South Australia's Strategic Plan, and that is a real shame because that vision was about more than just government doing the lifting for South Australia, it was actually engaging in a meaningful way a whole range of non-government groups, businesses and community organisations in that vision for South Australia.

The emphasis on that is now gone and that is a shame and it is quite disrespectful in many ways for the government to have not even spoken to those groups and told them, 'You are not needed anymore,' or 'There is a new place for you to be directing your energies.' I think that that is a great shame and a great waste. My concluding remarks would be that I still believe, and I want it firmly on the record, that the estimates process could be a lot better. I think there is opportunity for a bipartisan discussion on how we reform the estimates process to get the most out of them.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (16:48): I have had the opportunity to experience the budget and estimates process from all aspects as a backbencher in opposition, certainly as a backbencher in government, and as a minister for nine years.

I know what a difficult and considered process bringing down a budget is—as a minister, making sure that the money you have to spend is spent in the very best way, and how amazingly reliant you are upon the very dedicated public servants who work in our agencies. I was very privileged to work with I think some of the very best people in government.

I am very proud of the achievements of the Labor government in South Australia over 12 years. Our priorities have been very much on the health and wellbeing of our children and on their education. In doing so, we have brought about initiatives such as the Universal Home Visiting Program and investing in our children's centres. I am delighted to see further investment in children's centres here in South Australia in the current budget. We have something like \$25 million going into early years facilities in this year's budget, so that will bring us to 47 centres around South Australia.

The new centres are in Renown Park, Pennington, Mount Barker, Roxby Downs and Seaton. The Keithcot Farm Children's Centre, which serves both of our electorates, was in the first tranche of 10 centres set up in South Australia. I want to pay tribute to the parents and management of that centre. It was a big leap of faith on their behalf to agree to come on board and turn their kindergarten into a children's centre. It is so well received and functioning so well that it does need expansion, so I am delighted that funds have been made available for that.

We have also seen additional funding to expand the front-line and support team to further other person guardianship orders for children who come into care. For those who do not understand what they are, they mean that, rather than a child coming into care and remaining under the care of the minister, a family that has a strong connection to that child and is committed to that child until they are 18 (until the end of the order) can in fact apply to have guardianship of that child. This gives the families certainty of keeping that child within their family. More funds are going to help increase the number of foster carers, many of whom do a fantastic job, and I got to know many of them very well during my time as minister.

In addition, there will be funding to implement a program to reunite adolescents with their families. Be under no misapprehension: even though children are taken away, and some in very awful circumstances, children still love their parents and want connection with their family. That is why I have always been strongly opposed to adopting children, as is being undertaken in New South Wales. That legally severs the connection of a child with their family. There is absolutely no going back. Guardianship of another person allows that legal connection to remain, and the child has the opportunity, when it is appropriate, if they choose, to reconnect with their families.

Of course, \$2.2 million will go towards further expanding the Positive Parenting Program. So, there is a real focus on supporting children in care, but also supporting families to be the best they can be, hopefully keeping more children with their families.

It has been interesting, as a member of the government, to experience 12 years of listening to the opposition come in here with their post-budget speeches and to observe them in estimates. It has been a long time since I have been on a bench watching the different people come in here and do their questioning, as I was usually on the receiving end of it and only at one hearing. It has been quite an eye-opening experience for me this year to be on the backbench and watch, as the member for Bright referred to, the 'quality' of those people who were in here.

The member for Bright made some interesting observations in his little speech just then, referring to Mike Rann and his long-term vision, the State Strategic Plan and how much he respected that particular vision. I would ask the member for Bright to do some research and have a look at what his colleagues were saying about the Strategic Plan. He must be the only one on that side of the house who ever supported it, because they always canned it.

He talked about the waste of time in this place and the waste of time of everyone preparing for estimates and making their speeches, and I have to agree: our Public Service does an amazing job preparing for estimates. Estimates is examination of the budget; it is not examination of anything and everything that you can attach to some vague reference in the budget papers. If there is a waste of time, it is the waste of time of public servants, people in the minister's office and the minister preparing to answer budget questions only to be bombarded with anything and everything bar budget questions.

He talked about the quality of the minister. Let me just talk about the quality of the opposition. The member for Mount Gambier wants a forensic examination of the budget. The quality of the questions put in this place in this year's estimates have to be of the lowest quality I have ever experienced. They complain about the time available. We saw minister after minister having a question-free examination of the budget, not allowing members of the government to ask questions, which gave them a free-for-all.

They complain about government members having a question when they do; indeed I had some questions I wanted to ask but was told, 'No, we're giving this time over to the opposition.' They asked about everything other than the budget. The problem with estimates is that the opposition, quite frankly, do not know how to use it. If only some of them had been around when we were in opposition, they would have seen the forensic examination of the budget. We now know when we come into estimates that you just prepare for anything and everything; any wild question out of the stratosphere is what they are going to throw at you.

The member for Schubert said that estimates is the time he likes the best. Well, bless his heart. Did he raise any questions in the tourism estimate? No. Did he raise any questions about tourism and the wine industry in the Barossa Valley in the tourism estimate? No. He came in here trying to mimic the member for Unley, and he is making a grave mistake.

Of course, he is the darling of points of order. He called a point of order claiming the information the minister was using was already available and claiming that standing orders for estimates must be the same as standing orders for question time. If that were so, all their questions would have been out of order. They were sloppy and casual in their presentation. I would recommend that the member for Schubert actually read the standing orders. He is very good on his little computer. I am sure the standing orders are on the computer online; if not, we have a hard copy.

His budget speech was greatly lacking in any assessment. He refers to wastes and blowouts. According to him, areas of health and ageing, education and child development and others are wasteful and we are blowing budgets spending money on these areas. What he does not understand, of course, is that it is much like running the health service: when people turn up to be cared for, you actually have to care for them. One breath before making the statement about wasteful money on health, he wanted \$40 million to \$70 million for a new hospital in the Barossa. We know they do not support public education: Christopher Pyne and Gonski leap to mind. Not one Liberal in this place spoke out about the cuts against public education and private education made by Christopher Pyne and the federal Liberals. Clearly the member for Schubert sees this money as a waste.

The member for Schubert claims that \$90,000 a week cleaning Housing Trust properties is a monumental waste, but it equates to about \$2 a week. There are over 40,000 public housing properties in South Australia, so to talk about \$90,000 sounds like a lot of money, but you have to

calculate that across the number of properties that we are dealing with. The Housing Trust runs many effective programs supporting tenants. I remember the member for Schubert coming in here complaining about money being spent in Parkside. I am sure he would have wanted that clean-up had the homes been in Tanunda or Nuriootpa.

The member for Schubert described himself as a humble sausage maker; he was obviously performing for the people he had in the gallery at the time, but let me make the point that not every person who loses their job has the opportunity to come into this place. Holden workers and those working in our shipyards all face losing their jobs. Did they get any support from the federal Liberals? Have Liberals in here been standing up for those people? No, they have not.

The member for Hartley falls into the same trap as the member for Schubert: bemoaning every initiative and bleating for everything he wants in his electorate at the same time. The member for Hartley wants an upgrade of the park-and-ride at Paradise, and it is repeated in his newsletter. My question is: why did he vote against it? Why did he vote it away? He voted down the legislation that would have provided the funding for the upgrade of the park-and-ride. He claims that many schools in his electorate need funding. Why has he not taken this up with Christopher Pyne?

I have outlined time and time again the losses his schools and schools in Liberal seats face because of the federal Liberal government turning their back on a signed agreement. Our children, our parents, our schools and our teachers are left in the lurch. No Liberal—certainly not the member for Hartley—has stood up for them, and the member for Schubert considers them to be a waste of time.

The member for Hartley spoke at length today about the Attorney-General in estimates and his concerns. He did not ask one question—not one question—other than to read out the omnibus questions. The real frustration Liberal members must face is that a few shadows hog all the time. Little backbenchers like the member for Hartley do not get to ask questions and, when they do, they do themselves no credit.

I referred to the member for Hartley's newsletter. The state government made an announcement prior to the budget of the provision of the new cost-of-living concession. The federal Liberal government scrapped payments to the state for that but, lo and behold, in the member for Hartley's newsletter he claims they forced the state government to make this payment. Quite frankly, it is codswallop.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey has a point of order.

Mr WHETSTONE: Regarding the member for Hartley's newsletter, is there some relevance in what is coming out of the member for Wright?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are listening to her contribution and I am sure she is going to draw in the relevant matter in her last six minutes.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you. The relevance is the fact that the member for Hartley's newsletter is talking about the state government's budget initiatives, and that is what I am referring to. He voted away the ability to raise funds for his park-and-ride that he so badly wants and his federal Liberal mates took away the pensioner concession, and now he is claiming credit for an initiative by this government in this budget to provide that concession.

Mr Goldsworthy: We fought hard for it and won it.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sorry, what was that?

Mr Goldsworthy: We fought hard for it and won it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is unparliamentary to interject.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Quite frankly—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am reminding members of standing order 142, under which members are entitled to be heard in silence. It will be your turns shortly, and we will be able to offer you the same protections. Member for Wright.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you. Quite frankly, the contribution of these two members is far below par, trying to model themselves on people like the member for Unley, who has successfully seen off two leaders, and who campaigned in the seat of Ashford that needed only 0.6 per cent to change from Labor to Liberal but, under his stewardship, saw a swing against the Liberals and cost them government. For him, as an incumbent opposition member in an election where Labor was seeking a fourth term, to get a swing against him was truly remarkable. This is not someone any new member should try to emulate or look to as an example of how to conduct themselves.

I would suggest they look to the member for Goyder, who is always respectful, always considered in his comments but a tough opposition operator. Look at the new member for Mount Gambier. He conducts himself in a similar manner. The contributions of the member for Schubert and the member for Hartley are reminiscent of high school student debates. Even then, I would expect teachers would have challenged them about verifying the content—a grade C at best, as far as I am concerned.

I have been in this place for 17 years, and for 12 years in government. I could just about write the speeches—the same speeches for the same people, every year. They complain about estimates, but they do not know how to use it. They do not come in here and ask proper and effective questions about the budget, but I will say that the member for Chaffey actually did. The member for Chaffey is sitting here. He is not one of my favourite people in this chamber and he well knows that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr KNOLL: It is unparliamentary to reflect on a member's presence within the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is really, yes. The member for Wright is going to fix that up right now.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am sorry for congratulating the member for Chaffey, but he is in the chamber—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, don't compound it.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —and I did not think it was inappropriate to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I retract the fact that I said he is here, but what I am—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kavel! I am getting out the question time book. Who has got a tick? The member for Kavel gets his first call to order. Member for Schubert, you are already on your first warning, so you are on your second warning now, which is unfortunate because you are going to make a contribution shortly, aren't you? Okay, member for Wright.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The member for Chaffey (and I was in the estimates committee that he came into) actually spent the time that he had asking questions about the budget. It was a refreshing change. We had the member for Schubert dashing in and dashing out as the TV cameras came in, along with the member for Unley in tow. When the *Today Tonight* cameras appeared on the balcony, so they appeared, asked their trashy questions and, as they left, the cameras left and off they went—not a very good model for any young member.

Quite frankly, I think he needs to take a step back and have a look at how he conducts himself. He likes to tell people he is interested in waste and he is monitoring the waste of government. You know what? I am interested in the codswallop. I am going to be monitoring what they say, what they do and what rubbish they bring into this place. So, he might be waste watch; I will be rubbish watch.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:08): After listening to that, I think anything would be a good speech really. I would like to provide a few views of estimates. Yes, there are good sides to estimates and there are the poor sides to estimates. I guess this year provided some entertainment in some of the portfolios. It showed some of the weaknesses in both sides of the debate, but to hear the member for Wright say that you, Deputy Speaker, were doing a poor job in your role as the Chair, allowing anything to be answered, allowing any question to be put forward to a minister or their department, I think is a sad indictment of your very sterling chairmanship.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have a point of order from the member for Wright.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: One of the things I did not point out was the fact that the opposition come in here and consistently verbal—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hang on, I am waiting to hear.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am giving my point of order like you make your questions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you could point of order me, that would be useful.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you. They—

Mr Whetstone: Number?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sorry?

Mr Whetstone: Number, for your point of order?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You would probably just say 'relevance' and sit down.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, no.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am trying to help.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I didn't say any of the things that the member for Chaffey has attributed to me, and in no way—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, let's listen. You can make a personal explanation later.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —was I reflecting on you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let's listen to the member for Chaffey.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. You know, it is ironic that the member for Wright, sitting far back there on the backbench—I remember her in estimates.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, everybody! I am on my feet.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am on my feet. Now, we have upheld a point of order earlier this afternoon about reflecting on people being in the chamber and all those sorts of things. I just remind members that it is important not to waste the house's time. Let's all keep focus on what we are doing here. We have had a very big week. I know you are all keen to get back to your electorates, so let's just listen very quietly to the member for Chaffey and stay on task.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WHETSTONE: Can't hear you back there. Anyway, I would just like to get back to the estimates committee—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Listen!

