

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 2 August 2017**

The SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson) took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

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

*Bills***PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL***Conference*

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (11:02): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

*Parliamentary Committees***ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2017-18**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Odenwalder:

That the 95th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2017-18, be noted.

(Continued from 5 July 2017.)

The SPEAKER: There are two minutes on the clock.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:02): I rise to speak to the 95th report of the Economic and Finance Committee in regard to the emergency services levy 2017-18. I note that this funding is used to raise fees for our emergency services.

An honourable member: You only have a minute and a half left.

Mr PEDERICK: Have I? I did not realise I had only that much left. I probably had a good go earlier.

The SPEAKER: Feel free to complain about the limitation for the next minute.

Mr PEDERICK: I would like to reiterate what happens when we have a major event: the people of South Australia are hit with a rather large bill every time and our emergency services levy just keeps going up. We do get services, but sometimes those services take forever. I note that the Rocklea and Tailem Bend stations, if they have not been started, will be soon. Rocklea especially has been a bone of contention for a long time in making sure that the Crown land report had come through. That was a blue internally in government.

I note that Coonalpyn has a new station, which is good to see, but I will say that that took 14 years—14 years from conception to that station opening in only the last month or so. It is a good facility, but it is ridiculous that these stations take so long. With regard to Rocklea, it was only due to the kind generosity of a farmer and a member of the CFS who stored the fire truck on his property, so there does need to be some improvement.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:05): In the time that I have been in this place, I do not think I have seen the taxpayers of this state abused as much as they have been with regard to this particular levy in recent years. We had both the Premier and the Treasurer claim that they had to increase the levy because there were some cuts to funding to South Australia from the commonwealth, but that was an absolutely bogus claim and it certainly did not bear scrutiny.

Indeed, I recall that a couple of years ago the Treasurer was on the Bevan and Abraham program and again he was trying to make the claim that there were massive cuts to health and education funding from the commonwealth. The ABC at that stage still had their fact checker and Bevan and Abraham had run the Premier and the Treasurer's claims about this cut in funding from the commonwealth through the ABC's fact checker. The answer came back that there had been no cuts, because basically you cannot cut something that was never there. It reminded me of the time of Paul Keating's L-A-W tax cuts. They were there before the election, but as soon as he was re-elected (I think it was the 1993 election) they disappeared.

Certainly the Gonski funding and the health promises to the states of the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd period were a dog's breakfast, but we all know that the money was never budgeted for. It was never in the budget. The promises were way out beyond the forward estimates and yet we had the South Australian Labor government claim that they were facing these massive cuts and therefore had to raise additional revenue.

The reality was that they faced no cuts whatsoever. The money was never there; it was never factored into their budget because the so-called promises were way out beyond the forward estimates. Notwithstanding that, we have had this ruse ever since and an additional \$90 million a year, I think, that has been extracted from the long-suffering taxpayers of South Australia again to cover the bungling of this government's management of the state's finances.

The South Australian Treasury has never had such mismanagement. Certainly it has been in difficult times previously, obviously with the collapse of the State Bank, SGIC and other Labor Party bungles at the time in the late 1980s, which cost the state billions of dollars. The budget was in turmoil. However, the problems that we are facing as a state now and that the government faces in the turmoil of its budget are of its own making. It is not something that was an unintended set of circumstances—although I believe that the Bannon government of the 1980s obviously made huge mistakes that led to those huge losses.

The mistakes that are being made at the moment are being made every day. The government, the Treasurer and the cabinet just get it wrong day after day. They make stupid decisions—for example, the price of electricity in South Australia. Notwithstanding that the Treasurer and the Minister for Energy told this house earlier this year (back in March, I think, in question time) that \$7 billion had been invested in South Australia over the last little period on electricity generation, fundamentally on rooftop solar panels and wind farms, we still have the most expensive electricity and most unreliable electricity system probably in the world.

The emergency services levy imposed on people across the state and on my constituents is an outrage. When the measure was first brought in to replace funding from local councils, supplemented by a levy on insurance taken out in this state, it was brought in with the understanding—and the Labor Party argued for this at the time—that the government should supplement it, recognising that the government has a significant amount of the risk for emergency services, which creates the need for emergency services in South Australia.

The more recent move to do away with the rebate paid from the Consolidated Account ignores that fact, that the government is responsible for a significant amount of risk. It also ignores the fact that the government, by applying the rebate, is able to apply a considerable amount of equity because, after all, it is a property-based tax. The risk associated, for example, for fire and/or ambulance and police work really has no correlation with the value of a property. There is no correlation between the value of a property and the risk posed by that property or the ownership of that property. The rebate recognised that and enabled the levelling out of the impost on individuals.

Again, because it is a property-based tax, I believe that it has impacted on my constituents to a much greater extent than it has on the constituents of many other members of the house. A significant number of my constituents are farmers and, as such, have extensive property holdings and, as a consequence, are hit very heavily by this particular levy. I would define a levy as something that is raised to cover a recognisable cost. My analysis of this over recent years is that there is no correlation between where the levy is raised, the amount of money that is raised and where the levy is spent.

In the first iteration of the ESL, and for many years up until the government removed the rebate, there was a strong correlation between the amount of money spent in each of the four zones the state is divided up into and the amount of money collected in each of those four zones, so it was easy to argue that there was a strong adaption of the user-pays principle. However, in the last few years, that correlation has certainly broken down with regard to that zone, which is basically the agriculture area of South Australia, the regions excluding the major towns outside greater metropolitan Adelaide.

There has been a significant increase in the revenue raised in those areas. I am working from memory here, but it is an increase of 50 per cent in the revenue raised in those areas. I think it went from something like \$22 million or \$24 million to almost \$40 million. I cannot remember the exact figures because I do not have my notes in front of me, but it was a significant increase in revenues raised out of basically the settled areas of South Australia outside greater metropolitan Adelaide and excluding the major towns, yet there has been no increase in the expenditure in those areas, notwithstanding the information supplied in this report we are discussing suggests that there has been.

Some of my colleagues on the Economic and Finance Committee asked specific questions on this, and it seems that what has happened is that a lot of the management fees have been loaded up onto that particular region. In my opinion, there has been a deliberate fiddling of books to try to square the ledger to suggest that there has been a significant increase in money spent in those regional areas. I can assure the house that is not the case.

I represent a large part of rural South Australia, and my constituents are very grateful for the emergency services response we are able to achieve in those areas, but there has been no increase in the amount of money spent in those areas in the last few years, notwithstanding this huge increase in the revenue.

I sincerely hope that there will be a change of government early next year. The Liberal Party has already indicated that we will reinstate the \$90 million rebate that will provide much-needed relief to my constituents and those of a number of my colleagues on this side of the house. All I can say is, 'Bring on March next year.'

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:15): The emergency services levy is a very topical issue for all South Australians, and again we are seeing the report from the committee about the raising of the levy in more ways than one and also about the split in the spend on the levy. I am always keen to see that, of the \$302 million that will be spent on emergency services in 2017-18, the ESL will fund \$291.5 million. Some extras will be taken from the cash balances and some minor revenues interest and that sort of thing, but the \$302 million for emergency services in South Australia really does not reflect the unmet need for service delivery out there.

As we all know, the delivery of emergency services is a core responsibility of government, just as keeping the lights on, putting out fires and keeping people safe are other core responsibilities of this government. The Country Fire Service is getting \$87.5 million this year, but we know that you cannot put a value on the work and effort put in by all those dedicated volunteers. The need to support them by spending money in those areas is so important.

That is why I was particularly alarmed on Monday night when I was at the annual general meeting of the Meadows CFS—and I put on the record that I am a life member of the CFS and currently enrolled with the Meadows CFS. Members were asked if they wanted to spend \$8,000 of their hard-raised funds—from the chook raffles, working down at the local Meadows hall, working down at the Meadows fete and at the Easter fair and fundraising to buy a few things—to buy the new dark blue day uniform that the CFS has been making a lot of news about.

For it to turn out, to my surprise, that volunteers were going to have to pay for this out of all the hard work they had done to raise this money was just atrocious. There are so many brigades out there still waiting for second sets of their personal protective equipment, their second set of yellows. If their breathing apparatus qualifies, they still get a second set of the structural fire PPE, but they do not have the bushfire stuff and the normal PPE they would wear most of the time.

Under the PPE, you have your jeans, shirt and civvy clothing on. The new day uniform outfit is dark blue pants and shirts with logos on them. It is very smart and professional. I thought it was going to be given to every CFS member because that would be a very small token of gratitude from the taxpayers of South Australia—not from the government, but from the taxpayers of South Australia. But, no, it turns out that the CFS volunteers are actually going to have to buy this uniform, which is just another disgrace.

There are so many ongoing issues where the CFS are being hamstrung by the lack of funding, and to say, 'Do you want to put up the ESL?' is just a cop-out. Emergency service provision in South Australia is a core service of government. I still find it a real issue that \$22.3 million of the ESL is going to South Australian police this year. When we look at what that money is being spent on, it is metropolitan regional operations and emergency major event services. I suppose preventing emergencies is a genuine issue, and it is all part of managing emergencies if you can prevent those emergencies happening in the first place.

But the police taking money out of the ESL is not what I think it was intended for. It certainly was not intended to prop up attendance at floods, bushfires and rescue activities. To me, that should be standard SAPOL funding. That is what they are there for. They are the lead agency. It should come out of the police budget and not out of the ESL.

We see that the SA Ambulance Service picks up a smaller amount. I understand that is mainly for communications. I can live with that because I personally think that the Ambulance Service should come back under SAFECOM. It should be under the emergency services and not under the health department. Shark beach patrols get \$400,000 and the state rescue helicopter gets \$700,000. They are good spends. There is \$1 million for other things, and I know the Julian Burton Burns Trust used to pick up a fair bit of money. I saw in the paper the other day that was being wound up, so I wonder what this money is being spent on.

Again, I personally think that money should not come out of the ESL, but it should come out of the health budget because you are preventing kids burning themselves, for example, so you are preventing them going into hospital rather than having that cost on the health budget. The health budget should be putting in some preventive spending, as is the department of road transport. We know that the roads maintenance area in South Australia is sadly lacking in being up to date. Again, we should be making sure that money is being spent on road safety as well as on road repairs because the ripple effect, the savings in lives and property, is huge.

In relation to the MFS, the amount of \$137.6 million is an increase on last year. The new EB is coming out. They will be trying to cut down, as I understand, on their overtime payments by running more recruit courses so that they have more firefighters. The average age of the cohort of firefighters right now is getting right up there. There will be a lot more retiring, so we will need to run more recruit courses. Again, they are doing a sterling job with limited resources.

Not long ago, the Productivity Commission put out reports showing how much was being spent on fire services across Australia, and for many years South Australia was spending the least of all the states and territories. That may not be the case now, but we are certainly not leading the pack, and that catch-up that has to be undertaken is putting a lot of pressure on our emergency services.

During the estimates committee, I asked a question of the minister about extending the WorkCover protections given to the South Australian police members. If you were seriously injured, you were cut off after two years if you were less than 30 per cent injured. That was removed for South Australian police. The minister said that that is now being extended not only to paid firefighters but also to all first responders. Whether that includes ambulance officers will be an interesting question to ask, and certainly in relation to volunteers in the SES, the CFS and Volunteer Marine Rescue, I would think.

It is a good move, it is a welcome move and it is an overdue move. I assume it will be done by legislation because there is no EB for the CFS volunteers, but it is very good to see it happen. I look forward to seeing the legislation come in here and, with the support of both major parties, be put through this place. It is a small cost for the return we get on our investment, as is the ESL. What we get back from our emergency service workers is priceless.

There are no real surprises in this report on the ESL but just a lot of disappointment that the remissions are still not there. I can put on the record, and I said it in the Appropriation Bill speech, that the one case where I would have backed the bank tax—the only case where I would have backed the bank tax—was if that money had been hypothecated to reinstate the remissions on the ESL. If that money were put in to do that to reduce the burden on so many businesses and individuals and property owners across South Australia, then I would back the bank tax. That is the only reason I would back the bank tax because, as I have said before, it is a retrospective, retrograde step to the BAD tax and the FID.

The ESL was a Liberal initiative. It has been changed, it has been nuanced, but now it is being used to really punish South Australians by having those remissions removed, and those remissions should come back in. I note the Liberals are promising to do that at the next election, and that certainly has my strong support.

I look forward to the Labor Party manning up, recognising the impost this is on all South Australians and using some of the money that they are getting from the sales of their assets. Their no privatisation policy is out the window. With what they are reaping now—and the Lands Titles Office is going to be next—let's have the remissions back in so that South Australians can at least live their life with a little bit less stress on their costs and their daily outgoings.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:25): I would like to make a short contribution on the 95th report of the Economic and Finance Committee, regarding the emergency services levy in 2017-18. As we have heard, the report states that emergency services is projected to have a \$302 million budget, funded by the levy of \$291 million, plus other revenues from the emergency services fund of \$1.9 million and a cash balance of around \$8.5 million.

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge all the volunteers: the CFS, the SES, the marine volunteers and all the emergency service volunteers. It is not just about men and women, the young ones in uniform; it is about all the volunteers who help in an emergency, the service groups in particular. In the electorate of Chaffey, the Riverland and Mallee have a great support team behind the team of emergency service volunteers. Those service groups are always there to help by supplying food and support. Anything they can do, whether it is cleaning up roadsides or picking up rubbish, all contributes to reducing the risk of fire and reducing the risk of any emergencies.

During the hearings, the Economic and Finance Committee was told that in the year before the remissions were removed, there were people who just could not pay. The government are obviously hell-bent on increasing taxes, taking away the remission that was put there to support families and the cost of living, and it is clear that the current government just do not care. The current government are about survival and what matters to them. This emergency services levy hits people in regional centres harder because they have bigger land areas to pay levies on, they have more vehicles, they have more of most things to help their businesses run and they have more of most things to help the state's economy.

But the membership base of the current government, their electors, is primarily in city electorates that are not impacted like regional South Australians. At the time of the hearing, there was \$12.5 million owing in ESL bills in 2016-17 and just over 105,000 final notices were sent out with about 25,000 referred to debt collection. That is a sad story to tell when you consider that 96,000 had not paid in the 2014-15 year, and after the remissions were removed, that number obviously increased dramatically.

Based on the median residential house value in metropolitan Adelaide—\$443,000 in the 2015-16 year—the average ESL bill was \$264.75. Again, the ESL is a wealth tax; it is nothing more than that. With the removal of the remission, we are seeing more pressure put on day-to-day living, and more pressure put on cost of living for every person in South Australia. Whether you own a small dwelling, a large mansion, a small farm or a large farm, those people are being impacted on and it is all relative to the size of those properties.

The high levy rises are hurting business confidence in the state. Every little chip of the paint, every little bit of tax, every little increase is reducing the confidence in South Australian businesses and the confidence of South Australians in general to go out there, whether they are setting up a business, whether they want to be exporters or whether they want to employ more people. This

continual tax burden that the South Australian government continues to put on South Australians really is deplorable.

The ESL tax does not hit just home owners. As I have said, there are levies on sporting clubs, community organisations, churches and independent schools. All these organisations have to pass on that cost somewhere, somehow. At the end of the day, it comes back to the cost of living for every person who is a part of those organisations. Whether it be a sporting club, a church, or an independent school, all those associated costs are passed on.

Obviously, it has been widely documented that the South Australian Liberal Party will return the ESL remission. The ESL rises have added to challenges and we have recognised that; we have recognised what it means to South Australians and what it means to the cost of living. We have already heard that the continual increases in taxes, the continual increases on burden to do business and the continual burden just to live here in South Australia is something that the current government just does not realise. Congratulations to the South Australian Liberal Party on acknowledging that and promising to reinstate the remission.

In 1998 when the then minister, the Hon. Iain Evans, introduced the ESL, the cabinet submission, and a line previously quoted by Labor MPs, stated:

Everyone in the community has the right to expect access to affordable services...for the protection of life, property and the environment, and everyone has a responsibility to make a reasonable contribution towards the cost of doing so.

I want to stress the word 'reasonable'. This is where the current government are looking a gift horse in the mouth. They have whited out 'reasonable' and now they have said it is necessary tax that we need to put on every South Australian. This is why they have crossed out 'reasonable'—so that they can install this extra burden.

Farmers in South Australia are the ones who are going to be hardest hit; employers of any shape or form are going to be the people who are hardest hit; anyone who creates employment, anyone who creates an economy, anyone who has any form of business in South Australia that is supporting South Australia, supporting the bottom line when it comes to exports and the economy, is going to be hardest hit.

I note that every minister in the government stands up and takes the accolades for those businesses that do such a great job of employing and creating an economy. They take the credit. They stand up and say, 'What a wonderful job we have done. What a wonderful job we are doing supporting these businesses,' yet they whack them round the back of the head with another levy or an increased levy or an increased tax. It really is something that will take paint off them leading up to the March 2018 election. After that small contribution, I support the 95th report.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:33): I will not keep the house. I thank everyone for their contribution to this motion. I thank the members of the committee who worked very hard. I think it is universally acknowledged this is the hardest working committee in the parliament and I think the 95th report of the Economic and Finance Committee bears that out. I thank the staff for all their hard work. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Motions

SPEED DETECTION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Wingard:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report upon—

- (a) the operation of speed cameras and speed detection devices in South Australia;
- (b) the relationship between the location of speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents;
- (c) the impact of constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage;
- (d) the effectiveness and appropriateness of current penalties for speeding offences, including a review of fines imposed;

- (e) the operation of the Community Road Safety Fund; and
- (f) any related matters.

(Continued from 31 May 2017.)

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (11:34): I rise to speak on this motion before the house to establish a select committee to examine the use and effectiveness of speed cameras and other measuring devices used by South Australia Police in South Australia, specifically:

- (a) the operation of speed cameras and speed detection devices in South Australia;
- (b) the relationship between the location of speed cameras and the incidence of road accidents;
- (c) the impact of constantly changing speed limits and the effectiveness of speed limit signage;
- (d) the effectiveness of current penalties for speeding offences, including the independent review of fines imposed;
- (e) the operation of the Community Road Safety Fund; and
- (f) any related matter.

I would like to thank all the members who spoke on this motion before the house. I do note that, like me, the member for Hartley and the member for Mount Gambier particularly showed great concern. One of the big concerns is the perception of the police. It was interesting to hear the police commissioner on radio FIVEaa this morning talk about the fact that, when he goes to social engagements, the main thing people come up and talk to him about is speed cameras.

There is a perception out in the community that speed cameras are there to raise revenue. The police commissioner is pushed on that everywhere he goes. I think that perception is a burden that the police do not need, and that is why we want this select committee to get to the bottom of what speed cameras are really there for, to have a look at why speed cameras are in place and to assure the public that they are not there for revenue raising. That is the concern.

When we look at this year's budget, we see that 10 new speed cameras are outlined. The budgeted revenue has already been put in place for those new speed cameras, but we do not know where they are going to go. Year on year, revenue from speed camera fines goes up and up and up. The government is very keen to collect this revenue. We know they are driven on taxes, and the member for Chaffey was talking earlier about the massive rises to the ESL that the government has put in place and also the state bank tax that they want to inflict on all South Australians.

The perception is out there. When we look at the budget papers and see what is going on with the constant rise in speed camera revenue, people feel that speed cameras are there to raise funds for the government. That is why this select committee will go through and identify where speed cameras are, why they are there and evaluate their road safety capability against their positioning.

The member for Bragg also made mention—and no doubt the police commissioner is questioned on this as well—of people often saying, 'The speed limit was one speed here and then it changed by 10 kilometres, then went down by 10 kilometres a little bit farther down the road.' The variance and the inconsistency in speed limits is also something that people talk about all the time. This select committee will look at that and make sure there is a consistency in speed limit changes, that they are not constantly changing speed limits and that they are effectively signed.

That is the great concern that we have. That is what the community is concerned about. We know that the government is not interested in what we are trying to achieve here, which is to get some clarity for the people of South Australia and examine the effectiveness of speed cameras and other measuring devices used by the police, to make sure that we have safe roads and that these speed cameras are not being used to revenue raise and are being used to make our roads safe.

If the other side agrees with that, then by all means we would like them to support the establishment of this select committee because it will get to the bottom of the perception that is out there amongst the public that speed cameras are only placed to trick people and trap people. That is the great concern for everyone. That is what the committee will be created for. It is a great opportunity for the government to show all South Australians that speed cameras are not revenue raisers. Let's put it on the table, let's be transparent and let's show that we have nothing to hide.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 19
 Noes 23
 Majority 4

AYES

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

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Digance, A.F.C. (teller)	Gee, J.P.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.	Hildyard, K.	Hughes, E.J.
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.	Snelling, J.J.
Vlahos, L.A.	Wortley, D.	

PAIRS

Gardner, J.A.W.	Weatherill, J.W.
-----------------	------------------

Motion thus negatived.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: UPPER PASKEVILLE EARTH BANK STORAGE RELINE PROJECT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 510th report of the committee, on the Upper Paskeville 100 ML Earth Bank Storage Reline Project, be noted.

(Continued from 25 February 2015.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:44): I am happy to make a contribution on this, given that the project is within the Goyder electorate. I speak in support of the project. Yorke Peninsula is challenged, in that it has 16 communities that do not have a reticulated water supply at all. There is considerable pressure on the reticulated network to supply as much as is required, so the investment by SA Water in this project is a very welcome one.

It goes back some time. I recollect that in about 1999 or 2000 there was an outbreak of blue-green algae, I think, in the Paskeville storage capacity, which meant that one of the dams—and there are two, north and south—had to be taken offline and all on the Yorke Peninsula network, which is defined as within the Yorke Peninsula Council area, were unable to use their reticulated water supply from SA Water. That was a bit of a crisis situation—I think it was also pretty close to an Easter weekend—and it created the need for investment to occur.

Immediately after that there was investment, with the bladder situation put in place that ensured there was no risk of fouling of the water or contamination of that kind. That project was

welcomed, as is this one. I think it is an example of where SA Water is making investments in water infrastructure in appropriate locations to ensure the guarantee of supply.

In saying I congratulate SA Water on this and appreciate the report that has been prepared by the Public Works Committee on it, I note that SA Water is proposing to construct—reasonably soon, actually—a new 37-kilometre pipeline that will provide water supply to Warooka and Point Turton residents. This is currently supplied by the Para-Wurlie Basin, which will be taken off-line because of the fact that that basin is rather challenged; water quality is an issue there but quantity is also an issue. SA Water has presented it to the Public Works Committee, which will be subject to consideration of a later report here, but it is an example of where I fully support the investment occurring.

It is a good thing for the community and it demonstrates that, no matter where it is located, the investment is occurring when a project is a priority. However, it is subject to really good advice, and good advice has to come through to ensure that, with competing priorities and demands, appropriate investment occurs. I would like to think that, no matter who is in government, that is what the focus is, particularly from the non-government organisations when it comes to investment needs.

I support the report from the Public Works Committee that has come in and, on behalf of Goyder residents and the people who visit that community, I am very grateful for the investment that has occurred.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker I would like to welcome to the gallery today the former member for Mount Gambier—who my failing eyes tell me looks younger—with a group of guests. We hope they enjoy their time here in parliament.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: UPPER PASKEVILLE EARTH BANK STORAGE RELINE PROJECT

Debate resumed.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:47): I thank all those who have contributed to this debate on the report and I commend it to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY INTERCHANGE

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 511th report of the committee, on the South Eastern Freeway Interchange at Bald Hills Road, Mount Barker Project, be noted.

(Continued from 25 February 2015.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:48): I am pleased to say a few words on this matter that has come before the house. This particular report from the Public Works Committee in relation to the South-Eastern Freeway Interchange at Bald Hills Road has been on the *Notice Paper* for a long time.

As members know, this is a project I have been lobbying for and campaigning on for many, many years. Pretty much from when I first became elected to this place, I started talking about the need for a second freeway interchange at Mount Barker, given the significant residential development that has taken place over the past close to 20 years now, so I am glad we have finally got to this matter.

I think the interchange was opened probably close 12 months ago now, and it is functioning well. It has been an absolute boon to the local district and a boon to the businesses located in a certain part of the Mount Barker township. This provides a more direct route from the freeway along Bald Hills Road into that business and light industrial area—if I can term it in that context—of Mount Barker.

From memory, it was a \$27 million project: \$16 million from the federal government, \$8 million from the state and \$3 million from the council. I have to give credit to the local council, the Mount Barker District Council; they did a lot of work over many years to prepare for the construction of this interchange.

I also want to really strongly commend the previous member for Mayo, the Liberal member for Mayo, who campaigned and lobbied very strongly on the federal side of things to secure the \$16 million from the feds. If my memory serves me correctly, as the local member I wrote to the then federal Labor minister for infrastructure and transport, whatever the title was—I would have to check my files but I think it was to Anthony Albanese—seeking their support for the project and seeking funding, from memory. Again I would need to check the correspondence, as it was a number of years ago. I got back the usual response: 'Thanks very much. We understand what you're saying but, basically, we're not going to fund it.' I want to really stress that the previous member for Mayo did an enormous amount of work, working with his federal colleagues to secure that \$16 million.

As a bit of history for the house, on this side the Liberal Party made a commitment to that project at the 2006 election, the 2010 election and the 2014 election, and it was only at the 2014 election (again, if my memory serves me correctly) that the Labor government made a commitment to it. They were the last cab off the rank. They were the last level of government to make a commitment to the project, and that was for \$8 million.

However, that is history and the interchange is constructed. A couple of residents have raised some concerns, which we are still tracking through with the relevant minister, and we will deal with them as we go along. It is a tremendous infrastructure project servicing the local district very well and something that had been long called for and long required. As the local member, I like to think that I made a contribution to seeing the project come to fruition.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:53): I would like to thank all those who contributed to this debate and also the hardworking support team of the Public Works Committee. I commend this report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR (TORRENS ROAD TO RIVER TORRENS)

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Digance:

That the 512th report of the committee, entitled North-South Corridor (Torrens Road to River Torrens), be noted.

(Continued from 25 February 2015.)

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:54): I am more than happy to have a few words to say on this project. It will probably be the last time I get up to speak on a project for the Public Works Committee, as I am no longer on it. I am already missing it something terrible, but after 11½ years it was time to let somebody else have a go and get somebody else from this side—

The Hon. S.W. Key: That is your story.

