

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 14 May 2015

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:17 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Report, 2013-14

Ministerial Statement

STATE GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the new cost-of-living concession made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier (Hon. Jay Weatherill.)

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:19): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the appointment of the new Chair of the South Australian Tourism Commission Board made in the other place by my colleague the Minister for Tourism.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Question Time

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Oh, come on! What's a few minutes between friends?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What? You don't like things done properly, David? Clearly not.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Well, you ought to talk about things being done properly.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: You're scared of question time.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: He is scared. 'Chicken Little', they call him. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Automotive Transformation a question about automotive transformation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: As part of the state government's Our Jobs Plan, it identified 33 direct suppliers to General Motors Holden and some 700 indirect suppliers that would be impacted by the pending exit of General Motors Holden by 2017. The state government, along with successive

federal Labor and Liberal governments, has sought to assist these component suppliers in making adjustments post the GMH environment.

One program being funded and administered by the state government is the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, which provides \$11.65 million in funding to assist suppliers to diversify beyond the General Motors Holden supply chains. While we acknowledge the role played by everybody in supporting businesses and making this adjustment, I note the state government has invested a great deal of both taxpayers' money and energy in attacking the federal government over its support for this diversification process. My questions—

The Hon. G.E. Gago: Shame on you!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —are not to you. My questions are to—

The Hon. G.E. Gago: Shame on you!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable opposition leader has the floor. Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Chuck her out! She should know better.

The PRESIDENT: Continue.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: My questions to the Minister for Automotive Transformation are:

1. Of the 33 direct suppliers and 700 indirect suppliers identified, how many has the state government engaged with and provided direct support to?
2. What leadership has the government shown in attracting private investment in this sector to benefit these businesses and their employees?
3. Will the government redirect the \$1.6 million that is spent on political advertising campaigns towards providing a direct benefit to those who need it most?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister has the floor. Order! The honourable minister.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the minister sit down? Sit down, please. Order! Totally unacceptable. I must say, it is more disconcerting when I get the rabble from the government side of the chamber. The honourable minister has the floor.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable minister.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:22): I thank the honourable member for his question and interest in this matter. As the honourable member points out, there are great challenges facing the companies that have been engaged in the automotive sector. He specifically asks about tier 1 companies and he correctly points out that there are 33 tier 1 companies, that is, companies which supply things directly to Holden cars in South Australia. There are estimated to be some 700 tier 2 and 3 companies, and they range from supplying parts to go into the tier 1 companies to supplying other sorts of services that people in the automotive industry rely on.

I am advised that our automotive transformation task force has visited every single one of the tier 1 companies to understand what their business is, what they are looking to do immediately and what capacity they have to diversify post the closure of Holden. As the honourable member points out, there are programs the state government has put in place for our tier 1 and tier 2 and 3 companies to seek advice to put into place things that may help them diversify post the closure of Holden at the end of 2017.

Some companies have been successful and have been accessing some of the support the state government offers and, to a smaller relative extent, federal government contributions. Adelaide Tooling is one of those that I visited recently which, if my memory serves me correctly, with a state

government grant to help diversify, is now making parts to support cabling in the mining industry. The government is very conscious of the effect this will have on industry, particularly in northern Adelaide, and will continue to work with companies to see how they can diversify and see what companies can continue on post the closure of Holden.

INNES NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:24): I seek leave to make an explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation on the subject of the Innes National Park.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: A constituent visited the Goyder electorate office recently and reported to them the condition of the Innes National Park, particularly in relation to the ticketing, which is inefficient and turning visitors away. There is one option to go to Minlaton or Port Vincent to purchase a park pass.

Her own experience two weeks ago was that it took her 20 minutes to operate the machine within Innes, and she also came across some very upset visitors when she was there. Apparently, if you drive past the visitors centre and go to the place where you used to pay, it's only to realise that it's no longer there, and you apparently can't get back to the visitor information centre. You have to walk through the scrub, and it's all rather confusing. My questions for the minister are:

1. Is he aware that there are continuing problems with visitor access and passes to the Innes National Park?
2. Is he able to provide visitor numbers to the park over the period since the electronic ticketing has been required and how this compares to the same period in the previous financial year?
3. Does he acknowledge that the expectation of planned visits with electronic payment requirements has resulted in casual visitors just giving up as a result of problems with the new arrangements?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. She is quite right: the department has put a new online booking system in place to improve visitor experience. This system is being closely monitored to ensure that it is working effectively. I am advised the department has received positive feedback from visitors on the new online booking system. The system has proven benefits for park users, demonstrated recently by interstate and overseas park agencies who use similar booking methods.

The new system has been put in place to improve the distribution of park information and booking services. It's expected to be more modern, efficient and is the result of statewide advances in national park tourism and visitor management. It's designed to improve visitor access to national park tourism as well as the management of visitors.

This investment ensures our national parks align with broader tourism booking systems. The department has also implemented the system in response to feedback from visitors who expect the provision of a modern technological service. The innovation of an online booking system enables local, national and international access to park entry, camping and heritage accommodation bookings and information on national parks, all from a home computer or a smart device.

Bookings can be made up to a year in advance. A computer enabling public access to the booking facility and national parks website is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week at the visitor information centre within Innes National Park. The visitor information centre will maintain its key function as a distribution point for national park information via this new system.

I appreciate that the keyboard and inbuilt mouse for this computer takes a little longer to navigate. It certainly would for me, I expect. I am told the keyboard was specifically purchased for its strength and durability, and the keyboard shield design also makes theft and vandalism less likely. I

understand the online booking system encountered a number of technical issues during the first two months of the pilot; however, I am advised that these issues have now been resolved.

The system was in place for the long weekends in October 2014 and Easter 2015. I am told there has been an excellent uptake of the online booking system. For the first time in many years, campgrounds in Innes National Park were fully booked for the Easter period and this was all done, I am told, via the online system. I am also told that feedback from visitors was incredibly positive, with people especially grateful that they could book a site online and know that it would be there for them on arrival, thus cutting out the need to rush to get to a site before campgrounds filled up.

DEWNR trialed a mobile takeaway food van in Innes National Park over the Easter holidays, and I understand that this was also very well received by visitors. The department is currently assessing an expression of interest for a commercial lease of the Innes National Park visitor information centre and heritage accommodation. Once the lease is finalised, there will be opportunities for the lessee to operate as a booking agent and take cash payments for entry permits.

In the interim, cash and other payment for entry into Innes National Park can be made at the Yorke Peninsula visitor information centre located at Minlaton en route to Innes from Adelaide. Bookings can also be made on the way to Mount Remarkable National Park at the Natural Resources Centre in Clare. Further information on the booking agents can be found at www.parks.sa.gov.au. Park visitors have been informed of these interim arrangements via email, Facebook, the National Parks SA website and through local media.

The online booking system was rolled out to parks in the South-East of the state in February 2015 on the strength of its performance in the Innes and Mount Remarkable national parks. Innes National Park is an iconic park, and this government is committed to ensuring that the community and visitors from abroad can continue to enjoy this very special place.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, Hon. Ms Lensink.

INNES NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:29): For those visitors to Innes National Park who have not found it an 'incredibly positive' experience, is there a telephone number that they can contact so that they can give DEWNR some negative feedback about the new system?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:29): Mr President, we are always happy to receive feedback when it is constructive, positive, and will help us improve our services. They can find that number through the sa.gov.au website.

APY LANDS, CHILD SAFETY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation in relation to the safety of children on the APY lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In November 2013, the former minister for education and child development tabled the fifth and final annual report on the implementation of the recommendations of the 2008 Commission of Inquiry into child abuse on the APY lands. In that report, the minister acknowledged that the 'complex issues surrounding the prevalence and prevention of child abuse on the APY lands' required a 'long-term commitment from the government', and highlighted the role that the APY Lands Steering Committee would henceforth play in relation to 'the safety of children on the APY lands'.

A year after that final report was released, Uniting Communities (an agency of the Uniting Church in Australia) asked, by way of letter, that the Minister for Education and Child Development give them an update on the work of the APY Lands Steering Committee in relation to the safety of APY children. In a reply dated 12 March 2015, the Chief Executive of the Department for Education and Child Development (Mr Tony Harrison), having noted that the steering committee is co-chaired by the Department of State Development and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, advised

Uniting Communities that the steering committee had 'met twice in 2014' but that 'child safety did not form part of the agenda' of either of those meetings.