Mr WHETSTONE: —and just give a reflection of previous years. I remember the member for Wright as a minister, screaming and yelling and doing anything but answering the questions and, for her to come in here today and attack two brand new members of this chamber, and her being a 17-year veteran of this place, I think it is outrageous that she can try to make—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think it would be really good if we got onto the debate around the estimates committee.

Mr WHETSTONE: —examples of outstanding new members in this chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let's use our time wisely.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the good work that all the departmental people—CEOs right the way down to bureaucrats—for the work that they put in to the answers for their ministers and their departments. I think they do an outstanding job. It is quite sad that, for those many months of work that is undertaken in the answer folders, in a lot of cases it is not used. Sometimes it is, but it just shows that, as the member for Bright has said, ministers who are across their brief do a good job. Ministers who are not across their brief have their weaknesses shown through the estimates period.

The public servants, the bureaucrats, the executives of departments do a good job, and they are the backbone behind a minister. The minister is just a mouthpiece for their department and, in some cases, shows great leadership; in other cases, not so great. Over my time here I have seen poor examples of ministers with answers. I have seen poor examples of questions asked. Just as importantly, what I would like to reiterate is about the estimates process. I think that we have to give recognition to those people who have put many hours into the backgrounding of ministers and departments to give the people of South Australia the answers to the budget lines. I think it was very revealing this year that there really was not a lot in the budget, there were a lot of cuts. There was a small amount of sweeteners. When we have unemployment where it is going, I see very little there that is going to stimulate unemployment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. Caica: That's right. We don't want to stimulate unemployment!

Mr WHETSTONE: Hey? You are the kings of unemployment. What are you laughing at? Are you laughing at the people who are unemployed in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am back on my feet. I remind the member for Chaffey that he is on his first warning. Even though he is on his feet speaking, he can be pulled up and warned. I am asking all other members on my right to cooperate and to listen to him in silence which will be the courtesy accorded to you when you each have an opportunity to speak.

Mr WHETSTONE: This is what a little bit of criticism—and I have given balance on both sides of the estimates, whether it was the government, whether it was the opposition, and yet we just continually see that slanging match, particularly when ministers cannot answer questions, will not answer questions. It is a bit like question time. There are no answers in question time, let me tell you, it is all about the questions, no answers.

We have members on the government benches over there laughing about the unemployment rate in South Australia. I think it is at crisis point: 8.2 per cent and it is heading north. There is no sign of it heading south, not even close, and yet we have members of parliament and ministers laughing about it. I think it is a disgrace. If we look at unemployment in regional South Australia, it is continuing to decline. If we look at the government's focus on regional South Australia, they are looking more at centralisation than they are at decentralisation. Again, it is about looking after their own backyard.

Part of my role during the estimates period was with minister Hunter on water, the River Murray, DEWNR and the arms of DEWNR, the EPA, Zero Waste and climate change. Recreation and sport, racing, investment and trade, they were some of the roles that I was also a part of in the estimates process. I pay respect to those ministers who are across their brief. They answered the questions and understood what the questions were about.

I want to reflect on some of the portfolios, and I will touch on water and the environment. While there was a big announcement by the Treasurer about the Save the River Murray levy, that was just a cost shifting exercise and nothing more. What we are going to see now is—get ready for it—the NRM levy is going to be increased or we are going to see programs within NRM extinguished. There is nothing more than that. All it is is a cost shifting exercise from the general ratepayer in South Australia to the people who are using the water and the people who are using the NRM services—nothing more, nothing less. I think it is a disgrace. It is a cost shifting exercise that was touted as a win for South Australians, but when we get into the detail it is nothing of the sort.

We are seeing separation packages within DEWNR, within water. It has been replaced by a contract workforce—nothing more simple. I asked the minister questions about the exact impacts, why there were memos going out, why there were emails going out, putting the executive to task to undertake setting up a workforce under a contract regime. Potentially, that could be good. I think the voluntary separation packages are good, but we do need to leave a workforce in place.

I know the previous minister for water would agree with me that those departments have been cut to the bone. They have been absolutely cut to the bone and there is very little more there that the government can cut. It is a sad state of play, particularly with that side of their politics of looking after the environment and looking after water security for South Australia.

In asking questions of the Minister for Recreation and Sport, and Racing, I wanted to pay homage to the Office for Recreation and Sport, who work particularly hard in this area. I note that they have taken over 4,500 telephone calls from community organisations, in excess of 6,000 emails, attended more than 100 individual meetings with clubs, associations, councils and MPs and they have assessed about 1,720 grant applications. I think they do an outstanding job and the recognition those people get is probably quite underrated.

I raised a motion in this house for the need for grassroots sport in South Australia. I went to the front bench and asked the two Independents whether they would support my motion. The minister said that there is no cut to the community recreation and sports facilities program—no cut—yet it was revealed during estimates that there is a \$3.5 million cut. I asked for the Independents' support, the minister said no cut, so they sat down and supported him without doing any background on a vote. It just shows that maybe they need to do a little bit more homework on things they are going to vote on and back the government on.

The minister said the decision was made by the previous sports minister, who is present in the gallery—that decision was made when he was not minister, so it was not really his responsibility. He has had three years to overturn that community grants funding cut—three years—and he has done nothing other than rollover on it. The Office for Recreation and Sport advised against any reduction to this funding cut, yet the current minister has just rolled over on it, and I think it is a shame, because the grassroots sporting community will be that much poorer for it.

In the state budget, \$1 million of this cut was offset by spending on the \$50 voucher scheme, which the minister denied, saying it was all new money. Well, it is not new money when you cut out 3½ from one program and put money into another program. Again, it is just cost shifting, it is grandstanding. The taxpayers South Australia should be made aware of this, and I hope that through my contribution today they will hear about it—I will make sure that many of them do.

There has been no official grant review since 2011 despite cuts to major funding. The minister said that the Office for Recreation and Sport undertakes its own review annually, but it is considering a full grants review every three years. By 2018 we might see another review. We do not even see these grants increase with inflation, and we do not see any form of support other than just the basic raw grant funding, which has diminished by almost half.

Things are tight across the general budget. We would take more money any day of the week. It is of course tight economic times, but we do not have any such money, particularly for top-up funds, within sport. We have seen a great stadium built in Adelaide, and we have seen South Australia relish the great stadium, but that is as far as it goes. We have got our stadium and now we are just seeing grassroots sport cut more and more.

There were 21,400 vouchers redeemed for a total of \$1.06 million to March by having a different model of delivery program. One half-time person managed to do the grant program this

year. It is envisaged that the voucher program will escalate by about four times, yet there is no budget to put on any more staff to address these voucher programs. I think that people will be worse off for it. The 2,180 registrations of interest have been made, and 1,389 eligible providers emailed and provided with a username and password, and 1,095 accepted the vouchers. It is getting out there. It is a program that has been well accepted, but the government is a bad sport in funding these grassroots sporting programs. While they give \$50 to individuals, they are cutting \$3½ million out of community sport.

The number of athlete scholarship services dropped from 300 in 2013-14 to 220 in 2014-15, and it is targeted to only 230 in 2015-16. This is at a time when we are leading up to the Commonwealth Games, the Olympic Games and world championships, yet we can see what the priorities of the government are when it comes to sport. It is just cut and keep cutting and keep cutting. They are only interested in the big ticket items, where we can open up a big stadium or put some polish on something. I think it is just bad sportsmanship and, again, it shows what this government's priorities are when it comes to the real world of sport, the grassroots level of sport.

The recreation and sport youth traineeship incentive program was discontinued by the Office for Recreation and Sport in 2014-15. The minister claimed it was due to a pattern of decreasing applicants for the incentive allocations and because a large number of organisations funded under the program had the capacity to fund positions themselves. How are sportspeople able to fund themselves, particularly heading to an elite level? It really does beggar belief. When we send our athletes to these great sporting events, the great world games, we are always looking for a champion, yet this government is prepared to walk away from programs.

We listen to the minister talk about the Commonwealth Games bid, and he just did not know whether it was worth the bid money. He did not know whether it was really money well spent—no rush. So, where are the planning stages, minister? It will be 2018, 2019 when the bid is put in. The Commonwealth Games bid year is 2026, and I think that South Australia will be a much better state if we do get a bid and we do win that bid.

Let us be smart about it. We are not going to put money into a bid that we know that we are not going to win. It is about doing your homework and making sure that it will be, perhaps, Australia's turn to get the games here and move on. The minister needs to really sharpen his pencil and to work out exactly why he should be putting the \$5 million in to outlay basically the tender. Just imagine the facilities that would be upgraded; look at the partnerships between the federal, state and local governments to make South Australia a better sporting state and to give us much better facilities.

Again, questions were asked of the state budget. How much of that money is actually designated to women in sport? I notice that members on both sides of the chamber at that time said, 'That's a great question. We would really like to know where women and sport is within these programs.' We really did get a wishy-washy answer about women in sport. The minister blamed the media for not giving any support for women in sport, and I think that is an absolute cop-out.

The minister should be about setting an example and promoting women in sport. It is not about blaming the media or blaming someone else as to why there is no support there for women in sport. I did want to touch on investment and trade, and I guess that the minister implied that the opposition did not support overseas trade missions. However, the question was about whether the ratio of 1:4—one business to four public servants—was money well spent.

I reckon that if you do pretty easy maths there would have been close to \$1 million spent on five ministers and a Premier and 80 public servants on that trade mission. Now, yes, trade missions are a great platform for businesses to work off, but is that money best spent here in South Australia at a time when we have seen trade programs cut, we have seen representation in other countries cut and we have seen that support mechanism in place there for businesses that want to be exporters, that want to trade and being too hard to achieve with the Gateway program?

The minister is working towards making it easier to access the money. I am sure that he is having a tough time getting money out of the Treasurer. I am told that the Treasurer is a bit of a taskmaster when it comes to anything that is not his golden duck. What I would like to see is that the government support these exporters, support the economy and support small business at a time

when we need it. We need jobs in South Australia, and, at the moment, the government is not doing enough.

The Export Partnership Program is oversubscribed—48 applications for round 1 and just 12 were given grants instead of putting further funding to go directly to our exporters to access those markets. South Australia is spending hundreds of thousands of dollars travelling but we are not actually supporting the people who are going to do the exporting. Again, the priorities are just all wrong.

The minister claimed reported commercial outcomes from the trip, and I questioned what sort of real, tangible outcomes do we see? We saw photo opportunities, we saw a lot of handshaking. We saw a good exercise with the Premier and the minister standing next to Chinese government dignitaries, but it is hard work—the three and four years prior to those photo opportunities—that those businesses have undertaken to make sure that they get their product right, to get their packaging right, to get it on the right platform when it gets to China to make sure it is what the Chinese business people want.

I think that those businesses are doing a great job, and I think the government just needs to get out of the way and let those people do their job. The China Advisory Council has not met for 15 months and the India Advisory Council has met once in nine months. So, really, what are the minister's priorities? Is it about photo opportunities or is it about addressing these councils that are giving good, on-ground advice? The trade strategies, again were questionable. The investment attraction fund, we will wait and see how that turns out. International education has not met its strategic plan. I will continue my remarks at a later time.

Time expired.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:29): I am pleased to make a contribution in relation to what did and did not take place in the estimates committees. I particularly want to commend the members for Bright and Chaffey, whose contributions I have sat here and listened to over the past little while, for the accurate assessment and summation they have made concerning how the estimates committees are conducted.

I would like to make an observation. I think it was the 14th series of estimates committees I have been involved with and, this year, if I total up things correctly, I think I sat in on 10 different portfolio areas of responsibility across both chambers. I want to make the observation the members for Chaffey and Bright and, no doubt, other members on this side of the house have made, that is, the more competent ministers conduct themselves reasonably well, they do not take questions from government members, they do not take Dorothy Dixers, they do not make long opening statements that wind down the clock and they do not take a lot of questions on notice.

The less competent ministers always look to take Dorothy Dixers and they obviously always have pre-written answers to those questions, again in an effort to wind down the clock. It is really the usual tactics from the government in relation to how they deal with estimates. As I said, if a difficult question arises that might pose a bit of a problem or it is in an area where the minister feels vulnerable, they will often take the question on notice and come back at quite a later stage in the process and deliver an answer.