Mr PENGILLY: No, that is true. No, I was not coerced into anything, member for Ashford; it is a committee that I have taken a great interest in for a long time, and I have thoroughly enjoyed it and tried to participate in it. It has been a committee that has had a fairly constantly revolving membership over a number of years. Over probably the last 12 to 18 months, it has been pretty steady, but it changed far too often at one stage with the revolving door of presiding members and members on the other side. Anyway, that said, the committee work goes on. I know they have a meeting tomorrow morning, and we will wait and see exactly what happens with that. I understand the project then is the tram extension, which will be entertaining in its own right.

The north-south corridor project, which is here this morning, was supported by both sides of the committee, and we will wait to see exactly what happens when it is finished. It is going to be a significant project in the scheme of things. Like a lot of these projects, unless we get federal funding, a number of them will not go ahead. I do not think that enough praise is given to the current federal

government for their financial input into a lot of projects in South Australia. As I have said, many of them would just not go ahead.

Member for Elder, it seems like a long time ago that we dealt with this project—a long, long time ago. I really just about need you to get up and give us a bit of a rehash of it. We did not have any great issue with it. There were a number of questions we wanted to put to the departmental officers, which we did, and at the end of the day the project went through the committee. Might I say that, at the moment, the Public Works Committee probably has a fairly heavy load. It will be a fair bit of work between now and the end of the parliamentary year—possibly until the end of December—for the committee to deal with projects as they come up. It is a committee that puts in a big effort.

What has pleased me greatly, particularly in the last 12 or 18 months, has been that the committee has gone out around the state and looked at projects, and I think this is a critical part of its role. It needs to get out and see what is happening, and I believe that there may well be another one or two trips. The member for Elder can inform the house on that. I think there may be one included to parts of my electorate. The best way to learn where taxpayers' money is being used is to get out and have a look at the project and judge the merits of it for yourself and, particularly, talk with the workers on the job to get an understanding.

Let me say that the senior government officers we have had coming to the committee lately, particularly those from the Department of Transport, are very good people. They certainly know their stuff and acquiesce to any demands the committee makes with regard to tours or information. They are only too happy to take questions on notice back to various bodies and come back to the committee with answers, as required. In particular, I find Mr Jon Whelan and Mr Don Hogben, who I have had quite a bit to do with, very good operators. There is no beating around the bush: you know exactly where you stand and there is no attempt to fudge answers. I take my hat off to them.

Time moves on. I may even come back and pay a visit to Public Works at some stage when it is sitting, just to fill the day in. I think I have probably just about filled the time in here now, Madam Deputy Speaker. With those few words, the opposition supports the project, obviously, but it was a long time ago. It is a needed project and it is part of those roadworks that will only improve the state of South Australia as it goes along.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (12:00): With those final words from the member for Finniss, as his final duty with the Public Works Committee, I recommend this report to the house.

Motion carried.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2017

Estimates Committees

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:02): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:
That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

Motion carried.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (12:02): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion carried.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (12:03): I move:

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

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:03): It is with absolute delight that I stand here and inform the house that this will be the very last time that I participate in such a debate—the very last time. How happy am I that I will never have to sit through an estimates committee again. As I look forward to my retirement from this place, I can assure my colleagues in the house that one of the things that I will not miss is estimates.

I think, and have always thought, that the estimates process that is undertaken by this house is one of the most inefficient and ineffective things that this parliament does. In saying that, I by no means would argue that it is not an important process. What I am arguing is that the process is basically not much more than a system of abuse of the rights and privileges of the house by the government of the day.

The process of examining the budget line by line I think is an important function of this house. It is one of the ways in which we as members of this place can represent our constituents and their interest in the running of the state, but the way we go about doing that through the estimates committee process is an absolute joke. It wastes an inordinate amount of time, it costs an inordinate amount of money and it delivers diddly-squat.

If anybody, having been through the process over the last five days of the sitting of committees A and B, can say they now have a good understanding of the most recent budget and where the money that the state extracts from the taxpayers and from other sources of revenue, principally in this case from the commonwealth, is being expended, I would challenge their sanity. The reality is that the process is used to hide, to circumvent accountability and to try to bamboozle members in their genuine quest for an understanding of how the executive government is spending moneys from the Consolidated Account.

I make a serious plea. I fully expect that there will be a change of government in less than 12 months, and I make a plea to my colleagues on this side of the house that, if they are fortunate enough to be able to form government and have a group of their members form the executive, they have a serious look at the whole estimates process as a significant reform of the parliamentary process.

I have argued in this place many a time that a good government will not be worried about scrutiny. A government that makes good decisions, based on good research and good evidence, will always be able to justify those decisions, and as such will never need to shy away from scrutiny. Scrutiny is what the parliament is here for—that is our job. That is what we are here for: to scrutinise the workings of the executive.

It is through that that we actually provide the root of accountability between the electors and the executive government. It is only when the executive are too frightened to share what they are doing with the people of South Australia that they would undertake the sort of exercise that we have all been through over the last week and a half: an estimates process that hides more than it reveals.

The first thing that should be done is a ban placed on ministers making opening statements. They serve no purpose whatsoever. It is simply an avenue of disseminating propaganda from the executive to the media. It should be banned. I would suggest that, in an ideal world, ministers should not even be a part of the estimates process, but that may be a bridge too far.

The reality is that by and large the ministers do not know what is going on to the level of detail about which the members of the house should be inquiring. In my experience over 20 years, ministers who do have a sense of responsibility and a good overview of their brief have some understanding but invariably refer to the public servants who sit around them, the chief financial officers and the executive officers of their departments, to provide the information. Then we go through this torturous process where the people who know the answer to a question posed by the committee whisper it to the minister.

It is probably a system of Chinese whispers because I am sure that, when the minister regurgitates it, it is designed to obfuscate, to confuse and, in many cases, to mislead. I see no reason why ministers should be involved. It should not be a political exercise. It should be an exercise where the minutiae of how the funds of taxpayers are expended are scrutinised and, if need be, exposed. It is through that process that we as members of the parliament and through us the constituents, the electors, the taxpayers of the state, can have some surety that the processes of government are working to their benefit. That is the first point.

The second point is the timetable. I sat through a committee where we examined forestry. There are some important questions, and my colleague the member for Mount Gambier asked some very important and pertinent questions. He did not get fantastic answers, to be quite honest. The state sold the forests. It sold in excess of 100 years of production from the forest and pocketed the money. We all know that it was a miserable sale. Selling it was a stupid piece of policy. We see now that the purchasers of those forward rotations are making a profit in excess of \$120 million. I think the last reported profit was \$125 million. It is a huge profit compared with the up to \$40 million that used to be achieved by ForestrySA.

Why is time dedicated to examining the budget lines with regard to forestry when we have sold the forests and when other important areas of government expenditure receive such little scrutiny? In my mind, one of the ways to overcome that anomaly is to remove the time restrictions on the examination of the various budget lines. Maybe we should get away from this notion of committee A and committee B. I think the only reason we have those is that we have two committee rooms, the two chambers of the parliament.

I think that the budgetary examination should be an ongoing work of the parliament, doing away with this notion of having half an hour, an hour or, in some circumstances, an hour and a half to examine and that that is all the time necessary to get a full understanding. This is one of the reasons why some ministers make their opening statements. They have half an hour to be examined. They spend 10 minutes making an opening statement and then spend another 10 minutes of the half hour answering Dorothy Dixers from their own members.

That is something else that should be frowned upon—Dorothy Dixers—where the minister and his staff write the questions for his colleagues on his or her side of the house to ask, to which they read back a prepared statement that goes on and on, and reveals absolutely nothing to the committee. Again, all it does is offer more propaganda on either what a good minister or what a good government we have serving the people.

My argument is that if we had good ministers and we had a good executive, they would not need to hide via this process. I think the model which an incoming government could seriously look at is that which is provided by the Budget and Finance Committee of the other place, where executives from the Public Service are called before that committee to provide evidence on various matters of interest to that committee. I think that provides a good model.

I think the commonwealth government, through its Senate committees, in examination of the budget, again provides some pointers on how the exercise be made to work better. In the commonwealth, from what I understand, there are time limits. There are not ministers sitting in front of the committee putting their spin on things. The examination is of those who know the answers to the questions. The examination is probing and the relevant information is brought forth, and I think the parliament in that case is much better informed than we are. Again, I reiterate that I think it is a vital role of the parliament to have such a process where we have an opportunity not just to ask questions but to get answers.

It is my understanding that the bureaucracy spends many weeks between the handing down of the budget and the estimates committee hearings going through its own agencies and basically trying to work out every question that may be asked of them and preparing written answers that can be given to the minister to regurgitate. That entails a huge amount of work; work which is of no value to anyone, particularly when the answers prepared for ministers are designed specifically to not reveal anything.

We would be much better served if we were able to have a committee where the senior bureaucrats were not under the guardianship of a time limit but were exposed to questions until the

questioning was exhausted but, indeed, protected from having to answer political questions—I accept that. This should be about finding information and facts and where the money was spent, not why it was spent there, because that is a political question, but where it was spent.

One of the problems with the estimates process is that there has been this huge crossover from the revelation of where taxpayers' money is spent, and how it is spent, to the political question of why it was spent. I know we are all interested in why it was spent, and that is another function of the parliament, but I do not think it is the function of the estimates committee. That is a function where, rightfully, members of the house should be able to question ministers. There is a whole different discussion I could be having on that because, again, I think the experience in this parliament is that that process, the process of question time, has broken down as well and serves the people of the state very little.

I think that the estimates process has had its day. Its usefulness has long since departed. We need a new government to have a new look at how the executive should be examined. I do not know that this should be an examination of the executive, but it should be an examination of how the dollars are spent, where they are spent and not why they are spent. As I said, that is a different question. As such, my argument suggests that it is the bureaucrats, the chief executive officers and the chief financial officers, who should be questioned. There should not be a system of Chinese whispers, and we should not be subjected to nigh on a fortnight of spin—and that is putting it nicely.

My colleagues in the chamber may see why I am relishing the thought of not having to go through this torture again. It is with great disappointment that I witnessed what I have over the last 20 years. I cannot say that it was a brilliant system when I first came in here 20 years ago. It was not a hell of a lot better than it is now. I suspect the level of revelation of information has declined, but it was not a very worthwhile process back then. Ministers have said to me that it is a great process because even the ministers get to learn what is going on in their agencies. That is important, but I think this is a very expensive and cumbersome way for it to happen.

In my experience, I have not seen a lot of ministers in whom I have had great confidence that they were totally across their brief and that they were administering the portfolios. In my experience, most ministers are just trying to dodge their way out of serious scrutiny most of the time, and most of the day-to-day decision-making is not undertaken by ministers at all; in many cases, it seems to be taken by the Public Service, and that leads to an incredible breakdown of accountability.

Notwithstanding my delight at not having to go through the process again, I reiterate that it is an important process and that it should be made to work the way it should work. It should be a process that has the potential to reveal every budget line, what it means and where the money is going. In my opinion, that would lead to not only much greater accountability but a much better form of governance of this state. Madam Deputy Speaker, I will do something else that I do not do very regularly: I will stop with a little bit of time left on the clock.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That would be a first, wouldn't it? A first and last. Member for Goyder.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:23): Forty-five seconds left, member for MacKillop—disgraceful. I appreciate the feedback from the member for MacKillop and in many cases I concur with the things that he said, but not in all ways. As a person who has flagged his intention to leave this place as of 17 March next year, my contribution today will not be based on my experiences just over the last five days of estimates but over the last 12 years. For 10 of those 12 years, I had a responsibility to actually ask questions, and for two of those 10 years I have had a lesser role.

During the last year, I have supported those who had the responsibility, I have asked some questions about particular areas of interest and I have sought clarification of a response given by a minister or a question posed by the shadow minister. I hope that I bring a perspective that will allow for improvement to occur because I am a true believer in the process of estimates, but I believe that it can be much better.

When I talk to people about what estimates actually is, I tell them in a very simple way that I believe it is when the greatest level of knowledge exists about the state government budget in the previous year and across the forward estimates on one day than at any other time during the year. That is due to the effort that has gone into it from the bureaucratic support provided to the minister

and, one would hope, from the ministers themselves about the level of knowledge that they possess, the level of scrutiny applied by the opposition to the budget and a level of understanding from the opposition about the budget, because it is a substantial document.

Does it provide all the information? No, it does not. Its format also appears to change from year to year to make it even more challenging to follow consistent lines of where you might be able to find information or, indeed, to find where the particular question area has come from. My frustration has always been that portfolio areas might be just one page—that is madness to me. Thank goodness for electronic search capacities and the ability to find, through key word searches, where pages or words exist in budget papers now because, other than that, it becomes very difficult to actually find the reference.

Some ministers have great confidence when they walk into the chamber. Kevin Foley and I were not necessarily friends, but I respected the fact that Mr Foley, as treasurer, came in here believing he knew the answer to everything. It was exemplified one day in this very chamber when the honourable member for Waite was the leader of the opposition at the time and the treasurer was sitting there. The treasurer came in with either an *Australian Financial Review* or *The Advertiser*, I am not sure. He opened it up at the start of the estimates session and said, 'I don't need to read anything else. I actually have the ability to answer any question that these people are going to put to me.' Confrontational? There is no doubt about that.

I think that was the day that things got rather nasty. There was a suggestion that we were all going to leave this building and get called back in by a special resolution required from the Chair of the committee because it got rather aggressive in some stages, but it showed a minister who had faith. Was that faith repaid in accurate detail? That is a question for others to ask and, indeed, for history to record, but I have some other good examples. I am using Christian surnames here because they are no longer members of parliament.

John Hill acted at one stage on behalf of Michael Wright, who was ill. John had previously been the minister responsible for that area before Michael was ill. John came in and, even though he had not had portfolio responsibility for two years, he did have the support of staff around him and he was able to give a good range of answers. That demonstrated to me that he was a person who actually had a good memory about details of particular portfolio areas and the confidence to express it, so I commended him on that, and I was asking questions at that stage.

Another example is the member for Newland when he was a minister. There was a belief of others within the building that the member for Newland, as a new minister, would take up the opportunity for an opening statement of probably up to 10 minutes and then, across that two-hour question time, actually have questions from his own side. The member for Newland—and I commend him on this—came in and did not have an introductory statement and said at the very start that there would be no questions from his own side.

As a person who was asking questions on behalf of the shadow minister from another place at the time, I can assure you that the questions provided to me were not necessarily going to fit in with the time frame given to me to ask the questions. However, through the capacity of not just me but the others who were part of the opposition and questioning that day, we managed to get through it all.

The opposition shadow minister from the other place was rather grateful that we managed to fill that in, but it shows that, no matter what the portfolio area is, when you look at the budget papers question opportunities actually abound, and I am a believer in that. No matter how short the reference is, you can find information, a highlight area, a target or a report in a previous year that gives you the opportunity to ask questions, because it is all about detail. It is important that that exists.

For me, it has been detail based. There are some members who ask rather pointed political opportunity questions, mixed in with the detail questions that are required, but that is where it creates the confrontational attitude that exists a lot in the chamber. I understand that is what the place is for. I am not naive enough to assume that at all times we are going to sit here quietly and accept every answer given, but it is the point where clarification needs to be sought, it is the point where there

needs to be an opportunity for the question to exist and the responsiveness of the answers to be provided not just from the minister but from the staff who support the minister.

I am a bit like the member for MacKillop in this situation: I do not expect the minister to know everything, but I do expect them to have an overview of all matters. It would be rather challenging, across the wide variety of portfolio areas for which ministers have responsibility to possess every level of detail, particularly as some questions relate to historical aspects of budgets and others relate to the forward impact of budgets. It is impossible for one human mind to possess that level of information, and I understand that.

The necessity exists for ministers to respect that and, instead of referring questions to the staff who support them, they should provide them with that opportunity because it allows for the flow of more information. You could argue that by doing so, it gives an opportunity for a minister to be criticised and therefore attacked more at a political level. I actually think it makes for a better working environment and provides assurance to South Australians who are influenced by the matters that are discussed. It is an expenditure that relates to 1.6 million people, and it needs to exist. I think an attitudinal change is required.

It is impossible for all ministers to have all the detail, just as it is impossible for all shadow ministers, who have fewer staff to support them in the activities they undertake in that shadow perspective, to understand every detail, but it is a chance for the two to sit down and to flesh things out, and that is what I like to see. I recollect another occasion when I was asking questions of a minister from the other place on behalf of the shadow minister from the other place. For a two-hour session, I was given quite a few questions, probably about 50.

The questions were in order of priority, but the minister who was responding to them, though, being relatively early in their political ministerial life, had prepared responses to everything. It was a matter of asking a question and then listening for up to 10 minutes to a response being read into the record. After that, you attempt to seek clarification on particular issues because, no matter what amount of time is provided in a detailed written response to a question that is likely to come from the opposition, it does not cover every little detail that might be required.

Then they seemed to launch into another response opportunity, often repeating information provided in the first response, even though it was not in the fulsome detail that was necessary. That was a rather challenging day for me. I appreciated the chance to ask questions on behalf of the shadow minister. The other shadow minister and I spoke about it at length, and I had a good background on it. The minister, instead of being personally accountable for the level of information to be provided, chose to read out responses all the time.

In some cases, that is necessary; I completely understand that, and it comes back to the level of detail that is required. Indeed, it demonstrates where the bureaucracy supports a minister who has considered the potentials and developed responses based on that, but it should be a matter of reviewing the briefing papers that are provided—and this is work required to be done by the minister—and expanding upon those answers based on their knowledge after reading it, and I felt a level of frustration. I think it can definitely improve in future years, and it is an example of where we are getting it partially right but not fully right.

Like the member for MacKillop, I would love to see an opportunity where the parliament will sit beyond the traditional five days to consider the budget papers and do it over a greater expanse of time that is not restricted by time itself. From that, comes an increased level of availability of information that can therefore not only flow to the community but be possessed within the parliament. It is important that all who take part in the estimates session are engaged in it.

I know that it is the responsibility of government and opposition to appoint people who support the minister and the shadow minister when questions come in. It has frustrated me from an opposition perspective in previous years, though not this year, that a question is asked that has already been responded to or the information provided as part of an introductory comment made by the minister, and I think that is a lack of attention to detail. It is an example of an improvement from an opposition perspective.

This year, while not having the same level of personal involvement in the preparation of the questions, I have seen a significant improvement in the way the opposition has conducted itself, so

I congratulate all shadow ministers on that. Confrontation has still existed; in some cases, that is more of a reflection upon the personality clashes occurring between the minister and shadow minister. But it is also about the minister standing up for what they believe, for the budget priorities they determine and for the priorities of the government they represent versus the opposition's perspective, and I respect that. It is part of how this place works.

As an expansion on the opportunity for increased questioning, I reflect upon the level of time provided across all portfolio areas. Classic examples of where I think there should be a lot more opportunity for questions, and therefore for accountability to exist, are education and health. I have never had direct shadow responsibility for these areas, but over time I have observed the questions posed by others and the responses from ministers. If we look at the fact that, in round figures, each of those portfolio areas accounts for potentially one-third of the total state budget and has such a significant impact on all South Australians in the education of our young people and on the care of all of us across all age spectrums, they are key to the measurement of the success or failure of the government.

If we look at education from reception to year 12, on Friday last week the allocation for the Minister for Education and Child Development was an hour and a half. Given the number of campuses that exist—and I am trying to remember, but I think I have been told in the past that something like 700 schools exist across South Australia—it is a level of detail that is impossible for a minister to make an accurate response to everything. The collective of that creates a need for a larger amount of time to be allocated for the questions posed, which are all important—and that is just it: it is really hard to prioritise the education issues associated with our children and additional time is required.

You could say that it should be half a day at least, five or six hours; I have no doubt about that. That is where there could be a different practice of allowing an expansive list of questions to continue on and on—not being frivolous and repetitive and all that sort of stuff, but asking relevant and pertinent questions where an answer is required—to ensure that not only are the people informed about the decisions made by the government but also the opposition is better informed on the basis of holding the government to account, and its own perspective of being an alternative government is also important.

The other area I noted in this year's estimates session was health, which was two hours and 15 minutes. Given the significant infrastructure development that has taken place, and the accountability associated with 5 September, I think, the opening day of the new RAH, and the wideranging questions posed from a regional and a metropolitan hospital situation, I think more time should have been devoted to that, too—and these examples are not from just this year but from over my 12 years of viewing estimates sessions. From an accountability perspective, this is where the parliament can ensure that change opportunities are brought about.

Member for Little Para, I noted that yesterday you called one of my questions out of order, a follow-up question to the member for Frome. In my defence, I said that I thought that I did not ask questions out of order because I only ask questions that are relevant and to the point. I referenced my question back to part of the response given by the minister at the time. I respect the Chair for saying that, but I was a bit frustrated by it. The Chair was engaged, he was listening to the questions and the answers and so on, so it did not come out of left field completely, but it is an example of the need from an opposition perspective to ensure that questions are relevant.

In other sessions the member chaired, I looked at the questions being asked and I thought, 'I'm not sure if I would do that because I am not sure if they are relevant.' But they continued, and in some cases they went for some time, but they had a bit of a different focus from the one I would have had. However, that shadow minister believed that it was important background information for what the shadow minister wants to do over the next nine months, so he posed that.

The member for Frome is in the chamber, and I do not want to reflect on his personal capacity for the ministerial role because he has been doing it for 3½ years now and it is an extremely challenging position; there is no doubt about that. I asked some questions seeking clarification on the Regional Development Fund process and the opposition asked questions on it. The minister

provided, as part of his opening statement and as part of responses to the questions, the fact that there had been no call since round 3 in December 2015.

I had some concerns about a later response that was provided that talked about an opportunity existing for businesses and individuals, in the absolute majority of cases no doubt, via their Regional Development Australia boards that operate in their areas, to submit applications to be considered on a basis. I used the term 'ad hoc' and that was my choice of words, because to me there was no structure in place ensuring they all had an equal opportunity to put in applications and have them considered, based on the priority and the competing needs that existed at that time. That is the basis of the concern that I raised.

I respect the fact that the minister, not having had a call since round 3 in December 2015, further expanded on the significant level of applications that were lodged as part of that round and the decision that the minister made—and we were not able to get final clarification on that—presumably from a recommendation from the minister who had gone to cabinet about funds from future years being brought forward. That is an example of where need exists. The minister did his best to provide a solution and to make funds available. I understand that also.

The dilemma—and the member for Mount Gambier and I asked questions about this—is where does it provide an opportunity for those, who were not of a timing in their business or in their future operations to put an application in as part of round 3, and who are now without this knowledge of the capacity to lodge a one-off application and for it to be considered, to be part of a process to get support that is needed also?

In essence, it really requires more resources to be available. The great challenge for any minister is to get Treasury support for the dollars to be available to make that happen. I understand the reasoning behind it, but accept that it presented challenges. It was a good announcement at the time, but then it creates challenges further down.

The minister was good enough to give projections via his staff (on this occasion I believe it was Steve, the chief financial officer) of what future allocation commitments will be in the 2017-18 year outwards across the forward estimates, with the minimum of that being \$15.3 million or thereabouts in the last year, down from \$26 million. These are all good dollar spends, minister—absolutely all good dollar spends. I believe from the level of travel and the level of contact that the minister has had, he understands that there are many worthwhile causes out there and many will choose to do it with a level of government support or, in many cases, also through the opportunity that they see to pursue it in their own financial capacity, if that exists.

It is not a direct criticism of the member for Frome, but it is an example of where I think there could be questions asked about the structure. There is good intent from the outcome, but I see that creating potential problems, only because not all know about that opportunity it represents.

Given that this will be my last time that I speak about the estimates process, I have enjoyed that 12 years, I must say. I have enjoyed the dialogue I have had with ministers. I hope, upon reflection by the ministers I have asked questions of, they will respect the fact that I have asked questions to try to get information flow and, therefore, outcomes for people. In some cases I made suggestions for improvements, but at all times I was only trying to ensure that, through the estimates process, they make the best decisions possible.

I know that parliament represents a confrontational system, but there are many members of this chamber who believe, importantly, that collectively we make better decisions. I think the estimates process can be improved, but it is part of ensuring that the outcomes are positive.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:43): I rise to make comment about the Appropriation Bill. I echo the sentiments of the member for MacKillop. Unlike the member for MacKillop and the member for Goyder, I am hoping this is not my last appropriation or estimates process, but you never know. Hopefully, we will be doing it from the other side.

I think there are some improvements that can be made and, in fact, need to be made. If we are serious about running the state as best we can and in the most efficient manner that we can, the number of hours that must be put in by departmental officers and senior bureaucrats would be

absolutely staggering, yet the results that we get are full of political spin and ways of dodging the question.

It is quite interesting. I see very good ministers who are across their brief who do not take any Dorothy Dixers no matter how rough-and-tumble it gets in there, then you have others who have their Chief of Staff sitting up in the back corridors of the gallery. As soon as it gets a bit heated, you can see them on their phone and all of a sudden one on the government side asks a Dorothy Dixer and takes the focus away from the line of questioning.

If that is the real aim of it, I would say that the estimates process is a failure. There are better ways of doing it, and I think we should explore those ways. I am of the opinion that ministers do not need to be in the room. It is an opportunity for the parliament to interrogate departments and tease out information. I will just give an example of one that I found quite interesting.

I was the lead speaker in Forestry. There was obviously a bit of toing and froing about OneFortyOne and noncompliance of the forward sale. It got back to me that a report was being compiled, but it took me five questions to tease out from the minister that in actual fact a report was being compiled. I pick up my local paper this morning and find that, as of today, a new board member has been appointed to ForestrySA.

Of course, it is just quite convenient that this is after the estimates and I cannot ask questions like, 'Was Mr McEwen a Labor Senator? What was the process for that board appointment?' There is a whole range of issues.

The Hon. S.W. Key: It was in the paper Saturday.

Mr BELL: It was in my local paper today. That is what I am talking about.

Members interjecting:

Mr BELL: Thank you. I think that should receive a call to order at least. The dodging and weaving that goes on with some is quite remarkable, yet it is not aiming to achieve the objective for which the estimates process was originally set up. We have some major issues in South Australia, particularly regional South Australia. There are declining population numbers in our regions. TAFEs are closing in regional areas. There is a backlog of road maintenance in the order of \$1 billion. Education, as we saw in today's *Advertiser*, is failing students in South Australia.

These are quite serious issues. I sat in on the education estimates committee. The member for Morialta was asking questions about money directed towards literacy. The minister at the time could not give a straight answer, yet three or four days later, came out with a major announcement on the back of some very bad news about NAPLAN.

On a whole range of levels, the process is being corrupted in a political fashion, and I do not think that was the original intent of it. The time taken, the dodging of questions and not getting to the point of what it was originally intended for leads me to believe that perhaps the estimates process has run its course and may need to be either disbanded or modified in a pretty significant way.