I am advised that an officer of the Department of State Development co-chairs the APY Lands Steering Committee, in partnership with a representative from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. My questions to the minister are:

1. Which department of State Development officer co-chairs the APY Lands Steering Committee?
2. Given that the steering committee apparently has only met twice since the final annual progress report was released, and child safety was not on its agenda at those meetings, what has the government done to monitor the ongoing implementation of the Commission of Inquiry's recommendations over the last year and a half?
3. What steps will the minister take to ensure that the steering committee plays a more active role in addressing the implementation of child protection matters on the APY lands?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in matters concerning the APY lands. I do not have a list with me of which individuals sit on which committees, but I will certainly take that on notice and bring back an answer. In relation to matters to do with child safety, I will refer those questions to the Minister for Education and Child Development and bring back a reply.

APY LANDS, CHILD SAFETY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:32): Supplementary: could I ask that the minister might take my second question on notice as well? The reason why I would suggest to him that it is not an appropriate matter to refer is that I would stress again that the committee is chaired by one of the—it's not called AARD anymore, is it? I think they dropped the 'D'—

The Hon. T.A. Franks: It's the AAR.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It's the AAR. My understanding is that the committee is chaired by the AAR, so his department has responsibility for the steering committee, whilst the other minister is responsible for child protection.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:33): I am more than happy to take that on notice and see if it is appropriate for me to bring back a response, or bring back a reply from the other minister.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Business Services and Consumers a question about customer services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Consumer and Business Services (CBS) provides a diverse range of services to support the everyday activities of the South Australian community. Can the minister tell the house what CBS is doing to improve accessibility of services and information?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. We all know that prevention is better than the cure; however, it is almost inevitable that, at some stage, consumers will need advice about buying, hiring or leasing goods or services in South Australia.

All consumers are entitled to a fair deal and should expect reasonable satisfaction under the Australian Consumer Law (the ACL) and the Fair Trading Act 1987. Everything a consumer buys must last or remain in good order for a reasonable amount of time. In fact, some goods also have a

written warranty for a specified period. Even with these protections, there are times when consumers need advice about their rights and obligations and those of the trader.

CBS now offers a web chat service that offers a simple to use web interface that will allow consumers to communicate in real time with the CBS customer service centre team and receive prompt responses to their questions. With more and more customers switching online and using various devices to do so, communication with customers should no longer be limited to traditional methods.

Until now, online customers seeking information that is in addition to what can be found on the CBS website have only had the option to contact CBS either by telephone or visiting the customer service centre, or by using email and having to wait for a response. CBS have identified that a live help service will provide businesses and consumers with a quick and easy way to get information needed to assist them with their consumer issue.

I am sure that members have experienced the frustration of waiting endlessly on the phone or waiting for an email response when they want to access assistance in a timely way. A web chat is a type of customer interaction that is gaining popularity amongst customer service organisations globally. Unlike inquiries received face-to-face or over the phone, web chat customer service representatives will now be able to respond to several customer online inquiries simultaneously, enabling more inquiries to be dealt with overall.

The web chat appears as a pop-up window if the customer requests it while using the CBS website. It will not require customers to install specialised chat software, as all customers will need is a web browser. A transcript of the web chat is emailed to the consumer after the chat to ensure a simple process for any CBS representative to follow up, as well as ensuring that the customer has a record of all the information including websites that they may have been referred to.

Importantly, the web chat will also be of benefit to people who may experience difficulties communicating over the phone, such as those with hearing impairment, as they can now avoid the requirement of having to use often expensive support such as the National Relay Service.

The new feature will initially be offered on the website between nine to five from Monday to Friday. It is anticipated that, once established, the web chat function could be expanded to a range of CBS functions in line with the digital design principles, and these could include tenancy and things like fair trading advocacy.

ABORIGINAL MUSIC STUDIES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills questions on the topic of the Centre for Aboriginal Studies in Music at the Elder Conservatorium.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I have recently been made aware of a memorandum that has been sent from Professor Jennie Shaw, the Executive Dean of the Faculty of Arts, to all academic staff at the Elder Conservatorium of Music and cc'd to many others, dated 6 May, which states in part:

As stated in my email dated 20 April 2015 titled Notice to Staff of a Draft Change Proposal I outlined the catalysts for proposed organisational change to the Elder Conservatorium of Music as it has:

'...not been able to meet its allocated budget in recent years. There is now added pressure with the State Government's removal of VET funding effective from the commencement of 2015 which has resulted in the cessation of the VET program, as well as the Diploma courses no longer being viable in terms of both costs, resourcing and insufficient student numbers...'

It goes on to say:

It is no longer feasible for the university to offer the current stand alone Diploma Programs from 2016. The programs not being offered in 2016 are the Diploma in Aboriginal Studies in Music, Diploma in Instrumental Music, Advanced Diploma in Aboriginal Studies and Music, and the Foundation Year Program. Current students will be given the opportunity to complete their studies within candidature times.

The VET funded positions will be disestablished from approximately 1 July 2015 as the VET program within the Conservatorium is no longer available due to State Government funding ceasing from 31 December 2014.

It continues:

The centre's three stand-alone programs will no longer be offered from 2016.

It summarises that:

There will be job losses as a result of the proposed changes to the removal of VET funding and the cessation of diploma programs.

It also states that:

There will be a reduction in the number of staff within CASM due to the cessation of the three programs.

It goes on to say that indeed this will definitely see the loss of staff. My questions to the minister are:

1. What communications or representations have been made to or by the minister with the university with regard to these changes?

2. Did these communications, if any, include consideration of restoring the VET funding that was withdrawn from the end of 2014 and, if so, why was that course of action not taken?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions. Indeed, I think in this place some time ago there were questions around the Elder Conservatorium and funding in relation to that. I do not have the details in front of me but if I recall they received some base VET funding, and they had for some time received additional interim funding. My understanding, if I recall correctly, was that it was to enable them to design and develop a business case for the ongoing future of that particular course. My understanding is that they were unable to do that and the interim funding came to an end.

However, to the best of my knowledge, they are still receiving that core VET funding. That is the only information that I can recall at this point in time. I am happy to look further into the matter and bring back what information I can. Basically, training and education providers determine the level of demand for a particular course and curriculum, and they develop a business case for that and determine whether it is viable or not for them to continue, and it sounds as if this is what has occurred. As I said, I do not have any details in front of me but I am happy to take that away and bring back whatever information I can.

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Industrial Relations questions about work health and safety management plans.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Housing Industry Association, on behalf of its members, has contacted both the government and the opposition, as we understand it, in relation to changes to construction management plan arrangements in a number of other jurisdictions and the potential for mirror changes here in South Australia. Under the current national harmonisation model, a construction management plan is required for any construction project which exceeds \$250,000. We are advised that this particular level was set some seven years ago when the national harmonisation model process first commenced.

There have been two recent reviews, both a federal review of work health safety legislation and a state review, and we are advised that in both the reviewers have recommended that that particular limit be changed to reflect current day project costs. Prior to any national harmonisation agreement we are advised that in Queensland and in Victoria already a change has occurred, where the \$250,000 level has been increased to a level of approximately \$420,000.

I am further advised that representatives of SafeWork SA have not been actively opposing this particular proposition. I understand they even supported it in their submission to the national

review but that their preferred course of action is to wait for some time until it is implemented through the national harmonisation scheme. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister accept that house builders in South Australia are at a competitive disadvantage compared to house builders in Queensland and Victoria as a result of the changes in those jurisdictions compared to the lack of change in South Australia?
2. Is the minister prepared to take action to implement the change as recommended by these reviews and supported by the HIA in the near future without waiting for the results of the processes of the national harmonisation scheme?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:45): I thank the member for his questions. I will refer them to the Minister for Industrial Relations in another place and bring back a response.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Automotive Transformation. Minister, will you inform the chamber how the federal budget will affect the South Australian automotive industry?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his ongoing interest in these matters. Support for the auto industry has been bipartisan for decades. Under the previous federal Labor government, there was a commitment from Holden to continue manufacturing cars in Australia and a commitment from governments to continue to support this manufacturing.

