

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 17 June 2009

The **DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Thompson)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS, MANAGEMENT OF DISRUPTIVE CHILDREN

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (11:00): I move:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into the management of children who behave disruptively in our public school system; and in particular, whether—

- (a) Flexible Learning Options (FLO) are adequately funded;
- (b) behavioural management learning centres are adequately resourced;
- (c) coordination can be improved between the Department of Education and Children's Services and other agencies which support troubled families; and
- (d) any other relevant matter.

It is a well recognised problem in our society that we have a number of troubled families and, in particular, that means that we have a number of troubled children. I have heard people discuss this issue and call children 'bad', referring to children who are 'trouble'. However, the way I prefer to think of it is that these are troubled children, and their internal conflict and deprivation causes them to act out behaviour that is socially unacceptable.

Of course, in our schooling system, we have something of a blur between our private and public system. We have a private school system that is very well subsidised by the public, but the great advantage that private schools have is that they are able to pick and choose whom they accept as students. That is not the case with our public schools, and so it is fair to say that there is probably a greater proportion of troubled students in our public school system compared with our private school system.

Of those students, in many cases we are talking about children from families where there may be only one parent, where there may be drug addiction, where there may be child abuse, where there may be violence in the home and, not unnaturally, this causes problems for the child interacting with others at school. There is also ample evidence to suggest that those who are abused or bullied at home as children are going to repeat that behaviour as they grow up with others as victims. So, for a whole range of reasons, we have a number of students in our public school system who need extra support to overcome these terrible disadvantages.

Just to give members an idea of the extent of the problem, we are basically using suspensions—that is, temporary exclusion from school—to the extent of about 4,500 a year. In relation to exclusions—that is, banning children from a particular school for an extended period of time—we are talking about hundreds of cases each year. Those children are not just put out onto the streets. Our system has a good answer for them in that there are various behavioural learning centres around town. These are schools that take on these challenged students for a short period of time, often for the remainder of a term, if they are excluded from their local school.

There is the Bowden-Brompton Community School, which has three campus, and that school provides an alternative secondary school program. There is also the Adolescent Service at the Enfield campus, and there are three metropolitan learning centres. I am using language the department uses, but what it amounts to is that there are a number of sites around town where these troubled students can be sent if they are not able to keep their behaviour in their local school within the bounds of acceptable behaviour. Most of the services are available from the city to the north. There are not many facilities in the south. There is one, I believe, at Cowandilla and one at Christies Beach, but I think the south is hard done by when it comes to the provision of these services.

Many of these children come from homes where there is poverty or neglect of the children in the home. If these children are excluded from the local school, they may have to travel many, many miles to get to one of these behavioural learning centres. The department pays for children to catch public transport, and it might be, for example, from Mount Barker to Cowandilla. So, you might have someone who has trouble at their local school being paid by the department to go more than across town—perhaps an hour and a half in travelling time—to get to a school that will support

them better. That to me says that there is a need for more of these centres so that it is easier for troubled children to have access if they need that sort of support.

Incidentally, there is an ideal site in the electorate of Mitchell, in the suburb of Dover Gardens, where the Dover Gardens Primary School has just closed. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the buildings, and there is a beautiful oval there. I would hate to see that covered in townhouses when there is a crying need for more behavioural management learning centres like the ones I am describing.

The centres I have mentioned are full, and there are waiting lists. Of course, if you are talking about a place for a student to go for the remainder of the term once they are excluded from their local school, you actually need something that is available there and then. There is no point in having a waiting list, or you end up with young people being at home.

We had a case earlier this year of a child who died. Without going into all the details, this child was about 11 years old and suffered from neglect from the adults in his life. He had attended only a couple of weeks out of the several months of schooling he was meant to be attending prior to the end of his life. There is a suggestion in that case that there is a need for more available places and more support to enable troubled children to get to some sort of schooling and, in a case like that, it is important for it to be one of these specialist centres that deals with those who require behavioural management. There are higher teacher to student ratios than in normal schools, as one would expect, and the teachers become specialists in the field of dealing with difficult children and adolescents.

The need, I believe, is quite clear. There is scope for expanding the number of centres in that there are empty facilities at present that could be used for the purpose. There is an urgent need, because there are waiting lists at these centres and, as I have indicated, there are hundreds of cases each year that require these services. That said, the vast majority of our 170,000 students attending about 600 state schools get by without any problem, but we do need to cater for those who might be left behind. The social consequences and the consequences for our criminal justice system and the safety of our community are obvious.

I therefore commend this motion to the house because there are a number of ways we can better care for these students. I have indicated that this could be done through the behavioural management learning centres within existing high schools. There is a funding program called Flexible Learning Options, and this allows for students who have difficulty with regular academic work to undergo practical training, for example, in car maintenance or life skills such as cooking, etc., and students sometimes respond very well to these practical programs rather than the regular academic curriculum.

There is also a suggestion in the motion I have put to the house today that there could be better coordination between the Department of Education and Families SA, because the problems we are dealing with here need to be dealt with in a holistic way. We can deal with the child from approximately nine to three Monday to Friday, but each of those children has a story to tell about their family and the support that their mother or father, or both, need to be able to bring up that child in a healthy and encouraging way.

There are a host of issues, I believe, once we start to dig beneath the surface, and that needs to be explored in a committee. From the people that I have spoken to in my community, there is intense interest in how we can better deal with those troubled children who cannot behave themselves in a socially acceptable way within our schools.

There is a very strong passion in the community that those children at school who are willing and able to learn should be able to get on with it in the mainstream without the disruption caused by those children who cannot help themselves, to some extent. It is an appropriate matter for a parliamentary committee to examine, and I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:12): I strongly support this motion moved by the member for Mitchell. I think select committees—and I have said this before—perform a very useful role in the parliament, and I think that we should avail ourselves of the opportunity to conduct thorough reviews of issues and matters that are of concern in the wider community.

The first point that needs to be made is that public schools, and also independent and Catholic schools, reflect the wider community. So, it is not surprising that if behavioural standards have changed in the wider community then that will be reflected in the public school system, as well as in the independent and Catholic systems.

Many of the problems in our school system that now confront teachers and students who want to learn arise from the fact that we have, in my view, often poor parenting in the community. It is not a matter of blaming parents, it is more a question of: what can we do about it to ensure that children, in or out of school, have values which are respectful of themselves, others and so on?

Sadly, I think it is very obvious that many children are coming through the system and have not experienced boundaries and who have no guidance in terms of what they should or should not do, and that is compounded when you look at the individual students and see that many of them have psychological and, in some cases, psychiatric problems. That is particularly the case at secondary school, where some students are experiencing not just depression but other mental disorders of one kind or another. So, all those things need to be addressed.

It is often useful—and the same with the prison system—not to focus just on the ones who are seen as misbehaving but also to look at the ones who do not end up in prison or cause trouble at school. If you look at why that is, it gives some indication of what needs to be done to ensure that the children in our schools are all able to cooperate within the school system and benefit from what is available to them by way of education.

When the Hon. Lea Stevens was minister for health she did something of lasting value—and I have always commended her for it—namely, the postnatal visit program. I have always argued strongly that that concept ought to be extended further so that not just with the postnatal phase but with children up to age three or five years there is a visit to the home environment to look at how the children are being cared for, how they are developing and so on, because the key to a lot of these things, which becomes manifest in poor behaviour if you do not deal with it early, is what happens in the critical early years. By the time a child is three or four years old, many behavioural patterns are already well and truly set. The key message needs to be early intervention.

I have indicated before that one of my neighbours was a junior primary teacher some years ago. She taught the Truro murderer and Brooklyn Park murderer (she did not teach them how to kill!), and it was obvious to her at junior primary level that those individuals had severe behavioural problems—putting faeces on the wall, and so on, which is a classic sign of a dysfunctional person. I refer to the tragic case of Martin Bryant, who exhibited dysfunctional behaviour early on at school and elsewhere and it was never addressed, partly because one family member did not want it addressed. He then goes on to kill many people. They are the extreme end of the problem we are talking about, but if you do not deal with these things early, where you observe cruelty to animals and others, and young people do not develop an empathy, you will have behavioural issues, including disruption in school, etc., reflected throughout that person's life.

We need early intervention as part and parcel of ascertaining the issues at the school level, from junior primary through to secondary. The assumption that by the time you get to high school all is well is not the case, because that is when a lot of the problems manifest themselves. You have to deal with learning disabilities. If someone cannot understand what is being taught, they will muck around. If the curriculum is not relevant they will muck around and truant. All those issues are interrelated. It is not simply a question of putting children in a special school. We use the term 'special school' here, as members know, for those who have an intellectual disability, but putting a child in a behaviour management school is trying to deal with a problem that probably should have been dealt with much earlier.

If we look at the strategy schools adopt (they do not have many options, because we do not allow schools in the state system to have much local autonomy), all they can do is suspend and exclude. What does that do? It does not solve the problem. You have simply got the child out of the classroom and the school. You have not addressed the underlying issues, but made them worse because the child is then released into the community, often unsupervised if the parent or parents work, and you have made the situation worse. I have been dealing with a lad who is now in his early teens, but he came to me years ago through his grandparents—it is often the grandparents who seek to intervene.

I must say that the Hon. Trish White, who was then the minister for education, went out of her way to try to assist with this issue. I will just use his first name, Joshua. At one stage during the year he missed 22 weeks of school because his mother basically dumped him at the FAYS or FACS office when he was very young; I think he was two or three. She just dumped him and said, 'I don't want you anymore.' That would be pretty devastating for anyone. If a female teacher (and I am not picking on them because they are female) was perceived by him to be rejecting him, that would cause a third world war.

Someone like Joshua needed special attention and, sadly, he did not necessarily get that. Other children, not deliberately being cruel, would say at a footy match, 'Where's your dad? Why doesn't your dad come along?' That would trigger the kid off and he would end up having a fight with the other kids. What you often need with these kids is specific case management to deal with the issues. To be rejected by a parent when you are, say, two or three and dumped and never to see your mother again, or your father, is pretty shattering.

It is not surprising that that child will not be an A-grade scholar. Even though the child is now in his early teens, and, as I say, with some positive help from the then minister for education, the Hon. Trish White, hopefully he will come good in the end, particularly through getting him into sporting programs. Often you find with these characters that they are not actively involved in team sports, and that can be a way of giving them a sense of linkage with the community and to help them focus on other issues. This issue will not be resolved simply by creating more centres.

The introduction of more technical studies will help students who are not so interested in the academic stream and that, I think, is a worthwhile thing that is happening at the moment. In essence, I support this measure. It is a very complex matter. It cannot be resolved overnight, but I think we can do better. That is why I urge the government and the opposition to support this motion, because I think we can do a lot better in relation to ensuring that our children learn and are happy at school and become worthwhile citizens who feel good about themselves and who can achieve in life.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:22): I support the motion. We have had success previously with select committees formed in the lower house. I was in the fortunate position where I was able to sit on the select committee into work-life balance. I think that was a great way to examine people's lives and the difficulties that parents may have, whether they be single parents or from different socioeconomic backgrounds in terms of managing the demands of their working life. I think that it was a very well regarded select committee, and I would very much like to see another select committee established so that we can inquire into these issues, such as flexible learning options and ensuring that they are adequately funded.

The first thing we need to do is to establish exactly how they are funded, when they are funded and why they are funded and review that situation. I think it is fair to say that we have an increasing number of reported autism cases in children these days, whether it is because we are more aware that children can have these problems or whether there are other things that are happening in our environment that are making that change; I suspect it is probably a bit of both. It is a very frustrating situation for a parent to be in.

I had the good fortune to visit the Woodville Special School Council last week. I must say that I and a parent who had just moved from interstate and who had a child at that school were very surprised to hear that there is a waiting list to get a child into a special school such as that. It was something that she had never heard of, coming from the Eastern States: a waiting list for a special school for children.

With respect to behavioural management learning centres, I note that the new Liberal government of Western Australia has announced that it will be building six new centres for students who physically and verbally abuse teachers. The point was raised by the member for Fisher that it is all very well for the independent and Catholic systems, because they can expel students. And where do expelled students go? They end up in the government system. So, we need some way of managing that situation, even more so now that we have seen the school leaving age increase from 15 to 16 and now to 17, and young people must be learning or earning.

It is becoming more evident to me that we are failing to engage those 16 to 17 year olds who have struggled with school from the very beginning; those who have missed out on the extra help they may have needed in early childhood with reading and writing, numeracy and literacy, and so forth; and those whose parents might not be engaged in the education of their children. We all know how important it is for parents and families to be engaged in the education of their children.

So, we have a two-pronged situation with respect to the disruptive child, and I think it is fair to say that it is usually through no fault of their own: it is a combination of issues. Some would suggest that they are a victim of society, but they are certainly a victim of the parenting they may have experienced or, alternatively, the education process, where they have been able to move from year to year without learning the basics of reading and writing.

I have a lot of sympathy for students who have finished high school but still struggle with the basics of numeracy and literacy. However, generally, if their energies are channelled into

something that they can turn into a hobby, a part-time job, an experience or a skill gathering exercise, those types of people can be rescued and they will go on to become very good members of the community.

The alternative to not dealing with it at those sorts of ages is that they end up becoming a menace to society. They are not able to recognise an opportunity when it is there. They see others taking up opportunities and cannot understand why others are getting ahead but they are not, so they become resentful. Generally, it starts with things such as hate crimes or opportunistic crimes where, if someone has something and they want it, they will just take it.

It is very important that we deal with these kids when they have reached that stage of their education, in particular, so that we can channel them in a certain direction. I favour the trades. I think that the apprenticeship system is a great system for kids who are struggling with school. There are some trades where employers want very good results in maths and English, for example, but there are many other trades out there where they will learn those sorts of things on the job, and we should be encouraging those kids who are struggling to move down that path. And who knows—they may even be the entrepreneurs of tomorrow once they get over this blimp in their lives and their education.

I would like to see a select committee set up, and I would be very keen to be a part of that select committee if it received the support of the government and was established. It would be great for this measure to receive bipartisan support. I am a very strong supporter of the public education system. I chose to send my kids to public sector schools from the time they attended primary school, and they are now both in high school.

Some frustrations arise in the public education system and I hope that one day I might be in a position to deal with those issues. Generally, we should direct resources to areas to help identify behavioural management early. This is the argument I have been running with the super schools program, where there are larger schools so, consequently, less of an opportunity for individualised care and recognition of children's behaviour if it is antisocial or if a child is showing signs of being disengaged.

It is interesting that at a time when the rest of the world is moving away from a super schools concept this government is looking at selling schools and amalgamating schools to make them bigger. It has been a failed experiment in the United States and the UK. In fact, they are moving back to community-based schools. Bill and Melinda Gates of the Gates Foundation have donated \$2 billion towards establishing community-based schools and closing down larger schools, particularly in urban areas of Chicago. Even the state of Utah is doing the same. Utah is not a large state. You would not compare it with New York or California, but even in Utah the experiment of the super schools has failed and they are winding them back to smaller schools.