Obviously, with power being a major issue, observing the answers given in that estimates committee was like watching an extended series of question times. I have major concerns with the community grants and the application process for the \$40 million. To me, it looks like \$40 million of pork-barrelling, which will go into marginal seats. I see the member for Fisher, who might be a beneficiary of some of these if it is a marginal seat going forward.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: She's got 90 per cent, she's not marginal, don't be mean to her. Minus 0.1 is marginal.

Mr BELL: People from the other side, if you want to look at how some of this plays out, I recommend you grab a book by Michael McGuire, entitled *Never a True Word*. Obviously, Michael McGuire worked for Kevin Foley—not that this is a direct recount of his time with Mr Foley—but there certainly is some interesting information in the book, obviously not pertaining to anybody at all. When I was reading it, and then going through estimates, I saw the sentiment of what Michael McGuire was getting at. I will quote a couple of pages from it in the time that I have remaining:

I hate going to parliament. [Bugger]—

and I have changed that word—

all your talk about democracy and the idea of the people's representatives thrashing out the big issues of the day. It's all a facade. The truth is nothing of any real note is ever accomplished during sitting weeks. All the hard work, the negotiating, and the preparation are done when parliament is in recess. What parliament boils down to is theatre for bad actors. It's a stage for the polities to convince themselves of the importance of the work. Where they attack the other side of politics with hysteria and hyperbole, or stand for hours on end debating some minor point that no-one cares about to obstruct [or delay] a bill. The questions are inane, the answers incomprehensible. If you want to lose faith in democracy spend an hour watching Question Time or spend a day reading *Hansard*. It will cure you of any high ideals you might have felt towards the democratic process.

...In the old days, when politicians were more familiar with words such as dignity and responsibility, the punishment for misleading parliament—

this is the point I wanted to get to—

was to either resign or be sacked. These days you would have to be caught out in an outrageous lie, the Opposition would need to have photographic and audio evidence that you knew you were sprouting porkies, and there would need to be a dozen eyewitnesses before anyone would even think of doing the right thing.

It goes on and on, and I recommend it as something that people can perhaps look at for a bit of light reading. I take that point, because in the agriculture portfolio it had been brought to my attention in many, many meetings about the difficulty that dairy farmers were having with allocated water; the state government will not allocate water or stock as an asset to go towards the viability of a dairy farmer's farm. That was brought to me three or four times. I know DairySA had convened meetings and conveyed that to the government.

Yet, when I asked that question in estimates, the answer came back—and it is on *Hansard*—that no such communication had occurred. Of course, when I pushed the minister on this, the answer then came back, 'You were not being specific enough,' and, 'Yes, of course, we knew that that was an issue, but stock and water were not precluders to anybody not receiving a grant,' if that makes sense. It makes a mockery of the entire estimates process. If you are looking for another way of examining departmental budget lines, the Budget and Finance Committee is a good way because a lot of the information that comes out of that is really detailing what people might be looking for and how that department is actually being run.

With those words, I will conclude my remarks on the estimates process and just finish up by saying that I think we need to find a much better way in the future.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:54): I rise to speak to the estimates process here in 2017. Some people may be shocked, but I actually found it the best of a bad innings of estimates that I have had. I am not sure why I say that, but perhaps I am just getting used to the process. Hopefully, it is the last one.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I must be drinking the Kool-Aid.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So you think it's Kool-Aid do you?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes. It is very hard to get direct answers to very direct questions and I guess what upsets me, and this has been mentioned by other members in this place, is when good old Dorothy the Dinosaur gets wheeled out to ask questions. We do not see the courage that has been the case with some ministers in the past, and I reflect on the former member for Port Adelaide, who would sit down for Treasury estimates, reading the paper and looking very calm, and he would just say, 'Well, give it to me.' I do not give much to the former member for Port Adelaide, but I will give him that. He had a lot more courage than other ministers in this place.

It is the time that opposition members and Independents can ask those questions, if they are in the lower house. I certainly do not believe it is a time for government questions to be asked; we have a limited time and we have time lines we need to deal with. However, I guess it is what it is and you try to get what you can out of it.

Because I was interested, the other day I was sitting in on the estimates to do with corrections, police and the emergency services. As far as the corrections sector is concerned,

obviously I have the medium-security Mobilong Prison in my electorate. It was originally built decades ago to house 160 prisoners, and it has just been expanded with the Eyre Wing—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: It might be better than the original rooms, but it now has beds and cells for 460 inmates, so it is certainly squeezing out of the sides. I think the only place it now has left to build any accommodation is the oval, and I do not think anyone would like to see that, as far as not filling it up like a city block is concerned. So there is an issue with Corrections. There is an issue of hundreds of millions of dollars having to be spent in my electorate, at Mount Gambier, at Port Augusta, at Port Lincoln, and Cadell in the Riverland as well, in regard to these expansions.

I reflect on what happened in 2006 when it was announced on budget day—and budget day that year was my first year in; it was in September, delayed because of the election—on the front page of the paper that, 'We're going to build a new prison at Mobilong.' Whether or not you contacted the local member—which would have been helpful—it would have been helpful if you had let the mayor and the people of Murray Bridge and surrounding areas know. That did not happen.

Essentially, what happened in the end was it did not happen. The land is still there, and if it ever does happen in the future there will need to be long discussions about what other benefits can be brought to Murray Bridge so that they will accept a high security prison—because this was going to be the Yatala replacement and the women's prison replacement—being built in the vicinity. You can only do that by taking the community with you. You cannot do it by just imposing it on a community, notwithstanding the fact that there are opportunities for an electorate with prisons, as far as employment goes. However, there are many negative views in communities about having prisons in their community.

In regard to emergency services, I am a member of the CFS and I did ask some questions around the suitability of some of our fire truck equipment. I have been following up on that, after I asked my questions about some of our fire trucks where the exhaust systems get too hot and they are actually firelighters. The minister had not had that raised with him, but I will be sending correspondence to Mr Malinauskas in the other place when I have all the information together on that query about whether there is an issue with some of the trucks in regard to lighting fires. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:01.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SENTENCING BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (POSSESSION OF FIREARMS AND PROHIBITED WEAPONS) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

*Ministerial Statement***MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN**

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 24 July, the *Four Corners* program aired the alarming results of an investigation concerning the failure of New South Wales to comply with the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. The allegation that New South Wales had permitted the covert siphoning off of more than a billion litres of water earmarked for the environment to cotton farmers is incendiary, but only confirms our long-held suspicions that New South Wales is not committed to the plan.

Many believe these reports to be just the tip of the iceberg. Indeed, just today, we see new allegations that a New South Wales cotton farmer, who is also a major donor to the Nationals, has been using his clout to secure more water for his farm, in breach of existing regulations—again, at the expense of the health of the river. This matter is of the utmost seriousness. The response from the New South Wales government was to announce an internal inquiry. This is grossly inadequate.

An internal inquiry is far too narrow to determine whether there is material evidence of water being taken without legal authority. That internal inquiry will only look at allegations of water theft occurring over a four-day period in 2015, when in fact there are claims of systemic and long-term gaming of water in New South Wales. We believe that a judicial inquiry is the proper course in response to these allegations. The theft of more than a billion litres of water from the Murray-Darling river system, and allegations of Public Service corruption that potentially go all the way to the highest levels of the Department of Primary Industries, requires the highest level of scrutiny.

Those allegations deserve to be taken more seriously by the country's Deputy Prime Minister, a Deputy Prime Minister who was overheard recently telling farmers in a pub that he had no commitment to a healthy river beyond the water needed for his cotton and rice-growing supporters upstream. Barnaby Joyce has shown a total disregard for these serious allegations but, worse than that, he is personally playing a role in undermining the plan and the body set up to enforce that plan, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. Mr Joyce's appointment of former National and New South Wales Irrigators' Council representative, Ms Perin Davey, is a clearly calculated move to undermine the independence and expert nature of the authority. Ms Davey has already been reported as referring to the implementation of the basin plan as 'impossible'.

South Australia will continue to fight for the Murray. Shortly, I will give notice that tomorrow I will move a motion calling on the Prime Minister to commission a fully independent judicial inquiry into the allegations raised on *Four Corners*. It was encouraging to see that a broad cross-section of South Australian senators will unite when parliament resumes next week to apply further pressure on the Prime Minister to commission that inquiry. We call upon South Australian Liberals to put their state before their party and to pressure the Prime Minister to do the right thing, to do the fair thing and to ensure that South Australians get the water we have fought so hard to secure.

*Parliamentary Procedure***SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): I give notice that on Thursday 3 August 2017 I will move:

That this house calls on Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull to stand up to protect the integrity of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and honour his commitment to delivering the plan on time and in full by:

- (a) commissioning a fully independent judicial inquiry into the allegation raised on *Four Corners* to ensure the integrity of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan;
- (b) putting the river and all those who rely on it ahead of the profits of a minority of large landholders in New South Wales; and
- (c) complying with the legislative requirement to appoint independent experts to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority.

Mr GARDNER: I wish to move that standing orders be so far suspended as to allow the Premier's motion to take its place on the *Notice Paper* for tomorrow, despite the fact that he did not give notice when you called for notices of motion by private members.

The SPEAKER: Would it not just be government business that goes on the green? I do understand the opposition's familiarity with private members' time, but it is not private members' time.

Mr GARDNER: Usually you give us notice of things going on government business. We assumed that that was the case.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Suppression Orders—Report for Period 30 June 2017
Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005—Report 2016-17
Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Cross-border Justice—Miscellaneous
 Freedom of Information—Exempt Agency No. 3
 Independent Commissioner Against Corruption—Miscellaneous No. 2
 Legal Practitioners—Register of Disciplinary Action

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Services (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Casino—Approvals
 Gaming Machines—Approvals
 Lottery and Gaming—Trade Promotion Lotteries

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Local Government—Building Upgrade Agreements
Local Council By-Laws—
 District Council of Renmark Paringa—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Local Government Land
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Moveable Signs
 No. 5—Dogs
 No. 6—Cats
 Naracoorte Lucindale Council—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Local Government Land
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Moveable Signs
 No. 5—Dogs

By the Minister for Higher Education and Skills (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Flinders University—Report 2016
University of South Australia—Report 2016

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—Miscellaneous No. 2

*Ministerial Statement***ARRIUM**

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:09): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would like to inform the house that on 13 July the committee of creditors for Arrium approved the sale of the steel and mining group to the London-based GFG Alliance. On 6 July, federal Treasurer, Scott Morrison, signed off on the foreign investment approval for the sale. Deed administrator KordaMentha has set 31 August as the target date for the formal completion of the sale, which requires the approval of the transition of workers compensation coverage to the GFG Alliance and finalising the accounting restructure of Arrium.

KordaMentha is now working to complete a report to all creditors that will be provided after the completion of the sale. Mr Speaker, you would be aware that, following the approval of the sale, Mr Sanjeev Gupta visited Whyalla and spoke to workers, management and, through a televised news conference, the South Australian community about his vision for Whyalla. After 16 months in administration, Mr Gupta's belief in the future of Whyalla and the capacity of South Australia to expand its role as a world-class steelmaker is extremely welcome.

His enthusiasm for Whyalla and his acknowledged experience in successfully turning around steelmakers in the United Kingdom, through his company, Liberty House, provides me and the government with confidence Arrium will emerge stronger from this very difficult period. To quote a news release issued by GFG Alliance, Mr Gupta has pledged to work with management, staff and unions to forge a sustainable future for the whole Arrium business in Australia. In the statement, Mr Gupta said, and I quote:

The unanimous decision of the creditors' committee puts an end to a period of prolonged uncertainty for the Arrium workforce.

It allows them to look more confidently to the future as they become a part of our large and multi-skilled alliance of international businesses.

The South Australian government, through the Steel Taskforce, is committed to working with GFG Alliance to better understand the investment proposals envisaged in transforming the Whyalla business. We look forward to further updating the house, as we continue to work with the alliance.

I again thank the member for Giles, for his steadfast support for his local community, and the Mayor of Whyalla, the Hon. Lyn Breuer, for her support for the government's efforts to secure the future of this pillar industry for the state and the nation. I give personal thanks to the commonwealth government, especially its industry minister, who did an exceptional job of working in a bipartisan way with the South Australian government. Mr Sinodinos is a class act. I also want to thank Mr Rowan Ramsey for the exceptional work he did in supporting the workers at Arrium in conjunction with the member for Giles.

OUR ENERGY PLAN

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:13): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I wish to update house on the state government's energy plan, which has seen a number of important milestones achieved over the past few weeks. The state government's comprehensive energy plan was announced on 14 March and implementation is now well and truly underway, aimed at delivering a cleaner, more reliable and cheaper energy network for South Australians.

On 7 July, we announced that Tesla, in conjunction with Neoen, would build the world's largest lithium ion battery here in South Australia. Preparatory works at the battery construction site

near Jamestown in the state's Mid North have begun, and a significant number of local jobs will be generated during this phase. The 100-megawatt battery will provide stability and security services for the electricity network and will also be available to provide emergency backup power for short periods if a shortfall is predicted.

The deal, which puts our state at the forefront of global energy storage technology, could also trigger other investments by Neoen and Tesla into South Australia's wider economy, with details to be announced in the future.

With respect to the temporary generation for this summer, I am pleased to inform the house that, instead of procuring temporary generators, the government has agreed to purchase nine new General Electric TM 2500 aeroderivative turbines, providing up to 276 megawatts of generation to the grid when required. This long-term backup energy power plant will be temporarily installed ahead of summer at Holden's Elizabeth site and at the desalination plant in the south.

Our new power station will initially be operating on diesel at the temporary locations and will emit 25 per cent less carbon dioxide per megawatt hour than the former Northern power station. Once in its permanent position, it will be connected to gas and be more efficient than the Torrens Island power station. The total cost for this consolidated option will be met within the allocated budget and within the overall \$550 million energy plan budget.

We are also in the advanced stages of leveraging our purchasing power through our own electricity supply contracts to encourage a new generator into the market and increase competition. We will have another announcement on that very soon.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: That was going to be February.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Like your own energy policy. Our Energy Productivity Audit Grant Program, designed to help small to medium businesses in South Australia, has also had an encouraging uptake. As of 31 March 2017, we have received 557 applications, with almost 500 of those now approved. As of today, nearly 50 applications have been received for the Energy Productivity Implementation Grant Program so that businesses can start implementing their energy efficiency measures and cut their power bills.

Our efforts to get more gas out of the ground continue to gain momentum. I can reveal today that we have had 15 applications from 11 different companies for round 2 of our \$24 million PACE grant scheme. The grants will generate up to \$174 million in new investment by oil and gas companies in local production projects. Determinations will be made in October of this year. I know that members are looking forward to those dates and those announcements, and I will continue to update the house and the parliament on the state government's plan to create a cleaner, more reliable and more affordable energy network as it progresses.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:18): I bring up the 570th report of the committee, entitled Barossa Infrastructure Limited Capacity Increase Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms DIGANCE: I bring up the 571st report of the committee, entitled Warooka and Point Turton Water Supply Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:19): I bring up the 49th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***STATE BUDGET**

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer still believe that the recent state budget was a jobs budget and good for business given the release of today's State Monitor report, which shows that business and consumer confidence have never been lower?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:20): It's interesting that when the NAB survey came out after the budget there was no comment from the opposition.

Mr Gardner: That was from before the budget.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And it was done after the budget.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, again, again—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader, I call him to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The NAB survey was done after the budget—oops, oops!

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The monthly survey—

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: NAB's own monthly survey released on 11 July revealed that business confidence in South Australia—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Whenever there is positive news, the opposition get very upset. The NAB's own monthly survey revealed that business confidence in South Australia improved following the announcement of the SA major bank levy. The survey was conducted—conducted from when?—26 to 30 June. Oops, oops! Again, another one of those moments for the Leader of the Opposition, one minute telling everyone to vote Labor and then says the NAB survey was done before the budget, then gets it wrong. And here he is again, here he is again—foot-in-mouth disease! But again—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, it gets better. It gets better—and shouting is not a substitute for policy. This is despite coming from the Liberal Party that the major banks subject to the levy will hurt business investment. There is a very simple proposition here: if the banks could pass on this levy to South Australians, why would they be so upset? Why would they be so angry? They are upset because they can't pass it on. They are upset because they have to take it out of the retained offers. That's why.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Members opposite, in that moment when they have realised, 'We've chosen the wrong horse again—chosen the wrong horse again,' can't even rationalise in their own minds the reason that banks are so upset is that they can't pass it on. The anger and the frustration and the screaming from the Leader of the Opposition is because there is no alternative to talk about.

Mr Marshall: More taxes!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mr Speaker—

Mr Marshall: More taxes!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This government has cut more taxes than the opposition have ever dreamed about cutting. We have cut payroll tax, we have cut stamp duty, we have increased the tax threshold. The opposition have no tax policy. They say lower taxes—where is the policy?

Quite frankly, when they talk about the BankSA survey, what I think has been a very politicised survey, which is unfortunate for Mr Nick Reade and BankSA because in the end he answers to his employers in Sydney who run Westpac—and I note today that there was a question asked at a press conference about who was paying for Business SA's ads in the paper and we find out that it's the banks—it's the banks. It's the banks who are paying for the ads that Business SA have.

But, as I have said before, after branch closure, after branch closure, after sacking, after sacking, finally the banks have opened up a new branch. Finally they've got a new shopfront—it's the Liberal Party and they are here to help the banks.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Point of order: I don't know about other members on this side, but I am having trouble hearing the Treasurer and I am actually interested in what the Treasurer was having to say, but I had trouble hearing it because of all the bellowing over there. Through you, Mr Speaker, I for one would like to hear what the Treasurer has to say.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the leader be seated.

Mr Marshall: That was an impromptu speech, sir, and a bogus point of order.

The SPEAKER: No. No, I was having trouble hearing, too. No, it wasn't a bogus point of order.

Mr Marshall: What was the point of order?

The SPEAKER: The point of order is that standing orders were being breached by continual interjections. Standing order 142 reads that when a member is speaking no-one 'may make a noise or disturbance or converse aloud'. I think the Deputy Premier was drawing attention to all the conversing aloud that was occurring.

I call to order the members for Mitchell, Newland, Chaffey, Hartley and the deputy leader. I warn for the first time the leader and the member for Morialta. I warn for the second and the last time the member for Morialta. Leader.

STATE MAJOR BANK LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Treasurer. Is the Treasurer concerned that the BankSA State Monitor report survey found that 71 per cent of businesses stated that they had not created any new jobs in the previous three months and that the same number of businesses have no plans to create any new jobs in the coming three months?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:25): The ABS stats show something very different. If you look at our job creation in the last two financial years, in the last financial year our job growth rate nearly tripled. In fact, our gross state product grew faster than the nation's.

It's interesting if you look at the results of the NAB survey taken directly after the budget—which the opposition claims weren't, but they were taken directly after the budget—and then you look at the BankSA survey, you get these two very divergent results. But of course the unfortunate politicising of the BankSA survey by Mr Nick Reade is disappointing. They are not borne out by the facts.

The facts are that last financial year our economy grew stronger than the nation's economy and that our employment growth rate was three times faster than it was in the previous financial year. State final demand is up, and state final demand is a measure of expenditure in the economy, and the largest contributor to that growth was private business investment. All the facts aren't borne out by the hysteria. Again, I point out to the house that the reason the banks are upset about this levy is because they can't pass it on. If they could pass it on, why would they be upset?

There was a very good article today in the *Advertiser* pointing out the number of times banks have increased mortgage rates without a single signal from the RBA—not once. But apparently, according to the opposition, that is good for the economy. When the banks make more profits, that's good for the economy. It's okay for people who are paying those higher mortgage rates, despite the RBA not increasing rates. But again, when the RBA doesn't increase rates and the banks do increase rates, they have a champion—and the champion is the member for Dunstan. He is the person who says, 'We need the banks to make more and more super profits.'

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am, sir. I am talking about banks and bank profitability and the major bank levy.

The SPEAKER: No, you are talking about, perhaps a little bit too much, the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will continue to maintain his irrelevance. What we are seeing from the banks is a campaign that is fundamentally dishonest. It is not being honest with the people of South Australia and, indeed, we have a bank that calls itself BankSA, whose major role now is to attack the South Australian economy, to attack South Australian businesses, and I find that very disappointing.

STATE MAJOR BANK LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Treasurer. With BankSA's State Monitor reporting the lowest ever level of consumer spending confidence in the 20-year history of the survey, will the Treasurer concede that after 16 years of Labor our economic outlook has never, ever looked more desperate?

The SPEAKER: Well, the Treasurer has a very broad scope with a question like that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:28): On 26 July this year, Deloitte released a report saying that the value of infrastructure projects in South Australia rose by 6.4 per cent in the June quarter—the largest increase of all the states and territories. The Deloitte Access Economic investment monitor shows the value of projects in South Australia rose by \$2.8 billion, to \$45.7 billion. The result represents a 7.2 per cent increase for South Australia compared to the year earlier. The Commonwealth Bank survey released on 24 July—

Mr Gardner: Do you know how improvement works?

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is very close to departing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Commonwealth Bank State of the States report says this: South Australia topped the nation of business investment, according to CommSec's State of the States report—topped the nation. The ANZ Property Council Survey of industry professionals found confidence levels in South Australia to be at a record high. Then you have the NAB survey, but the opposition ask no questions about the Commonwealth Bank survey, about the NAB survey, about Deloitte or ANZ. Why is that? Instead, they ask their narratives on the basis of what suits them: talk down our economy, talk down the state, rather than being a champion for South Australia.

It was no accident that at a press conference the Premier held every other major political player in the state was there but the opposition—everyone but the opposition. Why? Because they can't lead.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All they have is shouting, a rabble and disorder.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Look at them, Mr Speaker. They can't even have a coordinated approach. They just all yell at once. It just shows you what a rabble they really are.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is called to order, and I welcome her back to the warning list. I am horrified—horrified—to have to call to order the member for Bright; the disorder was as bad as that. I warn the deputy leader, the member for Mitchell, the member for Newland and the member for Chaffey. I warn for the second and final time the members for Mitchell, Newland, and the leader and the deputy leader. The member for Morialta ignored my pleas to him to cease, so I ask him under the sessional order to leave the chamber for the next hour.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:32): My question is for the Minister for Energy. What is the duration of the lease period in the contract being entered into with APR Energy for the nine diesel generators?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:32): The lease period, I understand, has a period of over two summers. Of course, we can exercise our options to purchase that sooner. We are obviously looking at what the best options are for the state and we will be in discussions with AEMO. Indeed, I am meeting the AEMO Board later on tonight to have a discussion about how best to integrate the battery and the long-term generation so that we have our permanent supply available and not two sets of generators, that were going to be temporary diesel generators, as the opposition were talking about.

They even contemplated some sort of ship or barge coming into the port of Adelaide, and how wrong they all were. I sense they are a little bit disappointed that we've got a permanent solution at a temporary site rather than a temporary solution. But, as those negotiations go ahead, we will reveal more to the parliament. Importantly, on the advice of AEMO, because of our investments and because of Our Energy Plan, our reliability ratings for this summer are very, very good indeed.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Stuart.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:33): Who is actually purchasing the generators and leasing them to the government? Is it APR Energy or a third party?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:33): We are leasing them with a right to purchase. We have that right, and the contracts obviously have a level of confidentiality about them. The reason we have that confidentiality in place—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The agreement is that, obviously, General Electric and APR enter into other negotiations—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader and the deputy leader are both on two warnings. The Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Obviously, APR and General Electric are in the market to sell other gas-fired generators like these ones that are able to operate on diesel as well. I point out that our largest gas-fired generator in the state is also able to operate on dual fuel. It can operate on bunker fuel as well and often does if there is ever a shortage of gas.

It was a decision of former governments that there would be redundancy in place. It is good to have gas-fired generators, especially aeroderivative generators that can operate on two forms of

fuel rather than being called 'big, fat, dirty diesel generators', which is what the opposition just called them. These are highly efficient generators.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As a point of order, Mr Speaker, I ask you to bring the Treasurer back to the substance of the question, which is: from whom is the government leasing the generators?

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I answered that, sir: it was APR. Again, I think this debate would be better informed if we had two opposing policies we could discuss and debate, but unfortunately the Liberal Party are keeping their policies secret. We all know that they have an energy policy, which is to abolish renewable energy. We know that, but they are not telling us, and the question is why. Why aren't they telling us what their energy plan is? Why are they keeping it secret?

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: The minister has entered into debate.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the member for Unley's point of order. Has the Treasurer finished?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:35): A supplementary: what is the cost of installing and leasing the generators and will APR own them through the entire leasing period?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:36): We won't be releasing the details of the cost of the lease. Obviously, there are commercial considerations in place because the people we have leased these from are entering into other commercial contracts with other operators around the world, but I can inform the people of South Australia that it's within our budget. It's within our budget framework, and we are keeping within our budget. They will be delivered on time and on budget.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary, member for Stuart.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:36): Does the contract extend to the operation of the generators as well as the acquisition and installation of the generators?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:36): APR will be operating the generators for the lease period. We have yet to determine whether they will be the successful applicants to run them on a permanent, long-term basis. I do note that the government is committed to having a permanent solution in place. I note that the opposition refuse to confirm that they won't privatise these assets if they get into office. They can't even help themselves in opposition by saying they won't sell electricity assets. Think of the urges they must have to sell every asset they have.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the leader or the deputy leader interject again, they will depart the chamber under the sessional orders. They have had a full set of warnings and subsequent warnings. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We haven't decided on who will be operating the generators on a permanent basis but, on a permanent basis, we would like to have an operator in full-time. The government unfortunately does not have the internal skills to operate a gas-fired power station, and the reason we don't is that it was privatised by members opposite. So we want to have a professional operator run these generators—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —remembering that these generators are not designed to compete in the market: they are designed to offer security services. While members opposite laugh, South Australians were load-shed unnecessarily in their privatised market. If we had had these generators in place then, that wouldn't have occurred, yet members still laugh.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond, I call him to order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: A supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: Just make it another question. You have had three supps.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:38): Given that the minister said that the government would not be operating the generators because the government does not have those skills, why has the minister told this parliament, and the media and the public, numerous times that the government would be the operator of the gas-fired generator?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:38): I think that's probably the most embarrassing question the shadow minister has asked me. The idea that government ministers will be at the power plant running the operation—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Of course, we are going to contract with professionals to run this.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, exactly. On that logic, we don't build roads. On that logic, we don't build hospitals. On that logic, we don't build schools. What a ridiculous assertion, which is the high farce we have now from the opposition. They are keeping their alternative energy policy secret, then attempt to mock ours. Why don't we have debate? Let's debate them.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: I ask you to bring the Treasurer back to—

The SPEAKER: Is the Treasurer finished?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Stuart.

