HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 13 October 2015

Parliamentary Procedure

SPEAKER, ABSENCE

The CLERK: I inform the house of the absence of the Speaker. Pursuant to standing order 17, the Deputy Speaker is to take the chair.

At 11:00 the Deputy Speaker took the chair and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON JUMPS RACING

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (11:01): By leave, I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge in the gallery today students from Tanunda Primary School, who are guests of the member for Schubert. We welcome you back. We know you are very glad to be back at school, and we hope you enjoy your time with us here in parliament today.

Bills

LONG SERVICE LEAVE (CALCULATION OF AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 September 2015.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:02): For the benefit of those in the gallery, I have said before that I normally sit in the place back there; I am the lead speaker on this bill, so I get to sit up the front.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You could let me explain that, if you really needed to explain it. This is actually parliament.

Mr KNOLL: Sorry, Deputy Speaker; thank you. I point out that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. The Long Service Leave (Calculation of Average Weekly Earnings) Amendment Bill 2015 seeks to correct a problem that arose out of the Flinders Ports Pty Ltd v Woolford case, where a worker was injured for three years prior to being terminated but, in the calculation of the termination payment for that worker's long service leave entitlement as part of their severance package, because the person was on workers compensation for the three years prior, the sum, under the act, and the calculation that goes with it were negligible; therefore, this worker was denied what they otherwise would have been given, that is, a proper long service leave payment.

On the face of it, this bill corrects that, and we are quite happy to say that we are going to support it. I want to point out that, in the case we are talking about, Flinders Ports Pty Ltd v Woolford, as part of Justice Stanley's conclusion, he stated that the worker:

> …was entitled to a payment in lieu of long service leave upon the termination of his employment on 23 September 2011. However, in the unusual circumstances that obtain in this case, where the deceased did not work for almost all of the three years immediately preceding his entitlement to payment in lieu of long service leave arising, the calculation of that entitlement pursuant to s 3(2) is in a negligible sum. This is an unfortunate result. I consider it deserves the attention of the Parliament.

So, the judge considers it; the parliament takes action—and it is wonderful that our democracy is working in this way.

Long service leave, in a much broader sense, is a very important provision, and something that I think is universally understood to be a good thing. Long service leave gives the opportunity for workers to take longer restorative breaks after showing long periods of loyalty and good service to the companies they work for.

Long service leave is something that I am sure, in the heady industrial days, was fought long and hard for. But it is interesting that in a modern working environment, where workers are much more willing and able to move between jobs—we have a much more transient workforce and a more casual and part-time workforce—the provision of long service leave is quite evidently not as prevalent as it was before and so the ability for workers to take advantage of longer restorative breaks is less and less.

When long service leave was originally envisaged, it was very much around the idea that people would work for the same business for their entire lifetime. Quite clearly, these days that is not the case. Another thing that I suppose changes the use of the Long Service Leave Act 1987 is the fact that since the award harmonisation process of 2010 a lot more workers were then covered under federal awards, and those federal awards were simplified. Therefore, the use of this act is quite limited.

Interestingly, long service leave is something that came up in the newspaper only recently, due to the good work of Rob Lucas in the other place. It has been uncovered that many public servants are not taking their annual leave and accruing huge sums of money and a huge number of annual leave days. The reason that is not necessarily desirable is that every time a worker gets a pay rise those annual leave or long service leave days get more and more valuable.

The payment of that money is indexed, so people accrue days and not a total value. So we see, for instance, an example where an employee within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is owed 468 days of long service leave, currently valued at $521,000. That is a huge sum of money, and if this is allowed to continue it will end up costing taxpayers even more money.

This comes with a backdrop that governmental and departmental policy states that employees are supposed to take annual leave when it is accrued, up to only two years' worth of annual leave (so, if we are talking about 20 days per year, that is 40 days). But we see instances where workers have accrued up to five years' worth of annual leave entitlements, and this has been allowed by the public sector. Given that only four out of the 14 departments gave the information to the Hon. Rob Lucas, this appears to be a problem that is probably a lot more widespread than is otherwise being portrayed in the media.

I will have some questions to go through committee. In the diligence of being lead speaker on this bill, I went through and looked at the second reading speech brought down by the Attorney (the member for Enfield). Can I tell you that he caused me hours of pain because it was really hard to look for section 3(4)(a) and (b) within the Long Service Leave Act as it does not exist. I searched long and hard through hundreds of pages of legislation only to realise that there is no such thing as section 3(4). That is okay; I will tease out those issues with the Attorney and hope that it is only an oversight or slip of the tongue. It was part of the speech he read into *Hansard* as opposed to seeking leave to insert the rest of his remarks so, hopefully, that is a small issue which we can tease out. That said, the opposition is happy to support this bill and we look forward to the committee stage.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:09): I also speak in favour of the Long Service Leave (Calculation of Average Weekly Earnings) Amendment Bill 2015. As we have heard this morning, it was

introduced by the Deputy Premier on 9 September 2015. The bill seeks to amend the Long Service Leave Act 1987, and it has been drafted in response to a very significant Supreme Court appeal case heard in January of this year, that is, Flinders Ports Pty Ltd and Woolford.

Justice Stanley made a number of comments in his judgement. I have had the pleasure of having a little bit to do with Justice Stanley in the past, and he is an outstanding legal mind and an outstanding advocate as a solicitor as well. I know that he is an expert in this area of law and extremely well qualified to comment.

I implore the Attorney-General to not only listen to Justice Stanley's comments but also listen to some of the other judges who have, in recent times, made judgements and called on the parliament to bring into law their suggestions. The most brilliant legal mind in South Australia would have to be the Chief Justice, Chris Kourakis, who, in recent times, has made a suggestion to this parliament that the parliament correct part of the drug trafficking laws in this state. The Attorney has ignored the most outstanding legal mind and his suggestion—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. Minister.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Be seated for a point of order.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The tribute presently being offered to the Chief Justice by the member for Hartley is indeed touching, and if we were having a valedictory or something for him, I think it would be entirely appropriate, but considering the fact that we are not talking about either the Chief Justice or anything to do with drugs—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Your point of order is relevance?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Mr TARZIA: Thank you, Deputy Speaker.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

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

Mr GARDNER: I make the point that the Attorney's point of order is mischievous because clearly the member for Hartley's comments about the Chief Justice go to the merits of the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think that we will dispense with all the extra noise and return to the substance of the bill.

Mr TARZIA: I will say, Deputy Speaker, that when the Attorney does become a judge, I will have nice things to say about him too.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: Getting back to this bill, the bill does seek to amend the Long Service Leave Act 1937, and it has been drafted in response to a landmark court case, as I have said. It was a decision related to a casual worker at Port Lincoln who had worked on a number of contracts, I believe, from about 1990 until 2008. From 2008 to 2011, when his employment was formally terminated, that worker was unable to work, due mainly to the work-related injury he had sustained. Justice Stanley, in his conclusion, goes on to say at paragraph 115, that he was of the view that the deceased:

> …was entitled to a payment in lieu of long service leave upon the termination of his employment on 23 September 2011. However, in the unusual circumstances that obtain in this case, where the deceased did not work for almost all of the three years immediately preceding his entitlement to payment in lieu of long service leave arising, the calculation of that entitlement pursuant to section 3(2) is in a negligible sum. This is an unfortunate result. I consider it deserves the attention of the Parliament.

He went on to allow the appeal to set aside the order made by the Industrial Court magistrate and to remit the matter to the Industrial Court magistrate for the purposes of making an order, after calculating the entitlement to payment in lieu of long service leave, in conformity with the reasons that he had given.

As my colleague has pointed out, payments under the Long Service Leave Act are based on an average calculation of the worker's last three years of employment. In this case, due to the injury sustained, as we have heard, that earning capacity was not much at all because of the injury he had sustained. The bill seeks to clarify these aspects and to confirm the principle that part-time and casual workers should not be treated differently from full-time workers, who do not have their long service leave payment impacted as a result of workers compensation. Obviously the government is arguing that if a casual or part-time employee is entitled to long service leave payments they should not end up with a zero minimal payment because they were injured while performing their work.

The government has also claimed, I believe in a briefing to members on this side of the house, that the bill has been supported by IRAC, and obviously that organisation includes not only employers but also employee organisations. I understand that also we have had verbal confirmation supporting the bill by an array of organisations, including the Master Builders Association, the Australian Hotels Association and the Law Society of South Australia.

Obviously some organisations have flagged to us that this could potentially be another burden, hindrance and cost to business, however, I would say to them that on balance in this instance I think we do need to do what is right and stick with the judgement of the Full Court of the Supreme Court and the bill that the government has put before us. I think it is a common-sense bill; and, once again, I would implore the government to listen to the Supreme Court on more occasions, and I support the bill.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (11:16): Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker, and can I thank the contributions from the two members who have spoken. I appreciate the member for Hartley's support for the bill; and, if I can get a copy of *Hansard* from today and he would not mind autographing it, I will send it around to the Chief Justice and I am sure that it will find pride of place on his wall.

The member for Schubert raised a matter of being sent on something of a wild goose chase. I think that I might be able to help him, and I am sure that if I am not helping him he will advise me in committee. The reference in the second reading remarks to section 3(4)(a) was a reference to the primary act as opposed to the amending act. Section 3 of the Long Service Leave Act is headed 'Interpretation', and subsection (1) of that includes a definition of a bunch of words. Subsection (2) of that deals with ordinary weeks rate of pay. Subsection (3) deals with 'Employers are related for the purposes of this Act if', and then subsection (4) states:

> For the purpose of averaging weekly earnings under subsection (2)(a) or the number of hours worked per week under subsection (2)(b)—
>
> (a) any week when the relevant worker was on unpaid leave for the whole of the week will be disregarded; and

Now, that is the particular passage to which the second reading speech was referring those who were following it. I do not know whether that is helpful or not helpful, but that is basically where we were going. I have to say, too, that I do appreciate the fact that the opposition is supporting this bill. I think that any person, as both the speakers for the opposition said, who looks at the practicality of this would agree that this was clearly an unintended gap or omission in the scheme, and it clearly does constitute an unfairness which the parliament should remedy.

As I said, I do greatly appreciate the fact that the opposition has come to a similar conclusion and I look forward to its support of the passage of the bill both through this place and, perhaps, the sometimes more tempestuous passage through the other place.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr KNOLL: This is a little bit more broad and something I am trying to cover. The application of this award is only for those workers on state awards—that is correct?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that, in practice, what happens is that the state Long Service Leave Act in one way or another applies to most workers in the state. It does not, however, apply to commonwealth public servants and suchlike who have a commonwealth instrument, which is slightly different, which governs their arrangements. This is the general standard in terms of people employed irrespective of whether they are on a federal award or not.

Mr KNOLL: Can I seek some further clarification? I understand, especially after award harmonisation, at a state level there is a general provision that we have seven and 10-year pro rata and then full entitlement, but a lot of federal awards have a 10 year and 15-year provision. I also understand that federal and state awards generally differ where a federal award does not confer that right upon casual employees, whereas this state award does extend that to people under state awards.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is a very interesting point that the member raises. I will deal with the easy bit of it first. As I am understanding the advice I have received, since the modernisation of the awards in 2010, none of those federal awards continue to contain their own internal long service leave provisions. There are, however, people who have a hangover entitlement from pre-existing federal arrangements. That then gets us into the very interesting world of the inconsistency of commonwealth and state arrangements, and that is a university course on section 109 of the constitution of the commonwealth.

The gist of it is that, for current purposes going forward, the federal awards do not have their own self-contained long service leave provisions and therefore there is no conflict. It also is the case that the direct application of the federal long service leave laws is only to federal public servants, and so all we are left with, as I am advised, is a residual group of people who would have been in federal award conditions with their own internal long service leave arrangements who continue to be employed and continue to be entitled to the accruals under what was the former arrangement.

Mr KNOLL: My third question on this I will put in two parts, if that is alright. After 2010, we expect that the provision for casual employees has now been widened, where it was not an automatic entitlement for those under federal awards. It now is an entitlement under federal awards. Does anything in this bill confer new long service leave entitlements on any employee? Is there anything in the changes that we are enacting?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No—again, good point. This amendment is not intended to increase the scope or the capture of this piece of legislation. What it is intended to do is to say, for those people who are captured by this legislation, in the event of them being off in the same circumstances as the applicant in those proceedings, they will not be in a position where the time does not count for them. That is all it is doing. This is deliberately intended to do only what was necessary to rectify the defect that was identified by Justice Stanley in that case.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 4), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (11:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 September 2015.)

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:27): I indicate that I will be the lead speaker on this piece of legislation as well. The bill was introduced by the Deputy Premier on 9 September 2015 and seeks to, essentially, take three committees—the Industrial Relations Advisory Council, the SafeWork SA Advisory Council, and the Asbestos Advisory Council—and bring them together as one body. Obviously, there are provisions under the Fair Work Act and the Work Health and Safety Act that need to be changed in order to achieve this.

I can understand from the government's point of view that there is duplication around these three committees, although again there are some questions I would like to tease out in the committee stage of this bill in order to make sure that all three of these areas, which have their own distinctions, are captured in the new committee, because industrial relations is not the same thing as work health and safety, is not the same thing as asbestos, which is quite a specific issue. However, I do appreciate the fact that the committee has not met for nearly a year due to the reform process.

In terms of stakeholder engagement, we received some feedback and certainly the AHA and the MBA (Master Builders Association) verbally stated that they supported the bill. We had one stakeholder in SAWIA (South Australian Wine Industry Association) that expressed some concerns, especially around what they see are two different skill sets required. Again, I talk about the difference between industrial relations and work health and safety which are two very distinct fields. Having been involved with them, I can understand what he means by that, and also about the government's ability to find people who have expertise across both areas.

I would assume that the Attorney-General, who will sit as the chair of this committee, will want to make sure that his mind is challenged by minds of a similar stature in order for there to be lively debate leading to the best outcomes; he is going to want the best people sitting around him. There will obviously be a need to ensure that people can fulfil the requirements and have knowledge in all of those areas as opposed to just having a smaller number of specialists in each.

The other thing we would like to say is that not often enough in this place are we debating ways to reduce the size of government, so double thumbs-up to the Attorney on this one. Whenever I talk to my constituents they ask, 'How often do you sit?' I say, 'We sit about 15 weeks a year.' I think it's about 47 days—interestingly, the same number of MPs, and it has been suggested that journalists have one free lunch from each MP per day.

What I go back and say to my constituents is, 'You do not want us sitting any more than we absolutely have to, because in this place the vast majority of the time we are finding new and ever-increasing ways to take away the freedoms and liberties of the people of South Australia.' Happily, this bill is a very small measure away to reverse in the other direction.

I implore the Attorney, and the Labor government more generally, to find more and more ways to reduce the size of government. If you were to bring back some idea about shrinking the size of cabinet I am sure we can get around that, and shrinking the size of government as a whole, I am sure we can come together on those things. I am happy to say that the Liberal Party will be supporting this bill. There are a few questions that I want to tease out just to make sure that we are doing the right thing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you want to tease those questions out now so that by the time we get into committee we can have the answers for you?

Mr KNOLL: Maybe.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's what we really should do.

Mr KNOLL: Should we? If I sit down and we go into committee we can do the same thing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In fact the Clerk and I were discussing a bit earlier that we have allowed latitude on this. The questions have to be relevant to the clauses rather than the general

sweep we have been having. It is probably best to raise the general sweep in your second reading speech.

Mr KNOLL: Happy to sweep. In fact I think it is something that happens a lot more often in the other place, not that we should otherwise do what they do but—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are just trying to make it fair for everybody and every bill.

Mr KNOLL: I take the Deputy Speaker's point on this. The questions I want to ask are:

- How much money will be saved with the merging of these three committees?
- Are there any transition costs that we will have to deal with?
- We have an outline of what the current three bodies are being paid: does the minister have an understanding of what the new total cost will be—there is provision for payment of this committee in this bill—and whether the government has come to a conclusion on that?

I also have questions around the different skill sets and how the government is prepared to cover off on all of them, especially when the objectives of the new industrial relations consultative council do not make specific reference to asbestos, so how will that be covered as part of it?

I also want to understand the process. Obviously there are a number of members: there are 13 members on the Industrial Relations Advisory Council, 11 members on the SafeWork SA Advisory Council and then 13 on the Asbestos Advisory Committee and they are obviously going to be merged. I understand it is the minister plus 12, so potentially we have up to 37 people. How are they going to be shrunk into 12? Perhaps it is not 37, because I assume the minister is one of them. How is that process going to work?

The government obviously went through a huge piece of work reforming boards and committees and I seem to remember that it was large omnibus-looking bill that sought to get rid of quite a number of boards and committees. It seems that that could or would or should have been the opportune time to deal with this. I want to understand why there was the delay, given that we have gone through that piece of work. Indeed, these committees were obviously under consideration as part of the process because they have not met because of the process. I am keen to understand those things as well. With that, Deputy Speaker, I will conclude.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (11:34): I will attempt between now and a little later to find some information about savings. I do not have exact numbers but I am looking at some people who appear to me to have numbers on the very edge of their fingertips, and in the twinkling of an eye, I will be able to come back to that particular topic. Goodness me—here we are!

The total savings from the consolidation of the three committees, I am advised, is estimated at $133,238. The members will be paid a sessional fee of $206 per four-hour session. There will be 12 members entitled to fees. Does that mean the chair does not get paid fees? That is an oversight. If there are four meetings held per year, the cost of the committee would be similar to the cost of IRAC; therefore the IRAC fees have not been calculated in the calculation of the abovementioned cost savings.

The breakdown of the fees are that SWSAAC members are entitled to an annual sitting fee of $12,383, the chair of that committee is entitled to an annual sitting fee of—I see. The SafeWork advisory and the asbestos advisory committees have been stuck together. The annual sitting fee, as I said, is $12,383. The chair is entitled to a sitting fee of $18,574 plus a retainer of $10,000. There are nine members who are entitled to fees. The total cost of fees for those members is $127,638.

The asbestos advisory chair was entitled to an annual sitting fee of $5,600. There were no other fees paid to the advisory committee. IRAC members are entitled to a sessional fee of $206 for a four-hour session, with 12 members entitled to that fee. The budget allocation for fees is $9,888. SafeWork will utilise current FTEs to provide support to the industrial relations consultative committee. That is the issue as to costs.

As to the use of these committees, in my period as industrial relations minister, I have taken the view that these committees were initially a little bit unwieldy—two in particular—and it was not always clear that an issue fell cleanly within the province of one or the other, so there was an element of duplication. I actually raised with the bodies themselves that I was thinking of doing this and trying to consolidate them, so that we would have more of a one-stop shop for policy advice.

My view is that, rather than my convening meetings for the sake of convening meetings, I should only convene the meetings where I think there is a piece of work to be done—otherwise, I am just wasting everybody's time in preparing for a meeting that is just going through the motions, so to speak—so I would expect that the meeting calendar of this group would be relatively irregular. That is not to say that they might not go through a period of quite a bit of activity for some particular reason, but I do not necessarily think it is going to be regularly chewing through a lot of work.

The other question was about skill sets. The predecessor committees have always had the flavour of the old industrial relations club about them. They are a group who are largely the nominees, if you like, of employer organisations and another group who are largely nominees of employee organisations. Whilst I will obviously be trying to fit out the group with the best possible people, I will be, in significant measure, relying on those respective groups to offer me candidates.

On a matter that is completely by the way, can I say that I personally do not consider myself a large fan of representative boards. In fact, I spent some time and effort to make sure that the board of ReturnToWorkSA was transformed from a representative board to a commercial board, but given that has a different function to this, which is actually a policy advisory group, I accept the fact that having some sort of broadly representative constituency is not inappropriate. So, it will be largely dependent on the primary representatives of employer and employee organisations to help me in finding suitably qualified people.

As to the question of asbestos, it is true asbestos is a very particular issue and there are other groups that have a total focus on asbestos to which I can speak, so that is fine. I think it is also important that asbestos is on the agenda for the broader representation of employers and employees because asbestos is a terribly broadly spread and long-term issue which should be in the mainstream of conversation about workplace safety and not just confined to some little cul-de-sac somewhere.

One of the questions that was asked of me by the member for Schubert was: why was this not a part of the bigger bill that occurred earlier? I have an answer here that I prepared earlier which I might share with you all. On 8 July 2014, the Premier wrote to the chair of all boards and committees to advise of his reform program. The reform of the government's 429 boards and committees intended to abolish those that were no longer necessary and reform existing boards to create efficiencies and so forth.

The Premier's final report, released in October 2015, outlining the government's proposed approach, listed the SafeWork SA Advisory Council, the IR Advisory Committee and the Asbestos Advisory Committee as needing further investigation at that stage. To deliver the outcomes identified in the report the Statutes Amendment (Boards and Committees—Abolition and Reform) Bill was introduced on 11 November of last year. It was not possible at that stage to include provisions to establish the industrial relations consultative council in the Premier's bill as development of a discussion paper and a draft model was still underway at that time. I did think it was important for me to speak to the players at some length about this, even though I was reasonably confident of where we would ultimately land.

On 23 December of last year, I provided the discussion paper to the presiding member of each of these bodies proposing that this new committee replace them. Another thought has just occurred to me: how will the government ensure there is no loss of functions?

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Indeed. I am glad you asked that question. This committee will streamline consultation and advisory functions, providing one key body to provide high level advice to the Minister for Industrial Relations to facilitate the effective and efficient administration of laws covering safe and fair workplaces.

In addition, the committee will have the ability to establish a subcommittee to deal with a specific issue and invite members from other organisations with relevant knowledge and expertise to join the subcommittee. If an issue arises that requires specific attention and is requested by four or more members, I will be required to convene a meeting. So, it is a sort of two-way street. Either I can actually initiate one of these meetings or they can be initiated, in effect, by a quorum of the membership. I think that is all helpful information and I have a sense that I am about to tell the parliament something else.

Mr Knoll: Would you like to talk about: are you going to sack all the people and then start again, or is there going to be a merging?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As far as I am concerned, what will happen is these boards will be dissolved and then I will make an approach to the employer and employee organisations inviting them to provide me with some suggestions as to how we go about this in the future.

I have some information that I would like to share with you all, which arguably is relevant. I will give you an example, and that is the Asbestos Advisory Committee. The membership of that committee—and I am not sure if it is necessary to go through all of the names—the organisations involved are: the Master Builders Association, the Property Council of Australia, the Environment Protection Authority, SafeWork SA, an appointee of the minister, McMahon Services, local government, the Department for Health and Ageing, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, SA Unions and the Metropolitan Fire Service. There is an array of employer and employee groups represented there, and I think that is the sort of thing that we could expect to see.

So as not to detain members too far on this, if the honourable member wants full details of all of the current members of all of these committees, I am happy to provide that. I do not know that it is necessary for me to read it into *Hansard,* but I am very happy to provide that afterwards.

This change represents, I think, a sensible resolution of what were probably a series of committees that had evolved over time without due regard to the juxtaposition of other committees which were playing in similar space. I think this is a rational and constructive change. It should be the case that any minister for industrial relations, whether it is me or anybody else, should be in a position where they can convene, if necessary, a representative forum of people who can provide advice or counsel or a sounding board for issues that might be going forward. Whilst I have not found it necessary to do that using any of the formal bodies so much so far, one can never say what issues might arise in the future, so I think this is a useful change.

I do appreciate the positive remarks from the member for Schubert. Like him, I share the notion that, where possible, we should be trying to remove red tape and replication in government. It is often a great source of confusion to business and to members of the public, and there are many areas where I have been attempting in various portfolio responsibilities to eliminate some of that duplication and complexity in order to make it easier for people to do business. Planning, for example, is another area where I think there is an enormous opportunity for that red tape and complexity to be stripped out of the system to make things easier for ordinary citizens to go about their business without having to endure some bureaucratic nightmare.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (11:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (SIMPLE POSSESSION OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 September 2015.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (11:49): I rise today to speak in favour of the Controlled Substances (Simple Possession Offences) Amendment Bill. Obviously, drugs are a scourge on our society and we need to be doing everything we can to relieve our society from the dangers associated with people who are on drugs, taking drugs, caught up in drugs, etc.

This bill will stop a person charged with a serious drug offence from also being diverted under the PDDI scheme for a simple possession offence that has happened at the same time. I must give credit to the writers of the bill. It is a very sensible bill. I also note in supporting the position that our bill of the same nature could also be spoken about down the track on this issue. The member for Taylor, in her second reading contribution on the bill, on 13 November said:

> While the government supports the diversion scheme and opposes the bill, we agree that something does need to be done to deal with people who are clearly abusing the system. For this reason, the government is exploring an alternative proposal involving the use of undertakings.

While this bill is actually minor and somewhat technical, I understand that the government has advised that DASSA has undertaken internal policy changes to the way the assessments are made to enable a tighter and strict treatment of simple possession offenders who offend on multiple occasions within a certain period of time. I understand that stakeholders have been consulted in relation to this bill and that it is has been approved and supported by relevant stakeholders in the area.

At the moment, if someone is charged with, say, serious drug offences, such as manufacturing, but they also happen to have a personal quantity about themselves, this is an example where they might be caught up in the drug diversion process in addition to their serious charges. This can result in overlap and, given that the offenders are already being caught up in the justice system, it can be somewhat time wasting.

I want to make the point that where we can, where there are prospects of rehabilitation, we should be encouraging people affected by these sorts of offences to be rehabilitated, but at the same time, from our point of view as lawmakers, I think we also have to create deterrents and lead in this area by putting a message out to the community that we do not tolerate drugs in our society which, as I said, are a scourge in our society and impact our future generations. We want to be doing everything we can to ensure that our children grow up in a society that is as fair as possible and that our society is not affected by people taking drugs, manufacturing drugs, cultivating drugs, and the like. It is a somewhat simple law, a simple amendment bill, and I commend it to the house.

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (11:53): I also rise to speak on the Controlled Substances (Simple Possession Offences) Amendment Bill. The drug diversion initiative plays an integral role in helping people with simple possession offences. Offenders are able to address their drug habits with assistance from health professionals rather than entering the costly criminal justice system. The scheme is underpinned by a notion that personal drug use is more appropriately and effectively addressed with a health response rather than with a criminal justice response. SA Police, SA Health and non-government service providers play an important role in ensuring the effectiveness of this program. Drug diversion schemes for simple possession of illicit substances are considered a sensible policy response for first-time offenders.

I believe the proposed amendment under this bill, whilst minor, is also sensible, as echoed by the member for Hartley. This bill, which the opposition supports, would stop a person charged with a serious drug offence from also being diverted for a simple possession offence that has arisen at the same time. As it stands, someone charged with a serious drug offence—such as manufacturing or trafficking—who also happens to be carrying a personal quantity of drugs, will be caught up in the drug diversion process. A diversion under these circumstances is a waste of time, given that an offender—be it a manufacturer or a trafficker—is already caught up in the criminal justice system and is clearly an individual who is at a point in their life where a simple drug diversion program will not be of any assistance.

I believe there is also a community standard that requires those who are trafficking or manufacturing drugs to be dealt with within the criminal justice system. It is also important that those participating in the program use it for the purpose it was intended, as an education program, and as a health response and a program that educates people not to be involved in drugs and with those

peddling drugs. A drug division program should not be exploited as an unlimited, never-ending opportunity to avoid genuine punishment and justice.

A 2012 report by South Australia's Attorney-General's Department, 'Ten Years of the South Australian Police Drug Diversion Initiative', found that around one-quarter of the 13,627 individuals diverted over the course of the PDDI had been diverted more than once, 15 per cent had been diverted twice, 5 per cent had been diverted three times, and 4 per cent diverted four or more times. The maximum number of diversions that one person received was 32. That is clearly a shortcoming in the program; I suspect that an offender who has been through the program 32 times is probably not taking it seriously and should face the full force of the law.

We need to ensure that people who perpetually make the same choice, the wrong choice, are not able to repeatedly use the government's diversion program to avoid the courts and criminal convictions. It is our responsibility to ensure that the system cannot be manipulated. As the member for Stuart noted in his contribution to this debate, it is not sensible that the drug diversion system can be applied to a person an unlimited number of times, and I support the amendments previously proposed by the member for Stuart in similar proposed legislation.

Someone who has been diverted once, then twice, should not be able to divert a third time. They should go before the magistrate. That is not to say that going to court means going to gaol, but it means that there is an expectation of what society deems to be appropriate. It would be at the magistrate's discretion, and diversion would still be an option if the magistrate thought it appropriate for repeat offenders.

The bill introduced previously by the member for Stuart would have ensured a decisive approach that offenders would face a court on the third offence. It would have removed the unlimited character of the current legislation. Unfortunately, the government elected to vote against that bill but it did not offer any amendments, and the government did not make an effort to work with the opposition on the legislation. Instead, the government committed to introduce its own proposal into parliament, an alternative proposal that this government claimed would 'enable the prosecution of offenders who do not properly comply with a diversion process or who are not making genuine efforts to get off drugs', as stated by the member for Taylor in her contribution in 2014.

Despite this undertaking, the government bill before us today serves a different purpose and has, in my view, too narrow a focus. It only stops an offender charged with a serious drug offence from being diverted for a concurrent simple possession offence. It does not provide a legislative response to the ability for an offender to be diverted an unlimited number of times.

I do welcome the administrative changes implemented by Drugs and Alcohol Services SA to the procedures for the drug diversion initiative. These changes have already been detailed in the house by the member for Morialta. The essence of the changes means that a person who has been diverted under the scheme more than twice in the previous 24 months will be required to enter into an undertaking. It is a slight but worthy change; however, the government's decision to use an administrative measure does not provide any real certainty to South Australians. Administrative guidelines can be changed at any time.

I conclude by reiterating my support for the current bill, but note that I also support the view that on the third diversion the offender should face the magistrate. I will watch the application of the new administrative approach with much interest.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (11:59): I thank those who have spoken in relation to this bill. I welcome the support that has been offered. I note the member for Davenport's remarks and his quite reasonable proposition that we should keep our eye on this and see how it goes, and if it proves not to be as beneficial as we hoped then perhaps we need to revisit this at some point in the future. Can I also say that he resembles a member of the European royal family of the early part of the 20th century with his new look, and I congratulate him on that as well.

I welcome the support of the member for Hartley again. I do always feel when he starts to go through his 'drugs are bad' proposition that we are about to hear a Mr Mackey impersonation, but we never quite get that. I do say thank you very—

Mr Gardner: He's saying drugs are good.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, he says drugs are bad; you have not listened to it. Can I say again, thank you for the encouraging support from members opposite. I do hope this will make an albeit incremental but positive change in the way things are being done. I do say to members—and I know I say this particularly to the member for Morialta and others who, I believe, share this view—that to simply see drug abuse through a criminal paradigm is to largely miss the point. It is a medical issue; it is an issue which requires a little more than simply the heavy hand of incarceration or something to deal with it.