The notion that governments in Australia have been too generous in their support of the auto industry is, quite frankly, a lie—it is a big fat lie peddled by many Liberals. Australia is one of only 13 countries in the world that has the design, engineering and technical capabilities to develop a motor vehicle from concept to market. To maintain this capability, all car manufacturing countries have significant government assistance. Based on figures in 2011, in Australia direct budgetary support for the auto industry was estimated at \$US18 per capita per year. The corresponding figures in other countries are: \$28 per capita per year in the UK; \$90 in Germany; \$96 in Canada; \$147 in France; \$265 in the US; and \$334 in Sweden.

Australian government assistance for car manufacturing is relatively modest compared with these countries, yet there are those who think that even this modest level of support was too much. I can imagine that there are generations of federal Treasury officials who have secret plans to make savings by cutting this relatively modest support—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: Paul Keating.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —to the auto industry, no matter how much it wrecked local economies and people's lives. There is an injection saying 'Paul Keating'. That is complete nonsense; the Labor government has consistently supported the auto industry. I can imagine that Treasury officials have been waiting for a federal treasurer just dopey enough to go along with their plan. Then in December 2013, while the Prime Minister wasn't in parliament, the dopey Treasurer took his chance. It is not clear whether the Treasurer was just being opportunist in the Prime Minister's absence or whether this was a premeditated attack—

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Point of order: the minister has reflected on a minister of the commonwealth government in language that I think is unparliamentary, and I ask you, Mr President, to get him to reflect on that.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, when you refer to a minister from another house or another parliament, refer to them with respect.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The widely acknowledged less than able federal Treasurer took his chance. It is not clear whether, when he took his chance, he was being opportunist or whether it was a premeditated attack that the Prime Minister wasn't around for. In any event, the Treasurer launched an extraordinary question time attack on GM Holden, effectively goading them to close and leave

Australia. The Treasurer said that it was time for Holden to come clean, to be fair dinkum with the Australian people. 'You are either here or you're not,' the Treasurer carelessly quipped. Holden, the very next day, announced that it would be ending its manufacturing business in Australia. The Liberals don't care. They have a 'live and let die' attitude to one of this state's most important industries.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Hon. David Ridgway interjects even more. After earlier having a mildly insightful question about the auto industry, he is determined to prove his ignorance by mindless interjections. Notwithstanding—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down for a second. Standing order 193—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Standing order 193 states:

The use of objectionable or offensive words shall be considered highly disorderly; and no injurious reflections shall be permitted upon the Governor or the Parliament of this State, or of the Commonwealth, or any Member thereof, nor upon any of the Judges...

So, please treat standing order 193 with respect, and go about your business.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank you, Mr President, for your always wise guidance in these matters. Notwithstanding the fact that, had we had a federal Labor government we would not be staring down the barrel of the closure of the auto industry, we are where we are and we have to face those realities.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Yes, we would.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Another interjection that 'yes, we would'. The auto industry had relatively modest support through a written agreement with the former federal Labor government that this Liberal government did not honour. We are where we are.

On 10 March this year I welcomed the federal government's announcement not to cut the \$900 million that they were planning to cut from the automotive transformation scheme. These funds were desperately needed to help companies diversify from the auto industry, to support new industries that will create new jobs. I stood with the federal industry minister on that day and I welcomed that announcement. It became clear, as the day progressed on 10 March this year, that this in fact was just a cruel hoax. They were not planning to make the whole \$900 million available, but it was left up in the air and left in complete uncertainty.

This federal budget reveals that pretend good news to be nothing more than a cruel hoax. The federal Liberal government intends to spend just \$105 million, effectively ripping \$795 million out of the scheme. The federal Liberal colleagues of those opposite have chased this manufacturing industry out of South Australia, chased automotive companies out of this country. In the federal budget they have offered nothing to assist the industry, its workers and their families.

The South Australian government believes the guidelines for the scheme should be expanded to enable companies to use funds from the automotive transformation scheme for diversification strategies and new markets and to support new industries. It is not just South Australia that was bitterly disappointed at the careless disregard the federal government has shown. I have been in contact with my counterpart in Victoria, who is similarly dismayed at the carelessness of this federal government.

The Liberals, the South Australian Liberals, just will not stick up for South Australia. Rather, they will muck about, talk about where other money is coming in, but they just will not stick up for South Australia and call on their federal colleagues to spend the money in the ATS. It is a small target strategy of their campaign genius, the Hon. Rob Lucas: be a small target, don't say anything, don't stand for anything, don't stick up for anything and, most of all, don't rock the boat and argue with your federal Liberal colleagues in Canberra.

The last state election and recent by-elections showed the genius of this strategy! You don't need to be a genius to work out that you have to be unequivocally on the side of South Australians. Even if the Liberals here had not come to the realisation—

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: On a point of order, the minister seems unaware of the fact that, when he refers to 'you' he is talking about you, sir, in the chair, and I think he ought to actually learn that lesson.

The PRESIDENT: Take note, minister.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am always pleased to be guided by the Hon. John Dawkins. He has been here a very long time, Mr President, and he knows these things thoroughly. I am always pleased to be guided by him. Even if the Liberals have not come to the realisation that standing up for South Australians is the right things to do, then they ought to have the foresight to realise that they are politically finished if you don't. The Fisher by-election proved that.

I am not usually one to offer advice to the state Liberals, but I would encourage them not to follow the advice of the Hon. Rob Lucas, who has one eye on retirement and spending the good life with his ponies. I advise them to not follow: don't follow the Hon. David Ridgway, who has spent his entire political career in opposition; he knows no other way, and he, too, has one of his eyes firmly on retirement and drinking muscat till dawn at the Adelaide Club with his mates.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: On a point of order, I am not a member of the Adelaide Club, and I want the minister to withdraw that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —because I'm not a member of that club.

The PRESIDENT: Okay, alright, sit down. Obviously, the Hon. Mr Ridgway would find it embarrassing to belong to the Adelaide Club, so I think you should withdraw it, minister.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I withdraw that comment and note that he is disowning his mates who are members of the Adelaide Club, and that he finds it such an insult.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Point of order: I would like to know what relevance all of this rubbish has to the question that was asked.

The PRESIDENT: I hope it is the fact that you are very passionate about this issue that is leading you onto this line, but let's get back to the question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you very much, Mr President. As I have said, we are deeply disappointed with the lack of support for the auto industry. For people who have potential, like the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, there is a better way. Be on the side of South Australians. Occasionally call your federal mates out and stick up for this state and its people. Do not risk another generation in opposition, a lost generation, the generation of political Peter Pans. There is a better way. Stick up for South Australians, not like on water, not like on submarines and not like on the auto industry.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (14:55): I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's answer about not supporting the motor industry, does the minister therefore concur with the executive of GMH that one of the main reasons for leaving Elizabeth was the cost of doing business in South Australia, and particularly utility costs, and that they had planned to walk because they could not afford to do business here?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:56): It is almost universally accepted by anyone who has any understanding of this industry that if federal Labor had been in government there would still be cars being produced.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Vincent has the floor.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:56): Thank you, Mr President. I was just about to make a point of order to draw your attention to the fact that we are now more than halfway through question time and we have had only one crossbench question. That being said, I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, representing the Minister for Health, questions about the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder or PTSD.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Professor David Forbes of Melbourne University and Professor Sandy McFarlane of Adelaide University have described that up to one-third of post-traumatic stress disorder patients are not responding to current therapies. Their findings were published in the *Medical Journal of Australia* and reported in *The Advertiser* on 13 April 2015.

In these years of Great War commemoration, we remember the sufferers of 'shellshock' who were professionally stigmatised as morally inferior. Returned soldiers from Vietnam struggle with PTSD to this day, and there appears to be strong community support for the provision of ongoing treatment for veterans of subsequent conflicts. My questions to the minister are:

1. What plans are in place for the implementation of new clinical guidelines following insights gained through breakthroughs in neuroscience?
2. What impact will the planned closure of the Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park potentially have on PTSD treatment in South Australia?
3. Will the South Australian government consider establishing a centre of excellence at the Repat, focusing on research into best practice in the treatment of PTSD?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for her excellent questions on the treatments for PTSD. I will undertake to take that question to the minister in another place and bring a response back on her behalf.