SA POWER NETWORKS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:39): Again, to the Minister for Energy: as South Australian Power Networks is procuring this generation on behalf of the government, how much is the government paying SAPN for this service or any other service connected to these generators?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:39): We pay for the same services for connection as any other operator in the market would. We do not own SA Power Networks; we do not own the connection points for the private company. I do not think SA Power Networks have charged us a fee for the procurement—I think they have recovered their costs—but they will be charging us, obviously, for the installation of the equipment to connection through their distribution network. Whatever those costs are is the market rate.

GENERAL MOTORS HOLDEN

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:40): Again, for the Minister for Energy: what is the cost and duration of the arrangement that the government will have with General Motors Holden to operate diesel generators at the company's Elizabeth property?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:40): I do not have the lease arrangements on the contractual arrangements here with me. I will have to check with General Motors Holden about whether they want that made public. Ultimately, General Motors Holden are in

a process now for the sale of that plant. They may wish to make this public; they may wish to not make it public, depending on the level of contractual negotiations that they have in place right now. So I will check with them and get back to the house.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:40): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house about any recent data on the performance of the state economy?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:41): I thank the member for his question, and his keen interest, which is of great importance to South Australians. There are many indicators of the health of the economy, ranging from the ABS Annual Estimates of Gross State Product through to many other ABS reports, including other industry surveys and expectations, attitudes and results. There are also surveys by interest groups and, of course, anecdotal evidence. The more authoritative estimates and surveys show that the South Australian economy is performing well, despite the considerable headwinds this state faces with the destruction of our automotive manufacturing sector.

The ABS shows the economy is growing: jobs are being created, state final demand is increasing, exports are recovering, mineral and petroleum exploration is improving. South Australia has avoided the housing rollercoaster which is pricing young people out of the suburbs they know and love. Our market has much more stable growth in prices and, according to the Housing Industry Association Affordability Report for the June quarter of 2017, Adelaide is the most affordable mainland capital city with the average monthly loan repayments 55 per cent lower than Sydney and 40 per cent lower than Melbourne. The most recent Adelaide Bank/Real Estate Institute of Australia Housing Affordability Report found that the proportion of income required by homebuyers and renters is lower than the national average.

The government has delivered to the business sector the biggest reduction in taxes and costs in the state's history, including a \$220 million return per year in ReturnToWorkSA premiums. We have cut payroll tax, we have created the Job Accelerator Grant to encourage recruitment, and we have offered stamp duty concessions for off-the-plan apartments. Accordingly, positive results are being highlighted in economic surveys. Even today's BankSA survey showed an increase in consumer confidence, despite an unprecedented advertising campaign by the banking association talking down South Australia.

The Deloitte Access Economics Investment Monitor showed the value of investment projects in SA grew by 6.4 per cent in the June quarter, posting the highest growth of all states and territories. CommSec's State of the States report ranked South Australia top for business investment. The NAB Quarterly Business Survey, done after the budget, found business conditions improved in SA over the June 2017 quarter, with overall conditions ranked only behind New South Wales.

The NAB Quarterly SME survey recorded a strong improvement in the state's business conditions. Even the Sensis Business Index, on the outlook for SMEs, found expectations positive for all indicators. In contrast, our critics rely on unsubstantiated anecdote and push polling to try to paint a portrait of an investment drought in South Australia when the reality is very different. In recent weeks a British billionaire invested in South Australia through the GFG Alliance purchase of Arrium. Mr Gupta is investing in the future of Whyalla, its steelworks and its mining operations and plans to inject millions of dollars into the state. BHP invested a quarter of a billion dollars to open up the Southern Mine Area at Olympic Dam and committed to spend a further \$350 million to upgrade its smelter. In the June quarter, OZ Minerals—

The SPEAKER: Alas, the Treasurer's time has expired.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, it hasn't, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm sorry; we were on different clocks. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In the June quarter, OZ Minerals invested \$22.4 million in its Carrapateena project and \$2.6 million on studies for its concentrated plant as it prepares for its

major capital decision on Carrapateena this quarter. Elon Musk, one of the great disruptors and great billionaires of the United States, has partnered with a French company, Neoen, to invest in South Australia. Indeed, members of this house should not be fooled by commentators who misunderstand the purpose of the battery project. It is a good investment for South Australia. There are additional investments—alas, time has expired because of the Speaker's intervention.

The SPEAKER: I will not hear the member for Unley reflecting on the accuracy of that outstanding timepiece, the Crvena Zvezda stopwatch.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:45): My question is again to the Minister for Energy. Will the minister commit to providing at least weekly public updates on the operation of the diesel generators, including electricity delivered into the grid, wholesale prices charged for that electricity, operating cost of the generators and environmental emissions caused by the generators?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:45): Importantly, we are compelled to because AEMO will be dispatching the operations of the generator. We can't dispatch in secret, but you would think members opposite would know that. We have to be there in the market and we have to be available in lieu of load shedding. Whenever we dispatch, under whatever conditions we dispatch, it will be public, and I would have thought that the shadow minister would know that. I thought he would know that. I have to say that it is terribly embarrassing that he does not know that and is forced to ask a question.

Secondly, when it comes to emissions, these generators that are operating on diesel or gas meet all EPA requirements. Of course, it depends again on the conditions under which they will be dispatched. If the market is suspended, publication will be made by the AEMO about the nature of our dispatch, for how long. We will absolutely make all those public because they will be visible on the board because all dispatches are done publicly. When clearances are made, when generators bid into the market, they will know. But again, you would think that the shadow minister would know that given that we are five minutes to the next election and he aims to be energy minister.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:47): Supplementary, sir: just for clarification, is the minister confirming that all four of the requests I made will be made public?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:47): My answer speaks for itself.

RENEWABLE ENERGY PLAN

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister update the house on the impact of the renewable energy plan and the Neoen-Tesla lithium battery announcements on interest in investment in South Australia?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:47): I thank the member for Reynell for the question. The South Australian government's energy plan and the recent announcement regarding the Tesla battery storage has sparked—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —I thought you would like that—significant overseas interest in investment opportunities in South Australia. Investment Attraction SA has engaged with a significant number of major international renewable energy producers about investment opportunities in SA since the release of the renewable energy plan. IASA has been actively working with Neoen Australia for the past several years in relation to its Hornsdale wind farm, stages 1 to 3. My agency assisted the company with the development applications and construction environmental management plans. The SA government supported Neoen Australia and its proposals to secure the offtake agreements—

Mr Marshall: What's the name of the company?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Is it something sensible I hear from opposite?

Mr Marshall: What's the name of the company? We couldn't hear.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Don't you know the name of the company? Neoen.

Mr Marshall: Who?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Neoen. Have you got it? Neoen. I think that qualifies as the most intelligent question I have heard from you in the last few weeks, having sat with you through estimates. That was about the best—full marks. The Hornsdale wind farm, once fully completed in December 2017, represents a capital investment of \$830 million, 150 construction jobs and approximately 10 ongoing jobs during its operation. Other investment discussions include renewable energy production with technology including wind, solar PV farms, solar thermal and hydrogen and battery storage.

IASA has advised that the renewed interest in investment in South Australia is a direct result of South Australia's exposure to the world following the release of Our Energy Plan followed by the expression of interest processes for the 100-megawatt battery storage and the announcement of the battery storage at Hornsdale wind farm. As the Treasurer explained, this follows reports by both CommSec and Deloitte confirming that business investment in South Australia is at the top of all the states.

IASA is continuing to work with companies such as DP Energy in relation to investment opportunities for its Port Augusta Renewable Energy Park project 1 and its proposed Port Augusta project 2, which includes solar PV and energy storage. IASA's minerals and energy division has received substantial amounts of positive feedback due to the state battery expression of interest process. IASA is working with these global energy companies.

These groups were primarily focused on taking part in the expression of interest and have now shifted their attention to the long-term investment potential of taking part in separate battery storage agreements through bilateral agreements and additional vertical integration strategies. IASA has proactively identified over 30 global corporations in the battery/renewable energy sector that would be ideal participants in the state's growing energy plan. It has commenced with the design of a renewable energy investment road map.

The impact of the lithium battery project and the \$200 million Future Jobs Fund have created a significant level of investment interest in South Australia. We are open for business. People want to come here and invest not just in the energy sector. We have opened up to 80 lines of inquiry in the food and agri sector, financial and business services and technology and creative industry sectors.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:51): My question is again for the Minister for Energy. As the diesel generators the government will install are the same as those used in Tasmania last year, where emissions exceeded limits specified by the National Environment Protection measure for air quality, what operating conditions will be imposed by the South Australian EPA?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:51): First of all, I do not think that they are the same generation company, but I am interested to check the veracity of the claims made by the opposition that TM2500 General Electric aeroderivative generators were used by the Tasmanian government, which is the claim made in the parliament now. I will check and get back to the house, but my advice is that they meet all EPA regulations. I am interested to know that the opposition is now claiming that these generators are the ones used in Tasmania. Well, I will check and get back to the house.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:52): Supplementary: what noise control conditions will be imposed, given the generators will be installed near residential areas and there were complaints by residents in Tasmania about noise?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:52): The EPA will obviously monitor all those things. They are in industrial zones, not in residential zones. The General Motors Holden site has had a long period of heavy operations, as has the desal plant. I understand that the noise emissions will be almost indistinguishable from background noise. The hope is that (1) these generators will never operate and that (2) ultimately they are there temporarily. They are not there permanently.

There will be a permanent location found near a gas pipeline for a permanent solution. The attempts by the opposition to frighten people, saying that there will be generators permanently based here operating 24/7, is not true. The aim of the generators is to operate rarely. If they do operate, it will generally be at times of extreme heat when people will be inside their homes with their own air conditioners going and won't be bothered by these generators. I tell you what will bother people: if their power is not on and things are hot and they can't get air conditioning on because the opposition does not want us to intervene in the market. That would be worse.

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:54): Supplementary: why did the minister just tell the house that it is just 'a hope' that the diesel generators will be temporarily in these two locations?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:54): I have to say that this is now getting bizarre and creepy. We have announced publicly that we have found a permanent solution. We have found our permanent generators and they will be at a temporary site. We hope that the generators aren't needed. We hope that they don't have to run, but if we do need them, the state has backup.

Members opposite don't want us to have that backup. What will they say in December, January and February if these generators are called into action to avoid load shedding? Will they say then, during the campaign, that these were unnecessary, that we should load shed on these people rather than buy or lease these generators? Will that be the political tactic of the opposition, or are you just going to tell them to vote Labor again? What is the tactic here?

DIESEL SPILLS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:55): What conditions will be imposed to avoid a repeat of diesel spills which occurred in Tasmania?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:55): World's best practice by the contractor. We expect them to behave within Australian Standards and the requirements set by the EPA.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL TOURS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can you inform the house on what the response has been to the recent public tours conducted at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:55): I thank the member for Elder for the question. She certainly knows a first-class piece of health infrastructure when she sees it. There is strong excitement and pride in

the community as we approach the opening of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital on 5 September. This world-class hospital will provide care for all South Australians for years to come and will set a benchmark for hospitals of the future, and it is clear that South Australian people agree.

It is fantastic to see just how excited people are about moving into the world's best hospital right here in Adelaide. The community overwhelmingly responded to the offer to view the new RAH prior to its opening. Over 5,500 South Australians secured tickets to participate in the new RAH tour days, which took place over six days over the last fortnight. In fact, the first release of nearly 3,000 tickets in the last week booked out in under two hours.

In response to this overwhelming demand, another tour day was added, with 700 tickets available. These additional tickets were snapped up in under 10 minutes. A final public release of just over 1,200 tickets was booked out in a few hours. As the media noted, a ticket to the tour days became the hottest ticket in town—hotter than Ed Sheeran tickets, I am told. Tours were led by volunteer tour guides from across SA Health and included a look at the intensive care unit, inpatient bedrooms, outpatient consulting rooms and the emergency department. The tour days also included 20 assisted tours for people who are mobility impaired.

Many attendees completed an exit survey at the end of their tour and rated the facility an average of 4.73 out of five, which is an amazing result. Many were impressed with the size of the hospital, the amount of natural light and the quality technology and design of the building. Comments were overwhelmingly positive, with the key messages being: exciting for SA, well worth the wait, fabulous new facility, impressive design and go Adelaide! In fact, one survey respondent went so far as to say, and I quote one South Australian's message to the opposition: 'The opposition needs to back off with their negativity—maybe they should spend a night here!' Maybe they should listen.

Unlike those opposite, who have taken every opportunity to talk down this amazing hospital, the South Australian people have voted with their feet, almost breaking the internet by snapping up tour day tickets to take their first glimpse of this hospital. Poor old Stephen Wade, doesn't he sound increasingly desperate and lonely? I think he has some idea, when the Leader of the Opposition sends him out and says, 'Now, go and stand by that hospital and say everyone hates it,' poor old Stephen has to go there. He sounds a bit like the Iraqi information minister, sent out by Saddam Hussein as the tanks are rolling into Baghdad, saying, 'Nothing to see here. The Americans are being wiped out in their thousands.'

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: the minister is debating the substance of his own Dorothy Dixer.

The SPEAKER: Yes, that is one of the skills a minister needs. Member for Stuart.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier's department mislead parliament's Budget and Finance Committee on 24 July by giving evidence that sites for the diesel generators had not been finalised when a notice in yesterday's *Government Gazette* reveals that by 3 July, at the latest, the government had decided to install the generators at the Lonsdale and GMH Elizabeth sites?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:59): First and foremost, I think any accusation of misleading is probably disruptive without a substantive motion, but in answering—

The SPEAKER: Well, no, that's as against members of the house.

Mr Marshall: How long have you been here?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A lot longer than you.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright will be quiet and she is called to order. The Iraqi information minister that the health minister was looking for was Muhammad Saeed al-Sahhaf.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: At the time those comments were made to the estimates committee, the final contracts had not been signed.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: can I read the question again for the minister?

The SPEAKER: No, there seems to be no doubt what the question was.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I signed the final contracts, I think, the night before we announced, which is well after those comments were made, so there was no final decision made until, I am advised, the contracts were signed because the government could have decided on another option.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): Supplementary: given the minister's answer, is he suggesting that the Attorney-General provided information to the *Government Gazette* in advance of the contracts being signed?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:01): I am sure that the Attorney-General always acts in the interests of the people of South Australia but, in the end, the remarks that the opposition are attributing to the Premier were not made by the Premier: they were made by an agency. We didn't sign the final contract until the night before the announcement of the generators.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): Supplementary: on what date did the government decide to use Lonsdale and Elizabeth as the site for the installation of the diesel generators?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:02): When the government signed the final contracts, which would have been the night before we made the announcement, was the time when we decided—

Mr Marshall: What date?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The day before the announcement was the day that we decided to go ahead with these generators because that is when we signed the contracts. If we hadn't signed the contracts, we wouldn't have had the generators in place and we could have gone another path.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:02): Supplementary: is the minister telling the house that the contracts were signed on Sunday?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:02): Unfortunately, the person just making it up wasn't the government. We made an announcement on Tuesday and the contracts were signed the night before.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How is the state government's \$9.5 billion investment in infrastructure projects over the next four years providing opportunities for South Australian small business and workers?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:03): I thank the member for his question. This government is committed to assisting South Australian businesses so they can reap the benefits of the major infrastructure projects we are investing in. We are investing at record levels to build modern, safe and accessible infrastructure which supports thousands of South Australian jobs.

In the 2017-18 state budget, \$9.5 billion of major capital investments are committed to, focusing on modernising and improving our health, education and transport systems. This investment is expected to support 5,700 jobs on average per year over the next four years.

Tomorrow, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure will be holding an industry briefing that will provide an opportunity for local firms to understand the scope and the nature of the projects, the proposed procurement and tendering processes, as well as the potential construction contract packages. It will provide information on upcoming infrastructure projects across our state, including:

- our \$1.1 billion commitment to health infrastructure;
- our major road upgrades, including the Main South Road duplication and the realignment of Daws Road and Springbank Road;
- our \$464 million investment in education infrastructure, including two new birth to year 12 schools in our northern and southern suburbs;
- the \$175 million upgrade of Oaklands Crossing; and
- stage 1 of the \$152 million electrification of the Gawler rail line to Salisbury.

Of course, speaking of projects in the member for Light's electorate, the \$55 million Gawler East link road will also be the subject of discussion at tomorrow's briefing, as will the \$16.4 million spur line returning train services to the heart of Port Adelaide, the \$15 million for new park-and-ride facilities at Tea Tree Plaza and at Klemzig and our \$3.5 million investment, following the heavy lobbying of the member for Waite, into the Blackwood roundabout to service that community.

This government works hard to maximise opportunities for South Australian workers and businesses in major projects. For example, the Northern Connector project is exceeding our local participation requirements. Currently, more than 90 per cent of all on-site labour hours are being undertaken by South Australians, more than 50 per cent of all jobs are being filled by northern suburbs residents and more than 20 per cent of all labour hours are being undertaken by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, apprentices and trainees, former automotive manufacturing workers (including those from Holden) and people facing barriers to employment, including the long-term unemployed.

This project has also directly engaged several local Aboriginal-owned businesses within the supply chain, including South Australian company ART Services, as well as Intract Indigenous Contractors. Our government has made a deliberate commitment to provide opportunities to local businesses and contractors by setting in place policies that ensure South Australian businesses of all sizes share in the benefits of this investment.

Engaging with business and industry from the outset means we can maximise the benefit to local firms and to local workers. We want more and more businesses to be able to take advantage of that focus on local content and participation in major projects, and tomorrow's industry briefing is a great opportunity for companies from South Australia to learn more about how best to place themselves with the greatest chance of winning contracts and being successful tenderers.

We have made clear the importance for the South Australian economy of investing in infrastructure, and we remain the only major party in South Australia committed to infrastructure investment and committed to supporting South Australian jobs through these investments.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given that outpatient services in respiratory, oncology and cardiac were always going to continue at The QEH under Transforming Health, what services are now being put back to The QEH plan following the Premier's announcement on 18 June?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:07): We dealt with this extensively in estimates yesterday. It's obvious that the opposition have run out of questions and simply have to revisit their questions from yesterday. The answer hasn't changed since yesterday: we are going through these issues with the

clinicians. The government's announcement was that those services would remain. In particular, the cath lab would remain at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

I do like the opposition continually asking these questions to remind people of the fact that the government has had this change of policy. It is very useful of them to continue to raise this question—I am grateful to them—but we are working through these questions with our clinicians about what is the appropriate shape of those services. I have made it very clear there will be inpatient services, inpatient beds available for those three clinical areas, and there will be specialists for those three clinical areas at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:08): Supplementary: given that yesterday, minister, you said that decisions in relation to these three services were political decisions, why is it that you now need to go back to clinicians in order to understand what final services are going to be provided at The QEH?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:08): Because the political decision was to have those services remain, and, in particular, have the cath lab. With regard to the cath lab and cardiology services, the government has been very clear: there was differing clinical advice. We have clinicians who wanted us to consolidate those services in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and other clinicians—in principle, Professor John Horowitz, the head of the unit at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, who was adamant that that would set services back and be disadvantageous to patients. The government heard it and absolutely had to make a political call. That's why governments get elected.

That doesn't mean that, having shaped that policy, we completely disregard the views of clinicians and, in particular, how those services are to operate. We have made a policy decision about what are to be the services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The exact shape of those services and requirements in order to deliver a safe service is now a question for clinicians.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition loves to interject. Let's hear a health policy, something, anything, from the opposition. We would love to hear a health policy. All we hear in relation to a health policy is a commitment to boards. Boards, according to the opposition, are going to be the solution to the issues faced. Boards are all the opposition has to offer. If the Leader of the Opposition really thinks he can go into the next election and his entire health policy saying nothing but, 'We are going to put boards back,' he will have to do a lot better than that to convince the people of South Australia he has anything like an adequate health policy.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:10): Supplementary: where there is disagreement between your political decision and the clinical advice that you receive, which one of those arguments is going to win out?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:11): Well, that's just a silly question. The member for Schubert should be a lot better than that because, without doubt, he is one of the brighter members on the opposition's side. He is certainly a lot brighter than the poor old Leader of the Opposition here, a lot more politically astute—not that that's saying much. However, there is no doubt that the member for Schubert has a lot more going for him and will achieve a lot more in his political career than the poor old member for Dunstan. That's a silly question.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order: would you ask the minister to come back to the substance of the question?

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We obviously listen and take into very careful account the advice of clinicians. However, there come times when there are differing views among clinicians, particularly on the broader question of where services should be located. On this view, the government made a

call that we would keep those services at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I am more than happy for the opposition to continue to litigate this issue because we are happy for the people in the western suburbs to know that on this particular issue the government did have a change of heart.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:12): Given that the move for these services to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is going to take place in six weeks' time, at what point over the next six weeks are you actually going to make a final decision on what services are going to be transferred to the new RAH?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:12): This exact same question was asked yesterday in estimates. If the opposition has run out of questions, that's fine, we are happy to go to this side and I am sure there are government backbenchers who have lots of questions for the government, rather than rehashing questions. If there is any doubt, look in the *Hansard*; it's there.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:13): Given that the minister confirmed yesterday that the decisions on respiratory, oncology and cardiac were political decisions, which other Transforming Health decisions were political rather than clinical?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:13): There were a number of changes that we made from the original Transforming Health changes that were political changes. I will give you a few examples; one was changes to the Noarlunga Hospital emergency department. The original advice from clinicians was not to have an emergency department, but to have a free-standing, walk-in clinic. There was huge unrest in the community of the southern suburbs about that particular decision, and the government changed its mind. On that issue, the government changed its mind.

Mr Speaker, I will give you another one: the future of the level of the neonatal intensive care unit at Flinders Medical Centre. Under the original Transforming Health reforms, the proposal that came through clinical groups was for that to be reduced from a level 6 to a level 5 facility. Again, the government made a decision not to proceed with that plan. We have refined these plans over a period of time.

Of course, we will always listen and take very careful account of what our clinicians say about these macro changes, but we will also reserve the right where there is particular community concern about these issues. Where those community concerns threaten to undermine confidence in the community in a health facility, then we will change our mind and we will change our policy accordingly. We make no apologies for that whatsoever.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:15): Supplementary: in responding to significant community concern around the closure of the Repat site, will the minister now make a political decision, or was the decision to close services at the Repat site—was that clinical or was that political?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (15:15): They really have run out of questions, haven't they? Another five minutes to go and they have to try to pad out question time, and they have left it to the poor old member for Schubert: 'We have run out of questions. Can you pad us out and get us through for the last five minutes of question time?' I have never seen, in 20 years in this place, an opposition burning the clock in question time. It is the first time in 20 years—

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: I ask you to direct the minister to the substance of question; he is obviously debating.

The SPEAKER: Could the minister address the member for Schubert's question, rather than give us his correct views on everything.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will try to go for four minutes to help out the member for Schubert. I will see if I can help them.

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Minister for Agriculture is happy to help out, too. I am confident in the support for the changes at the Repat Hospital. The \$200 million investment that the ACH Group are going to make at the Repat site, the fact that they are bringing new services onto the Repat site, the fact that they have undertaken to protect and preserve the heritage buildings, the Peace Garden, the chapel and all those things are going to be enormously popular.

The opposition are going to look incredibly backward looking and silly in having opposed what is going to be a magnificent new development. Indeed, the new rehabilitation and palliative care building at the Flinders Medical Centre—a beautiful new palliative care in the southern suburbs is going from an old building with old facilities, without any privacy, into a beautiful new building on the rooftop, with a rooftop garden. It is going to be absolutely state of the art. I am looking very much forward to being there at its opening in coming months. It is going to be very, very exciting.

Mr Marshall: You promised you would never ever sell the Repat.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Absolutely. We will stand by that decision because we know how popular it is going to be—and doesn't the Leader of the Opposition just sound more and more shrill and silly the closer we get to this election?

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:18): My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General believe that current resources supplied to the DPP are limiting the DPP's effectiveness in assisting the community?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. The situation in relation to the DPP is one that again, if I am not mistaken, was canvassed to some degree in estimates but, at the risk of overcoming that and repeating things again, I will go into it to some extent.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's a shame the member for Schubert is not as interested in these important matters as the member for Hartley.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, 'repeat again' is a tautology, isn't it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, indeed. Mr Speaker, you make an excellent point. Now that things are settling a little, I would like to move on to answering the question by the member for Hartley, which is important. I have to say, the member for Hartley, unlike some of the other up and comers, is interested in these issues. He doesn't leave just because there is an apprehension that time may soon expire. He stays, he listens, he is interested, and I give him great credit for that. In that respect, he is like the member for Kavel, who always sits question time out because he wants to hear what is going on.

The DPP has recently gone through a fairly significant inquiry by an organisation called Partners in Performance, who my friends, who know more about these types of consulting things than me, tell me are the best people in the world at this kind of thing. They do excellent work. In fact, I think my ministerial colleague the Minister for Health at some stage had the opportunity to see their work and actually advised me that this was really top-shelf assistance we were getting. They have made a number of recommendations, which the director is busily working his way through, so there is a process of change going on inside the office. In addition to that—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You are pushing on an open door, mate.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Are you still with me?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Are you with me? Not only is the office going through a great deal of change internally but this parliament recently, and to its credit, passed the changes to the major indictable practices in our courts. Although that legislation was gelded in another place, it still has some work to do, and that will involve the need for change inside the office of the director. What I am holding is indicative of what happened to the legislation, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: That is the balance of the legislation, is it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This is what remains, Mr Speaker. In any event—

An honourable member: Time!

*Grievance Debate***PIPER, MR R.W.**

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:22): Bob Piper, a well-known and respected Adelaide lawyer, died on 28 June 2017, aged 87. Bob was born in Adelaide to Francis Ernest Piper and Joyce Gertrude Piper (nee Gillard) on 12 November 1929. Bob was the eldest of three children, his younger siblings being Geoffrey and Josephine. Bob was educated at Prince Alfred College, Adelaide, from 1938 to 1947, being the third generation of his family to be schooled at PAC. He then studied law at the University of Adelaide. In 1961, Bob met Margaret Ann Corfield Packer and they married in 1962.