An interesting statistic in a report released in 2002 by the Utah Department of Education indicates that in areas where there were large super schools there was a large growth in non-government schools. Parents were choosing not to send their children to the super schools but, rather, to send them to independent schools, even though it would cost them money to do that. They simply chose not to use the super schools.

Maybe that is the intention of this government. Maybe it wants fewer children in the public sector and that is why it is pushing for super schools, but it is disappointing that we are not seeing appropriate consultation and looking at flexible learning outcomes and other models that super schools might use. We have not been told about the education process but, rather, we have just been shown pictures of buildings. That is a confusing issue for parents. They want education outcomes, yet the minister keeps talking about buildings.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CHRISTIES BEACH POLICE COMPLEX

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (11:32): I move:

That the 322nd report of the committee, on the Christies Beach Police Complex Upgrade, be noted.

This project will undertake the third stage of major accommodation improvements to the Christies Beach police complex. It comprises a two-storey extension to the rear of the main building, removal of transportable buildings and provision of secure car parking in Bligh Street. In summary, the project includes:

- modifications to the cell complex to improve prisoner management and occupational health and safety concerns;
- new administrative accommodation for criminal justice, family violence unit and community programs;
- training and zone emergency centre facilities;
- an exercise room;
- a new property store;
- a limited refit of work stations and offices to integrate the extension into the main complex;
- demolition and removal of a transportable building in Bligh Street; and
- construction of a secure car park in Bligh Street to accommodate 49 vehicles.

The project aims to relocate staff from a temporary building to the main complex, accommodate additional police officers from the R400 program, provide specialist training and zone emergency centre facilities, upgrade facilities within the cell complex and provide additional secure car parking.

A pre-tender estimate of the project capital cost is \$6.473 million. We received correspondence to say that a public tender for the Christies Beach major upgrade project was called in February 2009 and that the selection process was completed in April 2009. SAPOL is currently awaiting DTEI ministerial approval to appoint the successful builder. Works are expected to commence on site in June 2009, with completion in June 2010. SAPOL will be responsible for the operating costs of these facilities. Ongoing facilities management expenditure will be met from within SAPOL's existing budget.

So, based upon the evidence presented to it, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:35): The opposition members on the committee were pleased to support this project and, indeed, it has been a long time coming. I pass the Christies Beach Police Station two or three times a week (depending on which the way the Southern Expressway is going), and I have been waiting with bated breath to see a bit of action down there but that has not happened yet.

It is fair to say that one of the major issues in the southern suburbs is criminal activity and the rate of crime and, in another role, I spend quite a bit of time talking to people in the south and pick up their concerns about what is and is not happening. Anything we can do to assist the South Australian police force to carry out its job more effectively and efficiently—and, indeed, to have better facilities to go about their tasks—we are pleased to support.

It was one of those things about which there was not a great deal of argument, if any. We just wanted to get on with the job and get it done. The conditions in some areas are fairly antiquated. I know a number of police officers who work out of Christies Beach, and it is fair to say that they look forward to the improved facilities. The change to the operations of SAPOL in South Australia and the fact that Christies Beach will no longer be running the south throughout the Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island will be interesting. It is important that our police force has the best facilities possible, and the Public Works Committee will be reporting shortly on the changes to the Fort Largs Police Academy, which it visited just recently, and that is another step in the right direction.

I would say, however, that concerns are being raised with me by members of the police force (and I heard them again this morning) that we have additional police coming from the United Kingdom. Police officers have spoken to me and said that they are really concerned because there seems to be a fairly high attrition rate: once they have been here for a while, they fall out and drop into something else. Indeed, I question whether it is not a means to an end. You can come to Australia and transfer to the South Australia Police and then move onto something else. I think we need to watch quite carefully the fallout rate from United Kingdom police officers coming here. We need to do a bit of homework on that and watch it. So, the opposition supports the Christies Beach upgrade and looks forward to its being completed.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:38): Obviously, we are very keen to support the work at the Christies Beach Police Station. This came to the committee last year, just before Christmas. Since

then, we have heard of a number of moves within the department to adjust the hours of some of our suburban shopfront police stations. I do not know whether that has come from the minister or elsewhere. I know there is a lot of concern about my local station in the Malvern 7 Day Centre in Unley where, currently, they are working hours from about 9am to 7pm, and that is a cut in hours from when the finishing time was 11pm a couple of years or so ago.

Now there are some concerns that those hours may be further reduced to simply business hours, Monday to Friday, 9 to 5. That is a big concern to residents and business owners. Members would be aware that the electorate of Unley has a big chunk of the state's strip shopping from Goodwood Road through to Unley Road, King William Road, Fullarton Road, Glen Osmond Road and Portrush Road. A lot of business happens within the electorate of Unley, and, inevitably, when you are in business, you are in contact with police, whether that be through shoplifting, a break-in or some other event, for instance, being on a busy road like Unley Road, you might be a witness to an accident. Therefore, having easy access to a police station to report these types of things is very important. Of course, business people work 9 to 5, so having a police station that is only open from 9 to 5 will make it very difficult to make a personal visit.

Something else which we will lose in Unley is that personal policing, where the police do become part of the community and, consequently, they understand what the community wants, what works in the community and what happens around the community. They know who they can talk to if they need some information. I think we are losing that in our community police stations. It is a very valuable tool, because sometimes you do not need the heavy hand of the law to fix the situation. A visit from the friendly neighbourhood policeman can often sort out a situation. It gets a satisfactory result for the victim and the alleged perpetrator gets a lesson in being a member of society, if you like, and what their responsibilities are. It is concerning that there appears to be a threat to some of our shopfronts in the suburbs, and, of course—

Ms CICCARELLO: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is about the Christies Beach Police Station. This is a rambling debate about Unley. It has nothing to do with Unley: it is about Christies Beach. I would ask you bring the member back to the topic.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Unley, the subject is the Christies Beach police complex, so issues relating to that matter are appropriate.

Mr PISONI: Of course, in Unley, we would hate to be in a situation where we would be relying on police stations as far away as Christies Beach to attend to or report incidents that happen in our area. I am pleased to see that the people of Christies Beach have received an upgrade to their police station, but I point out that it has come at a cost. The cost appears to be what is happening at police stations at Unley, McLaren Vale and elsewhere, where we are seeing cuts to police services.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL—STAGE 2B

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (11:43): I move:

That the 323rd report of the committee, on the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment—Stage 2B, be noted.

Stage 1 of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment provided for the construction of a new in-patient ward building consisting of 200 beds to replace inadequate and outmoded ward facilities in the Tower Building. This facility now provides modern in-patient facilities for staff and patients. A further \$120 million has been committed for stage 2 to continue the replacement of the aged infrastructure on the site and an analysis identified that \$61 million is available for stage 2B. Stage 2B will provide for:

- the delivery of the aged acute mental health unit as a priority;
- approximately 2,400 square metres of new allied health and rehabilitation service treatment and support facilities that was previously to be part of the future stage 3; and
- minimum essential requirements for the sustainment of the Tower Building to allow safe occupation until 2015-16.

The new 20-bed aged acute mental health unit will provide synergies with other acute mental health facilities on the campus. It is to be constructed in the south-eastern precinct of the main hospital site. The building site is made available by the relocation of existing site engineering

support facilities, including engineering workshops and steam generation plant and removal of associated buildings and building infrastructure.

The aged acute mental health unit facility will be a new purpose-designed and constructed facility designed to support best practice clinical services to patients and manage their behavioural risks in a safe environment. It will also minimise recurrent maintenance and operational costs. The design will incorporate lessons learned in the delivery and operation of recent facilities at Repatriation General Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre and Lyell McEwin Hospital, as well as interstate and New Zealand experiences.

The aged acute mental health unit facility is to be delivered in two stages as part of the overall site redevelopment. Stage 1 comprises construction of the clinical services module with associated connections to the hospital circulation system. Stage 2 comprises construction of the admissions/shared entry module as part of the proposed rehabilitation services building and associated links to the existing south building. Clinical support functions located within the admissions/shared entry module will be temporarily located within vacant facilities in the maternity building and Cramond Clinic building.

The new rehabilitation and allied health facility will relocate all the disparate allied health functions in one place, create synergies by being closer to inpatient areas, and will allow for the creation of treatment zones for allied health services. The facility will be established over two levels and provide for a third floor if the need arises.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Redevelopment Stage 2B will provide high quality and efficient health care services that directly align to patient needs. It will do so by redesigning health care services to meet current and future needs of the local population. The redevelopment will also streamline services and reduce unnecessary delays, overlaps and duplication, as well as improve the functionality between service areas within the hospital.

In addition, the redevelopment will achieve economies of scale through amalgamating services and/or functions wherever possible without compromising service delivery. Client focused services will be ensured by re-engineering services to maximise integration, coordination and responsiveness.

The new facilities will support the effective and efficient provision of health care services by providing a well-designed modern day facility for patients and staff. The facility will meet quality standards and statutory requirements. By incorporating a health and well being approach to facility design, the facility will improve functionality and enhance workflow, thereby enhancing the continuum of care for patients.

The facility is flexible in its capacity to meet changing demand and has been configured to minimise patient and staff risk and improve patient outcomes. Greater use will be made of available resources within the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This will be achieved by providing the equipment and infrastructure necessary to deliver effective services within a modern, safe and secure environment that enables the effective delivery of health care services and enhances staff morale. Current service practices and models of care will be redesigned and streamlined. The project is expected to be completed by June 2012.

Based upon the evidence it has considered during its inquiry, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTHERN URBAN RE-USE PROJECT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (11:53): I move:

That the 326th report of the committee, on the Southern Urban Re-use Project, be noted.

The Waterproofing the South initiative is an integrated approach to expanding or substituting traditional sources of water with alternatives to better manage Adelaide South's existing water systems. The key elements of the initiative are:

- expanded use of recycled water from the Christies Beach Waste Water Treatment Plant for viticulture;
- irrigating some council owned parks and ovals with recycled water;

- dual reticulation of recycled water at new residential developments south of the Onkaparinga River; and
- localised stormwater capture and re-use.

SA Water was an active participant in the City of Onkaparinga's application to the National Water Commission for commonwealth funds to implement Waterproofing the South. The commonwealth agreed to fund \$34.5 million and SA Water will contribute through its funding to the Southern Urban Re-use Project, which has been allocated \$15 million by the commonwealth through the City of Onkaparinga as the lead agency.

The project is highly complex due to the need to integrate with other projects in the area, negotiate with other participants, and take account of contractual arrangements relating to recycled water in the area. The project will intercept treated effluent from the Christies Beach Waste Water Treatment Plant prior to discharge to the ocean, and transfer it to the Aldinga Waste Water Treatment Plant site. SA Water-owned land is available at Aldinga to provide annual balancing storages and further treatment to achieve the water quality required for dual reticulation re-use of the effluent. From Aldinga, the treated water will be supplied to the proposed developments in residential areas around Seaford.

The Adelaide Coastal Waters Study Report determined that, for ongoing seagrass health and recovery, the load of total nitrogen discharged into the gulf from the Christies Beach Waste Water Treatment Plant should be reduced by approximately 60 per cent from the 2003 level.

The reduction can be achieved exclusively through the implementation of further significant treatment plant upgrades or by a modest plant upgrade together with an increased customer uptake of treated wastewater for re-use applications. The most cost-effective approach is to upgrade the plant and to actively pursue additional re-use opportunities.

On the completion of this project, an additional 1,600 megalitres per annum will be available for residential re-use, and the re-use demand has the potential to grow to 3,200 megalitres per annum over the next 25 years. The cost to SA Water of the proposed scope of works is \$62.615 million and includes:

- an effluent capture structure at the Christies Beach Waste Water Treatment Plant;
- a 10 megalitres per day pumping station at Christies Beach to transfer treated wastewater to Aldinga;
- a 375 millimetre diameter transfer pipeline from Christies Beach to Aldinga;
- a 700 megalitres bulk water storage at the Aldinga site;
- an 8.5 megalitres a day tertiary water treatment process at Aldinga;
- a 10 megalitres a day pumping station at the Aldinga site; and
- a 375 millimetres diameter dual reticulation recycled water pipeline from Aldinga to the Seaford Meadows development.

United Water International Pty Ltd will be responsible for the project management and design and construction management of this project in accordance with the terms of its existing agreement with SA Water. In accordance with the terms of that agreement, an external consultant has independently assessed the delivery fees and target costs proposed by United Water.

The staging of works is critical for the successful implementation of the project due to key site constraints. For example, the effluent transfer pumping station is at an operational plant which needs to be functional at all times, as effluent discharge cannot be temporarily stopped. Also, the available space for the pumping station within the Christies Beach Waste Water Treatment Plant means it must have a small footprint. The target date for construction to be complete is 30 June 2010.

Altering the discharge at Christies Beach from marine waters to an aboveground storage lagoon at Aldinga will require a licence under the Environment Protection Act. An assessment of potential environmental impact is needed, so close consultation with the EPA has occurred through the project development.

As the project involves providing recycled water to new residential developments, SA Water is developing a Recycled Water Risk Management Plan for this proposal effectively to

minimise the risk to public health. This will be in accordance with the National Guidelines for Water Recycling and will be presented to the Department of Health for approval. The key aims of the project are to:

- provide recycled water for dual reticulation in new residential areas to the south of Adelaide, thereby reducing demand for potable water;
- reduce the volume of treated effluent discharged to Gulf St Vincent;
- accommodate growth to around the year 2020; and
- enhance sustainability of the Christies Beach and Aldinga wastewater treatment plants.

By increasing the volumes of treated wastewater re-used from the Christies Beach plant, the project will reduce the volume of treated wastewater discharged into Gulf St Vincent.

The treated wastewater will be used at new developments in the southern area for urban uses, including garden watering and toilet flushing. This will be a direct benefit to new homeowners and will also bring broader environmental and social benefits through direct savings on potable water use and reduced flows to the marine environment. Additional storage at the Aldinga Waste Water Treatment Plant will make this water available year round, including winter when re-use demand is usually low.

Based upon the evidence presented to it, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:59): This is an interesting project which will be good for the Southern Vales and McLaren Vale. It is important to note that the driving force for this was the local community, not the state government. The government was able eventually to get it going and get it through the Public Works Committee, but the local community down south look after their own business. They know what needs doing and they put forward this project, as I understand it, and we dealt with it many months ago, it seems.

We look forward to this project coming to fruition. We look forward to it being of benefit. The member for Norwood has indicated a myriad of uses that this water will be used for and where it is going to go. They talked about Seaford Meadows, the vales, the vineyards and everything else, so it is a step in the right direction. What we must do in this state, which we are not doing at the moment, is to secure more of our stormwater and re-use more of our effluent disposal water.

Motion carried.