STOLEN GENERATIONS COMPENSATION

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation a question regarding the Stolen Generations (Compensation) Bill.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: On Tuesday I asked the minister what the government's intention was regarding this bill. The minister, in his answer, promised to consult widely. My question is: has the government reached a position to support this bill, has caucus agreed to progress this bill and has cabinet agreed to progress this bill?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his question and his continuing genuine interest and concern in these matters. Of course, I am not going to talk in this chamber about what caucus and cabinet do or do not agree to, but I will reiterate to the honourable member that it is an important issue and we are continuing to progress it and consult on it. In fact, tomorrow I am spending a couple of hours out at Tauondi with members of the stolen generations to further talk about this matter.

STOLEN GENERATIONS COMPENSATION

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:59): Supplementary: when will the government reach a position as to whether or not it is going to support this bill?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:59): I can't

put a date on it, but I do undertake to consult with the honourable member and, once there are firmer positions from this government, to talk to the honourable member about this. At some stage in the future—I can't put a date on it.

ENVIRONMENTAL VOLUNTEERS

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:59): My question is to the minister for sustainability, environment and natural resources. Will the minister inform the chamber about the significant contribution made by volunteers to the successful management of our state's natural resources, our parks and reserves and the environment in general?

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: I didn't see natural resources in his ministerial title.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for the most important question. Sir, if the Hon. Mr Ridgway wants to ask a question of me, he is perfectly at liberty to do so at a later stage about my portfolio responsibilities. It is, of course, National Volunteer Week, 11 to 17 May. It is time for us to stop and reflect on the great contribution that volunteers make to our state.

The theme of National Volunteer Week this year is a theme that the opposition could probably do well to study: it is Give Happy, Live Happy, to highlight the fact that volunteering has been found to have a positive effect on both health and happiness—something that is very lacking on the opposite side. Of course, most of us would be unhappy with the federal budget that has just been brought down. I don't blame the opposition for their distress.

Over six million people volunteer their time in Australia, including almost one-third of all South Australians, and volunteers contribute around \$200 billion to the Australian economy annually. Volunteers are integral to the work of the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. Their contribution is enormous, of course. In 2013-14, over 21,000 people from, I'm advised, over 479 community groups volunteered their time and effort in environmental projects. In total, they contributed about 420,000 hours to natural resources management projects coordinated or funded by the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources.

Volunteers work on a huge array of projects, including soil and land management, revegetation, native animal and plant surveys, fire management, trail maintenance, weed and pest animal control and heritage site restoration. As you can imagine, this is an important contribution to the successful implementation of our environmental program.

Volunteer involvement in natural resource management is particularly important for us. Our natural resources, including our soil, water, plants and animals, are absolutely vital to our health and wellbeing and our way of life. They are the foundation for the state's prosperity. There are, of course, eight NRM regions in South Australia, each with an individual board. The goal of this system is to enable a highly collaborative partnership between government and local communities, industry and business, because we believe this gives us the best outcomes for both the local communities and the environment.

The model also allows us to utilise local knowledge, skills and expertise. Each natural resources management board is made up of highly skilled local people who understand their region's needs and their challenges. Board members help ensure that our natural resources are managed in a way that is not only sustainable but also benefits landholders and the broader community. The role of local volunteers is an important part of this model.

Volunteering also creates a sense of ownership of the different, and sometimes competing, challenges facing the management of our natural resources as well as their solutions. Our volunteers care deeply for their environment and make an enormous contribution that should not be underestimated. It is wonderful that volunteers are being recognised for their often thankless work during National Volunteer Week, for example. NRM boards around the state will be paying tribute to, and thanking, their volunteers in a number of ways.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members and staff of our natural resources management boards for all that they do, particularly for creating such a collaborative and positive working and volunteering environment. In particular, I would like to thank the countless volunteers

who give their time so generously to make our state a better place for us and for future generations. Their contribution is truly valued and very much appreciated. For anyone interested in becoming involved in volunteering through the department, there is a website they can visit to obtain further information at http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/Work_With_Us/Volunteering_with_DEWNR.

ENVIRONMENTAL VOLUNTEERS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:04): Supplementary: does the minister agree that very many of the environmental volunteers he has been talking about are associated with non-government environment organisations; and will the government be making a submission to the federal parliamentary inquiry, which seeks to strip environmental organisations of their tax-deductible status if those volunteer activities extend to advocacy as well as planting trees?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:04): What an excellent question from the Hon. Mr Parnell! He may have heard that I said there were over 400—I think 479—community groups. They would almost all be non-government organisations. Indeed, they are all committed to their local environment and that probably extends to, in fact, speaking up for their local environment.

As I understand it, the federal government is threatening organisations that do that by removing some of their tax advantages, tax benefits or charitable status. That is an outrage, as indeed the honourable member suggests. I should probably raise that with my cabinet to see what the state government can do in persuading the obdurate federal government in its attacks on community, on volunteering and on people who want to speak up for the things they find very valuable.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: Check your welfare contracts before you start.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr Wade says check your welfare contracts. I remember very well that, when I was minister for communities and social inclusion, the Premier gave an instruction that we wouldn't go along with the federal government when they were trying to strip away the rights of community organisations to actually speak up for the vulnerable people that they represent. Where were the Liberals then? Where were they? Nowhere to be seen, as usual—nowhere to be seen. They're out there supporting their federal government, stripping away the rights of communities to speak up for their members. They are a shameful bunch of people—a shameful bunch of hypocrites who come in here every day and lick up to what the federal government is doing in their budgets year after year, and they do not stand up for our state.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Point of order: the relevance of the last 30 seconds. Please, Mr President, direct the minister to answer the question and stick to that. We've already had complaints from the crossbenches that we haven't had enough questions today because they are wasting time.

The PRESIDENT: I think you had finished, had you, minister?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I had almost finished, but I think the honourable member needs to be answered, of course, because at a stage when we in this state are being overlooked by the federal government, what do we hear from this bunch over here? What do we hear from this bunch over here? Nothing in the budget about submarines. What did the Treasurer, the Hon. Joe Hockey, have to say to South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: What did the Treasurer, the Hon. Joe Hockey, have to say—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —to South Australia—

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —have to say for our state?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, sit down.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Where were you?

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: You're hopeless!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! What an outrageous—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable opposition leader should also control some of his side of the fence while allowing me to try to get—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Your behaviour—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Half the interjections, or three-quarters, are from your side of the fence. There is one issue that is quite correct—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The crossbench must be horrified at the moment. I'd like to see them get at least four questions in today, so, minister, I'd like you to quickly finish your answer so we can get on.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I will dispatch the Hon. Mr Stephens with alacrity, Mr President, the invisible man opposite who says nothing for our state. What does the Treasurer of the commonwealth, the Hon. Joe Hockey, say to South Australia? What does he say to South Australia? Take a number!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: That's the amount of concern—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down. Shame on you with your behaviour, the Hon. Mr Stephens. The Hon. Mr Brokenshire.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, I will finish—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Brokenshire has the call.

WATER PRICING

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Water and the River Murray a question about water pricing in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: And this is not a fishing exercise: this is fact. In this chamber on Tuesday, I asked the honourable minister whether he agreed with Professor Richard Blandy that South Australia has the highest water prices in Australia. The minister informed this house that he did not know Mr Blandy and was not sure if Mr Blandy had actually made the statement concerning water prices and suggested I check my sources. I have taken notice of the minister's advice, and I have checked my source and facts. I quote from a document Mr Blandy put to the parliament in evidence on 27 April:

Water prices are very high in South Australia. In 2012-13, of Australia's top 10 urban water utilities SA Water had the highest overall bills, the highest water supply charges, and the highest usage charges. The highest average

water bill was some 60 per cent higher than the average of the other nine jurisdictions. The highest average water usage charge for a residential customer was 36 per cent above the average of the other jurisdictions.

One more:

The highest annual water supply charge of \$293 was 130 per cent above the average of these other jurisdictions.

Professor Blandy, who consequently tabled a letter from Premier Weatherill thanking him for his outstanding work as commissioner, particularly his work during the commencement of the independent economic water regulation, goes on to say he believes this government is in fact imposing a tax—a water tax—of about \$275 million per annum on SA water consumers, which he says is largely hidden in SA Water's regulated asset base. So, they are the facts. My questions, therefore, to the minister are—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You wouldn't know what the facts were.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: I am sorry, but I actually think I do.