Bob was a significant figure in the Adelaide legal and business communities for over 60 years. Bob's legal career started in 1950 when he commenced work as a solicitor in the firm Piper, Bakewell and Piper, the same firm in which his father, Justice F.E. Piper, and grandfather Justice A.W. Piper worked prior to their appointments as Supreme Court judges. After a short period as an articled clerk, he worked on criminal matters. Bob developed his legal career as a commercial and estates lawyer. In 1988, he was instrumental in the merger of Piper, Bakewell and Piper with another historic Adelaide law firm Aldermans, forming Piper Alderman, now a national law firm.

Bob's common-sense approach to resolving legal and commercial problems led to his appointment to many boards of Australian public companies. Bob was a founding director and shareholder of Austereo Limited, and he also held directorships with Advertiser Newspapers, FH Faulding, Adelaide Bank Limited, Standard Chartered Bank Australia Limited, Envestra Limited, Adelaide Stevedoring Co Limited, Alexander Stenhouse Limited, G & R Wills Limited, JN Taylor and Co Limited, AFMECO, Reid Bros Holdings Limited, TVW Enterprises Limited and other listed and unlisted public companies. Bob was also chairman of the boards of Quarry Industries Ltd, Austereo Limited, Australian Executor Trustees Australia Ltd, Co-Op Retirement Services Pty Ltd and the South Australian Gas Co. Ltd.

Bob's community work was also reflected in his appointments to the boards of national and local statutory and charitable organisations, including the National Gallery of Australia, the National Archives of Australia, the National Trust of South Australia (as president), the Australian Council of National Trusts (as chairman), State Records of South Australia (as chairman), and the Art Gallery of SA Foundation. He also served as an Adelaide city councillor for four years.

Bob was also President of the South Australian branch of the Institute of Company Directors and a trustee of the Gordon Darling Foundation. Bob was chairman of the Prince Alfred College Council from 1980 to 1992 and a founding member of the Prince Alfred College Foundation. From the late 1960s to the mid-1980s, Bob also served on the boards of the South Australian Lawn Tennis Association and then the South Australian Lawn Tennis Club, and the Memorial Drive Tennis Club as president from 1968 to 1987.

In 2000, Bob was made an Officer of the Order of Australia for his services to the law and to the community. Throughout his career, Bob never failed to acknowledge the support and love from his wife Margaret. Margaret was born in Melbourne and grew up in Sandringham, before her family moved to Adelaide in 1960, where she met Bob. Bob and Margaret had five children: Hugh, Bill, Ann (deceased), John and Tim.

Bob will also be remembered as a hardworking and loving family man whose pastimes included learning French, tennis, golf, following the Norwood Football Club and gardening. His

passion and loyalty to South Australia and his Christian work and family values were an example for many of his family, friends and colleagues. Bob is survived by his wife Margaret, his four sons and 14 grandchildren. Vale, Bob Piper.

NATIONAL CALISTHENICS CHAMPIONSHIPS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:27): I am pleased to report to the house today my recent attendance at the 29th Australian Calisthenics Federation National Competition held in Sydney between 5 and 8 July. As ACF national patron and a CASA life member, I can say it is one of my happiest associations. Calisthenics is a sport that offers so much, and it is such an honour to be associated with such a wide national network, united in making so much available to young people in their care. The opportunities and life skills calisthenics offers are immense and I am truly in awe of the professionalism I have witnessed over the past 20 years since my first involvement.

The sport is moving with the times in every way, and all involved are to be commended. This year, it was more national than ever, with teams from all states and territories, save Tasmania, travelling to compete over the four days at the NIDA auditorium in Sydney. NIDA became calisthenics central and, with the modern wonders of live streaming, the competition had the widest possible audience. The last nationals held in New South Wales were in 1996, so for many it was the very first time they had been involved in calisthenics in that state. Thanks must go to the ACF President, Liz Kratzel, Director of Competitions, Anita Roser, and all the committee of management and council delegates.

Competitions take a great deal of organisation, and this one was no exception. Whatever the venue, they all bring different challenges, but the calisthenics fraternity are no strangers to adaptation and things are always 'alright on the night', as they say. Calisthenics is amazing in that it has always paid attention to detail in the most impressive way and the logistical skills are outstanding. Mountains of costuming, props and competitors arrive and depart at appropriate times and no matter what is happening backstage, front-of-house moves along without much more than the odd technical hitch.

This year, the Australian Capital Territory sent 55 girls in three teams, New South Wales sent 26 in two teams, the Northern Territory sent 24 in two teams, Victoria sent 93 in four teams, Western Australia sent 82 in four teams, Queensland sent 28 in two teams, and South Australia sent 79 in four teams, one of our juniors being Olivia Gilmore Rankine, the granddaughter of the member for Wright.

It is indeed a happy moment for me to know that one of my colleagues has had the chance to witness the awe-inspiring spectacle that calisthenics provides and perhaps share a little of my passion for the sport. As parliament was sitting, it was not possible for me to arrive before Friday, meaning that I had missed the Gracefuls, Solos, Duos and Sub-juniors comps. From what I heard, when I arrived, it was a magnificent competition up to that point.

Sub-juniors had five states and territories competing, with Western Australia first, closely followed by South Australia with ACT third. Juniors saw seven states and territories with Victoria a clear winner, Western Australia second, ACT third, and South Australia close behind in fourth in a very even competition overall. Inters had four states competing with Victoria first just ahead of Western Australia, South Australia third and Queensland fourth. Seniors had five states and territories in competition with ACT first, WA second, Victoria third and South Australia fourth.

The standard was high and all these results would indicate that, on a national level, there is a very healthy degree of competitive pride on show, with each girl and each team doing their very best not only to win their place in the team but to go on and represent their state or territory to the best of their ability. It is this ideal of being a great team member that is one of the skills that calisthenics girls carry into their future lives.

I must mention, too, that the adjudicators have one of the toughest jobs at competitions. Even the slightest little thing could make the difference between a winning or losing performance, and with such amazing artistic coaching, costumes and props, the task becomes even harder as the level of competition improves each year. We must thank, too, the writers for all they do to make the competitions run smoothly. I would like to congratulate every state and territory on sending their

beautiful teams and I would like to thank also CASA in South Australia and Carolyn Fortune for organising my time while in Sydney.

Each state or territory body has a large voluntary group behind it doing all the tasks necessary to keep local clubs going and to ensure that calisthenics is the best it can be. Parents give their (mostly) daughters the opportunity to be involved in an activity that is healthy and promotes healthy lifestyles and outcomes. This is a real gift for life and the beginning of lifelong friendships, as we see more than ever now with masters calisthenics being an ever greater, growing part of the calisthenics calendar.

The backstage contribution of the dads deserves a mention too. Each state sent a crack team to help out. I would like to put on notice to my thanks to John Maguire, who is the president, and all at Calisthenics South Australia. Thank you for allowing me to continue as your patron. You are a credit to yourselves and do so much for your sport and your state. I really look forward to being associated with you in the years to come and to finally seeing the Royalty Theatre brought up to scratch.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:32): I rise today to speak about the *Four Corners* program on Monday 24 July and raise concerns I have about those allegations. Yes, they are allegations. Yes, there were allegations of a senior New South Wales government official helping irrigators undermine the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. Other allegations were harvesting taxpayer-funded environmental water, water theft or meter tampering. These allegations are serious, and if they are deemed to be true then these people need to have the book thrown at them—if not the book, the kitchen sink.

My anger was matched by every Riverland person watching that show. Currently, we have an independent review by Ken Matthews AO. Ken Matthews is the inaugural chair of the National Water Commission. We have an investigation by the New South Wales ICAC. The Australian National Audit Office is doing an investigation. We have the Murray-Darling Basin-wide review brought together by the federal government. The New South Wales Auditor-General will expand his ag department inquiry to the basin plan allegations.

Most water diverters—or irrigators, as they are known—are doing the right thing, but to watch some politicians frenzy feed on this is concerning, particularly if the basin plan is to succeed. This week, we have seen the South Australian Premier and his lame water minister rally the troops together and hold a press conference, minus the South Australian Liberals.

The minister rang the cohorts of irrigators in my electorate: 'Come down and rally against this plan.' They said, 'No, we're more interested in the basin plan being implemented,' so he then rang the next cohort. He rang the Lower Lakes irrigators: 'Come and rally against this water theft.' They came down and there were no Liberals there, and they were very disappointed that they were lied to by a lame water minister who has no interest in the River Murray.

He is only interested in political pointscoring. To see the South Australian Premier do what he has done is just another example. When he first visited the Riverland, elected as the Premier after knifing the then premier Mike Rann, he pledged a 4,000-gigalitre basin plan. He also pledged that no water would come from South Australian irrigators.

To date, almost all South Australia's 183 gigalitres of SDL water is from irrigators and river communities. It is through their hard work and their determination to reform the management of their properties; some of it is through selling their water through bank and financial pressure; some of it is through the love of that river so that they can put water back into the environment. Not one drop of efficiency gains has come from the state government. Not one drop has come from SA Water, and I think it is an absolute disgrace.

The basin plan is progressing. It took more than 100 years for the basin to get into this mess, and it is going to take more than 100 days to fix it. It will take time. The South Australian Liberal Party supports the basin plan in full. We support the 2,750 gigalitres by 2019, and we support the 450 gigalitres of upwater by 2024. We have also already released a water policy. It is about good information and forward projections for irrigators to make informed decisions, particularly in times of

water shortages. We support a full inquiry into these allegations, and that is supported by the South Australian Liberal Party.

As the member for Chaffey, I am calling on a national water audit on compliance, as I did in 2009 and 2012, and I am calling on a national audit on water extraction via water meters. That is the front bar nod test of approval. It is about putting everyone in the same category. They all have to be accounted for when it comes to water extraction. South Australia will be the biggest winner with a fully implemented basin plan, but hearing the Premier today telling the South Australian Liberal Party to put their state before the party is an absolute outrage. South Australians must get the water we have fought so hard to secure.

I tell the Premier that he has not fought to secure any water here in South Australia—not one drop—nor has his lame water minister. South Australian irrigators in the Riverland and South Australian irrigators in the Lower Lakes have fought hard to put water back into the environment to be part of the 183 gegalitres that are going back to the basin plan. I continually raise the issues about political grandstanding. This government have no interest in the River Murray: they have interest only in political gain, and it is an outrage that he can stand here today and say that he is fighting for the river.

LIGHT ELECTORATE

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:37): I would like to use this opportunity to talk about a few matters pertaining to my electorate. Yesterday, I had the opportunity to visit the Mark Oliphant College Children's Centre. I met with staff, volunteers and parents who are involved there. The centre is part of the Mark Oliphant College at Munno Para and caters for a whole new community, in the sense that not only is it a growing area with new people moving in but it is also a new community because a lot of the young children who attend the centre were either born overseas or their parents were born overseas, so it is quite a culturally diverse group of young children.

Walking through the centre, I could sense the positive feel about the whole place and the commitment by the staff, volunteers and parents to give every child who goes there the best head start in life. I talked to some of the staff. Like many centres in the northern parts of Adelaide and also in some parts of Gawler, a number of children experience learning difficulties. Rather than seeing this as a problem, this centre, like many others, sees it as a challenge to make sure that no child is left behind.

I was quite impressed with the way the centre uses play, art, craft and a whole range of activities to develop not only the children's motor skills but also their language skills. I was told stories about some young children who started at the centre not having any language skills whatsoever for a whole host of reasons. The work the volunteers and staff are doing is just magnificent. A whole range of health services is available at the centre that help with early diagnosis of any learning difficulties and also early intervention.

The centre has also made a conscious effort to introduce new programs so that parents, when their children are at an early age, have the opportunity to visit the centre for a period of time and the centre has a chance to engage with them and make an assessment about the special needs they require so that, when they formally start, those programs are in place and the children grow very quickly. It is one of a number of children's centres I have in my electorate. They are one of this government's important reforms to make sure that all our children have a good start to life. I commend the work being undertaken by the staff, volunteers and parents at the Mark Oliphant College Children's Centre.

There are a couple of things I would also like to mention in the time I have available, including the SALA Festival (South Australian Living Artists). There are a number of events and activities at a range of locations in my electorate. I would like to talk about several events that, in some way, I am personally involved in. Yesterday, I had the privilege of officially opening the SALA *Three worlds: triple the insight* art exhibition at Sia cafe at Evanston.

As an aside, the Sia cafe was recently announced the best cafe in regional South Australia. It is the third state award they have won. If you need a good cup of coffee or any other food, Sia cafe

is not only good for its coffee and food but it is also a place to look at the artworks as part of the SALA Festival.

The exhibition, which is part of the Gawler SALA Art Trail, showcases the wonderful work of three talented local artists I am fortunate enough to know personally. Their works reflect their different perspectives and diverse life experiences. One of the artists is Scott Rathman, an Aboriginal artist whose work reflects both his Aboriginal ancestry and his desire to bring his art into contemporary society. His work is visually very stunning. The second artist is Barbara Palmer, a former art senior at Trinity College, who was inspired to create work based on the surface of water, the texture of stone and the elongated shapes of shadows. Her work is also visually very stunning. The third artist is Paul Pearce, another teacher from Trinity College, whose work reflects the urban setting, whereas Barbara Palmer's work reflects the rural setting. I commend this exhibition to people.

Time expired.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:42): I rise today to once again urge the government to revisit its decision to close the Repat Hospital. The Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, and indeed all South Australians, simply cannot afford to lose this critical institution. If the government ignores the repeated request to save the Repat and goes ahead with its plans, I believe that so many people in my electorate, including many clinicians, whom the government chooses at times to ignore, will feel the consequences that will reverberate across South Australia's health network for years to come.

In 2015-16, 17,867 patients were admitted to the Repat and about 134,933 outpatients consultations were performed in that financial year. The question I ask the minister, which I repeated in estimates yesterday (believe it or not, I did not get an answer) is: where will the patients go if the doors of the Repat are closed? We still do not have an answer from the health minister and the government.

The Repat provides more than 200 beds for general medicine, surgery, palliative care, mental health and rehabilitation services. Over the next four months, in the lead-up to its closure, around 120 beds will become available in SAHLN, with the new rehabilitation facility, palliative care ward and geriatric unit at the Flinders Medical Centre, as well as the addition of the Jamie Larcombe facility. However, that still leaves a shortage of about 100 beds.

During a recent hearing of the Select Committee on Transforming Health in the other place, Professor Bill Heddle, Transitional Lead Clinical in the College of Medicine and Public Health at Flinders University, was asked if there were any programs or initiatives that he is aware of in the next four months to deliver efficiencies that will free up 100 beds. His answer was, and I quote:

Not that I'm aware of. The changes in care at FMC started when the doors of the hospital opened in 1976, and have been incessant since then. It's not as though there's been a period where we suddenly say, 'We have to be more efficient'. It has been part of the ethos of the institution from the very beginning that we continue to look at innovations of care, providing better health outcomes and shorter length of stay.

The loss of 100 beds will come at a time when medical services in SALHN are stretched. Flinders Medical Centre is already straining under the weight of chronic overcrowding. Emergency department physicians have warned SA Health chiefs that they are 'unable to guarantee the safety of our patients', noting that the ED was designed for a maximum of 70,000 presentations a year but that activity is on trend to exceed 90,000 visitations this year. They are profoundly concerned at the high likelihood of a critical adverse event or events occurring.

Secretary of the Ambulance Employees Association of South Australia, Mr Phil Palmer, has described the current situation of ambulance ramping outside major hospitals, including Flinders, as 'the worst in his 30 years as a union secretary'. SALHN simply cannot afford to lose 100 beds from their network, and I do not know any other network in this state, whether it be country, NALHN or CALHN, that is losing 100 beds out of its network.

Sadly, the concerns about Transforming Health of those living in southern Adelaide in my community, through the suburbs of Kingswood, Urrbrae, Blackwood, Belair, Coromandel Valley, Glenalta, Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley—and they are, indeed, opposed to Transforming

Health—have fallen on deaf ears. We have many elected members in the southern parts of Adelaide sitting on government benches, but they are unwilling or unable to represent the views of their constituency, including the member for Elder and the current member for Waite.

In contrast to the deathly silence of those opposite, I will continue to stand up for the constituents in my community, voice my opposition to the closure of the Repat and put the voice of my community forward— and that is of strong opposition to the closure of the Repat and, indeed, the downgrading of services across SALHN.

This government's short-sighted position has to be reversed. The closure of the Repat will have a devastating effect on teaching, training and research within SALHN. While less obvious, the consequences of these disruptions are no less important to our public hospital services, but they will have a likely long-term impact on the provision of health care in our community.

I will take these last couple of seconds to commend the good advocacy of the Liberal candidate for Elder, Carolyn Habib, in whose area the Repat now sits. Carolyn Habib is hosting a community forum tomorrow evening at the Repat at 7 o'clock to talk about what our plan is to renew the Repat and to inform her community of the devastating changes this Labor government is putting on her community as well.

COMMUNITY EVENTS

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:47): I rise today to speak about a number of events and initiatives, both in my southern community and beyond. The first is the Think. Eat. Save event that I had the pleasure of speaking at and attending on the Monday before last. It is an event that I take pleasure in attending each year, together with our Lord Mayor and many community members. It is an event that happens in communities right across the country, and it is an event that gives thousands of community members an opportunity to better understand what the wonderful organisation OzHarvest does to nourish and feed our community, to reduce food waste and to provide great food to those who need a hand.

Like many people in our South Australian community, I grew up in a household where money was often scarce, and my mum was and is literally an expert in turning every single leftover piece of food into something new that fed our entire family. I did not always love this as a kid; in fact, sometimes I really disliked it, but I have come to absolutely admire it and to know that she loves the work of OzHarvest and could also share a few tips with them.

Think. Eat. Save is an incredibly important community initiative run by an organisation and big-hearted people that make a profound difference in communities right across our country, an initiative that positively encourages us all rightly to reduce our waste and to consider how excess and unwanted food can be provided to our more vulnerable community members. Events like this and OzHarvest itself deliver results in so many ways. The first is probably the most important—OzHarvest feeds people, and there is, of course, enormous value in that alone.

A shared meal elevates eating to a family and community ritual. Feeding people is a simple, yet profoundly human, act of generosity and we honour that act at the Think. Eat. Save event where the many people there enjoyed delicious leftover food made into stunning meals by a number of our most loved South Australian chefs. Chefs who also spoke—as did Karena from the Salopian Inn, in McLaren Vale—about how they reduce food waste at their restaurants and how they ensure that every bit of their freshly grown produce is used.

Secondly, OzHarvest helps to reduce the amount of waste we send to landfill thereby reducing the amount of greenhouse gases entering our atmosphere. Thirdly, by reducing landfill costs to restaurants, markets and large food organisations, our economy benefits greatly, given that millions of dollars are currently lost through food waste, and our precious lovely food is used and enjoyed as it should be.

Here in our South Australian community, OzHarvest achieves all those results with their fleet of food rescue vans, which source excess food from restaurant and cafes, or imperfect food from growers and supermarkets that would struggle to sell on shelves. After collection, food is provided to many charitable organisations across our state that distribute to those in need.

Our South Australian Labor government is a proud sponsor of OzHarvest and the food rescue and relief sector, having awarded a number of grants over the past few years to help expand their operations to reach even further into our communities. I know the difference that these food rescue vans and this distribution make in our southern community with their deliveries to a number of local community organisations and also to high schools in our area.

There is still a long road ahead. Food waste is a huge concern and costs our Australian economy in excess of an estimated \$10 billion per annum and, sadly, an estimated two million Australians rely on food relief agencies just to get by. OzHarvest provide such a simple solution to a series of complex problems, and they do so through an exemplary team of generous, big-hearted staff and volunteers. Thank you to every one of those OzHarvest staff members and volunteers whose passion for our community and our environment makes a real difference to South Australians and to future generations.

In the short time I have left, I will speak briefly about another incredible community organisation that is directly improving the lives of women living in my electorate of Reynell, Share the Dignity, which is run by the amazing Rochelle Courtenay, together with other organisations, including the outstanding team at Essentials for Women SA, ably led by Amy Rust and her group of volunteers, to ensure that women who are homeless or at risk are able to access sanitary products with dignity.

I was delighted to recently attend the launch of the Share the Dignity vending machine at the Hackham West Community Centre. Share the Dignity has the admirable mission to ensure that no woman should suffer the indignity of going without sanitary items, regardless of her financial situation. It is tragic to hear stories of women who are unable to access sanitary products and struggle to remain hygienic and keep their dignity. For vulnerable or at-risk women, Share the Dignity services are life transforming.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2017

Estimates Committees

Adjourned debate on motion:

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

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:53): When I was finalising my brief remarks before the lunch break, I was talking about an issue that has been brought to my attention regarding hot exhausts under some fire trucks. I am conducting a bit more of an investigation, but I did stress to both the chief officer and the minister that I will be sending them some correspondence because I think it is a serious matter that needs to be addressed.

In the agriculture estimates, we asked a lot of questions in relation to moneys for various financial issues that farmers have faced, whether it be the dairy concessional loans, financial farm assistance concessional loans or drought assistance loans. It is interesting how much money was not approved to go out to farmers and some of the hoops that people had to jump through to apply for those concessions. It makes it so darned hard when people just want to keep producing great food for our state. As was acknowledged in estimates by the minister, just far too much money is made available that gets absorbed back into the budget.

It was most telling when I asked questions of the agriculture minister about a GM canola outbreak in this state, which was found when a farmer was trying to spray out some volunteers after he had grown the crop. Because he was in a vineyard sensitive area, he was only using Roundup—he was not spiking it with a broadleaf spray, as they say in farmers' terms—but these volunteer canola plants kept growing and he realised there was a problem. I believe that he went out and had another go and dosed it up with a bit more Roundup, but he could not take out these volunteers. Obviously, through no fault of his own, he had grown some genetically modified canola, as somehow some genetically modified canola seed had become involved in some fresh seed bought from the seed supplier.

When the Khapra beetle issue was happening, we were brought into a briefing by the minister and his staff outlining the issue around it. We understood on this side of the fence that we did not want to alarm people about how it was being managed, and we were satisfied. But it was kept under the carpet and kept in the cupboard of secrecy that there had been a genetically modified canola outbreak.

When I questioned the minister about the size of the paddock, his staff answered the question and said that it was one paddock. I said, 'That is very subjective. That could be 40 acres, as in the old days, or it could be 400 acres now.' Actually, it was bigger than that: it was a 200-hectare paddock (500 acres), which is a sizeable piece of country. With the season we have had, a lot of canola would have been grown. It is interesting that this has happened in this state, and it certainly adds to where there have been, and I assume still are, licences for genetically modified seed canola grown at Mount Gambier.

I asked some questions in relation to tourism and around the Elite Systems bungle by the government in relation to seating for the Clipsal. Contractors were left a million dollars out of pocket, and we know of one company that was left \$450,000 out of pocket yet still had to pay payroll tax on that money, even though they did not receive the money, and did not receive any relief from the government. When I asked the member for Mawson whether he had done any lobbying on their behalf, he just said, 'That's a Treasury issue. Don't want to know about it.'

The caring soul that he is, he had not done any work to make sure that these people did not have to pay tax on money they had not even been paid. It is just outrageous and beggars belief. This money is held by the government and we are still awaiting an outcome. The Elite debacle is a real tragedy for some local businesses, and the effect it would have had on those businesses and the harsh decisions they would have had to make to make up those massive shortfalls of a billion dollars all-up just beggars belief.

Then we were talking about regional development, and this was quite an eye-opening event. We were talking about the different rounds of the Regional Development Fund. The members of the Liberal Party on the committee just about fell over when we realised that the minister was telling us that they did not shut off these funding rounds and then start another round; there was just a rolling-round program for people who were applying in 2016-17 to go into 2017-18.

That sets off alarm bells at all levels in regard to managing a grant program in that manner. In all the time I have been a politician (I am now in my 12th year) we have had to deal with people who are applying for a grant that is closing and we are writing support letters or assisting them with those grants, yet we were told in the estimates session for regional development, 'No, it's just a rolling program. We have had hundreds of applications and people trying to get grants.'

That is all fine, but the member for Goyder asked a very good question: 'What about the people who didn't apply because they thought, "Oh, well, the new grant fund will open up for 2017-18."?' But essentially it is just a rolling fund. It is like a lottery: it just keeps rolling on. It seems that there is total unaccountability by the government. I asked the minister whether there were any companies that were disaffected and shared their disaffection with the government. I did not get a very satisfactory answer to that question at all.

In regard to issues around companies that finally did not take their grant, I think there were seven because of different things that happened. There was a McLaren Vale distillery that did not accept about a \$500,000 grant, I think it was, because it was just too hard. They just got on with it and did it themselves. Sure, you have to be compliant because half a million dollars is a lot of money, but you do not need to make the program that hard. It is a big decision for anyone. If I was in that company and I was going to make a decision to knock back half a million dollars, that is a very serious decision to have to make, but people are making those decisions.

In his opening remarks, the Minister for Regional Development talked about making power affordable for regional South Australians. Well, hello! This gets into the power debacles that we have not just for regional South Australians but for people right across this state. We have a government that has put us in the dire straits and the total debacles in which we find ourselves in relation to power supply to this state and affordability of power, and it is just disgraceful.

A perfectly good power station at Port Augusta was shut down on ideological grounds. That plant could have run for another three years for less than \$25 million and stopped all this chaos. We have seen Hazelwood close, which generated 22 per cent of Victoria's power, and our interconnectors fed right into that. It is interesting to note that our interconnectors still suck into Victorian coal, but let's not let that reality get in the way of where we source our power.

We have lost Port Augusta and, for \$25 million of taxpayers' money, we could have kept it going. Alinta could not compete with the RET subsidies for wind and solar, but mainly wind. We have seen what happens in this state when ideology gets in the way and the wind stops blowing: the lights go out, and that is exactly what has happened.

More and more regional businesses have come to me that have had long-term quotes put to them. They have been told, 'Because Port Augusta has gone and Hazelwood is shutting down, here are the different quotes.' I have a full list of quotes sent to me by one business, and the highest quote for what their power bill was going to be was 142 per cent, and the others were not far behind. That is just outrageous. This is what is killing business and incentive not just in the regions but in this state. For the regional development minister to make such a bold statement as, 'We are trying to make business more affordable with power prices,' shows the debacle we are in.

We have had all sorts of commentary. We were even going to have Turkish power-generating ships come in that could have run on bunker oil, sump oil or basically anything, but now we are going to be running on diesel. I note and have stated here before that the clean energy targets were at 55 per cent, and the government's own documents have them coming back to 43 per cent.