HARBORS AND NAVIGATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12:01): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Harbors and Navigation (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2009 makes amendments to the *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993* to establish a Facilities Fund consisting of levies payable on recreational and commercial vessels and applied towards establishing, maintaining and improving facilities for use in connection with vessels.

The Facilities Fund replaces the Recreational Boating Facilities Fund established by regulation. Currently the Harbors and Navigation Act gives powers for regulations to be made to charge a levy to be paid on the registration of a power-driven recreational vessel and for payment of the levy into a special fund for recreational boating facilities. Power also exists under the Act to charge a corresponding levy in respect of commercial fishing vessels and for collected monies to be paid into a fund for commercial fishing vessels.

The Bill establishes one Facilities Fund at the level of the Act, broadens the application of the Fund to include recreational and all commercial vessels and repeals the ability to establish a levy from the regulation-making powers of the Act. This makes the establishment of a Fund and its application more equitable for all vessel users

and more transparent. The levy funds will continue to be required to be expended on vessel facilities, thereby ensuring vessel owners obtain a direct benefit from the levies they pay. The amount of the levy will continue to be set in the *Harbors and Navigation Regulations 1994*.

Unlike the current arrangements in the Harbors and Navigation Act, which separates levy monies into commercial and recreational funds, the Bill contemplates only one Facilities Fund. Only one Fund is proposed because it is often not possible to distinguish between vessel facilities that benefit recreational as opposed to commercial users and because it will be more efficient to administer a single Fund.

It is important to appreciate that vessel facilities are not limited to vessel launching or retrieval ramps but include the installation, maintenance and improvement of navigation aids and emergency marine radio which all vessels rely on when navigating our waterways, irrespective of their launching or mooring arrangements.

The regulation-making powers continue to provide for a committee to advise the Minister on the amount and allocation of levy funds. The South Australian Boating Facilities Advisory Committee was established by the Harbors and Navigation Regulations in 1996 and it will continue to assist the Minister in the setting of levy amounts and providing advice on the application of levy funds to vessel facility projects. The committee will be established by regulations under a new name and will include members representing the interests of commercial and recreational vessel users.

The opportunity has been taken in this Bill to increase penalties for the operation of an unregistered recreational vessel to ensure a penalty commensurate with the cost of registration and any required levy, and to deter non-payment. The penalties applicable to commercial vessels for this purpose are already at an appropriate level and provide an appropriate deterrent.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Harbors and Navigation Act 1993*

4—Amendment of section 55—Registration

This clause increases the penalty and expiation fee of the provision.

5—Amendment of section 90—Recreational boating fees and charges

Currently, the fund may only be applied to defray the costs of administering the Act as it relates to recreational vessels. This clause amends section 90 to broaden the scope of the fund so that it may be applied to defray the costs of administering and enforcing the Act as it relates to recreational and commercial vessels.

6—Insertion of section 90A

This clause inserts proposed section 90A

90A—Facilities Fund

Proposed section 90A establishes the Facilities Fund. The Facilities Fund is to consist of facilities levies payable under the regulations on the registration, inspection or survey of vessels and income from investment of money belonging to the Fund.

Proposed subsection (4) ensures that a certificate of registration, inspection or survey will not be issued for a vessel until any levy payable on the registration, inspection or survey is paid.

The Fund may be applied by the Minister towards establishing, maintaining and improving facilities for use in connection with vessels and the payment of expenses of administering the Fund.

7—Amendment of section 91—Regulations

This clause makes consequential amendments to the regulation making power in the Act by deleting paragraphs (ad) and (ae) and amending paragraph (af) of section 91(2).

The establishment of the Facilities Fund by proposed section 90A removes the need for a power to make regulations to establish a fund for recreational boating facilities and a fund for commercial fishing vessel facilities.

The amendments to paragraph (af) of section 91(2) ensure that a committee established by the Minister is able to provide advice on the amounts of the facilities levies, and the application of the Facilities Fund, under proposed section 90A.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Interpretation

2—Funds

These clauses contain transitional arrangements for the implementation of the measure. The effect of the arrangements is to ensure that all money in the Recreational Boating Facilities Fund is transferred into the Facilities Fund.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Venning.

HYDROPONICS INDUSTRY CONTROL BILL

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to prevent criminal infiltration of the hydroponics industry; to prevent the misapplication of certain types of hydroponic equipment by monitoring its sale and supply; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

In its election promises for the 2006 election, the Government dealt with hydroponics cannabis in its tough-on-drugs policy. In that policy it pledged to make it an offence to possess hydroponics equipment without lawful excuse and also to require hydroponics equipment retailers to maintain a record of sales of the equipment including promising legislation to require customers to provide identification when purchasing such equipment.

In November 2004, in the first instance the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy agreed to develop a National Cannabis Strategy. The Strategy was endorsed by the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy in May 2006. The strategy made it a priority action to assess the feasibility of the regulation of the sale of hydroponics equipment, similar to regulation of the liquor and second-hand dealer industries whereby businesses selling hydroponics equipment need to register on a police-controlled database, business owners must be judged to be of good character and the identification details of purchasers need to be recorded.

Cannabis is the most widely used illicit drug in Australia. In developing the National Cannabis Strategy 2006-09, the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy identified that 5.5 million people over the age of 14 have tried cannabis at least once. It further recognised that personal use of cannabis is not quarantined from the larger criminal economy and through purchasing cannabis the user may, without knowing, be funding organised crime. The 2006-07 Australian Crime Commission Illicit Drug Data Report indicates that approximately 69 percent of all drug arrests in Australia relate to cannabis.

Cannabis plays a significant role in the financial base of organised crime in this State and intelligence indicates that South Australian has the largest rate of production nationally with a number of cannabis networks trafficking hydroponically grown cannabis to the eastern states of Australia.

Recent trends identified by SAPOL indicate an organised syndicate approach to the commercial production and trafficking of cannabis, with growers of a small number of plants being part of a larger network that cultivates and distributes cannabis.

Not limited to OMCG's, organised crime is believed to be highly involved in the hydroponic cannabis industry, particularly through hydroponic equipment supply and the organisation of syndicate growers.

SAPOL has identified that certain pieces of hydroponics equipment being sold by hydroponics dealers are being used for the cultivation of cannabis. Further to this SAPOL has found that some persons working within the hydroponics industry are associated with organised criminal networks formed to produce and distribute cannabis. Legislative reform is required to regulate the hydroponics industry including the sale of prescribed equipment listed in the *Controlled Substances (General) Regulations 2000*.

The purpose of the *Hydroponics Industry Control Bill 2009* is to prevent criminal infiltration of the hydroponics industry and the misapplication of certain types of hydroponics equipment by monitoring its sale and supply. The Bill is part of a series of measures implemented by the Government designed to reduce the impact of drugs on the South Australian community.

The aim of the proposal is the regulation of certain aspects of the hydroponics industry and the disruption of the hydroponics cultivation of cannabis. This is consistent with Objective 2 of the State's Strategic Plan—Objective 2, Improving Wellbeing and the aim of the South Australian Drug Strategy 2005-2010, which is to 'improve the health and well being of all South Australians by preventing the use of illicit drugs and the misuse of licit drugs'. A key area of the Strategy is to reduce the supply of drugs through strategies that will reduce the availability and supply of illegal drugs.

The Bill, an Australian first, will support Police to combat drug-related crime. The Bill consists of two components, the first being the requirement to have a licence to operate certain hydroponics businesses and the second component relates to the sale of the prescribed equipment.

Licensing

The Bill provides for the introduction of two levels of regulation of people working in the industry.

There will be a requirement for a person to be licensed to carry on the business of a hydroponics equipment dealer as a retailer. A hydroponics equipment dealer will relate to the sale of prescribed equipment. While the prescribed equipment will be declared in regulations it is expected to include the following:

- metal halide lights, high pressure sodium lights and mercury vapour lights of 400 watts or greater;
- ballast boxes;
- devices (including control gear, lamp mounts and reflectors) designed to amplify light or heat;
- carbon filters designed to filter air within a room, or from 1 area of a building to another or to outside;
- cannabis bud or head strippers;
- units designed to contain plants and rotate around a light source so that the plants grow hydroponically while being exposed to a consistent degree of light or heat or both.

In December 2007, a Bill was passed in Parliament to amend the Controlled Substances Act to include the offence of possessing prescribed equipment without reasonable excuse. These new laws commenced in October 2008 in regard to the possession of items closely linked with illegal drug making and cultivation. A person, an organisation or business needs to provide a legitimate reason for having the prescribed items of equipment. The prescribed items of equipment are the same items of prescribed equipment in the *Hydroponics Industry Control Bill 2009*.

The Minister has the ability to grant exemptions to the Act. This is particularly pertinent as some prescribed equipment have legitimate uses not related to the hydroponics industry, such as in the lighting industry. It will be in these cases that the Minister may consider granting exemptions.

The second level of regulation applies to the employees. In this regard, an employee will be required to obtain an approval to work as a hydroponics industry employee. An employee may receive a temporary approval to work in the industry while waiting for his or her application to be processed.

The Bill requires, before a licence or approval can be issued or renewed, both dealers and employees to undergo a fit and proper person test, similar to that used in other licensed industries. Furthermore the Bill requires that the Commissioner of Police must not issue or renew a licence or approval to an applicant that has been found guilty of a prescribed offence within the 5 years immediately preceding the application or who is a subject to a control order. Applicants will have to submit photographs and be subject to fingerprinting as part of the fit and proper person test. The fit and proper person test will have further regard to the reputation, honesty and integrity of the person and that of any associates.

When working within the industry, licence holders, directors of licence holders that are bodies corporate and employees will be required to carry identification. This is designed to ensure that licensed or approved personnel can readily be identified.

The Bill provides for the right of appeal by any applicant. If the applicant is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner he/she may appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court within one month of the decision being made.

Sale of prescribed equipment

The Bill requires that a person must not sell prescribed equipment to another person unless the purchaser first produces identification that complies with the regulations. A significant part of the legislation is to obtain accurate records of persons in the community purchasing the prescribed equipment. This can only be achieved by ensuring that the purchasers provide identification at the time of sale.

The licence holder will be required to maintain records for every transaction involving prescribed equipment, with the information being transferred to the Commissioner of Police by way of an online transaction monitoring system. The information will include, but is not limited to, the time, date and location of sale, details of the equipment, details of the person who facilitated the sale, and details of the purchaser including details of the identification produced.

The Commissioner will require transaction information to be transferred within a time frame yet to be determined. The timeframe will ensure SAPOL receives the information in a timely manner to investigate any irregularities or associate the information with other SAPOL lines of enquiry.

The Bill gives authorised officers authority to enter any premises, place or vehicle that they reasonably suspect is used for carrying on a business of selling prescribed equipment by retail and use such force as is reasonably necessary. Authorised officers may inspect records and may also be accompanied by such assistants as reasonably required. The police previously have had no authority to enter a hydroponics business and do such things.

Conclusion

The *Hydroponics Industry Control Bill 2009* provides for the regulation of specialised hydroponics stores as opposed to businesses that either provide the equipment for other purposes or primarily for other functions. The licensing component will impact mainly on businesses where there are persons with certain criminal records or associate with certain types of persons. In these cases, persons will be unlikely to obtain a hydroponics dealers

licence or receive an approval to work in the industry. The licensing component will have little impact on business owners with no criminal record or criminal associations.

The requirement to keep and transfer to police records of all transactions of prescribed equipment will assist the police to investigate the mass manufacture and distribution of hydroponically cultivated cannabis in South Australia.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure. In particular it defines what prescribed equipment is, and provides that the 'Commissioner' referred to in the measure is the Commissioner of Police.

4—Carrying on business of selling prescribed equipment by retail

This clause provides that a person will be taken to be carrying on the business of selling prescribed equipment by retail if the person—

- (a) sells prescribed equipment by retail on not less than 6 days in any calendar year; or
- (b) sells prescribed equipment by retail with a total wholesale value exceeding an amount prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph; or
- (c) sells prescribed equipment in the circumstances prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph.

By carrying on the business of selling prescribed equipment by retail, the person's activities are brought under the operation of the measure.

Similarly, proposed subsection (2) provides that, if a defendant in proceedings was a licence holder and had possession of prescribed equipment, then he or she will (unless he or she proves otherwise) be taken to have the prescribed equipment for the purposes of sale in the course of his or her business of selling prescribed equipment by retail, and thus any transactions involving the equipment become subject to the measure.

5—Commissioner subject to control and direction of Minister

This clause provides that the Commissioner is, for the purposes of this Act, subject to the control and direction of the Minister (however a direction under the measure is not a direction for the purposes of section 8 of the *Police Act 1998*, which requires directions to be published in the Gazette and reported to Parliament).

6—Delegation

This clause provides that the Commissioner may delegate a power or function under the measure to a police officer of the rank of inspector or higher, other than the power to classify information as criminal intelligence, which may only be delegated to a Deputy or Assistant Commissioner. This provision is a restriction on the general power of delegation found under section 19 of the *Police Act 1998*.

7—Criminal intelligence

This clause provides for how information that has been classified as criminal intelligence by the Commissioner of Police may be used or disclosed etc in respect of the measure.

8—Non-derogation

This clause provides that the provisions of this measure are in addition to, and do not derogate from, the provisions of any other Act.

9—Exemptions

This clause provides that the Minister may exempt a specified person or class of persons, or specified prescribed equipment, from the operation of the measure, or specified provisions of it. However, the Minister must consult with the Commissioner before doing so.

Part 2—Licences and approvals

Division 1—Hydroponic equipment dealer's licence

10—Requirement for licence

This clause makes it an offence for a person to carry on the business of selling prescribed equipment by retail (or hold themselves out as doing so) without a hydroponic dealer's licence. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section is a fine of \$20,000.

11—Hydroponic equipment dealer's licence

This clause sets out how a person can obtain a hydroponic dealer's licence. The clause requires the Commissioner to be satisfied that the applicant, or each director of the applicant, is a fit and proper person to hold such a licence. The clause also sets out circumstances in which the Commissioner must refuse a licence application. A licence may be conditional: a licence holder who contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of his or her licence is guilty of an offence, the maximum penalty for which is a fine of \$20,000.

The clause also makes procedural provisions related to a licence and any application.

12—Commissioner may require fingerprints

This clause permits the Commissioner to require an applicant, and each director of an applicant in the case of a body corporate, to have his or her fingerprints taken to aid the Commissioner in determining the licence application. The clause provides that the Commissioner need not consider an application until the applicant has met the requirement and the results of checking the fingerprints against the relevant databases have been provided.

13—Suspension or revocation of licence

This clause provides that the Commissioner may, by notice in writing given to a licence holder, suspend or revoke the person's licence on the grounds set out in the clause. They include a contravention of the Act by the person, that he or she is not a fit and proper person to hold a licence or that the suspension or revocation is in the public interest.

14—Change of information relating to licence

This clause requires a licence holder to notify the Commissioner, in writing, of any change in the information supplied to the Commissioner in the person's licence application. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section is a fine of \$2,500.