One would hope we could find a way of dealing with simple users. I am not meaning to excuse the use of illegal substances, but if we are talking about users of substance as opposed to those people who traffic in the substances and perpetuate the use of substances, then one would hope that the most humane way of dealing with those people would be to find some way of engaging with them to move them into a different space. I think all members who have spoken seem to be of that view and I think that is very positive.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WATER INDUSTRY (THIRD PARTY ACCESS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (12:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Water is our most valuable resource, fundamental to our way of life, our economy and our environment. The millennium drought in the early 2000s challenged our traditional assumptions about the security of our existing supplies and highlighted the need for a longer term strategic approach to water security in South Australia.

In particular, our traditional reliance on a guaranteed minimum volume of flow into South Australia from the River Murray, under an agreement with other Murray Darling Basin States, was found to be vulnerable under severely reduced rainfall. In essence it never occurred to the State, from a water security perspective, that there could be situations where there is just not enough water in the system to allow for a 'guaranteed' level of water.

In response to the unprecedented drought conditions, the Government developed a long term water security plan for South Australia. *Water for Good* was released in June 2009 outlining its long-term strategy and actions needed to ensure safe, secure and reliable water supplies able to sustain continued economic and population growth. *Water for Good* is based around a number of core elements:

- Diversifying water supplies;
- Improving the way we use water;
- Improving governance arrangements; and
- Modernising the water industry through a new regulatory framework.

Progress with the implementation of *Water for Good* is reported annually and this report is made public and tabled in Parliament. In the most recent annual review, there had been significant progress in implementing actions, with 30 being completed, 50 on track and only 13 experiencing some minor delays.

A strong legislative base that provides sensible regulatory arrangements for the water and wastewater services sectors is a key foundation of the Government's approach to water sector reform.

The proclamation of the *Water Industry Act 2012 (the Act),* a key action in *Water for Good*, marked a significant milestone in the Government's reform of the water industry in South Australia and marked the first major legislative reform for the water and wastewater services sector for decades. The Act provides a new legislative foundation to promote competition and drive more efficient and innovative service delivery.

The Act declared water to be a regulated industry under the *Essential Services Commission Act 2002* and appointed ESCOSA as the economic regulator and licensing authority for retail water and sewerage services in South Australia. Other significant reforms to the sector include:

- Avenues for future pricing reform;
- Streamlining of technical regulation of the sector;
- A commitment to ongoing water demand and supply planning;
- The formalisation of SA Water's customer service standards through the SA Water customer charter and the standard customer contract;
- The requirement for external reporting and monitoring of SA Water's performance and compliance;
- The introduction of formal customer consultation requirements for SA Water's future regulatory determinations; and
- Requiring audited regulatory accounts for SA Water.

In May 2013, ESCOSA released its first Revenue Determination in respect of water and sewerage retail services provided by SA Water for the 3 years to June 2016. ESCOSA also identified savings of about $300 million in SA Water's operational and capital expenditure over the three years period of the Determination. The Government subsequently reduced water prices by 6.4 per cent in the first year and limited increases to inflation in the following two years. This provided relief for consumers from the recent increases in water prices as a result of necessary investments in water security measures.

To build on these reforms and to satisfy the requirement of section 26 of the Water Industry Act, a process to establish a state based access regime was initiated with the release of a Report on Access to Water and Sewerage Infrastructure in February 2013.

An effective access regime will promote the economically efficient operation of, use of and investment in water and sewerage infrastructure and encourage greater competition in upstream and downstream markets, increase standards of service and security of supply, and provide longer-term downward pressure on prices.

The current policy framework allows SA Water to pursue opportunities, on appropriate commercial terms, arising from spare water transportation capacity within their water infrastructure (eg in the Barossa and Willunga). However, this framework does not apply on an industry wide basis, nor does it include transparent pricing and negotiation principles, disclosure requirements, and provisions for review and arbitration, if an agreement cannot be achieved. A legislated state based access regime will address these shortcomings in the current arrangements.

The Access Report set out a range of issues relating to the amendment of the Water Industry Act to provide a right to businesses to negotiate access to water and sewerage infrastructure services and invited feedback from industry participants and interested community members.

Following feedback on the Access Report, a consultation draft Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill was tabled in Parliament in September 2013 along with an accompanying explanatory memorandum.

Six submissions were received in response to the Access Report. They were from Business SA, ESCOSA, SA Water, Alano Water, the Roxby Council and Adelaide City Council. Business SA, ESCOSA and SA Water also provided submissions to the exposure draft Bill.

Based on the Access Report, and with appropriate consideration being given to the public submissions received, the *Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill 2014 (the Bill)* introduces a further major reform to the water industry. The Bill was initially introduced into Parliament on 4 December 2014 and is now being re-introduced as a result of the last Parliament being prorogued.

The Bill is the end result of a long and inclusive consultative process. Part of this consultation involved a protracted negotiation with the Commonwealth Government regarding the interaction of the proposed access arrangements and Commonwealth Water Charge Rules.

The Bill amends the Water Industry Act by inserting a new part 9A that provides a light handed negotiate/arbitrate framework for businesses to seek access to services provided by natural monopoly water infrastructure (e.g. transport services via SA Water's bulk water pipelines).

The Bill establishes access arrangements to SA Water's bulk water transport services. The Bill does not relate to retail services or bulk water resources. Given the current stage of development of the South Australian water industry, it would be premature to establish full retail competition.

The Bill amends the Water Industry Act to ensure that access seekers and infrastructure owner are not limited from negotiating commercial agreements outside of the provisions of the access regime. The Bill, as a safety net, confers rights on the access seeker in relation to negotiating access and imposing obligations on the infrastructure owner when the access seeker exercises those rights.

The Bill appoints ESCOSA as the regulator of a state based access regime for water. ESCOSA will be required to adopt a light handed regime of monitoring and enforcing compliance with the access regime. ESCOSA will be required to report to the Minister each year about the work carried out by the regulator under the access regime.

The adoption of a light handed regime that facilitates commercial negotiation and arbitration in a low cost manner is considered appropriate in an environment where access negotiations are likely to be infrequent and specific to the needs of the access seeker. This approach has been adopted in South Australia's certified legislative access regimes for railways (set out in the *Railways (Operations and Access) Act 1997)* and port services (set out in the *Maritime Services Act 2000).*

In an environment where access negotiations are likely to be frequent and the needs of the access seekers are common, then an access regime that involves prior determination and approval of access terms and conditions and associated prices is likely to be more cost effective for facility owner and the access seekers. This approach has been adopted for industries that have been vertically separated and subject to substantial economic reform, including the gas and electricity industries, where there is full retail contestability.

While important economic reforms to the water industry have been made in South Australia through the Water Industry Act, the water industry is not at the same stage of reform as the energy sector and such a heavy-handed approach cannot be justified. Interstate and international evidence shows that a gradual transition approach is more appropriate for introducing third party access regimes in an attempt to avoid unintended adverse outcomes and minimise potential costs to industry and general public.

The key to a well-balanced access regime is to promote greater competition while not disadvantaging SA Water customers broadly by, for example, facilitating private providers gaining access to infrastructure in the low-cost/high-revenue sections of the network, leaving SA Water's customers to bear the full costs of the high-cost/low-revenue sections.

The scope of the access regime established by the Bill includes all water infrastructure services that comply with clause 6(3)(a)(1) and (2) of the Competition Principles Agreement (CPA) and are significant to the South Australian economy. At this stage this would include SA Water's bulk water transport services. The access regime may apply to other services, such as water storages and treatment plants, to the extent that they are integral to the operation of the infrastructure services for which access is being sought (e.g. the transport services cannot be provided without passing through the water treatment plant).

The CPA requires that: *wherever possible third party access to a service provided by means of a facility should be on the basis of terms and conditions agreed between the owner of the facility and the person seeking access*. That is, to the extent possible, governments should avoid intervening in commercial negotiations between providers and access seekers.

The amended Water Industry Act will establish that nothing in the proposed legislation prevents a regulated operator from entering into an access contract with another person on terms and conditions agreed between the parties.

Water and sewerage infrastructure owned by water industry entities regulated under the Water Industry Act range from critical pipelines serving hundreds of thousands of people to local distribution networks serving less than one hundred. While the scope of the access regime should be broad in order to have consistent regulation across the South Australian water industry, it is not considered appropriate for the regime to be fully applied to all water infrastructure services.

The state based access regime will not be applied to community facilities, such as community waste management schemes and small water distribution systems, which are relatively small in scale and are unlikely to facilitate competition in dependent markets. Thus, it is considered that they do not meet the requirement of the CPA that the infrastructure be significant. Applying a formal third party access regime to these infrastructures would impose unnecessary costs and excessive administrative burdens on the owners of the infrastructure without any appreciable benefits being realised.

There is a range of water and sewerage infrastructure that does not easily fit into either of the categories described above (full application and not applied). Only some sections of Part 9A of the amended Water Industry Act relating to basic information requirements and reporting would apply to this infrastructure.

Over time, the significance of some infrastructure may increase and may then warrant full application of a state based access regime. But, at this stage the cost to the infrastructure service provider of complying with a state based access regime may not be justifiable.

The infrastructure operator will be required to provide information about access seekers to the regulator, and as part of its report to the Minister, ESCOSA will report on whether the access regime in relation to specific pieces of water or sewerage infrastructure should be extended.

ESCOSA will also be required to review the access regime established under Part 9A to ascertain whether the access regime should continue to apply to particular water infrastructure services in South Australia. ESCOSA will be required to conduct the review by 30 June 2019 and every five years thereafter. The report would be provided to the Minister and tabled in Parliament.

In an effective access regime, the right to negotiate will be supported by provisions to enforce that right. The Bill provides the access seeker the right to trigger an access dispute and commence binding arbitration after the regulator has first sought to resolve the dispute through conciliation.

The arbitrator will be appointed by ESCOSA and the decision of the arbitrator will be enforceable as if it were a contract between the parties.

South Australia is well placed in relation to its regulation of public health, environmental and safety standards and the community rightly expects the Government not to compromise these standards.

The Bill does not seek to alter existing frameworks in these areas and includes an explicit requirement that no decision taken by the regulator or arbitrator in relation to access to water infrastructure can override requirements or directions under the *Safe Drinking Water Act 2011*, the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011*, the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*, the *Environmental Protection Act 1993*, or other law or other legislative requirement relating to health, safety or the environment.

Charges made by water industry entities in South Australia, including SA Water and South Australian irrigation trusts, may be subject to Commonwealth water charge rules made under the Water Act 2007 (Cth).

The Commonwealth water charge rules appear intended to exclude urban water supply activities from their remit, however, the precise scope of the application of the Commonwealth regime is not easy to determine. There is potential for inconsistency between the state based access regime and the Commonwealth regime where both regimes apply to the same infrastructure operator.

The Bill avoids this regulatory uncertainty by allowing for the use of the provisions of Part 11A of the *Water Act 2007* (Cth) to exclude or displace the operation of the Commonwealth water charge rules in the event that any such inconsistency arises. The use of the displacement clause brings with it some obligations to other stakeholders under existing intergovernmental agreements.

Negotiations with the Commonwealth are continuing to find an alternative solution which does not necessitate the use of these displacement provisions.

The use of the displacement clause will not be automatically triggered with the passage of the Bill and will only come into effect if an inconsistency arises. This provides the opportunity for continued dialogue with the Commonwealth.

The Government regards the establishment of a state based access regime for water infrastructure, certified effective, as a necessary further step in the ongoing reform of South Australia's water industry.

Unlike some other industries subject to access regimes, the delivery of water and wastewater services presents some challenging social equity considerations including affordability, health and safety, as well as environmental issues. Careful consideration and incremental application of any access arrangements is necessary to ensure that unintended outcomes are minimised.

The amendments to the Water Industry Act contained in the Bill provide for the establishment of a light-handed access regime the Government considers appropriate given the current stage of development of the State's water industry. The access regime will be monitored and regularly reviewed by the regulator and, where appropriate, it can be adjusted to suit changing circumstances.

While it may take some time to fully realise their benefits, the extensive reforms implemented by the Government establish a foundation for the development of a competitive, efficient, innovative and safe water services sector so crucial to the well-being of the whole South Australian community.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Water Industry Act 2012*

4—Amendment of section 3—Objects

An additional object is included in section 3 of the Act for the purposes of proposed Part 9A.

5—Insertion of section 5A

This clause proposes to insert new section 5A:

5A—Provisions related to operation of Part 9A

The Governor may, by proclamation, declare the extent to which Part 9A will apply in relation to specified water infrastructure or sewerage infrastructure (or specified classes of such infrastructure) or specified infrastructure services (or specified classes of such services). A proclamation may limit the operation of the access regime. It will also be possible for the Governor, by proclamation, to activate a Commonwealth water legislation displacement provision in relation to Part 4 Division 1 of the *Water Act 2007* of the Commonwealth if this becomes necessary.

6—Repeal of section 26

Section 26 of the Act imposed certain requirements on the Minister relating to preparations for a third party access regime. This clause repeals the section.

7—Insertion of Part 9A

This clause proposes to insert new Part 9A:

Part 9A—Third party access regime

Division 1—Preliminary

86A—Interpretation

Definitions are set out for the purposes of the Part.

86B—Application

The access regime will apply to operators of water infrastructure or sewerage infrastructure, and infrastructure services to the extent specified by proclamation.

The access regime does not (and cannot) apply in relation to infrastructure operated by an irrigation infrastructure operator that may be subject to water charge rules under Part 4 Division 4 of the *Water Act 2007* of the Commonwealth (whether or not such rules have been made in relation to the infrastructure (or in relation to any service that may be provided in connection with the infrastructure)).

Division 2—Regulator

86C—Appointment of regulator

The Essential Services Commission of South Australia is the regulator.

86D—Report to Minister

The regulator must report to the Minister on an annual basis.

Division 3—Information to facilitate access proposals

86E—Segregation of accounts and records

Special accounting requirements will apply in order to assist in the implementation of the access regime.

86F—Information brochure

A regulated operator will be required to provide, on application, an information brochure giving terms and conditions on which access may be provided.

86G—Specific information to assist proponent to formulate proposal

A regulated operator will be required to give a person with a proper interest in making an access proposal detailed information about specified matters. A charge may be made for information provided under the proposed section.

86H—Information to be provided on non-discriminatory basis

Information is to be provided to persons interested in making access proposals on a non-discriminatory basis.

Division 4—Negotiation of access

86I—Access proposal

A person who wants access to regulated infrastructure or to vary an existing access contract in a significant way or to a significant extent may put an access proposal to the regulated operator.

86J—Duty to negotiate in good faith

The respondents to an access proposal are required to negotiate in good faith.

86K—Existence of dispute

The circumstances in which an access dispute exists are set out.

Division 5—Conciliation

86L—Settlement of dispute by conciliation

If a dispute is referred to the regulator, the regulator must, in the first instance, seek to resolve the dispute by conciliation (except in certain circumstances).

86M—Voluntary and compulsory conferences

The regulator may call voluntary and compulsory conferences of the parties to the dispute to attempt to resolve the dispute.

Division 6—Reference of dispute to arbitration

86N—Power to refer dispute to arbitration

The regulator may appoint an arbitrator and refer a dispute to arbitration.

86O—Application of *Commercial Arbitration Act 2011*

The *Commercial Arbitration Act 2011* applies to an arbitration.

86P—Principles to be taken into account

The principles which an arbitrator must take into account are set out.

86Q—Parties to the arbitration

The parties to an arbitration are defined.

86R—Representation

A party may be represented by a lawyer or, by leave, another representative.

86S—Participation by other parties

The Minister and the regulator may participate in an arbitration.

86T—Arbitrator's duty to act expeditiously

The arbitrator must proceed with the arbitration as quickly as possible.

86U—Hearings to be in private

The proceedings are to be in private unless all parties agree to public proceedings. The arbitrator may give directions about who may be present.

86V—Procedure on arbitration

An arbitrator is not bound by technicalities or the rules of evidence. The arbitrator may obtain information on matters relevant to the dispute in any way the arbitrator thinks appropriate.

86W—Procedural powers of arbitrator

The arbitrator has power to direct procedure including delivery of documents and discovery and inspection of documents.

The arbitrator may obtain expert reports and may proceed in the absence of any party given notice of the proceedings.

The arbitrator may engage a lawyer to give advice on the conduct of the arbitration and to assist with the drafting of the award.

86X—Giving of relevant documents to the arbitrator

A party to an arbitration may give the arbitrator a copy of all documents (including confidential documents) the party considers to be relevant to the dispute.

86Y—Power to obtain information and documents

The arbitrator may require information and documents to be produced and may require a person to attend to give evidence.

Information need not be given or documents need not be produced where the information or contents are subject to legal professional privilege or tend to incriminate the person concerned of an offence. The person concerned is required to give grounds of objection to providing information or producing documents.

86Z—Confidentiality of information

The arbitrator is given power to impose conditions limiting access to or disclosure of information or documents.

86ZA—Proponent's right to terminate arbitration before an award is made

A proponent has the right to terminate an arbitration on notice to the other parties, the arbitrator and the regulator.

86ZB—Arbitrator's power to terminate arbitration

Where the dispute is trivial, misconceived or lacking in substance, or where the proponent has not negotiated in good faith, the arbitrator may terminate the arbitration.

86ZC—Time limit for arbitration

An award must be made within the period of 6 months from the date on which the dispute is referred to arbitration. However, the period does not include time awaiting compliance with orders of the arbitrator for the provision of information or documents.

86ZD—Formal requirements related to awards

Before an award is made a draft must be circulated to the Minister, the regulator, the parties and each designated agency to enable representations to be made.

An award must be in writing and must set out the reasons for it. If access is to be granted, the award must set out the conditions.

A copy of the award must be given to the Minister, the regulator, the parties and each designated agency.

86ZE—Consent awards

An award can be made by consent if the arbitrator is satisfied that the award is appropriate in the circumstances.

86ZF—Proponent's option to withdraw from award

After an award is made, the proponent has 7 days within which to withdraw from it. If the proponent withdraws, the award is rescinded and the proponent is precluded from making an access proposal within 2 years unless the regulator agrees. The regulator may impose conditions on such agreement.

86ZG—Termination or variation of award

An award may be terminated or varied if all parties affected by the award agree. The provisions of Part 9A relating to an access proposal and arbitration apply to a proposal to terminate or vary an award (or a dispute arising out of such a proposal).

86ZH—Costs

The costs of the arbitration are at the discretion of the arbitrator except where the proponent terminates an arbitration or elects not to be bound. In that case, the proponent bears the costs in their entirety.

86ZI—Contractual remedies

An award is enforceable as if it were a contract between the parties.

86ZJ—Appeal on question of law

An appeal to the Supreme Court is allowed only on a question of law. An award or decision of an arbitrator cannot be challenged or called into question except by appeal under the proposed section.

86ZK—Injunctive remedies

The Supreme Court may grant injunctive remedies if required to enforce compliance with an award.

86ZL—Compensation

The Supreme Court may order compensation to any person where there has been a breach of an award.

Division 7—Related matters

86ZM—Confidential information

The regulated operator is required to ensure that confidential information (which is defined) remains confidential.

The regulator may, however, disclose confidential information to the Minister or the public if it is in the public interest to do so.

86ZN—Access by agreement

The proposed section clarifies that the new Part does not prevent a regulated operator entering into an access contract with another person on terms and conditions agreed between the parties.

86ZO—Copies of access contracts to be supplied to regulator

Copies of access contracts must be supplied to the regulator on a confidential basis.

86ZP—Regulated operator's duty to supply information and documents

A regulated operator must give the regulator specified information or copies of documents relating to the regulated operator's water/sewerage service business.

86ZQ—Unfair discrimination

A regulated operator must not unfairly discriminate in relation to access to regulated infrastructure. A regulated operator must not unfairly discriminate between entities in the terms and conditions on which it provides access to regulated infrastructure.

86ZR—Review of Part

The regulator must review the Part within the last year of each prescribed period (which is defined).

8—Amendment of section 90—Consultation between agencies

This amendment is consequential.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:04): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker on the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill and I will be moving some amendments at the committee stage. This bill aims to provide a legislated regime for third-party access to South Australian water and sewerage infrastructure. I note that late last year the former head of the Essential Services Commission of South Australia said that households were collectively paying up to $150 million a year too much for water because the state Treasury forecast a higher annual demand for water than ESCOSA. I think it has been reasonably well documented right around this state over many years this government's failure to stop its addiction to SA Water's price gouging to prop up their coffers, and it has become more and more of an addiction as the years go by.

Following the revelations that the state government was price gouging in water services, the state Liberals demanded that the Weatherill Labor government conduct an independent inquiry into water pricing. A third-party access regime should be designed to enable other players in the water industry to utilise, for a price, an existing supplier's infrastructure to supply services, and therefore provide some level of competition.

I am sure every person in this chamber would understand that competition is healthy. Competition is usually a mechanism for bringing competition into a marketplace, driving prices lower, making the price of that commodity more competitive and, hence, driving the price down for the end user, but that simply has not happened. As it currently stands, SA Water has a monopoly on providing potable water and sewerage services for a huge proportion of city and country consumers, and the majority of industry in South Australia.

Support for a robust third-party access scheme has been a key platform for the Liberal Party over successive elections and continues to be that way. Competition in the water industry is a requirement under the national competition principles. Previously, the Weatherill government ignored its own independent pricing regulator (ESCOSA) to adopt a robust third-party access scheme for SA Water's infrastructure, which would provide relief for all SA Water customers.

Competition in the provision of water would drive down the price of water. However, companies selling water would need access to SA Water's pipe network at a fair price. I think everyone acknowledges that anyone who is in business does need to make a profit and they do need to perform maintenance and upgrades to their infrastructure, but what we are seeing is a continual gouging of the price of water in South Australia. Every South Australian, whether they be rich or poor, are paying for the government's addiction to the high cost of water in South Australia.

Competition in the provision of water would drive down the price of water. However, companies that are looking to profit from gaining third-party access to water infrastructure would need to be regulated. I will touch on some of those competitors as I get into my contribution, but there are many water providers that are providing competition indirectly to SA Water. I think it would be only right that we look further into how South Australian householders and, just as importantly, how industry and irrigators can access that water as a third party, and prosper, create jobs and make South Australia a better place to do business.

The majority of our exports are driven by the need for water, and it has to be competitive water. When I say 'driven by needing water'—whether it is for growing food, for watering animals, for hygiene, for industry, for processing or for cleaning—we all in some way, shape or another need water. In any industry, the workers need to drink water, let's face it, so the cost of water in every sense is having an impact on South Australia's economy.

The proposed legislation before us basically leaves it up to SA Water to decide how much other parties pay to access its infrastructure. It would enable other players in the industry to utilise an existing supplier's infrastructure (most likely SA Water) to provide services, thereby providing a level of competition. In theory, bulk water has been able to be purchased through trade since the introduction of water licensing.

The most notable scheme is run by Barossa Infrastructure Ltd, and I am sure the member for Schubert would take a lot of pride in their great water delivery network. They are also a member of a group that I once chaired, the South Australian Murray Irrigators. Their example of putting in their own infrastructure and accessing water and storage is second to none, and I think it is a proud platform that the wine industry, in particular, and some horticulture rely on, particularly in the Barossa Valley and surrounding districts.

It has enabled them to be part of the 21st century. As many of us would know, a lot of the Barossa and outlying districts, once upon a time, were dry grown. Some of it was supplemented by underground water, and that created problems, particularly in very hot weather and heatwaves with very hot winds. The other extreme is frost and weather that is detrimental to the longevity of those commodities, particularly the vines in their early stages of maturity.

Barossa Infrastructure provides approximately 6,000 megalitres of untreated River Murray water to irrigate, as I said, predominantly wine grapes, but we must remember that this scheme would not have happened if it were not for former water minister John Olsen driving it through SA Water. I think he has left a long-lasting legacy in South Australia and it has helped establish the Barossa as a more sustainable wine growing region and we have been able to highlight some of the world's best iconic wines.

We have realised that we cannot just rely on dry grown product. We also have to supplement it to create a more uniform product so that everyone knows, when they open their favourite bottle of wine, it has uniformity and will please the pallet. Every time you open a bottle, it is consistent and it excites those passionate wine lovers because they know they are going to get a quality product every time they pop a cork or twist the Stelvin cap.

I guess examples of scenarios which are not third-party access include the Salisbury council wetlands and the aquifer storage and recharge. It is not actually third-party access because the Salisbury council installed its own pipe network system to service customers. Similar situations exist in and around the River Murray where there is private infrastructure, where there is also not third-party access, because that has been built especially for the customers and not through the SA Water network.

I will touch on some of those businesses that do a great job. I would not say it beggars belief, but the cost of having water supplied through the SA Water network is $3.32, thereabouts, and that

price is going up. Some of the water suppliers are the CIT, the RIT and particularly some of the BOOT schemes (obviously, the Gawler and Virginia reworked water). It is very noticeable and I think it is great to see. It is long overdue that that system is going to be extended. Nothing makes me more agitated and disappoints me more than to see any form of water, whether it be in a primary treated situation or natural runoff, flowing out to sea. Not only is it an opportunity lost, not only is it an economic platform being let go, but it also causes environmental degradation of both seagrasses and sea life, and it is bad practice to see opportunity slipping through our hands.

Again, in talking about the bill and the Central Irrigation Trust, which I believe has about 10 districts and really is a leader in water supply and the continual upgrade of their infrastructure, it is also about being able to supply a product at a fair and reasonable price. It is not treated, but in many cases where SA Water networks supply water to primary production—and I know that in my electorate a number of livestock owners have either sold or got out of the industry because they cannot afford to pay those outrageously high water prices, particularly for watering livestock and the hygiene and cleaning of dairies—we have to remember that supplying treated water is unviable in primary production.

I have done a bit of research on, particularly, the Woolpunda scheme up in the Riverland, which is situated between Waikerie and Kingston-on-Murray. It is a water treatment plant that supplies hundreds of outlets, hundreds of farmers who in one way, shape or another need that water, whether they are spraying crops, watering their livestock, turning on a tap in their piggeries, dairies or businesses, and every time they turn that tap on it costs them $3.32 per kilolitre, and it is simply not sustainable.

We also need to recognise the Renmark Irrigation Trust; of course, a private diverter. They are probably one of the prime examples of how water can be pumped through private infrastructure and delivered on farm, and the cost of water shows you the benefit those private diverters have over a farmer who is reliant on the SA Water network. It is not totally comparing apples with apples because the SA Water network is treated water. With the private diverters, there are the irrigation trusts, the BIL scheme and the BOOT scheme. Obviously that is secondary treated water so it is a product that is a shandy with, in most instances, underground water, and they are still competitive.

When we look at the Clare and Gilbert Valley irrigators watering vineyards and, again, we look at livestock producers right across the SA Water network, it is becoming more and more uncompetitive for them to turn on a tap to water their livestock, to water their needs—as I said, their piggeries, their dairies, their feedlots. For us to be competitive and to be able to have an economic platform to drive our economy, we simply need to make it more appropriate, and these primary producers, and industry in many cases, need that third-party access.

There are some who would say—particularly SA Water, particularly the current state government—that this is something that they will not entertain. I say to them that they need to get off the drug. That drug is the reliance on people in South Australia paying the highest water prices in the country. We are uncompetitive in providing water for primary production, and so how on earth are we going to be winners now that we are entering more of a global market? We are seeing free trade agreements—the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement was recently signed—and I congratulate minister Robb on doing outstanding work.

I think, as the current federal Treasurer has said, he will probably be one of the most successful trade ministers in Australia's history, getting those trading partnership agreements through and giving every Australian the opportunity to grow produce, to put it onto an international market at a competitive price. We are not constricted by tariffs or high duties. We are not constricted by other countries that are putting barriers in front of our traders, particularly in South Australia.

However, if we look at the national picture, I think South Australia is punching above its weight. What we do in South Australia we do well but we are being priced out of the markets, particularly with being competitive. It is not just the cost of water, it is not just the cost of power; whether it is regulation, WorkCover, payroll tax, the land tax or any of these, we are the highest taxed state in the country. Water is just a part of it, and I think that having third party access is going to help us be more competitive and it is also going to help us deal with this unemployment issue, the economic issue. South Australia is one the rust-bucket states in the country, and it is not about the

opposition talking down South Australia. It is about the opposition giving the punter, every South Australian, the real information.

Most South Australians are becoming sick and tired of the spin that they continually get, and that spin is that everything is alright, South Australia is a great state. Yes, it is a great state, but it is competitively at a disadvantage to every other state in South Australia. Why is our unemployment at 8.1 per cent and rising? Why is Tasmania, which was always at the bottom of the pack, at 6.5 per cent and declining? We look with envy at immigration right around this great country and we look at the combined Western Australian, Queensland, New South Wales and Victorian immigration numbers—320,000 new immigrants into those states combined. Obviously that immigration coming into the state is creating economic activity, it is creating opportunity and for that to happen they need to be competitive, and they are.

We look at South Australia, ACT, Northern Territory and Tasmania, and immigration into those states has been a paltry 20,000, and I really do think that that tells a story. Why aren't people coming to South Australia? We are not competitive. Why aren't people coming to South Australia? Because it is the dearest place in the country to do business. Why aren't people coming to South Australia? Because the other states have more to offer. The opportunities are growing. On a couple of recent trips I have done around the country, I have seen that the primary production is just booming.

We look at investors. They go to government looking for assistance, not actually for monetary assistance but looking for regulatory assistance, looking for reform, power, water, and connections, and those governments are saying, 'How can we help you? Please come in.' How can we bring them into our state of South Australia to be competitive? When they come to South Australia it is, 'Fill out these forms.' They fill 100 to 200 pages of forms and then the bills start rolling in. 'This is what it is going to cost you to connect up the power. This is what it is going to cost you for water. This is what it is going to cost you to do business, whether it is WorkCover, payroll tax, land tax, the regulatory burden.'

I have had many businesses that have looked at coming to the Riverland and they simply said, 'This is too hard.' Off they go to Victoria or New South Wales. They have the water security, they have cheap water, cheaper power. They do not have the regulatory burden and they just do not have a government that does not have the will to invite them in, sit them down and work out how they are going to support that business to come into the state, and that is exactly the same footprint as having that third party access to water.

I notice that the Minister for Regional Development's electorate encompasses the Clare Valley and Gilbert Valley areas. It almost feels like he has been sitting on his hands when it comes to gaining third-party access for those irrigators. Many of them are frustrated and many of them are uncompetitive, yet it appears that the once Independent, now Labor, minister has been almost told to sit down and, 'We will deal with this when we deal with it.' They do not say whether it is going to be this year, next year or next century. There just does not appear to be anything of substance happening.

We hear a lot of spin about third-party access into the Clare Valley, but we obviously need storage. We need those businesses to be able to access water through a third party which can make them more competitive. At the moment, they cannot afford to pay those huge costs of putting water into those vineyards because, as we all know, the commodity prices in the wine industry are very low at the moment.