We have the Treasurer coming in here today, saying that he is hoping these diesel generators will not have to run. I am prepared to have a small wager with anyone on the government side, and I am pretty sure I will win it, that all nine of those diesel generators will have to crank up. We will have such a deficit of power that, on days during summer when the wind does not blow and interconnectors do not have enough coming across because so much other energy generation is shut down, we will need those diesel generators.

It is all based on an ideological lie. The Finkel report itself states that at the moment the whole of Australia is reliant on 58 per cent coal generation and that in 2030 we will still be relying on 56 per cent of our power coming from coal. So, yes, we need to have affordable options for power, and they need to happen fast, because this government have driven us into darkness.

I want to close with a few remarks about water. We had the press conference earlier this week with a range of people from different parties, with the Premier looking very smart and happy with himself up the front, and a few River Murray community people. I asked the water minister, the Hon. Ian Hunter from the other place, whether these community people were told that the Liberal Party were part of this process, because I know that his office was directly asked this when they contacted one of these people. They said, 'Yes, the Liberal Party are involved. They will be there on Monday with everyone else.'

Imagine the shock on this bloke's face when he turns up and realises he has been duped. I suggested that these people had been misled, but the water minister did not want to have anything of it, but that is what really happened. People were duped. They were told the Liberal Party were going to be part of the action calling for a judicial inquiry into the River Murray, but they were duped.

What I also get upset about is this government talking about how strong it is about the River Murray yet, when we had \$25 million coming to us for the diversification fund that would have assisted businesses from the top of the river near Renmark right through to the mouth, that did not need so much reliance on the river, to get funding, the government just knocked it back because they did not like it. That is how much this Labor government like the River Murray.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:08): It is that time of the year again—estimates time—and it reminds me of my childhood. I can remember world championship wrestling every Sunday afternoon on *Nine's Wide World of Sports*. In those days, there was a lot of local TV. As children of a father who migrated from Milan, we were very interested in the wrestler Mario Milano. Do you remember him, Madam Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am far too young, but I have heard of him.

Mr PISONI: My grandfather actually thought it was fair dinkum. He thought it was real. It reminds me of estimates because we get in here and we have the two teams: we have the government minister with 30 or 40 advisers, and we have the opposition, who have been in here since the day after the budget writing questions for estimates. Then there is this lock, this clash of the Titans, where the shadow minister and the minister embrace in all sorts of positions in order for one to trip up the other.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It sounds exciting. Which room were you in?

Mr PISONI: This is obviously taking some artistic licence, Madam Chair. Then, of course, we get through the one or two hours, however long it is, and the truth of the matter is that a lot of questions are asked but a lot of answers are avoided. It is very reminiscent of the days of Mario Milano and world championship wrestling on Sunday afternoons.

I would like to raise a couple of issues that popped up in the estimates process. I was not terribly satisfied with the responses; one is the development plan amendment by the minister for one particular development plan in my electorate of Unley. Just for the benefit of the house, Unley has been a very cooperative council for ministerial DPAs and I think generally they balance the containment and the preservation of heritage and streetscape with the ability to also allow corridor developments of up to five storeys high, which is part of the first round of the development amendment in Unley.

Basically, that development assessment process happened quite a number of years ago now. No-one has taken up the offer yet, of course; the economy is not running very well here in South Australia so we have not seen any development. We have seen development applications but we have not seen any of those come to fruition. We have not seen any building work happen. We are quite pleased that the first one that was approved was in a five-storey zone.

The whole idea of the development assessment process is really about doing all the consultation work prior to applications coming forward. The consultation with the community, the council and stakeholders happens at the time of the DPA amendment, when matters of height limits and change of use are being decided. That was a concept that people were prepared to put some trust in and there was a lot of activity in Unley and there was very large community engagement in that process.

Although many people living in Unley were not entirely happy about the five-storey proposition, they were realistic. They thought, 'It's going to happen on Unley Road. We understand that, but we do know that this will help us keep our streetscape and our heritage in many of our other suburbs in Unley.' So it was agreed to, the DPA was signed off by the minister and then there was going to be a second round that was south of Cheltenham Street and south of Northgate Street. However, earlier this year the minister basically said that that was not going to go ahead because there had not been the population growth that was forecast by this government 10 years ago. In fact, the population growth was about half what the government had forecast.

As to that second phase of the DPA, not just in Unley but in the inner and middle ring, that was planned to go out for consultation sometime in the near future, the minister decided that that was not going to happen. What we saw in its place were a number of DPA amendments of specific properties in particular areas. Some of them make a lot of sense, such as the Le Cornu site on Anzac Highway, for example; obviously there is an opportunity there for a change of use. The curious one in Unley was 299 to 307 Unley Road in Malvern, which has only recently had a new buyer. About 18 months ago, it changed hands and, curiously, the agent who was acting for the sale seemed to know a lot about proposed planning changes that were going to happen on that site.

I was curious how widely that information was held, so I asked the city manager whether information had been publicly released that that property was going to have its zoning changed from two storeys to five storeys and whether that had been publicly discussed or publicly released before the DPA was produced—in other words, 18 months ago to two years ago. The answer was no. That process had not even started, so heights were not part of the discussion at that stage.

I know that the council was very reluctant to allow five storeys in that second phase because that is a lot more residential. There are more offices there, as opposed to retail. The focus for the

council was around the CBD in Unley, around the Unley council chamber and the Unley Shopping Centre, where there was a focus on even higher density, which has recently been approved in what they call the Unley commercial district. The council was very keen to have the focus of the development around the CBD, and they were not keen to see a five-storey development south of Cheltenham Street and south of Northgate Street.

Interestingly, in relation to the purchase from 301 to 305, one of the owners, Bookends, was told that there was an opportunity for him to sell the property because it was going to get a five-storey zone and that raised alarm bells from my point of view. I was very concerned about how a real estate agent would have that information when it was not publicly available. It was certainly not the intention of the Unley council, so much so that at the planning committee meeting last month the committee voted to remove that particular property from the development plan amendment, and that was endorsed by a unanimous vote of the full council a couple of weeks later.

It was very clear from the beginning that five storeys was not the intent of the Unley council on that site, but for some reason somebody had been given information—and we do not know where that has come from—that that property was going to get a five-storey rezoning on its own. There was no other rezoning south of Cheltenham Street or south of Northgate Street. There were no other changes to the zones other than that particular building owned by a new owner, a known developer, and purchased less than two years ago.

I tried to get a bit more information about that process, but debate was raised continually during that process about the relevance to the budget, and there was an attempt not to really address questions on that matter. However, the budget is very clear. It does describe the role of the office of planning, and that is implementing the policy, regulations and parliamentary acts under which the South Australian planning regime operates.

There is a point of difference there, or a difference of opinion I suppose you could say. I felt it was relevant to discuss it in that process. The Chair was generous in allowing me to ask some questions, but the minister, as generous as he was in attempting to answer them, when some of those questions became a bit more uncomfortable then decided that it was not really relevant to the budget and that they were doing me a favour answering the questions I had asked earlier. It was an interesting exercise.

This development actually comes before a consultation process where 435 or so submissions have come in from the public on this particular development plan. That will be heard on 8 August. I am not quite sure how many of those have requested to present orally, but I believe that there are a couple of hundred at least. That will certainly be a process worth watching. I think it shows what value my constituents in Unley put on their surroundings and on proper process. As I said earlier, I am very happy to work with the council with the first DPA.

There were very justifiable reasons for why some changes were made and some compromises were accepted, but my constituents find it very difficult to understand why this particular property has been singled out and why the DPA is now at five storeys. It was news to everybody that it was even a consideration—except for the person I believe was acting for the developer in trying to purchase the properties in that area—that five storeys was going to be the outcome of a change of zone. We will keep an eye on that and see where it ends up.

My time with the Minister for Local Government was interesting. If any of you have had a chance to review the budget paper for local government, it is literally one page with a budget of about \$1 million. There are three lines in the expense and income column, there are some targets and highlights, about three or four under each of those headings, and that is about it. Dare to try to ask a question more generally where you cannot refer to a literal highlight or a literal table and the Minister for Local Government simply confers with his advisers on how to answer. The answer came back time and time again, 'That is not an estimates question,' or, 'That is not part of the estimates process.'

It is concerning that the minister was not as generous with his answering as were both the transport minister and the planning minister.

Mr Gardner: He was not as confident in his capacity.

Mr PISONI: As my colleague the member for Morialta suggests, I think it is evidence of the lack of confidence he has in his capacity. I think that most ministers tend to relish the opportunity to expand on their portfolios. I certainly know that, if I am fortunate enough to be in a position next year, I will be very proud to talk about the portfolio I am managing because I will certainly be very engaged in that process.

I was interested to read about the Premier's State/Local Government Forum, which I believe was set up as part of the 'Brockument' with the member for Frome. This is one of the rare occasions where the Minister for Local Government chaired the meeting. There are a number of highlights in the communiqué, which I suspect are edited or based on the minutes from the meeting itself. This was a direct line in the budget, but they wanted to continue working with the group and the minister on the Premier's State/Local Government Forum.

I think it was legitimate for me to ask questions about the latest minutes that were available online and refer to rate capping. I asked the minister if he was able to advise the chamber about the views raised by Mr Lamb and Mr Scales, who represent the Australian Workers Union and the Australian Services Union. They believe that rate capping will impact negatively on councils, in particular the local government workforce. I asked the minister whether they expanded on that view, and he refused to answer the question. He was at that meeting, and that was back in March.

Rate capping is a very important political debate occurring in the community. I was very surprised by the local government minister, who has gone only so far to say that his agreement for the government to oppose rate capping is relevant at the moment and that he does not know what will happen after that, in other statements. It was disappointing that he was not able to elaborate. There were a number of other areas of interest in that communiqué.

I have now applied to be on the mailing list, so I look forward to keeping up to date with the limited amount of information that comes through on the communiqué, but it certainly makes for interesting reading, despite the fact that it is a very abrupt version of what actually happens in those meetings. It covers the topics discussed, but it does not have an action sheet, nor does it report on previous issues that were raised, so I am not quite sure how effective that committee has been. That is my experience of the estimates committee this year. I also spent two hours with the transport and urban development minister, but that is for another day.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:27): I thank the various ministers with whom I spent some time over the last week in estimates procedures for their courtesies. As the shadow minister for multicultural affairs, the arts and education, I had a range of interactions. I will briefly take this opportunity to reflect on what the people present and the South Australian community learnt in those portfolio areas during the estimates process.

I thank in particular the three ministers I asked questions of—the Minister for Multicultural Affairs, the Minister for The Arts and the Minister for Higher Education and Skills—because they gave time to the opposition to ask questions without having lengthy, prepared statements in response to so-called questions without notice from government members.

The time allocated in the program for multicultural affairs and the arts was fully given to the opposition. The time in education was negotiated, and the time allocated was reduced slightly through those negotiations in order to have no government questions. However, I acknowledge that the Minister for Education provided more than half the time that would have been allocated in the original program in return for having no government questions and that she did not seem to obfuscate or delay her responses.

Those thanks given, I do have some concerns about the way that the government manages the South Australian budget. The poor choices that they have made have dreadful consequences in some areas, and today's shockingly bad NAPLAN results are a prime example of that; however, I will come back to education last. It is the topic on which I talk about most often in this chamber and there was plenty of time devoted to it last Friday in the chamber.

I will start with what we learnt in some of the other areas. The multicultural affairs line is one of the shorter ones that I had the opportunity to interrogate. We learnt a couple of things. The budget for SAMEAC last year was \$409,000. The estimated result is \$410,000, and \$409,000 is again

provided for SAMEAC in the year to come. In addition to that, of course, multicultural affairs forms part of the Minister for Social Inclusion's various programs, and much of the support work done in multicultural affairs is done by the back office in that department, which has been combined with other units in recent years.

In particular, in relation to SAMEAC, various things make up that payment, but one of the jobs that SAMEAC used to have and has traditionally had was an allocation of grants that were considered by the commission. However, it was made clear in estimates last week that that process is well and truly concluded. The input that SAMEAC and the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission members now have in the allocation of grants is reduced to two commissioners participating in the consideration of grants by a broader committee that takes place within the Department of Communities and Social Inclusion. They contribute to the consideration of grants for non-multicultural grants.

Of course, the alternative side of that is that the decisions about multicultural grants are made by a group of people, only two of whom are SAMEAC commissioners. This causes some consternation in the community, as the board traditionally had a much more significant role than this. I note that one community organisation wrote to me just two days ago, since the multicultural estimates, having had their grant application denied. It is just one example of a range of community groups that find this development somewhat troubling.

I will go to the arts portfolio. Yesterday, the Minister for The Arts in this chamber presented for an hour. In relation to multicultural affairs, I thank the member for Hartley in particular for asking many questions on those issues. In the arts portfolio, I was joined from the opposition benches by the members for Davenport and Heysen.

The member for Heysen indicated that it was her last estimates hearing yesterday and it will not be the same without her. Of course, I had to remind her that next year, had she not chosen to retire, she would have had a different role because we would have been sitting on the other side of the chamber. Nevertheless, I think that there is part of the member for Heysen that may well be missing the prospect of future estimates, but maybe not a substantial one, though.

In relation to the arts, we learnt a number of interesting things. In relation to the South Australian Museum, the former director of the South Australian Museum, Suzanne Miller, was arrested the week before last on fraud charges in Queensland for having allegedly gained \$45,000 in benefits for herself using the private health insurance of the Queensland Museum. The minister, through his deputy chief executive of the Department of State Development, Ms Reid, confirmed that the department is 'undertaking some due diligence to have a look at our records and our arrangements at that time'.

As has probably been made clear from the media, when Ms Miller arrived in Australia to take up the role at the South Australian Museum following an international recruitment process, she was not a citizen of this country. She went on to say:

The strict answer to your question is, yes, we are undertaking some proper due diligence ourselves about the matter, but no questions have been raised for us at this point...

and then went on to confirm that Queensland police may not have approached them to their knowledge. This is a concerning matter, and we hope that the due diligence work that has been done in Arts SA and in the Museum has not seen any adverse outcomes for South Australia. Of course, there is also the possibility that the case may not proceed. In Queensland, everyone is innocent until proven guilty, obviously. Nevertheless, it is a troubling matter, and I note that the information provided by the Department of State Development indicates that due diligence is now being done, and consideration of what happened in South Australia is now being undertaken.

We learnt that despite the press release issued by the Minister for The Arts on 6 November 2014 in relation to Fowler's Live—which is of course an all-ages live music venue in the Lion Arts Centre—that at the time, with the State Theatre moving in to become the anchor tenant, the Minister for The Arts said:

We will work with the current tenant on how we keep live music performances continuing in the event of any changes.

However, we then learnt from Mr Louca, the head of Arts SA, that the lease for Fowler's Live will not be extended after 30 June 2018 and it is therefore unlikely that this institution will continue at that venue into the future. It is a venue that the government has previously seen fit to use for their own events, but obviously they have lost interest in that going forward.

We learnt some other things. We learnt that in the government's current review, which some members of the arts community would have noticed, some 80 groups in the arts and cultural organisations of South Australia have been approached to participate in a survey of South Australian cultural infrastructure, and that is a significant piece of work that is being undertaken by the department and by SGS Economics and Planning, which was engaged by the government to assist with the project. SGS Economics and Planning is of course a Sydney-based firm. The value of this contract, which is money going to an interstate firm, was not, however, available to the minister yesterday. He took it on notice, and we look forward to finding out that quantum of money.

Anyone who works in the building and who has been out on the balcony of the Balcony Room lately would note that despite the first of the Hajek sculptures plinths being removed just over a year ago, a year later the rest are still there. It was confirmed that a year ago the first plinths were removed so that they could be preserved for future acknowledgement of that sculpture and to be reimaged 'in the new plaza works' to quote from Mr Louca. However, the rest are of course going to be demolished when work on that car park commences on the Walker development, presumably in the months to come. No doubt, that will be a sight to see.

We also learnt that of the \$300,000 that was committed towards the Riverbank Palais, currently in a denuded form showing itself as a blank concrete block on the River Torrens from the vista of Adelaide Oval right now, that Riverbank Palais was installed without any undertakings being sought from the state government in relation to how the Palais would be managed between festivals. The state government committed \$300,000 towards its construction, no questions asked. Now the new director of the Adelaide Festival and the Adelaide city council find themselves in the challenging position of how to manage that process in the intervening years. A number of other things came up in both those portfolio areas, but I think those were some of the highlights and some of the things that were interesting and new.

We had some time with the Minister for Education, Skills, and training and various other things, on Friday. Of course, one of the questions on training was in regard to subsidised training places, and the support that the state government provides to the training sector is going to become contestable again. After the Skills for All debacle, the state government decided that all the money was going to go to TAFE so that it could compete in the years ahead, and our private RTOs and others were left in a more difficult situation. So 2019 is supposed to be the year in which the state government has decided that these funds will be more contestable. The minister reported, and I quote:

TAFE has undertaken an extraordinary effort in modernising its service operations. It has made significant savings in the process and is operating extremely professionally, so I have no reason not to believe that they are well on their way to the contestability anticipated by the end of 2018-19.

That is good news, I suppose. A lot of damage has been done in the meantime, but in 2019 we will be in a better situation. We also learnt that the board remuneration for TAFE in 2016-17 had grown to \$518,000 and the remuneration for the chair had grown from \$85,000 last year—which was \$37,000 plus a retainer of \$48,000—to 'just under \$100,000'. The board members have a base remuneration of \$24,000 and \$23,000 in payment and more for participating on board committees—\$5,000 a year for those board members. That was information in relation to the TAFE Board.

In relation to the education portfolio, there were a number of concerning aspects that came out and there were some interesting things that came out. The government announced in the budget that there were going to be two new superschools in the north and the south. We asked for some details on this and on some of the work that had gone into it.

In relation to the southern superschool, which is identified in the budget papers as being at Sellicks/Aldinga, I asked, 'Which is it to be?' and the minister confirmed that the location for that school is yet to be determined. She did say that they will be completed by 2022. So, presumably, at some stage before then the government anticipates choosing a location. She suggested that they

were not quite sure which schools would be impacted in the surrounding area. I am sure those schools within the catchment will be interested to know some of those details and hope that the minister will engage with them in detail and the department will consult with them in detail in the years between now and then to ensure that that transition is managed properly.

Of course, the opposition will be very keen to see any new infrastructure completed in a way that works in well with the neighbouring schools, so obviously we will be committing to consult very closely with any neighbouring schools that will be impacted before the new schools come on line. I hope the government will do the same.

In relation to the proposed Magill education precinct announced about four years ago by the member for Wright when she was education minister, the current Minister for Education, the member for Port Adelaide, confirmed, 'I understand with Magill that a feasibility study is either close to completion or may, indeed, have been completed. I am yet to see it.' This, of course, comes after the scoping study that was undertaken in 2014 and a large range of works undertaken with the governing council members of the Magill Primary School, Norwood Morialta High School, Magill Kindergarten and the University of South Australia.

There has been back and forth over this and an enormous amount of work undertaken, not just by paid staff, which is what they are paid to do of course, but by volunteers and volunteer parents, parents of children, particularly at Norwood Morialta High School, who are putting in work because they care about their school community and they value the future of their school, even though by the time these works are completed they know full well that their own children may well have left the school.

This is altruistic work from volunteers that deserves more credit than to be spun a line for four years and then still have no further information in the budget process, as was the case. The minister was able to provide no information as to even when the feasibility study would be completed. She said, 'I cannot comment about the timing. We will see.' That was very disappointing and we hope that information about this project and potential future plans will be forthcoming sooner rather than later.

Some questions were asked about the issues at the Errington Special Education Centre. On 11 April, the minister took questions on notice and said she would get back to the house about the findings made by Magistrate O'Connor in relation to criminal charges brought against a teacher. She was very critical of the department and some people in the department.

The minister had no answers in relation to those questions, which she again took on notice. I look forward to some responses coming in due course. I do note, however, that in the days since former members of the governing council of the Errington Special Education Centre have expressed their concerns in a public way about the way the department has handled the situation, the lack of support given to teachers, SSOs, parents and students at that school.

It was described as extremely unprofessional conduct, so we are very concerned about what has happened here and we are very eager to hear from the minister about what actions are being taken in response to the review of those matters. That review is being undertaken by not only the chief executive of the education department but also SAPOL, and that was the reason that the minister made the excuse to take questions on notice.

We asked many questions about the detail of staff in different areas and all of them were taken on notice. We learnt that there is a new building being refurbished at Hindmarsh, which will finally take the 300 staff that were promised to be moved out of the education department I think when Tony Harrison, two CEOs ago, was appointed as the head of the education department. He said that 300 staff would be moved into schools, then it became closer to schools and then we learnt it was going to be Hindmarsh.

At estimates last week, we learnt that they had not actually finished building the accommodation at Hindmarsh that all these people would move into, so they are all still in Flinders Street, which is not what was suggested by the former minister about three years ago, or certainly by the former education department CEO about two or three years ago.

We learnt a number of other things, but I will finish by touching on the state contributions as a result of the National Education Reform Agreement, where there have been promises of increased money by the state government in what was sometimes described as years 5 and 6 of Gonski, which this parliament has put in its budget papers for the last two years and which will be delivered under the current budget or, indeed, under a Liberal administration would also be delivered in full.

With that state component, we learnt that a section is going to non-government schools, but the minister said on Friday that she could not tell us where the rest was going. She could not tell us because it had not been decided yet because the government was considering how that money was going to go. We asked who it would be spent on and she said, 'We will determine within our system the best priorities for that money.'

Today, we have learnt where a little bit of it is going to be spent. Some \$70 million over four years will be spent on literacy and numeracy programs. Can I say that, after 15 years of utter failure by the government through the NAPLAN tests, it is nice to see that they have noticed that literacy and numeracy are a problem, but pretending that that was new money that they announced today when it has been in the budget papers for the last two budgets is just outrageous, and it is a pathetic and cynical attempt at crisis management.

Time expired.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:48): It is actually rather a joyous occasion for me today to stand up and speak about estimates because it will be the last estimates I attend as a member. I can assure you all that I will not be rushing back when I retire from this place to sit in on estimates committees in the future. I will not be attending any further estimates by choice, but I would suggest there are some in this place who will not be attending estimates in the future, although they do not know yet that they will not, but that is another story.

I would like to pick up on some of the points the member for Morialta raised in relation to the superschool that is proposed down south. Nobody I know would object to this new facility; however, what they will object to in most strident terms is that it is not much more than pork-barrelling and spin. I sincerely doubt whether we will see it for years and years. The answers that were given to the member for Morialta by the minister were completely useless. She had no detail that she could come back to the member for Morialta with.

There is no site, regardless of whether or not that be in Sellicks/Aldinga as was announced in the budget. I might add that Sellicks is a village without a town centre. It only has a small shop and post office down on the foreshore, whereas Aldinga is quite a busy little area. Interestingly, the fact that the minister could not answer questions about when it was going to happen, how much it was going to cost, where it was going to be sited, etc., is somewhat in keeping with the porky pies that came out with the budget announcement.

It is quite clear that this was really designed to assist the current member for Mawson and the current member for Kurna more than anything else, but when it came down to the guts of the business the minister could not answer any questions. What makes it interesting for me is that Sellicks Beach is currently part of my electorate. The Myponga Primary School has around 140 students, half of whom come from the Sellicks area. It is pretty significant that 60 or 70 students come up Sellicks Hill each day to go to Myponga.

I am told anecdotally that there are parents who do not want their children to go to the other schools down that way on the Plains. I do not have any evidence that that is right, but I am told that it is the choice of parents to go up that hill. Likewise, there are children moved back and forward between schools across the Southern Fleurieu to fit in with what parents want for their children in relation to education. That is pretty common right across my electorate. The issue of why the government made this announcement of a superschool in the Aldinga/Sellicks area is quite bewildering when they cannot put any guts into the debate whatsoever.

I also raised the issue of the Main South Road. Again, there was an announcement, some months ago now, that the Main South Road would be upgraded. Nobody, least of all me, has any objection whatsoever to that; however, nothing will happen in the foreseeable future. The budget

process does not allow for anything to happen between now and probably the end of June next year, with the state election in the middle.

An upgrade to that road is much needed. This side of the house is very cognisant of the fact that something needs to be done with that road. However, there is quite an agitated group down there at the moment that does not want the proposed works that have already gone through the Public Works Committee to happen. They want those held off, and then they want the road upgraded properly.

Some \$11 million was going to go into roundabouts and whatnot down that way. There was some expectation that, after that work was done, the speed limit would be raised to 100 km/h again. I have talked about that before in this place. People in the country need to get from one spot to another, and the constant reductions in speed limits being put in place only serve to aggravate people in much the same way as the bus lanes up Anzac Highway did.

I was very pleased when those bus lanes were removed the other day. It was with some glee that I came up Anzac Highway today with three lanes in use. I suspect it cut 10 to 15 minutes off the time it took me to get into Adelaide. Quite frankly, it was a damn fool move in the first place. Why governments do these things I do not know. It was a bad mistake, and it must have certainly been impacting on the polls. People who use that road more regularly than I do felt that these bus lanes were a joke. It was made even more ridiculous by the fact that normally the bus lanes were pretty much full of cars anyway. Apart from one day when they stopped and warned people, when driving on Anzac Highway when the parliament was sitting, I did not see the police pull over and penalise anyone. I welcome the announcement and I welcome the fact that this morning all is back where should be.

If I go back and look at the speeches I have made over the past 10 or 11 years, I have probably repeated myself ad infinitum. I think estimates are just a joke. My view is that the estimates that are held in the Senate in the federal parliament are a much more useful exercise. They get the public servants in to answer questions. They are required to answer questions. My view is that the Senate is a good place for that to happen. We would probably get much more out of members of the Legislative Council in this place if they did estimates instead of doing nothing for five days. My view of the world is that they should be involved. They should be doing it. House of Assembly members who have electorates to service should obviously be able to be out doing that rather than being tied up in this place for five days.

I have not heard any comments from government members whether they support my remarks, but I feel that over the years the general consensus would be that the estimates are pretty much a waste of time. Enormous effort is put in by the Public Service departments to provide answers for hypothetical questions that may or may not be asked. A lot of work has to be done by this side of the house in formulating questions. The long-winded introductions that I heard when I attended a couple of meetings, particularly from the member for Mawson, who puffed and blew and really said nothing over 10 minutes, were a waste of time.

If ministers are not going to be serious about the estimates, if they are just going to try to puff out government spin, there is not much point in having them in any way, shape or form. I may be cynical—and I probably am—but I know that the shadow ministers from this side of the house and their staff worked very hard to formulate questions, as did the team on this side, and not to get answers I find supremely ridiculous. It is no surprise to me that the general public is highly cynical of the political class. If they came here and sat through five days of estimates, they would probably be even more cynical.