Division 2—Approval of hydroponics industry employees

15—Requirement for approval

This clause makes it an offence for a person to carry out certain duties (to be prescribed by the regulations) in relation to the sale of prescribed equipment by retail unless he or she is approved as a hydroponics industry employee. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section is a fine of \$20,000.

However, this prohibition does not apply to a licence holder, or a director of a licence holder who is a body corporate that was identified in the application for the licence.

Subclause (3) further provides that, if a person does contravene proposed subsection (1), then any employer of the person in respect of the sale of prescribed equipment, and the relevant licence holder, are each guilty of an offence carrying the same maximum penalty of \$20,000. However, it is a defence to a charge if the employer or licence holder proves that he or she believed on reasonable grounds that the person was in fact approved as a hydroponics industry employee at the relevant time.

16—Temporary approval on application

This clause enables a person who has lodged an application for approval as a hydroponics industry employee to carry out prescribed duties without it being a contravention of proposed section 17. However, this temporary approval does not apply in the case of a person previously refused approval, or has had his or her approval revoked, nor to a person who must be refused approval under section 17(4) (other than a refusal on public interest grounds).

17—Commissioner may approve hydroponics industry employees

This clause sets out how a person can obtain approval as a hydroponics industry employee. The clause requires the Commissioner to be satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person to be approved. The clause also sets out circumstances in which the Commissioner must refuse a licence application, essentially the same grounds as for refusal of a licence. Approval may be conditional, and a person who contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of his or her approval is guilty of an offence, the maximum penalty for which is a fine of \$20,000.

The clause also makes procedural provisions related to an approval and any application.

18—Commissioner may require fingerprints

This clause permits the Commissioner to require an applicant to have his or her fingerprints taken to aid the Commissioner in determining an application for approval. The clause provides that the Commissioner need not consider an application until the applicant has met the requirement and the results of checking the fingerprints against the relevant databases have been provided.

19—Revocation of approval

This clause provides that the Commissioner may, by notice in writing given to an approved person, revoke the person's approval on the grounds set out in the clause. They include a contravention of the Act by the person, that he or she is not a fit and proper person to be approved or that the revocation is in the public interest.

Division 3—Appeal

20—Appeal

This clause provides that a person may appeal to the District Court if he or she is dissatisfied with a decision of the Commissioner, and sets out related procedural matters.

Part 3—Sales of prescribed equipment

Division 1—Identification

21—Purchaser must produce identification

This clause requires a purchaser to produce identification that complies with any requirements set out in the regulations before he or she can be sold prescribed equipment. A person who sells prescribed equipment to a purchaser who has not produced identification is guilty of an offence, the maximum penalty for which is a fine of \$20,000.

22—Identification cards

This clause requires the Commissioner to provide identification cards to licence holders, directors of licence holders and approved persons.

These cards must be carried by the person to whom it was issued in the circumstances set out in the proposed section, and the person must produce the card forthwith if requested to do so by an authorised officer. Contravention of either of these requirements is an offence, carrying a maximum fine of \$2,500.

Division 2—Record keeping

23—Records of prescribed transactions

This clause requires a licence holder to keep certain information in relation to certain defined transactions involving prescribed equipment. The regulations will set out what the information is, and how it must be kept. Failure to keep the required information is an offence, carrying a maximum fine of \$20,000.

The information must also be transferred to the Commissioner; proposed subsection (4) provides that the regulations may require that such transfer be effected electronically.

24—Staffing records

This clause requires a licence holder to keep certain information (to be set out in the regulations) in relation to the licence holder's staff. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section is a fine of \$2,500.

Part 4—Enforcement

25—Authorised officers

This clause enables the Minister to authorise a person to be an authorised officer for the purposes of the measure.

26—Powers of entry and inspection

This clause sets out the powers of authorised officers in respect of entering premises, places or vehicles and sets out the powers that may be exercised in relation to the premises etc.

The clause makes procedural provisions in relation to obtaining a warrant (required when exercising the power of entry conferred by the proposed section in relation to residential premises), and establishes an offence of hindering an authorised officer or refusing or failing to comply with a requirement under the proposed section.

27—Commissioner may require information from wholesalers

This clause enables the Commissioner to require a wholesaler of prescribed equipment to provide the Commissioner with specified information regarding the wholesale of the equipment to a retailer. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section without reasonable excuse is a fine of \$5,000.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

28—False or misleading information

This clause provides that it is an offence for a person to make a statement that is false or misleading in a material particular in information provided, or records kept, under this measure. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section is a fine of \$20,000.

29—Statutory declaration

This clause enables the Commissioner to require that information required to be provided to him or her be verified by statutory declaration.

30—Liability for act or default of officer, employee or agent

This clause provides a standard provision imposing vicarious liability for the acts of officers, employees or agents on a person carrying on a business.

31—Offences by bodies corporate

This clause provides that, if a body corporate is guilty of an offence against this measure, each director of the body corporate is, subject to the general defence under this Part, guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as may be imposed for the principal offence.

32—Self-incrimination

This clause provides that if a person is required to provide information or to produce a document, record or equipment under this measure and the information, document, record or equipment would tend to incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty, the person must nevertheless provide the information or produce the document, record or equipment. However, the information, document, record or equipment so provided or produced is not admissible in evidence against the person in proceedings for an offence, other than an offence against proposed Part 3 of this measure, or an offence against this measure or any other Act relating to the provision of false or misleading information.

33—General defence

This clause provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence against this measure if the defendant proves that the offence was not committed intentionally and did not result from any failure on the part of the defendant to take reasonable care to avoid the commission of the offence.

34—Annual report

This clause requires the Commissioner to submit an annual report to the Minister, and a copy of the report to be laid before Parliament.

35—Service of documents

This clause sets out how documents under the measure may be served on a person.

36—Evidentiary provision

This clause provides that certain allegations in the complaint for an offence against this measure will be taken to be proved, in the absence of proof to the contrary.

37—Review of operation of Act

This clause requires the Minister to conduct a review of the measure, as soon as practicable after the third anniversary of the measure commencing. The Minister must prepare a report on the review, and cause a copy of the report of the review to be laid before Parliament.

38—Regulations

This clause allows regulations to be made under the measure.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Existing hydroponics businesses

This Schedule makes transitional provisions, enabling a person who was carrying on the business of selling hydroponic equipment by retail before the measure commenced to—

- (a) carry on the business of selling prescribed equipment by retail; and
- (b) hold himself or herself out as carrying on such a business; and
- (c) carry out prescribed duties (within the meaning of proposed section 15),

in relation to the sale of prescribed equipment by retail, provided that they are not a person who must be refused a licence under proposed section 14(4)(a), (b) or (d).

The effect of this provision is to enable them to continue to run their business until they are able to make the relevant applications under the measure, and have them determined.

However, the person may only operate under this clause until their application for a licence is determined, or for 3 months, whichever occurs first.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Venning.

SECOND-HAND GOODS BILL

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:03): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to regulate second-hand dealers, pawnbrokers, auctioneers of second-hand goods and second-hand markets; to repeal the Second-Hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 1996; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of the *Second-hand Goods Bill 2009* is the prevention of property related crime through improved regulation of the second-hand dealer and pawnbroker industries. This is achieved by the establishment of a new licensing and regulatory regime, together with enhanced record keeping requirements and electronic transfer of transaction information to police.

A secondary objective is the introduction of legislative controls to address the current market imbalance which exists between pawnbroker service providers and consumers. The Bill will address this imbalance by requiring pawnbrokers to provide consumers with accurate information to enable the public to make informed choices when seeking these services.

The licensing regime will be administered by the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs and is targeted for businesses dealing in 'high risk of theft' second-hand goods. License holders (including second-hand markets and auction houses offering prescribed goods for sale) will be required to transfer records electronically via the Internet to a transaction management system administered by police.

The dual enforcement model I've outlined will enable officers from both agencies to enforce the legislation with the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs responsible for licensing and enforcement and police responsible for administration and compliance of the web-based transaction management system and resultant matching and investigation of stolen property.

Background

Research throughout Australia, USA and Canada has identified property criminals frequently exchange stolen property for money, using second-hand dealers and pawnbrokers. In order to reduce the number of crimes, police in these jurisdictions have or are taking steps to electronically monitor property processed by dealers in order to identify offenders and recover stolen property.

Over the last decade, several Australian and overseas jurisdictions have enacted legislation requiring dealers to be licensed as well as providing details of their transactions electronically to police. Governments are also equipping police with the technology to be able to automatically search dealer's property against police databases. Australian jurisdictions who have adopted this technology include New South Wales, Western Australia and Queensland.

Interstate and overseas experience suggests a positive licensing system, together with the introduction of a compulsory on-line transaction system to record goods bought by second-hand dealers, reduces the opportunity for stolen property to be converted into cash and significantly reduces theft and associated offences.

Current Environment

South Australia Police advise a data base enabling the electronic recording of dealer transactions has been in use in this State since the mid 1990's. Police estimate 5—10% of dealer transaction records is currently received and activities monitored for stolen property or persons of interest. Previous reviews have concluded the system is resource intensive and if not replaced, will cease to function in any productive form.

In response to these issues, on 3 June 2007, the Government announced \$2.1M had been allocated from the State Budget to introduce a compulsory online transaction reporting system for second-hand dealers and pawnbrokers to combat the stolen property market.

Currently, the laws relating to second-hand dealing and pawnbroking are contained in the *Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act, 1996* and regulations which have been in place since 1998. The Act provides for a dealer to operate a second-hand business simply by registering their intent in writing with the Commissioner of Police.

Since the Act's introduction, there has been continued community concern over second-hand dealers and pawnbrokers and their possible role in the receipt, distribution and disposal of stolen goods. In particular, the current Act does not regulate the purchase of semi-precious metals by scrap metal dealers and anecdotal evidence within the industry suggests that less scrupulous operators have taken advantage of this environment.

Features of the Bill

The proposal of this Bill is to repeal the *Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 1996* and replace it with legislation targeted to prevent and remedy current and possible future issues associated with the second-hand and pawnbroker industries.

At risk goods will be prescribed by way of regulation and will be similar to current regulations in so far as they will include commonly stolen items such as jewellery, electronic goods, power tools etc. Licences will only be required by those second-hand dealers who deal in prescribed goods. All pawnbrokers will be licensed.

The Bill also makes reference to the term 'approved persons' which refers to persons who are approved to conduct or supervise outright buys of prescribed goods and in the case of pawnbrokers, all pawns. An approved person must undergo probity checking to ensure he or she is fit and proper to carry-out this role.

The Bill will retain a number of features contained in the current legislation including:

- The requirement to record details of a person from whom prescribed second-hand goods are bought or received, and all pawned goods;
- The requirement to record an accurate description of the goods including serial numbers and any identifying features;

- A retention period for those goods acquired by a second-hand dealer;
- Labelling of goods with a unique identifying code;
- The power for Police to enter business premises to inspect and examine goods and records;
- The ability for Police to place 'holds' on goods suspected of being stolen;
- A requirement for a second-hand dealer to advise Police of any goods acquired which he or she suspects are stolen;
- Second-hand dealers and pawnbrokers are not to acquire goods from a child (a person under the age of 16 years);
- Operators of second-hand markets are required to keep certain records of people selling goods at their market;
- Prescribed goods categories will be similar to the current Regulations;
- Charities, school fetes and the like will be excluded from the provisions of the Act.
- The Bill will further strengthen current provisions by requiring licensed dealers to comply with a number of features not contained in the present legislation including:
- Businesses which acquire prescribed second-hand goods for the purpose of resale (and all pawnbrokers) will be required to be licensed.
- In deciding whether or not to grant a licence or approval the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs will take into account whether the applicant is a fit and proper person to hold a licence or approval;
- When acquiring any prescribed goods, a licensee or approved person will be required to be present on the premises to conduct or supervise the transaction.
- Documents verifying a seller's identity will have to be produced meeting a regime similar to a '100 point system'. The scheme will not be as stringent as required in the banking environment and will use recognised and easily produced documents outlined in regulations.
- When buying or receiving prescribed goods, details of the transaction including the person's identity details and description of the goods must be electronically transferred to police in a manner and timeframe prescribed by regulations.
- Goods received by a licensed second-hand dealer are required to be retained and not offered for sale for a period of 14 days from the date of transferring the transaction details to police.
- Employee records are required to be kept and produced upon request to an authorised officer.
- The Commissioner of Police may prohibit the employment of a person in a licensed business if the person is found guilty of an offence or offences as prescribed by regulations.
- Police have the ability to apply to the Magistrates Court for a barring order for a person identified as being a prolific property crime offender.
- The Bill also contains a number of consumer protection mechanisms specific to pawn transactions and the redemption of pawned goods including:
- The issuing of 'pawn tickets' to persons pawning property outlining interest rates, fees and charges and the rights and obligations of both parties;
- Provisions applicable to the redemption of the pawned goods, extending the redemption period and the sale of unredeemed goods, and
- Provisions applicable to 'surplus' funds following the sale of unredeemed goods.

Licensing

As the licensing authority, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs will have administrative responsibility for the processing of licence and approval applications as well as issuing, disqualifying and suspending of licences and approvals. Additional authority regarding disciplinary proceedings will be vested in the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court.

Electronic transmission of records

The requirement to electronically transfer transaction information is seen as an important tool to combat and restrict offenders disposing of stolen goods. Allowance will be made for the phasing in of on-line transfer of transaction information for use by police in the cross-matching of vendors, traded goods and recorded stolen goods.

Barring Orders

Research together with police observations has identified a nexus between property crime offenders and the second-hand industry. Anecdotal evidence suggests that a small number of offenders are responsible for selling or pawning a disproportionate amount of stolen or unlawfully obtained property such as DVDs and small electrical appliances, often in new or near new condition.

In order to address this issue, the Bill provides the Commissioner of Police in circumstances where a person is charged with, or found guilty of a property related offence, to make application to the Court to bar a person from disposing of goods via a second-hand dealer, pawnbroker, auctioneer or second-hand market.

Consumer protection

As indicated in my introduction, a further objective of this legislation is to redress the current imbalance of information provided by pawnbrokers to consumers. This initiative will enable users to make more informed choices when seeking these services and as well as bringing greater consistency and transparency to the pawnbroker industry which the Government believe, is warranted in the current economic climate.

Scrap Metal Dealers

Semi-precious metal theft continues to be a significant community problem predominantly occurring in and around residential properties and businesses where copper in the form of piping and cabling is targeted by offenders. The Bill will address the issue of regulation of the scrap metal industry by way of regulation with the inclusion of copper, aluminium and brass as 'prescribed goods'. This will bring scrap metal dealers and recyclers under the second-hand dealer licensing and regulatory regime.

Regulations however, will exempt licensed scrap metal dealers and recyclers from the requirement to tag, retain and quarantine prescribed semi-precious metals. Furthermore, semi-precious metals derived by dealers directly from manufacturing or commercial transactions are not intended to be captured by the legislation and will be exempted under Regulation.