We are not just competing with other districts in South Australia, nor are we competing on a national level: we are competing on a world stage. Yes, South Australian wines are by far the best wines in Australia, region by region, but when we talk about competing on a world stage, where we have the large consumption, where we have large need for premium wine, South Australia is up there asking a huge premium because, in South Australia, there is a huge cost in producing that premium product.

We are at a disadvantage when it comes to competing for a similar product from any country all over the world. Whether it be in Europe, whether it be in the US, whether it be New Zealand, we

are top of the pack when it comes to costs and bottom of the pack when it comes to being able to find efficiencies and the cost of doing business.

The third-party access water concept was first mooted by the Labor Party through Water for Good. I think, back in 2010, 2011 or 2012, this paper was brought forward, and it anticipated that a scheme would be in place by 2015. The Water Industry Act 2012 made some minor progress by requiring that a report be undertaken prior to the bill being drafted.

We know that South Australian water prices, as I have said, are absolutely through the roof. Primary producers are sick of feeling the effects, particularly here in South Australia, of their responsibility for paying the highest prices for having water delivered and also the most expensive prices for water to be supplied to their gate.

SA Water is a government monopoly making massive profits. As I said, this government is addicted, absolutely addicted, to price gouging within the water industry: the water supply and the water delivery network here in South Australia. They are not prepared to look seriously at water, particularly delivery. When we talk about the cost of water, it is not just about the cost of water. It is about supplying the water, it is about the delivery of water and, of course, it is also about the sewerage component that has a huge bearing on that cost of water.

Why is it that the government continues just to flout the prosperity of this state? As I said, the addiction is holding the state back in many ways. It is not just about primary production: it encapsulates just about every South Australian in one way or another. We look at some of the great export opportunities at the moment. Whether it be through livestock, whether it be through export meat, whether it be through live trade or frozen beef products, they all consume a lot of water and, at the moment, South Australia is the highest costing jurisdiction in this country. I do not know what the cost of water is in other jurisdictions but, in many cases, we are now relying significantly on South Australian beef exports to underpin our economy.

Starting right from the beginning with the calves, they need water to grow, they need water for feed, and they need water when they are put into the processing plant. We need water for hygiene, and we need water to keep that processing infrastructure alive, yet the whole way along it is just a multiplication of the high cost of water.

Whether it is about the cost of giving that animal water to drink, whether it is the cost of growing the feed or putting them in a feedlot to keep them growing and make them one of the best pieces of beef carcass that the world can offer, it really does add up. Then, of course, we get to the processing side of it. The cost of running an abattoir is growing out of control. We all know that abattoirs require high hygiene levels. Abattoirs also require a large amount of water, and this is just another example of how the high cost of doing business in South Australia it holding us back.

Many primary producers are not only struggling with high water prices, but they are also paying the full tote odds of utilising that infrastructure. One of the lowlights in my electorate is the SA Water's Woolpunda pumping scheme. It is a treated water plant that pumps water through a huge network. For those of who you do not know, Woolpunda is between Waikerie and Kingston-on-Murray. It is on the Sturt Highway, and pumps water directly from the river. It pumps out to a huge network, including Qualco, Sunlands and Waikerie. It goes all the way up to Kingston, out to Loxton, and goes all the way out through some of that Mallee country. The water is provided to farmers and a lot of the farming districts for livestock, spraying and the day-to-day running of those businesses.

Recently, I was taken out to the end of the line at a place near Qualco, Sunlands, which I guess you would say would be the north-west of the Riverland. There were two outlets pouring treated water out onto the ground. I asked the farmer, 'What is going on here?' and he said, 'We tell SA Water, they come out and have a look, and they let it go.' SA Water's reasoning for having an open-ended pipeline running out onto the ground is, 'It gives the animals something to drink.' I have never heard anything more absurd in all my life.

To give the animals something to drink, it is called a ballcock and a trough; it is not called an open pipe running on the ground, soaking away to waste huge amounts of water. Not only is it just water running out onto the ground, it is treated water for which farmers are paying $3.32 a kilolitre. I think it just outrageous that something like that can be let go. Yes, it has been something that I have

raised with SA Water, and it is something that I have raised with the previous water minister, but it is something that has just continued to go on and on.

By my reckoning, this just highlights that SA Water are prepared to rest on their laurels while they are making hundreds of millions of dollars, and let this small amount of water run out. I would estimate from the way that it was running out that there may be 100 megalitres out of each outlet. Do your sums: there are 1,000 kilolitres in a megalitre; $3.32 a kilolitre times by 100 megalitres, for two of those outlets in close proximity. That is the sort of money that is running out onto the ground. That is just another example of what we are facing with a government that is more focused on the profit bottom line than it is on those efficiencies.

As an irrigator for 25-odd years, I have had to find efficiencies and savings in every way, shape or form, whether it is about putting in state-of-the-art pumping facilities, whether it is about putting in new-age pipes, whether it is about reducing friction, whether it is about reducing energy, or whether it is about reducing the start-up of energy. Many of you might understand that one of the serious problems with pumping water, particularly in a lot of the irrigation districts, is that they are on high country.

To pump water up onto high country means that you need to pump at an increased head, which means that every metre that you pump up, you need an extra pound of pressure to substantiate the pressure at the end of your pipe, whether it be a filter or whether it be that filtration that leads onto drip or sprinkler irrigation; in some cases, it is pivot sprinklers. You need a lot of pressure to get up the cliff or to get up onto that high country, and that is where we have had to find efficiencies. But to find efficiencies, it has come at a huge cost not only to irrigators, irrigation trusts, private diverters and to all water providers. It has been shown that it works for some, but it does not apply to others, and I make reference to the open pipes at Woolpunda.

I am not saying that it is happening anywhere else but, if it is happening in that district, it must be happening elsewhere, which would mean those water networks would have that kind of waste and that kind of burden put on the system. Let's face it, all of you would know that, if you have an open pipe, with water running out onto the ground, you are losing pressure. So, those farms that come before that network will have efficiency losses because they are going to have to leave their valves on to fill up their tanks. In hot weather, you will have livestock standing at a trough while the water dribbles into the trough because it cannot keep up. Every trough has a demand, but by the same token, you have an open-ended pipe that continues to make everyone else on that network suffer.

With respect to installing a third-party access, giving the opportunity for third-party access into a network, if it is using the SA Water network, that is great. If it is using a third-party pipe that comes away from SA Water, in many instances that would mean that you would have to put in some form of storage so that you could pump that water on demand. As I have said, in many instances people do have to put storage in. For some, they can put in a network of tanks, whether it be above ground or below ground tanks, because that is probably the most efficient way to store any form of water. Evaporation is an irrigator's worst friend. The loss from evaporation creates salinity and it creates huge loss, and I have already referred to the $3.32 treated water that is put into storage or put into a trough.

Let's face it, whether it is a trough, lake, river or an open tank, no matter what sort of water storage or water use you have in a climate such as the Riverland, for example, we lose between 1.2 and 1.7 metres a year. The bigger the surface of the water, such as a dam, you are going to lose about 1½ metres out of that dam without using a drop, simply because of evaporation. That applies to every other storage, whether it be a trough that water sits in or a tank that water is stored in or whether it be a river or wetlands, and we look at all forms of water storage.

One of the great disappointments I have had with this current government is their lack of willingness to address evaporation and, in many ways, the lack of regulators that are put on wetlands. Yes, there are some wetlands, backwaters and creeks that have regulators on them, but sadly most of that infrastructure has been put there by the federal government. The state government's will to put some of their own skin in the game and look after how they deal with water loss is something that is a bugbear of mine.

Obviously, we have huge wetlands. Let us be clear, the river system here in South Australia is the delta of the Murray-Darling Basin. It is the delta. It is the flat country. It is where our rivers are shallow, they are wide. The difference is that in the high country the rivers are very deep, they have a lot more trees and less evaporation, and the rivers are much narrower, so they are a much more efficient way of storing water as opposed to down here, particularly in South Australia.

I think that the delta essentially starts from the area Euston to Robinvale—near where the Darling and the Murray meet together, that is essentially where the delta is coming from. That delta is the start of huge evaporation. Once that water comes into South Australia, historically it has not been South Australia's problem; it has just been a national problem. It was once the responsibility of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, but now the authority is managing the way that we deal with putting flows down the river.

I must say that, over a number of years, the efficiencies have led to less evaporation and less water being purged down the river for little environmental gain; but when, of course, we look at the drought, any part of the river below Lock 1 suffered a huge loss. There was huge disappointment. There were salinity issues. There were acid sulphate issues. There was a lot of death. There was a lot of unusable water, particularly in the lower reaches of the river.

However, above Lock 1 most of those pool levels were all at pool level. People would come up to the Riverland and say, 'Oh, you know, this drought's a terrible thing,' but they would get up there and say, 'I can't believe it. There's water in the river. We were led to believe that there was no water in the river.' I think that was something that the government did grapple with for a long time when it was talking about drought watch, just like it was dealing with flood watch. And any time you send a message of drought or flood it raises people's alarm bells and they think that if it is drought watch the river is dry and if it is flood watch the river is overflowing and you cannot get into the place.

What it meant was that, while we were dealing with drought watch, those communities all suffered terribly. As an irrigator, as I was for 25 years, I had to give up a large percentage of my livelihood. I gave up all bar 18 per cent of my water allocation, and I will explain a little bit about allocations. In most cases, an irrigator, a primary producer, has an allocation of water assigned to a parcel of land, and that parcel of land will have adequate water to grow the crop that we choose. In many cases, we look at wine grapes, seven to eight megalitres a hectare; we look at citrus, 10 to 12 megalitres a hectare; we look at almonds, upwards of 15 plus megalitres a hectare.

We need that sort of water to keep those plantings alive and we need that sort of water to keep them into production. So, when you have 100 per cent of your water needed to keep those perennial crops alive—trees, vines, permanent crops—and suddenly you are given 18 per cent of your allocation, what are you going to do? What decisions are you going to make—either to keep your trees alive or are you going to keep them into production? Well, sadly, many irrigators had to let parts of their orchard die.

In a lot of cases, it particularly affected the Greeks and Italians I used to deal with. As I said, I was the chair of the South Australian Murray Irrigators and that group represented all irrigators in South Australia who diverted water from the Murray; so, it was not just about river communities. Obviously, a lot of water is piped away from the river, so there were communities in Clare, there were communities in the Barossa, there were communities in the South-East, there were communities all around certain parts of productive areas of the state who were just bamboozled that their asset, their 100 per cent allocation, had been cut to 18 per cent; so, they were having to almost let a part of their family die.

Just understand that for a family that plants and nurtures a patch of trees, a block of vines or a paddock of almonds it is almost a cultural thing—they put in the trees or vines as rootlings and then they water them, fertilise them and let them grow. It is about it being part of their family: they raise them over the years until they come out of infancy and into production and all of a sudden they are starting to peel fruit off these trees and vines that have been in the family for 10, 20, 30 or 50 years in some cases,

When you are told that you have to let part of your property die, it is like letting part of your family die, and that is something that really did ring a bell, particularly in that first instance when restrictions hit home. People were dealing with a 60 per cent allocation and having to lease in some

water if they had to. Sometimes they would go away and find efficiencies, but to find efficiencies is costly. To find efficiencies is, again, going to the bank, looking for more money and looking for how they can keep that property alive. As I said, it is almost like keeping part of their family alive to make sure that that family is providing them with income and keeping their family together, keeping people employed and keeping those communities alive.

Sadly, there are still a lot of scars left from the drought and a lot of scars left from the way that governments I say negotiated. In many instances, when I came down to this place as an irrigator and a farmer and met with my local member and the then premier, I put a position paper to him on, if you like, a HECS-style scheme of finance so that these irrigators could remain in the game. They were not asking for a handout, they were not asking for something for free; what they were asking for was for government to provide them with low-cost finance, low-interest finance, so that they could remain in the water market, actually put food on their table and produce the food that underpins our economy here in South Australia.

I do give it to the government, who said, 'For one year, we will provide some sustainability into that sector and we will provide you with a calculated amount of water.' They did that for one year: the drought went for 10. They thought they would provide some water for one year and then hang them out to dry for the next eight years. That was the telling tale. Where the government went wrong was they did not provide people with any vision and they did not provide people with any real hope. They strung them along, gave them a little bit of water to keep their plantings alive for one year and then the next year they were on their own. Again, that is about the lack of understanding about what water means to primary production and our state's economy.

Again, as an irrigator, I had to make a decision. I had a holding of vineyard and I was a private diverter, so I had to go out to the water market and lease in water at huge cost because, as we all know, of supply and demand. When we are in a drought, there is a smaller amount of supply and there is a large amount of uncertainty. To do that, it cost my business a significant amount of money: many years of profits were simply consumed in a matter of months in entering that water market. I had a citrus property at Renmark, and I made the decision that I was going to lease in some water but that I was also going to cull some of my orchard. To do that, I would start with the least productive area and slowly pull out trees, until I got to the point where I could not justify continuation of tree removal, so that I would have less water usage.

It also gave me the opportunity to try to futureproof the water requirements for that property. The long-range forecast was that El Niño was still here, still biting us, and it was made very clear by the government that, after giving us one year's help, they would wipe their hands of us. As long as people in Adelaide were given the opportunity to turn on the tap and out came the water, the government were happy. Let us be fair about this: the current government's constituent base is here in Adelaide. If they were fair dinkum about keeping their constituent base alive, they would have been better negotiating water into the market.

I hear some rumblings from the other side. I am sure that if you had a few trees or a few bushes die in your garden, that was no heartache. There might have been a bit of heartache if one of your favourite trees died and tipped over, but you did not lose. You still picked up your wage every week. The people on the river—the people who were sustaining water here in South Australia—gave up their water for people in Adelaide to be able to turn on a tap and have water come out.

We were put on restrictions in Adelaide, but it was not about a quantity restriction, it was about when you could water: what time of the day or night and, really, it was about our gardens. The aesthetics were mentally pleasing, but it was about just how much economic gain did we lose in South Australia by just walking away? How was it that in South Australia we had an 18 per cent allocation in one year, yet when we look to Victoria and New South Wales, they received a 40 per cent or 60 per cent allocation. How did that work? That's right—that was the lack of ability of the government to go over there and negotiate a sharing arrangement. It was not about the government here going, 'Those bad, bad New South Welshmen and Victorians won't give us the water that we need.' It was about going over there and negotiating.

For that reason I spent many days, weeks and months in Canberra trying to put ideas to the federal government so that we could have better water-sharing arrangements and I was not helped by the South Australian government, let me tell you. One of the reckonings for me to actually put my

hand up and stand for the state parliament was the day that the then premier said to me that he would not support my concept to help a HECS-type finance scheme for irrigators in South Australia because there were no votes in it for him. That was outrageous! No votes. What are we saying about our garden now, 'No votes, so I'm not going to support you.' I went home and thought long and hard about it for approximately two weeks, and I decided that I had had enough. Rather than talk and whinge about it, I was going to do something. That is why I stood for state parliament and came into this place to make a contribution.

The previous minister, the state member of parliament who I succeeded in the seat of Chaffey, was the water minister, but she was hijacked. She had the poisoned chalice of a Labor government calling the shots. She was trying to look after her people, but she had made her bed and decided that she was going to lie in that bed, and she had to die by drinking from that chalice. That was, she supported a Labor government with their lack of support, their lack of vision, their lack of being able to negotiate, and I think that was a telling tale.

That placed South Australia behind the eight ball—not only behind the eight ball but it made us a laughing stock right across the basin. Every time this current government goes to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority or to COAG or to negotiate with other states, ministers or premiers they say, 'You want more water for the bottom end of the river—well, what have you done down there? What have you actually physically done? Environmental works and measures?' The reply, 'Oh well, we've planted some trees to try to reduce acid sulphate soil.' 'So, what have you done to create efficiencies within that fragile environment down there?' 'We did a scoping study; primarily financed by the federal government with a small amount of backing from the state government.' But the state government's call was to do nothing. A $750,000 scoping study to do nothing; no environmental outcome.

We had 20,000 gigalitres come down from 2010 to 2012—I am pretty sure those numbers are around the mark. We still had high salinity in Lake Albert. We still had high salinity in the Coorong. What was done to try to reduce that salinity and try to make those environmental assets more sustainable? Nothing. It was to put the scoping study in the bottom drawer. The current water minister has a lot to answer for because he knows that he is very good at playing political games and he is very good at achieving nothing. He is very good at achieving no outcome.

Let's face it: the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was to achieve an outcome. The initial basin plan 2007, 150 gigalitres to be achieved by 2019 so that by 2019 we will have brought enough water back in and presented it to the commonwealth environmental water holder. The majority of that water has been put into the system through efficiency gains and buyback from irrigators to the detriment of an economic platform. To date we have seen the South Australian government contribute little to nothing.

We have seen the South Australian government contribute no environmental works and measures in South Australia, particularly below Lock 1. We see some environmental works and measures at and above Lock 5. We have to remember that every lock in our river system has a bypass; it has a wetland around it. We look at Lock 6 and the Chowilla wetland, the historic forest. We have put a regulator in the Chowilla Creek. We look at all the feeder creeks that feed the Chowilla Creek and they have had regulators put on them too. Is there any environmental work coming away from there? Is there any environmental outcome? Yes, we are breeding carp and we are breeding introduced weed species.

Where is a management plan in South Australia to deal with those issues? We have built another regulator at Lock 5 at Pike Creek. They have gold plated a lot of infrastructure that existed there. They have found efficiencies, yes; I think it's a great initiative. But, again, where are the efficiencies? They have taken out stone walls and put in concrete walls. They have put in more regulators that were once regulated by boards and rock walls. We go down to Lock 4 and look at Katarapko—same thing: we are looking at putting in regulators there.

We go to Lock 3, Banrock Station, private enterprise. Hello! Banrock Station engineered regulators, a watering regime around Lock 3. Private enterprise went in and did it. We go to Lock 2 at Taylorville. They are having some success down there. We go to Lock 1 and then below Lock 1 everything just falls in a heap.

When South Australia has its next dry, I want everyone to take note that the South Australian government will go cap in hand and say, 'Those terrible Eastern States are taking all of our water.' Those Eastern States will say, 'What have you done in the good times to prepare for the dry times?' They will not have an answer because of a lack of will to start upgrading the barrages. We have huge saltwater seepage back into our bottom end of the river system; we have the connector between Lake Albert and the Coorong to provide a flow out of Lake Albert into the Coorong to create flow so that fresher water, low-salinity water will go into Lake Albert, into the Coorong, and create a much more sustainable environment—no, not interested.

We look at The Narrows at Narrung and just exactly what was achieved down there—nothing. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we adjourn, I would like to note that in the gallery there are some students from the Eastern Fleurieu Milang campus who are guests of the member for Hammond. We welcome you to parliament. Are you staying for question time later? We will look forward to seeing you in the chamber then and hope that you enjoy your time with us.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING MEASURES) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2015

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION (DETERMINATION OF REMUNERATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

LOBBYISTS BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

RAINBOW FLAG

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition signed by 103 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to restrict councils or other organisations from displaying a rainbow flag or any other design of a rainbow as a symbol of homosexuality. That it would be an offence with a fine imposed.

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 Speaker—

Auditor-General—
Part A—Executive Summary Annual Report 2014-15
Part B—Agency Audit Reports Annual Report 2014-15
State finances and related matters Supplementary Report October 2015
[Ordered to be published]
Independent Commissioner Against Corruption—Annual Report 2014-15

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

Rules made under the following Acts—
District Court—Civil—Supplementary—Amendment No 2
Supreme Court—Civil—Supplementary—Amendment No 3

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

Return to Work SA—Annual Report 2014-15

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

Declaration of a Special Declared Area pursuant to Section 9A of the Mining Act 1971 over the Central Middleback Ranges Area, east of Iron Baron—Report
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy—Fees No.2

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

Education Adelaide—Annual Report 2014-15
State Development, Department of—Annual Report 2014-15
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fair Trading—Franchising Industry Dispute Resolution Code

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Correctional Services—General

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—Meat Food Safety Advisory Committee

By the Minister for Recreation and Sport (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Boxing and Martial Arts—General

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

Local Council By-Laws—
City of Playford—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Local Government Land
No. 4—Dogs
No. 5—Cats
No. 6—Bird Scaring Devices
No. 7—Roads

City of Prospect—No. 6—Waste Management
Light Regional Council—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Roads
No. 4—Local Government Land
No. 5—Dogs
No. 6—Cats
No. 7—Nuisances Caused by Building Sites

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

Environment Protection Authority—Annual Report 2014-15
Heritage Council, South Australian—Annual Report 2014-15
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Animal Welfare—Miscellaneous Amendment

By the Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability)—Exemptions

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—Demerit Points
Road Traffic—
Miscellaneous
Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions

Ministerial Statement

LEIGH CREEK

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: On Wednesday 7 October Alinta Energy announced that operational mining at Leigh Creek will cease on 17 November 2015 and the Port Augusta power stations will cease generation around 31 March 2016. Our priority is the 440 Port Augusta and Leigh Creek Alinta workers and the future opportunities that may present themselves for these workers and their families.

That is why the state government announced last month that it would continue to provide services to Leigh Creek until at least July 2018 to provide certainty for the communities of our state's Far North. At the same time, the state government has been talking with the Port Augusta and Leigh Creek communities to better understand the kind of services and infrastructure the Leigh Creek community in particular needs moving forward.

Last week, the government provided a $50,000 grant to fund a pilot skills development project with Sundrop Farms near Port Augusta, which will assist Sundrop Farms to deliver specific skills to 32 local jobseekers, with the first intake of 25 people expected to gain a job at Sundrop Farms within the coming months.

The state government is contributing $6 million from the Regional Development Fund towards Sundrop Farms' greenhouse expansion—growing high quality produce in the desert using solar energy and desalinated water. This pilot project aligns with the state government's Our Jobs Plan and supports a number of the economic priorities within the state's economic plan, including

premium food and wine produced in our clean environment exported to the world and growth through innovation.

We continue to advance the upgrade and sealing of the Strzelecki Track, identified in both our Integrated Transport and Land Use Plan and our Roadmap for Oil and Gas Projects in South Australia. On 29 September, Infrastructure Australia announced that the Strzelecki Track upgrade and sealing project had achieved an early stage rating on their infrastructure priority list, and the South Australian government will continue to work with Infrastructure Australia to advance this project.

Also, there remains a strong community ambition for a clean energy future for Port Augusta. At least two proposals for large-scale clean energy production appear to show potential and we will continue to work with the community and the proponents to advance these projects. We will continue to work closely with the Alinta employees to help them find new employment opportunities within the region and more broadly across the state, if that is what they choose. We also know that 132 of the Alinta workers have the right to return to public sector employment opportunities and we will honour that commitment under the electricity corporations act 1999.

But we must also consider the future opportunities that the closure of coalmining may bring for Leigh Creek and the surrounding communities. Leigh Creek is located in a particularly picturesque part of the Northern Flinders Ranges and has neighbours which include Beltana, Copley, Lyndhurst and Farina, Nepabunna and Iga Warta. It is also on the route leading travellers to the Birdsville and Strzelecki tracks. Leigh Creek's main tourism potential revolves around the tavern, airport, Leigh Creek South Motors and the caravan park. The Aroona Dam sanctuary and the mine itself show potential for future tourism ventures.

I was recently in Leigh Creek and the surrounding parts of the state. There is enormous potential for new industry and tourism for the region, something I saw during my recent visit. It is a beautiful part of the state. That is why I have announced today that the state government has opened a request for information process, inviting industries to put forward their ideas for new business ventures in the Leigh Creek region. Former South Australian education and tourism minister Dr Jane Lomax-Smith has been appointed to oversee the process.

Partnerships with government, new industries and businesses will be crucial when decisions are made about Leigh Creek's future beyond July 2018. We know through the state government's Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback Community Engagement Team, which has been on the ground in Leigh Creek for the last four months, that the Leigh Creek community has already floated some ideas to keep the town viable, especially in the areas of tourism and education. We now want to hear from people, businesses and industries who have firm ideas for new ventures in the Leigh Creek region.

Dr Lomax-Smith's experience in government and in education and tourism makes her an ideal choice to oversee the request for information process. The Department of State Development and other state government agencies, such as the South Australian Tourism Commission, will support Dr Lomax-Smith as requests for information are received. Businesses with a proposal will be given information about the current infrastructure in the town, and state government officials will meet with those requesting information to discuss their ideas. The request for information process will remain open until 31 January 2016.

At the same time, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure will be undertaking a strategic option study which will look into issues such as the financial and social analysis of infrastructure and service provision in the town; assessment of a range of options as to the spatial form that the township should adopt in the future; private sector opportunities and challenges based on the new town form; possible governance models; recommendations on the preferred way forward for the township and governance based on the points above; and a transition plan.

The state government remains very optimistic about Port Augusta and Leigh Creek's future. With the ideas already suggested by the community, elected leaders such as the member for Stuart and the business ventures set to be proposed during the next few months, we are confident the Upper Spencer Gulf and its surrounding communities will have a sustainable and exciting future.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15

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: The 2014-15 annual report of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, is being tabled today in parliament. The annual report is the first full year report of the ICAC and the Office for Public Integrity. I thank the commissioner for his work in the past year.

During 2014-15, there were a total of 927 reports and complaints involving 1,525 issues referred to the OPI. This compares with 923 complaints and reports about 2,276 issues reported in the previous year's annual report which, of course, reported on the first 10 months of its operations. There were 82 corruption investigations commenced in 2014-15, which is an increase of 11 from 2013-14. The commissioner exercised his powers of an inquiry agency 12 times in the past year, compared with 22 times in the 2013-14 year.

The commissioner recommended separate legislation be introduced to deal with the conduct of lobbyists, and I am pleased to report that this has now been passed by both houses of parliament. The government is considering the recommendations regarding lobbyists being considered public officers for the purposes of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act. The commissioner has also recommended a central record be kept of public officers who have been dismissed or who have resigned from employment because of investigations or findings regarding misconduct. We will be considering this recommendation.

A key piece of work the commissioner published on 30 June 2015 was the Review of Legislative Schemes, which contained 29 recommendations. The government is undertaking further work regarding these recommendations. The Hon. Kevin Duggan AM, QC has again conducted his review report of the ICAC. I am pleased to advise the report does not find any evidence of noncompliance in the exercise of powers under the ICAC Act. The review report again recommends a mechanism for the making of complaints of abuse of the exercise of powers by the commissioner or other forms of misconduct on the part of ICAC. The government is considering progressing this recommendation.

The report also suggests amendments to the information sheet provided to people who are the subject of a warrant to expressly state such people are entitled to request a copy of the warrant. It further suggests references on the information sheet to provisions of the ICAC Act which do not apply to search operations should be removed. I now table the report of the review of operations of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Office for Public Integrity.

Members

MEMBER FOR LITTLE PARA

The SPEAKER (14:13): I inform the house that the member for Little Para is not with us today. He has become a father again. His wife, Ann, gave birth to Felix Henry on Friday.

Question Time

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): My question is to the Premier. Considering that all states and territories in Australia operate under the same commodity prices, the same shift away from traditional manufacturing and the same economic conditions as our state, why do we currently have the highest unemployment rate in the nation?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:16): Yes, I noticed this inaccuracy that, sadly, was perpetrated by the shadow minister for industry, who I regard as, generally speaking, a straight shooter. He said these things:

Seems like every week we're losing more jobs in the resources sector. What's also very unfortunate is that the Government keeps blaming it on international prices. The reality is it's not happening in other states, it is happening in South Australia.

The truth is it is happening all across the nation. These changes are occurring all across the nation and we are not immune from them. To give you some example—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, this is the inaccurate material which was placed on public radio this morning and it needs to be corrected. Santos did, of course, announce 200 job losses yesterday, which will occur over the next few months, but they have also announced 315 Queensland job losses. Origin, also an industry in the gas sector, has announced 800 job losses across the Eastern States. Chevron has announced 400 job losses in Western Australia. We have also seen—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Wait a moment. It's very important that there is accurate information on the public record. Arrium has recently announced a $100 million cost-saving exercise, which will no doubt have some associated job losses with it, but last week BlueScope Steel announced 500 job losses from their Port Kembla facility as part of a $200 million cost-saving exercise. Alinta, of course, has announced 450 job losses in the coal-fired power station and the coalmine.

But we also know that very recently, in the Illawarra, Wollongong's Russell Vale colliery closed with the loss of about 80 jobs. Victoria's Anglesea brown coal-fired power station, which is the same type of coal we are talking about at Leigh Creek, closed earlier this year, with 83 jobs lost in the power station and associated mine. It is expected, across the New South Wales Hunter Valley, that many thousands of jobs have been lost over the last few years.

It is simply inaccurate to say that the South Australian resources sector is in a different position from the picture across the nation, but it is true that we have a perfect storm here. Sadly, due to the decisions that were taken to close the car industry, we are seeing a dramatic fall in employment in the manufacturing sector. That, together with the falling commodity prices, has combined to create a perfect storm. There is no doubt that this state's economy is very currency rate sensitive. We had a sustained period, almost two years, of the Australian dollar at parity and that had a particular effect on the South Australian economy.

The question isn't describing the problem: the question is coming up with solutions. We have a 10-point economic plan for South Australia's future and those opposite should join us in promoting confidence in that economic plan and the future of our state.

The SPEAKER: Before the leader asks his question, I call to order the leader, the deputy leader, the members for Morialta, Finniss, Mitchell, Hartley, Schubert, Mount Gambier, Morphett and Kavel. I warn for the first time the leader and deputy leader and the members for Morialta, Finniss, Hartley and Schubert. Through to the semi-finals are the member for Morialta, the deputy leader and the members for Hartley and Finniss, who are warned for the second and final time. Leader.

MINING EMPLOYMENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Does the minister still believe he is on track to create 6,000 jobs from the Gillman redevelopment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:21): The proponents have not exercised their option, as far as I am aware, but, obviously, commodity prices made a dramatic impact on mining across the country, if not internationally. I think the idea that somehow we are immune to it here in South Australia simply by hoping—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am trying to answer your question. The truth is that mining companies and mining services companies are doing it exceptionally tough right now. The question is: how do we react to a changing commodity price? What do we do to support those companies that are out there doing it very tough in very difficult international conditions? Do we simply bury our heads in the sand? Do we accept that we are living in an economy that is transitioning and an economy that is dealing with a change in commodity outlooks?

We saw the announcement of Santos yesterday, we have seen the announcement of Alinta, we have seen the announcement of BHP, we have seen the announcements of Atlas Iron and Rio Tinto, and we have seen announcements out of Western Australia and Queensland. All the mining jurisdictions and mining companies are doing it tough across Australia.