Another tactic I have noticed is that the government members sitting on the committee raise points of order on anything that gets a bit tricky or a bit difficult for the minister, particularly a less competent or inexperienced minister. It is a tactic that the government members raise a point of order if they see an opportunity to, again, wind down the clock so the minister is not necessarily exposed to more questions from the opposition. I could also comment on the member for Wright's contribution, but I do not particularly want to waste my precious time in the house on making comments in relation to what that member has said.

The first committee I sat in on was the one relating to agriculture, food, fisheries and Primary Industries and Resources. I am very interested in agriculture, horticulture and viticulture because all those primary production pursuits are undertaken in the electorate of Kavel. Obviously, we have a big horticultural industry, with the apple and pear industry, and we have a big viticultural industry, with the vineyards and wineries. Also, we have an area to the east of the electorate through what we call the Bremer Valley, through the townships of Callington and through there, which is an agricultural

district. While the electorate of Kavel does not cover every area of primary production, particularly obviously in relation to fisheries and things of that nature, we do cover a reasonable spectrum of production.

Agriculture and the associated industries are a key part of our state's economy. They are major industries within the state, and they are a significant economic driver within South Australia. It was one of the first industries that commenced when the state was settled. Farming, agriculture, animal husbandry, running stock and the like are what actually got the state established, and then mining and other activities ensued.

I know from my own personal experience about how the state benefits if we have a strong, vibrant and profitable agricultural sector. I worked in rural South Australia in my previous banking career for quite a number years (probably 10 or a dozen years, if I count them up) and I know the effect that a good season has out there in the rural sector, and I know the really positive impact it has on the local economy—and when I say 'local economy' I am talking about the machinery dealers and the stock and station agents.

In banking, customers would pay their loans, make loan repayments, and if they had good seasons they would look to buy new machinery, which would obviously help the banking industry; we would write new business and keep things clocking over there. They might buy some more land if a neighbour wanted to retire or for whatever reason wanted to exit the farming industry, so the whole thing cranked along.

The government knows that agriculture is a key part of our economy and, while they pay lip service in terms of supporting the industry, we do not see any real tangible results from their efforts. There are trade missions to China, and that is all good, but the things that really matter are the free trade agreements the federal government negotiates through the hard work of the very competent and accomplished federal minister, Andrew Robb. He an outstanding minister, and he and his department and others have worked very hard to achieve these free trade agreements.

But what do we see from the Labor Party in relation to the free trade agreements? We see at their national conference on the weekend that they voted against it. We have asked questions in the house today about who voted for them, but no answer. The Premier was not there; he had to go off and do something else. Well, that is all very well and good. And then we have the unions, the CFMEU, running television advertisements opposing free trade agreements with China.

We have had the Treasurer get up and try to lecture members on this side of the house on where we need to take control of what is happening. Well, my advice to government members is: you need to take control of what your party is doing and what the left wing of your party is doing in terms of the CFMEU. You, the members opposite, the government members, need to take control of what is happening within your party structure because it is painting a very negative image to a key market—the Chinese market—when we have the national conference of the Labor Party voting against these free trade agreements.

It is a very bad look and it is sending a very bad message, and the government members, as I said, need to seize control of what is going on. We do not need the Treasurer lecturing us when he had trouble in his own backyard over in Melbourne on the weekend. The Treasurer needs to look in his back garden, clean his mess up and take control of what these left wing unions are doing in terms of the CFMEU.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The government members need to check out what they are doing before they look to criticise anything over this side of the house. I move on in relation to some other committees I sat in on. There was the Disability Services committee, and there were some issues with the NDIS which were raised. Obviously, it is a very important scheme. There was also the committee in relation to Veterans' Affairs. I think the veterans' affairs portfolio is actually very important, and I think it should have a higher profile. I think it needs a higher profile in government.

I have made this statement before: everybody knows a veteran. It does not matter whether your close relatives have not been involved in serving in the Defence Force; everybody knows a veteran. It really goes to the heart of our community and our society. I think how we deal with veterans' affairs is indicative of what is important to a government and to the parliament.

As I said, we should honour and value the contribution made by our veterans, and then, obviously, care for them on their return to their duties on Australian soil. We know that PTSD is a big issue. It is or may be an issue for every returned serviceman and woman. It can affect any serviceman or woman from any conflict over the history of our nation, whether in World War I, World War II, Vietnam—we know there are some issues with the Vietnam vets—Korea, and the more recent conflicts in which we have been involved in Iraq, Afghanistan and other areas of conflict. I believe that the Veterans' Affairs portfolio should have a higher profile within government.

We also had a look at emergency services. I sat in on the Emergency Services committee and we raised questions in relation to the emergency services levy hike. I made these comments and observations in my budget speech, but really, the Premier—sorry, not the Premier; well, him too—the Treasurer has had his way with the 9 per cent ESL hike. He has got his way in terms of having a backdoor tax on the family home.

The Treasurer was out there early on saying, 'We are going to consider it; we want to talk about it, but it is not our policy,' prevaricating and wobbling around it. But, he has got his way, because we have seen the 9 per cent hike on the ESL, which is a direct tax on the family property. That issue was raised.

The member for Morphett, as shadow minister, was the opposition lead in the Emergency Services estimates committee. We asked the minister about the ESL hike, and he talked about how we needed additional funding for the Sampson Flat fires. The question was: what are we going to do if we have another bad fire next year?

Mr Duluk: Put up the ESL.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Does that mean that we are going to put up the ESL again? We have a 9 per cent hike; does that mean we are going to have another hike in the ESL if we have a bad fire event in the 2015-16 fire season? The minister could not really answer that question. This is a pretty fundamental issue we are dealing with, because we want to know the answers to those questions. We need to know, and the public of South Australia needs to know, if we are in for another ESL hike. It is very important. Every property owner in South Australia needs to have a clear answer to that question, but unfortunately the minister—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who created this mechanism for this land tax you are so opposed to?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I will tell you who created it: the Bannon Labor government created the need for it, because they bankrupted the CFS.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The CFS was serious—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, I am on my feet! Sit down; stop the noise. Members are reminded—if I could just let the Treasurer know he is already on his second warning and the member for Kavel has been called to order. Irrespective of the fact that you are on your feet speaking, I will not have any hesitation in warning you, and the Treasurer will want to stay, I am sure, to hear the remainder of the remarks, so we will just go straight back to your speech.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Treasurer!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It prompts me to talk about the reason for the establishment of the ESL. It was the previous Labor Bannon government that almost bankrupted the CFS. They had an

enormous debt that they could not manage and the poor old CFS volunteers were out there running sausage sizzles and fundraising events to try to assist the brigade. I will tell you: the CFS brigade in Mount Barker were so short of money (they had two units in their station) and so bereft of funds from the previous Bannon Labor government that they could only afford the diesel to put one unit out on the ground if there was a call. I know that for a fact, because the brigade members have spoken to me about that.

If the Treasurer wants to raise issues like that, we have got all day and every day to respond. It was only out of the necessity to get the CFS and emergency services adequate and satisfactory levels of funding that we introduced the ESL. It was a consequence of the abject failure of a previous Labor government. I only have a short time to go, Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I move for an extension of time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An extension of time has been called for. Unfortunately, it is not part of my prerogative to grant.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I just want to close my remarks in relation to the local government estimates committee I sat in on. The member for Bright gave a pretty good summation of what took place in the local government estimates.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And you remember that we did have to call him to order about reflecting on members in particular?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and the Minister for Local Government is a genuine person. There is no question about—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think either way we don't need to reflect.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —his integrity and his—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let's just concentrate on the speech.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: He is an honest person. I do not doubt the integrity of the minister for one moment. However, anybody who observed the minister in the estimates committee knows—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You won't be sailing too close to the wind.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —he was struggling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You won't continue in that way.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: He relied heavily on his advisers. There were Dorothy Dixers and every tactic, every trick in the book that the government has to lessen the time for exposure to opposition questions was taken. As I said, I do not doubt the integrity of the Minister for Local Government for one moment, but any observation shows that he was struggling.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Treasurer has a point of order?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All the good humour aside, personal reflections on members are disorderly and I would ask him to withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have asked the member for Kavel in his last minute to not reflect on the member in question.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I take your guidance, Deputy Speaker. Another important area of the estimates committee I was part of was that of road safety. I have a very strong interest in road safety, obviously representing an electorate that has many kilometres of winding road, up and down dale. I have said this before and I will keep on saying until I leave this place: I am a very strong advocate for guardrails. I think guardrails—whatever you want to call them: crash barriers, Armco; whatever the name is—are a very important tool in terms of infrastructure and improving our road safety, not just on the Adelaide Hills roads but all around the state.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:50): I rise to give my summation on what I do classify as being one of the greatest weeks on the calendar; it does rival Christmas. The reason I say that and the

reason that I tweeted that was not for any other reason than the fact that it is the greatest opportunity that we have in this house, as new members of parliament, to understand the workings of government. I learned a great deal of things over the course of this week about the way government works, and for that I am entirely grateful. A lot of those things are too numerous to mention and go through, but again through the course of this week I did learn quite a bit. Sitting there and forensically looking at a budget paper, understanding in great detail some of the finer points of what the government is spending money on, I think is an extremely valid use of time and I am extremely grateful for the opportunity.

Can I say, though, that there have been reflections made upon me in this house and I am not going to respond to them directly, in accordance with Madam Deputy Speaker's wishes. However, I do take as a badge of honour the fact that I have had some comments made against me, because it shows that I have maybe had a level of success. Can I say that in this place I think anybody who sticks their head above the parapet has given other people the opportunity to chop it off, but the only alternative is to sit there quietly and do nothing, and I think that is a great waste of the opportunity that we have in this place.

What I would say is that the questions that I have asked and the issues that I seek to attack are the issues themselves and are not about the people who come behind them. It is the issues themselves and I will not resile from that fact. I will not resile from being frank and fearless in the questions that I ask, because I do not do this for me. I do not do this for any sense of personal satisfaction. I do this because I am here as a representative of the taxpayers of South Australia, and they deserve an opposition that will stand up and not be scared to ask questions that may from time to time attract criticism, because that is what they expect us to do.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Treasurer, order!

Mr KNOLL: For the 25,000-odd members of the electorate of Schubert, I am proud of the questions that I ask and my conduct. I would like to also point out that criticising spending will often not win you many friends, and I really do not envy the Treasurer's job in saying no. I would suggest that the Treasurer probably needs to say no little bit more often. In doing so, we may be able to get the budget back on to an even keel.

I came into this place and in my maiden speech stood up as a small government conservative. I would be doing myself and the values that I hold so dearly an injustice by not standing up, and I am unapologetic and will continue to be a harsh critic of government spending in a whole host of areas, because I believe that is entirely consistent with what I was sent here to do.

It is quite interesting that I did not ask that many questions on the Barossa in this past week. The reason for that is that there is nothing in this budget for my electorate—nothing! In the regional statement and the breakdown of government spending in regional areas, it breaks down into the seven RDA boundaries. RDA Barossa had the lowest spending—I think it was about \$6.2 million off the top of my head—of any RDA region across South Australia, and it only outlined two specific projects.

The first of those projects is a dialysis unit in Gawler, which was already announced last year, and we are extremely grateful for that. We are extremely grateful for those four chairs. The second lot of that spending is the Evanston Gardens Primary School upgrade. They are both very worthy projects, but both are not in my electorate, so it is very hard to ask a question about them. So when it is suggested that we try to find spurious ways to tie government programs to the lines on the budget paper, it was pretty difficult for me because there were no lines to talk about.

I did congratulate the tourism minister when he discussed the continuation of the Barossa Be Consumed campaign into the 2015-16 year. That is a good win for the Barossa, but that is the only win that we had. For a region that is so productive for this state, it is an absolute disgrace. I will not cover that topic again because I covered it in my budget reply speech.

The other question that has been put is that somehow I have attacked worthy government budget spending because I attacked budget overruns within government spending, but I am not the one who set those budgets. All I am doing is holding the government to account for their own figures.

These are not my budgets. I do not make them up. They are made up by Treasury, they are made up by government, and it is the job of the opposition to hold the government to account on their own numbers. So, to suggest that I was somehow criticising spending that is worthy because it blows over budget, I make no bones about whether that spending is worthy.

When the government turns around and says, 'When people rock up to a hospital, we treat them,' that is exactly right, but it is not like that is somehow a factor that could have slipped their mind. People have been rocking up to hospitals, every year, since the first hospital was built. This government has been here for 13 years. They should know very well how many people rock up to emergency departments. This idea that somehow, in 2015, the flu season was invented is an absolute joke.

Mr Gardner: Every winter, there is another one.