Market Operators and Auctioneers

The Bill also acknowledges the level of risk in the trade of stolen goods associated with second-hand markets and auction houses is significantly less than second-hand dealers and pawnbrokers. As a consequence, the legislation will not subject market operators and auctioneers to the same stringent requirements. Instead, second-hand markets and auctioneers will be required to ensure an approved person is present during business hours to supervise and comply with legislative requirements.

Conclusion

The Bill, in large, builds upon existing provisions as well as addressing current community concerns and expectations by equipping police with the necessary legislation and technology to assist in the prevention and detection of property related crime. It represents, in the view of the Government, a sensible balance between the needs of those who conduct business and the needs of the law enforcement to have an increased ability to deal with the trade in stolen goods.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines terms and concepts used in this Bill.

4—Application of Act

This clause ensures that people will not require 2 statutory licences in respect of any activity by providing that nothing in this measure applies in relation to an activity undertaken in accordance with a licence issued under another Act. The regulations may also modify or exclude the application of this measure in relation to persons, goods or transactions of a specified class.

In addition to the above, the Minister may, by notice in writing, exempt a person from the application of this measure.

5—Non-derogation

This clause provides that the provisions of this measure are in addition to, and do not derogate from, the provisions of any other Act, nor do they limit, or derogate from, any civil remedy at law or in equity.

6—Commissioner to be responsible for administration of Act

The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs is responsible for the administration of this measure. In so doing, the Commissioner is subject to the control and directions of the Minister.

7—Criminal intelligence

This clause provides for how information that has been classified as criminal intelligence by the Commissioner of Police may be used or disclosed etc in respect of the measure.

Part 2—Licences and approvals

8—Requirement to be licensed

This clause provides that a person cannot act as, or advertise or otherwise hold himself or herself out as, a second-hand dealer or pawnbroker unless licensed under proposed Part 2. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (1) is a fine of \$20,000.

Proposed subsection (2) provides that certain specified second-hand dealers are exempt from this requirement.

9—Requirement to be approved

This clause makes it an offence for a person to act as, or advertise or otherwise hold himself or herself out as, an approved person unless approved under proposed Part 2. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section is a fine of \$20,000.

10—Application for licence or approval

This clause sets out procedural matters in respect of how a licence or approval can be obtained.

11—Applications to be furnished to Commissioner of Police

This clause provides that an application for a licence or approval must be communicated to the Commissioner of Police, who in turn must provide the Commissioner with certain information relevant to the application.

The clause also provides that the Commissioner of Police may object to an application by notice in writing provided to the Commissioner within the prescribed period, and sets out associated procedural matters.

12—Entitlement to be licensed or approved

This clause provides that a natural person who satisfies the eligibility requirements set out in proposed subsection (1) is entitled to be licensed or approved. Proposed subsection (2) makes similar provision in respect of the right of bodies corporate to be licensed.

13—Factors to be taken into account in deciding whether to grant licence or approval

This clause sets out factors the Commissioner must take into account in deciding when assessing an application for a licence or approval. These include the reputation, honesty and integrity of the applicant, or people associated with the applicant. The Commissioner must also take into consideration the grounds for any objection made by the Commissioner of Police in respect of the application.

An application for a licence or approval can only be granted if the Commissioner is satisfied that to grant the application would not be contrary to the public interest

14—Conditions

This clause provides that the grant of a licence or approval may be conditional or unconditional, and that the holder of a licence or approval must not contravene, or fail to comply with, a condition of the licence or approval. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (2) is a fine of \$20,000.

15—Appeals

An applicant for a licence or approval, or a licensee or approved person, may appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court against certain decisions of the Commissioner, and the provision sets out related procedural matters.

16—Power of Commissioner to require photograph and information

This clause provides the Commissioner may require photographs and other information from a licensee or an approved person.

17—Identification to be carried

This clause provides that the Commissioner must issue each licensee who is a natural person and each approved person with an identity card in a form approved by the Commissioner. The person must carry the identity card when performing functions as a licensee or approved person, and produce it if requested to do so by an authorised officer or a person with whom the licensee or approved person has dealings as a licensee or approved person. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (2) is a fine of \$1,250.

18—Duration of licence or approval

A licence or approval remains in force until it is surrendered or cancelled, or the licensee dies or (if the licensee is a body corporate) is dissolved.

The clause also sets out procedural matters in relation to the payment of fees and the lodging of returns. A failure to do either may result in the Commissioner requiring the licensee or approved person to make good the default, and, if that does not happen in accordance with the proposed section, the relevant licence or approval is cancelled.

19—Change of particulars relating to licence or approval

This clause requires a licensee or approved person to notify the Commissioner in writing of any changes to information that was required by the Commissioner in determining the person's application for a licence or approval. The Commissioner must pass a copy of any such notice on to the Commissioner of Police.

20—Commissioner may require surrender of licence or approval etc

This clause provides that (if a person's licence or approval is suspended or cancelled) the Commissioner may require a licensee or approved person to surrender their licence or approval and any identity card issued to the person under this measure. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (1) is a fine of \$1,250.

Part 3—Regulation of licensees

Division 1—Provisions applicable to licensees generally

21—Prescribed transactions involving second-hand goods

This clause requires a licensee to ensure that each prescribed transaction that occurs in the course of, or for the purposes of, the licensee's business is conducted or supervised by the licensee or an approved person. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (1) is a fine of \$20,000.

The clause also requires the licensee to make and keep certain records. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (2) is a fine of \$5,000.

The licensee must transfer to the Commissioner of Police, in accordance with any requirements that may be set out in the regulations, prescribed particulars of such records. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (3) is a fine of \$20,000.

The regulations may also require the transfer of the prescribed particulars to be done electronically.

22—Labelling of prescribed goods

This clause requires a licensee to ensure that any prescribed goods that he or she takes possession of in the course of, or for the purposes of, his or her business are marked or labelled in accordance with the regulations. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (1) is a fine of \$20,000.

23—Retention of prescribed goods before sale

This clause provides that a licensee must not alter the form, or part with possession, of certain prescribed goods until at least 14 days after the day on which the licensee transferred the prescribed particulars of the record relating to the goods to the Commissioner of Police.

The clause also provides that the licensee must keep the goods at the premises at which the goods were received, or premises notified to the Commissioner for the purposes of the proposed section, and must ensure that the goods are not moved to any other place.

The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (1) is a fine of \$2,500, and the clause also provides that the section does apply to goods in the circumstances listed in proposed subsection (2).

24—Staffing records

This clause requires a licensee to make and retain certain records in relation to the persons working in, or for the purposes of, the licensee's business. The maximum penalty for a contravention of proposed subsection (1) is a fine of \$2,500.

25—Power of Commissioner of Police to prohibit employee or agent from working for licensee

This clause provides that the Commissioner of Police may prohibit the person from working as an employee or agent of a licensee. A prohibition is effected by notice in writing, and may only be done if the person has been convicted of an offence of a kind specified by the regulations. A prohibition may be permanent, or for a specified time. This clause also sets out procedural matters related to making a prohibition, and provides for a right of appeal for a person the subject of a prohibition.

Division 2—Additional provisions applicable to pawnbrokers

26—Preliminary

This clause defines terms used in the proposed Division.

27—Information to be provided to person pawning goods

This clause requires a pawnbroker to give (at no charge) to a person who pawns goods a pawn ticket. A pawn ticket includes a signed copy of the pawn agreement, required to set out matters relevant to the pawn such as interest rates and fees applicable, the rights and obligations under the pawn agreement and any other information that the regulations require be included. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section is a fine of \$5,000, and the pawn agreement is invalid in the event that the section is not complied with.

28—Replacement of pawn ticket

This clause requires a pawnbroker, at the request of an entitled person (a term defined in proposed section 26), to replace (at no charge) a pawn ticket that has been lost, stolen or destroyed. The person requesting the replacement ticket must verify his or her identity in accordance with the regulations. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed section by a pawnbroker is a fine of \$2,500.

29—Redemption

This clause sets out how a person may be redeemed by an entitled person.

The clause also sets out a number of things that the pawnbroker cannot do in relation to the pawned goods during the redemption period, with penalties of up to a \$5,000 fine if the pawnbroker contravenes those requirements.

30—Extension of redemption period

This clause provides that pawnbroker and an entitled person may extend a redemption period. The regulations will set out requirements regarding such an extension, while the proposed section sets out procedural provisions in relation to an extension. The maximum penalty for a failure to comply with the proposed section is a fine of \$5,000.

31—Sale of pawned goods at end of redemption period

This clause provides that a pawnbroker must sell pawned goods, where the pawned goods have not been redeemed by the end of a redemption period. The goods must be sold in a manner that is conducive to getting the best price reasonably obtainable. The clause sets out further procedural requirements in relation to such sales, and requires that any surplus proceeds arising from the sale be paid, on request made by an entitled person before the end of the prescribed period, to the entitled person. The maximum penalty for a contravention of the proposed subsections is a fine of \$2,500.

32—Fees and charges in respect of sale of pawned goods

This clause sets out the fees and charges that may be deducted from the proceeds of a sale of pawned goods.

33—Pawnbroker not to purchase pawned goods

This clause prevents a pawnbroker, or a person acting on his or her behalf, from buying goods that have been pawned to and are being sold by, or on behalf of, the pawnbroker. The clause provides similar restrictions in the case of pawnbrokers that are partnerships or bodies corporate, extending the prohibition to partners, the body corporate and officers or directors of the body corporate.

Any sale in contravention of the section is void and of no effect, and contravention of the section carries a maximum penalty of \$2,500.

Part 4—Regulation of auctioneers

34—Consignment of prescribed goods for auction to be supervised

This clause creates 2 offences relating to the consignment of prescribed goods for auction. Firstly an auctioneer must ensure that the consignment is conducted or supervised by an approved person. The penalty for contravention of this provision is a maximum fine of \$20,000. Secondly, an approved person must ensure that the identity of the consigner of the goods is verified in accordance with the regulations. The penalty for contravention of this provision is a maximum fine of \$2,500 or an expiation fee of \$210.

35—Records relating to prescribed goods consigned for auction

This clause requires an auctioneer to keep records relating to the consignment of prescribed goods (with a maximum penalty of \$5,000 or an expiation fee of \$315) and to transmit prescribed particulars to the Commissioner of Police (with a maximum penalty of \$10,000).

Part 5—Regulation of markets

36—Market to be supervised

Under this clause, a market operator is required to ensure that a second-hand market is supervised by an approved person. The penalty for failure to comply is a maximum fine of \$20,000. The provision does not apply if the operator establishes that he or she has taken reasonable measures to ensure that prescribed goods are not sold at the second-hand market.

37—Sale of prescribed goods at market

A person must not sell prescribed goods at a second-hand market without the permission of the approved person supervising the market and the approved person must ensure that the identity of the seller is verified in accordance with the regulations. The maximum penalty for each offence is \$2,500 or an expiation fee of \$210.

38—Records relating to prescribed goods sold at market

A market operator is required to keep records relating to the sale of prescribed goods (with a maximum penalty of \$5,000 or an expiation fee of \$315) and to transmit prescribed particulars to the Commissioner of Police (with a maximum penalty of \$10,000).

Part 6—Special powers to suspend or cancel licence or approval

39—Suspension or cancellation of licence or approval—prescribed offences

This clause allows the Commissioner to cancel or suspend a person's licence or approval if the person is charged with or found guilty of an offence of a kind to be prescribed by regulation.

40—Suspension of licence or approval in urgent circumstances

This clause provides the Commissioner with a special power to suspend a licence or approval (for up to 6 months) if there are reasonable grounds to believe that a licensee or approved person has engaged, or is engaging, in conduct that constitutes grounds for disciplinary action, that the conduct is likely to continue and there is a danger that a person or persons may suffer significant harm, or significant loss or damage, as a result of the conduct unless action is taken urgently.

Part 7—Discipline

41—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the Part.

42—Cause for disciplinary action

This clause defines when proper cause exists for disciplinary action.

43—Complaints

This clause provides for the lodging of a complaint with the Court in relation to a disciplinary matter.

44—Hearing by Court

This clause provides for the hearing by the Court of a disciplinary matter.

45—Procedure on hearing of complaint

The Court is not bound by the rules of evidence but may inform itself as it thinks fit and must act according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case without regard to technicalities and legal forms. The clause also provides that, in determining whether there is proper cause for disciplinary action, regard may be had to evidence of the conduct of persons with whom the licensee or approved person associates or has associated as the Court considers relevant.

46—Disciplinary action

This clause sets out the Court's powers on finding that proper cause exists for disciplinary action.

47—Contravention of orders

If a person contravenes an order of the Court, the person is guilty of an offence. If a person is employed or engaged in the business of a licensee or becomes a director of a body corporate that is a licensee in contravention of an order of the Court, that person and the licensee are each guilty of an offence. Both offences are punishable by a maximum fine of \$35,000 or 6 months imprisonment.

48—Joinder of Commissioner and Commissioner of Police as parties

The Commissioner and the Commissioner of Police are each entitled to be joined as a party to any proceedings of the Court under this Act.

Part 8—Enforcement

49—Exercise of powers under *Fair Trading Act 1987*

The powers of authorised officers under sections 77 and 78 of the *Fair Trading Act 1987* may be exercised by police officers for the enforcement of this Act.

50—Powers of entry and inspection

This clause sets out other specific powers of entry and inspection.

Part 9—Barring orders

51—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in this Part.

52—Barring orders

This clause allows a police officer to apply to the Magistrates Court for an order (a *barring order*) barring a person who has been charged with, or found guilty of a barring offence from disposing of second-hand goods to, or through the agency of, a second-hand dealer, pawnbroker or auctioneer or at a second-hand market.

53—Issue of barring order in absence of respondent

This clause provides a procedure for the issue of a barring order in the absence of the respondent.

54—Service

This clause makes provision in relation to service of a barring order and in particular provides that a barring order must be served on the respondent personally and is not binding until it has been so served.

55—Variation or revocation of barring order

The Court may vary or revoke a barring order.

56—Burden of proof

The civil burden of proof is applicable to proceedings under this Part (other than proceedings for an offence).

Part 10—Miscellaneous

57—Where goods suspected of being stolen

This clause is similar to the current section 11 of the *Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 1996* and imposes various obligations on dealers and pawnbrokers where goods are suspected of being stolen. In particular, the clause provides for the issue of notices by the Commissioner of Police in relation to suspected stolen goods, for the making of claims by members of the public in relation to suspected stolen goods, and for notification by dealers etc to the Commissioner of Police in relation to suspected stolen goods.

58—Offence to deal with child or intoxicated person

This clause prohibits certain dealings with children or intoxicated persons (the maximum penalty being a fine of \$2,500 or an expiation fee of \$210).