One of the items that comes through in the budget is an allocation to Kangaroo Island of \$8 million over four years for road funding. I have some concerns about where this is going. I had a few words to say about it recently. An amount of \$2 million a year has been spent over the last few years, which came in via former minister Conlon of blessed memory. For all intents and purposes, much of that money has been wasted. It has been put into unsealed roads and, in some instances, it has not been done properly.

We now find ourselves in the absurd situation where some of the first roads to be done, such as the North Coast Road, are almost back to where they were before. This is after \$2 million a year.

The wrong material was put down and the road surface was not worked on properly before the material was put down. That is, the potholes were still there and the material was dumped on top of them and, of course, the material has fallen into those potholes and some of the roads have turned to slush.

In my view, the government would have been far better off insisting that that \$2 million a year was put into sealing parts of the road network, not into unsealed roads that were not done properly. I do say that two of the roads that were done by a local contractor, Mr David Halloran, namely Harriet Road particularly and, this year, the Bark Hut Road were examples of how to spend taxpayers' money properly, and he is to be commended for the work he has done on those roads.

However, I am concerned and I intend to get to the bottom of this. In relation to future roadworks over there and the necessity to upgrade roads just in case a port is developed for the timber industry—which I will say again should not be at Smith Bay—there is a very nasty smell coming out of all of that, which concerns me greatly. There seem to be forces at work that have close connections to the government that thinks that this thing is all cut and dried and is going to go forward.

The message I got this morning in relation to some of this next \$8 million promise is that it is going to go into the roads that are to be used by Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers, if they get approval. They want those roads upgraded. This money is allocated pretty much by the council in terms of where it should go. I am asking the question: has there been a shady deal done? It would appear that the message that is coming out of at least the administration at Kangaroo Island Council is that part of that \$8 million will be used to upgrade the road network so that KIPT can use it. Let me say this: that would be completely rejected by island residents.

Quite frankly, if the timber industry—and we want to see the trees gone, I might add—want roads done up, they should have to pay for a vast part of it. They are even talking about doing up a road called McBrides Road, which is not much more than a goat track now, and it would cost millions of dollars to do up that road alone. I am adamantly opposed to any of this \$8 million going into roads to build up a road network for a private company. If they want roads and if they want particular roads, they should be making a major contribution, and the poor long-suffering ratepayers over on the island should not be hung out to dry to provide roads for that company.

I know that in the past when CSR and Frickers were operating the gypsum mines on the eastern end of the island, the dirt roads that were used then were upgraded almost on a weekly basis, graded and fill-carted as required. In those days, the Dudley district council had the roads, but they did not even ask the council to come and do it. They did it themselves. They got in there and upgraded the roads, put down fill and kept the roads in a good condition.

There is a precedent and I am sure that other members in this place are aware of similar projects with other mining or forestry projects in South Australia. I do not like it. I am going to look into it. I intend to have more to say about that because I do not trust what is going on with KIPT. I think they are hoodwinking too many people. They are conning people. They are putting out far too many spin announcements, and I do not think that they have any intention of actually operating the tree-felling operation and export.

My view is that they will flog it off to the first probably overseas company that comes along, once they have approvals. They should never get approval for Smith Bay. It is wrong, wrong, wrong and it should not happen. I intend to say more about that in the weeks ahead in this place, but I am not going to sit back and watch taxpayers' money be put into doing up those roads for a company that has no income, no industry and no business and are complete spin doctors, in my view. I do not think that they are serious. I take the opportunity again to thank the house for putting up with me and I resume my seat.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:05): I rise to make my report on estimates from last week. I am no longer the shadow minister for social housing or youth; however, I did participate and ask questions on behalf of the shadow minister along with sitting in on the questioning about the status of women. They were all with minister Bettison. I must say that I almost developed an ulcer from frustration with how long every single question took to answer, how rambling and long all the answers were and how they went off on tangents. The minister was certainly very skilful at not actually answering any questions.

It was quite a frustrating experience, and I certainly do not feel that I am any more enlightened in any way on the topics of social housing, youth or the status of women. I think about two questions on each of those were actually answered in full. In contrast, it was fantastic to have an hour and a half with minister Close on child protection. There were no Dorothy Dixers, which was wonderful as well. We got through a lot of questions. Unfortunately, 14 of those were taken on notice, so we do not actually have the answers, but I did ask the questions. I really hope that I am able to get some of those answers in a timely manner, preferably in the next few weeks or the next month—that would be fantastic. I hope that I do not have to wait until after the election to get those answers.

We were able to get some answers. It has been over a year since the royal commission report was handed down, and there have been slight improvements in the time taken to answer the Child Abuse Report Line. However, we find that there were still 23,000-odd calls that were not answered. It is a small improvement, but it is no joy for those 23,000 people who attempted to make a call to the Child Abuse Report Line in good faith because they felt that children were being left in danger or neglected but gave up before their calls were answered. It is quite shocking to think of how many children are left unsafe.

There were also still a lot of children who were substantiated and then resubstantiated within 12 months, which means that whatever processes or safety plans were put in place for those children, or whatever remedies were sought, made no difference to those children's lives. In fact, they were left in danger for a further year and then reported again. As many of the non-government organisations and stakeholders have said repeatedly, the government needs to put a lot more effort and energy into early intervention and prevention.

In August last year, the government had already committed an extra \$200 million into child protection. In the Mid-Year Budget Review, they announced a further \$232 million, and in this budget a further \$86.5 million was introduced, which was mostly for the extra cost of housing children in residential care due to their inability to actually fill the full-time equivalent staff. They are having to outsource. It was mentioned in 2014, in my first estimates with minister Rankine, that 360 extra staff would be employed in the residential care facilities to save money by not outsourcing to commercial care.

Three years later, that is still not fixed. This government makes announcement after announcement of big spending. Money is announced and there is a big show and a press conference, yet nothing happens. It is incredibly frustrating that three years later the government is having to put a further \$86.5 million in this budget because they have failed to employ enough people in residential care. We saw that last year \$99.7 million extra was required for residential care as well because they were unable to fulfil those FTEs.

The government has reduced the number of children in commercial care, which is eight-hour shift workers in accommodation such as hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts and that sort of thing. They have reduced that from 212 to 162 and we are assured that, whilst they are in commercial care, they are no longer in hotels or motels, but the number in residential care has risen by more than the commercial care numbers have dropped. Basically, they have just moved them to another eight-hour rotational shift care that may be slightly better, but we still know that eight-hour shift workers with different staff is the worst form of care a child can have, and we know that they are 12 times more likely to end up in the juvenile justice system.

Many of them become institutionalised. Many of the teenagers I have heard speak who have come through the government system, particularly through residential care, have mentioned in their speeches that their breakfast was made for them every morning and everything was done. When they are put into their own private accommodation at age 17, they have never made breakfast or lunch, they have never travelled on a bus or got themselves to an appointment, and they have never had to ring and make an appointment. These children are totally institutionalised. They are not taught life skills, they have very bad results in schooling and in NAPLAN and they are failing to finish year 12.

They are at a serious disadvantage, and it is costing around \$200,000 a year to give these children this horrible life. This government is failing to make the necessary changes to turn that around. For \$200,000 a year per child, you would think that you would have the best tutors, the best chefs and the best mentors for these children and that a lot could be done. I understand that some

children are better suited to residential care, particularly those with high and complex and multiple needs.

However, at the only residential care facility that I have been allowed to visit with the minister, Tregenza House, the five or six children I personally met did not have a severe or a particular need to be in that residential care facility. They were all under the age of 10, and we know that children under the age of 10 should definitely never be put in these types of facilities. Years ago, the Guardian for Children and Young People recommended that the large facilities all be closed and as many children as possible be moved out of residential care and into family homes.

We know that the government has made multiple announcements on foster care. There was \$4.4 million one year and \$9 million the year after, I think in February 2016, and we still do not have any answers on how many new foster families came in. How many foster families left? How many are there in total? These are the answers that I am not able to get; the questions were all taken on notice. We need to be more transparent because apparently there are 4 per cent more children in foster care, but I would allege that this is probably just extra capacity with the families that already existed and that all the ads that we are all hearing repeatedly on the radio and on TV, costing millions and millions of dollars, are not getting results.

We know that word of mouth is always the best form of advertising and that looking after existing foster carers is the best way to strengthen and increase the numbers of foster carers in the system. I was also unable to get figures for Other Person Guardianship. Years ago, again in estimates in 2014, there were over 100 children under OPG orders and at that time, there were 85 ongoing applications. That has dropped off, and only about nine or 15 each year have been added.

Clearly, there is an issue, and there has been an issue for three years, so what is being done about it? Why are children not given the stability they need? It is in every report that children need stability, that they need security and that they need to know where they are living. Foster families want to be able to make decisions about going away on the weekend, going on school camp or cutting hair. They do not want to have to hassle the department and wait for them to get back to them. It is mutually beneficial, and I do not understand why it is so difficult for this government to enact it. What is the hold-up and why has it not been fixed?

There are still so many different areas with so many unanswered questions taken on notice. It is still unclear how many FTEs the government is under. The Public Sector Association alleges it is somewhere around 380 FTEs under, if you include the expected increase as well as those that have already been promised. It is very difficult, with so many questions being taken on notice. I hope that we can get answers back soon.

Whilst we have spent around \$6 million on the royal commission, I am also still waiting to hear what the cost is on the one-year report, the cost of the government's response, the cost of the legislative changes made and the cost of the new child protection safety act, the screening act. What is the cost of what is going on and what are the results? This government is very good at throwing around millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars to make it look like something is happening. However, it has been more than three years since the Shannon McCoolle incident, which was the trigger for this royal commission, and a year since the reporting of the royal commission, yet there are no substantial positive changes.

The number of children going into care is still rising. The number of children on eight-hour rotational shift workers is still rising. We still have over 23,000 unanswered calls to the Child Abuse Report Line. We still have a backlog of eCARL reports. We still do not have children assessed for the NDIS, which was a recommendation due to be fulfilled by 31 March this year. There are still so many failings that the government needs to get on top of.

Whilst it was an improvement, insofar as I asked lot of questions, I am still waiting on at least 14 questions on notice from child protection. Not enough has changed so far, but I hope that we and the minister continue to make changes and amendments, definitely at the early intervention and prevention level, because the numbers are burgeoning, the system is not coping with the number of children it now has and more needs to be done.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (17:17): I had not intended to speak, but I feel compelled to do so, and I will elaborate on that a little bit later. Like others who have already spoken in the chamber, this will be my last estimates, and of course I am very pleased about that. There are going to be things that I am going to miss about being a member of parliament, but one of them will not be estimates. I am often asked by people, 'How's estimates? What's it like? It must be exciting.' I explain it to people by saying, 'Have you ever been to the dentist and had a tooth drawn?' They say, 'Yes, I have.' I say, 'Well, imagine going to the dentist and getting every tooth in your mouth drawn. That's about how exciting estimates is.'

Mr Picton: Over five or six days.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, that's right—over five or six days. As I said, I was not going to speak, but I feel compelled to do so. I have been sitting down in my office having a listen to what is going on, and it is safe to say that I have never heard so much diatribe in my life. That is probably not true because I am used to hearing diatribe, particularly in this place, coming from the other side. To have members talking about those ministers who are not answering questions, those who are circumventing the process, those who are just not willing to answer the way it is—well, I did not witness that in the estimates that I sat in.

Mr Wingard: You were asleep.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I was not. Well, if I was asleep, it could only have been because your questions put me to sleep. The opposition's questioning is a bit like an anaesthetic: it does put you to sleep.

Getting back to the point, before I was so rudely interrupted by the member for Mitchell, I sat in the estimates. I am reliably informed—and this may be wrong; I hope not to have to come back and correct the record—that in estimates B, the one I attended, about seven government questions were asked during the entire estimates. I can say, in having a look at those government questions, that they were more probing, more interesting and I got more out of them than I did out of any one of the questions that were asked by the opposition. I assume that might be the case for estimates A as well; I do not know, but I expect it would be.

I will tell you when you know you are bored: when you are sitting in estimates and you are grabbing the *Hansard* to read the estimates from the other committee. I did that. Interestingly, in doing that, I had a look at the questions that were answered by the Minister for Transport, minister Mullighan. I look at him—and I have told him this before—and he, amongst a few others on this side of the house, is what I call the future. He is a very good operator, he knows his stuff and he is right across his portfolio responsibility. He answered every question in not only a forthright way but with a high level of expertise.

But, when reading *Hansard* and looking at the questions that were asked by the member for Unley, he ran to a script, it appeared to me, and that script was, 'I'm going to ask these questions because I've worked them through and I will continue to ask them,' bearing in mind that for about 50 minutes—I assume it was 50 minutes because it almost took me that long to read it—those questions that were directed at minister Mullighan were not connected to his portfolio responsibility.

Far be it from me to suggest that the opposition are saying that ministers are circumventing the process and not willing to answer. In reality, you have to ask the right questions. You have to ask questions that are in accordance with the rules that apply to estimates hearings. From what I witnessed, I do not think that the opposition were complying with those rules. They used it as a mechanism to try to get some political mileage. I will tell you how well it went. Looking at both the media reporting and what I have read, I do not think one glove was laid on any one of our ministers during that time.

I saw a bit in the *Sunday Mail* when I got up very early on Sunday morning and had a look at it. Dan Wills and Laurie Oakes usually have this little bit about state politics and federal politics and who has had a good week and who has had a bad week. Contained within who had a bad week was the Minister for Disabilities. I sat through her estimates hearing. If I had had breakfast, I would have vomited because that was just a misrepresentation of what the circumstances were. She certainly did not have a bad week. That was very poor form. It must have been written before she actually appeared before estimates.

Anyway, getting back to the point I made and I am going to reinforce now, every minister answered every question. Where the information was not available to answer that question appropriately, those ministers took that question on notice and, as is always the case, will get back to the committee and the parliament with respect to answering those particular questions.

I do not think the opposition should mix, if you like, the performance of ministers during estimates with their incompetence. I heard the member for Finniss saying, 'We have some extremely hardworking shadow spokespeople.' That may be true but, if you are not competent, the fact that you are working hard actually shows you up as being more incompetent than you are. Continue to work very hard, but I would suggest that you need to get better at what you do because you were exposed during this estimates period as being, as I have said in the past, an opposition that has become not even a very good opposition over 16 years.

This was my last estimates and, as I said, I am pleased about that. I liked estimates a lot more when I was a minister because you are actually in the action, or when I got the opportunity in the first four years to replace the Chair of the day, but it can be very frustrating as a backbencher. It is particularly frustrating when I sit there and think, 'Good God, I wish I was asking the minister questions because I think I can ask better ones than the opposition.' It might actually create more trouble for our ministers than their questioning actually does. Notwithstanding that, there is no reason for me ever to come back to witness an estimates anymore or ever again in the future.

I do want to say that the opposition ought to have a good look at themselves in the mirror because if that is the best they can do, God help us. The next election is going to be tight; there is no doubt about it. Deputy Speaker, you would be aware of that. The next election is going to be tight. I feel that we are in at least an equal or even slightly better position than we were at this time leading into the electoral cycle in 2013.

The difference between us and the opposition is that we enter every election on the basis that we think we may win and that we have a chance of winning. The opposition go into the election thinking they have a God-given right to form government because that is what they were born to do. The reality is that that then reflects on the level of work they put into winning an election.

It is going to be a lot tougher this time for a couple of reasons, not the least of which is the very unfortunate boundary redistribution that occurred. Notwithstanding that, unlike the opposition, who whinged for the four years leading into the 2014 election and then whinged for another—however long it is—three years since then that they were robbed, the reality is that we know it is going to be difficult, but we are going to work accordingly. We do not take anything for granted.

The point I am trying to make in a very longwinded way—and I know that you are used to me being longwinded in this way, Deputy Speaker—is that it relates back to their performance during estimates. Their performance during estimates was lazy. It was lazy to the extent that it reflected as incompetence and did not do anything that was going to properly extract from the ministers of the day the information that they purported they wanted, because the questions they asked were answered in a very good way.

I am going to leave it at that. Again, I am not going to apologise for taking up the time of the house. As I said, I had not intended to speak on this because the sooner we get anything that refers to estimates over the better, and this is part of that particular process and part of the rules. I could not sit in my office and listen to the diatribe and what I thought was nonsense and—it has become a common term these days—their ability to attempt to promote what is fake news about the reality of estimates because I found them, as boring as they were, to be very competently and expertly conducted by our ministers and, indeed, the chairpersons of both committees.

I did pop my head in here for a little while and I thank you for the way you did it. Generally, I think the estimates were conducted in a proper way and that is no small credit to the Chair of the committees. Also, I think generally they were conducted mostly in—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Civil.

The Hon. P. CAICA: —a civil and respectful way. At the same time, as I said, you cannot make up for incompetence that exists and, in my view, the opposition was incompetent during the

estimates process and should be looking in the mirror and not blaming ministers for doing their job as effectively as they did.

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (17:28): I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill and to outline the experience in estimates. I must say that it is good to see that the member for Colton is awake today. We know he likes to nod off. As he works his way into pasture, it is great to have him in the house. He talks about the estimates situation and what goes on in estimates. Apparently, his friends ask him about it regularly. I would really like to know who his friends are if they are interested in estimates because it is a tedious task. I know what you mean: it is hard getting answers out of the government when we ask these questions.

I asked a number of questions, as we do each estimates, and they took them on notice. They do not know the answer and they take them on notice, so we have to wait. I note with interest that 22 October is the deadline for those questions to come back.

The member for Colton will take interest in the fact that, having asked questions just recently in estimates, today some answers to questions on notice were returned to me. It was only a few days ago that I asked these questions—I was flabbergasted. The member for Colton would appreciate this because he knows how efficient this sort of system is. You will not believe it, but the problem with the answers that I got back is that they were from last year's estimates; they were 12 months late. They were 12 months old. That is how efficient this government is.

The member for Colton is a big part of this government and he is a big part of the reason that South Australia is in the position it is in. We are languishing at the bottom of the table. Maybe when the member for Colton and his colleagues on the other side go out and actually engage with their community, whether it is in the pub, at the school, at the local shopping centre or wherever it is out in the constituency, rather than talk about estimates, maybe they could ask these people, 'How is South Australia going? How is our state going?' If the member for Colton, or anyone else on the other side, is brave enough to ask that question, I can tell you that the response would be, 'We are not going so well.'

People out there do not believe South Australia is going well. That is a fact. The government on the other side of the chamber are the reason for this. We have had some more figures come out today. The BankSA State Monitor figures have come out today, outlining how South Australia is going. It recorded the lowest ever level of consumer confidence about South Australia's future. Also, when people were asked about state pride, it recorded the lowest level ever for South Australia. The lowest ever level of mood in South Australia was recorded. That is how people are feeling about our state. It is the first time there has been a negative figure in this category. It also recorded the lowest ever level of lifestyle stability in South Australia. That is how consumers—people out there in the community—are feeling about our state. That is what the current Labor government have done to South Australia.

Business is important. We know that growing business grows jobs in this state. We know that we have the highest unemployment rate in the nation and have had for 31 months in a row. We have been sitting at the bottom of the table for a very, very long time. Quite frankly, South Australians have had enough. If you do go out into your community, like the member for Colton talked about, you will not hear people talking about estimates, you will hear people talk about how badly South Australia is going.

As far as business confidence is concerned, again the survey that came back today recorded the lowest level of business confidence since August 1998. That is a heck of a long time. It was the lowest level of confidence about the future recorded in the last five years. So this is the worst government in the last five years as far as business and confidence in businesses in this state is concerned. It is also the lowest level of state pride recorded and the largest decrease recorded in South Australia.

Last week, the Sensis report came out as well, which said that there was no faith whatsoever in this government. The state Labor government really have let South Australians down. Again, we talk about the budget and the bank tax—that is their response to everything. The Treasurer on the other side just wants to tax everything that moves. He wants to take money out of the pockets of South Australians and it is crippling our state. That is where we sit.

When we get to estimates, we like to ask questions to find out what is going on. They must turn off the smoke alarms during estimates because the smoke and the mirrors that we see come out is absolutely phenomenal. I started with my questions to the Minister for Employment, Kyam Maher, from the other place. He gave me an hour for employment questions so we could talk about jobs. Just about everywhere I turned to ask about the job situation, he would say, 'Oh no, the Treasurer deals with that. No, someone else deals with that.' He said that on every issue I asked him about. He is the employment minister, but he will not talk about jobs and our unemployment crisis that has been created, again, by the Treasurer, who sits on the other side. He has given us the highest unemployment rate in the nation.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WINGARD: He smiles about it. I think it is absolutely laughable that he has that sort of attitude and is doing that to South Australians in this state. As we went through employment looking at what was going on, we looked at industry and innovation to see where jobs will come from in the future and what sort of support the government is giving. Industry and innovation is very important in South Australia in growing our state.

If we look at grants and subsidies, or even just the total expenses for 2016-17, the government spent \$52,900,000 on industry and innovation in 2016-17. That is quite a healthy figure, yet we roll over to the budget going forward and they have slashed—slashed—\$33,700,000. That is what the Treasurer has done to industry and innovation in this state—slashed \$52 million down to \$33 million. Nearly \$20 million has been taken out of that budget. He has just slashed it because that is how he considers industry and innovation. It was an amazing thing to see that sort of money cut out.

If we roll over to industry development, last year \$19 million was spent in that program. That was slashed down to \$8,700,000 for the 2017-18 budget. What they will say is, 'Oh, we're spending it somewhere else.' Well, we can see where they are taking it from. They are just shuffling the deck chairs, and that is the smoke and mirrors that I talk about. Money has been taken out of the Our Jobs Plan and the Manufacturing Works program, which is a 10-year program. We have reached the fifth year of it and had two reports. The government spent nearly \$100,000 on one of the reports and we are still waiting for the figure on the second report. It is a 10-year program not five years in and they have cut funding to it.

That is where the funding was; they have taken it out, shuffled it over to somewhere else and said, 'Look at our new plan. We've got money here for that.' They are just shuffling the deck chairs, which the Treasurer is very adept at. When the member for Colton talks about not getting any answers and smoke and mirrors, there is a classic example. They are cutting money out of programs: \$52,900,000, which is as good as \$53 million, down to \$33,700,000. Money is just slashed left, right and centre.

Automotive transformation was also fascinating, and we talked about this with the minister as well. We know that Holden of course closes at the end of the year and that there have been programs in place to help transition workers out of Holden. This program has been underspent; budgeted money has been underspent by \$15 million, so the government cannot find the programs they need to put in place to help transition these people. The minister said, 'You know what? People haven't been ready to move. That's why we haven't spent that money, but now is the time to move forward with this.' There is \$15 million in budgeted money that was not spent over the last three years.

When we look at last year's figure, \$19 million was budgeted and \$18 million was spent. That was what was forecast last year. With Holden closing in the next 12 months, that is when you would think there should be an injection of funds into that program. If you look at the automotive program, sub-program 1.2, how much are we going to spend now that Holden is closing? An amount of \$10 million. We are going to slash it in half.

We have underspent by \$15 million over the last three years, and now we are only going to spend \$10 million when last year we spent \$18 million. That is what this Treasurer is doing. He is slashing money out of that program and half the money has gone out of it. Again, \$7.6 million has

come out of the Our Jobs Plan and so on. It is just quite phenomenal that this government wants to have the smoke and mirrors, and they cut money out of programs like that.

Let's look at the value of grants committed under the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program. The target in 2016-17 was \$6.6 million. The result was \$3 million. That is how much was spent. They budgeted \$6.6 million and they spent \$3 million. What is the target on the value of grants committed under the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program for 2017-18? It was \$6.6 million, but they managed to spend only \$3 million. Bearing in mind what the minister said, that this is the time that it is really needed when Holden is about to close, what did they budget for? They budgeted \$1 million—again, a massive cut. Last year's target was \$6.6 million, but this year's target is \$1 million. They amaze you everywhere you turn. It is quite phenomenal.

Again, more money has been cut out of innovation and commercialisation. The estimated spend for last year was \$14,661,000 and the budgeted target for this year is \$13,703,000. Mind you, they do say that the decrease in expenses of \$1.1 million is primarily due to a once-off expenditure in 2016-17 for the establishment of marketing and promotion of the state's innovation strategy—\$800,000. The state does not even have an innovation strategy. They have a statement but no strategy, and that has been pointed out in a number of reports. They have spent \$800,000 on the state's innovation strategy, but it does not even exist. That is quite amazing.

No doubt the Treasurer will use smoke and mirrors to get his way around that; he always does. It is quite phenomenal how he keeps doing it, but South Australians are waking up. Again, as the member for Colton pointed out, if he goes to the pub and asks people, 'How are we going in the state?'—it is a very simple question: how is South Australia going? How are we going when you stack us up against everyone else?—I can tell you that the answer is, 'Poor'. I am not sure what the Treasurer does on weekends. He probably stays home, too afraid to show his face in public, because the answer is very clear and very pointed to him—that South Australia is going very, very poorly.

We also had plenty of questions about science, technology and the information economy and where South Australia is going. Again, there were not a lot of answers, but we will wait with bated breath for when they come back from questions taken on notice. It does take a while. As I said, last year it took more than 12 months for me to get some of those responses. Of course, with an election only a few months away, it will be interesting to see if we do get those answers before that next election.

We had a look at growing small business as well. This centres around the Small Business Commissioner and also the Industry Advocate. A number of questions were raised in this session as well, and a number of questions were also taken on notice in terms of how much money was spent through different grants programs. We hope we do get that information back but, again, only time will tell. One of the things we did notice with the Industry Advocate, though, is that there has been a slight change in role.

The Industry Advocate, of course, is put in place to help South Australian companies with the procurement of government money. In an ideal world the government would be working with these businesses and there would be a great relationship, and whether or not the Industry Advocate would have a lot to do would be questionable. Just facilitating things, helping things go through, making sure everyone is happy could pretty much be the extent of it in an ideal world, but that is not the relationship the government has with business and industry in South Australia, so they have had to put this person in place.

We questioned a bit further regarding the Industry Advocate and whether or not they spent any time overseas, and there were two overseas trips taken by the Industry Advocate. If you read the description on page 88 it quite clearly outlines the direction or objectives of the Industry Advocate. It states:

The Office of the Industry Advocate investigates, monitors and ensures compliance with the South Australian Industry Participation Policy (IPP), investigates complaints about industry participation in government contracts, oversees supplier commitments in industry participation plans and assists small to medium enterprises (SMEs) to participate in government procurement processes.