The PRESIDENT: Just ask a question.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: My questions are:

1. Will the honourable minister now concede that we do have the highest water prices in the country?

2. Could the honourable minister explain why his government has restricted ESCOSA's regulation, if it isn't, as Professor Blandy believes, to keep prices high as a way of effectively taxing the public for water?

3. The third and final question, and I would love a factual answer on these three: will the minister agree to rescind the pricing orders it has issued to ESCOSA about how to regulate water and allow the independent regulator to actually be independent and get on with its job properly?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:11): Let me go through the information once more that I have given this house previously, and I will give it in a slightly different way. Let me just say this: I don't expect the honourable member to understand really how science works. I don't expect that at all, but let me just explain to him, and this is something he should have checked when he was checking his data.

When did Mr Dick Blandy, I think he said, give this evidence? Was it before or after the Bureau of Meteorology brought out its report? Was it before or after? On what was that evidence based? What was the data and what were the facts? Were they presented? How old were they? Were they in fact current or out of date? That's not something that the Hon. Mr Brokenshere comes into this chamber with—not up-to-date figures. When information changes, and it doesn't support his story, what does he do? He clings to old information that supports his preconceived position.

He doesn't change his mind when new facts and evidence come to the fore. No, that's not what he does. He holds tightly like a drowning man to data that supports his position. Factual or not, he doesn't care about that because he has already made up his mind, and he will hold on to what he has got even when new data comes forward to show he was completely wrong. So, that's what I suggest to the honourable member. Again, he comes into this chamber tangentially supporting positions of the Liberal opposition of getting rid of community service obligations and driving up prices for country consumers of water in this state. He wants to get rid of the—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: And the Hon. Mr Stephens supports it with a laugh across the chamber.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: You are a buffoon.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: He wants to get rid of the postage stamp pricing for water in this state.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: Point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: One second; sit down. The Hon. Mr Stephens is totally unparliamentary in calling someone a buffoon across the chamber, so I really think you should withdraw that.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: Good. The Hon. Mr Brokenshere, a point of order.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: My point of order is that the minister is making statements to you in this house that are not true. I want a better go for country people, not what he is saying.

The PRESIDENT: It's not a point of order. The honourable minister, finish your answer, please.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President. We clearly have a different point of view as to what is going to be better for country South Australians. He thinks, get rid of postage stamp pricing: I say, no way, Jose, because that will actually drive up the cost of water for people in regional South Australia—something the Hon. Mr Brokenshere doesn't care about and something the Liberal opposition don't care about.

The latest National Performance Report was conducted by the Bureau of Meteorology and released on 7 May 2015. NPRs benchmark the pricing and service quality of Australian water utilities. NPRs are produced jointly by the Bureau of Meteorology, state and territory governments and the Water Services Association of Australia.

The release of this NPR is the ninth in the series and the first to be produced by BoM. The National Water Commission has previously produced the NPRs, but BoM has taken over the role of producing the NPRs since the National Water Commission's recent disbandment—well, abandonment, really—by the federal government, as they have abandoned any other organisation that wants to teach them things about scientific data. The NPR covers approximately 150 performance metrics and indicators including water resources, finance, pricing, assets, health, environment and customers.

Based on estimated water consumption of 200 kilolitres per customer per annum, a comparison of interstate water and sewerage bills reveals that, in 2013-14, SA Water had the ninth lowest estimated water and sewerage bill out of 13 utilities. As I said this time, the last time I was asked this, and the time before, this analysis includes only utilities with at least 100,000 connected properties, so we can compare apples with apples.

Logan in Queensland, Gold Coast Water, Unitywater in Queensland and Yarra Valley Water in Victoria were more expensive than SA Water in that analysis. Based on typical residential water consumption (the actual average annual volume of residential water consumed for each utility), a comparison of interstate water and sewerage bills reveals that in 2013, SA Water had the 10th lowest typical water and sewerage bill out of 13 utilities. SA Water had the 10th lowest typical water and sewerage bill out of 13 utilities, and again, Mr President—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Again, Mr President, this analysis includes only utilities with at least 100,000 connected properties. These are the figures produced in a national performance report by the Bureau of Meteorology.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Provided by SA Water.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: And the data is provided by every other water utility, Hon. Michelle Lensink. Where do you think they get the information from?

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Where do you think they get the information from?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, have you finished your answer?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: No.

The PRESIDENT: Well, don't buy into interjections; just finish your answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: You are absolutely right, Mr President; I shouldn't listen to ignorance. SA Water has undertaken a similar comparison of water and sewerage bills—and this is where SA Water has done it, as I said the last time I was asked this question and the time before that—based on 2014 prices and water consumption of 200 kilolitres per customer per annum. This comparison, as I have said previously, is not restricted to only utilities with at least 100,000 connected properties.

In the BoM's NPR, some smaller Queensland water providers are grouped together for the sake of BoM's analysis. However, SA Water's internal analysis treats all water providers as separate, which is why the NPR's analysis compares 13 providers, whilst SA Water's internal analysis compares against 20 water utilities. SA Water's internal comparison shows that SA Water has the ninth lowest estimated total water and sewerage bill out of 20 utilities.

All of the Queensland utilities rank higher than SA Water, along with the Northern Territory's Power and Water and Victoria's Yarra Valley Water. When comparing single-service only, using the 200 kilolitre methodology, SA Water has the 12th lowest water-only bill and the fourth lowest sewerage-only bill out of 20 utilities. If the honourable member is honest, he will update his thinking, look at the new data and change his position. But I will not hold my breath.

WATER PRICING

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:17): Supplementary: will the minister be kind enough to send me all the documentation so I can actually have a look at the fine print?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:17): It is in the public realm.

WATER PRICING

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:17): Supplementary, based on the minister stating that these figures are all public: if that is the case, will he also ensure that the unaggregated figures (which is how these were previously calculated from 2012-13 and proceeding years) will also be made public, as I asked recently?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:18): I invite honourable members with an interest to go to the Bureau of Meteorology's website and download the report for themselves.

CYCLING STRATEGY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:18): My questions are to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, representing the Minister for Transport, on the subject of cycling:

1. Is the government intending to replace the Cycling Strategy for South Australia, which expired five years ago?
2. If it is intending to replace the strategy, when will it do so?
3. If it not intending to replace the strategy, what will guide government priorities and spending in relation to cycling over the coming period?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his questions. I will take them on notice and have a reply brought back in relation to his questions. But, I do note, as a reasonably keen cyclist (as is the honourable member) I have seen over the past few years some vast improvements in some areas of cycling. So, regardless of what strategies apply when, I think there have been improvements, and I look forward to continuing the improvements. But, to his specific questions, I will have a response brought back.

MICRO FINANCE FUND

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:19): My question is directed to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. How many applications has the Department of State Development received for the 2014-15 financial year for grants from the Micro Finance Fund? If there have not been any applications, have there been any funding grants to date?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for his heroic question. He often asks insightful questions. I don't have the exact data on how many applications from that fund. However, there are many government funds and grants and programs aimed at supporting small business, aimed at supporting innovation and aimed at supporting manufacturing—far too many to have data on any given day for all of them. But I will seek to find an answer and bring back a reply for the honourable member, who no doubt will soon be Leader of the Opposition in this chamber.

DEFENCE INDUSTRY WORKFORCE STRATEGY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Science and Information Economy a question about STEM in the defence industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: By 2020, South Australia aims to expand the defence industry so that it can provide 37,000 direct and indirect jobs and inject about \$2.5 million into our economy per year. My question is: can the minister tell the chamber about the 'Defence Industry South Australia—Workforce Strategy' and STEM Scholarship and Internship Program?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for his important question. We know the South Australian economy is currently in a state of transition. This government is committed to ensuring that we are able to shift from traditional to high-value manufacturing which will enable us to compete on a global level.

Recently, I was very pleased to launch the 'Defence Industry South Australia—Workforce Strategy', which will guide the defence industry through to 2020. I was also able to simultaneously launch the Defence and STEM Scholarship and Internship Program. Both initiatives demonstrate the importance of the defence sector which creates long-term employment for our communities, attracts significant investment and helps drive innovation.

The recently launched 'South Australian Defence Strategy 2025' shows that we have a clear plan to grow and realise the potential of the defence industry in South Australia. This government, through the DSD, has partnered with the Defence Teaming Centre and industry to contribute \$100,000 toward the 'Defence Industry South Australia—Workforce Strategy'.