59—No contracting out

An agreement or arrangement that is inconsistent with a provision of the measure or purports to exclude, modify or restrict the operation of the measure is to that extent void and of no effect.

60—False or misleading information

This clause creates an offence relating to the provision of false or misleading information. The maximum penalty is \$10,000 if the person made the statement knowing that it was false or misleading or \$2,500 in any other case.

61—Statutory declaration

The Commissioner or the Commissioner of Police may require information to be verified by statutory declaration.

62—Investigations

The Commissioner may request the Commissioner of Police to investigate and report in relation to certain matters.

63—Register of licensees and approved persons

This clause provides for the keeping of a public register in relation to licensees and approved persons.

64—General defence

It is a defence to a charge of an offence if the defendant proves that the offence was not committed intentionally and did not result from any failure on the part of the defendant to take reasonable care to avoid the commission of the offence.

65—Liability for act or default of officer, employee or agent

An act or default of an officer, employee or agent of a person carrying on a business will be taken to be an act or default of that person unless it is proved that the person acted outside the scope of his or her actual, usual and ostensible authority.

66—Offences by directors of bodies corporate

If a body corporate is guilty of an offence against this Act each director is guilty of an offence unless it is proved that the director could not, by the exercise of reasonable diligence, have prevented the commission of the offence by the body corporate.

67—Service of documents

This clause provides for the service of documents under the measure.

68—Prosecutions

This clause makes provision in relation to the commencement of prosecutions under the measure.

69—Evidentiary provision

This clause provides for certain certificates and evidentiary presumptions for the purposes of the measure

70—Annual report

This clause provides for annual reports by the Commissioner.

71—Regulations

This clause is a regulation making power.

Schedule 1—Repeal and transitional provisions

Part 1—Repeal

1—Repeal

This clause repeals the *Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 1996*.

Part 2—Transitional provisions

2—Act applies to transactions occurring after commencement

The measure is to apply to transactions occurring after commencement of the measure.

3—Regulations

This clause provides for the making of savings and transitional regulations, including, for example, regulations which allow the new provisions to be phased in.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Venning.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12:04): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982; and to make related amendments to the Young Offenders Act 1993 and the Youth Court Act 1993. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Correctional Services Act dates back to 1982. Since that time, it has been regularly amended to reflect changes in government policy and correctional practice, and to address community concerns. The changes to the act proposed in this bill are wide ranging and are considered necessary for the effective management of prisoners and offenders.

Many of the changes proposed in this bill remove impediments that impact on effective custodial management. Others streamline existing processes to maximise the use of the Department for Correctional Services' resources. The changes proposed will make prisoners more accountable for their actions whilst at the same time providing correctional authorities with more efficient prisoner management tools. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Removal of the Community Service Advisory Committee and the various Community Service Committees

These Committees were introduced many years ago when there was concern that Community Service offenders may take paid jobs from members of the community. Additionally, at the time that the Committees were established, departmental Community Services Centres were managed by officers at the lower to middle management levels.

Whilst the Committees have done extremely valuable work over the years, it is the general view that they are no longer necessary. Community Service has now gained a significant level of community acceptance. Furthermore, restructuring within the Department for Correctional Services has seen responsibility for Community Services transferred to senior Regional Managers.

Allow persons of good standing to be appointed as Visiting Inspectors

The Correctional Services Act requires prisons to be regularly inspected. This is an important accountability measure, ensuring independent scrutiny of prisoner management and prison operation.

Under the Act, Visiting Inspectors currently are required to be Justices of the Peace, retired judicial or magisterial officers or legal practitioners.

The requirement is onerous and prevents otherwise suitable and qualified members of the community from becoming Visiting Inspectors. Regularly there has also been a suggestion that the current legislative provisions prevent many Aboriginal people from qualifying as Visiting Inspectors.

The amendments included in this Bill will expand the existing groups from which Visiting Inspectors may be chosen to include respected members of the community. This is an important amendment to strengthen the scrutiny of our prison system.

The establishment of multiple committees to assist the Chief Executive assess prisoner classifications

The present Act allows the Minister to establish a committee to assist the Chief Executive to carry out prisoner assessments. Best practice suggests that better assessments are achieved by drawing together prison staff and prisoner Case Managers who work with prisoners every day, to decide the assessment priorities. This requires the establishment of committees in each prison, which has occurred on an informal basis.

The Department has on numerous occasions been questioned about the legislative base for these committees and the legality of their recommendations given that the Act only provides for a single committee.

Whilst it is recognised that the *Acts Interpretation Act, 1915* legislates that words in the singular are to be construed as plural, it is considered necessary to clarify this section to put the meaning beyond doubt.

Ensure that, where appropriate, conditions of parole apply to prisoners who are given early release

The Chief Executive has the authority under the Act to approve prisoner release from prison up to 30 days prior to their release date.

Recent advice has indicated that if a prisoner is released on parole prior to his or her original release date, the conditions of parole will only be enforceable as from the original release date.

Whilst the early release provision is only sparingly used, it is necessary to ensure that prisoners who are subject to parole, are subject to parole conditions as soon as they are released.

This Bill rectifies this situation by ensuring that where early release is approved, a prisoner's parole conditions will apply from the date of actual release.

Enable the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services to approve short term prisoner separations. Longer term separations to remain the responsibility of the Minister

Every day there are about 10 prisoners who need to be separated for a range of reasons, mainly relating to the safe and secure operation of the prison. Most of these separations are short term, often less than 2 or 3 days.

The current Act requires the Minister to consider all separations. The Minister may review or revoke the decision.

Given the short time frame of most separations and the time necessary to complete the normal administrative processes involved, very few reports reach and are reviewed by the Minister before the separation order expires.

Under the Bill, only separation orders expected to exceed, or having exceeded, 5 days will require consideration by the Minister. All other orders would be approved by the Chief Executive or his or her delegate.

Amend the regulation making power to reflect current practices regarding the amount of property that a prisoner may have and provide flexibility in the management of that property

Under the current regulations, a prisoner may keep personal effects to the value of \$200, and property that will fit into a clothes protector and container/locker area measuring 45cm x 41cm x 29cm.

The regulations regarding these matters are out of date and do not reflect modern prison practice.

Amendments proposed in this Bill will allow regulations to be made to provide more flexibility for the management of prisoner's property without necessarily increasing the amount of property a prisoner may have.

Amendments to the Act to increase penalties for persons who breach the Act and/or regulations

Many of the penalties that exist under the Act and regulations have not been amended since 1994. As a consequence, they do not adequately reflect contemporary good practice.

As part of this Bill, amendments are proposed to ensure that the behaviour of prisoners who breach prison rules can be adequately dealt with.

For administrative purposes, remove from the Act duplicated sections that prescribe a class of prisoner who may not be released from prison on Home Detention

There are several similar sections of the Act that relate to the release of prisoners on Home Detention.

Administrative amendments are proposed in this Bill to remove the unnecessary duplicate sections.

Remove the requirements that make it necessary for the Governor to appoint and revoke private service provider staff as 'officers of the Crown' for the purpose of providing the services for the contracts of Prisoner Movement and In-Court Management Services and the Management of the Mount Gambier Prison

Presently, the appointment and revocation of any private service provider staff member (G4S) as an officer of the Crown must be ratified by the Governor in Executive Council pursuant to section 68 of the *Constitution Act 1934*.

This process must occur each time a new employee commences or ceases work under the contracts and is necessary to provide G4S staff with the same powers and authority as Correctional Officers.

This process is administratively cumbersome.

The amendments included in the Bill transfer the authority to appoint and revoke G4S staff members to the Minister for Correctional Services.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These provisions are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts a definition of *officer of the Department* for the purposes of the Act. An officer of the Department is proposed to be defined as a person who either has been appointed by the Governor as an officer of the Department prior to the commencement of clause 5, or is appointed by the Minister under section 4A after the commencement of clause 5. It is desirable to have this definition given the changes proposed under clause 5 of the measure a result of which there will be 2 ways in which a person could have been appointed as an officer of the Department.

5—Insertion of section 4A

Currently employees of a contractor undertaking duties and responsibilities under the *Correctional Services Act 1982* (and other Acts) pursuant to a contract between the Crown and the contractor are required to be appointed as officers of the department by the Governor with notice of each appointment published in the Gazette. This clause provides for the Minister to make such appointments if the Minister is satisfied that the person being appointed is employed by a contractor in respect of a contract with the Minister and is a suitable person. A person appointed under this clause will be excluded from the Public Service.

6—Repeal of sections 17B and 17C

This clause removes the sections of the Act that relate to the community service advisory committee and the community service committees. These committees will no longer exist. The functions of those committees, having been required in the initial stages of the community service programs, are now largely unnecessary and any required functions are now performed by senior Departmental staff.

7—Amendment of section 20—Correctional institutions must be inspected on regular basis

Under section 20 of the Act prisons are required to be inspected regularly to maintain standards. Currently, under section 20(2a), a person is not eligible for appointment as an inspector of prisons unless he or she is a person who has retired from judicial or magisterial office, is a legal practitioner or is a justice of the peace. In some instances there is a lack of local persons eligible to be inspectors. This clause removes the requirements of the current section 20(2a) and provides for the Minister to appoint any person who is considered a suitable person as an inspector of prisons for the purposes of section 20.

8—Amendment of section 23—Initial and periodic assessment of prisoners

Currently section 23(2) of the Act provides for the Minister to establish a committee to assist the Chief Executive Officer in carrying out prisoner assessments under section 23. In practice it is desirable that there are additional committees, for example at each prison, to enable prisoners to be individually and carefully assessed. While section 26(b) of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1915* provides that a reference to 'committee' includes 'committees', this clause clarifies that the Minister may establish more than 1 committee to assist the Chief Executive Officer in carrying out prisoner assessments.

9—Amendment of section 24—Chief Executive Officer has custody of prisoners

The proposed amendments to this section will clarify that a regime for the management of a prisoner may be varied and that any such variation does not constitute a penalty for the purposes of the principal Act.

10—Amendment of section 36—Power to keep prisoner apart from other prisoners

Under section 36 the Chief Executive Officer may direct that a prisoner is to be kept separately and apart from the other prisoners for a specified period. On such a direction being made, section 36 currently requires the Minister to be provided with a report on the direction and the circumstances of it being made as soon as is practicable after it is made. This clause provides for reports to be provided to the Minister only in respect of directions made to keep a prisoner separately and apart for a period exceeding 5 days, or any direction that will result in a prisoner being kept separately and apart for a period exceeding either 5 consecutive days, or an aggregate of 5 days within any 10 day period. For example, a report to the Minister will be required when 2 directions, each for a period of 3 days, are made resulting in a prisoner being kept separately and apart for those 6 with a 3 day break in between the separations.

11—Amendment of section 37A—Release on home detention

Currently powers with respect to the release of a prisoner on Home Detention are referred to in both section 37A and section 89(2)(d). This measure proposes for this question to be dealt with under section 37A only by

deleting the specific regulation making power in section 89(2)(d). As a consequence, it is necessary to delete the reference to the regulations in this section.

12—Amendment of section 37B—Authorised officers

This clause proposes to increase the maximum penalty for the offence of hindering an authorised officer, or failing to answer truthfully a question put by an authorised officer, in respect of the powers under this section. The maximum penalty is currently a fine of \$2,500 which is proposed to be increased to \$5,000.

13—Amendment of section 38—Release of prisoner from prison or home detention

Under section 38(2) the Chief Executive Officer may release a prisoner from prison or home detention 30 days earlier than the prisoner's due release date. In many cases, a prisoner's due release date is a date fixed by the Parole Board for the prisoner's conditional release on parole. This proposed clause clarifies that a prisoner, who is due for release on parole and is released early under section 38(2), will be subject to parole and the conditions of parole fixed by the Parole Board from the date of actual release.

14—Amendment of section 41—Powers of Visiting Tribunals

Section 41 currently provides a maximum penalty of \$5,000 or imprisonment for 3 months for offences with respect to Visiting Tribunals. This clause proposes to increase the pecuniary maximum penalty to \$7,500, while the maximum penalty of imprisonment will remain unchanged.

15—Amendment of section 42A—Minor breaches of prison regulations

Section 42A provides maximum penalties that apply on a prisoner breaching prison regulations to which the section applies. The current penalties provided for are forfeiture of any specified amenities or privileges for a specified period not exceeding 7 days, or exclusion from any work that is performed in association with other prisoners for a specified period not exceeding 7 days. This clause proposes to increase the maximum time period allowed for each of those penalties from 7 days to 10 days.

16—Amendment of section 43—Manager may deal with breaches of prison regulations

This clause proposes to increase 2 of the maximum penalties available upon a breach of general prison regulations—

- 1 maximum penalty currently available (under section 43(2)(b)) is that a prisoner may forfeit any specified amenities or privileges for a period not exceeding 28 days. It is proposed to increase that maximum period to 35 days;
- Another maximum penalty currently available (under section 43(2)(c)) is that a prisoner may be excluded from working with other prisoners for a period not exceeding 14 days. It is proposed to increase that maximum period to 21 days.

17—Amendment of section 89—Regulations

The amendments proposed to the regulation making power in section 89 are as follows:

- Consistently with the amendment proposed by clause 11, it is proposed to delete paragraph (d) of section 89(2) (referring to the release of a class of prisoners on home detention). Under section 37A, the Chief Executive Officer is given an absolute discretion to release a prisoner from prison on home detention conditions;
- The deletion of the reference to personal property from paragraph (j) of section 89(2) is in anticipation of the proposed new paragraph (ja) to be inserted in section 89(2) that will refer to personal property of prisoners;
- Paragraph (ja) to be inserted in section 89(2) will provide for power to make regulations with respect to the acquisition and retention of personal property of prisoners (including the transfer, storage or disposal of such property). This clarifies how a prisoner's property may be dealt with by prison officials and is important in particular instances where prisoners accumulate additional property in excess of the restricted amount of property they had on admission.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

1—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends the *Young Offenders Act 1993* in order to permit those persons appointed under proposed section 4A of the *Correctional Services Act 1982* (see clause 5 of the measure) by the Minister as officers of the Department to assume responsibilities and perform duties in respect of youths as provided for under the *Young Offenders Act 1993*.

Part 2—Amendment of *Youth Court Act 1993*

2—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause deletes the definition of *Department*.

3—Amendment of section 24—Persons who may be present in Court

This clause proposes to include those persons appointed by the Minister as officers of the Department of Correctional Services, under proposed section 4A of the *Correctional Services Act 1982* (see clause 5 of the measure), as persons who may be present in the Youth Court during proceedings in that Court. This is desirable because of their duties and functions in relation to youths under the *Young Offenders Act 1993*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Venning.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 June 2009. Page 3181.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:06): I will be brief. Overall, I believe that the budget is quite sound and sensible in very difficult financial times. I do not think that one should be too harsh in making any criticism, because of the constraints that have been imposed as a result of the global financial crisis. However, I do have some issues in relation to the budget.