Mr KNOLL: It is like it is a surprise. It is potentially like the goldfish swirling around the fishbowl. Every time it gets to the front and sees the bottom of the fishbowl, where you get the gravel and the little castle, it thinks, 'Hang on, there is a castle here, fantastic!' It will swirl around again, 20 seconds later, 'Oh my gosh! There is a castle.' These things should be known to government, and especially after 13 years of this Labor administration, so I definitely hold the government to account on those figures. I definitely hold the government to account on their own figures.

One question I did not get to ask in estimates, and I am not going to reflect on members' presence in this house but I will put forward this question: in the Appropriation Bill—and I would like to get a hold of a copy of the Appropriation Bill—it outlines in the first schedule a list of spending by different departments and administered agencies within government. It lists a figure and, off the top of my head, I am going to say it is \$12.039 billion worth of spending.

If you go to the end of Budget Paper 3 in general government sector spending, I think the figure is \$17.055 billion. In the Supply Bill, we also had an appropriation of money, and I think again it is \$3.039 billion. The question I have is that, in the Appropriation Bill it suggests that governments must not spend in excess of the amounts stipulated in schedule 1. I will read it out. Thank you very much, member for Morialta. It says here:

The aggregate of the amounts issued and applied by the Treasurer under subsection (1) and under the *Supply Act 2015* for each of the purposes listed in Schedule 1 must not exceed the amount set out opposite each of those purposes in that Schedule.

So, here we go. What did I say? It is \$12.037 billion. I think I was about right. My point is that \$12.037 billion does not cover off on all the spending the government makes. The question that I had that I unfortunately did not get to ask is: this bill says that the government spending 'must not exceed the amount set out opposite each of those purposes in that Schedule'.

Does that mean that contingency money is built into this budget—in which case, I will shut up because I would hate for the Treasurer to have to say what contingencies there are and potentially give different government departments the understanding of what leeway they have in their budget—or is it the case that, when the government blows their own budget, they are indeed exceeding the amount set out opposite each of those purposes in that schedule?

It is a question that nobody I have asked has been able to answer. I would love, if the Treasurer was indeed listening, to be able to get an answer to that question because I think it is quite pertinent. Certainly, if you put the \$12.037 billion together with the \$3 billion or whatever it is from the Supply Bill, it does not add up to the \$17.055 billion worth of general government spending that the government is going to undertake.

I am just a simple sausage maker. As a new member to this place, I think I can, with a level of ignorance, ask these questions and have somebody give me a very sensible answer, pat me on the head and say, 'Everything is okay. This is what that really means.' So I put that on the record.

Having said that, it was a wonderful estimate season but, unfortunately, it did throw up some things where government spending has been, shall we say, suboptimal. First off, we have the fact that the Minister for Tourism spent \$700 on a limousine to drive him to and from the NRL grand final. He also suggested there were a couple of other stops along the way. That is all well and good, except

for the fact that that same limousine needed to wait for 1½ hours out the front of the NRL grand final, waiting for that grand final to happen.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Mr KNOLL: He spent \$700 on a limousine that spent 1½ hours waiting in front of the NRL grand final for the minister to finish to take him back to his accommodation. I think that is a bit rough; I definitely think that is a bit rough. Then we found out that the minister spent—well, there is conjecture about the figure. The way I equate the pound to dollar ratio is about \$2.20 Australian per pound which says to me that the minister spent \$150 on an Argentinian bottle of wine and gave this fantastic answer where he said, 'I tried that wine and it was actually a good wine.' Well, for \$150 it would want to be more than just good.

He continued, 'Argentina is producing good wine.' Well, again, I do not think that a \$150 bottle of wine is representative of Argentinian wine. It is also not representative of what everyday consumers are consuming and understanding Argentinian wine to be. I do not care which country it has come from, if I am spending \$150 on a bottle of wine, it had better blow my mind. He continued, 'We cannot go out there and say that Argentina has crap wine and it is really bad if they actually have good wine because it points to our own credibility by our talking it down.'

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Where's Argentina?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: The minister continued, 'That is the reason I went for an Argentinian over a South Australian wine, but I can tell you that when I was talking to the manager of the establishment I was definitely spruiking South Australian wine and congratulating him for the list that they had, which was very extensive.' That is all well and good. It is basically saying do as I say but not as I do, I will drink the Argentinian wine but spruik the South Australian wine and thank you for having the South Australian wine, but I am certainly not going to drink it.

I would suggest that if we were going to look at estimating Australian wine with Argentinian wine, it might do well to understand what comparable bottles of Australian wine sell for and then maybe look at Argentinian wine within that same bracket. Can I tell you that in London at the moment, a bottle of Jacob's Creek will set you back between £4 or £5 and then there are other Australian wines that are better that go up from there, but let's say four or five times that amount, so £20 to £25 is probably where it is at. That is the type of wine that maybe the minister, if he was to be credible on this issue, would actually have drunk, be he did not. He went through his answer, and that is all fine. We move on to the Minister for Social Housing—

Mr Gardner: The member for Ramsay.

Mr KNOLL: Actually, she is the member for Ramsay—admitting that the CASIS system was woefully over budget. In fact, it went from \$600,000 in the end to \$7.7 million and, at that \$7.7 million figure, they decided that the system still was not going to work, so that entire amount of money is wasted. The minister told the media that she was disappointed with how the project was managed. Well, can I tell you that from the South Australian taxpayers' point of view, so are we. I think the minister should give herself a bit of a cross in red pen for that government spending because that is \$7.7 million that we are never going to get back.

The minister has said but it is okay because we are going to try again and put \$2.2 million in for a new system. Now, I will say this at the outset: I am willing to give the minister the benefit of the doubt, and I would dearly love for \$2.2 million to deliver a system by which pensioner concession cards can be administered electronically. On behalf of the people of South Australia, we wish her the best of luck in her endeavours and we look forward to updates to the house, a wonderful ministerial statement in which she claims victory—mission accomplished on delivering a concession card holder IT system for the people of South Australia! We dearly wish.

We also have a previous revelation of the fact that the government spent \$226,000 on a website promoting STEM subjects, only to collapse that website 12 months later and put the information into a different website—\$226,000 of money that we are never going to get back. I know the Deputy Premier often refers to himself as a bit of a Luddite but can I say on that point that it would do well on behalf of the people of South Australia to please learn how to send and receive an email,

please learn what a website is, please learn what the interwebs are because it may help us to actually get better value for money. I do not want to go into it, but there is a whole host and hundreds of millions of dollars that have been wasted on IT projects across this government.

We then move onto the Treasurer's estimates. I did appreciate the Treasurer's estimates. I do very much respect a minister who will sit there and say, 'No government questions. I am prepared to stand and fall on my own answers and I am prepared to think of myself as well enough across my brief that I will take the questions you have in the right light.' You can tell this by the number of questions that are asked and the back and forth that happens. As soon as there are no government questions you do not have to try to jam everything into one question because you know that after the third one we are going to government questions and the next 15 minutes is wasted.

So, we did get that from the Treasurer. We also got that from the Attorney-General, who at various points did not even have advisers. I think that is what government should be. Estimates should be ministers testing themselves as being across their brief. It is also a chance for ministers to learn about the little rabbit warrens we send them down to try to find very specific bits of information about the government they lead. We did ask questions of the Treasurer on his four-day journey to Canada and the \$52,000—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Ten-day.

Mr KNOLL: Ten-day trip to Canada—sorry, the four-day convention in Canada and a 10-day trip, \$52,000, and he decided to take a couple of ministerial staff along. We also asked questions of the minister with regard to ESL spending. When we look at the Economic and Finance Committee reports of last year and this year on ESL spending, it says that from budget to budget there was going to be an increase from \$30.1 million to \$48.3 million in expenditure in regions 1, 2 and 3, which are the regional areas.

We could not find, by adding up SES, CFS, SAFECOM and MFS—even if we included the MFS, although they are not in regions 1, 2 and 3 really; there is one in Tanunda but most of their spending would be in metropolitan South Australia—we could not get a figure that added up to \$18 million. The Treasurer has committed to taking that on notice to bring back an answer about where our \$18 million is because the truth is that there are parts of regional South Australia that, through their ESL payments, subsidise other parts of South Australia.

I move on to say that the minister was also asked questions about why his trip was not disclosed in the proactive disclosure requirements, which are normal, and he said, 'Well, actually, we don't have an answer.' That answer mirrored the answer the Minister for Health gave about not uploading his travel to the government website in proactive disclosure. But it actually does not matter, when they do disclose it does not really—and when I say 'does not really', it does not comply with Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular 35. When they disclose the cost of the travel, they disclose the total cost. Well and good. But in the policy document, DPC Circular 35, it states:

5. Policy
 2. Details of Ministers' overseas travel arrangements including the cost of travel paid for out of the budgets of Ministers and/or agencies.

All we get is two or three sentences to understand what the minister did on that trip. I do not think that on any normal person's understanding that constitutes details of ministers' overseas travel arrangements. That is not something that is unique to one minister, that is all ministers, that is a decision taken by ministers across government.

I would call on the government, in the interests of being fair dinkum about your travel expenses, and we all have to be accountable for them, to please provide that information in light of your own guidelines. Again, these are not guidelines that we put forward, these are the government's own guidelines, which were updated on June 2015. There you go. So, I daresay there are issues there that the government needs to answer.

We were trying to understand waste in terms of the scrapped new courts precinct. We have an understanding that there was \$300,000 that was spent on a scoping study, but the government was not able to give us answers as to what other costs were incurred before that project was scrapped. Given there was a scoping study done—I think Activate 408 was the preferred tenderer—

given they were gone so far down the process, I am extremely certain there is a significant amount of waste in terms of the work that was done that was ultimately then scrapped by this government. Again, funds and money that we are never going to see again.

In transport there was quite an interesting one where the government has not electrified Gawler but has electrified Seaford but still bought 22 railcars instead of the 17 (the 16 plus one spare) that it needed for the Seaford line. Those railcars, those trains, cost \$10 million apiece. So, we spent \$50 million on railcars that we do not necessarily need.

We are also maintaining those trains when they are not necessarily needed. This is where government decisions to scrap and delay projects mean that not only has \$50 million been scrapped in terms of the Gawler electrification and the assets written down by that amount of money but that we also now have other assets that are not being used to their full potential because the government chooses to make the decisions that they do.

We also questioned the CEO of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, a man who, different from the previous CEO of DPC, got an extra \$100,000 on his salary. What he did not disclose is the \$35,000 a year he gets for a car allowance. I really want to see that car because for \$35,000 I am sure we could get quite imaginative about the types of cars you could get. The fact is that that was not disclosed in schedule 2 of the CEO's contract and we were not able to get answers as to why that was not done.

We did get answers, however, about the 11 sacked executives from DPC, which cost the people of South Australia \$2.74 million, not including statutory entitlements for early termination payments. To sum up, these examples of waste are exactly why we need to ask questions during estimates—because South Australian taxpayers deserve answers.

Time expired.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (18:10): I also rise and appreciate the opportunity to reflect on my first estimates processes, and in doing that thank the member for Goyder for guiding me through my first estimates last Thursday during the planning portfolio. As a new member of parliament, it was my first experience of estimates and one that I was looking forward to participating in. In my eagerness, I put my hand up to sit on 11 committees.

I understand there have been quite a few comments already about this process, and quite a few of my colleagues, probably on both sides of the house, have not shared my enthusiasm for estimates. However, as an accountant and a banker, what more could you like than looking at the budget in the estimates process? Indeed, I view it as a great chance to learn and be involved in the parliamentary process.

My experience across those committees was interesting, although not as enlightening as I hoped it would be. The estimates process itself is designed to provide an opportunity to examine the budget in greater detail so that we can better understand the expenditure outcomes and policy highlights from the previous year, seek further explanation of the policy targets for the year ahead, and gain greater clarification on how the budget will be rolled out across the forthcoming year.

Estimates should be an integral part of the process of ensuring executive accountability to the parliament. Given its purpose, I am more than a little disappointed with the outcome of this estimates process. The lengthy opening statements delivered by some ministers, the use of Dorothy Dixers, the verbatim listing of organisations and grants programs as answers to questions, and the cumbersome answering of many of the opposition's questions limited the effectiveness of the committee hearings. In saying that, though, I do commend the Treasurer, the Attorney-General and the Minister for the Arts, when I had them in my committee, for their use of estimates and for not taking Dorothy Dixers.

It is worth noting that a significant amount of time and effort are invested in preparing and engaging in estimates, not just on both sides of the chamber but also by government departments. I would like to acknowledge and thank the efforts of the public servants involved in the process, not just those who attended the estimates committee but also the many others who assisted in preparing the countless pages of background information, talking points and answers for their respective ministers. I do feel for them and wonder if their time could be better spent because, after all the

countless pages of background information, talking points and answers prepared for the ministers, there was a number of ministers who said they would take the question on notice and report back to the house.