The truth is that some of the first casualties of a downturn in commodity prices are mining services, and mining services are something that we are attempting to grow in this state because, as the commodity price returns, what we want to take advantage of isn't just extracting the commodities and getting royalties and creating jobs at the mines but we want to value-add to those commodities and value-add to the supply chain, and we do that by doing all we possibly can to develop a mining services hub, whether it is at Gillman, in the Upper Spencer Gulf or in the industrial precincts of Adelaide. We are doing all we can to incentivise and help build this industry.

I will tell you what doesn't help, Mr Speaker: inquiries into unconventional gas, not releasing a mining policy at the last state election, constantly talking down our mining services centre and constantly talking down mining. We aspire to make this state a mining state. We aspire to do all we can to try to get the commodities that we have in the ground out, and for a profit. Also, we are attempting to value-add, as referenced by the royal commission announced by the Premier into the nuclear fuel cycle, something members opposite have opposed. Some of them have embraced it but some have opposed.

We are attempting to value-add. We won't be able to do this immediately, obviously, because commodity prices are down: but, if the Leader of the Opposition actually thinks that we can go out, regardless of what commodity prices are, regardless of what profits mining companies are making and just bury our heads in the sand and somehow click our fingers and make it all go away by clicking our shoes together—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: I think the minister is now debating.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Before the supplementary, I call to order the members for Chaffey and Flinders, the Premier and the Minister for Health, and I warn the member for Chaffey for the first time. The deputy leader has a supplementary.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): A supplementary to the Treasurer: given the depressed circumstances of the resources sector, as the minister has outlined in the answer, can he tell the parliament if his government has entered into any negotiations with ACP in respect of diversifying the development of the site outside of being an oil and gas hub?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:25): The situation in respect of the negotiations with ACP is that they have entered into an arrangement whereby, in effect, they have an option to purchase. There are certain conditions precedent in that option which had to be discharged by the government, and those have been discharged. We are now in the phase of the agreement where there are certain conditions precedent which are entirely in the hands of ACP, and it's my expectation that they should get on with the process of getting those things dealt with as quickly as possible so that there can be—

Mr Marshall: What sort of things?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They have to make appropriate preparations for the subdivision of the land, for example. These things are things that they, under the agreement, are obliged to do.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I say again: what the government has to do in respect of fulfilling the conditions precedent necessary for the final execution of this agreement has been done, and we are now waiting for ACP to do their bit so that there can be settlement upon the land. Now, what ACP ultimately choose to do with that land, at the time of the settlement, is a matter between them and the people who they are negotiating commercially with.

I think we need to make it clear that, in the event of ACP fulfilling their obligations under this agreement, what we are expecting to see is them to actually pay a substantial amount of money to the government as an initial first-phase purchase for an amount of land. They will then deal with the commercial aspects of that with whomever they are dealing, so that's a matter for them. Can I say that this question has been asked in many ways.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This question has been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned for the second and final time. The deputy leader is already on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My silence was apparently goading them.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I have said repeatedly in this place, the fact of the matter is that, whilst there was an expectation by ACP that there would be an opportunity for the creation of an oil and gas hub, it has been said many times here, by me and by the former minister, that, obviously, that is a commercial matter over which the government ultimately does not have control. Things such as, for example, the fact that the price of oil has been reduced substantially by market forces or market manipulation, some might say, over the last 12 months or so, and there has been a dramatic change in the economics of the oil and gas industry, are things over which this government has no control whatsoever.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: That's a matter which ACP will deal with in its own commercial fashion, in its own good time.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order, and the member for Mount Gambier is warned for the first time. Supplementary, deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Yes, if I may, to the Attorney-General as Minister for Urban Development. Has the government had any discussion with ACP in respect of any alternate development that they propose on the site, given the depressed circumstances of the resources industry?

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) (14:29): I will do my best to answer that question. To the best of my knowledge, there have been no discussions that I am aware of where the government has said, 'ACP, we want you to change from your oil and gas vision and do something else.' What we are interested in is them fulfilling—I want to make this very clear, and I will say this very slowly because it important—

The Hon. P. Caica: So they can understand it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes; I want to be really clear. What we are interested in seeing now is—ACP approached us in order to purchase some land. They agreed to pay a certain price for that land, which we judged to be good value for the state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Anything out of order from the leader and the deputy leader, they will be leaving us for the remainder of question time. The member for Kavel is warned and so is the member for Stuart. The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the second and final time. I think the Deputy Premier is being vindicated about Kavel.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you; he is relatively quiet in some respects, but he stirs them all up, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Lethal.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He is lethal; we have noticed it from here. The point I was trying to make was this: we secured an agreement with them, which was that we would enter into an arrangement whereby they would have an exclusive option to purchase at an agreed price. There were milestones along the way. The first few of those milestones were government milestones; they have now been completed.

The next set of milestones are milestones for ACP to complete, and it is my expectation that they will get on with it and complete them. When they have completed them, at that point the preconditions for the settlement upon the first parcel of land will be met, and it is my expectation that we will receive a cheque and there will be a settlement. What they then do, in terms of how they manage that property and how they make some business proposition out of that property, is their responsibility, not the government's responsibility.

Mr Pederick: I think it has run out of gas!

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond laughs at his own jokes; he is called to order. Supplementary, deputy leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I have a final supplementary to the Attorney-General: if the new circumstances are in relation to receiving the money upon the preconditions set, why did the former minister for urban planning (now Treasurer) state, before the election, 'This deal is not about value for money, it's about jobs—6,000 to 12,000 jobs for South Australia'?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform) (14:32): I have learned, in my time here, to be wary of deputy leaders bearing quotes. Just leave that one to one side. What was said, and what has been maintained all along, was that there were two aspects to this deal: the first one was the price being offered by ACP for that land was good value, full stop.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am telling you what the advice was, and I am telling you that no—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Despite all of the chaff that has been thrown in the air by the deputy leader and others over a period of time, nobody has produced anything, including through any court process, to suggest that the valuation—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He is intimidating me, Mr Speaker.

Ms Vlahos interjecting:

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

Mr Gardner: She has been doing it all day, sir.

The SPEAKER: She has.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The other point which was made was: there was an aspiration on the part of ACP at that time, which was entirely reasonable in the context of the then quite bullish view about the oil and gas sector here in South Australia, that there would be an opportunity to establish a hub very close to the Port, very close to rail and very close to major road networks—an ideal placement—and that, given the way in which these things are calculated—the way it works is, as I understand it, if you have X hectares of employment land, there is a rough rule of thumb that these people who are economic people use. It is per hectare—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I note that this is very scientific, but it is true. Per hectare of employment land, there is a general expectation that there will be a certain number of jobs if that land is disposed as employment land. So, what you do—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Let me put it another way that might be more helpful.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It might be more helpful if I put it this way: if you buy a paddock and you know the paddock can take two sheep per acre, if you multiply the number of acres in the paddock by two, you work out how many sheep you can have.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am trying to break through, Mr Speaker. Or, like the member for Finniss, who has some of the finest free-range chicken producers in the country, you can get much larger numbers than two per hectare. I think some of his producers are up in higher numbers than that and they are all running out free in the open air and having a lovely time. That is the nature of what we have said.

They said, 'Look, there is a bullish market expectation for oil and gas. We think we are going to be well positioned adjacent to transport connections, a port and the opportunity to be able to basically take business away that otherwise might migrate across to Queensland.' That was all a perfectly reasonable proposition at that point in time. Had that proceeded at that point in time, if you multiply the job-generating capacity of that type of industrial activity, you get the sort of numbers they were talking about.

LEIGH CREEK

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:36): My question is for the Premier. When will Dr Lomax-Smith report her recommendations coming from the Leigh Creek request for information process? How much will Dr Lomax-Smith be paid for this work and for how many hours?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have had the opportunity to travel—actually during my annual leave, but I took the opportunity to visit Leigh Creek and a range of the surrounding communities a few weeks ago. What became—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I didn't pop into Pirie, although it does have fond memories. I did pop into the Prairie Hotel, which I must say produces the best kangaroo feed you can get anywhere I have experienced. Just a little tip, if you are travelling.

I did have the opportunity to also meet with the member for Stuart. I think he has the view, and I share it, that there is a critical window of opportunity for the future of Leigh Creek. People are making their minds up now about whether they stay or go. Other people who have recently left because they have retired are making their minds up about shifting back. It is partly, if you like, the window of opportunity which has led the government to make the decision to separate out Leigh Creek and make it a discrete, very quick project to see if we can describe a future for it, because it is on a tipping point, I think.

You cannot travel to that area and not be staggered by the physical beauty, but also by some of the internationally recognised tourist icons there. We have 560-million-year-old Ediacaran fossils which, shamefully, are not given the promotion or protection they deserve. I think we need to, as a state, realise that we are sitting on an international tourism icon of extraordinary significance. Leigh Creek has an airport the member for Finniss would die for. It is a fantastic airport.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right, he doesn't want an airport. He doesn't want people to visit—that's right, I forgot. Leigh Creek has a great airport and it is a hub and quite closely connected. I found out to my surprise—I should have known this—that there is a sealed road all the way to Blinman now, so it does actually have some great infrastructure. Leigh Creek has an Olympic-sized swimming pool, an amazing set of tennis courts, resort-style accommodation, leafy tree-lined streets and the Aroona Dam, as I mentioned. So, we do need to get cracking on this. I expect it to be a relatively short timeline.

Ms Chapman: How much?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I don't know what we have agreed to pay her, but I will come back with an answer on that. The minister is responsible for that; I will get him to bring back an answer—the minister in the upper house, the Hon. Kyam Maher. What was your third question? Money, time line—

Mr Marshall: When does she report and how many hours is she going to work.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: How many hours? I don't know. I will get the answer back on those three questions.

Mr Marshall: It's good that you said, 'I don't know what—

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I knew a bit about it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart.

ALINTA ENERGY

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:40): My question is for the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Given the Alinta power generation business in Port Augusta will close on 31 March and that one of Alinta's legislated obligations is to remove the three existing power stations on the site and remediate the land to a condition comparable to never having had power stations built there, when will the government announce its future intention for the site?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:40): Yes, Alinta does have a number of obligations with regard to the remediation of both the Port Augusta and Leigh Creek sites, and the closure plan will require the assessment and determination of environmental risks at both the power stations and the mine, and that is appropriate. It includes the removal of chemicals and hazardous material on the sites. The closure of the power station and the associated mines, as well as related infrastructure, is a complicated matter and takes into account many factors, including employment implications and service provisions for the community, specifically, of course, at Leigh Creek.

The rehabilitation of the sites is subject to several South Australian acts, and Alinta has committed to meeting obligations in regard to remediation, and the Alinta Energy Task Force, which I know is happy to engage regularly with the local member of parliament and the shadow minister,

will take an active role in ensuring that these obligations are met; and as more information comes to light and more information becomes available to the public we will make that publicly available.

We actually think that, in light of the closure, the remediation can actually offer opportunities for employment and can offer opportunities for alternative business proposals, as we have seen with Sundrop. But, of course, we will have more to say about that as we are negotiating with Alinta because it has a very keen incentive to work cooperatively with the government, given its requirements to remediate, but if the local member and the local community have—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: When will you announce the intention—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We will. We are negotiating with the companies, but we would like more feedback from the local community and we are working very properly with the local council. So, rather than this sort of setting arbitrary deadlines and time lines, we want to make sure that we do this properly for the benefit for everyone in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know members want to yell out interjections thinking that it somehow contributes to the debate: it doesn't. All it does is just show that you are not interested in actually getting an outcome. It's just political pointscoring.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is?

Mr GARDNER: I was going to point out debate, but the minister seems to have finished.

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

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that the minister said last week that the decision to abandon the proposal for an eye hospital at the Modbury Hospital is based on advice from the College of Ophthalmologists, why wasn't the college consulted when the original decision was made?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:43): Well, the college was free to be a part of the process, but it came to see me after making the announcement and it had strong reservations (as I think, from recollection, did the Royal Society for the Blind) about doing the high-end eye surgery at Modbury Hospital. So, we are currently working with ophthalmologists about an alternative proposal, but I hope to have more to say about that shortly.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary, sir: can the minister confirm that the royal college wasn't consulted before making the decision to base the ophthalmology services at Modbury?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:43): It would have been invited to put in submissions into the Transforming Health process, just like every other stakeholder in the area.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Supplementary, sir: so your understanding is that it didn't make any submission and so therefore you made the decision in glorious isolation of the royal college?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:44): I will check to see whether it made a submission or not, but I don't know what the big deal is. Nothing has been

started at Modbury Hospital. We announced our intention to establish an eye centre there; upon further investigation, that appears to be not the best place for it and so I have changed my mind. That happens.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): Supplementary, sir: what was the basis of the objection of the college to having the eye surgery centre based at Modbury?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:44): Well, I think basically because—far be it from me to speak on behalf of the college; they can speak for themselves—I do think that they had reservations about doing high-end eye-type procedures at Modbury. There's no big deal there.

I think the other thing I should just say is they have other proposals about how we can further promote eye surgery in this state. I don't think it's any secret that the college's preference would be to have a dedicated eye hospital, but these are things which the government are working through with the ophthalmologists as we speak.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): Is it not the case that the college was concerned that the separation of trauma and elective eye surgery was not practical?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:45): That was never an issue because it was always the case that we would have eye surgery available for trauma, high-end trauma, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. It was never anticipated that that would be moved from the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We've always been quite clear about that. If you have a look at the documents, it was quite clear that we would always have a dedicated team, ophthalmology team, to deal with trauma at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Health. With the transfer of complex and emergency surgery from Modbury Hospital to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, can the minister guarantee that there will be no reduction in the level of acuity that the Modbury Hospital emergency department will be expected to handle?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:46): It's certainly not anticipated because the Modbury Hospital emergency department deals, generally speaking, with a relatively lower acuity level now. You wouldn't take a high-end trauma to there, so generally speaking, no, I wouldn't expect there to be much change for the overwhelming majority of patients who currently go to Modbury Hospital and are seen, treated and discharged. That will continue to happen.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Is the minister prepared to provide a guarantee that there will be no scaling down of the acuity at the emergency department at Modbury?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:46): What I guarantee is that there are going to be 3,000 additional patients being treated every year at the Modbury Hospital. The opposition can bleat all it wants about the hospital being downgraded, but I don't see how you can downgrade a hospital when it's dealing with 1,800 additional elective procedures every year and 3,000 additional patients going through it every year.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Florey.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:47): Could I ask the Minister for Health to tell the house about the improvements that he's planning at the Modbury Hospital then?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:47): I can, very happily. As part of the state government's ongoing efforts to improve the Modbury Hospital, the member for Florey has brought to my attention the good work of a group of University of South Australia's occupational therapy students who recently undertook a placement at Modbury Hospital and worked with the local Tea Tree Plaza Walking Group to create an open air, green space at Modbury Hospital for the use of patients, their families and staff members.

This great local initiative is already underway, with new plants being installed to provide a new outdoor area at the hospital for patients and their families. The new garden area will be located to the right of the main hospital entrance and will help to beautify the hospital and create a more pleasant environment for people to congregate.

I am pleased to say that, as part of the capital works to develop and improve Modbury Hospital, the government will help complete this project by adding a shaded area to the garden to help enhance the garden and allow patients and their families to make better use of the area. While final quotes are still being obtained, it's expected that around $5,000 will be spent to enhance this space for hospital users. Can I commend the member for Florey for her important advocacy for this project.

In coming weeks, SA Health will also hold community information sessions that will give the local community a chance to meet with the clinicians at Modbury Hospital and answer any questions they may have and encourage residents to get along to see the transformation of the hospital. Under Transforming Health, the government is building a bigger and better Modbury Hospital that will see more than 3,000 additional patients every year.

As an elective surgery hub, the future Modbury Hospital will perform 1,800 more elective procedures a year. This not only means faster access but fewer delays for the community in the north-east. Modbury's current specialist outpatient services will all remain, with the addition of a gastroenterology outpatient service. The new purpose-built rehabilitation centre, with hydrotherapy pool and gym, will help patients recover sooner.

With October being Breast Cancer Awareness Month, it's timely that Modbury also receive an expanded one-stop breast service for faster diagnosis and treatment. In contrast to some outrageous claims that have been made, Modbury Hospital's emergency department will continue to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Transforming Health will create a better Modbury Hospital, one that delivers the principal aim of providing patients with the best care first time, every time.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that the 62 beds at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital north and south pods will be relocated to make way for rehab services from Hampstead?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:50): Sorry, the 62 beds—

Mr Marshall: —at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital's north and south pods will be relocated to make way for the beds that are coming from the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will need to check and I am happy to get the information back to the Leader of the Opposition.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): I will move on to my next question, in that case, also to the Minister for Health. Given that physical exercise is a key component

of rehabilitation for people who have sustained a spinal cord injury, why has a physical education department been left out of the rehabilitation facilities at The Queen Elizabeth 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) (14:50): We're working with consumers about what the needs for spinal patients will be at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital when it is relocated to The QEH. I find it quite understandable that there may be some concerns, but I'm confident we can work through these. One of the important components of the changes that we're making for patients with spinal injury is to actually start their rehabilitation far earlier.

In fact, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will have rehabilitation beefed up substantially, and patients with severe spinal injury will be able to begin their rehabilitation at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital far sooner than currently happens when, essentially, they have to wait until they are transferred to Hampstead for their rehabilitation to begin in any substantive way. We are very confident that this new service will be to the benefit of patients with spinal injuries, but my department is working through any concerns consumers have about what facilities will be available to them.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary, sir: is the minister aware of Paraquad SA's concerns regarding the downgraded facilities that will be put for rehabilitation at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital? They believe that, in fact, a physical education department is fundamental to the needs of people trying to rehabilitate.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:52): They have written to me and I will get a reply back to them addressing their concerns, but we're very happy to meet with them and talk with them about any concerns they have, so we can reassure them that, far from being a downgraded service, it will be an upgraded service. It will be far and away to the benefit of patients with both brain injuries and spinal injuries.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Is the minister therefore suggesting to the parliament there is no downgrade, that there won't be a loss of gym with full-time staff as there is currently at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and that those facilities will be put down at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital? If that is the case, where will they be located?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:52): I reiterate what I've said and that is that we are not downgrading services to patients with spinal injuries.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Can the minister outline to the house what consultation he undertook prior to the decision to remove the physical education Department from the facilities going forward?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): I can't add to what I've already said and that is that I'm happy to work through these issues with consumers. I understand Paraquad have some concerns and I'm more than happy to work through these issues with them, to reassure them. It is certainly not my intention to do anything that would be to the detriment of patients recovering from spinal injuries, and I'm very confident, with the changes we're making, that this will be far and away to the benefit of patients with spinal injuries.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Would the minister therefore consider reinstating a physical education department at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital site with a gym and full-time staff?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): As I said, I'm

more than happy to sit down and talk with consumers to reassure them, to hear any views that they have and any concerns that they might have, and to do anything at all that is practical in order to address any concerns they might have.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): A further question to the Minister for Health: how will the proposed brain injury and spinal injury units cope with 19 fewer beds at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital than the 53 beds these units currently have at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:54): I don't hold with that reduction. I would need to check with that reduction that the Leader of the Opposition alleges. I know there is concern about the change in the number of beds for spinal patients from 25 to 22, but I am very confident that with improvements in rehabilitation and particularly with our engaging patients far earlier in their recovery that we can, in fact, provide for a lower length of stay which is going to be to the benefit of the patient, and it means we can get better use of the beds we have.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): Can the minister explain to the house how many beds will be reduced from both the brain injury and the spinal injury units? My understanding is there is a total of 19 beds. The minister has just explained to the house that it is two or three. Can we have some clarity around this issue please?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:55): I do not know about brain injury, but I have been advised about spinal injury. It is probably anticipated that the number of beds will be 22 and are 25 at the moment, but we are very confident that with improvements in rehabilitation, and in particular engaging patients in their rehabilitation far earlier than currently happens, that will more than provide for any increase in capacity we will need.

As always with bed numbers, we provide the number of beds that we need based upon presentations that we have and we are always able to flex up the number of beds to make sure that patients who need to be accommodated can be accommodated. Spinal injuries and brain injuries will be no different from anywhere else, and if we need extra beds at any time because we have an influx in the number of patients requiring a particular service, we will make sure those patients get looked after.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): How is it, minister, that we can have a reduction of almost 40 per cent in the number of beds both between the brain injury and the spinal injury units and no diminution of services? If it was so simple to be treating these patients with fewer beds going forward, why hasn't this been in place in the past?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:56): I don't hold necessarily with the Leader of the Opposition's allegation that there is a 40 per cent reduction in beds. I will need to check with brain injuries, but with regard to spinal injuries it is potentially a very small reduction because we believe we will be able to get better use of those beds by engaging patients in their rehabilitation much earlier. I think this is something that should be applauded.

BRAIN INJURY AND SPINAL INJURY UNITS

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): Will the minister come back to the house tomorrow and confirm the reduction in beds for both the brain injury and the spinal injury units in South Australia going forward?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:57): I am more than happy to come back to the Leader of the Opposition with advice about bed numbers, but as—

Mr MARSHALL: We're still getting answers to questions asked years ago.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Because you ask such inane questions. As I constantly state—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Inane questions, yes. Inane questions, that is what I said. Inane questions.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kavel.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The simple issue is—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Poor old Warren, yes. With regard to bed numbers, not only in brain and spinal injury but right across our health system, our bed numbers depend upon activity. If we have a greater number of presentations then we flex up the number of beds. Bed numbers is not a static thing that is set in stone. We always increase the number of beds if we have a greater number of presentations and so, likewise in these clinical areas that the Leader of the Opposition is referring to, if ever we needed additional capacity for patients recovering from brain or spinal injury, then we would simply flex up the number of beds to make sure we could accommodate those patients.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE IRRIGATION SCHEME

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister presented a detailed business case submission to Infrastructure Australia regarding the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme and, if so, when?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:58): I thank the deputy leader for her question. I haven't personally. Whether something has been transmitted from my department or another agency of government, I will take it on notice and come back to the house with a response.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Protection. Does the minister agree with the comments made by the Attorney-General that the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse are 'basically a bunch of Johnny-come-latelies'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:59): One of the proudest moments I had in parliament was the role I played in establishing the Mullighan inquiry into child sexual abuse for children in state care. We took a lot of time and effort in discussing the way in which we conducted that matter with the people who were the survivors of child sexual abuse. Also, we took very extensive advice from experts in the field about what would be the most beneficial form of redress and inquiry. We took detailed soundings from respected psychologists about what was the thing that was going to make the largest contribution to the health and wellbeing of those people who suffered from this abuse.

The truth is that judicial processes and claims for compensation, while important and a necessary part of the process, do require that, in order for people to maximise the amount of entitlement, they need to maximise the amount of loss and damage that they have suffered. Many of the psychologists who gave us the advice about how we should construct this inquiry told us that that was the last thing that they wanted.

The way we constructed the Mullighan inquiry was as a process where the telling of the story and the healing process associated with that was as important as the payment of money. We did not preclude the payment of money, but we did not make it the first and most significant element of the equation. Many of the young people in South Australia who availed themselves of that very substantial inquiry—I think resources from the state were allocated in the order of $11 million to that inquiry to allow every single one of them to come forward and tell their stories, and to have those stories respected. For many of them, it was the first time they had the opportunity to tell their story.

For many of them, they had been through a judicial process, which sadly resolved, for many of them, as just sitting in a corridor waiting for a settlement conference to occur and then getting, essentially, a paltry sum of money put in front of their nose and being told, 'You'd better accept this, this is the best we can do.' Or, even worse, told by a police officer, after they had been grilled by the police officer, 'I don't think this thing is going to stack up in court and, sadly, we can't pursue the matter.'

I know for many it might seem like the payment of money is the most important thing, but the truth is it can often be not the salve that many people think. That is not to say that we did not provide for it, and we have set up our own scheme of compensation, and it ought to be respected by the royal commission and we ask that it be respected. We note that a national scheme is being proposed. We do not think it properly takes into account the steps we have already taken here in South Australia; it should. If the commonwealth want to establish their own scheme and fund it, well and good, but we think that we have struck the right balance in the way in which we have responded to the victims of this awful abuse.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES TO CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Supplementary to the Premier: given the Premier's commitment to the state inquiry and the importance of the victims telling their story and the therapeutic benefits of that, will he now require the Attorney-General to apologise to those who sought to still put their stories to the national inquiry, particularly those outside the terms of reference that were offered in the state inquiry?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:03): I think this is a misconstruction of the Attorney's remarks. The Attorney was responding to questions about whether he would agree to establish a new form of redress in the context of us already having established a state form of redress, and I do not think the construction that the honourable member is putting on his remarks is a fair one. I don't think I have anything I can add.

MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Minister, can you outline to the house the effect of the federal leadership change and cabinet reshuffle on South Australia for mineral resources and energy, especially in relation to unlocking the full potential of our state's copper and uranium resources?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:04): I thank the member for his question, his ongoing interest in mining and his support for the government's economic priority of unlocking the full potential of our resources, energy and renewable assets. The reshuffle announced by incoming Prime Minister Turnbull has brought new faces into the industry, resources and energy portfolios. From the outset, I want to thank outgoing minister Macfarlane for his strong support in further developing South Australia's mineral and oil and gas sectors.

He has followed, with keen interest, the advances made in this state, in particular, the establishment of the royal commission into the nuclear fuel cycle and our commitment to a comprehensive copper strategy. Minister Macfarlane recognised the infrastructure requirements for our resources and energy sector and knows how important it is to have the road, rail and port links that provide a pathway to market for our exports. I thank him for his service and I thank him for his friendship.

I hope, and am sure, that incoming minister Frydenberg and, of course, incoming Treasurer Scott Morrison have the same positive attitude as their predecessors towards the infrastructure needs of our copper belt and the importance of sealing the Strzelecki Track to support ongoing development in our Cooper Basin. South Australia's geology and geography put us in an enviable position to develop our vast copper resource to supply the growing needs of the powerhouse economies of our region.

Another area in which I will be seeking cooperation from the federal government is in framing our response to the findings of the royal commission into the nuclear fuel cycle. I note that minister

Frydenberg recently endorsed the royal commission, calling it 'a good opportunity to have a community discussion about these issues to examine the opportunities and the risks'. I also note in his first speech to parliament, as a new member of parliament, he identified the need for a constructive and thorough debate about nuclear power as the only base load carbon neutral energy source. Of course, without pre-empting the commissioner's findings, due next May, I think it is fair to say that commonwealth and state governments will have their work cut out for them to cooperatively and collaboratively analyse the recommendations of this most important generational inquiry.

I look forward to working with new minister Frydenberg. We have had many conversations. I met with incoming new Treasurer Scott Morrison last week and I am looking forward to seeing him again on Thursday and Friday, talking about the Harper review into productivity and, of course, state-based tax reform. I welcomed his comments when he congratulated the state Labor government on its tax reform package and spoke of the merits of the tax reform package, which was in stark contrast, of course, to members opposite, who derided it.

AUSTRALIAN MASTERS GAMES

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Tourism and Minister for Recreation and Sport. What is the government doing to secure the future of the Masters Games as an event in Adelaide?

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) (15:07): I thank the member for Wright for the question. The 15th Australian Masters Games wrapped up here on Saturday night with a great closing ceremony at the Convention Centre. It ended eight days of terrific competition and socialising by about 10,000 participants and officials, who came from all parts of Australia—we had a team of 70 come from India for athletics—and it was great fun on and off the sporting arena.

I want to thank the member for Wright for getting out to so many events, including some hockey events where her son, Brett Rankine, became a three-time gold medallist, along with his Port Adelaide Magpies hockey team, who have been in three Australian Masters Games in a row. I also must mention the member for Reynell, who was a participant in basketball. She did not quite make it to the podium and is still feeling a little bit stiff and sore from the experience, but that is what the Masters Games are all about. They are available to people aged 30 and over, and it is just a terrific way for people to have a lot of fun.

It is a great way for us to show off our state as well. In this year's budget we put in an extra $35 million to attract more events and conventions to South Australia. The next Australian Masters Games will be held in 2017 in northwest Tasmania and, in 2019, we would love to have these games back in Adelaide. When we had them here in 2011, they injected $8.9 million into the economy. I had a text from a publican mate of mine who has a very good establishment (David Basheer from The Strathmore hotel on North Terrace), and he said, 'This is like The Rolling Stones but spread out over eight or nine days. It is a similar sort of impact.'

The other great thing about having all these people come here and have such a good time is that they go home and tell their friends and families about the tremendous time they had, and then they bring them back and show them what they saw.

I just want to point out a few of the highlights. Tennis player Henry Young was the oldest participant at 92 years of age. Roger Churchwood, the oldest track and field competitor, won gold in the five-kilometre, the 100-metre and 800-metre runs at 90 years of age.

Mr Griffiths: What were his times?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I don’t know but, if I was 90 and doing the five-kilometre run, I would probably be still out there running I reckon, so he deserves a huge round of applause. Sunesh Kumar, Malaysia's only representative at the games, won four gold medals in race walking, 55-year-old Clare Burrell was Australia's newest indoor rowing record holder after breaking the 500-metre lightweight time, and Sherry Gale broke her own archery record in the 60 to 69-plus recurve event.

One person, I think, who didn't get a medal, who probably deserves the biggest gold medal of the entire Masters Games, was the pilot who brought a plane down safely in Victoria Park. We had a parachuting team on board, it was the day before the games opened, and they were going through some practice runs. It was a very scary moment for the pilot and those people on board but a testament to the great skills of the pilot, who is a very modest man who didn't want to talk publicly about what he did.

He found a spot in Victoria Park—as I understand it, the first place that he had. People moved into his line of sight, so he had to turn around and take evasive action, but he brought that plane down with relatively little damage to the aircraft and, thankfully and fortunately, without any major damage to any of those people who were on board. It was a great Masters Games, and I would love to have them back here in 2019.

VOLUNTEER AND EMPLOYER RECOGNITION AND SUPPORT PROGRAM

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister advise the house about the Volunteer and Employer Recognition and Support Program that was held last Wednesday evening at Clare Town Hall?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for her question and also her support for volunteers. Last Wednesday evening, I attended the Volunteer and Employer Recognition and Support Program (known as VERSP) at the town hall in Clare. I was joined by the shadow minister (the member for Morphett) and the member for Goyder, and I would like to thank both of them for their support of the sector. The CEO and the deputy mayor and other elected members from the Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council were also present at the presentation.

VERSP events are held throughout the state to acknowledge and thank the employers of emergency service volunteers and our retained MFS firefighters. There have been more than 30 VERSP events across South Australia, with over 750 certificates presented. Since the program started, I can actually recall representing the minister, the Hon. Carmel Zollo, some years ago at a VERSP event in Clare Town Hall.

In addition to the employers recognised at the event, many volunteers who are self-employed were also recognised, and they are the important group we sometimes forget. The self-employed volunteers often have to close their business to attend incidents and emergencies, putting the safety of the community ahead of their personal profits. The Clare VERSP event was an opportunity to acknowledge and thank them all for their contribution to the safety of their local community.