In particular, there is an issue that has been raised in my electorate and I have been asked to raise it here. Even though the government seems to be able to increase its fees and charges (in some cases by more than CPI—water up by 13.8 per cent; bus fares, 5 per cent; multitrip fares up by 4.3 per cent; and CTP premiums up by 8.3 per cent), the government is unable to increase the concessions available to pensioners and others who are eligible for such concessions on utilities such as council rates, water and sewerage, energy, emergency services levy and public transport.

I indicated at the start that the financial situation is tight, and I accept that but, even when finances have not been so tight, the government has been reluctant to increase or adjust the concession on utilities to take account of the fact that charges in all those areas—council rates, water and sewerage, energy, etc.—have increased. I make that point as a result of representation at one of my community meetings this week.

There are other aspects that concern me. I notice in the budget significant cuts to the environment department. As I said, times are tough, but it always seems to be the case that the environment department cops a whack around the chops, irrespective of global financial conditions. I want to remind the government that it has made (and, over a long time, has had) a long-standing commitment to the environment, and I trust that the cuts in the budget to that department are only short term and do not reflect a lack of interest in or commitment to environmental management.

I note that there is an increase in provision for cool burns (prescribed burning) and I welcome that, but some areas within the environment department have been cut harshly, and I believe that there are many areas of government where some savings could be made that would more than offset the small amount (in relative terms) that has been taken out of the environment department.

Overall, taking into account the financial situation globally and the impact of reduced GST and so on, the budget is a fairly reasonable financial commitment by the government. However, as the financial situation improves and the Australian and South Australian economy perform at a higher level, I would expect to see the government commit more money to particular areas that have missed out once again.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:11): This is the budget that should have brought home the bacon for the government and the taxpayers of South Australia, after years of record revenues from the GST—and we are not talking about budgeted revenues; we are talking about revenues over and above what had been budgeted—and increases in state fees and charges, including land tax, in particular. Last year there was a 38 per cent increase in the government's take from land tax, and payroll tax and WorkCover levies are out of control, yet this Labor government still cannot balance the books. South Australia is officially the highest taxed state in Australia.

There was a time, of course, when South Australia was a competitive place to do business. When I take school tours through this place, I mention Tom Playford's plan to keep costs low in South Australia so that we would have a competitive edge in relation to New South Wales and Victoria in order to encourage manufacturers to set up in this state. Obviously, this government has decided that it is not important to be cost effective.

These budget papers tell us that South Australia is officially the highest taxed state in Australia, with record revenues of \$14.4 billion. Remember, the Treasurer has been telling us that revenues are down, but this year's budget is bigger than last year's budget. There is more in this budget than was in last year's budget, because the government is being bailed out by Canberra in

relation to education programs and infrastructure projects to make up for the programs for which the government has failed to plan and for the blowout in the public sector the government has failed to contain. We have seen a growth in the public sector of around 16,000, and of that number only about 4,000 employees have been involved in service delivery by way of police, doctors and nurses. So, we have seen an enormous increase in the growth of the public sector, and that is a cost the public has to bear year after year.

The government is now telling us that the budget will contain job cuts. So, the question we can legitimately ask is: what are those people doing now that is no longer required? What has changed in the scope of government that makes these people surplus to requirements, or were they not required in the first place? The problem is not money; money has come in very easily over the last seven years. As we have seen, Australia has become a model for the western world in relation to growth. We have just come out of a record period of growth here in Australia.

I can tell members that it is not nice doing business when there is no growth and we are in negative growth. I had a business in the early 1990s in the area of discretionary spending, that is, an item you tend to spend money on when you are feeling good and you have surplus money. Selling furniture is a fairly hard slog when people are losing their job and the country is in recession, and that has a spin-off effect on employment right across all sectors and industries, whether it be restaurants or even selling a set of new towels or a new suit. We saw what a widespread effect it had when the economy stalled or was in reverse during the recession that Keating said in the early 1990s that we had to have.

In that time, this government has been spending like drunken sailors. It has been throwing its money around with no thought as to what it will be looking at when it wakes up sober in the morning. It certainly has a hangover now and, unfortunately, it is South Australians who will be left with the headache from the lack of action over the last seven years.

It is interesting that the government's election slogan is 'Action now for the future' when it has already been there for over seven years. This is a self-admission that there has been no action, and come 20 March next year I think South Australians will be looking over what this government has achieved and what it is promising, and I think they will be making their choice on what the government has actually done and not on what it has promised, because we have seen a number of promises broken, certainly in the short time that I have been in this parliament.

Let us not forget that the Treasurer is claiming \$3.1 billion in debt. In actual fact, if you include all the government instrumentalities—SA Water, TransAdelaide, SA Housing Trust, and superannuation and WorkCover unfunded liabilities—we are looking at closer to a \$20 billion problem. It all has a very similar ring to it. It is a 'back to the future' debt with state and federal Labor.

We all recall what it was like running a state under a very heavy degree of debt after the State Bank collapse. Under Treasurer Foley's description of state debt the State Bank would not have been included because it was an instrumentality of government, not the government itself, just like SA Water, TransAdelaide and the Housing Trust. So, it is important that we acknowledge that the debt goes beyond the direct government budget; we are seeing debt in other areas of government enterprises.

The most amazing element of the pea and thimble budget, and the most cynical, is the promised razor gang, whose recommendations for fat trimming, the public sector and job cuts, will not be revealed until after the 20 March election—extremely convenient. Here we have a government that has been in power for nearly eight years, and I think I heard the Treasurer, on either television or radio, saying, 'We're going to get these people in, because we don't really know how we can contain costs and how we can make cuts, and we're not going to get them in until after the election.'

Even though the Treasurer announced in the Mid-Year Budget Review that there was a global financial crisis and that changes had to be made then, we are to wait until 18 months after that before the government takes any action. I suggest that that timetable has more to do with the timetable of the election than with the government's desire to control its expenditure.

Fancy going out there saying, 'We are going to make \$750 million in cuts, but we're not going to tell you what they are until after the election.' This is from a government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: —that demanded all the detail of our upgrade of the hospital proposal, right down to ceiling heights. It wanted to know what the ceiling heights were going to be. Yet, it expects the people of South Australia to accept the fact that there will be cuts in the budget, 'But we won't tell you what they are. We won't tell you whether there will be extra taxes. We won't tell you whether we are putting school fees up. We won't tell you whether we'll be putting water charges up over and above the cost of producing water. We won't tell you whether we'll be asking our state instrumentalities to deliver a bigger dividend for us,' which will, of course, mean increases in motor registration.

They will not tell us what government departments will be cut. They will not tell us whether we will be seeing cuts in police, education or health. None of that. They are not prepared to debate that in the lead-up to the election. They have admitted that they have an expenditure problem, but they are not going to tell us how they are going to fix it until after the election, because they know that they will be held accountable for that—and they do not want to be held accountable on this budget. That is why they will not reveal what they are cutting or taxes they are raising until after the election, to try to get themselves another four years. In other words—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How old will you be in 2014?

Mr PISONI: I will be younger than you, minister, in four years' time. I will always be younger than you, minister.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How old is that?

Mr PISONI: So, in other words, they do nothing for eight years other than unwisely spend windfall gains from GST and other state taxes, property taxes in particular, put nothing away for a rainy day and then promise to sort it all out if elected for a third term. It is an interesting concept, but not the sort of thing you would expect from a government that claims to be experienced. One would think that if they knew what they were doing they would be honest about the cuts they intended and would bring them forward before the election so that, instead of being the last state to come out of the financial downturn, we are the first state, and that needs action now and not for the future.

It is like the promises of expanded reservoirs. Remember the Mount Bold reservoir, which was in the 2006-07 budget? Where has that gone? That promise has gone: that was going to fix our water issues. The desalination plant at Spencer Gulf has gone after being promised. The Premier announced that the state government's partnership in that project was the biggest in the world, but that has gone, so maybe it is the biggest political backflip in the world—I do not know. The tramline extension to Port Adelaide: where has that gone? It is not in the budget, but it has disappeared, just like the many other promises announced in this budget; they will not be there after the election. It is designed to get the government over the line at the next election and for no other purpose.

They have form on this: promising one year and dumping it the next. We have seen it all before. This budget is a monumental bail-out of state Labor by federal Labor in terms of education program funding to improve literacy and numeracy. Fancy: after nearly eight years of Labor, when group training organisations take on apprentices they have to give them a crash course in numeracy and literacy because they have not learnt them at school. That is an enormous concern. I am pleased to see some federal money coming in there. The minister will not answer questions about the IT revolution, because she says it is a federal issue. However, it is in the budget, but when I ask questions about difficulties in delivering that she says that it is not her concern as it is a federal issue.

The budget will allow state Labor to continue to underspend on education, as we have seen in this budget. What will happen when the flow-on from Canberra dries up, when the credit card has reached its limit and there is no longer federal money? Where will education be then? The Rann Labor government and Treasurer Foley have taken an axe to education spending and have used the federal government's building education revolution to try to disguise the fact that there is less state money in the education budget this year than there has been for many years. They have broken their own rules.

The memorandum of understanding that was signed by the states stated that they would not substitute their state programs with these federal programs but continue with their capital and other programs and that the federal money was to be extra. However, we have seen \$204 million cut from programs in schools and have seen slashing of capital funding by 12 per cent.

As a matter of fact, state spending on capital expenditure in this budget—if you allow for inflation—in real dollars is less than it was in the last Liberal budget. We are going backwards on state expenditure on capital, and that is why we are seeing a mass number of schools being put under pressure to close by this government. The government has been starving them of needed capital expenditure for maintenance, for school buildings and for other purposes—even the rebitumising of basketball or netball courts.

Of course, desperate parents are shown shiny new plans for schools that do not specify ceiling heights. We see parents getting excited about the prospect of sending their kids to a brand-new school. You have schools in the Spencer Gulf where 30 per cent of the girls' toilets are decommissioned because they are so badly in need of repair. The school has given up trying to deal with them. It is no wonder that the federal government has had to bail out the state government on capital expenditure.

South Australian students are unfortunately bearing the brunt of the failure of the Treasurer and the self-styled education Premier to manage the state budget. The education budget is a big chunk of the budget, I concede that, so that is where the government has gone to try to save money to hang onto its AAA credit rating. The problem with the Building the Education Revolution—the get-out-of-gaol free card from federal Labor to state Labor—is that it has comprehensively welched on education infrastructure and maintenance for the past seven years. Where has the Rann government been on maintenance in our schools over the past seven years? There is nothing revolutionary about that.

Instead of well-planned and thought-out options tailored to the specific needs of individual school communities, Labor is giving us biscuit mould designs off the back of the truck. My office is being inundated with the problems that schools are having in trying to administer that. We are seeing an enormous increase in costs. As an example, a country school approximately 12 months ago completed a school hall. That same model was offered to another school but at \$1 million more than the school had paid for it just 12 months earlier. However, that problem is not happening in the independent Catholic sector, I must say; it is managing its own grants, managing to keep builders at bay, choosing its builders and using the competitive process.

The government's hand of bureaucracy is all over this Building the Education Revolution, and we are seeing poor value for money from this significant amount of borrowed money that is being spread throughout the community. Schools are either getting what they do not want, putting up with something that is half baked, or they are saying, 'No, it will not work. We simply cannot justify it.' Of course, there is a lot of concern about the push to close and amalgamate 150 schools throughout South Australia, and it is interesting that those schools are in regional South Australia. We know that Labor does not understand regional South Australia, only very safe Labor seats.

I know the Premier, and, if he thought it was going to be a winner for South Australians, he would be putting the super school program in those marginal seats. That is how this Premier works. He is not doing that because he knows it is a costcutting exercise. The government is attacking the regions and attacking its safest seats and closing schools to cut the costs of education in South Australia. It is a failed model.

We have seen how the United States and the UK are moving back to community-based schools after the failed experiment of super schools. Of course, with the cuts in the education budget and the cuts in state contribution to education in South Australia—hidden underneath the BER spending—it is no wonder now that the government is looking at all sorts of ways it can extract money elsewhere (rather than from its own tax base) in order to fund its school system.

It is no coincidence that this week we read about the government's plan to make it easier for schools to raise the compulsory materials and services charge. Of course, the department will not make that decision, because it wants parents to make that decision. So, parents are starved of materials and discretionary spending for their schools and are left with no choice but to agree to raise fees; in other words, to shift our schools to a user-pays system where we are seeing a greater contribution for education from parents rather than from the state.

I am predicting that we will see an increase in the contributions forced on parents by this government. The government is looking at ways to make it easier for school councils to make that decision. So, instead of polling the whole school and making sure that it is agreed to by everyone, they want to short-cut that process.

Time expired.

Ms FOX (Bright) (12:30): I would like to address the house today on the forward thinking initiatives within the 2009-10 state budget. However, I would like to apologise to everyone in this house, because I may have a slight cold and I sound slightly ridiculous.

An honourable member: As long as it's not swine flu!

Ms FOX: It is not swine flu. If it is swine flu, I will come over and breathe on you.

Mrs Geraghty: No, it's the droplets.

Ms FOX: Or droplets, apparently. In the storm that has been the global financial crisis, Australians have been sheltered by the Labor Party's fiscally responsible policy aimed at creating jobs and stimulating the economy. This state budget was never going to be easy, and I commend the Treasurer for making the tough decisions that he has had to make to keep our debt at a level we can recover within two years, which has led us to maintaining our AAA credit rating (much to the sadness of those opposite) and at the same time building for the future.

It is also important to acknowledge the many policies within the budget aimed at reducing our carbon footprint. When the severe impacts of climate change were first realised, many thought that governments would struggle to reduce their carbon footprints without jeopardising the economy. However, the state government has found the right balance, and it is fantastic to see that within this budget we will be creating thousands of green jobs while at the same time strengthening our economy.

South Australia was one of the first jurisdictions in the world to pass the climate change legislation back in 2007, and we are still leading the way on the international level, implementing measures which will reduce that impact. In fact, I was honoured to represent the Premier last month at the United Nations World Business Summit on Climate Change in Copenhagen, where I delivered a presentation on territorial private partnerships for climate change solutions.

I was very pleased to report to this group (and it was an international group) that the targets set within our climate change legislation—to have 20 per cent of our power needs sourced from renewable green energy sources by 2014—are well ahead of schedule. At the time of the legislation being passed only two years ago, 20 per cent seemed like an ambitious goal. In fact, I have a recollection of certain members opposite scoffing at such a thing. I shall not name them, on account of how I am a gracious person!

However, I was glad to point out to the group in Copenhagen that we as a government had worked in partnership with industries and the private sector to have this on track to be easily achieved, and I am now pleased to say that within the budget a more ambitious target of 33 per cent by 2020 has been set, with the government setting aside \$20 million in this budget to further accelerate investment in the green energy sector. This again highlights South Australia as being among the world leaders when it comes to clean, renewable energy development.