Notwithstanding my concerns about the effectiveness of the process, I turn my attention to the budget and estimates committee hearings. Firstly, I would like to highlight my disappointment that the budget and estimates process does not offer further effective benefit for local businesses and residents in my electorate of Davenport. As I noted in my maiden speech earlier this year, road infrastructure, public transport and a dedicated transport master plan for the Mitcham Hills area have been a priority for local residents, councils and politicians for some time. The central corridor through the Mitcham Hills must be upgraded to deliver improved bushfire safety for residents and reduce peak hour bottlenecks that frustrate the daily commute on Old Belair Road, Main Road, Flagstaff Road, and many other local roads.

I appreciate the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning's acknowledgement during the planning committee hearing that there is potential for serious congestion in this corridor with 'only one way in and one way out as residents sitting on top of the gully'. I strongly encourage the Attorney-General and Minister for Planning to remember this during the review of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and to prioritise upgrading this important corridor.

Transport and land use are crucial to achieving measurable outcomes and integration in this area, and I welcome the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Planning highlighting the importance of linking these two areas in the Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan. I am also pleased to see the need for the review of the 30-year plan to incorporate the Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan, and this has been acknowledged on the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure website. I look forward to material outcomes for my electorate when the review is delivered later this year.

I also look forward to discussion of the Adelaide-Melbourne railway freight corridor. Priority 32 of the government's Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan for Outer Adelaide prioritises 'improvements to the Adelaide-Melbourne railway corridor through Adelaide Hills to allow for double stacking'. I would urge the Minister for Transport and Planning to give tangible consideration to improving South Australia's freight network.

Motorists experience lengthy delays at crossings as freight trains make the slow passage through the Hills, and residents suffer the intense noise emitted by the wheel squeals which often exceeds 100 decibels, a level that exceeds the state and federal noise guidelines and international guidelines. The health and safety concerns generated by the current passage of freight along this rail were constantly raised by my predecessor in this house, and I will also continue to champion this cause at every opportunity.

Identifying and delivering a long-term strategy for freight movement in South Australia is vital not just for the residents of the Mitcham Hills and surrounding suburbs but also for residents in the electorates of Ashford, Unley and Waite, especially for businesses importing and exporting goods that will benefit from the more efficient movement of their products. Indeed, this would be a better benefit for exporters and importers than moving our time zone in South Australia. The Melbourne-Adelaide freight corridor is a major policy issue this government cannot continue to put in the too-hard basket.

Small business is the heart of this state's economy and, as I noted in my budget reply speech, I welcome the changes to stamp duty announced in this budget, but I will say again: these measures should be introduced immediately. The budget does not deliver the urgent impact our small business sector is craving and this budget does not provide the significant impact the small business sector desperately needs. The budget also fails to provide any immediate relief or impetus for small business at a time when South Australia needs a government that will take action and, for me, this was validated by the answers from the minister in the small business estimates committee.

As to action to address the surging unemployment rate, when I spoke in this house in response to the budget last month, South Australia's unemployment rate was ballooning at 7.6 per cent and, four weeks later and today, I am now talking about an unemployment rate of 8.2 per cent and there are realistic fears it will hit double figures before Christmas. Nothing in the

estimates committee indicated to me that the decisions of this government will be reducing unemployment in the short or long term.

A quick look at the other key indicators within the South Australian economy at the moment shows that the picture is very, very grim. South Australia's gross state product grew by only 1.3 per cent in 2013-14, compared with 2.5 per cent nationally. In 2013-14, South Australia had the lowest business entry rate of any mainland state or territory, at 11.4 per cent, compared with the national average of 13.7 per cent. In the same period, the number of businesses operating in South Australia reduced by 14. A reduction of only 14 may not appear to be alarming until you compare South Australia's performance with that of the other mainland states.

New South Wales gained 8,522 businesses, Victoria gained 7,160, Western Australia gained 2,929 and Queensland gained 2,032. In all major indicators we continue to fall behind our state counterparts and I do look forward to the answers of the Treasurer and the small business minister from my committee yesterday in relation to businesses operating in South Australia. We have fewer jobs, we have less growth, we have higher debt, huge interest payments, outrageous utility charges and a government that cannot put the brakes on South Australia's economic decline.

The Labor government has created only 1,670 jobs since its 2010 promise of 100,000 extra jobs over six years, although we did discover during the estimates hearing that the 100,000 commitment is no longer a commitment but merely an aspiration. The Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, in response to a question about the government delivering on its 2010 promise to create 100,000 jobs, stated: 'The economic climate has overtaken our aspirations and it is most unlikely we will achieve that target.' When the minister was questioned about the change from a commitment to an aspiration, she confirmed, 'When we set the target, it was indeed an aspiration.' An aspiration—it is interesting that the government went to the 2010 election with only a jobs aspiration. It is interesting that the government went to the 2010 election with only a jobs aspiration.

The executive summary of the 2010 consultation paper *Skills for All: Productivity and Participation Through Skills*, released prior to the launch of *Skills for All* states:

The South Australian government has committed to jobs growth of 100,000 over the next six years, supported by the 100,000 additional training places.

So in the *Skills for All* document, a government-produced paper, it definitely was a commitment and not an aspiration. Today we barely have an aspiration for 100,000. Indeed, that aspiration is only about 1,600 jobs.

Former premier Mike Rann clearly stated in his 2010 post-election press release that the government has a:

...central commitment to creating an extra 100,000 job-training places available and an extra 100,000 jobs created over the next six years.

It certainly seems like a commitment to me and, as my colleague the member for Unley noted during the estimates hearing:

What the minister is telling us is that when the government makes a commitment, what they are really saying is that it is only aspirational.

Whilst the government is no longer certain it made a commitment, we can all be certain that this Labor government has fallen well short of creating 100,000 new jobs. I am certain that 13 years of Labor leadership has led South Australia into an economic quagmire. It should come as no surprise that any 'commitment' by this government should be seen as nothing more than an 'aspiration'. Their continued failure to deliver any benefit to the people of South Australia means the best they can do on a policy front is to hope because they have no track record on delivering.

It is important that the government creates the right framework for business to grow, a framework that makes it easy to do business. Whilst the budget and estimates process failed to deliver any immediate outcomes for small businesses in my electorate, I strongly encourage the Minister for Planning to take action now to deliver a real and tangible benefit for Blackwood businesses by rezoning the Blackwood business centre.

Rezoning this area would significantly benefit the local small business community as the Blackwood community centre is currently identified as a secondary renewal area, but elevation to a primary renewal area is essential to improving retail and commercial activity, and to improving local employment opportunities. It would be encouraging to see government action, particularly given the government has repeatedly stated its commitment to helping small business to rezone this area within my electorate—or perhaps helping small business is just an aspiration as well.

South Australia has identified itself as the Festival State since the early 1980s and, while our numberplates no longer spread the word, South Australians have made festival living a part of their identity. And whilst in the Arts estimates, minister Snelling valiantly tried to channel the ghost of Sir Les Patterson, our identity and our reputation as the Festival State are under threat. Cuts to arts programs and the cancellation, hibernation or relocation of the Festival of Ideas, Adelaide Food and Wine Festival, Word Adelaide and the Australian International Documentary Conference threaten our standing as the Festival State.

But it is cutbacks to our music sector, and the cuts that are deepest are the ones to music education. The music scene is an integral component of South Australia's art and creative industries, and whilst it is often overlooked, it is a major contributor to South Australia's festival stature. Music funding cuts to music education have been ongoing in recent years and funding is continually withdrawn from music education. Once again, our public instrumental music service, known as IMS, for school students is under threat with a review by the minister at the moment, and all South Australians will lose, young and old, performers and audiences alike.

Answers from minister Close in relation to IMS during my questioning in estimates on this issue have not reassured me in relation to the proposed IMS restructure. State government funding cuts have resulted in students being unable to enrol for music courses at Noarlunga TAFE from January 2014. The VET courses are instead delivered 50 kilometres north at the Salisbury TAFE campus. Whilst a 50-kilometre trip may not seem especially long for the Minister for the Arts or the Minister for Employment and Higher Education Skills—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Do you need a chopper?

Mr DULUK: Definitely not. No, for most students it would be a train and a bus trip. The majority of students attending or planning on attending the Noarlunga campus do not have the means of travelling to Salisbury regularly to attend these classes, and it is an absolute shame on this government for cutting services to Noarlunga TAFE in relation to their music program. There is no chance that students who want to do a VET course at Noarlunga could attend Salisbury TAFE, especially when they work and have other commitments as well.

Noarlunga TAFE courses are not the only casualty of the government funding cuts. The University of Adelaide's decision that all its vocational music courses would no longer be offered in 2015 has also been blamed on declining state government funding. Students from lower socioeconomic status schools have traditionally used the vocational programs offered by TAFE and the University of Adelaide as a pathway into South Australia's tertiary music school (Elder Conservatorium) and a Bachelor of Arts in music.

Without these pathways, the government is denying young musicians and prospective students equal access to South Australia's premier music programs, and it is failing to support the development of local musicians and the creative industries in South Australia. Adelaide's music scene will suffer, with fewer up-and-coming musicians performing around our city and our regional areas, and the quantity and quality of our future educators will suffer. Fewer courses means fewer graduates, and fewer graduates means fewer tutors, teachers and industry leaders.

Tertiary music education in Australia is seriously underfunded compared with our international peers. South Australia has an opportunity to invest in this area and create a world-class education program—a program that will separate our tertiary music programs from every other university program in Australia and make South Australia the preferred destination for aspiring musicians and educators alike. Alas, this is not happening. Instead, we are doing the opposite.

Investing in music education is also an opportunity to live up to our billing as the Festival State. Adequate funding would enable the delivery of educational opportunities to rival our

international peers, and it would also enable South Australia to be the music destination for industry leaders and offer excellence in teaching. We would attract the best in academia. We would be a destination that teachers want to teach at and where students want to enrol to be taught.

The government's Destination Adelaide campaign commits \$5.7 million over four years to market South Australia as a destination of choice for international students. It does not make sense to me that on one hand the government is spending a significant amount of money on a marketing campaign to attract students to our universities whilst on the other hand it is cutting funding to the very programs that the universities teach—programs that would gain international attention and attract students naturally if they received suitable funding. The social and economic benefits of tertiary music to Australia should not be undervalued.

Getting back to estimates, the estimates process does seem to have raised more questions than answers for me, not just in relation to the budget, but also about the government's priorities, the government's process for developing and implementing policy, and especially about the government's strategy for fixing South Australia: creating jobs, creating economic growth, and delivering a more prosperous state.

The Premier keeps telling the people of South Australia that the government has to accept responsibility for fixing the jobless mess. He keeps telling South Australians that the state is in a transition from old economy to new economy. He keeps telling us that the government is working hard to create jobs. I am just not sure that I have a better idea today of how this government is doing this compared to a week ago after the budget estimates process.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (18:28): This is the 14th estimates that I have sat through and participated in. One of the things that you do see as you sit there (particularly on the opposition benches, as has been my remit) is how ministers perform.

When I came into this place, the makeup of the front bench was completely different from what we see now. We had the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse, as I called them, on that side. There was Mike Rann, Kevin Foley, the current Speaker and the current Treasurer. Why did I call them that? Because they were very tough operators. It was like hand-to-hand combat coming in here at question time. You had to toughen up.

If there is one thing I can pass on to the newer members of this place, it is this: do not take it personally. This is politics; if you cannot take it, go and read some of the books about the history of politics and understand that this is what you are dealing with. You are dealing with the political process. You are dealing with issues. You are dealing with people with passion and purpose, and also with many people who have the wiles and skill to talk their way out of any issue, talk around issues and sell issues. That is what we had.

If I was to rank the ministers, as you can when you watch the estimates process, certainly the Treasurer and the Attorney-General would have to rank as being the best performers. I think ranked third would have to be the Minister for Health. I did not see the Treasurer's whole performance, but I know he is quite capable of thinking on his feet. You see them performing in estimates and they are able to be relaxed about it. There are no long opening statements and Dorothy Dixers are kept to an absolute minimum, if at all. They are able to handle the process well. Younger members in this place should watch that.

Certainly, once you go past those frontbench performers (and credit where it is due, it is an interesting political process), unfortunately it goes downhill rapidly after that—and that is not personal; I like everybody on the other side. There was only ever one person in this place I never got on with, and I am not going to name that person—I just could never get on with them—but there is nobody on the other side that I dislike as a person. I know why we are all in here, but this is the political process: you watch them perform, and I am afraid some of them are just clearly out of their depth. It is sad for them to be put in that position.