At no stage does it talk about international relations or anything like that, so why the Industry Advocate would travel overseas is a very perplexing question. We also noted that the FTEs of both

the Industry Advocate and the Small Business Commissioner were rising. When I asked about the number of FTEs going up for the Industry Advocate, they said that they had two more people on board to help with procurement initiatives. Again, one of the questions raised was whether it was because the Industry Advocate has been spending time overseas that we needed more people in that role.

That is a concern because we do not want to add red tape to businesses and we do not want to create situations where businesses are getting bogged down and cannot get on with doing what they have to do—that is, growing their business, growing the economy, creating jobs for South Australians and giving people plenty of opportunities. That is what we want to see from business, and that is where we sit.

As I am running out of time, Deputy Speaker, we will roll over to sport, recreation and racing. I think the minister was not long back in the country when he gave a very long blurb at the start of this one. He read his heart out to chew up as much time as possible. It was interesting that any time you started to get some good traction with some of the questions you were asking the ministers, someone from the other side would ask what is called, in this place, a Dorothy Dixier. That is just a straightforward question with a very straightforward answer that you could probably have got off a website anywhere around, or perhaps a ministerial statement had been done on it in this place once before.

That is a tactic of the government; we understand that. That is the way it all goes and we have to deal with it. Of course the other tactic is at the start, where the minister can make a speech. They are entitled to do that—I am not questioning that—but some of them are excessively long. Also, when you ask a question there are no real bounds to the answer they can give, and a number of times, when the minister was under some sort of pressure, the answers were long and varied. I thought I was going to hear about grandparents and first loves and all that sort of stuff; they were going off on a number of different tangents. Again, that is what ministers do and that is what the member for Colton has come to expect from this place, and if that is what he is happy with then so be it.

We got to sport, recreation and racing and we had a look at that. We know, looking through old budget papers—2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14, those three years, I think, or it might have been three years after; I will have to double-check old budget papers because this is where this stuff gets shuffled away to—that for three years the government underspent its sport, recreation and racing budget by \$15 million or thereabouts, maybe \$13 million to \$15 million, something in that vicinity. I will have to go back over the old budget papers and confirm that; in fact, I might have the exact figures here, if you will bear with me.

This is in the sporting section, and I find it quite fascinating, and it is just a trick out there that the member for Colton would no doubt be aware of. Across a four-year period (I do apologise; I said three)—2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15—the government underspent by nearly \$15 million. That is quite a considerable underspend. They do that and then, lo and behold, we get towards election time and they start throwing plenty of money around and catching up.

In that time period, what has happened, and what has been brought to my attention, is that a lot of sporting clubs and facilities have been left to run down and now the government is playing catch-up. That is disappointing because communities miss out, grassroots sport misses out and so on. That was a line we were keen to pursue with the minister, but he did not want anything to do with it. It was before his time, and that was his cop-out from that line of questioning.

We did see on program 1, recreation, sport and racing, summary expenses, income and FTEs, that the number looks really good, with an increase in total expenses, from \$63,000 to \$77,000, so again it looks as though more money is going in. Last year, other expenses were \$786,000, but this year they are \$18,375,000. We asked the minister why this was. The reason is that there is a deal with Netball SA at what was ETSA Park (now Priceline Stadium) for Netball SA to buy that precinct for a dollar, which would mean, I think the budget papers say, about a \$17.6 million write-down against the budget bottom line.

We asked whether or not Netball SA had taken up that option, and again they did not know. I am led to believe that they will not, so that is going to leave \$18 million sitting in the budget. We are

keen to see what the Treasurer does with that money and where it goes because it could go back towards helping a lot of these clubs that have been struggling with funds and with their facilities right across the state, but mostly in areas where grassroots sport is really important, as it is right across the state.

We cannot forget recreation because not everyone plays competitive sport. I am involved in a number of sporting clubs, but recreation is also important because keeping people active is very good for the health of our state. We did ask the minister a number of questions about the programs: the Sports Vouchers program and the Female Facilities Fund. Coincidentally, all these close in 2018-19, so they all have a cut-off time. The government is turning its back on these programs, and it is interesting that they run them through an election cycle, use them politically to every measure and then walk away from them.

Likewise, Thoroughbred Racing South Australia has had two lots of \$3 million towards their autumn racing carnival, but that is it. After 2018-19, there is no more money going forward for them and it dries up. That is the tactic they use, and they are the sorts of things we do like to expose in estimates, as the Treasurer gets out his smoke and mirrors and tries to weave a whole heap of magic.

If the Treasurer does get out into the suburbs and if he does speak to people and asks the very simple question, 'How do you think South Australia is going?' I can tell you that the answer is, 'Very, very poor.' We need to roll up our sleeves. We have great people in South Australia and we can turn our state around; we on this side of the house know that. It is going to take a lot of hard work. There is a lot of mess that has been made by this government. They really have done very poorly by South Australia. We need to get ourselves off the bottom of the ladder, using a sporting analogy, because South Australia is languishing, but this side will do everything we can to get South Australia up and moving once again.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:49): First off, can I say I am an estimates junkie. I did not beat my record from last year in the number of sessions I was involved in, but shadow ministerial duties have had to come first. I was lucky enough to sit in on the Premier's estimates on Wednesday when we went through the Premier and Cabinet and then went through sitting with the Treasurer in relation to the Treasury and Finance portfolios, especially in relation to the South Australian finance authority, the Motor Accident Commission and a number of other budget lines that were included as part of that.

Interestingly, on questioning the Treasurer—who some would say became increasingly agitated—he became increasingly belligerent, in the way that he does. In fact, you can tell when you are really getting to the Treasurer because he turns up the dial, turns to attack mode and talks not about the record of his government's 15 years in office but tries to somehow malign the opposition, which is a pretty sad and pathetic tactic, especially from someone who pretends that he has the prowess to be across his portfolio. For me, the thing that really stood out, though, was the questioning on the bank tax. In the opening statement, the Treasurer said that South Australian consumers and customers will be protected from this tax.

Admittedly, that is a fundamental misunderstanding of how the system works, but that is fine. We then asked, 'What sort of exposure does the South Australian government have to bank equities?' The answer was \$1½ billion. The next question that logically flows from that is: has the government done any modelling to see whether or not there has been an increase to borrowing costs when SAFA funds need to go back to the market, which they need to do in August? I understand it is about \$2 billion or \$2½ billion or thereabouts that we need to refinance. The answer was, 'No, we haven't done any modelling on whether or not we are going to see an increase in borrowing costs, but we don't expect it to be anything because borrowing costs aren't going to increase.'

We then asked a question about bank equities and the fact that the government is exposed to \$1½ billion worth of bank equities through its portfolio. Then we asked, 'If it's not customers and if it's not going to increase borrowings, then how much less dividend money and what is going to be the net change to the share portfolio of the government's exposure to bank equities?' The answer, again, was none. This is what gets confusing for me because the bank is not a physical thing. It is a corporation that exists on a piece of paper, but it is made up of employees and staff, customers and

shareholders. If customers are not going to pay, borrowers are not going to pay and shareholders are not going to pay, who is going to pay?

The only answer we could get out of the Treasurer was, 'It's going to come out of retained earnings.' In fact, he said it today in parliament again: 'It's going to come out of retained profits.' I genuinely think the Treasurer thinks that there is this bucket of money that exists called 'retained earnings' that just sits there and that he can put his hand in to grab that money but that does not affect any of the other equations in relation to how a corporation operates.

In any company I have ever seen, when they look at what is left over at the end of a financial year, that bucket of money is split up. Some of that money is retained in the company to reinvest in the company; some of it can go to paying off debt and some of it then goes to shareholders by way of a dividend. If you have less money in your retained earnings, the only way you can do that, if you are looking to balance your distributions, is to reduce your dividends so that you can maintain your retained earnings. Presumably, you have worked out how much retained earnings you need in order to reinvest in the business and also whether that will keep the business to a level of liquidity and whether that would be looking at future capital spending.

But you cannot turn around and say retained earnings are a pot of gold. The Treasurer is basically like a leprechaun looking for the end of the rainbow, trying to find this pot of magic money that somehow does not hurt consumers, does not hurt borrowers and does not hurt shareholders: it only hurts the bank. It is such a fundamental misunderstanding of how a corporation works and how our economy works, it really does make me worry for broader South Australia.

We moved on then to the afternoon and estimates that I attended in relation to Consumer and Business Services, where we found out that Mr Robert Chappell, essentially, was paid from September of last year through to May of this year. The government could not tell us how much he was paid out.

In fact, the Attorney-General was extremely coy about what information he could tell us in relation to Mr Chappell and whether or not he had been referred to police. He certainly told us that he had sought legal advice in relation to Mr Chappell but was not able to provide any further details. I think there is still more to come on that case. We then talked about liquor licensing, the potential restructuring of the Independent Gambling Authority and a number of other issues in relation to declared public precincts, which was an interesting discussion and probably quite worthwhile.

On Thursday, I had the 'pleasure' of leading estimates questions on the youth department in South Australia. We were questioning the member for Ramsay, who was quite interesting. We were referring to a budget line, and under that referred to a youTHRIVE youth strategy, but there was spending contained in that strategy that the minister refused to talk about because, even though it was within her portfolio, it was not in the budget line that we were talking about, even though the spending came under a plan that was talked about in the budget line that we were referring to.

The smile that was on her face suggested to me that she was much more excited about hiding information from South Australia than actually providing information to South Australia. These questions, I might add, were fairly benign, but she seemed to take great joy in hiding how the government is spending taxpayers' dollars from South Australians. We had a separate short session, again with Zoe Bettison, on a number of other issues as well.

Turning to Friday, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas and I sat opposite each other for the vast majority of the day. We started off with Police. Minister Malinauskas was at pains to move questioning as far away as he could from the Coroner's damning report into the Marksman incident and the suicides that happened there. He was ably protected by the Chair in that regard. Suffice to say that this issue also has a long way to run.

We then moved on to questions about delays within the e-crimes branch. In fact, Commissioner Stevens admitted that, quite regularly, cases are delayed in the court, and the judges' comments on the cases have been delayed, as a direct result of the e-crimes branch of South Australia Police not being able to cope. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ELECTORAL (LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VOTING) (VOTER CHOICE) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

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

No. 1. Clause 1, page 2, line 4—Delete '(Voter Choice' and substitute 'and Other Measures'

No. 2. New clause, page 3, after line 19—Insert:

5A—Amendment of section 57—Deposit to be forfeited in certain cases

Section 57(1)(c)—delete '4 per cent' and substitute '2 per cent'

No. 3. Clause 10, page 4, line 35 [clause 10(6)]—Delete subclause (6) and substitute:

(6) Section 66(4)—delete 'the electoral material referred to in subsection (1) is arranged' and substitute 'material is displayed in a poster or posters prepared under this section'

No. 4. Clause 11, page 5, line 9—Delete '76(1)(b)—delete paragraph (b)' and substitute:

76(1)(a) and (b)—delete paragraphs (a) and (b)

No. 5. Clause 11, page 5, after line 9—Insert:

(a) by placing the number 1 in the square printed opposite the name of the candidate for whom he or she votes as his or her first preference and consecutive numbers in the squares printed opposite the names of other candidates so as to indicate the order of preference for not less than 12 candidates in total (or, if there are 12 or fewer candidates in the election, so as to indicate the order of preference for all remaining candidates); or

No. 6. Clause 11, page 5, line 12 [clause 11, inserted paragraph (b)]—After 'preference' insert:

and consecutive numbers in other group voting squares so as to indicate the order of preference for not less than 6 groups of candidates in total (or, if there are 6 or fewer group voting squares on the ballot paper, so as to indicate the order of preference for all remaining groups of candidates)

No. 7. New clause, page 5, after line 12—Insert:

11A—Amendment of section 84B—Applying provisions of Act to elector using electronic assisted voting

Section 84B(1)(b)—delete 'satisfy the requirements of section 76' and substitute:

not be an informal ballot paper

No. 8. Clause 12, page 5, lines 16 to 28 [clause 12, inserted subsections (2) and (3)]—Delete inserted subsections (2) and (3) and substitute:

(2) If 1 or more numbers, that are not disregarded under section 94(4d), are placed in group voting squares on a ballot paper in relation to groups of candidates (each group being a *preferenced group*), the ballot paper is taken to have been marked as if—

(a) each candidate in a preferred group was given a different number starting from 1; and

(b) candidates in a preferred group were numbered consecutively starting with the candidate whose name on the ballot paper is at the top of the group to the candidate whose name is at the bottom; and

(c) the order in which candidates in different preferred groups are numbered is worked out by reference to the order in which the groups were numbered on the ballot paper, starting with the group marked 1; and

(d) when all the candidates in a preferred group have been numbered, the candidate whose name is at the top of the next preferred group is given the next consecutive number.

No. 9. Clause 12, page 5, lines 29 to 31 [clause 12, inserted subsection (4)]—

Delete 'a ballot paper in accordance with subsection (2) and also indicates preferences for individual candidates (whether or not the voter also places other numbers in other group voting squares)' and substitute:

1 or more group voting squares in accordance with subsection (2) but also indicates preferences for individual candidates

No. 10. Clause 12, page 5, line 34 [clause 12, inserted subsection (4)(a)]—Delete ' , if it stood alone, constitute a valid' and substitute 'not, if it stood alone, constitute an informal'

No. 11. Clause 12, page 5, line 39 [clause 12, inserted subsection (4)(b)]—Delete 'not, if it stood alone, constitute a valid' and substitute ' , if it stood alone, constitute an informal'

No. 12. Clause 12, page 5, line 40 [clause 12, inserted subsection (4)(b)]—After 'recorded their vote' insert:
by the marking of the group voting square or squares

No. 13. Clause 12, page 6, lines 1 to 15 [clause 12, inserted subsections (5) and (6)]—Delete inserted subsections (5) and (6)

No. 14. Clause 13, page 6, lines 28 and 29 [clause 13(1), inserted paragraph (b)(ii)(B)]—Delete subsubparagraph (B) and substitute:

(B) the order of the voter's preference for groups of candidates in accordance with section 76(1)(b); or

No. 15. Clause 13, page 6, after line 29—After subclause (1) insert:

(1a) Section 94(3)—after 'ballot paper' (first occurring) insert:
for a House of Assembly election

No. 16. After 'delete subsection (4a)' insert:

and substitute:

(4a) A ballot paper for a Legislative Council election where there are more than 6 candidates is not informal under subsection (1)(b)(ii)(A) if the voter has placed consecutive numbers (starting from the number '1') in the squares printed opposite the names of at least 6 candidates in total.

(4b) For the purposes of this Act, the following numbers placed in a square printed opposite the name of a candidate on a ballot paper for a Legislative Council election are to be disregarded:

(a) numbers that are repeated and any higher numbers;

(b) if a number is missed—any numbers that are higher than the missing number.

No. 17. Clause 13, page 6, after line 34—Insert:

(5) Section 94—before subsection (5) insert:

(4c) A ballot paper for a Legislative Council election is not informal under subsection (1)(b)(ii)(B) if the voter has placed the number '1' in a group voting square, or has placed the number '1' and one or more higher numbers in group voting squares, on the ballot paper.

(4d) For the purposes of this Act, the following numbers placed in a group voting square on a ballot paper for a Legislative Council election are to be disregarded:

(a) numbers that are repeated and any higher numbers;

(b) if a number is missed—any numbers that are higher than the missing number.

No. 18. Clause 14, page 7, lines 1 and 2 [clause 14(3)]—Delete subclause (3)

No. 19. Clause 14, page 7, lines 10 and 11 [clause 14(6)]—Delete subclause (6)

No. 20. Clause 14, page 7, lines 23 to 39 [clause 14(11)]—Delete subclause (11) and substitute:

(11) Section 95(15)—after 'last vacancy' insert:
for which 2 continuing candidates remain

(11a) Section 95(16)—delete 'the last vacancy' and substitute:
a vacancy referred to in subsection (15)

(11b) Section 95(17)—after 'are elected' insert:

(regardless of whether those candidates have received a number of votes equal to or greater than the quota)

No. 21. New clause, page 8, after line 4—Insert:

16—Amendment of section 130Q—Payment not to be made or to be reduced in certain circumstances

(1) Section 130Q(1)(a)—delete 'at least 4% of the total primary vote; or' and substitute:

—

(i) in the case of a candidate in a Legislative Council election—at least 2% of the total primary vote; or

(ii) in the case of a candidate in a House of Assembly election—at least 4% of the total primary vote; or

(2) Section 130Q(2)(a)—delete '4%' and substitute '2%'

No. 22. New clauses, page 8, after line 4—After clause 15 insert:

17—Repeal of section 130ZU

Section 130ZU—delete the section

18—Insertion of section 130ZZH

After section 130ZZG insert:

130ZZH—Regulations

(1) The regulations may require greater detail to be provided in returns than is otherwise required by this Part.

(2) Without limiting subsection (1), the regulations may—

(a) require that a return under Division 7 include additional information relating to persons making gifts, loans or bequests; or

(b) require that the total amounts referred to in section 130ZN be broken down in the way specified in the regulations.

(3) The regulations may reduce the amount of information to be provided in returns under section 130ZO.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Thursday 3 August 2017 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY**

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (15 November 2016).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries): I have been advised:

The department has held discussions with the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) to keep it informed of the unfolding national public health consensus associated with exposure to per-fluorinated alkyl substances.

The Department of Defence meets with the EPA monthly to provide updates on its Edinburgh assessment program. Defence has also held two community meetings and provides relevant updates on its website. The EPA has kept SA Health informed of the Edinburgh investigations.

The risk posed to residents surrounding Edinburgh Air Force base and Adelaide Airport from exposure to per-fluorinated alkyl substances is low and consistent with the general community in Australia.

The Environment Protection Authority advises that it has not undertaken any tests for per-fluorinated alkyl substances, perfluorooctane sulfonate perfluorooctanic acid contamination in runoff or groundwater around the Adelaide Airport.

The department recommends that all owners of bores have their water tested to ascertain fitness for purpose and, if contaminated with per-fluorinated alkyl substances, it not be used for drinking, showering and topping of swimming pools, but rather reticulated mains water be used for these purposes.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (11 April 2017).

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

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) has put significant steps in place to ensure all eligible children in state care can and do apply for the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS).

As stated in A Fresh Start, recommendation 223 may not be fully achieved by 31 March 2017:

The Department for Child Protection will work towards ensuring that every child in care, who is potentially eligible for NDIS, applies to participate by 31 March 2017. However, given the high number of children in care who have a disability, and the potentially high number of children in care who have not yet been assessed or diagnosed, this recommendation may not be fully achieved by 31 March 2017. The Department for Child Protection is committed to the ongoing work required to ensure all children eligible for NDIS, access services efficiently.

DCP has analysed client data to identify those children potentially eligible for the NDIS and provided contact information for the National Disability Insurance Agency (NDIA) to initiate the application process. Training has been delivered to DCP staff on the NDIS, eligibility and application processes.

DCP offices continue to progress access requests for all new and existing children in care, and will continue to work with the National Disability Insurance Agency and DCSI to transition children on to the scheme.

Already more children in care have an NDIS plan than were clients under the state disability system.

The specialist disability workers approved under recommendation 226 will bolster the work to ensure every child in care who is potentially eligible, applies to participate in the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

Additionally, a pilot project commenced on 1 May 2017 between two DCP offices and Anglicare SA. This pilot established an Anglicare SA NDIS Customer Advocate to assist these DCP offices in their interactions with the NDIS for children in care. The pilot will test the effectiveness of this partnership over a three month period.

ROYAL ADELAIDE CLUB

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (21 June 2017).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet provided \$300,000 excluding GST in each of the 2015-16 and 2016-17 financial years to the proponents of the Royal Adelaide Club to sponsor the event.

*Estimates Replies***TAILEM BEND MOTORSPORT PARK**

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): The Minister for Tourism has advised:

The state government agreed to provide \$7.5 million funding to the Peregrine Corporation to facilitate The Taillem Bend Motor Sport Park project. Any questions relating to operational matters should be directed to the Peregrine Corporation.

AUTOMOTIVE TRANSFORMATION TASKFORCE

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

1. To date, around 120 jobs will be retained in supply chain firms as a result of program funding provided for their diversification efforts under the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program.

The Automotive Workers in Transition Program is a voluntary career and transition support program which provides case management to workers to pursue new career options. No modelling has been undertaken to predict future job growth from this program.

2. The \$10 million is divided between the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program and the Automotive Workers in Transition Program. The funds are not exhausted due to the demand driven nature of these programs. Greater uptake is expected closer to GM Holden's closure.

SALES, GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

1. Income for the sale of goods and services predominantly relates to corporate income from the hire of facilities. These corporate overheads have been allocated across the agency according to program expenditure. Variations in overhead allocations between financial years occur due to movements in the overall expenditure for programs, for example a program that has a reduction in expenditure between years will receive a lower allocation of overheads and vice versa.

2. Actuals results for the 2015-16 financial year will be available in the 2016-17 Agency Statement.

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been advised:

Yes, there is a government policy in place regarding no performance bonuses for government employees.

ENTERPRISE BARGAINING AGREEMENT

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been advised:

The relevant union organisations in regard to the Plumbing, Metal and Building Trades, Ambulance, Nurses and Midwives, Visiting Medical Specialists, Rail Commissioner (Maintenance), Rail Commissioner (Rail Operations and Infrastructure) Agreements and Adelaide Venue Management have been advised that as negotiations had commenced prior to the 2016/17 state budget for these agreements the 2.5% limit on future wage growth would apply.

Whilst the SA Ambulance Service Agreement 2011 nominally expired on 3 February 2015 it remains in force, pursuant to section 83 of the *Fair Work Act 1994*, until it is superseded by a new agreement or rescinded.

JOBS4YOUTH PROGRAM

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been advised:

Year	Allocation	Placements	Graduated
2014	200	188	140
2015	200 + shortfall from 2014	178	80

The allocation for each year of the program is 200. Over four years of the program the global allocation is 800. Currently in the third round of the program. The global target for the end of 2016 is 600. As of 18 October 2016, 526 placements have been achieved, with a further 74 to be achieved this calendar year.

It should be noted that some participants in the 2015 round resigned, were terminated or secured contract or ongoing employment prior to the completion of their traineeship and therefore were ineligible for graduation.

DEPARTMENTAL STAFF

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been advised:

Service SA's increase of 1.2 FTE for the forthcoming year (compared to 2015-2016) is due to the transfer of JobsSA from the Office for the Public Sector.

As the customer facing arm of the South Australian government, over 85 per cent of Service SA staff are directly engaged in providing frontline services to the South Australian public.

The work Service SA performs in registration and licencing on behalf of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) is just one aspect of its business. The full suite of services provided by Service SA includes:

- 20 Customer Service Centres across the state—staffed by around 245 FTE serving an average of 6,000 customers per day on behalf of DPTI, South Australia Police, SafeWork SA, Consumer and Business Service, Revenue SA, Fines Enforcement, the Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA, Housing SA, and SA Water. In addition to registration and licencing, the primary services provided on behalf of these agencies include payment and application processing, and verification of identity.
- A Virtual Contact Centre network performs similar functions and is staffed by 40 FTE that receives and average of 3,300 calls per day.
- SA.GOV.AU—the whole-of-government website service that receives almost 25,000 visitors per day.
- Web, print and data solutions—incorporating Government Publishing and leading a scan-to-data initiative to benefit the whole-of-government and deliver on customers' expectations of a digital by default public service.
- The whole-of-government switchboard—connecting an average of 245 customers per day to the right agency to assist with their needs.

SA HEALTH

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been advised:

The rollout of the e-Procurement Solution in SA Health was delayed so that it could be implemented at the same time as the new Oracle Finance and Procurement System. The costs to government would have been significantly higher had these two projects been progressed separately.

SHARED SERVICES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been advised:

Shared Services provide full services to the following nine South Australian Government Agencies:

- Attorney-General's Department
- Department for Communities and Social Inclusion
- Department for Correctional Services
- Department for Education and Child Development

- Department of Primary Industries and Regions
- Department of State Development
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Department of Treasury and Finance; and
- South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission.

Shared Services does not provide services for the following two Agencies:

- Courts Administration Authority; and
- SA Water.

The table below, reflects services provided by Shared Services SA.

Service/Agency		Aud Gen	Defence SA	DEWNR	DPTI	El.com SA	EPA	Funds SA	Green Ind SA	Parliament SA	Renewal SA	SA Health	5 x Health Networks	SA Amb	SACA	SAPol	SAHT	SATC	TAFE SA	
Payroll	Pay	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
AR	Inv	N	F	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F	F	N	F	N	F	F	F
Financial Services	Acctng	N	F	F	F	N	F	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	N	N	N	F
	Tax	N	F	F	F	N	F	N	F	N	F	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	F
	F Asset	N	N	F	N	N	F	N	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	F
AP	AP	N	F	F	F	N	F	N	F	F	N	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F
	P Card	N	F	F	N	N	F	N	F	N	N	N		N	N	N	F	F	F	F
System Support	HRMS	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	N	P	F	N	F
	Fin	N	F	F	F	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	F	F	N	N	F
	Proc	N	F	F	F	N	F	N	F	N	N	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	F

Full Implementation	F
Partial	P
Nil	N

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to various members (28 July 2016) (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors within Shared Services SA, Service SA and Office for the Public Sector:

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount	End Date
DPC	PROGRAM MANAGER	ASO803	Retention 15%	\$16,539	11/12/2015
DPC	PROJECT MANAGER CHRIS21	ASO803	Attraction \$	\$10,757	3/3/2016
DPC	SAGSSA PRINCIPAL CONTRACT MNGR	ASO803	Retention 30%	\$33,077	31/7/2017

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount	End Date
DPC	PROGRAM MANAGER	ASO803	Retention 15%	\$16,539	11/12/2015
DPC	PROJECT MANAGER CHRIS21	ASO803	Attraction \$	\$10,757	3/3/2016
DPC	SAGSSA PRINCIPAL CONTRACT MNGR	ASO803	Retention 30%	\$33,077	31/7/2017
DPC	MANAGER RETURN TO WORK SVCS	MAS301	Retention allowance 10%	\$11,226	

Note: Two retention allowances expired and were not renewed in 2015-16.

OFFICE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): The property is owned by the Motor Accident Commission but is currently for sale.

OFFICE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): 5 years.

STATE GOVERNMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS DISPUTES

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): I advise:

Type of cases	No of cases
Small Business Issues	166
Local Government	3
State Government	13
Other	97
Total	279