The strategy aims to boost the capacity of defence companies by addressing workforce planning, skills gaps, enterprise needs and fostering transformation through change. This collaboration between industry and government will ensure the longevity of the South Australian defence industry.

Consistent with the objectives of the workforce strategy, I was also pleased to launch the Defence and STEM Scholarship and Internship Program. The scholarship will be comprised of two streams: the Defence Honours Scholarship and the Defence and STEM Internship Program. These provide university students with opportunities to enhance skills and thereby improve career and employability prospects.

The Defence Honours Scholarship Program will enable students to work collaboratively with industry as they undertake specific Honours projects nominated by defence companies, so real problems in real industry. This government is proud to provide nine scholarships, each worth \$10,000, which have been awarded to projects involving students from the University of Adelaide, Flinders and UniSA, and a number of South Australian companies working in the defence sector. The internship program provides invaluable industry experience as students undertake structured

work placements with local defence and STEM companies, thus providing students with important workplace skills which can't be taught in a classroom.

The government of South Australia is committed to the defence industry. I look forward to updating the chamber with the progress of the strategy and the Defence and STEM Scholarship and Internship Program. It is just a real shame that the recent federal Liberal government budget did not commit itself to building submarines here in this state—a real shame and missed opportunity.

The PRESIDENT: Before we go on to business, I refer to a call made during question time. The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation had finished an answer, no-one sprang to their feet and I called upon the Hon. Mr Parnell, who had stood up and was about to ask his question. At that time, Hon. Ms Lensink, you jumped up for a supplementary question. I indicated that he had already been called and you questioned whether that was within standing orders. I was correct in what I did, and in future when somebody is called and on their feet no supplementary questions will be entered into.

Bills

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (PROSECUTIONS UNDER REPEALED ACT) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 13 May 2015.)

Clause 2.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: With the good graces of the acting chairman and the minister I want to briefly raise one issue in response to the minister's statements at clause 1. That was in response to answers that she had provided to questions that had been raised during the second reading debate. Can I just indicate that certainly the Liberal Party supports what appears to have been some of the changes the minister has outlined that have been instituted in SafeWork SA in terms of its processes and procedures. Our criticism remains that these things should have been part of any effective compliance regime over a long period of time and not necessitated by events of recent times, but I will put that to the side for the moment.

The only other comment I would make—and I do not seek a response from the government; ultimately, it is an issue for the minister, himself or herself—is that, as I indicated in the second reading, in addition to this much more rigorous process in terms of managing compliance of prosecutions or possible prosecutions, which has been outlined, my view is that the minister responsible has a responsibility as well and that the minister, if not this one some future minister, I hope would indicate in terms of the oversight of his or her office over the work of SafeWork SA. What has been outlined has been at officer level within SafeWork SA; there is going to be monitoring of progress towards prosecutions.

With the greatest respect to SafeWork SA, my view is that the minister ultimately has to accept responsibility and his designated ministerial liaison officer or ministerial adviser, through that officer and he as the minister, should be keeping a weather eye on progress towards prosecutions to see that there is compliance. That is not actually mentioned. It may or may not be the intention of the minister to be so advised. I am sure that there are processes available, if he so chose, that he could be, on a regular basis, updated with progress on these particular issues.

As I said, I do not seek a response from the minister. Ultimately, that is a decision for minister Rau and his office at this stage, but I would have thought that sensible governance, given the history of this agency in this particular area, would mean that there should be tight monitoring and oversight of progress by the minister's office. Ultimately, these decisions are decisions made by the agency—I accept that—but, ultimately, the buck stops with the minister should something lapse as a result of an expiration of the time period.

My question to the minister is: is she in a position to indicate whether in the past there have been any prosecution which have lapsed as a result of the two-year period? The minister has outlined

that in the recent transition period there were four cases and two were managed to be handled, and these two are now being handled by this legislation, but what I am wanting to clarify is: is the minister able to answer today and if not take on notice: have there been other examples in the past where prosecutions have lapsed as a result of an expiration of time?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The advice I have received is no, but we will check to make sure.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am happy with that and, if the advice is ultimately different, I will be happy to receive a letter from the minister indicating the nature of that new advice. With that, I indicate that is the only issue I did want to respond to in terms of the answers to questions at clause 1.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

The CHAIR: There is an amendment to clause 3: Amendment No. 1 [Darley—1]—Page 3, after line 13. The Hon. Mr Darley.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: Mr Chairman, I will not be moving that amendment.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BOARDS AND COMMITTEES - ABOLITION AND REFORM) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 12 May 2015.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:36): I rise to support this bill. This bill seeks to further reform government boards and committees. Last year a major review was undertaken to determine which government boards and committees should be kept, consolidated or abolished. Government boards and committees were required to prove that they are necessary. In total, 429 state government boards and committees were audited. The final audit report determined that 107 would be abolished, a further 17 boards merged and 62 to be subject to other reform.

The government is reclassifying 120 boards and committees that it identified as non-government boards and committees. The remaining 33 are still being considered. A total of 90 boards, less than one in four, will be retained without reform or reclassification. This bill will amend 43 pieces of legislation to abolish 28 boards and committees, merge eight and simplify a further 20.

The review found that, in many cases, there is an unnecessary level of red tape in how boards and committees operate. Thirty-two boards and committees will no longer require the Governor to appoint members. This solidification alone will save hours of work by public servants. Many of these boards and committees have been around for decades. Some have fulfilled their initial objectives and no longer need to continue. Many of these boards and committees were set up to make the departments operate in a more commercial manner, by giving the department and its chief executive a board to monitor its direction, but in reality CEs work directly with the relevant minister on a daily basis. There is no longer a portfolio where a minister has to go through a board to direct the CE of that department.

An interesting point I would like to make is that most appointments of these boards are recommended by the CE to the minister in consultation with the chairman. Very often the minister

signs off on these appointments based on the CE's recommendation, because the CE is generally more aware of these issues and the working relationship at board level than is the minister. In reality, you have a situation where the servant is actually appointing the master.

Minister Bignell, in his second reading speech, also expressed several situations where he had to sign off projects coming from a board or launching projects that he had no involvement in or that were outside of the government's policies.

When I worked as an adviser to minister Snelling, as board or committee vacancies came up, we liked to refresh the board with new members who had community or industry experience. I can remember one appointment where the minister went against a recommendation from the CE and appointed two out of three new members who had private industry and corporate experience in that particular area. The CE was not very happy about the minister doing that. The CE spoke to me directly about his dissatisfaction and lobbied pretty hard to get me to speak to the minister to get him to reverse the decision. Now, five years later, I note that those members are still there. They must be doing a good job if the CE continues to recommend them to the new minister.

This bill will not only make decision-making more efficient, it will also lead to greater community involvement in decision-making. Reducing the number of boards and instead using community input where possible would lead to a fairer and more effective system. A key example of this is replacing Community Benefit SA with Fund My Community, which allows the community to have a say in how funding is allocated. More than 2,000 people have had their say in the first Fund My Community so far.

This audit review also gives members of the public with community and industry experience the opportunity to have a say on some of the boards and committees. When I was an adviser—going back to my story—I kept note of who was on government boards and committees, and I noticed that there were people who regularly were appointed on various boards. It was as if being a board member was their career. They seemed to be appointed to lots of boards. Adelaide is a small town and, if you are seen often enough at functions or at meetings and if a CE feels comfortable with you, your name gets thrown around for these board positions. This often creates an unhealthy scenario where the same views and advice are put to the government and views from a different angle are not put forward. So I support this bill to amend legislation to abolish some boards and committees and merge or simplify some of them.

I would like to congratulate the Premier on taking action to reform this area of government. Some members here have raised several concerns about this bill, particularly that some boards that are being abolished should remain. I must plead ignorance when discussing particular boards. I am sure the ministers responsible for those boards in question would have their reasons for implementing these reforms.

I note that there has been some discussion surrounding the tourism board, and the Hon. Mark Parnell has also raised issues with the abolition of the Fisheries Council and the Wilderness Advisory Committee. I trust that the ministers responsible for these boards will find effective compromises to ensure that any relevant aims that the government was progressing through these boards continue to be addressed in one way or another. I commend this bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.M. Gazzola.