I think you, Acting Speaker, should be up there. You are one of the better performers. You could be there; I hope to see a reshuffle and you get there. There are other aspiring members on that side who should be on the front bench, in my opinion, but, unfortunately, that is the way politics works. You have to wait your turn, as I will have to wait my turn until 2018 to be on the benches over there.

In relation to the particular portfolios I was involved with, Minister Snelling in Health had no opening statements and no Dorothy's. I will complain, though: it was \$38 million a minute on the timing we had. We used to have a long time. We would be here until 10 o'clock at night. We would be going right through the portfolios. We would be making sure that we were able to drill down on issues, but now it is under four hours for Health. I had an hour for the Office for the Ageing. For heaven's sake, where is the Office for the Ageing in relation to a \$5 billion health portfolio? Veterans' affairs is a very important portfolio, but really, on the scale of financial expenditure, it is a minor portfolio—half an hour.

There was three-quarters of an hour for Disabilities, and we are about to start spending over \$20 billion a year on the National Disability Insurance Scheme. It would have been much nicer to have had a bit more time there. Emergency services is a dear portfolio of mine that I love very much, that had less than an hour, in reality, by the time opening statements and Dorothy Dixers were finished.

If everybody in this place is not aware of the fact, I try to work in a very bipartisan way with Aboriginal affairs and I am very passionate about it. Aboriginal affairs again had a fairly limited time, but that was not of such a consequence because minister Maher and I work in a cooperative way and we are able to satisfy the queries and questions and I know that he will be forthcoming with further information.

The whole time that is spent in estimates is criticised a lot. I feel sorry for the public servants. If it was not for the fact that it would cost so much in Public Service wages, I would put in FOIs to find out about the accountability and cost of preparing the briefs for the ministers for estimates, because I will be very surprised if it is not in the millions of dollars, preparing for estimates. There must be a better way.

I had the federal Minister for Disabilities (Hon. Mitch Fifield) in here a bit earlier on, and we were talking about the federal system. He will appear for four or five days, starting at nine in the morning and going through to 11 at night with his advisers before the Senate estimates committees. If we have not already done the work on looking at the way estimates committees work federally and could work in the state sphere, I think we should be doing that. It is my understanding that there has been some work done on that, and I would be very surprised if across the chamber here we could not come to some better arrangement that would suit everybody. The farce where you have an upper house minister coming down but cannot have an upper house shadow minister coming down, to me, adds to the whole puzzlement of the estimates committees.

The real thing is the time that I know my staff put in and the time that Heidi Harris, who works for me, has put in preparing for my portfolios. One day, members on the government benches will be in opposition and they will realise that their facilities, the resources you get, are very limited and you will wonder what has hit you. I know most of the young staff were probably still at school in 2002 when this government came in. They will never have seen opposition. They will not know what has hit them—the realities of life, the coalmine, the salt mine that you work in as an opposition, working away, burrowing away to get that information.

The need to reform the process is something that I just cannot overstate. In the time I have, I will talk a little bit more about the system. Let us just talk about where we are in 2015. I look back at 2002 and the rivers of gold to where we have come, and it is sad. I sat here with Mike Rann and I remember him haranguing us about any nuclear issue. The attacks were just searing, and he was very good at it. But now what do we have? We have a former governor with royal commission powers out there looking at nuclear power, nuclear waste and the nuclear processing industry, and good on them. I think it is fantastic.

I was in France in the mid-2000s as the guest of AREVA. I should not say 'guest': they took me to places. Obviously, through the parliamentary travel system, I paid for that and there are full reports there. Please, anybody, have a look at my travel reports if you are worried about what I have been spending on my travel, because I guarantee that I have given this state value for money.

The nuclear industry is one we should not have been ignoring. I think it was 1968 when the industrial development branch of the premier's department drew up plans for a nuclear power station—and the member for Giles will love this—at Whyalla. The two reasons were cheap electricity

and desalination of water. I am glad they did not build it then, because the level 3 and level 4 power stations I saw when I was in France with AREVA are fantastic technology. I am sure that former governor Scarce will come back and tell us that there is a real future for us in South Australia in the nuclear industry. I do not know whether it will be nuclear power, but certainly at the other end.

When Mike Rann was Don Dunstan's press secretary—and I have the *Hansard* somewhere in my office; I had to do some real digging because it is not on the electronic form—Dunstan agreed even back then that there was an opportunity, if you felt that way inclined, because of the geopolitical stability of South Australia, to look at the nuclear industry and nuclear waste storage. Certainly, it has been an interesting journey.

We are talking about that as a diversion, I think, in some ways. In that case, it is a good diversion, but I do have problems with time zones and driverless cars and I certainly have problems with trams out to Norwood in 15 years' time. People in this place know that I was the only Liberal in this place who wanted to extend the trams.

I remember moving a private member's motion for the tram to be extended up to O'Connell Street, North Adelaide, back through the Parklands with the new third rail technology and no overhead catenary systems—it was just parkland and, like Victoria Square, you mow the tram tracks—and then bring the trams back down North Terrace, past the Wine Centre, the universities, the hospitals and back down here. I think it would have been a very good extension then, but I was not talking in 15 years' time: I was encouraging the government to do it then.

I am very pleased with what they have done. I am very pleased that there are further plans. I look forward to those plans not being in 15 years, not being unfunded, but actually being a reality. I do not see that at the moment; I do not see that at all. Certainly, I am not sure what the next diversion is going to be. Is it going to be a cable car to Mount Lofty or is it going to be something else? Who knows? Please, I ask the government, let us concentrate on the state of the state.

Let us have a look at the state of the state. I am more than happy to be corrected here if I have my figures wrong. I am just a humble veterinarian, not an accountant and not an economist. Going back to the Swan federal budgets and then comparing them with the Hockey federal budgets in the forward estimates, in the year 2014-15, the Swan federal budget GST payments for South Australia were \$4.7 billion in round figures, but under the Hockey federal government, it is nearly \$5 billion. It was \$232 million more this year—not the total payment, but more than was expected even under the Swan budgets. In 2015-16, it is \$678 million more; in 2016-17, it is \$1.1 billion more. It is more than \$2 billion extra GST on what the Swan budget was predicting.

The thing that is missing from the Hockey budget is that Monopoly money (the funny money) that was way out past the estimates for health and Gonski—money that was never there. It was never there, yet this government clings to the falsehood that there have been budget cuts. That money was never there in the first place, but in the meantime you have nearly \$2 billion more than you ever expected. So you are getting a lot more.

There have not been the cuts, so how the heck can you justify even the ESL increases—\$90 million out of a total of \$232 million extra. This is GST. This is not money tied to specific purposes like roads or anything else. The GST can be spent on anything the government really wants and it is extra money. It is black and white; there it is in black and white. I do not think I have misread the figures and I do not think I have exaggerated in any way, shape or form. In fact, I have underestimated some of those figures.

The state of the state should be a lot better than it is. In the statistical summary for South Australia, we all look at the disaster of 8.2 per cent unemployment. To be employed, I think you only have to be in a job for about an hour or two. Who can say that is genuine, life-sustaining employment? A job is a job is a job—35 hours a week, earning money that you can actually live on, not an hour a week, so what is the real employment rate? What is the underemployment rate in South Australia? That is what we need to know.

Unfortunately, in South Australia economic growth is 1.3 per cent, with a national growth rate of 2.5 per cent. It is a real sad state. If you look at the debt of \$279 million, the net debt of \$11.27 billion, and of course when the new RAH—the third most expensive building in the world—comes online that is going to jump up. We are paying massive amounts, not to the Belgian dentists

anymore, like it was with the State Bank in 1993, but it is to somebody else; they are getting this massive amount of interest.

In the few minutes that are left—and how time flies when you are having fun; and I do enjoy my time and consider it to be a privilege to be the member for Morphett—let me look at these portfolios. I did enjoy the Minister for Health's full and frank replies to questions. I am very concerned about the fact that we are going to have two half hospitals for a while there. I visited the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in Birmingham in England, where their model of care was similar with lots of single rooms. They were still using the old hospital and they did not see any end to using the old hospital, so I hope that the Minister for Health is able to give us assurances that that is not going to be the case here.

In my emergency services portfolio with the CFS, MFS and SES, I will do everything I can to make sure that they are valued by this government and they get what they are worth, particularly the volunteers who put in over a million hours in attending incidents—add on all the training and all the community stuff they do, so how much more is that? Certainly, the men and women of the MFS do a fantastic job. People know my history with my father being in the MFS for 30 years, so I will do everything I can to make sure that they get a fair go as well.

To fund emergency services we have the emergency services levy, brought in by the Liberal government. What did we see this government do? They removed the remissions last year, and that was a big hit, but it went up again this year, and Sampson Flat was blamed. Let's go back to the estimates committee and see what minister Piccolo, Minister for Emergency Services, said about this when I asked him about increases in the ESL because, if it has gone up for Sampson Flat, what else? I asked minister Piccolo about what happens if there are more incidents, and he said:

We work out exactly what has been spent, whether it is Sampson Flat or whatever other event, whether it is a flood, etc., the money is then raised in a subsequent year and paid back—

I went on to ask, 'Raised from whom, though, minister?' I said:

So the ESL will go up. If there are two Sampson Flats the ESL will then go up again, further and further—that is what you are saying.

Minister Piccolo said, 'Well, we said that this year.' So, I said, 'So if we have an Ash Wednesday, where there is billions of dollars worth of damage, who pays?' Minister Piccolo started to say, 'Who do you—' He was going to say, 'Who do you think pays?' I interjected and said, 'The taxpayer,' and he said 'Yes. Who do you think pays...[and] pays all the other taxes...' 'The taxpayer pays,' minister Piccolo said.

It will be an interesting response from this government when they say what is going to happen if we do have an earthquake, say—we are in an earthquake fault zone—or if we do, heaven forbid, have an Ash Wednesday fire where there are literally hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars worth of damage done. I hope beyond hope that there are no lives lost, never mind the property damage.

Who is going to pay? The taxpayers will pay. We all know that taxes and charges go up with inflation, but to leap up the way they have is just incredible. So, with the ESL, the sky is the limit according to the Minister for Emergency Services. Look out the taxpayers of South Australia because there is no restraint on this government when it comes to the emergency services levy.

With the disabilities portfolio, this government has badly underestimated the number of participants in the trial. It is not a cost overrun when you say there are going to be 5,000 participants and there are nearly 10,000. The actual figure I think has come back to about 8,500 now. Every other state got it right. They used the Productivity Commission figures, but not South Australia.

How could we get it so wrong? It is not just a cost overrun, it is an absolute cock-up in working out the figures. No wonder kids are missing out and families are missing out. It is a terrible mistake made under minister Piccolo. The ESL is going up under minister Piccolo and disabilities is just a slow train to nowhere at the moment under minister Piccolo.

Communities and social inclusion are under minister Bettison. I have been asking questions about the Concessions and Seniors Information System (CASIS) for years now. I remember asking minister Bettison, or minister Piccolo it was last year, about this.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): Member for Morphett, can I ask you to refer to ministers by their occupation rather than their name, thank you.

Dr McFETRIDGE: That is why you should be on the front bench, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): I get good advice up here, member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The Minister for Disabilities and the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion really have some issues to answer. With the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, the Concessions and Seniors Information System really is a disaster. It is \$7 million. Last year, I was told by the minister that it was going to be over \$5 million. They have just thrown it out; they have scrapped it.

What could have been done with that \$7 million and another \$2 million to try to replace it? It is not a farce: it is a scandal. Where is the ministerial accountability with any of this? It started under the Premier, went to the now Minister for Emergency Services, and now to the current Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Where is the ministerial accountability? There is none.

As former governor Kevin Scarce said of the problems with the South Australian government, the executive ignores the parliament, there is no ministerial accountability and the Public Service has been highly politicised. Until this government recognises the state of the state and realises that they need to be more than just smart performers on the front bench, and that they actually have to deliver to the state, this state is really going to keep suffering under Labor.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Odenwalder): The member's time has expired. Thank you, member for Morphett, and I will overlook this one time the insertion of the word 'cock-up' into *Hansard*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

At 18:48 the house adjourned until Thursday 30 July 2015 at 10:30.