The emergency service chiefs, chief executive of SAFECOM and I provided a number of appreciation awards and certificates to those businesses attending. I also had the opportunity to thank some very inspiring volunteers, including Neil Gibson from the local Clare CFS unit, and also to congratulate Mark Hill from the Tarlee CFS brigade, who received an Order of Australia in this year's Queen's Birthday honours list. Mr Gibson, from the local Clare CFS unit, was also inducted as a life member of the SES. This year has been a particularly busy year for our sector. Without the support of employers and self-employed volunteers, things could have been much worse at places like Sampson Flat.

Individuals grow and learn new skills and experiences while serving as emergency service volunteers, particularly in management and leadership, administration, work health and safety, bookkeeping, auditing and many more. This was highlighted by Horrocks CFS Group Officer, Michael Colbert, who talked about his early days in what was then the emergency fire service and fitting out trucks from scratch. He still retains those skills which he learnt in those days and which are of benefit to his employer. One of the important things about the program is to actually highlight the additional benefits for an employer from people who volunteer in their community—they bring a lot of skills with them. All these skills and experiences benefit the businesses where they work.

I encourage businesses who are recruiting to consider hiring emergency service volunteers as they will certainly see the benefits in the long term. Those businesses that already have emergency service volunteers on their books will certainly testify to that.

Last but not least, I would also like to acknowledge the support of family members of the volunteers. They often miss out on a lot of family life as the volunteers are working for their communities. In closing, I would like to thank everybody involved in this event, with a special mention of the staff of the Volunteer Services Branch in SAFECOM who organised and ran this very effective event.

FREGON CHILDREN AND WELLBEING CENTRE

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister advise the house on a new facility on the APY lands supporting children to get a start to their education?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:15): I thank the member for his question and for his commitment to the ongoing welfare of Aboriginal communities on and off the lands. As members will recall, I recently visited the APY lands, which was my first visit as an adult, and very much enjoyed seeing the ways in which education in particular, and support for early childhood, is adding to the quality and security of that community and its future.

In particular, one of the reasons I attended at that time was to participate in the opening of the Fregon Children and Wellbeing Centre. I would like to pay tribute to all those involved, particularly from the community, who really insisted that we make such an investment. It was an investment that was a contribution not only by my department but very significantly from the federal government. The Fregon Children and Wellbeing Centre was built by the Army, and it was delightful to see that the two Army men who came back to be part of the opening were so impressed with the way in which it was flourishing post their departure.

Very briefly, I would also like to draw the house's attention to Pollyanne Tjunkaya Smith, who is an Aboriginal education worker of some 30 years' standing. I would like to pay tribute to her work, which started 30 years ago in an informal way—making breakfast porridge for children before school to make sure that they not only came to school but that they were able to study with a full belly—and culminated in her getting a Bachelor of Education. She is a very impressive woman—a woman who has shown enormous commitment to her community in Kaltjitji—and I was most impressed not only to meet her but also to be part of the opening of that centre.

Grievance Debate

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:17): For 14 years, Labor has been running the South Australian economy, and for at least half that time Labor was relying on all of its eggs in one basket: the 23,000 jobs promised for Olympic Dam that never happened. We heard the member for Playford, in his first and only budget in this place, tell us that next year and the year after would be very different in South Australia because the Olympic Dam would be operating. That never happened at all.

We heard that 6,000 jobs would be created at Gillman—there is no confirmation of that happening. Five thousand new jobs in the mining industry were announced this time last year, and there are actually fewer people now working in mining than when that announcement was made.

I remember there was a promise of hundreds of jobs at McLaren Vale for the Marcos sports car company that was moving to Adelaide. We all remember the photographs of the Premier down at the race track, telling us about the Markos car factory moving to McLaren Vale. McLaren Vale was important because it was a marginal seat that Labor needed to win at the 2006 election in order to be in government in their own right, which of course they did, without being part of the promise.

The government told South Australians that this year's budget was a jobs budget. Since then, 3,400 South Australians have joined the job queues and 1,800 full-time jobs have disappeared. South Australia's unemployment rate has trended up every month for the past 12 months. The Premier and his government have been telling South Australians that our economy is going through a transforming phase for at least the last decade. It was the reason why Skills for All was announced as an election policy in 2010, and at the same time they announced that there would be 100,000 new jobs in South Australia by 2016. That is only a few months away, and guess what: they are more than 90,000 jobs short of that target.

We saw, with the news yesterday of another 200 jobs gone from Santos, that the government felt that it needed to at least pretend it was doing something, that it was interested in the job losses that are happening in South Australia, and so we saw the government start ringing South Australians, asking them to participate to find solutions for jobs in South Australia. This is code for, 'We don't know what to do. We've run out of ideas. We have no idea. For 14 years we have let this situation deteriorate.' Up to 115,000 people will be cold-called over the next couple of days, with 48,000 last night.

My mother was one of them being called by the Premier last night with a recorded message. From that message, she actually expected a personal call from the Premier tonight, because that is what the message said, that he would call her tonight at 6.30. But, of course, what is happening is there will be another 100,000 people on hold while the Premier is making this town hall call in the northern and western suburbs. What is he going to tell them? Is he going to be spinning more nonsense about Labor's plans to blame others for the situation that South Australia is in?

My mother understands what is going on. Living in the seat of Lee in Semaphore, she sees the unemployment issues and the poverty. She is very concerned about it, and she believes it is the government's role to fix it. She will not be answering her phone today because she does not want to be part of a government stunt by Premier Weatherill and the Labor Party. She wants to see results. As a matter of fact, she was quite offended by the fact that there was no genuine interest in what she had to say from the Premier when he called.

After 14 years in South Australia of Labor government, we have the highest unemployment in the nation. It is 8.1 per cent in South Australia; the next highest is Tasmania at 6.5 per cent. The problem with this government is that it has given up and it has no idea of how to generate jobs in South Australia, but it can generate stunts and it is happy to use taxpayers' money to do it.

UNEARTHED HACKATHON

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:22): At the very least, I am happy that the member for Unley's mother has a very hardworking member of parliament in the member for Lee. South Australia has a strong and growing innovation and start-up community, but we need this to grow in the future to create economic opportunities for this state, particularly for our home-grown developers, designers, scientists and entrepreneurs. One of the many opportunities for growth in this sector is in the mining and energy industry.

On Friday night, I had the pleasure of representing the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, giving a speech at the launch of the first Adelaide Unearthed Hackathon at the St Paul's Creative Centre. This event brought together over 130 South Australians to participate, many of whom were young people studying at our universities. It was a 54-hour open innovation event. Teams were formed to develop solutions for particular challenges for the mining and energy industries. Five challenges were set by the Department of State Development, BHP Billiton and OZ Minerals. These were real-world challenges facing the mining industry and they used real-world data from the government and those mining companies.

This is the fourth Unearthed event that has been held across Australia, following similar events in Perth, Brisbane and Sydney. I am proud to say it was one of the best attended by developers participating across the country. When people think of digital innovation and start-ups, you immediately think of apps and consumer technology: social media, ride-sharing and the like. But, as Zane Prickett, who is the director of Unearthed, explained on the weekend, when you look at the statistics, most of those start-ups are occurring in industries like arts, media and IT, industries that comprise a relatively small percentage of our GDP or, in our state, gross state product. Whereas industries such as mining and energy or even industries such as agriculture comprise a relatively high percentage of our GSP, we are not seeing the same level of start-ups in them, and there is a huge opportunity there for our state.

In the past it was regarded that mining companies work to solve their challenges internally without engaging many external service providers compared to other sectors, such as oil and gas. However, this is changing. These companies are now more open to looking externally for solutions to their challenges to improve efficiency, including through start-ups. This creates opportunities for South Australia to expand our mining services industry and to export those services to the world,

even during this period of lower commodity prices where everybody is trying to become more efficient.

Participants had access to the South Australian government geological data base, SARIG, which is regarded amongst the world's top-ranking data sites and which contains a wealth of exploration data, as well as access to real-word data and expertise from the mining companies involved throughout the weekend, BHP Billiton and OZ Minerals.

The judges were Dr Jana Matthews from UniSA, Doug Adamson from Accelerating Commercialisation Entrepreneurs Program, Dr Paul Heithersay and Christine Gerrard from the Department of State Development (DST), Andrew Wellington from BHP Billiton and John Penhall from OZ Minerals. Thank you to all of those judges, as well as the mentors from those organisations and many others who were available for participants across the weekend.

I would also like to thank Susan Andrews from DST for her efforts in seizing the opportunity to bring Unearthed to Adelaide. The winners of the weekend were the team HyperSpecX, comprising Ravi Hammond, Daniel Camilleri, Jack Gerrits and Konrad Janica. I hope these young men will further develop the technology they created during Unearthed and further the benefits for both the efficiencies of mining operations and the start-up community in South Australia.

This work links to projects the South Australian government already has underway, including the ICT roadmap for minerals and energy where we are working with the Australian Information Industries Association to identify 11 opportunities where we can improve the productivity, environmental management and global competitiveness in the resource sector through the use of ICT.

Through this program there are projects underway, including remote monitoring and mine assets, big data analytics to improve the purity of ores and the real time transfer of information from the drill site. In my speech on Friday night I encouraged all the participants to keep in touch with the department and the Mining and Petroleum Services Centre of Excellence because this government has a strong commitment to helping new mining service companies develop in our state.

I hope that we can see Unearthed become an annual event in Adelaide because there are significant opportunities for our economy through the growth of mining services start-ups and entrepreneurs.

MINNIPA CENTENARIES

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:27): I rise today to talk to an event which I attended in the electorate of Flinders over the long weekend in October and that was the centenary of the township of Minnipa. I had a private member's motion back in September congratulating the committees involved with the celebration of not just the Minnipa Agriculture Centre but also the township.

They were two separate events. I got along to Minnipa on Saturday 3 October where the town was celebrating its centenary with a range of events. I will talk about those events very briefly and congratulate the people who were involved. My wife and I travelled to Minnipa, and I must say at the outset that something I am very passionate about is local history and the Minnipa people, certainly in their celebration of their centenary, embrace local history also.

The morning began with registration at 8am with an invitation to be seated for the national anthem at 9.30am. Local identities took part. Mr Jon Fromm gave the introduction. Mr Elliot McNamara gave a speech and welcomed people to Minnipa. I must say that it was an extraordinarily good speech from Elli, who is a member of an Aboriginal family who, along with his siblings, grew up in Minnipa through the 1950s and 1960s, and it was wonderful to see him back and talk about his life during and since his time at Minnipa.

Mrs Eleanor Scholz, Mayor of the Wudinna District Council, who was a Minnipa girl originally, gave an address. I had the pleasure and honour of officially opening the weekend. Mr Murray Cook, Mr John Kwaterski and Mr Ken Gosling then unveiled a plaque, which commemorated the early farming families, and those three gentlemen have families who are still farming in the district today and they were representing the early settlers and all the previous and continuing landowners and all who have lived and contributed to the Minnipa district. They unveiled the plaque, and I was pleased

to be part of that ceremony. I will just very quickly outline what the plaque says because it is very important.

It stated that the township of Minnipa was officially proclaimed on 28 January 1915. Minnipa has occupied a unique place in the development of Eyre Peninsula. The Minnipa railway terminus and station was completed on 5 May 1913. The Minnipa Agricultural Centre was also opened in 1915, and it continues to operate as one of Australia's most significant agricultural research farms. Also, the Tod River pipeline and Minnipa Tod pressure tank were opened in June 1928, and remain pivotal to the Eyre Peninsula water scheme. Murray Cook, John Kwaterski and Ken Gosling as descendants, along with Peter Treloar MP, unveiled the plaque. It was erected by the Minnipa Centenary Celebrations Committee as a memorial to the pioneers who over the last 100 years have made Minnipa the independent and proud town it is today.

The event continued after morning tea with an acknowledgement of the sponsors by Mr Jerel Fromm. A cake was cut by Mr and Mrs Doug and Beryl Elefsen. Doug is 89, about to turn 90, and is a lifelong resident of Minnipa. Mr Graeme Dodsworth, who was the last principal of the Minnipa Area School before it closed and students shifted to Karcultaby, read the roll call of the last students. Mr Murray Gerschwitz talked about the pioneers. Mr Matthew Cook, chair of the book committee, spoke and launched *Minnipa Memories*. I congratulate Matthew on all his work. Mr and Mrs Peter and Maggie Knife as the book publishers responded to that. I must say that Peter and Maggie are now residents of Port Lincoln and they are absolute treasures. It is the fourth history book that Peter has been involved with, and we are absolutely privileged to have those two people living on Eyre Peninsula.

Tours of the town followed, and then during the evening a dinner dance was held in the local town hall. It was emceed by Mr Anthony North, and guest speakers were Mr Jack McKenzie and Mr Bob Holloway, who managed the Minnipa Agriculture Centre for a time. Mrs Fiona Carey acknowledged the sponsors. No weekend such as this can occur without significant sponsorship, mostly local, so we thank them. A final thankyou was made by Bruce Heddle, and I congratulate him on his work as chair of the celebration committee. He does a terrific job along with all his helpers. The Phillips family pancake breakfast followed on Sunday, and I know that the Redding family had a get together as well. Congratulations to all involved. It was a wonderful day, and congratulations to Minnipa on their centenary.

AUSTRALIAN MASTERS GAMES

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:32): I rise to speak about the outstanding 15th Australian Masters Games that were held last week in sporting venues across our beautiful state. I was both delighted and privileged to represent minister Bignell and help welcome competitors from across the globe at the opening of the games on the Saturday before last at the stunning Adelaide Convention Centre, where thousands of athletes gathered to celebrate their sports and long histories of sportspersonship, their friendships and their forthcoming clashes on the fields, waterways, courts and tracks of our state. It was a night to remember, with a fabulous sense of excitement for the week ahead.

I participated in two basketball teams at this year's Masters Games and, pardon the pun, had an absolute ball. Our teams played hard, enjoying passionately fought-out yet social games against new friends, women from all walks of life and many different places, including Christchurch, Melbourne and the Australian Defence Force, a very fit team indeed. Whilst neither of my teams secured a ticket to the big dance, we thoroughly enjoyed our time in the games, and if you catch me crawling this week it is because I am not fit, not particularly skilled at my chosen sport, but was totally committed to running as hard as I could in support of our team efforts.

From an early age, participation in sport has provided me with a wonderful sense of being part of the bigger community family filled with generous volunteers and friends who have been there for me in so many ways. I know that many involved in the Masters Games have also experienced a similar sense of belonging in their communities on their journeys to the pinnacle of many of our sporting careers, the Australian Masters Games. This same spirit was deeply embedded in these games. They were filled with passionate and friendly competitors, extraordinarily generous

volunteers and tireless organisers working together to advance a common love of sport and, importantly, a great sense of community.

The games were made possible by in excess of approximately 1,500 volunteers over the course of the event, an extraordinary number of people to donate their time and effort to the event's success, and a successful event it was. Thousands of passionate South Australian community members participated in these Masters Games, which we were privileged to host for the sixth time since they commenced.

More than 10,000 athletes competed across almost 60 diverse sports including softball, dragon boat racing, weightlifting, darts and roller derby. The games provided a great opportunity for people to try new sports, for people who left their sporting careers behind many years ago to start afresh and for seasoned senior athletes to test their mettle at a high level. Records were broken, personal bests were achieved, and extraordinary displays of courage, camaraderie and athleticism were shown by athletes aged right into their 90s.

South Australians can be proud that we hosted this year's Masters Games. They are estimated to provide an economic benefit to our state in excess of $9 million in addition to the incredible community benefits. I was pleased to show off our beautiful state and facilities to our interstate and international guests. Amongst the 10,000 athletes were thousands of visitors, as well as their family members and other supporters.

The Masters Games are also a very social occasion, as I am sure many of you who were around the city last week would have seen. They are a time for friendship, laughter, reminiscing about past glories and perhaps a few quiet drinks. It was clear from the many conversations I had with fellow participants that our social program was incredibly well received, with many a basketball team heading off post a drink at the Wayville or Pasadena stadium to the games village to enjoy the not-so-real Abba, the not-so-real Kylie Minogue or just some time in our beautiful CBD.

Over the next two months in South Australia, we will host the ITU Duathlon World Championships, which are on this weekend, the Bridgestone World Solar Challenge, the Adelaide Motorsport Festival, the Australian International 3 Day Event, which will incorporate the Equestrian Grand Final for the first time, and the Pacific School Games. I look forward to welcoming participants and supporters of these events.

In closing, I want to recognise the fantastic women I had the opportunity to play with last week. All of us lead incredibly busy lives, yet we made time—with the support of our families, many of whom cheered us on throughout the week—to get together and enjoy these amazing games. Thank you to all of them for their friendship, their patience and the fine spirit with which they approached our games campaign.

In particular, thanks to the legendary and incredibly kind Amanda Miller, who I know volunteers in many ways in our community, including at the mighty Christies Beach Surf Life Saving Club and who selflessly took on the task of organising our bunch of hard-to-organise and extraordinarily busy women. I am looking forward to the games in 2019.

SOUTH-EAST REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:37): We hear a lot about doom and gloom around the state of South Australia and, whilst some of that is true, with job downturns and economic distress in certain areas, there comes a point where opportunity meets goodwill. I want to talk today about some exciting opportunities in the South-East of South Australia, which I think has a very bright and prosperous future, and all that is required is a minuscule amount of investment from the state government.

I am talking about Mount Gambier Airport in particular. We are sitting on the cusp of a tourism tsunami. Last year, international tourists coming just into Mount Gambier increased by 20 per cent, from 36,000 to 45,000. A large percentage of those were from China. Golden Travel inbound tour operators are regularly talking to our city leaders around the opportunity for bringing international tourists into Mount Gambier, but there is a stumbling block. Unfortunately, our current airline—we only have one, and that is Regional Express (REX)—has a 15 kilogram bag limit.

For international tourists, as you might appreciate, Deputy Speaker, 15 kilos would be difficult—certainly for my wife, but also for me—to take on an international trip. We are on the cusp of a major increase in international tourism. I must admit, just being a local member, the number of delegations in my region talking about business opportunities and investment is something that I have rarely seen before.

I also want to talk about a very exciting development which has been going on now for 12 months, and that is the James Morrison Academy of Music. I want to inform the house that this academy, which offers a university degree, started off this year with 50 students. They are already interviewing, and next year there will likely be 70 to 80 students on top. The 50 students this year will go into second year university and the 80 coming through will be in first year. There are 130 students and, of course, the year after they are looking at another 100 students coming along starting first year. What an amazing opportunity for our town.

This academy is world class. I do not want people to get confused with Generations in Jazz, which I will talk about in a minute. This is James Morrison and his academy. He has people from around the world coming in providing tutorials or instruction for these students. To give you an indication of the calibre of the lecturers, Mat Jodrell was at the Juilliard School in New York, which is the best school of jazz in the world. As soon as James Morrison rang him and said that he had set up a school here, he resigned from the Juilliard institute, came to a little old place like Mount Gambier and started instructing.

In addition, there is Jeff Clayton, who is a saxophone player from the USA and an amazing individual, David Jones, Phil Stack, Ross Irwin, Carl Dewhurst, Gordon Rytmeister and James Muller. This has had international focus put on Mount Gambier. The opportunities are boundless in terms of this little place called Mount Gambier going onto the jazz circuit. People would fly in, visit Adelaide, Mount Gambier and Melbourne and then fly out.

I also want to bring Generations in Jazz to the house's attention. Currently about 5,000 people come to this event with 3,500 students playing jazz. As the Deputy Speaker just indicated, it has been a great addition to the town for the last—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Fifteen years.

Mr BELL: —15 years. The organisers believe that the number attending could grow to 10,000 or 15,000; in other words, it could be done multiple times during the year, but the one thing holding us up is our airport.

Time expired.

ARRIUM

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:42): I rise today to talk primarily about the agreement that has been entered into between Arrium and the state government in relation to Arrium's harbour. It is one of those items that represents what I believe is good news for the state and good news for my region but, in saying that, it might well be that the benefits that accrue will be medium to long term. There will not be any short-term benefits, given the state of commodity prices.

Before going into some detail about the proposal, and the whole saga of port proposals in this state over recent years, I think it is important when flagging good news also to acknowledge that there is also some bad news tied up with my region at the moment, especially in the community of Whyalla. Last week, BGC, the largest of the contractors at the Middleback mines, laid off or identified the people who would be laid off in the coming weeks—another 125 people added to the people who have already been laid off at the mines in the Middleback—so that is certainly not good news.

Coming on top of that is Arrium's announcement that $100 million worth of cuts will be identified at the Whyalla steelworks in addition to the $60 million worth of cuts that have already occurred. It is a little bit hard to estimate how many jobs have been lost at the steelworks in the last year. It would probably be relatively low in terms of the overall employment base at the steelworks, but about 90 staff members, primarily, have lost their jobs there. There is no employment target associated with the $100 million worth of cuts, but it is clear that additional jobs will be lost at the steelworks. That is why the announcement about the Arrium harbour, and the agreement that has

been entered into between Arrium and the state government about opening up the harbour and reaching its full potential, is such good news.

As members from my part of the world would know, and as the member for Flinders would know, there has been a whole range of harbour proposals in our area. At Port Lincoln, Centrex were at one stage going to move iron ore through the Port Lincoln harbour, and that was a deeply divisive push by Centrex at the time. Fortunately, I think, for the Port Lincoln community, Jim White, the late general manager of the Whyalla steelworks, took over as CEO at Centrex and decided that it would be a very bad fit to put iron ore through that very attractive community, and he focused on the Sheep Hill proposal just to the north of Lipson Cove. That was a far more sensible proposal, but of course it has not gone anywhere because of commodity prices.

Just to the north of Centrex, we had Cape Hardy with the Iron Road proposal; that is still clearly on the drawing board, and I understand that Iron Road will be submitting formal documentation to the state government for approval very soon. Cape Hardy, as one of a number of ports that have been proposed, was one that seemed to make more sense, with the potential to build a relatively short jetty into deep water and therefore capable of handling capesize vessels.

To the north of Cape Hardy and to the north of Cowell harbour we had the Lucky Bay transhipping proposal, which I did not think was a very sensible proposal for a whole range of reasons. I doubt very much whether it will get off the ground, but I have been wrong before. Then to the north of Lucky Bay we had OneSteel Arrium. With the exception of what went out of Outer Harbor through IMX, they are the only people to export iron ore over recent years out of South Australia. Over on the other side of the gulf is Port Pirie, with the on-again off-again proposal, and Bob Duffin.

Time expired.

Ministerial Statement

MARINE PARK SANCTUARY ZONES

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:47): I table a statement made by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation in the other place.

Bills

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PROTECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:47): I move:

That this bill now be read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading and explanation of clauses incorporated into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The *Residential Tenancies (Domestic Violence Protections) Amendment Bill 2015* amends the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* (the Act) to provide protections to victims of domestic violence in the tenancy sector to terminate a residential tenancy or rooming house agreement where the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) is satisfied domestic abuse has occurred or there is an intervention order in force against a person residing at the premises.

Domestic violence continues to have a profound impact on the South Australian community. It is found across all cultures, ages and socio-economic groups, but the majority of those who experience domestic violence are women. However, it is not possible to measure the true extent of the problem as most incidents of domestic violence go unreported. Australian women are most likely to experience physical and sexual violence in their home, at the hand of a male current or ex-partner. For 62% of women who had experienced physical assault by a male perpetrator, the most recent incident was in their home.

The Weatherill Government has made a strong commitment to addressing domestic violence in our community. Last year, the Premier reaffirmed domestic violence prevention as a priority for this Government with the release of the 'Taking A Stand – Responding to Domestic Violence' paper. Since then, the Government has embarked

on a series of initiatives to address domestic violence in our community. To build on these initiatives, the Government is pursuing changes to strengthen the level of protection afforded to victims of domestic violence in the tenancy sector.

As currently structured, residential tenancies legislation does not provide sufficient protection to victims of domestic violence in the tenancy sector. Presently, a tenant or landlord may apply to SACAT to terminate a residential tenancy based on hardship, and SACAT may consider any special circumstances that may result in undue hardship to the tenant or landlord. However, SACAT's powers are limited in cases where the tenant is a co-tenant with the person being violent towards them. Co-tenants are jointly and severally liable, it flows from this that SACAT cannot terminate a residential tenancy, unless the other tenant joins the application, indicates no opposition to it, or SACAT is satisfied that the other tenant has abandoned the residential tenancy. This means that where a tenant has established that there are grounds which would ordinarily have met the test required to terminate a tenancy based on hardship, because the person is a co-tenant, SACAT is unable to terminate the tenancy unless one of these situations apply.

SACAT is also unable to make an order that one tenant in a co-tenancy is liable for compensation to the landlord (to the exclusion of other co-tenants). In situations of domestic violence this generally results in the victim being required to pay for damage caused to the property by the perpetrator, either out of the bond or as compensation, or both. This may also lead to a victim of domestic violence being listed on a Residential Tenancy Database, often referred to as a 'tenant blacklist', as a result of damage caused to the property by the perpetrator from a situation of domestic violence.

On application by a landlord where there is risk that a tenant (or person permitted on the premises by a tenant) may cause serious damage to property or personal injury, SACAT may make an order restraining the tenant or other persons on the premises from engaging in certain conduct. However, at present it is not explicit that a tenant may apply for a restraining order against a co-tenant or person permitted on the premises by a co-tenant.

The *Intervention Order (Protection of Abuse) Act 2009* (the IO Act) contains measures to help victims of abuse safely stay in their home. It allows an intervention order to prohibit the perpetrator from being anywhere near the family home, even though the perpetrator may own or rent it. The aim is to encourage victims of abuse and their children to stay in the family home if they want to and prevent their lives being unnecessarily disrupted. It also offers a means of longer-term security to protected persons who wish to stay in the home. The IO Act allows the Court, when making an intervention order that excludes a defendant from rented premises in which the defendant lives with the protected person, to make another order by which the defendant's interest in the tenancy agreement is assigned to the protected person or to some other person or persons other than the defendant. This measure takes into account the needs of the landlord and prevents the order being made if incompatible with the legal obligations of the landlord. These orders do not terminate the tenancy agreement but allow it to continue in terms that are consistent with the assignment of a tenant's rights in a residential tenancy agreement under the Act.

The Bill aims to support victims of domestic violence in the tenancy sector to leave a hostile environment or remove the perpetrator from the environment, without incurring further unfair expenses caused by the perpetrator, and to minimise any further dealings with the person in relation to the tenancy in the future. Domestic violence is not limited to physical and sexual assault, it is violent, threatening or other behaviour that controls a member of the person's family or causes the family member to be fearful. It is not always between partners, it can be perpetrated by grandchildren, cousins, brothers, sisters uncles, aunts, mums or dads. Domestic violence can include a wide range of behaviour between family members. It is proposed to adopt existing definitions under the IO Act, including, abuse, act of abuse, and domestic abuse in the Act. Domestic associate is a new term, however it reflects the relationships outlined in the IO Act for the purposes of domestic abuse, which includes a broad range of intimate, family and informal care relationships. It is also proposed to define co-tenant for clarification purposes.

Under the Bill a tenant may apply to SACAT to terminate a residential tenancy based on domestic abuse in the following circumstances:

- where there is a Court issued intervention order in force against a person residing at the premises for the protection of the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant residing at the premises. The inclusion of domestic associates aims to extend these protections to children or other domestic associates that are not named on the tenancy agreement. An intervention order may relate to domestic or non-domestic abuse. This aims to afford a level of protection to victims of non-domestic abuse. Requiring a Court issued intervention order provides a level of protection to the landlord against applicants fabricating evidence of non-domestic (or domestic) abuse in order to terminate a residential tenancy agreement; or

- where a person who resides at the premises has committed domestic abuse against the applicant. Without limiting the evidence that may satisfy SACAT that domestic abuse has occurred, it may include a South Australia Police report or report from a domestic violence service provider.

Under the proposed Bill, on application to terminate a residential tenancy based on domestic abuse, SACAT may make an order terminating the residential tenancy and:

- requiring a new tenancy agreement be entered into on the same terms and conditions for the remainder of the tenancy between the landlord, applicant and /or any co-tenants, subject to any objections by the landlord or any co-tenants. SACAT must not make an order effectively creating a new tenancy

agreement if the hardship likely to be suffered by the objector, is greater than the hardship likely to be suffered by the applicant (or domestic associate of the applicant), if the order was not made. This aims to support the victim to remain in the premises and remove the perpetrator from the residential tenancy; or

- requiring a new tenancy agreement be entered into on the same terms and conditions for the remainder of the tenancy between the landlord, perpetrator and any co-tenants, if the landlord has not indicated that it would be unreasonable to do so. This aims to support the victim to leave the residential tenancy and no longer be liable for any damage caused to the premises.

However, SACAT must not make an order requiring a new tenancy agreement, unless satisfied that any co-tenant under the new agreement could reasonably be expected to comply with obligations under the agreement. This aims to ensure that any co-tenants remaining at the premises under a new agreement are not caused hardship.

The Bill extends these protections to rooming house residents and empowers SACAT to terminate the rooming house agreement of either the applicant or the perpetrator. This takes into consideration the nature of rooming houses and the likelihood of the applicant having a separate agreement to the perpetrator at the same premises.

It is proposed that SACAT may find that one or more, but not all, co-tenants are responsible for compensation to the landlord, either in relation to the early termination of a tenancy or for damage to the premises or ancillary property. The Bill empowers SACAT to make an order that the responsible co-tenant/s are liable (to the exclusion of other co-tenants) for a payment of compensation to the landlord. SACAT may direct the bond be paid in such proportions as it thinks fit, to the landlord and any co-tenant who is not liable for making a payment of compensation, but such a direction may not operate to limit the amount of bond payable to a landlord. In making such a direction, SACAT should consider which co-tenants were liable for a payment of compensation to the landlord, which co-tenants contributed to the bond and in what proportions, and the existing principles of the Act, including the intended purpose of the bond. These amendments aim to provide a balance between the victim's interest in the bond, if any, and the landlord's right to compensation out of the bond. However, compensation exceeding the bond will be an order against the responsible co-tenants only.

Where SACAT makes an order requiring a new tenancy be entered into, the tenant (or co-tenants) to the new agreement may be required to lodge a new bond, at the request of the landlord. It is proposed that SACAT will consider the payment of any bond when making the order and may make a self-executing order terminating the new tenancy agreement if the new bond is not lodged by the date specified in the order.

Under these proposed amendments, a tenant may apply for a restraining order against a co-tenant and SACAT may prohibit a tenant's personal information being listed on a Residential Tenancy Database in certain circumstances relating to domestic abuse.