Resolutions

JUMPS RACING

Consideration of the House of Assembly's resolution:

1. That in the opinion of this house, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on jumps racing in South Australia and whether it should be banned;
2. In the event of a joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly shall be represented by three members of the House of Assembly, of whom two shall form a quorum of House of Assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

(Continued from 12 May 2015.)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:46): I move:

That the House of Assembly's resolution be agreed to.

I support the motion. In South Australia, jumps racing events are held at Oakbank, Morphettville, Gawler, Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge, I am advised. The controlling authority, Thoroughbred Racing SA, is responsible for race programming, including jumps races.

Thoroughbred Racing SA has very clear responsibility to ensure that the thoroughbred racing environment is as safe as possible for both horse and rider. Thoroughbred Racing SA recently released the racing program for 2015 and has reduced the number of jumps races to be held at Morphettville in 2015 to six races over four days, I am advised.

I am aware that there is growing unease within the community concerning the continuation of jumps racing. This motion presents an opportunity to examine in more detail all the elements surrounding the sport, including the safety of horses and riders in jumps races (steeplechases), the potential economic impact of a statewide ban on jumps races and the views of the racing industry, animal welfare organisations and the wider community.

This joint committee does not necessarily mean that the government intends to ban jumps racing. A joint committee will allow both sides of the debate to be heard. I note that New South Wales is the only jurisdiction in this nation in which there are legislated bans on this sort of event. However, as far as I know, jumps races are held only in South Australia and Victoria.

I understand that the thoroughbred racing organisations of the other states and territories have decided not to hold these events without the need for government intervention. I look forward to the findings of the joint committee, so we can better understand all the elements of the sport and reach an informed decision on the future of jumps racing in our state.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:49): I move the following amendment:

That the words 'whether it should be banned' be deleted from point 1.

The opposition is concerned that the parameters set by the original motion are too narrow and serve only the minister's end of banning jumps racing in this state. We would prefer to see a wider discussion on the pros and cons of jumps racing from an objective standpoint, given that racing is a vital industry to the South Australian economy and that jumps racing is an integral part of the racing calendar. Those honourable members who have been here since before last year's election would know of my personal view on jumps racing, which is shared by the Liberal parliamentary party, and that is one of unequivocal support. Thoroughbred Racing South Australia has shown nothing but a commitment to animal welfare in its conduct and administration of jumps racing in the time that I have been in this place.

It certainly seems that this issue is raised on an annual basis around Easter time, when we have 70,000 people converge on the beautiful Hills town of Oakbank for their racing carnival—anything but a coincidence. This famous and ancient carnival has two steeplechases as its flagship races, and without them the Oakbank carnival would have a very different feel to it. The Oakbank Easter Racing Carnival brings in \$13 million to the local economy. Just why the government and the Minister for Tourism, of all people, would want to mess with that is beyond me, particularly in this economic climate.

Many of my colleagues in the other place have mentioned that those who protest these events have a certain ideological agenda which is against the so-called exploitation of animals, full stop, and this extends to the use of domesticated animals as working animals or as food sources. I emphasise that domesticated animals, in many cases, were domesticated thousands of years ago for human assistance and subsistence. To suggest that these animals have been mistreated simply by doing what they exist to do is ridiculous. Furthermore, it is in the interests of human owners to care for animals whether they be for food, sport, work or companionship. Weak, maltreated animals would not produce the desired results. Happy horse: happy human.

Frances Nelson QC of TRSA has said publicly that interstate where these bans have been implemented, animal rights protesters have simply moved on to other equestrian events as their

source of outrage. Something that is rarely mentioned in these debates is the risk to the jockey in jumps racing. Quite often it is the jockey who is at risk also during a fall in the race, both from trampling and from being crushed by the horse weighing around half a tonne.

As I alluded to earlier, I have made many contributions in this place in favour of jumps racing. I will not clog the public record with more of the same argument, but I refer honourable members to those debates and to the debate in the other place. I look forward to the deliberations of this joint committee and encourage honourable members to support the amendment to allow an objective investigation into this very important issue.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:51): I rise to speak against the amendment and note that it was the same amendment that was put in the other place. It was soundly defeated there, and I believe it should be soundly defeated here. If you are to consider a ban on jumps racing, that does not mean you actually endorse a ban on jumps racing: it means you consider a ban on jumps racing. Given that that is one of the most controversial calls, I would imagine that members of this council and parliament and the committee to be appointed would welcome that debate, because otherwise why are we having a committee at all if we are not going to actually have the debate?

I would also note that I have often raised concerns about the welfare of jockeys. I have asked for WorkCover statistics on injuries related to this sport, not just for the animals but indeed for those employed in this industry, and I look forward to those figures being made available through the fullness of this debate. With that, I indicate the Greens will be supporting the motion in its entirety, but not the amendment.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes 11
Noes 9
Majority 2

AYES

Brokenshire, R.L.	Darley, J.A.	Dawkins, J.S.L.
Hood, D.G.E.	Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Lucas, R.I.	McLachlan, A.L.	Ridgway, D.W.
Stephens, T.J. (teller)	Wade, S.G.	

NOES

Franks, T.A.	Gago, G.E.	Gazzola, J.M.
Hunter, I.K. (teller)	Kandelaars, G.A.	Maher, K.J.
Ngo, T.T.	Parnell, M.C.	Vincent, K.L.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:58): I move:

In the event of a joint committee being appointed, this council will be represented on the committee by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee. The members of the joint committee to represent the Legislative Council will be the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Terry Stephens and the Hon. Kelly Vincent.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:58): I move:

To leave out the Hon. K.L. Vincent and insert the Hon. J.A. Darley.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes 11
Noes 9

Majority..... 2

AYES

Brokenshire, R.L. (teller)
Hood, D.G.E.
Lucas, R.I.
Stephens, T.J.

Darley, J.A.
Lee, J.S.
McLachlan, A.L.
Wade, S.G.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Ridgway, D.W.

NOES

Franks, T.A.
Hunter, I.K. (teller)
Ngo, T.T.

Gago, G.E.
Kandelaars, G.A.
Parnell, M.C.

Gazzola, J.M.
Maher, K.J.
Vincent, K.L.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

Personal Explanation

JUMPS RACING

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:03): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: I would just like to put on the record, because I fear that what has just happened will insinuate that there was something untoward about me being a member of the committee. As far as I am concerned, that is not the case. I was approached to be a member of the committee, as is part of my duties as a member of this place, and I agreed to carry out those duties. As far as I am concerned, that is the end of the matter.

Given that the people that have supported my being kicked off that committee are the same people that have allowed an amendment to this motion that will not even allow for a debate about jumps racing—again, I remind this chamber that the wording was 'whether' it should be banned, not 'that' it should be banned. So, before we go blaming people for pushing particular ideologies, why don't we actually allow a debate to occur.

I just want to put on the record that there was nothing untoward about my membership of this committee, but I accept the will of the council.

The PRESIDENT: I think we are all quite aware of that; it was absolutely no reflection on the Hon. Ms Vincent.

Bills

THE UNITING CHURCH IN AUSTRALIA (MEMBERSHIP OF TRUST) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 May 2015.)

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (16:05): I rise to speak to the Uniting Church in Australia (Membership of Trust) Amendment Bill 2015 and to put forward the views of the Liberal Party. Can I indicate at the outset that the opposition will be supporting the passage of the bill in this council. The bill was introduced by Attorney-General on 11 February 2015 following a request from members of the Uniting Church. The Uniting Church in Australia Act 1977 was passed to make the relevant amendments to the state law when the three churches—Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian—sought union.

The act was needed in order to facilitate the coming together of these three great traditions of the Christian faith, and even though I am considered by some in this place relatively young, I can recall the angst to many in the three faiths, but more particularly the Presbyterian Church, at the proposition of this union. The Presbyterian Church for we Scots not only served as a place for us to worship but also to keep our culture alive so far from our motherland, which many of us were forced to leave.

The union of these three expressions of the Christian faith proceeded in accordance with the act, but more particularly in accordance with the basis of the union, which was set out in the first schedule and which I would encourage members to read as it is beautifully drafted as a clear expression of the faith both of the three threads of the Christian faith but also of the principles of the union.

The 1977 act also established a property trust to hold all property of the newly formed Uniting Church, with the trust activities remaining under the control of the synod. At that time, it was considered appropriate that a 70-year age limit was imposed on the members of the trust. In August last year, the Uniting Church wrote to the Attorney-General indicating that their board members and the members of its property trust had agreed to pursue an amendment of the trust.