*Estimates Replies***GRANT EXPENDITURE**

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

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):

Deputy Premier

Attorney-General

Minister for Industrial Relations

2013-14

Attorney-General's Department

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant\$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Aboriginal Sobriety Group	45,255	Saying good bye to crime	Y
Australian Bureau of Statistics	20,747	2013-14 Contribution to the National Criminal Courts Statistics Unit	Y
Australian Council on Children and the Media	57,300	'Children and Gambling Watch list' program	Y
Australian Council on Children and the Media	15,407	'Know Before you Go' program	Y
Australian Institute of Criminology	15,549	Criminology Research Grants	Y
Australian Red Cross	49,720	No Regrets—crime prevention program	Y
Centacare	50,000	Ceduna Gardens project	Y
City of Burnside	10,000	Crime Prevention Grant	Y
City of Marion	11,831	Take pART—Trott Park Neighbourhood Centre Aerosol Art Mural Project	Y
City of Playford	28,500	'Piece Playford' grant	Y
City of Salisbury	40,500	Gawler Street Safety initiative	Y
Community Arts Network SA	49,800	'Cops and Robbers' grant	Y
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	18,825	Funding for the National Centre of Excellence to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children Board	N—Transfer to another SA Government Department
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	107,000	Office for Women: Family Safety Framework	Y
Department for Correctional Services	250,000	Street Crime initiative	Y
Department of Justice	37,892	2013-14 National Coronial Information System (NCIS) contribution	Y
Department of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	325,000	Native Title Tenure History searches	N—Transfer to another SA Government Department
Department of the Premier & Cabinet	90,000	Citizens Jury—new democracy project	N—Transfer to another SA Government Department
District Council of Coober Pedy	33,690	'Saturday Nights' crime prevention grant	Y
District Council of Grant	13,860	Limestone Coast Cyber Safety Awareness workshops	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant\$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Encounter Youth	20,000	Encounter Youth Hindley Street Green Team program	Y
Environmental Defenders Office SA	275,964	Community Legal Services program	Y
Flinders University	226,000	'SA Justice Chair in Forensic DNA Technology' grant	Y
KESAB Environmental Solutions	37,950	Graffiti Watch—removing graffiti project	Y
KESAB Environmental Solutions	31,440	Respect it, don't wreck it project	Y
Legal Services Commission of SA	36,175,000	Legal Assistance Services under Commonwealth and State Law	Y—subject to National Partnership Agreement and State Legislation
Legal Services Commission of SA	144,506	Drug Court	Y
Marra Dreaming	30,200	Connection to Culture program	Y
Multicultural Aged Care Inc	49,859	Identifying and responding to Elder Abuse	Y
National Judicial College of Australia	24,804	SA contribution for 2013-14	Y
Northern Community Legal Service	757,977	Community Legal Services program	Y
NSW Department of Attorney-General and Justice	60,818	Contribution to the Standing Council on Law and Justice (SCLJ) Secretariat	Y
NSW Department of Attorney-General and Justice	13,151	Indigenous Justice Clearinghouse	N—Agreement by Ministers from all jurisdictions at the SCLJ
NSW Department of Attorney-General and Justice	161,472	Secretariat support for Professional Standards Council in 2013-14	Y
Offenders Aid & Rehabilitation Services of SA	24,500	Restorative Practices for Youth at Risk and Professional staff grant	Y
Operation Flinders Foundation	447,000	Operation Flinders program	Y
Pika Wiya Health Service Aboriginal Corp	50,000	Young Aboriginal Men's Leadership initiative	Y
Port Adelaide Football Club	97,920	2013 Aboriginal Power Cup	Y
Riverland Community Legal Service	452,388	Community Legal Services program	Y
Road Trauma Support Team	82,000	Annual grant	Y
Royal Association of Justices of SA	15,664	Grant for accommodation	Y
SA Health—Central Adelaide Local Health Network	72,000	Establishment and administration of a victim register within Forensic Mental Health Services	Y
SA Health—Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	50,000	Flinders Medical Centre Child Protection Services	N—Transfer to another SA Government Department

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant\$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
SA Health—Women's and Children's Health Network	356,000	Yarrow Place: Provision of Forensic Medical Services to victims of rape and sexual assault	Y
SA Health—Women's and Children's Health Network	50,000	Child Protection Services	N—Transfer to another SA Government Department
SA Native Title Services	550,000	2013-14 Native Title negotiation expenses	Y
Sammy D Foundation	350,000	Great Night Out campaign	Y
Sammy D Foundation	360,000	Late Night Safety project	Y
Sammy D Foundation	148,500	Connect to Re-engage project	Y
South Australia Police	16,413	Offender Management Plan contribution	N—Transfer to another SA Government Department
South Australia Police	32,625	2013-14 contribution for the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council	Y
South East Community Legal Service	429,900	Community Legal Services program	Y
Southern Community Justice Centre	1,167,551	Community Legal Services program	Y
The Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration (AIJA)	15,562	Standing Council on Law and Justice (SCLJ) contribution to AIJA funding for 2013-14	Y—SCLJ Agreement
The University of Adelaide	36,095	Administrative support for the Law Reform Institute	Y
Uniting Care Wesley	730,200	Community Legal Services program	Y
Victim Support Service	1,770,000	Annual grant	Y
Victim Support Service	595,600	Domestic Violence Safety Packages program	Y
Vietnamese Community of SA	49,331	Staying Connected: Vietnamese and African Communities School Engagement project	Y
Welfare Rights Centre	345,196	Community Legal Services program	Y
Westside Community Lawyers	907,658	Community Legal Services program	Y
White Lion Inc	46,350	Ceduna Youth Hub Mural project—crime prevention grant	Y
Women's Legal Services	859,767	Community Legal Services program	Y
Young Women's Christian Association of Adelaide	49,096	Driving a Different Conversation project	Y

POLLING BOOTH OFFICER

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

I am advised that the officer in question was reprimanded and counselled by the Returning Officer responsible for the management of the pre-poll centre where the incident occurred. The Returning Officer reported that the officer understood that he had acted improperly, apologised and acknowledged that any further incidents would result in more serious action against him. The officer has long experience as a polling booth manager and until this incident had received satisfactory reports during previous events.

It has been reported that at the time of the incident there was unexpectedly high demand for pre-poll voting at the centre and ongoing difficulties were being experienced in recruiting and training additional staff at short notice. Based on his previous work performance history as an electoral official the decision was taken not to stand the officer down.

I am advised the Returning Officer was directed to monitor the officers' performance and he attended the pre-poll centre regularly following the incident. Feedback from other staff at the centre confirmed no further complaints were received.

The officer did continue duties as a polling booth manager and with his Returning Officer in the week after election day but was advised that he would not be re-employed at future events. The officer's staff record has been so endorsed.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S OFFICE FILES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

The increase in the projected closed files for 2014-15 reflects an emphasis by the Crown Solicitor's Office (CSO) to undertake to formally close files that had remained open on the SCO system, notwithstanding that the matter had been finalised in previous years.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS TRIBUNALS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Sub-program 8.6: Conciliation and Arbitration	2014-2015 \$'000
Income:	
Commonwealth revenue	272
Other grants	207
Fees, fines and penalties	22
Sales of goods and services	262
Other	161
TOTAL	924

GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Government Publishing SA (GPSA) provides print production, publishing and distribution services to enable access to information generated from several long standing processes of government.

Budgeted revenue for 2014-15 is generated through the following services:

Print Production	\$1,235,000
Government Gazette	\$450,000
Standing Orders	\$225,000
Subscriptions	\$340,000
Total	\$2,250,000'

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

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):

Minister for Planning

2013-14

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure

Ongoing Grant Programs

Name of Grant	2014-15 (\$'000)	2015-16 (\$'000)	2016-17 (\$'000)	2017-18 (\$'000)	2018-19 (\$'000)
Planning & Development Grants Grants are predominantly for <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Open Space • Places for People • Strategic projects 	14,255	18,201	18,575	19,206	19,754

2013-14 – Grants Expense

Name of Grant Recipient	Grant Amount \$ ('000)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to an Agreement ? (Y/N)
<i>General Grants</i>			
Dept of Environment and Natural Resources	25	Funding over three years toward the Cooperative Research Centre for Low Carbon Living to bring together industry, government and research institutions with an aim to become a knowledge hub for leading social and technological innovation and for developing integrated products, materials and tools to achieve a low carbon future.	Y
SA Councils (66 councils)	7,495	The funding was provided by the SA Government and the administered Planning and Development Fund. This Local Government Stimulus fund was re-distributed to local governments for minor works.	Y
University of South Australia	1,000	The once-off fund was provided by the Commonwealth Government and was on-forwarded to the University of SA for the redevelopment of Hindley St in the University SA precinct.	Y
Hubs Australia	220	Hub Australia received grant funding for the fit-out of the entrepreneurial hub in Peel St. The hub is a space for entrepreneurs, businesses and government agencies to exchange ideas, mentor, educate and support in a way that fosters innovation and emerging small business.	Y
Adelaide City Council	45	Contribution to towards developing a strategy to increase economic activity in the city during the night-time period.	N
Adelaide City Council	100	Contribution to the development of a placemaking strategy in the West End.	Y
Renew Adelaide	300	To support Renew Adelaide in creating a vibrant city by bringing together the creative entrepreneur and property sectors to activate underused property.	Y
Subtotal General Grants paid	9,185		
<i>Planning and Development Grants</i>			
Dept of Environment and Natural Resources	1,150	Funding for Million Trees Program, a SA Government initiative to create a greener, more sustainable city by planting native plants across the metropolitan area.	Y
Dept of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	1,000	Development a network of green walking and cycling corridors across Greater Adelaide, enhance biodiversity and encourage walking and cycling.	N

Name of Grant Recipient	Grant Amount \$ ('000)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to an Agreement ? (Y/N)
University of SA	840	Redevelopment of Hindley St by the University SA in its precinct as part of a national partnership agreement with the Commonwealth.	Y
Adelaide City Council	1,000	Redevelopment of Hindley St by the Council in the University SA precinct as part of a national partnership agreement with the Commonwealth.	Y
Dept of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	500	For Royal Adelaide Hospital international design competition	Y
Renewal SA	100	Establishment of a buffer zone around the development to create a green gateway to McLaren Vale	N
Dept of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	2,506	Funding for Creating a Vibrant City—a strategic priority seeks to have more people living, working and spending time in the city.	N
Dept of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	455	Development of a Kangaroo Island Structure Plan to improve opportunities for economic development and to investigate and protect land for the provision of appropriate infrastructure to support sustainable growth.	N
Renewal SA	200	Funding for an independent study to identify the social planning and community engagement gaps across Kilburn and Blair Athol.	Y
Dept of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	500	For the establishment of a cantilevered shared use path.	N
Dept of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	3,500	Local Government Stimulus fund for local government projects for small community infrastructure projects.	N
Dept of Planning, Transport & Infrastructure	1,000	Funding from the Planning and Development Fund to support the implementation of the 30 Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. This includes structure planning, planning reform, Development Plan Amendments and the pre-lodgement service for city and inner metropolitan developments.	N
Mt Barker Council	1,000	Mt Barker Council—Polo Club	Y
City of Charles Sturt	400	Coast Park (Grange Road)	Y
City of Charles Sturt	50	Coast Park (Third Ave to Recreation Pde) documentation	Y
City of Charles Sturt	2,000	Henley Square redevelopment	Y
City of Holdfast Bay	180	Design of Minda Dunes Coast Park	Y
City of Holdfast Bay	300	Patawalonga shared use walkway/overpass across Glenelg lock gates	Y
City of Onkaparinga	675	Foreshore Access Plan stage 5: Snapper—stage two project	Y
City of Onkaparinga	50	Foreshore access plan stage 2	Y
City of Mitcham	200	Recreation Trails Project (Randell Park—Zone 1)	Y
City of Prospect	42	Prospect Memorial Gardens project	Y
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters	100	Masterplan for The Parade	Y
Town of Gawler	50	Gawler Town Centre Masterplan	Y
Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council	25	Hutt River Linear Park project	Y
District Council of Tumby Bay	25	Tumby Bay Urban Design Framework and Master Plan	Y
City of Alexandrina	250	Bristow Smith Reserve Nature Playspace	Y
City of Mount Gambier	1,000	Redevelopment of the Railway Lands—Stage Two	Y
City of Playford	1,000	Fremont Park project	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Grant Amount \$ ('000)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to an Agreement ? (Y/N)
District Council of Yorke Peninsula	32	Port Vincent Paved Foreshore Walkway	Y
City of Salisbury	1,000	St Kilda Adventure Play Space Upgrade	Y
City of Whyalla	235	City Plaza Landscape Upgrade	Y
District Council of Peterborough	154	Main Street Development	Y
City of Onkaparinga	190	Aldinga District Centre Town Square project	Y
Subtotal Planning & Development Grants paid	21,709		
Total Grants Paid	30,894		

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT CODE

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

The Residential Development Code was introduced in 2009 to streamline the assessment process for home construction, home renovation and minor domestic outbuildings and structures.

The Residential Development Code for dwelling additions and minor domestic outbuildings applies to residential developments generally, while the Code for new dwellings applies to areas determined by me as the Minister administering the *Development Act 1993*.