By this Bill, the Government strengthens its commitment to women's safety in South Australia, which is reinforced through *A Right to Safety* the next phase of the Women's Safety Strategy 2011-2022. A key part of our Government's agenda is supporting women to remain in their homes when it is safe to do so rather than a response that results in the woman and any children she may have being displaced from their familiar surroundings, social supports, school and employment. The Government is committed to ensuring victims are respected and supported and not suffering hardships associated with relocating. This can often mean leaving employment which leads to financial hardship, and leaving community connections and support, impacting their children's education and isolating them further.

If these reforms are enacted, Parliament will send a clear message that the use of violence to control or intimidate another person will not be tolerated, particularly in a domestic setting. Consequences of violence should not have further negative impact on victims and the Bill aims to ensure that victims are supported and can remain in their homes when it is safe to do so.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Residential Tenancies Act 1995*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The clause inserts several definitions into the Act to support provisions in the measure.

5—Amendment of section 5—Application of Act

This amendment is consequential on proposed section 89A(2).

6—Amendment of section 72—Right of entry

This amendment is consequential on proposed section 89A(4)(b).

7—Insertion of section 89A

This clause inserts a new section:

89A—Termination based on abuse of tenant

Proposed subsection (1) provides that the Tribunal may, on application by a tenant or co-tenant, terminate a residential tenancy from a date specified in the Tribunal's order if satisfied that an intervention order is in force against a person who resides at the residential premises for the protection of the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides at the residential premises. Alternatively, the tenancy may be terminated if the Tribunal is satisfied that a person who resides at the residential premises has committed domestic abuse against the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides at the residential premises.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that the Tribunal may, on application by the South Australian Housing Trust, a subsidiary of the South Australian Housing Trust, or a community housing provider registered under the *Community Housing Providers National Law,* terminate a residential tenancy from a date specified in the Tribunal's order if satisfied that an intervention order is in force against a tenant for the protection of a person who normally or regularly resides at the residential premises, or if the Tribunal is satisfied that the tenant has committed domestic abuse against a person who normally or regularly resides at the residential premises. The applicant, the landlord and any tenant or co-tenant under the agreement are all parties to proceedings concerning a tenancy dispute (proposed subsection (3)).

Proposed subsection (4) sets out a number of orders the Tribunal may make on application by a party to proceedings under the proposed section including:

- an order requiring the landlord to enter into a new residential tenancy agreement with the applicant or a co-tenant under the terminated agreement (or both) for the remainder of the term of the tenancy. The Tribunal must be satisfied that the co-tenants under the new residential tenancy agreement could reasonably be expected to comply with the obligations under the agreement. The Tribunal must also be satisfied, if the landlord is the South Australian Housing Trust, that the tenants under the new agreement meet the Trust's eligibility requirements, and if the landlord is a community housing provider under the *Community Housing Providers National Law*, and the residential premises constitute community housing within the meaning of that Law, that the tenant meets the requirements for such community housing (proposed subsection (6)). The new agreement must be on the same terms and conditions as the terminated tenancy agreement subject to any changes made by the Tribunal (proposed subsection (8)). The Tribunal must not make an order requiring the landlord to enter into a new residential tenancy agreement with a co-tenant under the terminated agreement if the co-tenant is the person against whom an intervention order is in force, or who has committed domestic abuse against the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides at the residential premises, if the landlord indicates that the landlord considers it would be unreasonable for such an order to be made (proposed subsection (5));
- an order that the landlord may enter the residential premises at a time determined by the Tribunal to inspect the premises before a determination is made under the proposed section;
- an order for possession of the premises on a date specified by the Tribunal;
- an order that the landlord, landlord's agent or a database operator must not list the applicant's personal information in a residential tenancy database under section 99F(1) if the Tribunal is satisfied that the applicant did not cause or reasonably cause a breach of the residential tenancy agreement, or if the nature of any breach of the residential tenancy agreement resulted from an act of abuse or domestic abuse against the applicant.

Proposed subsection (7) provides that if a landlord or co-tenant objects to the making of an order under proposed subsection (1) or (4)(a), the Tribunal must not make the order unless satisfied that the hardship likely to be suffered by the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides at the residential premises would, if the order were not made, be greater than any hardship likely to be suffered by the objector as a consequence of the making of the order.

Proposed subsection (9) lists a number of orders and proceedings the Tribunal must have regard to in considering an application under the proposed section.

Proposed subsection (10) provides that if a residential tenancy is terminated under the proposed section, the Tribunal may order a co-tenant to make a payment of compensation to the landlord for loss and inconvenience resulting, or likely to result, from the termination of the tenancy or from any additional order made under proposed section 89A(4).

Proposed subsection (11) provides that if the Tribunal finds, in relation to a residential tenancy that is terminated under proposed section 89A, that 1 or more, but not all, of the co-tenants under the residential tenancy agreement are responsible for damage to the residential premises or ancillary property, the Tribunal may determine that the responsible co-tenant or co-tenants are liable (to the exclusion of other co-tenants) for making any payment of compensation ordered under section 110(1)(c).

Proposed subsection (12) provides that if a payment for compensation is ordered under subsection (10) or (11), the Tribunal may give a direction under section 110(1)(i) that the bond (if any) be paid to the landlord and any co-tenant who is not liable for making the payment in such proportions as the Tribunal thinks fit, but such a direction may not operate to limit the amount of bond payable to a landlord under section 110(1)(i).

8—Amendment of section 99F—Listing can be made only for particular breaches by particular persons

These amendments are consequential on proposed section 89A(4)(d).

9—Insertion of section 105UA

This clause inserts a new section:

105UA—Termination based on abuse of rooming house resident

Proposed subsection (1) provides that the Tribunal may, on application by a resident, and from a date specified in the order, terminate a rooming house agreement if satisfied that an intervention order is in force against a person who resides in the same rooming house as the applicant for the protection of the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides in the rooming house. Alternatively, the agreement may be terminated if the Tribunal is satisfied that a person who resides in the same rooming house as the applicant has committed domestic abuse against the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides in the rooming house. The applicant, the proprietor and any other resident under the rooming house agreement are all parties to proceedings concerning the tenancy dispute (proposed subsection (2)).

Proposed subsection (3)(a) provides that if the Tribunal makes an order under proposed subsection (1) the Tribunal may also make an order requiring the proprietor to enter into a new rooming house agreement with the applicant or another resident under the terminated rooming house agreement (or both) for the remainder of the term of the agreement. Proposed subsection (3)(b) provides that the new rooming house agreement must be on the same terms and conditions as the terminated rooming house agreement, subject to any changes determined by the Tribunal. The Tribunal must also be satisfied that the residents under any new rooming house agreement could reasonably be expected to comply with the obligations under that agreement (proposed subsection (5)).

Proposed subsection (4) provides that the Tribunal must not order a new rooming house agreement between the proprietor and a resident against whom an intervention order is in force, or whom the Tribunal is satisfied has committed domestic abuse against an applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides in the rooming house if the proprietor indicates, as part of proceedings before the Tribunal, that the proprietor considers it would be unreasonable for such an order to be made.

Proposed subsection (6) provides that if a party to proceedings objects to the making of an order, the Tribunal must not make the order unless satisfied that the hardship likely to be suffered by the applicant or a domestic associate of the applicant who normally or regularly resides at the residential premises would, if the order were not made, be greater than any hardship likely to be suffered by the objector as a consequence of the making of the order.

Proposed subsection (7) lists a number of orders and proceedings to which the Tribunal must have regard in considering an application under the proposed section.

Proposed subsection (8) provides that if a rooming house agreement is terminated under the proposed section, the Tribunal may order a resident to make a payment of compensation to the proprietor for loss and inconvenience resulting, or likely to result, from the termination or an order under proposed subsection (3).

Proposed subsection (9) provides that if the Tribunal finds, in relation to a rooming house agreement that is terminated under this section, that 1 or more, but not all, of the residents under the agreement are responsible for damage to the rooming house or property provided by the proprietor, the Tribunal may determine that the responsible resident or residents are liable (to the exclusion of other residents under the agreement) for making any payment of compensation ordered under section 110(1)(c).

Proposed subsection (10) provides that if a payment for compensation is ordered under proposed subsection (8) or (9) the Tribunal may give a direction under section 110(1)(i) that the bond (if any) be paid, to the proprietor and any resident who is not liable for making the payment in such proportions as the Tribunal thinks fit, but such a direction may not operate to limit the amount of bond payable to a proprietor under section 110(1)(i).

10—Amendment of section 112—Restraining orders

This clause inserts new subsections 112(1a) and (1b). Proposed subsection 112(1a) provides power for the Tribunal, on the application of a tenant, to make a restraining order against a co-tenant or other person on the premises if the Tribunal is satisfied that the person may cause serious damage to property, cause personal injury, or if the co-tenant is a domestic associate of the tenant, commit an act of domestic abuse. Proposed subsection 112(1b) lists a number of orders and proceedings the Tribunal must have regard to in considering an application under proposed subsection 112(1a), as are relevant to the application.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Speirs.

WATER INDUSTRY (THIRD PARTY ACCESS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:49): I rise to continue my contribution to the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill. The reason I am making this contribution is that obviously my electorate of Chaffey is underpinned by the economic platform known as water. The third-party access amendment bill is something that would not only complement river users or people who access river water but it has complemented all forms of water use right around the state. If I touch on where I left off, I was talking about environmental water and environmental works and measures which are a by-product of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

Environmental water that has been sold back to the commonwealth environmental water holder, technically, is third-party access water. That water has been in natural storage, it has then gone down as an allocation into the state and it was, once, an irrigator's allocation and it has now been sold to the commonwealth government under their environmental water holder portfolio and is being used as an environmental asset. To use water wisely as an environmental asset I think is critical for the future, particularly when we have shortages of water. We do not necessarily have a shortage of water in our storages but we need to use our environmental water efficiently.

Whether it be government or those people who need a competitive edge to be economically viable, you have to use your water efficiently. As I said in my remarks earlier today, it is the lack of will that is so frustrating in South Australia. We have the opportunity to better manage our environmental assets but we have a lack of will to actually enact change. We have a lack of will to look at how we can enhance what we already have.

I am sure that the member for Hammond would agree with me that the Lower Lakes are the lungs of the Murray-Darling Basin and are tell-tale. We have some deterrents in political circles and some deterrents in community circles in other jurisdictions who continually push the case that we should let the sea water back in, and it is an absolute furphy that South Australia should be a scapegoat for the mismanagement in other jurisdictions.

Just as importantly, the mismanagement is happening here in South Australia and the mismanagement is happening under the leadership of the current water minister, under the leadership of the Premier and under the leadership of this current South Australian government. It is their lack of will to enact any recommendations for environmental works and measures to get a better environmental outcome with the same amount of water. I could not think of anything simpler than to get outcomes with no extra cost or no extra water.

I will clarify the no extra costs. There are some environmental works and measures that will cost but, while things are relatively buoyant, while we still have water in storage and while we still have good inflows—below average, but still good inflows—we have a lack of will by the government to enact any reform at the lower end of our river. The next time we have a dry, as I have said, and we go to our other basin state partners looking to negotiate better sharing arrangements and environmental water for our environmental assets, they are, essentially, going to be very resistant. I

was going to say that they would give us the bird but I will not say that because it is unparliamentary, Deputy Speaker, but that is what is going to happen: mark my words.

If we cannot lead by example down here in the delta of the basin, when we ask our partner states for a fairer share or a larger share of that pie of environmental water when we have low inflows and are desperately needing water, we will go begging. I think, for too long now, we have seen the lack of will, particularly on the part of governments, to act.

As I have said previously, the government tipped almost no water into the basin plan. South Australia had to contribute 183 gigalitres of water to the basin plan. That is, 183 gigalitres is South Australia's share of the SDL, which is the 2,750 gigalitres for the basin plan. I will talk about the 450 gigalitres of additional up-water shortly in my contribution, but I do not want to put the cart before the horse, so I want to deal with the basin plan as it stands today.

We look upstream, we look at below average inflows, and we are now dealing with issues around uncertainty again. Back in 2010, as I have said, one of the main criteria for me putting my hand up to come to this place and represent the good people of Chaffey but, just as importantly, to make a contribution to South Australia, was primarily around the uncertainty about the lack of reform of water management in South Australia.

I will not go on about the lack of environmental works and measures but, when this is taken by Hansard and put on record, I want people to understand that, when we have our next dry, this is exactly what is going to happen: we will have achieved nothing below Lock 1—not a cracker. The environmental works and measures will not have been undertaken, we will not have the environmental water to actually make those environmental assets worthy and make them work. What we will see is the Lower Lakes' water levels drop, we will see acidification in soils, we will see death, we will see that area under severe pressure again—and no-one wants to see that.

We had an economic base around Lake Albert alone of around, I think, just over $40 million before the drought. We currently have an economic platform of around $3 million around Lake Albert. It is screaming out for reform. What South Australia is screaming out for is reform. What South Australia needs is water reform in this state.

The only people who are reforming at the moment are the irrigators and their communities. They are the only people who have any will to make change, and the reason that they are doing that is they are droughtproofing their properties. While they have got access to full allocation, while they have access to some of the commonwealth government's grant funding, they are doing the right thing. They are putting in better management measures, they are putting in droughtproofing measures and they are addressing the future of their business. They are addressing the future of their communities.

This current government is doing none of that, and that is what really upsets me and anyone who has any vision about the long-term future of water sustainability and water security in South Australia. That is one of the other issues that I am urging the government to look at again and look at seriously.

I want to touch on the Premier's $2 million campaign coming out of the drought. I think it was absolutely outrageous that he sold this $2 million campaign to the people of South Australia. He was leading them to believe that he was doing what was best for South Australia. All he was doing was putting himself on a pedestal and saying that he was the champion of the river. I can assure you he is nothing of the sort. He has achieved little in South Australia.

He might say that he went and did a deal with Julia Gillard. He might get on the airwaves and the media might have thought it was just a crackerjack campaign, but what is going to happen in the next dry? That is something that I will continue to present to this parliament until the day of reckoning when we do have a dry and nothing has been achieved. The $2 million campaign by the Premier achieved not one drop of water for South Australia. What it did was give him a platform to stand up and tell everyone that he was the champion of the river. He was nothing of the sort.

Through that basin plan, through the good work of irrigators, farmers and business people, the idea was put to the federal government, through the state government, that we needed a financial package that returned a level of water that was going to help people in future irrigation and help

people to be ready when we have our next dry. There were a number of parcels of water, but I will talk about the 3IP—the $265 million. That was put in place to achieve 40 gigalitres of water. It was administered through PIRSA and they put up their targets: $240 million went into the 3IP and $25 million went into research—it went into the Loxton Research Centre and some other areas.

The $240 million to achieve 40 gigalitres of water was put on the table and sadly, as quite often happens through no fault of the irrigators that are tendering for that money, all of a sudden the government departments are playing games with that money. They are trying to get bigger value for their buck. In round 1, they were paying around $5,000 a megalitre. All of a sudden, the brains trust made the move and said, 'I think we can get more water for less money.' Sure enough, it created a wedge between all the communities and businesses, both successful and unsuccessful.

I say to that department: why did you not apply a value per megalitre of water and then judge projects on their merit? That is what South Australia needed. We needed innovation and creative ideas, so that in 20 years' time that investment is still of benefit to those businesses, to the environment and to South Australia. Yet, businesses got money for tractors, and businesses got money for sheds and for putting concrete on their shed floors. That is not looking after the future of water efficiency.

That is by the bye, and to those businesses that were successful recipients of the $240 million, good on you. I urge those that missed out to consider implementing those changes without government assistance. Let's face it, government money is never easy money; there is no easy government handout. What I can say to the good irrigators and communities who were beneficiaries of that money, it was an overdraft in advance. All it enabled them to do was to speed up that investment into their business and on their property.

Perhaps those people will have to look at investing that money at a slower rate, but there are no tax advantages when you take government money. You are held to ransom by government money. I have had many people come to my electorate office concerned that they missed out on the funding, that it was not fair, that the criteria changed (yes, it did), and the amount of money changed per return of megalitre (yes, it did).

At the end of the day, it forced up the price of water. It fouled the temporary water market and increased the price. Let's face it, two years ago, there were growers paying $15 a megalitre for temporary water. As we stand here today, I think we are talking over $300 per megalitre of temporary water. Again, that is a real bugbear.

But, it enabled South Australian irrigation communities and businesses to fast-track their business models, upgrade their old plantings and old technology, and put some of the new technologies such as more water efficiency in train. I am sure that the previous water minister would agree that South Australia is well deserved. It was one of the early pioneers of water efficiency gains, and I think we once again have to lead by example into the next decade.

Other programs have been put in place by the commonwealth government and are administered by the South Australian government. These include the PIPSA and the riverine recovery programs. There are many programs that have come out of the basin plan. Out of the $12 billion in the federal government coffers, South Australia has received what I consider to be less than a proportionate share of that money, but beggars cannot be choosers.

I think what initially happened was that they made the call that we had already done all our efficiency gains and there was nothing to be achieved in South Australia. While the other states were beavering away and looking at how they could spend government money, South Australia fell foul by being a bit complacent. But, they certainly picked up the baton and have run with it over the past couple of years, so that is good for South Australia.

The Loxton Research Centre has been a beneficiary of the federal government's basin plan money. That will be in good stead there, because that is about research and development. As some people in this chamber would understand, the Loxton Research Centre in its heyday was the Mecca of water efficiency gains, soil moisture monitoring and irrigation application. What came away from that research centre was that the Riverland region exported a lot of its technology and research right around the world, and I think it was a great achievement.

All the growers who had embraced that technology were benefiting from it on farm, and while they were benefiting from it on farm, it showed us what could be achieved. I think what we are seeing today is the next generation of efficiency gains, but that was based on what was achieved 30 years ago. If we look at the Peter Magareys and the Peter McGlaschs and many more water experts who came away from the research centre, they do need to be congratulated. For those I have not mentioned, they were equally important in the role of the R&D needed. Again, I look at the BOOT scheme at Gawler and Virginia and I know that some great work has gone on out there. It is another area that has huge potential.

There is still a large amount of treated water that is being pumped out to sea that needs to be put into production, and that is another area where R&D will be very important. A public-private partnership is something that I think we should be prepared to embrace, and that is a public partnership with government to actually look at ways we can pipe that water out to productive ground and grow food. I think we need to target the best soils and the best contour country. I do not think we need to be just attacking it en masse and planting any available ground that the pipeline passes through. We need to carefully identify where the appropriate soils are for the appropriate crops.

I did speak about dam storage, and that is sadly a very expensive way of storing water. Obviously, the Salisbury council have pioneered in a sense a lot of the aquifer storage here in South Australia, but I can assure you that there are many more aquifers that have capacity for South Australia to store water in and also to be a part of a bigger diversity of water supply in South Australia.

Let's not forget about the desal plant, and which was once a 45-gigalitre plant that was a little bit more than duplicated up to 100 gigalitres. The government of the day decided that they could not resist doubling the size of the desal plant because they were going to get all this government money to do it. I will not touch on all the numbers, but what happened was the state government were outsmarted and it was all GST compliant. Sadly, it was something that the South Australian taxpayers had to foot the bill for, and while we had the powers that be pushing the agenda for doubling the size of the desal plant, the idea of diversity fell by the way.

The opportunity to put more water into aquifers and to re-use water, whether it comes away from Bolivar, the South-East drainage scheme or the Highland scheme in the South-East, was one that went begging. As we speak today, there are still many gigalitres of water running out to sea that could be diverted and that are going to be diverted into the south Coorong. It is going to be used as environmental flow, and I think it was wise.

There were deals done between I think the then water minister, minister Caica (before he got slotted), and our federal assistant water minister, Simon Birmingham. I think they did some great work for South Australia in negotiating some of the rule changes in terms of getting some of the works and drawings so that we could actually look at how we were going to redirect some of that water into an ailing bottom end of the Murray-Darling Basin. I think that along the way what we have seen again is that the new water minister has taken the easy option—he has played politics and given us all the spin in the world, but no action at all has come away from his brief. He will be remembered as the lack-of-action minister.

As I say, the Lower Lakes are the lungs of the basin. They are the lower end of the delta and they will be wanting because what we saw when there was a drought was that all things were bad; now that we have a bit of water back in the Lower Lakes, and we have our levels back up to pool, everything is fine, nothing is wrong and it will never happen again, but mark my words: it will happen again and South Australia will be the loser from a government that had the lack of will and the lack of capacity to implement changes and spend federal government money.

That is the thing that really gets my goat. It was federal government money that would have been put on the table to enact these environmental works and measures at no cost to the South Australian taxpayer, yet they were just not enacted. I will touch on the Save the River Murray levy before I take my seat. Again, it is another dirty trick that has come our way. While we see the Treasurer stand up and say, 'We have removed the Save the River Murray levy. This is a great win for South Australia,' who is going to pay the running and the maintenance costs of the Murray into South Australia? Where do we think that maintenance money came from?

It was not just coming out of general revenue, it was coming away from the Save the River Murray levy. What we have seen, again, is that the Treasurer cannot be trusted. The Treasurer is the trickster of political spin, and so that money will now have to be raised from another source. I am not a betting man but, if I were, I would say that it is going to come from NRM. It is going to come out of NRM levies. If it is not going to come out of the levies, it is going to mean reduced projects within NRM, and if we cannot reduce projects any more I am figuring that the levy will go up, and that will affect anyone who uses water.

Anyone who is part of the Murray-Darling Basin catchment is going to pay more money for the sake of running our maintenance costs within the basin and to pay the state's contribution. It really is just cost shifting, taking the cost shift from the regular metropolitan regional taxpayer in South Australia and lumping it all on regional South Australia—once again just a really little tricky bit from the Treasurer there, which, again, irks me and makes me wonder just what is going on. As I say, it really was a trickster of a prank by the Treasurer, but it was at cost to regional South Australians.

Again, we talk about the 2,750 gigalitres as the basin plan water. I will just touch on the 450 gigalitres of up water. To date, the 183 gigalitres will almost have been achieved as South Australia's contribution and it has all come from irrigators. So where is the 450 gigalitres remaining as up water to bring the total of 320? I will just clarify it. The basin plan is 2,750 gigalitres and the up water is 450. We will not have people believe what the Premier's spin is all about—that he achieved 3,200 gigalitres and that is what the basin plan is.

The 450 gigalitres was a sweetheart deal he did with then prime minister Gillard with no accountability. Where was that 450 gigalitres going to come from? Well, I guess we will have to watch this space because that water will be achieved by 2024, and by 2024 I just do not think that South Australian irrigators and irrigation communities can give up any more water, otherwise we are going to have no economic base, no economic platform to irrigate and to grow food and for industry.

It is going to be a real burden on the future of South Australia, particularly when we talk about our economy, particularly when we talk about our new free trade agreements and the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreements that have just been undertaken. Who is going to supply the commodities? Who is going to supply the food, the wine, the green products? Who is going to supply the meat? Who is going to supply all the products that are currently underpinning this state's budget?

We have seen what happens in resources and mining. You can only mine for so long until you are affected by world prices or the hole runs out, and when the hole runs out the resources are finished. When commodity prices go down, it becomes unviable to dig the hole, so we walk away from that mine. I think that every South Australian knows exactly what is happening at Roxby Downs and Arrium and right around South Australia in terms of its resources.

I take point with the Premier today saying that I was blaming the state government for the drop in job numbers and that it did not happen anywhere else. Well, that is totally incorrect. I think that the Premier was grasping at straws. The comment I made was that, while every other state is dealing with low commodity prices, every other state is dealing with resources at a low, their unemployment rates are in the sixes and ours are in the eights and growing. Our rates are heading north and those of the other states are heading south.

What is really upsetting me is that the Premier and the government are in denial about what we need here as an economic base—that is, water—and we need to be more competitive when it comes to sourcing our water. I urge the government that, instead of just spinning the story about giving third-party access, they need to enact it, they need to look at what was put in place, some of those opportunities, and they need to look at the SA Water policy in 2012, which said that we will enact third-party access, we will endeavour to make water access cheaper. It has not happened. As I said, the government is addicted—it is like a drug, the revenue from SA Water—and it is something they just cannot give up.

I say to the Premier and to his government that they need to go to rehab and get off the water drug because the water drug is costing every South Australian household dearly, and it is costing dearly every South Australian irrigator, every pastoralist, industry, every abattoir. Every water user in South Australia is getting absolutely smacked around the back of the ears by the high cost of water, and is all about the addiction the South Australian government has to high water charges,

high sewerage costs and using SA Water as a cash cow for a very finite resource that in the very near future will be running short again, I can assure you.

It has not been that long since we had the dry in 2010 and the drought broke. We are in 2015 and I would like to think it happens every 18 years, but the way that the forecasters are predicting El Niño, and the way we are seeing water shortages around the world, these dries are becoming more frequent. There is an argument for human intervention in global warming, but I think it is a cycle and whether that cycle is being sped up by human intervention remains to be seen.

Third-party access needs to be something that can give South Australia a shot in the arm, some confidence. The Water for Good policy paper back in 2012 is something that the government promised us; they have not delivered. That is why the Liberal Party has introduced this Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill. I am looking forward to the government supporting the amendments.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:19): I congratulate the lead speaker for the opposition on his sterling effort, the statesman-like delivery of his contribution and his research on this bill. I rise also to make a contribution on the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill 2015. The intention of this bill is to provide a legislated regime for third-party access to South Australia's water and sewerage infrastructure, and not before time. It has been on the government's books since at least 2012, and it has taken them some time, despite encouragement from the opposition, to get to this point.

SA Water is a vertically integrated monopoly provider of potable water and sewerage services for metropolitan Adelaide households, the majority of industry and a significant number of country SA customers. A third-party access regime should and could be designed to enable other players in the water industry to utilise an existing supplier's infrastructure—which, in our case, of course, is SA Water's—and they would use this infrastructure to supply services and, theoretically, provide a level of competition to SA Water and in the water market more generally.

In theory, bulk water has been able to be purchased through trade since the liberalisation of water licensing and the most notable scheme is that run by Barossa Infrastructure Ltd in the member for Schubert's electorate, which provides approximately 6,000 megalitres of untreated Murray water to irrigate wine grapes, and I understand that that system has proved to be very successful.

Salisbury council's world-renowned wetlands and aquifer storage and recharge scheme is not necessarily an example of third-party access. SA Water's intransigence led to Salisbury installing its own pipe network system to service customers, so it is a system that works outside SA Water's jurisdiction. Competition is required in our water industry under national competition principles. As I mentioned earlier, the Water Industry Act in 2012 made some progress towards this and, in fact, the first time the government flagged third-party access was in its Water for Good program, which was prior to 2012.

The proposed bill appoints ESCOSA in a limited role as the regulator to negotiate, conciliate or arbitrate through the process. There are eight steps that ESCOSA would be responsible for. I will not go through those because they are well detailed in the bill, but the key issue, as far as we are concerned is that, of course, ESCOSA and the Department of Treasury and Finance/SA Water have differences of opinion on a number of accounts.

In fact, in its second submission to the bill, ESCOSA stated that the nature, strength and scope of the proposed regime is so limited as to materially impede the delivery of those benefits to South Australians. On that basis, ESCOSA recommends that those provisions be revisited There were, of course, a number of amendments passed in the other place and I understand that the member for Chaffey in this house has a number of amendments which he will also put to address the limited regime that would be put in place if this bill goes through in its current form.

I think this is a wonderful opportunity for the government, this state and SA Water to embrace an opportunity to deliver and take on board water security. As many in this place would be aware, water security on Eyre Peninsula is something that I have spoken about many times and will continue to speak about until it is properly addressed. I am going to take the opportunity today to touch on it yet again.

One of my first achievements in this place was to convince the Natural Resources Committee of parliament to undertake an inquiry into water resource management on Eyre Peninsula. It had been an issue for many since settlement because Matthew Flinders suggested that Port Lincoln would be and could be a suitable site for the state's capital, apart from the fact that it did not appear to have a regular and consistent water supply.

In fact, earlier today I spoke about the centenary of the Minnipa township. Minnipa really began to grow as a terminus of the Eyre Peninsula railway which arrived there in 1913. The laying of that railway track and the train itself led to the settlement of the inland of Eyre Peninsula and allowed settlers and wheat farmers to establish their towns and properties. One of the things the train did in those early days was cart water. Water was in such short supply and so desperately needed by the settlers that the train brought water to the communities along the track.

It was not until the Tod reservoir scheme was built, established and extended in the 1920s that reticulated water was supplied to Eyre Peninsula and that was as a result of the building of a reservoir in the Koppio Hills, just north of Port Lincoln, where the rainfall and topography is such that water catchment is possible. That delivered and secured reticulated water for a time. It was always less than ideal quality. I guess salinity was always an issue and, in later years, the water body became a product of its catchment and has been recorded as being high in nitrates and having traces of agricultural chemicals so it has been taken off line.

During the 1960s, the Polda Basin was included in the reticulated scheme. That was a wonderful idea at the time, but recent history has it that extraction exceeded recharge quite significantly to the point where that basin has essentially collapsed and has been taken off line and is now used wholly and solely by the landowners above the basin. Further supplementation of the water supply occurred with the southern basins coming online. Originally, the Uley Basin, Uley South, Lincoln Basin and Coffin Bay-A lens were all incorporated into that reticulated supply on Eyre Peninsula in post-war years and the Uley South continues to supply the majority of reticulated water on Eyre Peninsula.

It was in 2005 that the River Murray pipeline was extended from Iron Knob to Kimba, which then linked the Eyre Peninsula reticulated supply, that had been, up until then, autonomous from the rest of the state. It linked us into the Murray and there was some criticism of that at the time. I think it was a good thing. It provided extra water security at a reasonable price.

My predecessor, Liz Penfold, who was the member for Flinders for some 16 years, spoke often about water in this place and petitioned government many times on the water security issues of Eyre Peninsula and, famously, in 2002 minister Conlon at the time committed to building a desal plant on Eyre Peninsula. Here we are 13 years later and that desal plant has never been built. History will show, of course, that desalinated water is expensive water. It is there if security is a real issue but, as has been highlighted by the member for Chaffey, the extraordinarily large desal plant built south of Adelaide by this government has no doubt added to the cost of water in this state.

So what for the future? I do not believe that the water security issues on Eyre Peninsula have been addressed and it is not until they are, until we find another source of water and our water supply is supplemented that the pressure will come off the southern basins and the Uley South Basin in particular. Many concepts have been thrown around. People are making their own engineering solutions for their own problems. I know many farms have dams on them. Many farms now have large sheeted catchments which produce good quantities of water from relatively little rain, which they can reticulate privately around their own farms.

Desal plants are being talked about still, as well as improved catchments above the basins and accessing other sources of water. I think that this bill, as it is proposed—and with the amendments would make it even more so—would be an opportunity for not just South Australia but also Eyre Peninsula to secure that water supply. The reason I say that is that it invites third-party suppliers. It is not just third-party access but it is third-party suppliers, and I will give you examples.