An amendment was sought for the removal of section 11(4) of the original act, that 'No person who has attained the age of 70 years shall be eligible for appointment as a member of the trust.' The letter, and I will quote from the same, is dated 19 August 2014 addressed to the Attorney-General from Peter Battersby, Executive Officer Resources, Uniting Church in Australia Property Trust (SA). The letter stated:

The removal of this age restriction benefits the Church by allowing members who have attained the age of seventy years to continue to serve on the Trust. Recently two members who have served the Church with distinction have regrettably concluded their tenure on the Trust and would have continued to serve, if not for this clause. Likewise, other valuable candidates who could serve on this Trust are ineligible, due to this clause. The implications of this clause are outdated, discriminatory and no longer reflect the values of the Uniting Church or society's expectations regarding age and volunteering.

In a subsequent paragraph, Mr Battersby goes on to say:

We would be most grateful if you, as Attorney-General, would sponsor and lead the amendment of this Act including the preparation, introduction and passage of a Bill through Parliament.

The bill that is currently before us in this place was drafted in accordance with this request and simply seeks to remove the 70 year age restriction. As the bill is a hybrid bill, it was necessary to refer it to a select committee. The select committee was established and comprised members of both sides of this house. Advertising for submissions took place, to which there was only one response, which came from the Uniting Church itself.

The Uniting Church wrote to the select committee in a letter dated 10 April 2015. I will be quoting from particular parts of this letter which was addressed to the select committee and was from three signatories: Deidre Palmer, Moderator, Uniting Church; Nigel Rogers, Secretary of the Synod, Uniting Church; and Peter Battersby, Property Officer, again of the Uniting Church. It states:

Following a review of The Uniting Church in Australia Act 1976-1977...The Uniting Church in Australia Property Trust (S.A.)...agreed to pursue this amendment to the Act. For your convenience, please find attached an extract from the minutes reflecting this decision and a copy of the letter sent to the Attorney General requesting the change to the Act.

The Uniting Church is well aware of the limitations of keeping the Act in its current form. In 2010 the first cohort of baby boomers entered an older age group of 65. In our experience this demographic includes a vibrant, productive and engaged workforce with much to contribute. Within our 300 congregations in South Australia many of our retirees have enjoyed long careers in which they have accumulated diverse skills and experience in professional, business and leadership arenas. Once retired they seek opportunities to contribute to the community in a meaningful way, on a part time or voluntary basis.

It seems clear that the legislation that limits an individual's ability to contribute to society based on their age is discriminatory and outdated. In the case of the Uniting Church, the legislation in its current form limits our available Volunteers to serve on the Property Trust. Just recently the Property Trust farewelled two experienced and highly valued members who concluded their tenure on the Trust and would have continued to serve, if not for reaching 70 years of age.

The Uniting Church (S.A.) believes removing the age limitations of the Act will be a step towards recognising the changing needs of Australia's population by creating opportunities for our older people to remain engaged in the community. As well it will better reflect the current thinking of the Uniting Church in respecting people of all ages and valuing volunteers.

The Liberal Party endorses those sentiments. Indeed, the Liberal Party has formed its position based on the report of a select committee that was laid on the table in the House of Assembly on 6 May 2015. The Liberal Party's views have not only been informed by the report and the submissions of the Uniting Church, but also because the Liberal Party believes in these circumstances it is a matter for the Uniting Church how it constitutes its property committee and how it conducts its trust. It seems appropriate in this day and age to accede to the request and pass the amendment.

However, I would like to comment that there are other age restrictions in the community, and two immediately come to mind: one in the military and one for judicial officers. In the military, the rationale, as I understand it, is to ensure operational capability for defence. For judicial officers it has been a longstanding debate, which I understand continues to rage in legal circles, regarding the capability to work until they are of a certain age. Of course, we are in the modern age and people are healthier and even after they retire they continue to work whether it be as a volunteer or in another context. So we come to these age caps—I suppose I can call it—with a different lens and with a different perspective.

However, it does lead me to have regard to the proceedings of a select committee. These are simply observations. One cannot help thinking—and I stress these are not criticisms of a select committee—that the proceedings of select committees in the other place tend to be simply for compliance rather than necessarily seeking out diverse views in a range of these hybrid bills.

I take note that, in the minutes of the meeting of the select committee on 25 March, the inquiry strategy lists a number of bullet points, but one of them is that 'no witnesses to be called unless issues raised in the submissions warrant the taking of further evidence'. Only one submission was received, following an *Advertiser* advertisement.

One might reflect, with the benefit of hindsight, on whether there should be more active engagement of the Uniting Church community to seek their views, whether for or against, and I would suspect that most would be for. Indeed, it could be said that it was an unhealthy reliance upon simply an extract of the minutes, which I have referred to in the quote from Uniting Church, which is from the Property Committee, which has a number of individuals, variously described as chairperson, resourcing officer or minute taker or even observer. Minute No. 6.6.1 simply says:

That a review be undertaken of the Act and action initiated to amend the Act to bring it up to date noting in particular the need to amend Section 11(4).

The point I am raising is that there is nothing from the select committee's report that I have read that is a broader assessment, simply taking the letter on faith that there has been a resolution from the Property Committee and not necessarily the general synod. In saying this, I in no way seek to denigrate the views—the very forceful views—of the moderator herself or the secretary or the property officer.

This is a time to pause and reflect, given if you compare it with the report of the select committee in relation to the bill—and I acknowledge that the original bill was very complicated and involved considerable angst in some parts of the three threads of the Uniting Church. It was quite detailed, and there were up to 20 witnesses, including the late Trevor Griffin, in his role as procurator of the Presbyterian Church of South Australia.

As we pass this bill, members of this council can reflect that perhaps we are a better place to conduct these select committees to ensure that there is sufficient consultation with membership. It may well be that everyone in Uniting Church is of one view in relation to passing these trusts, but in my experience in church affairs, it has often been that there will always be counterviews of varying degrees of weight. Perhaps I will leave my comments there. Perhaps it is the lawyer in me that I believe that these things need to be done with a degree of precision, rather than, as someone unfair might say and not myself, in the casual manner in which some select committees are conducted.

I reiterate that the Liberal Party supports the passage of this bill and endorses the sentiments expressed by the Uniting Church in its correspondence with the select committee. But, more broadly,

we take the view that the Uniting Church should conduct its affairs as it sees fit, in accordance with its Christian conscience. With those remarks, I commend the bill to the council.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:17): Briefly, I found the remarks of the Hon. Andrew McLachlan stimulating, and I concur with his suggestions that we as a parliament need to reflect on how we deal with hybrid bills and how we can best consider them. I also think it would be useful for us to consider the role of private acts generally going forward. I appreciate that there are historical reasons why private acts exist and therefore why hybrid bills and select committees need to reflect on them, but I am very uncomfortable with the series of private acts which we have which relate to the affairs of churches. I would remind members that this parliament was pre-dated in 1851 by the first general election in this state, which was fundamentally flawed on the issue of separation of church and state. This state has a very proud tradition of religious liberty.

For various historical reasons, the Uniting Church, Prince Alfred College, the Catholic Charitable Trust, which we discussed recently—various private acts exist in relation to religious organisations. I strongly associate myself with the remarks of the Hon. Andrew McLachlan that we as a parliament do not want to interfere in the internal operations of religious organisations. I would suggest that, as well as heeding the call of the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, in terms of considering how we can better consider hybrid bills and select committees, there might also be an appropriate place at some time to reflect on, if you like, the residual private acts. It might well be a matter that could be considered by the Legislative Review Committee.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (16:20): I understand that there are no further second reading contributions to this bill, which is fairly straightforward. I thank members for their valuable contributions and look forward to its being dealt with expeditiously through the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (16:22): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 16:25 the council adjourned until Tuesday 2 June 2015 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***LAND ACQUISITION**

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (22 May 2014). (First Session)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure has received this advice:

Accounts submitted by dispossessed owners for reimbursement of reasonable valuation expenses are assessed by departmental officers directly involved in land acquisitions by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure's (DPTI).

DPTI officers who assess accounts hold relevant valuation qualifications in accordance with the Land Valuers Regulations 2010 made under the *Land Valuers Act 1994*, and have ongoing practical valuation experience through DPTI's activities.