A development that meets the criteria of the Residential Development Code must be approved by the relevant authority and apart from street setback requirements; no regard is necessarily given to the development plan.

During the implementation process of the Code, explicit exemptions were made to where the Code would apply including where a referral to a statutory body, such as the Coastal Protection Board is required. Furthermore, councils were able to nominate other areas for exclusion from the determined areas such as interface areas with industrial land uses.

As planning policy within development plans is evolving to address changing strategic directions and site circumstances, adjustments can be made to the determined areas of the Residential Development Code. Approximately 20 alterations, to either include or exclude areas, have been made to the determined areas since the Code was introduced in 2009.

I am advised that the request from the Copper Coast Council is currently being reviewed by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and while this is still to be finalised, an exemption to address coastal hazard issues would be a sound basis to review the determined area.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

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):

Minister for Planning

The total estimated cost has been adjusted to \$141,500 to ensure consistency with reporting across government Agencies.

Between 30 June 2013 and 30 June 2014 positions with a total employment cost of \$100,000 or more:

(a) Abolished:

There were no positions with a total estimated cost of \$141,500 or more abolished between 30 June 2013 and 30 June 2014.

(b) Created:

There were no positions with a total estimated cost of \$141,500 or more created between 30 June 2013 and 30 June 2014.

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

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):

Minister for Planning—Renewal SA:

2013-14

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Renewal SA did not operate any grant programs during the 2013-14 financial year. Accordingly no grant expenditure was incurred during this period.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

In 2013-14 Renewal SA purchased 16 allotments with a total purchase price of \$21,343,500 (GST exclusive).

Renewal SA has no planned acquisitions in 2014-15.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Renewal SA's total estimated cost of land sales for 2013-14 is \$44.442 million and the total estimated revenue for land sales in 2013-14 is \$84.485 million.

Renewal SA's originally forecast net operating balance for 2013-14 is a loss of \$13.366 million.

Renewal SA's operating balance for each of the forward estimate years is as follows:

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Net operating balance before dividends and income tax equivalents	(20,082)	22,199	(17,495)	(14,727)	(7,458)

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Currently, Renewal SA has one property in the Industrial and Commercial Premises Scheme that is subject to an indemnity deed. The property is located at Dalgleish Street, West Thebarton and is occupied by Hospira Adelaide Pty Ltd (formerly Bresagen Pty Ltd).

The acquisition, development and sale of the site located at OG Road, Felixtow (the former J P Morgan facility) was governed by an Indemnity Deed between the Hon Rob Lucas MLC (then Minister for Industry and Trade) and the Industrial and Commercial Premises Corporation (ICPC).

The Indemnity Deed, dated 27 November 2001 provides within Clause 2.1 as follows:

'The Minister indemnifies ICPC against all claims suffered or incurred by, or brought, made or recovered by any person against, ICPC in connection with:

1. the sale of the Land, for a price less than the Actual Cost Price and costs incurred by ICPC in selling the Land (which includes break costs incurred by ICPC from SAFA as a consequence of the sale of the Land) provided that if at the time of sale, Completion of the Works has not occurred at a price

determined in accordance with clause 3 of the Agreement to Lease as if at the date of sale Completion of the Works had occurred.'

As there was a shortfall between net sale proceeds and the loan against the property of approximately \$2.8 million, Renewal SA (as the successor to the ICPC) sought reimbursement for this shortfall from the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade in order to clear the loan balance against the property in accordance with Clause 2.1(l) of the Indemnity Deed outlined above.

RENEWAL SA, ASER SITE TRANSFER

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

In June 2013 ownership of the Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment (ASER) site was transferred from the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure to the Urban Renewal Authority (Renewal SA) by proclamation under the *Passenger Transport Act 1994*.

The ASER site includes the Adelaide Railway Station and subsidiary sites which are home to the Adelaide Casino, Adelaide Convention Centre, Exhibition Hall and car park, Intercontinental Hotel, Riverside Centre, the northern and southern car parks and common areas and shared facilities.

The ASER site does not include the Festival Plaza or Adelaide Festival Centre car park.

The ASER site does include land which is under consideration by the Adelaide Casino for construction on as part of the Casino upgrade works. The upgrade works may extend past land situated within the ASER site.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Incitec Pivot has been offered approximately 10 hectares of land immediately east of Renewal SA's East Grand Trunkway Project.

Renewal SA have advised the possible sale of this land is contained within their forward estimates.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Renewal SA's net debt balance across the forward estimates is outlined in the following table:

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Cash	20,333	14,042	25,570	29,349	34,222
Mortgage debtors receivable (Industrial & Commercial Premises Scheme)	21,811	15,036	8,639	1,788	0
Cash & Cash Equivalents	42,144	29,078	34,209	31,137	34,222
Current borrowings	(56,706)	(56,073)	(56,472)	(52,122)	(50,618)
Non-current borrowings	(410,822)	(454,236)	(470,827)	(451,442)	(461,965)
Gross Debt	(467,528)	(510,309)	(527,299)	(503,564)	(512,583)
Net Debt	(425,384)	(481,231)	(493,090)	(472,427)	(478,361)

Projects that significantly impact the net debt balance include Tonsley and Bowden. Both projects have forecast significant capital development (cash outflows) within the forward estimates with sales (cash inflows) forecast later in the project life cycle and beyond the forward estimates.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

There were two deferred commercial property sales from 2013-14:

1. Optus Building, which reduced the 2013-14 dividend by \$10.860 million. This sale was deferred to 2017-18 which is when the current lease option is due to expire.
2. New Castalloy Building, which reduced the 2013-14 dividend by \$3.400 million. This sale was deferred beyond the forward estimates following new arrangements with the current tenant to extend the lease.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Renewal SA has sold one property in the past two years that was subject to an indemnity deed. The sale occurred in 2013 and the property was the former AWD Building (previously the J P Morgan facility) located at OG Road, Felixstow.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Renewal SA sold a total of 166 hectares of land over the past 3 years.

Current sales forecasts for the each year in the forward estimates are as follows:

- 2014-15 – 228 hectares
- 2015-16 – 76 hectares
- 2016-17 – 79 hectares
- 2017-18 – 94 hectares.

RENEWAL SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

Since the appointment of John Hanlon as Chief Executive of Renewal SA on 21 July 2014, Renewal SA has responsibility for negotiations related to the development of the car park at the Festival Centre which involves Sky City Casino and the Walker Corporation.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been advised of the following:

Ministerial appointments as at 30 June 2014 were as follows:

Title	TEC (\$)
Ministerial Adviser	113,245
Ministerial Adviser	113,245
Ministerial Adviser	113,245
Ministerial Adviser	113,245
Ministerial Adviser	136,875
Chief of Staff	165,507

Non Ministerial appointments as at 30 June 2014 were as follows:

Title	TEC (\$)
Receptionist	29,018
Correspondence Clerk	51,670
Records Officer	60,177
Ministerial Support Officer	64,433
Ministerial Liaison Officer—Planning & HUD	97,230
Ministerial Liaison Officer—SafeWork SA	82,336
Ministerial Liaison Officer—WorkCover SA	103,150
Redeployment	71,951
Cabinet Officer	71,951
Personal Assistant to Chief of Staff	71,951
Personal Assistant to Deputy Premier	76,698
Senior Officer	85,173
Senior Parliamentary Officer	91,577
Manager, Office of the Deputy Premier	114,914
Senior Legal Officer	121,111

VIBRANT CITY INITIATIVE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (17 July 2014). (Estimates Committee A) (First Session)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform): I have been provided the following advice:

- I am advised that in July 2013, approval was given for the Riverbank Precinct Coordination (Events and Activation) project which comprised of coordination of precinct events and activities as well as a demonstration project known as the Blue Hive.
- The project was led by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI), in partnership with South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) and Precinct Partners.

Experience Riverbank

- I am advised the partnership successfully delivered a suite of community events and activities from 1 December 2013 to 31 March 2014, known as the Experience Riverbank Program, which included the temporary opening of the Riverbank Bridge and coincided with the Ashes Cricket Test Match.

Blue Hive – Demonstration Project

In addition to the Experience Riverbank Program, DPTI commissioned a demonstration project in the public realm. Known as the Blue Hive, the temporary installation demonstrated how the underutilised space could be transformed into an active space showcasing opportunities for both business and the community.

- The Blue Hive has capitalised on increased activity along the Riverbank the installation is host to a range of social, commercial and cultural opportunities for activation within the precinct. I am advised this has led to (as at June 30 2014):
 - 25 events

- 115 stall holders—consisting of South Australian small businesses, wineries, entertainers and community groups
- Approximately 18,000 visitors to events held within the space.
- I am advised one such event was the Sunday Sessions. A series of events held over six (6) consecutive Sunday's from 19 January 2014 to 23 February 2014, which showcased premium South Australian food and wine.
- The costs associated with the Sunday Sessions, I am advised totalled \$69,000 which consisted of event management, communications and marketing, temporary infrastructure (furniture, toilets and waste management), security associated to Liquor Licensing, and entertainment. Please refer to the Attachment for a complete list and associated details for each of the Sunday Sessions held at the Blue Hive.

Attachment : Summary of Blue Hive Activation Events and Program (December 2013 to July 2014)

Event Activity	Date	Partners	Description	Attendance
Sunday Sessions on the Riverbank at the Blue Hive.	Sundays, 19 January to 23 February	Adelaide Festival Centre InterContinental Adelaide Adelaide Convention Centre Adelaide Food and Wine Festival Adelaide wineries and restaurants Wine makers without borders Feast Fine Foods Say Cheese Yelp	Family Friendly Themed Food and Wine Events	955
	19 January 11am-5pm		GIANT BIBIMBAP Korean Cuisine: Chef Chung Jae (MAPO) cooked signature Korean rice dish. Wineries: Ducks in a Row Pewsey Vale Vineyard Hill-Smith estate 3 Dark Horses Heggies Vineyard Adelaide Hills Cider Music: Sons of Fuzz DJ's	175 (approx)
	January 26 11am-10pm		GREAT AUSSIE BBQ Aussie Cook-Up: Richard Gunner cooking BBQ. Wineries: Oliver's Taranga Ducks in a Row McLaren Vale Brewing Co Adelaide Hills Cider Music: Sons of Fuzz DJ's	150 (approx)
	February 2 11am-5pm		PAELLA PARTY Spanish Cuisine: Paella and Sangria—El Choto (food) Wineries: Fox Gordon Black Bishop	150 (approx)

Event Activity	Date	Partners	Description	Attendance
			La Curio 3 Dark Horses La Linea Gulf Brewery Music: Sons of Fuzz DJ's	
	February 9 11am-5pm		MEATBALL MELANGE Aussie Cuisine: Meatballs by Delectables Breweries: McLaren Vale Brewing Co Swell Brewing Co Gulf Brewery Barossa Valley Brewing, Mismatch Brewing & Prancing Pony. Music: Sons of Fuzz DJ's	200 (approx)

Event Activity	Date	Partners	Description	Attendance
	February 16 11am-5pm		IT'S CLASSIC Cheese, Local Wines, Beer & Cider Food: Say Cheese Wineries: Fox Gordon 3 Dark Horses Breweries: Gulf Brewery, Barossa Valley Brewing Music: Sons of Fuzz DJ's	180 (approx)
	February 23 11am-5pm		VERMENTINO & SARDINES—Chef David Swain (FINO) Wines: Serafino, Fox Creek, Oliver's Taranga Ducks in a Row Salena Estate 919 Black Bishop Angove YalumbaVigna Bottin Chalmers Bellwether Seppeltsfield Mitolo Adelaide Hills CiderMismatch Brewing Music: Sons of Fuzz DJ's	250 (approx)

Blue Hive Event Participants December 2013–March 2014

SUNDAY SESSIONS 19 January 2013 to 23 February 2014			
Wineries, brewers, drinks vendors			
Ducks in a Row	Pewsey Vale Vineyard	Hill-Smith Estate	3 Dark Horses
Heggies Vineyard	Adelaide Hills Cider	Oliver's Taranga	McLaren Vale Brewing Co.
Fox Gordon	Fox Creek	Black Bishop	La Linea
Gulf Brewery	La Curio	Swell Brewing Co	Barossa Valley Brewing
Mismatch Brewing	Prancing Pony	Serafino	Salena Estate
919	Angove Wines	Yalumba	Vigna Bottin
Chalmers	Bellwether	Seppeltsfield	Mitolo
Intercontinental			
Food Vendors			

SUNDAY SESSIONS 19 January 2013 to 23 February 2014			
Mapo	Feast! Fine Foods	El Choto	Delectaballs
Say Cheese	Fino		
Coffee and Drinks			
Adelaide Centre	Convention	InterContinental	