Over recent years, the District Council of Ceduna has talked on and off with a particular company about building a small localised desal plant near Ceduna to supplement the town water supply. Ceduna is right on the very end of the Eyre Peninsula reticulated system. Water quality is not always good and water supply is not always adequate to meet demand, and this would go some

way towards supplementing the town supply and taking the pressure off the system overall. They have not been able to achieve that. There have been many hurdles along the way, but I think that providing access to SA Water's pipes and infrastructure would provide an extra incentive or an extra opportunity for projects such as that, and they could be dotted all around our coastline at places like Streaky Bay, Port Kenny, Coffin Bay, Tumby Bay—the list goes on. Right around South Australia's coastline there would be the opportunity for small localised desal plants at relatively low cost to provide water security to small coastal townships.

There could be water from mining companies, and that is certainly part of the Iron Road proposal, which we will see in more detail very soon (probably later this year). Without knowing the exact detail of it, part of that proposal will be to source slightly saline underground water along with infrastructure corridor, and there is the opportunity for them to desalinate more than they require in their mining operation and feed into and supplement the Eyre Peninsula water supply. That is another opportunity that would not otherwise be available except as a result of this bill.

This bill could also provide an opportunity for landowners who, in the southern part of Eyre Peninsula or in other parts of the state, have been blessed with a good water supply on their own property. It could provide them with an opportunity to put water, as a saleable item, into the reticulated scheme. All in all, what South Australia needs desperately is water security. For the most part, we have a relatively low rainfall and, in a modern industrialised state, our water demands are high, and this bill goes some way towards addressing that.

Other towns have done their own thing along the way. Certainly there are towns that have managed stormwater and wastewater within small catchments and with their own engineering solutions, and that is a credit to them. Often town ovals and bowling greens, etc., are watered from run-off from town streets, and I commend them for their initiative.

The member for Chaffey talked about irrigators, and he has great experience in this area. He can speak with authority on the challenges that irrigators have in this state at the moment. I understand flows in the Murray are reasonable at the moment. An El Niño is forecast certainly, but it remains to be seen as to how that plays out. Of course, not all El Niños are devastatingly dry; sometimes it can mean extra rain, but we will have to wait and see on that. The thing about the River Murray is that flows do vary considerably from year to year and from decade to decade. Although flows are good at the moment and dams are relatively full, there will come a time when there is demand greater than supply.

I am a great fan of rainwater tanks also. I think they give an opportunity for householders to capture water that would otherwise run off, run down the street, away and into the sea often. It gives householders an opportunity to supplement their own water supply. With relatively low initial cost in the first instance, they can save money in the long term. Even if they decide just to use the water for their garden, that is, at least, a saving not just to their own pocket and to themselves but to the state's water supply as a whole.

The opportunities are boundless. I think they are only limited by our imagination and preparedness to do something different, and I think this bill does give us the opportunity, at long last, to do that. I compliment the member for Chaffey on his work and the dozen or so amendments he is going to put to this place. I also thank and congratulate our shadow minister, Michelle Lensink in the other place, on the work she has done. An extraordinary amount of work has gone into this—over some years, in fact—to get us to this point. I commend the bill and look forward to debating the amendments that will be put.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:35): I indicate that I will not be the lead speaker on this bill today.

The Hon. P. Caica: We know that. Why are you telling us the obvious?

Mr KNOLL: It's good to see you awake, Paul. I know the member for Mawson was boring you to tears. I rise to support this bill, with a number of caveats—caveats, obviously, that the member for Chaffey has dutifully put to this place. Can I say that third-party access for the water industry—what we are really talking about here is the ability for the private sector to get access to SA Water's monopoly infrastructure assets around South Australia—is a very important idea, and I will touch quite heavily on the Barossa Infrastructure Ltd scheme later.

This concept of better utilising this public asset in order to be able to generate growth (food production growth, predominantly) in South Australia is a very important concept. I know that grape growers in McLaren Vale and the Clare Valley are hampered by the high cost of water because they are not able to access Murray water or cheaper water supplies in irrigation schemes. It means they are at a structural disadvantage. It also means that they are a lot more reliant on weather conditions, which means their production volumes are a lot more variable, but they also risk doing damage to the watertables in their local water sources in the process.

It is really important for us to get this bill right. As previous speakers have mentioned, there are weaknesses in this bill. It is a bit frustrating that this is not the old college try when it comes to getting this sort of third-party access right. There is a lot more that the government could have done and should be doing (and that is what we talk about in our amendments) to give full weight to allowing the private industry to get access, and to pay fair and reasonable rates for access, to this infrastructure.

Before going to those amendments, the Barossa Infrastructure Ltd scheme (and I have a heap more to say about that) came about in the early 2000s because the Barossa had a problem. I can talk about this now. We did not talk about it at the time because it was a bit scary. There was increased salinity in the water and we were getting to a situation where we were going to have to look at significantly reducing the number of grapes that we produce in the Barossa Valley.

There were detractors of this scheme at the time. There were those who said that putting irrigated water into the Barossa Valley would lead to cheap commodity grapes and then bulk wine production in the Barossa that would kill the Barossa's brand and also lead to an oversupply of grapes that could potentially kill the entire industry. Those arguments had merit but they were outweighed by a group of people who saw that we needed access to a sustainable water source and access to better quality water. In the beginning, the idea was not about cost but it has turned out to be a fantastically cost-effective scheme down the track.

The scheme was the brainchild of a number of different grape growers, and chief among them was a gentleman by the name of Grant Burge, whom most people would know. He recently sold his winery to Accolade but still maintains a presence as quite a strong vineyard owner.

Burgey was one of the originals who came on board. A wonderful gentleman named Edgar Schild—who, with his wife, Lorraine, have Schild Estate Wines, which is again another great South Australian and Barossa wine company—had the foresight to invest in this scheme. A whole host of others got involved and, can I say, they were willing to put their own money on the table. They were willing to invest significant sums of money, also in the face of what is otherwise a capital intensive industry.

Producing grapes and producing wine—and both Schild Estate and Grant Burge are vertically integrated wineries, in that they own their own grapes as well as produce wine—is a very capital intensive business. For every dollar of extra sales, you need somewhere between $1.50 to $2 worth of capital to put into your business in order to be able to sustain that growth because, essentially, you only get one crop a year. You turn that crop into a product, it takes time to mature, and for red wine, for instance, you are only putting it into the market 12 to 18 months and, in some cases, three to fours years later, and you have to be able to hold on to that stock.

White wines obviously have a lot shorter turnaround time because you tend not to put them in oak, or at least not since people stopped drinking wooded chardonnay and started drinking this dirty New Zealand sauvignon blanc. To get back to the BIL scheme—

Mr Goldsworthy: Nothing wrong with savvy blanc.

Mr KNOLL: Sorry, a good Adelaide Hills sav blanc from the member for Kavel's electorate is beautiful and fantastic. To give you an idea, the annual value of chardonnay sold in Australia used to be around $400 million to $450 million; it is now down to around $150 million. Fair enough, more goes into champagne but, essentially, less than 10 years ago we bought about $30 million a year worth of New Zealand sav blanc, and we are currently buying somewhere between $300 million to $400 million a year. What is worse, at the moment, we provide a tax rebate for that wine to come here and be sold. It is an interesting—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Strange set-up.

Mr KNOLL: —an interesting set-up, that's right. I have been talking to people about how the legislation got through at the time. It was in the shadow of the GST changes, and I understand that there is a discussion paper about changing the WET rebate.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I beg your pardon.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I need to remind members—

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, I am speaking! I need to remind members—do not make me stand up; I will be angry—the book is heavily ticked, and you are all just about on your second warning, so another outburst we have just had means that the member for Schubert will be speaking on his own, and it will deprive the rest of us of the other contributions I have on my list, and we do not want that to happen.

Mr KNOLL: Deputy Speaker, can I suggest that what I am talking about here is approximately $30 million worth of rebate on a WET (wine equalisation tax) that raises about $750 million to $800 million and has facilitated the growth of small cellar doors and wineries, some of which may be in the member for Kaurna's electorate. So, he may want to be a little bit careful when he talks about that because the WET scheme overall has been a resounding success in creating diversity.

We have gone from a smaller number of wineries to now having over 3,000 wineries in Australia, and the vast majority of the industry is situated in South Australia. We in South Australia have been a huge beneficiary of WET and what it has done to help diversify our industry and get many small craft players in and many great names of great wine that we now drink. That said, always with legislation there are unintended consequences or unforeseen consequences, and this happens to be one of them.

Interestingly, we stand here talking about a bill which has been around, I am going to say, for 11 or 12 years. It is funny that Barossa Infrastructure Ltd did not need the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill to get their scheme up and running. What happened was we had a premier called John Olsen, former member for Kavel, who was able, through existing legislation, to get the scheme up and running. He turned around to the SA Water executives at the time and said, 'I want you to get this deal done, and I am not going to stand for any excuses about why it can't,' and it got done.

It is interesting that we need here the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill to help provide for what is otherwise able to be done—manifestly, the pipes are in the ground, the water comes every day—without this bill. What I am trying to get at here is the fact that, whilst a bill like this enacted into law will help and there are some better mechanisms around forcing SA Water to come to the party, the truth is that if there was some decent political will this is something that could be done right now.

We can talk about the legacy of the Olsen years to South Australia. It is interesting, in the current light of manufacturing job losses, we have industries in McLaren Vale and the Clare Valley that could hugely benefit from third-party access but they have not been able to do so and, in the case of Clare Valley, did not take advantage at the time of what could have been extremely fortuitous for them. We have—

The Hon. P. Caica: John Olsen's legacy is us; you know that, don't you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. Caica: Took you from the most outstanding position to—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNOLL: Deputy Speaker, it is obviously out of order to reflect on—

The Hon. P. Caica: —a hung parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have to—

The Hon. P. Caica: Look over here at Olsen's legacy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: —call the member for Colton to order!

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You aren't really.

The Hon. P. Caica: I am sorry.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are misleading the house.

The Hon. P. Caica: No, I'm not. I am not; that's got to be done through a suspended motion.

Mr KNOLL: Deputy Speaker, it is good to see everybody in the chamber is awake; I think that is fantastic. I think it is great that I have spurred members opposite into action, into high voice—

The Hon. P. Caica: Get back onto your computer. That's what you're good at. You do put me to sleep.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

Mr KNOLL: I think it may or may not have anything to do with post question time coffees.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No-one knows.

Mr KNOLL: Maybe there is a little bit of perk in the step from a little bit of caffeine. We are looking to create a number of amendments to this bill to try to strengthen it, and those amendments come in the form of helping ESCOSA to set prices up-front, and to broaden the scope of the scheme to at least include bulk water. I think that is a hugely important amendment.

We have agreed to amendments to put in time limitations for regulated operators, increasing penalties for regulated operators not providing information in a timely manner, reducing time periods for mediation, and amendments to the arbitration principles. All these things are designed to help redress the balance. SA Water is the monopoly provider in this area: they are the ones, in some cases like Clare and McLaren Vale, providing water. Certainly, it is not necessarily in their interests to do so, but it is in the broader interests of South Australia for this to happen. I reiterate that it could be done with a bit of political will that does not necessarily seem to be there.

I will talk about Barossa Infrastructure. In the Barossa, on the valley floor and out to the north-west, to Seppeltsfield and Marananga, it is suggested that 50 per cent of the 60,000-odd tonnes—at the moment it is low to mid-50s—of grape production that we crush a year is underpinned by Barossa Infrastructure Ltd water. This is an industry that this year exported $150 million worth of directly labelled Barossa wine and produced somewhere between $1 billion to $2 billion worth of wine that was either sold domestically or produced for other regions and sold under their geographical indicators. This is a huge boon for South Australia. Fifty per cent of my electorate, directly or indirectly, is employed by this industry; half of it is underpinned by the Barossa Infrastructure Ltd scheme.

The scheme has gone from strength to strength; it has actually almost paid off all its debt. What it has done is provide secure, high-quality water that comes from the Murray, goes down the pipes and sits in the Warren Reservoir—that we hope one day, as was envisaged by the member for Colton when he was the minister, will include recreational boating access; although, minister Hunter from the other place seems to have a different idea about that, and in a recent letter to me suggested that the government is not looking at recreational boating on the Warren—where the high-quality Murray water sits, and then the Barossa Infrastructure pipes distribute that water all over the Barossa.

At the moment, if you were buying water from SA Water, you would be paying, say, $3.45 per kilolitre, or has it gone up again? If you are on the Barossa Infrastructure Ltd scheme, at

the moment for premium peak water you are paying 72¢—$3.45 versus 72¢. I am going to suggest that the cost of water would be about 60 per cent to 70 per cent of the cost of producing grapes.

Mr Whetstone: It depends how much water you use.

Mr KNOLL: It depends how much water you use. In the Riverland, it is a little bit more than what we do down in the Barossa. We are talking about a quarter of the cost of providing water, so what we have is a scheme that delivers a competitive advantage. That is a scheme that could deliver a competitive advantage for more regions in South Australia and should for more regions in South Australia, which is I suppose the purpose of this bill, but one that we would actually like to see enacted properly, as opposed to the Clayton's halfway house 'Maybe we will go through the motions without doing it properly' amendment bill.

BIL has hit some milestones. They went from an initial seven gigalitres to eight gigalitres, and have just celebrated the fact that they have bought and sold the ninth gigalitre of water. Of that extra 1,000 megalitres, 70 to 80 per cent of that water was sold to existing vineyards, making them more sustainable or able to replace SA mains water—a huge cost saving for South Australian businesses at this time when we desperately need to help improve the cost structure for South Australian businesses. It has also addressed a number of environmental issues, and these are the issues that BIL has addressed:

- The potential for the use of BIL water to result in a rise in the regional water tables

I think that is a pretty good outcome.

- The effects on the salt budget and the potential for increases in the salt load entering surface drainage as base flow

This is, again, another way they have helped to improve water quality in the Barossa.

- The potential for the creation of perched water tables with adverse effects on plant growth, and for migration off-site
- The effects of any changes in salinity and chlorine residuals on ecosystems and the implications of inter-basin transfer of water.

All these problems were mitigated by BIL.

The BIL has future plans, and can I tell you that I wholeheartedly support them in their future plans. The scheme was always designed to be most cost effective distributing 10 gigalitres of water a year. Now that the ninth gigalitre has come and gone and is being fully utilised, we look forward to that tenth gigalitre being approved by SA Water to flow through SA Water's system. In typical Barossa fashion, where we do not always get the support from government that we would like (and after 23 years of waiting for a Barossa hospital we can see where the deficiencies are), again what we have is a situation where the Barossa came together and was willing to put their own money on the table to get a better outcome for themselves. In this case, it did take a little bit of negotiation with government, and full credit to a fantastic premier in John Olsen in getting that job done and delivering for the people of the Barossa.

I would encourage other regions, whether it be the Clare Valley, McLaren Vale or a whole host of other people willing to get involved in this type of set-up, to band together and be willing to put your own money on the table, but do not let government off the hook. Do not let SA Water suggest that it is too hard, because those assets are there for the people of South Australia. The benefits and the growth that we have seen in the Barossa industry—and it is not only contained within Schubert: it also stretches across into the electorate of Stuart across the highway. If I look at some of the BIL water that supports the production of Grange in beautiful places like Ebenezer and Moppa in the member for Stuart's electorate, we are talking about grapes that get $10,000 a tonne. This is exactly the kind of production we want to support.

In fact, there was a beautiful story last week about Thorn-Clarke, which is a winery in my electorate—in fact it is a couple of kilometres up the road—and their 2012 Ron Thorn shiraz, which won best shiraz in the world. I will give credit to the fact that those grapes come from St Kitts, Dutton, which is just out from Truro in the member for Stuart's electorate, but I do not think that that bottle of

wine was anything without the effect of Schubert on those grapes and the good work of Helen McCarthy as the chief winemaker and Sam Clarke to get that wine to market.

It shows the ingenuity and the ability of private industry to get in there and to do the job, and amazingly do the job in a way that is much more cost effective. I would implore those to use these instances, use this scheme, as much as they can. Let us hope that we hear announcements of more good news to come, and that is better financial underpinnings and better cost structures for irrigators and other food manufacturers into the future.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:55): I rise to speak to the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill, which was part of a requirement of the National Water Act several years ago to allow third-party access to monopoly suppliers. The aim of this legislation is to provide that regime for third-party access to water and sewerage infrastructure in this state, but essentially the main operator we need to get access to is SA Water infrastructure, which is a vertically-integrated monopoly provider of potable water and sewerage services for this state, and that includes a lot of country and a lot of industry.

I would just like to make comment that there have been so many opportunities over the years for better ways to use water, for better ways to access water and for better ways to create potable water. I commend all the previous speakers for their contributions; and, as the member for Chaffey rightly put, the River Murray is the keystone in this debate, and certainly his electorate, my electorate and the electorates of the members for Stuart and Schubert—pretty well every electorate in this state—are connected in some way to the River Murray. Whether it is direct supply, whether it is just-in-time supply, whether it is through allocation or whether it is piped 700 or 800 kilometres to Ceduna, where about 20 per cent of its potable water use comes from water from the River Murray.

I think that we should have learnt so many more lessons in what has happened with the millennium drought which lasted around 10 years but which really bit in those years between 2006 and September of 2010 when it was such a relief to see that murky Darling water flow down past Murray Bridge and out through to the mouth, because we were in dire straits—we were in more than dire straits, I can assure members.

Apart from being the member at the bottom of the river, for many years I was the shadow minister for the River Murray during that time and there was a whole range of proposals put up about what should be done to work with water on the river, what should we put in place, what should not be put in place, what should not be done but, in the end, some common sense prevailed (although there are a few wild ideas out there).

We saw the river drop about two metres, which created a lot of slumping. We saw a lot of infrastructure south of Lock 1 (which is most of my electorate, or all of my electorate), and it was more than a worry, it was disgraceful that it was allowed to get to this when we have seen so many manufactured water channels in the further upstream states. That being said, I do not want to bash them too hard. I want to think about what more could have been done by the government even though major reforms have been made in the last 40 or so years, particularly in the Riverland with upgrades to infrastructure. Whether it is sprinklers in the first instance, then drippers, closed systems and converting channels into pipes, we are the leaders in this country. We can show a lot of states and a lot of countries, quite frankly, how best to utilise water to get the most out of it.

Certainly, there is a whole range of things that were getting thrown out into the ether during the drought, and one was about keeping water for Adelaide. If we did not have Adelaide at the end of the River Murray, I think most of my electorate would have been sold out. Unless you have a million people hanging on the end of a pipe, I do not think we would have had the forbearance of some people in regard to what did and did not happen in the end. There were certainly ministers and people in departments planning to build things like the Wellington weir—lock 0, it is called. This structure was to be built from of a lot of stone. There is no shortage of limestone in my electorate, and it would have cleaned up a load of stones. A lot of contractors would have made a lot of money.

Contractors were coming to me and saying, 'Adrian, I've got to apologise, I put my name down as a potential contractor.' I said, 'You've got to make a dollar. If you weren't doing it someone else would.' This would have been a sinking structure that was going to cost hundreds of millions of dollars from the time it was first put in, and then it would have to be topped up. What I found most

interesting was that property owners on either side of the proposed structure were at the stage of being compulsorily acquired by government and had to enter into confidential agreements to allow access to the river. They did sign those agreements, and roads were constructed and gates were put in, but thankfully the weir did not go ahead.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, we did. It might have been Nalpa station and the McFarlane property on the other side. This would have been a disaster for about $500 million of producing country and would have just written off everything below Wellington. It was certainly the desire of some ministers and some people in departments to put this in place with no thought for those people—no thought at all. It was just a panicked response to keep water supplies for Adelaide. In fact, my property at Coomandook is on the Keith just-in-time pipeline, and it even got to the level of discussions, because I had one meeting with the former minister, and they were going to put in a desalination plant at Tailem Bend. I was even asked by some of the authority people, some departmental people, 'What do we do with the salt?' I said, 'It's not my problem; it's your problem. If you've got to the stage that you need to desalinate water at Tailem Bend, that is your issue.'

It got very close; in fact, I know that bottled water was being stockpiled for emergency supply. Thankfully, we managed to just get through that, and the madness of the Wellington weir did not happen. We saw the Langhorne Creek and Currency Creek producers get on track and put in a pipeline, and because of a barrier potentially being built at Wellington they put the outtake at Jervois for a bulk unfiltered water supply to take water through to the 7,000-plus hectares of vineyards at the end of that pipe around Langhorne Creek and Currency Creek. That is the only way that those people kept going. It cost a lot of money, whether it was high security that they paid for through that pipeline or lower security water, they put in a system which went in very rapidly, and I commend everyone involved in that work.

Also, I look at the issue around the Lower Lakes, around Lake Albert, where some people, dairy farmers, are paying $5,000 a week to truck water to their dairies just to keep going. That is just a ridiculous amount of money. Below Lock 1, where we once had about 130 dairies, there are about 20-odd now. As the member for Chaffey indicated earlier, there is the potential, with the full use of water and land around Lake Albert, to produce over $40 million and now it is down to about $3 million of output. It has had a massive impact on the local community and on the school, and that flows right through the community to sporting clubs—netball clubs, football clubs, cricket clubs, etc.

Almost at death's door, the federal government came on board with over $100 million that was administered through the state government. I am sure the state Labor government did quite well out of it. They put in an emergency pipeline down around Meningie so people could have potable water. The contractors did a fantastic job. They had teams of rock saws going and teams of men. I have to take my hat off to those contractors. Once they got the bureaucracy out of the way—and that was the biggest hold-up—they got that pipe in the ground as quickly as they could. They even put in hook-up points for communities that did not want to hook up, like Wellington East. There is a point there so that they can hook into that pipe in the future, so they were future proofing some of these other areas if need be.

That work was put in, but now we find that the water is too expensive for these people who are used to having allocations drawn off the River Murray. They have to pay, I think, $3.32 a kilolitre at the moment for water through the pipe. It is making them unviable, and it is not just dairy farmers. There are beef farmers in that area who are just finding it ridiculous. Out of every seven cattle they sell, they have to sell one beast to pay for water for the rest, and that is hardly profitable because you have all the other costs—feed, management—

An honourable member: Levies!

Mr PEDERICK: Yes—levies. You have to hand it to farmers. When they are put under the pump, they come up with innovative ways to beat the system. Certainly, in recent years some private pipelines have gone in, and this exemplifies the madness where there is not a fair access scheme, and I do not think even this gives fair access. It is a step in the right direction but it is so weighted towards SA Water that it is not funny.

People are putting in their own pipelines and they are basically paying for them within two years. Two farmers—one is a dairy farmer and the other is a beef farmer—spent a couple of hundred thousand dollars on putting a pipeline straight into Lake Albert and they have access to the lake directly with a pump shed. They paid for that within a couple of years out of what they would have paid in SA Water fees.

The community around Meningie has said, 'Let's get on that.' Certainly people were pressuring me before the election: 'What's going to happen? Are we going to be able to access the SA Water pipeline after the election?' I said, 'Well, there are a couple of caveats—we've got to win.' Sadly, we did not do that. I said that we do not know the state of the books to know how cheaply we can put water through that pipeline.

To me, it looks like you are still a fair way ahead if you can access water out of Lake Albert for about 15¢ a kilolitre and pump it to your farm. There are third-party schemes. Clare Valley has just instigated one, and I know the BIL scheme has been there for a long time with untreated water. Clare Valley is different—that is treated water. I think they have managed to reduce the price by a dollar a kilolitre, which is a lot of money, but it is still a fair way ahead of what people are able to do with these private schemes.

Some of the private schemes to put in water that are being proposed are about $1 million. Essentially, because of the greed of SA Water and the state Labor government, they are not going to make a cracker out of any of this water that comes out of these private pipes. They are going to be run up the other side of the road, basically in the same line as the SA Water pipes, so we have a duplication of infrastructure.

An honourable member: Madness!

Mr PEDERICK: It is madness and it is crazy, but that is the way it is. They are doing it and they are getting on with it, and it is not just those sorts of things that are going in for people to save their hide, save their business and keep them operating locally. Certainly, I commend the Coorong Local Action Planning group and Coorong council for some of the field days they have had on how to access cheaper water.

People are revitalising bores. As you get closer to the sea, between Coomandook and Meningie, it is too salty. It is too salty on my place at Coomandook, but people are revitalising those bores, getting them going again and doing a bit of desal or accessing wells and shandying it with potable water. There are also some schemes where people are digging a dam on a gradient, lining it with plastic and catching rainwater, but those sort of schemes cost at least $100,000 each.

People are spending lots of money, up to seven figures, in light of the fact that they can get a better deal than if they used it out of the pipe. I know the member for Chaffey talked about what is happening down there and about the Lake Albert connector because here we are, five years since the drought finished, and we still have water that is well over 2,000 EC units in Lake Albert. That would not be acceptable if you were in Adelaide, but that is what it is. If the Lake Albert connector went in, that would clean it up and give better water for everyone in that region.

It is not as if the Meningie and Coorong region is taking enough belting. We have the recent issue of the New Zealand or long-nosed fur seals, and they are a serious issue—another side effect not just on the environment and on the Ngarrindjeri totems but on the fishing industry, which I believe will be wiped out before this government does anything. I think there are people within government who would be quite happy to see an MSC accredited fishery wiped out, and that is a disgrace when there are people on their knees—and I had a meeting last Wednesday night—and there are fishermen on suicide watch who do not know where to look because there is no real management of these seals.

They have talked about underwater firecrackers and noise emitters. The firecrackers will not happen until November and then they will only be operated by DEWNR staff who are contractors. Whether they will be anywhere near a fisherman is another thing. This is a community that is struggling and they continue to struggle, and I hope we do not see dire consequences before something happens. People are being looked after and looked out for, and there was a reason that a doctor spoke on suicide and depression for an hour last Wednesday night.

Certainly, in regard to water that is being put back into the system, I believe infrastructure upgrades are the best way to do that and, as was mentioned earlier, 2,750 is the main game. All the way along it has been a bit of a pipe dream of the Premier's for 3,200 gigalitres. He is a late player in the field in thinking he is going to save the River Murray. Buying water is the cheap and nasty option. Yes, it is good to buy a little bit of water, but I believe hundreds and probably well over a thousand gigalitres of water could still be obtained through infrastructure upgrades in the northern basin.

Many of us have been up through that way; I know the member for Chaffey and I have. Some people do not think it is that simple. They think, 'We will just do the quick and dirty option and buy water,' and it all sounds good and fuzzy. That is great. You can destroy communities. I am all about supporting communities. I do not support open channels and that sort of thing. I support putting it into pipes or covering those wider channels like the Mulwala Channel at Deniliquin which would be pretty difficult to put into pipes; if you did, it would cost a fortune—in the billions, as I believe it is 160 kilometres long. There have been plenty of opportunities for more reform in infrastructure in the Eastern States. I know the Wimmera in Victoria has put many hundreds of kilometres into pipe, which has saved many gigalitres of water, and we need to push for these things to happen.

What I will say in my closing few seconds is that this bill is a step in the right direction, but it is a long, long way off—it is about 10 per cent there. People will keep creating their own ways to access water, to gain water, to catch more rainwater and get on with the job. At the end of the day, when it is too late, the government will realise they are losing out on much valuable money into Treasury coffers because they have not allowed the proper access regime so that people can function, be viable and basically live their lives well here in this state.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:15): I am pleased to follow my colleagues who have spoken on this bill already, particularly the member for Chaffey. As we all know, he represents the Riverland region, which has a very large section of the River Murray within South Australia. Not only is he an expert on what happens there but he is extremely knowledgeable about what happens with water more generally across our state.

You have heard from other country members of parliament from this side of the chamber on this topic as well because, as I hope all members would understand very clearly, there is no more important natural resource than water across our entire state. It is the country members who talk about this a lot, but it is true in Adelaide as well: water is a fundamental building block for our state. It does not really matter what your interest is—whether you are a city person who is quite happy living, working and entertaining yourself in the CBD or a remote country person or an outback person who rarely every goes to Adelaide and perhaps lives on a sheep or cattle station, an Aboriginal community or somewhere like that—water is absolutely fundamental to everything we do in our state.

In the electorate of Stuart, which is obviously a pretty large electorate, we have a lot of different solutions for water supply. The member for Hammond was just talking about the need to be flexible and innovative, and that is very important. We have a large amount of water in Stuart that is SA Water from the Murray. A large amount is supplied by SA Water but not from the Murray. We have a great deal of non-SA Water supplied water. Within that, we have a very wide range of quality. Also, as I mentioned before, we have a large number of innovative solutions, and I will give a few examples of these.

In Port Augusta, it is pretty straightforward: pipelined Murray water into Port Augusta, with a diversion off the Morgan-Whyalla line. At Wilmington, where I live, we get SA Water supplied water out of an old abandoned copper mine, which was abandoned because they struck water and it is now an accidentally man-made underground aquifer. In the Upper Mid North area and southern Flinders area (the Orroroo, Melrose and Booleroo district), they get SA Water supplied water from underground bores, from genuine naturally occurring underground catchments. The towns of Morgan, Blanchetwon and Cadell are right on the Murray River.

The township of Leigh Creek, which unfortunately is in the news a lot at the moment, gets their non SA Water supplied from the Aroona Dam. Alinta manages all that water supply for the township of Leigh Creek, as did Alinta's predecessors when they operated the town. Another very interesting example is the township of Copley, where the progress association supplies the water to

the residents of Copley through their own small town reticulation system, and that is supplied by a pipeline from Leigh Creek, which is the Aroona Dam water.

There is a wide range of different ways for things to work in my electorate, including the northern Barossa, just the very tip of the northern Barossa, which is in Stuart, on the BIL scheme. There are also many communities and many remote homes and homesteads which look after themselves essentially on rainwater. Really, what I am talking about there is water for human consumption. I can go on and on about the wide range of water like the BIL's scheme. There is an endless list of other ways that people supply irrigation water and stock water, but I just mention those to give some examples of the type of diversity that is around, and SA Water is a key player in all of that.

SA Water, in my opinion, is a key player in the water supply in places that they actually would not like to be in. I am sure that SA Water, which supplies bore water to the town of Orroroo, would much prefer not to have to do that job but it does. I am sure SA Water would much prefer not to have to supply water to the towns on the Barrier Highway out from Terowie, that is, the five townships that run out to Cockburn on the New South Wales border where the water that SA Water supplies is sometimes provided by locally built dam catchments which are then settled, filtered a bit and reticulated around the town. Sometimes, those catchments have bulk water carted in to fill them when there is no natural rainfall or run-off to make it happen. Sometimes, SA Water has to deliver bottled water to provide townships with drinking water. Again, it is more examples of diversity and flexibility.

On a tangent, Deputy Speaker, I can tell you that it frustrates us no end to have very good reservoirs owned and operated by SA Water (such as Baroota Reservoir, Belalie Reservoir and the Beetaloo Reservoir, which is just outside of my electorate in the electorate of Frome) which actually do not supply hardly any water to anybody at all—certainly, no drinking water. They supply a little bit of irrigation water, but barely that.

I will not go through all of the arguments that my colleagues have put with regard to this bill because they have done so particularly well, especially the lead speaker, the member for Chaffey. My message is simply that, when it comes to South Australia, not just the electorate of Stuart, we need to have flexibility, we need diversity and we need to encourage innovation with regard to the supply of water, within Adelaide and to the furthest flung parts of the Western Australian and Northern Territory borders, the Queensland and New South Wales borders, etc. We need to encourage innovation so that we get the most efficient and most appropriate results.

I touched before on the fact that SA Water, I believe, would love to not supply some of the communities it does, and I think that people living in the real world (whether it be government, whether it be MPs, whether it be mums and dads at home or whether it be graziers and irrigators) will have to provide some flexibility as well because it would not be fair to say, 'SA Water supplies us here and we have that as the backstop and we are going to hold onto that but we want all of the flexibility and innovation opportunities to come to us alone.' I think it is going to have to be a two-way street. I think it is going to have to be a situation of, in some cases, negotiation, and that is how the real world works.

I am not trying to say that there is any one of my communities that does not deserve what SA Water is obliged to give but it may well be that there are situations where we can get more from the government. I know SA Water is an independent statutory body but, essentially, it is government-overseen and taxpayer-owned so, for the public to get more from the government one way or another, the public will also have to be innovative and flexible and willing to participate in that.

I cannot, for the life of me, understand why third-party access has ever been a problem and why it should ever be a problem. I think we should be considering fourth and fifth-party access where necessary. The member for Schubert gave a very good example in the BIL's scheme that has been a tremendous support for his electorate, absolutely vitally important for his electorate, and very positive to that southern section of my electorate as well. It happened without any legislation like this. If there is political will, it can happen. It is a great shame that there is not the political will to just get on and do the job and that the government feels it needs this sort of legislation when, clearly, it does not. I believe that a large part of that is the government's reliance upon SA Water profits—the

hundreds of millions of dollars of profit every year that SA Water provides to the government—so that the government can tax people less. It taxes them another way. Basically, it is a tax on water.

I respect the fact that SA Water operates with an independent board and independent management, but when, essentially, a wholly government-owned body, which is a monopoly in our state for the most basic, necessary commodity of water, is making hundreds of millions of dollars of profit, then that is a government tax. It translates directly to being a government tax. The government needs that money. I am not saying that they do not need the money and it does not have to come from somewhere, but my fear is that SA Water will get dragged, kicking and screaming, towards doing deals where they think they will not earn as much money by doing the deal as they would earn if they did not do the deal.

For SA Water, as an independently operated body, that is logical, rational behaviour because they have a structure and a set of objectives and requirements. Essentially, they are told, 'Do it properly. Focus on quality, safety, efficiency, etc., but earn lots of money.' That is what they are told to do, so I do not begrudge them at all for the fact that they do that, but we will have a situation where SA Water, quite naturally, will say, 'Why would we do this deal? We will lose money. It will be a less profitable organisation if we do this deal than if we do not do this deal.' Juxtaposing that against the point that the government could make SA Water, one way or another, do this anyway if they really had the political will, it is a shame that we need this legislation.

Nonetheless, third-party access is incredibly important. I believe that we should be doing everything that we possibly can to make water supply across our state as flexible and innovative and as cheap as possible within the confines of safety, both with regard to delivery and operation and water quality and that sort of thing. With those few comments, I will wind up.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (17:27): I also rise today to support the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill 2015. I commend the member for Chaffey for his enlightening address to the house. He obviously has an enormous amount of experience in this area, and we are all better off for listening to his speech today.

Water obviously affects every electorate and, as my colleagues on this side of the chamber have alluded to, it is an area that we can all be doing much better in. Every single one of us has parks in our electorate. Every single one of us has reserves and grounds, either utilised by a school or a sporting organisation, in our area, and every one of our electorates and these groups will benefit from more competition. We know that competition will create much better standards. Ultimately, it should provide cheaper prices for the consumer. This is an area that we certainly need to take very seriously. We need to encourage competition in this area.

In my electorate of Hartley, for example, there is an ongoing water issue where, perhaps if there was more competition, incompetence would not be allowed to flourish. Residents in Lochiel Park have waited for over seven years now to receive the recycled water that they were promised. Many of these residents only bought into the area because this government promised recycled water to some of them. If we had more competition, if there was another player in the market, perhaps we would have a different result in Lochiel Park, and perhaps we would have better results, standards and prices across the state.

When I look at the history of water prices, I note that the latest data that we have confirms that, over the past 12 years, water prices have actually risen by 236 per cent, which is absolutely outrageous, despite inflation only rising by about 41 per cent during the same time.

There have been allegations of price gauging, and there have been allegations that water is being used to milk South Australians to prop up an ailing South Australian government budget, as some of my colleagues alluded to. There have been scathing allegations made of SA Water by people such as Mr Kerin recently. I do not have to bring up that history, but he is not the only one to cast doubt over the water issue. The bottom line is that we can be doing much better in this regard.

The Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill aims to provide a regime in a legislated manner for third-party access to South Australia's water and sewerage infrastructure. SA Water is a monopoly provider of potable water and sewerage services for households in the city, the metropolitan area, the majority of industry, and also a substantial proportion of country South Australian customers, as we heard today.

It is argued that a third-party access regime should be designed. It would enable other stakeholders in the water industry to use, for a price, an existing supplier's infrastructure which, in reality, would be SA Water, for example, to supply services. More importantly, it would provide a level of competition in the market. We understand that bulk water has been able to be purchased through trade, as was touched on today, since water licensing was liberated. Obviously, the scheme that comes to mind would be that which is run by Barossa Infrastructure Ltd, as my colleague alluded to. I am told that provides approximately 6,000 megalitres of untreated River Murray water to irrigate wine grapes, as we heard.

If it were not for the former water minister and premier, John Olsen, driving it through SA Water, arguably this scheme would not have even happened. We on this side of the chamber have for some time now argued for a robust third-party access scheme, and this has been a key point of difference between us on those opposite.

We all know that competition in our water industry is certainly called for, and it is a requirement under national competition principles as well. The bill that we have in front of us appoints ESCOSA in a limited role as the regulator of a negotiate/conciliate/arbitrate model. There are a number of steps in the process for an access seeker to apply for access to a regulated operator. For example:

- A regulated operator has 30 days to provide an applicant with a brochure regarding the terms and conditions on which it is prepared to make its infrastructure available, the procedures that it will apply, and information about prices and costs associated with access;
- On application, a regulated operator must provide technical information to an applicant regarding current utilisation and the likely price or reasons why access cannot be provided. The regulated operator can also charge the applicant for providing this information;
- The applicant will then write to the regulated operator to outline the access that they are seeking and their proposed terms and conditions, and then that operator would have a right to seek more information. The regulated operator would then have one month to notify the applicant and ESCOSA of its decision—

and it goes on. I note that there were several submission to the February 2013 DTF paper, and there was a preference theme for light-handed regulation that came through. Obviously, none of the submissions would advocate for full retail contestability; however, the main thing is the agreement for a light-handed regulation approach. We have actually been told privately that, obviously, for a number of companies who do bid for SA Water's business, it is going to be unlikely for them to make formal submissions, because they would have to err on the side of caution. They do not want to be accused of undermining SA Water or being critical of it. They would have a vested interest in this, and so that is why it is up to us to stand up for these companies.

There have been a number of key issues raised through the submissions, which I will in turn touch on. For example, I note that ESCOSA welcome the move towards the development of a third-party access regime, but they do remain concerned that 'the nature, strength and scope of the proposed regime is so limited as to materially impede the delivery of those benefits to South Australians'. When you go onto some of these other submissions, and I look at SA Water, they make a number of suggestions regarding minor drafting issues for consideration. I encourage the government to look closely at these, for example:

1. Transitional arrangements;
2. Appropriate qualifications for conciliators and arbitrators;
3. Clarification on accounts and record-keeping requirements;
4. Information required from access seekers;
5. Requirements to provide confidential details of other third parties to an access seeker and various publication and consultation requirements which can be resolved easily by the 'first-in-time' principle;

6. Simplification of the application process;

7. Extension of the period of time before a dispute is deemed to have arisen; and

8. Reciprocal rights.

Then we have Business SA. Business SA obviously a long time ago have recommended that a legislated state-based access scheme be implemented. They say it should apply to bulk water transport, water distribution transport, local sewage transport and bulk sewage transport. They also suggest that the Essential Services Commission of South Australia be appointed the regulator and, as I said, that a light-handed regime be applied, a negotiation framework modelled on other similar systems be considered, and a robust dispute resolution procedure be implemented as well.

With those comments, I will support the bill and I will also be supporting the amendments if they are put by the member for Chaffey on this side of the chamber. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:37): I rise to speak on the Water Industry (Third Party Access) Amendment Bill 2015 and commend the member for Chaffey for his generous and informative contribution to the parliament in the debate of this matter. He has comprehensively outlined the importance of the bill and the movement towards allowing third-party access and contestability of water in the state, together with highlighting the deficiencies which need to be addressed.

From my assessment, this is a movement which is a bit like observing a horse being dragged to water and then forced to drink, the government (being the horse) taking a sip and then continuing in its resistance. I think it is a good start that at least the horse has come to the water and it has taken a sip. It has been years in the coming in an environment of repeated promises. It is singularly an area of difference between our side of the parliament and the government, and its advance at glacial pace has been extremely disappointing. However, it is here, there is significant room for improvement, and I think the government should seriously look at the amendments which have been foreshadowed by the member for Chaffey, having clearly rejected them in another place when this matter was debated.

I will not traverse the purpose of the legislation and its particular areas of deficiency, other than to say that the introduction of ESCOSA to provide supervision of SA Water, which is going to have such a comprehensive level of control in relation to this industry contestability, is interesting. I say 'particularly' because I have heard the Treasurer say, 'We want to open the opportunity for insurance in the motor accident world, and to do that we have to have a very strict regime of protection. We have to have supervision in these environments,' yet here, when they are leaving a monopolist in charge (some would say it is a bit like leaving the fox in charge of the henhouse), they seem to be somewhat lax in the scrutiny they are expecting under this regime, given that water is such a critical element—it is not for only the survival and prosperity of the state but the sheer survival of our population relies on water distribution, in addition to the safe accumulation and distribution of that resource.

It is disappointing to see this very limited role that has been provided to ESCOSA and the importance of expanding the scheme to at least include bulk water. As the shadow minister for infrastructure, I watch with interest a number of the acts of the government that have caused me concern. As the local member for Bragg, we have ongoing issues in relation to water. First of all, can I say that SA Water has come to the party eventually in providing the residents of Skye who live eight kilometres from the GPO finally with mains water. It is in a hugely high bushfire-risk area—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: —yes—which the capital cost is nearly $20,000 per household, but it is finally implementing it. I was pleased to hear on the weekend a report back from one householder who said that there had been some discussions about the physical arrangements for that and that it is progressing well. I am pleased that it has finally happened, but nevertheless there was a delay in this, and leaving that population without adequate drinking water services when its access to bore water was becoming increasingly saline and therefore inalienable to them had been appalling. That has been remedied and to leave them in the plight of bushfire risk was scandalous, but nevertheless it has occurred.

The Greenhill water supply, which was originally established through the local board, is absolutely critical for bushfire management. It was actually established to have a tank ready for the residents of Greenhill, which has fewer than 100 residents and so is called a settlement in South Australia, not a town. Some members would remember it being under fire literally on Ash Wednesday. Fire ripped up both sides of the hill and many dwellings were incinerated. So that, thanks to the local people who got together to secure water, is now underway.

We are having ongoing difficulties in the Uraidla/Piccadilly area, an area which is flooded with water each year, and the government in its wisdom has introduced a water levy through the NRM board only to find this year that we had the scandalous situation where the Minister for Water under a ministerial direction directed that the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board apply some of its funds towards capital infrastructure, including the upgrade of the Patawalonga system—a worthy project in its own right but scandalous to think that the government should require the NRM board, in my view, to apply it.

It has responded by saying, 'Well, we're not actually applying the water levy to it: we're going to apply the land levy. We may have to cut out some other projects that we need to deal with it under their jurisdiction, so we're waiting for their response on that.' The Uraidla township, I should explain, is very commonly replicated across the state. It is a township of some hundreds of people. It has an incredible history. It comprises a hotel (which is about to be refurbished and reopened), a local football club, a local school, a local store, residents old and young, and a very healthy community ethic.

They rely entirely on their own water supply from a local farmer, through a bore, and they pay a fee to receive it. It is a minor fee to the extent that access is provided, but by the good grace of that owner they use the water. They have their own rainwater tanks, but essentially they are completely independent of SA Water. They sit in a catchment zone, so they cannot expand their town. They are under severe restrictions under planning laws.

As the local member, I have tried to negotiate with planning ministers. Mr Holloway comes to mind, Mr Rau, and I think there was one in between—I cannot remember now—but they have all been quite useless when it comes to allowing this town to become independent, even though they have made provisions in every other way. They do not ask for much and they do not get anything from the state government and little, frankly, even from the local council.

Nevertheless, when I suggested to SA Water some time ago that they might like to buy the property that has the bore on it, to actually administer this service to the local people, they were not interested. They could have picked it up for less than $1 million at the time. How ridiculous it was that they did not acquire the asset is beyond me. In any event, that is what we are dealing with—a situation where people are living without the assistance of SA Water and, when they do ask for it, comes a heavy cost.

At a statewide level, I am very concerned about SA Water and its operations. I can recall a circumstance when minister Conlon, covering transport and infrastructure, announced that he would put a desal plant on the West Coast. They are still in a dire predicament in respect of water supply both to their town and for future enterprises. If they are going to be a future developing area in relation to mining, they are going to have to get that right and get on with it. The second, of course, is the desalination plant, which is a scandalous waste of money—$2 billion. We had—

Mr Whetstone: 2.3.

Ms CHAPMAN: It was 2.3, the member for Chaffey and shadow minister reminds me. It is an absolutely scandalous waste of money. Recently, I was informed about the information centre, which I think was put up at a cost of about $5 million and which is visited by schoolchildren and others who are interested in looking at the interactive technology within this facility that tells them about desalination, the importance of water and so on. It is a very pleasant little information facility. However, the children who visit are not even allowed to go into the desalination facility to have a look at it, and it is actually a magnificent piece of infrastructure. It is a huge four pumping station operation. The tragedy for South Australia is that we have had to pay $2.3 billion for it, its utilisation is negligible and it is a massive cost on an annual basis to South Australians.

We can add to that the over $400 million project for the north-south interconnector pipeline and pumping stations which traverse the eastern side of Adelaide. They have ripped up brand-new roads, ripped up local streets, disrupted businesses, caused a disturbance. It is a massive cost essentially to move the water from the Happy Valley region to the Hope Valley region, a consequence of the establishment of the desalination plant. Here is the wicked aspect of this that I think is just a scandalous example of where governments and their allegedly corporatised boards—namely, SA Water in this instance, failed to investigate alternatives, failed to cost alternatives to providing this water supply pipeline from the south to the north in anticipation of future planning. It is absolutely disgraceful.

The excuse of the board is that they are told by the government what to do. The excuse of the government is that SA Water is an independent corporation and does what it wants to do. Somebody at the end of the day has to take responsibility for the scandalous spending of money which is not directed and targeted at benefits which are important for the survival and prosperity of this state. Somebody sometime is going to have to take responsibility. How do they get away with it? These people just kept spending someone else's money. They do not care how much it costs. They just do not care, but the people out there who are having to survive and need a chance to continue to live in South Australia at a reasonable cost, to have some prosperity, to be able to grow produce for the state, are just completely alienated from being able to do that.

Then of course we have the consumers. They are mostly people in metropolitan Adelaide and some other regional towns that are supplied by SA Water. The water is predominantly captured in the Adelaide Hills, a significant portion of which I represent here in the parliament; the rest of it, of course, is sucked across from the River Murray. The amount of rain we have largely determines how much we take out of the River Murray for metropolitan consumption, and it is piped across to Kimba and other parts of the state—the lifeblood of the state.

Again, we have a situation where the money that is spent on infrastructure is, I think, without adequate scrutiny. Why do I say that, given that we have a Public Works Committee in the parliament? It is because SA Water present as the infrastructure builders, approvers and funders of water infrastructure in this state. They present the material, brief as it is, to Public Works—sometimes scandalously less than they make public even to other entities, I note—and they expect that they will be approved.

I think many of the members on the Public Works Committee do the best they can to ask questions and require answers, and they are fairly short in the delivery of those. I will use a current example for Public Works, which is the O-Bahn project. The Department of Transport turned up with their proposal after the stop-start, stop-start of this project several weeks ago, scandalously short on information. Members of the committee have to ask for more information to be provided and I think it is meeting again this week.

We are yet to see whether these departments and entities, which have a life of their own, actually start to deliver and provide to the parliament some explanation of what they have done—that they have looked at a number of options, that they have costed other options, that they have rigorously assessed what is the best model, whether it is building a road or a piece of water infrastructure, and that they are delivering a recommendation that is consistent with the best possible outcome for that region and for South Australian taxpayers. That is what we expect them to do and that is what the public expects them to do, and it is not acceptable when they do not.

I did note, in the Auditor-General's Report today that in the 2014-15 year, there had been a $2.7 billion repayment of equity to the government by SA Water in addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars every year that they provide as an income stream to government. They have been for a long time a cash cow of the government. We could speak all day about the consumers who, even at the domestic level, are paying an outrageous cost for water to local residences, but that of course just increases the long-term borrowings of SA Water and just transfers debt.

It makes Treasurer Koutsantonis's figures look better and reduces his liabilities on his balance sheet but it puts huge extra borrowings on SA Water. The experts say that this sort of situation should not occur. They should not be raiding out money from the Motor Accident Commission—over $800 million last year—or requiring its entities, such as SA Water, to massively extend their borrowings to repay their equity debt. It is just not acceptable.

Then on the other hand, they run entities such as the Urban Renewal Authority. That is a cot case if ever I have seen one. That had a massive debt in its operations again this year. It was claimed initially to be because they had not completed the first stage of the Gillman deal, which was to bring in $45 million by 30 June.

We find, on reading the Auditor-General's Report today, big problems with that entity. They are well over $100 million short and it is scandalous mismanagement of an entity that is responsible for buying and selling and for the management of hundreds of millions of dollars of the government and the people of South Australia. That is their responsibility and they are just hopelessly inadequate.

The list goes on. It was concerning to me today to hear from the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure that he did not even know whether his own department had put in a business case yet for the Northern Irrigation Scheme. This is an irrigation scheme out of the Bolivar treatment works which is at saturation point, pardon the pun. It is fully utilised. It has been known for some time that we need to expand that. We have had ministers for planning come in and say that we are going to expand the north, we are going to have population growth, blah, blah, blah, blah and no water to go with it.

What is wrong with these people? They have a job to do. They should be doing it properly. That business case should be over there with Infrastructure Australia and it should have been there years ago. I think the irresponsibility of this government is just scandalous.

There are ministers one after another who do not keep an eye on these things, make hollow promises and end up having to cancel projects after the whole razzamatazz of the announcements with the press release, the coffee mornings and all this nonsense. They then have to cancel them because they have not got their act together and properly managed these major projects.

They are sucking out the financial oxygen of the reserves of this state. We have hardly anything else left to sell except probably a few billion dollars worth of Housing Trust stock because this government have sold everything to keep living in a manner to which they have become accustomed, which is to spend whatever you like, to not give a toss about what the responsible management of that is and who cares if we just run up more debt.

I say it is a good start that we at least have the bill. The government have been kicking and screaming like a horse being dragged to water to introduce some level of third-party access and contestability, but let's get it right. Do not come into this parliament with this duplicitous approach of saying, 'We will just let SA Water manage all of this on the side. They do not need to have supervision.' They then come in here and pretend that they give a toss about integrity, scrutiny, supervision and transparency when it comes to the Motor Accident Commission and other private players in the insurance world. Do not come in here and speak with a forked tongue.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I go any further, I would like to acknowledge that earlier this afternoon we had a group of year 11 students from the 2015 Wilderness School SRC who were the guests of the member for Flinders. We hope they enjoyed their time with us.

Bills

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

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

CLASSIFICATION (PUBLICATIONS, FILMS AND COMPUTER GAMES) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Wednesday 14 October 2015 at 11:00.

Answers to Questions

STATE EMERGENCY RELIEF FUND

28 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). In relation to the State Emergency Relief Fund—

1. Were there expenses associated with the cost of distributing the public donations into the State Emergency Relief Fund following the Sampson Flat bushfire and, if so, what were they?

2. Did these costs come out of funds donated or is there a ministerial account to cover these costs?

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

1. There are administrative costs associated with the distribution of the publicly donated moneys deposited into the State Emergency Relief Fund (SERF) following the Sampson Flat bushfire.

2 Pursuant to the *Emergency Management Act 2004*, all administrative costs associated with the collection and distribution of money donated by the public into SERF are absorbed by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion. One hundred percent of the money donated by the public is directed to those affected by the bushfire.

LOW INCOME SUPPORT SERVICES

30 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). In reference to low income support services provided by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion:

1. What are the amounts that were provided for 2014-15?

2. What agencies/organisations were they were provided to, both for services within and not within the Cabinet Affordable Living Strategic Priority?

3. What is the budgeted amount to be provided in 2015-16?

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

1. $1,235,250 was allocated towards low income support services in 2014-15.

2. In 2014-15 the organisations that were provided funding towards low income support services were the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, a.c.care, Anglicare, Centacare Diocese of Port Pirie, Community Food SA, District Council of Peterborough, Lifeline South East, Lutheran Community Care, Northern Metropolitan Aboriginal Corporation, Overseas Chinese Association, Uniting Communities and UnitingCare Wesley Bowden.

3. The allocated budget to be provided to low income support services in 2015-16 is $1,235,250, plus indexation.

COMMUNITIES AND SOCIAL INCLUSION DEPARTMENT BUSINESS CONTRACTS AND SERVICE LEVEL AGREEMENTS

32 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). How many major business contracts and service level agreements were undertaken by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion in the current financial year and how many payments are overdue by each of 20, 30, 60 and 120 days?

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

During 2014-15, the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion held 10 major business contracts and service levels agreements with an annual contracted value of over $4.4 million (GST inclusive), which is a commonly used financial threshold in government in relation to major or significant contracts, consistent with Treasurer's Instruction 17.

Of a total of 289,855 invoices paid by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion during 2014-15, 2,340 or 0.811% were overdue using the government standard of payment within 30 days.

INTERPRETING AND TRANSLATING SERVICES

35 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). How many people have utilised interpreting and translating services in 2014-15 and what is the current funding provision for 2015-16?

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

In 2014-15, ITC undertook 36,833 interpreting assignments in various formats. These assignments were across 100 different languages. ITC also completed 1,892 document translations.

As a fee-for-service entity operating under competitive neutrality principles, the Interpreting and Translating Centre is not reliant on the provision of budget funding. Revenue from fees and charges generated by the centre is used to offset the expenditure the centre incurs in earning this revenue.

In 2015-16, the budgeted revenue from fees and charges is $3.55m and total expenditure is budgeted at $3.41m.

FINANCIAL COUNSELLING SERVICES

37 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). How much funding is being provided specifically for 2015-16 for financial counselling and through which organisations is this being delivered?

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

$927,000 has been specifically allocated to financial counselling services in 2015-16 as part of the Financial Counselling Services Program. The organisations that are providing these services are ac.care, Anglicare SA, Lifeline South East, Lutheran Community Care, The Salvation Army, UnitingCare Wesley Bowden, Uniting Communities and UnitingCare Wesley Country SA.

Some of these agencies, as well as others in the community, are in receipt of other sources of funding such as the Low Income Support Program that can be used for financial counselling services, but these funding sources are not provided exclusively for financial counselling.

For example, a total of $1,280,000 has been allocated via the Low Income Support Program in 2015-16 to reduce and alleviate the effects of poverty through the provision of advocacy and financial counselling, together with other strategies such as targeted information and community education programs.

FOODBANK SA

38 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). How much funding is being provided specifically for 2015-16 for Foodbank programs and through which organisations is this being delivered?

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

$250,000 is being provided in 2015-16 for Foodbank programs. Funding will be provided to Foodbank SA to maintain operations at the Community Foodbank outlets in:

- Bowden (operated in partnership with UnitingCare Wesley Bowden);
- Edwardstown (operated by Foodbank SA and is co-located with the Foodbank SA warehouse);
- Elizabeth (operated in partnership with Anglicare SA); and
- Port Pirie (operated in partnership with UnitingCare Wesley Country SA).'

COMMUNITY SUPPORT SERVICES

47 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). In relation to Community Support Services Programs—

1. What is the Results Based Accountability outcomes framework utilised in community support services programs, has it been fully implemented and how many community support agencies are adhering to this requirement?

2. Which Community Support Services Programs have not implemented this framework?

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

1. Results Based Accountability (RBA) is a flexible evidence-based planning, evaluation and continuous improvement tool which the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion is using to measure the impact of government funding in the community sector.

RBA can be adapted to fit the unique needs and circumstances of different individuals, communities, programs and organisations. It offers a systematic approach to thinking and taking action that starts with defining the desired results and working backwards as a means of achieving them.

RBA is available at no charge to any agency that wants to use it. There are a small number of products developed by the founder of RBA available for purchase, however they are not mandatory to implement the RBA approach.

The Community Support Services Program is a statewide program commencing from 1 July 2015. The program will see 63 different community-based services provided by 32 agencies across South Australia. The services provided will target the six key areas of youth, families, community and neighbourhood development, life skills development, community hubs and low-income support.

All agencies are currently implementing the RBA framework and have selected appropriate performance measures to accurately record progress for their clients against the agreed outcomes for the Community Support Services Program.

The RBA framework includes a focus on continuous improvement to support services to achieve the best possible outcomes for all clients accessing the service. If required, agencies will receive further support and training to maximise the effectiveness of applying the RBA framework to service delivery and impact measurement.

2. All Community Support Services Programs have implemented this framework.

RED TAPE REDUCTION

48 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). What is the current status of government red tape reduction amongst the not-for-profit sector?

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

The Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (DCSI), in partnership with the non-government sector and other government agencies, is leading the implementation of a number of state government initiatives to reduce red tape in the non-government organisation (NGO) sector. The initiatives include:

- establishing generic grant agreements;
- developing consistent legal clauses;
- introducing rolling (3+3+3 year) contracts; and
- delivering a tender-ready training program for small community organisations with a focus on multicultural and Aboriginal groups.

DCSI is also investigating the feasibility of introducing a whole-of-government NGO Indexation Policy, to develop a consistent approach across government.

A working group from the Human Services Partnership Forum is also developing new funding guidelines for all not-for-profit organisations in South Australia, which are due to be released in 2015-16.

A program to assist non-government organisations to be tender-ready is in place, and a tool, the STARservice Development program, has been developed to assist agencies to assess their governance and management capabilities. This program is now available and is currently being promoted.

THRIVING COMMUNITIES

49 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (30 July 2015). Under the Thriving Communities agenda—

1. What opportunities have been identified in the southern Adelaide area?

2. What opportunities have been identified in the northern Adelaide area?

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

1. The primary object of the Thriving Communities initiative in the southern Adelaide region (known as Together in the South) is to improve the emotional and social wellbeing, and success, of over 6000 children aged between birth and eight years in Christie Downs, Huntfield Heights, Noarlunga Downs, O'Sullivan Beach/Lonsdale, Christies Beach, Hackham, Hackham West and Morphett Vale.

The Together in the South initiative particularly targets developmentally vulnerable children, who, according to the Australian Early Development Census, make up one third of the population in this age range.

The aim is to ensure 'Every child is safe, healthy, active, ready to learn and getting along with others'.

Together SA, a non-government organisation committed to leading collective impact approaches in South Australia to achieve population-level change, is actively supporting the Together in the South initiative.

2. In the northern Adelaide region, individual discussions with a range of local leaders indicate interest and support for Thriving Communities work at two levels:

- a Playford-Salisbury wide strategy, in order to create change at scale;

together with

- deep engagement in identified neighbourhoods.

The initial focus for engagement through these individual discussions with local leaders has been wellbeing and resilience spanning the 'early years to early careers'. While local leaders have supported this as an appropriate area of focus, they have also highlighted the need for community engagement to allow community members to raise other pressing areas of focus.

The Thriving Communities initiative in northern Adelaide will align closely with the development and implementation of the Northern Economic Plan (NEP). As part of this process, a broader community consultation process will be occurring with local residents and leaders (parents, sporting clubs, school governing council members etc.), young people, business, and agencies with a presence or service in northern Adelaide.

In addition, discussions are occurring with a range of stakeholders (Aboriginal community, young people, non-government sector and government) to build on the work started by the Northern Adelaide Solutions Group 2011-14 (a Closing the Gap partnership) to address long-standing community concerns about Aboriginal young people's engagement with the youth justice system.

MURRAY MOUTH

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (4 December 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I provide the following information:

1. SA Water has applied for a Section 26 Aquatic Activity Licence under the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993 to undertake dredging activities associated with the River Murray Mouth.

As a condition of the licence, SA Water will allow general vessel traffic through the area where it doesn't interfere with dredging. Vessels will be permitted to pass between the Goolwa and the Coorong Channels during daylight hours between sunrise and sunset, but will only be able to pass to the north side of the dredge (on the south side discharge pipes will be in place for sand removal). Vessels not associated with dredging operations will not be permitted to anchor in the licensed area.

The dredge vessel will display the required navigation signals (day) and lights (night) to advise of the appropriate passing side. SA Water may permit the entry of vessels in the waters specified in the licence outside of sunrise and sunset, at such times when the dredge is not in operation e.g. long weekends or school holidays. On these occasions SA Water will publish a notice in the Adelaide Advertiser indicating periods of access and applicable conditions of access.

There may be times when the boating public is excluded from the area for safety and operational reasons. SA Water has been requested to minimise periods of total channel blockage. SA Water will inform the public when access is excluded. Notification of total channel blockages will be notified by blocked channel markers, through Notice to Mariners in the Adelaide Advertiser, and signage at boat ramps in the area.

2. The licensed area is the same as it was during the millennium drought but the scope of the dredging is far more significant than previously undertaken. It is proposed to dredge an 80m wide channel where it was previously only 40m wide and the projected channel depth is 3m below Australian Height Datum.

Special marking buoys will be placed around each dredge. A 4 knot speed limit currently exists in the vicinity of the Murray Mouth. This will not change.

Coorong access will continue to be available through Mundoo Channel.

All steps have been taken to ensure access to the area when it is safe to do so.

Estimates Replies

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (23 July 2014). (Estimates Committee B) (First Session)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

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, job titles and total employment costs of positions within the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure with a total estimated cost of $141,500 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:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Project Director	$162,843
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	Group Executive Director Infrastructure	$225,475