When the government came to power in 2002 there was not one wind farm in South Australia and geothermal energy exploitation was virtually untouched. South Australia now hosts 56 per cent of Australia's installed wind capacity and more than 70 per cent of geothermal energy exploration activity and, as a state, it is really important that we build on this to secure a renewable power supply for the future.

When I was in Copenhagen I met a very forward thinking South Australian businessman, Barrie Harrop, who is in charge of a group called Windesal. He is getting wind turbines with diesel generators capable of producing power and linking them to standard desalination plants, and I think that is a very interesting project. This has already happened in other countries and it is proven technology, and it is wonderful to see that at a global forum a South Australian businessman was at the very top of innovation. I was very proud to be there.

Another major component of the budget that as the member for Bright I am very pleased about is the investment being made into our public transport system, in particular the fast-tracking of the electrification of Noarlunga railway line. Many people in my electorate rely on trains to commute to and from the city on a daily basis. I myself use the train system. By electrifying this system the public will have access to faster and more reliable transport.

Now, in order to actually make this happen, you have to do a thing called resleepering. I do not know whether the member for Finnis remembers being in this place and mocking me because I stood up and made a budget appropriation speech about sleepers. He said 'Oh, that poor member for Bright, all she can do is come in here and talk about railway sleepers!' Thanks to those

railway sleepers we suddenly find ourselves able to do the electrification. It is absolutely astonishing.

This electrification is yet another way in which we are working towards reducing our carbon footprint. Switching from the current diesel system to the electric system will drastically reduce carbon emissions. It also goes without saying that, by increasing the capacity and reliability of our public transport system, members of the public will be encouraged to leave their cars at home and, instead, commute to and from the city using trains, buses and trams—and this is in line with the ambition set within our State Strategic Plan. We have a plan. While others may have passing visions, we have a plan.

Since being elected to parliament I have spoken with many members of the public who have voiced their concerns over their safety and wellbeing while taking public transport. Many have informed me that the safety issues about trains, in particular, have led them to opt for other means of transport. I welcome our government's move to increase security on all trains that depart the city from 6pm every day. This is yet another measure that will indirectly help us reach our Strategic Plan target.

It goes without saying that one of the major issues affecting every electorate in this state is that of water. In the 32 street corner meetings I have had recently a lot of emphasis has been placed on water. I would say it is the No. 1 issue that people in my electorate are talking about. As a result, I welcome very much the investment being made by both the state and federal governments to fast-track and secure this long-term water source.

However, it is important that we as a state look at diversifying our water supply—which is why I am very pleased to see the government continuing its ongoing commitment to stormwater harvesting. Stormwater harvesting is very important as it does create extra water that can be used on parks and gardens, as well as in industry. This creates less of a reliance on the desal plant to produce water for such needs.

I recently attended a function at the Somerton Park Bowling Club where I listened to a very interesting presentation by Colin Pitman. I do not agree with everything that Colin says, but he certainly does have some useful input to make. Recycling of stormwater helps to not only secure our water supply but also, by increasing and retaining the number of wetlands across metropolitan Adelaide, it allows many varieties of plants, water bugs, reptiles, birds, fish, frogs and mammals to live and breed in their natural environment.

As I am sure members are aware, I am quite passionate about the environment. Brighton is predominantly a beachside electorate, so I will conclude by touching on an ongoing project for the state government. I am happy to say that through the Living Beaches project construction is about to begin—if it has not begun already—on a sand transfer pipeline. Many residents in my electorate have voiced their discontent at the current system of transporting the sand via trucks, as it leads to a large amount of sand being lost in transportation.

I can also say that, if you live where I do in Brighton, it makes the roads quite dangerous. They are small roads and the trucks are quite big. By installing a pipeline to channel this sand from Semaphore along the coast to Marino, there will be a greater retention of sand which will lead to a more invigorated coastline. This project had a great deal of community consultation, which ensured that those who frequently use our beaches were able to have their say.

Members interjecting:

Ms FOX: I am sorry, did someone say that the member for Finniss was being rude?

The Hon. S.W. Key: Yes, as usual.

Ms FOX: There is no news there. I am confident that, when construction on the pipeline is completed in 2011, the pipeline will please environmentalists, residents and beachgoers alike. It is not very often that governments can find a way to balance the economy, environmental concerns and community-based issues. However, this budget is proof that it can, in fact, be done. It is through actions such as investing in green energy and water, as well as encouraging greater use of public transport, while at the same time sustaining our current natural environment, that we can indeed work towards a cleaner, greener state for future generations to enjoy.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:40): Thank you, sir. I am feeling very put down. The savage attack with a lettuce leaf has knocked me around, and I am subdued. I am a delicate sort of a

fellow, sir, and that vitriolic attack on me has upset me. However, I will proceed as best I can. Thank you for the opportunity to speak about the Appropriation Bill 2009. I do not share many of the sentiments of those opposite who have spoken about it. I am waiting with interest for the Attorney-General to get up and make his 20-minute contribution.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I will make it during your contribution.

Mr PENGILLY: Good on you! We will share it, as long as you agree with me, Attorney. Actually, I would be most surprised if you did not share it with me: you usually do. It is interesting to look at this budget and think where we could be instead of where we are not, and I would like to point out a couple of things in regard to my electorate and also a couple of areas that I have responsibility for.

This is where the Attorney-General may be able to help me, because the Minister for Veterans' Affairs has been appointed, yet nowhere in the budget can I find any line of expenditure by the state for veterans' affairs. I hope he can correct me, because we have been through it chapter and verse and we have 30 minutes allocated in estimates committees and I cannot find any budget line. So I would be very pleased if he can help me with that.

It is likewise with the member for Kaurna, the Minister for the Southern Suburbs. There are a couple of lines, but I have discovered there is only an \$8,000 increase in the small budget line; and there are no programs and that money goes to wages. So I am concerned that we are only paying lip service to these things.

I will say in regard to veterans' affairs (and I am sure the Attorney will agree with me) that, very largely, we take a bipartisan approach and we work in the best interests of veterans in South Australia. I hope that continues, whoever is in government, and I think it is important.

In relation to where the state is going, it is a bit of a sad story, and probably nowhere is it sadder than in the regional areas of South Australia. The regions have been neglected sadly in this budget process. I look at my electorate of Finniss and the only expenditure I can find is \$20 million-odd for the Clayton regulator, which has already been announced and gone through the public works process and, indeed, the contractors are on site now. That is an extremely good project which I want to happen, and it cannot happen soon enough.

The tragedy is that, while we are doing that, the rest of the lakes and the lower Murray River are slowly dying. Indeed, there seems to be little or nothing happening about that while we wait for a decision on the weir, which the government seems terrified about making—and which I have always adamantly opposed and still continue to adamantly oppose. The only other item of expenditure that I can find for my electorate is \$10 million over three years for increasing the quantity of storage attached to the Middle River dam on Kangaroo Island, which I have been calling for since I have been in this place, and I am glad that will proceed.

It may be that in the departmental budgets there is some money to be expended, and we will wait with bated breath for that. In due course we will probably see some announcements on passing lanes or upgrades to some roads—small jobs, but nothing major.

I do point to the Victor Harbor-Adelaide road. There is absolutely nothing in the South Australian state budget for the Victor Harbor-Adelaide road. We have had some money spent on passing lanes between Mount Compass and the Goolwa turn-off, which have just been completed and which certainly have improved that section of the road, but, more to the point, the long-term planning does not seem to be there. There is no purchase of land, and by far and away the worst piece of that road at the moment, in my view, is the Cut Hill section. Cut Hill, which is the long hill as you go down towards the flats of Victor Harbor, is by far and away the worst piece of that road. That urgently needs something doing to it. We do need to—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I very much doubt it. We as a state very much need to do some work on that road or some long-term planning on that road as a matter of urgency. It is just ridiculous that the tens of thousands of vehicles a week that use that road have to put up with these substandard conditions. At the moment, consultation is also occurring regarding the turn-off from the Main South Road onto the Victor Harbor Road. I wait with interest to see what comes out of that. I am not convinced that the plans that are floating around are the ideal outcome for that road either.

Sometimes I wonder why we in South Australia do not jump over the bridge and take the big decisions. They were putting clover leaves, for example, in Los Angeles 50 years ago to assist

with traffic, but it seems that we cannot do anything like that in South Australia. You only have to look at the debacle at the moment at the intersection of South Road and Anzac Highway. The underpass is now open, although the traffic is still something of a nightmare. We completed that and now we are going to make a mess across Glengyle Terrace and South Road while building an overpass. We cannot seem to get things happening very well—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What would you do?

Mr PENGILLY: It is not a matter of what I would do, Attorney. You are in government and this is the plan that you have come up with. Through my time on the Public Works Committee, I have inspected the site and I have made my comments in the appropriate place. However, it seems to me that it is continuing to impact fairly heavily on the traffic flows and, in the last couple of days, we have had highly restrictive flows on South Road. The fact is that, in my view, these things could only be done better.

Over and above all that, regional South Australia has been neglected. Nowhere near enough money is going into regional South Australia. It seems to me that, if you put the underpass at Anzac Highway, the Bakewell Bridge and the trams up North Terrace into some sort of perspective, it does not do a lot for the rest of South Australia, quite frankly. And also, we still have this issue—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: That's all right, let him go. We still have this bottleneck from the north to the south. We are inhibiting manufacturing industry in the south by not having a reasonable traffic corridor to get production out of the south, up to the north and through to the Eastern States. We are bogged down, and it is simply not good enough.

It is also becoming glaringly apparent that the health system in regional South Australia is not moving forward as it should be. Indeed, the changes to the structures and the direction by the current Rann Labor government have not been at all helpful. The abolition of boards has resulted in bureaucracy running the health system and reigning supreme from Hindmarsh Square. That is not helpful. Local decisions have been taken away. The health advisory councils, although full of well-meaning people, I am sure, do not have any real power and they have seemingly little effect, and I think that is disappointing.

I have representatives on the two HAC committees in my area. I make the point that the members on those committees who represent me and who have been nominated by me are somewhat frustrated with where health is going. Likewise, the staff in these outfits are also concerned, and they do not seem to be able to make any decisions without resorting to Hindmarsh Square again. I think that is a crying shame, given the input of regional and country communities in health over so many decades, if not 100 years, around South Australia.

South Australia provides a great engine room. If we look at existing industries in regional South Australia—whether it be the farming sector and the multitude of industries that come out of that; the fishing industry, which is vital to South Australia; or the mining industry, which has underpinned this government for a few years now, until the current world financial situation—we wonder where we are going. To my mind, it is a tragedy that we have allowed the state to get in the mess that it is in.

Just looking at where we were a few years ago and where we are now, South Australia's contribution to the national economy in 2002, when the Rann Labor government came in, was just under 7 per cent. We are now down to about 6½ per cent. The indicators are all bad for us. We are the highest taxed state in the nation.

It would be remiss of me not to mention the impact of the most unfair land tax regime on South Australians. It is having an extremely heavy impact down in my electorate, and I am sure it is in others as well. I have a high proportion of independently funded, self-funded, retirees in my electorate who, quite frankly, are at their wits end over how to make ends meet. I think it is a disgrace that the good people of South Australia (and I include migrants and all sorts of people) who have invested in building one or two extra properties, in addition to their own, to look after themselves in their retirement now find themselves in the position where the land tax they are required to pay is more than the rent they receive from their properties.

I think it is an injustice. It is wrong. It is totally wrong that people who have worked hard to try to set themselves up are now required, in some cases, to go to Centrelink to get some sort of pension to help them get through. They have set themselves up and they now find themselves at the mercy of the government of the day through Centrelink. I think it is an absolutely ridiculous situation. No-one argues that we do not have to have taxes—that is nonsensical—but the land tax formula is wrong; it is not right, and it is impacting heavily on many senior citizens in South Australia who deserve better at their time of life.

Another issue is that what is going on internationally impacts on the farming community, and it is pretty obvious that it is having a dramatic impact on the dairy industry on the Fleurieu at the moment. There was the debacle a few months ago concerning Warrnambool Cheese and Butter, when the price drop forced farmers to get out of dairying pretty much straightaway. Lo and behold, a couple of weeks later, the price was lifted again, but it still does not match the cost of production.

One has only to look at my electorate or the member for Hammond's electorate, where some of the dairy-based industries around the river and lakes have gone, never to return. The issue of water is just so critical in this state. We live in the driest state in the driest continent in the world, and this outfit sitting across the chamber has done absolutely nothing in nearly eight years to increase or secure more water.

We now have the desalination plant which will come online sometime in 2011. As I recall, it was actually a Liberal initiative that was pooh-poohed by the Premier and others and then, all of a sudden, 10 or 12 months later, it was a wonderful idea. Then we had the federal government bailout to double the size of the desal plant. So, in due course about 25 per cent of Adelaide's water will come out of the desalination plant.

Meanwhile, what have we done with stormwater? We have a small unit just off Anzac Highway near the Patawalonga drain, and I see the tens of millions of litres of water that flow down that drain when there is a good rain up in the Hills, and I shake my head in disbelief. While poor old South Australian householders go on water restrictions and watch their garden die each summer, and watch everything else fall apart, this water is running out to sea. Even this morning it was running about 15 to 20 centimetres deep, and it has not rained since the weekend. It is all disappearing.

These things impact on the public of South Australia, and they impact quite deeply. There are a multitude of things that have not happened under the Rann Labor government, and the Treasurer came into this place a couple of weeks ago and put down his budget, promising this, that and everything else—with the \$3 billion-odd bailout from the federal government which will help them across the line. It is indicative of a government that has no idea of where it is going.

The fact is that, under the former Howard coalition government in Canberra, those years when the economy was bustling along, this government just wasted opportunities. When the Premier came into government there was an announcement that there would be a cap on Public Service numbers, but we now have 17,000 or 18,000 more than we had when this government came into office, and those employees have to be paid every fortnight (or whatever it is). It is a travesty of justice that these poor old public servants are now put under pressure and have to live in fear about their futures, many wondering whether they will even have a future. They have tenure but I suspect, from the way the government is going, that that tenure is looking a bit shaky. One only has to hear some of the utterances coming out of the Public Service Association and some of the union organisations; they know of those public servants' concern.

The Treasurer is terribly worried about his AAA rating. Well, he has kept that, but at what sort of cost, at what sort of detriment to the population of South Australia? Rather than a self-fulfilling ego trip, it has not really accomplished much at all. As I recall, he said that it would save the state \$60 million a year in interest (I think that is the figure, but I will stand corrected if it is wrong), but the fact is that it is an ego trip. This mob could not run a chook raffle, and they have proved it time and time again.

The former Liberal government had the state debt down to just over \$2 billion but we are now up to over \$6 billion again. We are heading to State Bank mark 2, courtesy of Premier Rann, who was there when the State Bank fell over. He is back there now and—whoops-a-daisy—we are \$6 billion in debt. I am just waiting to see what will happen with the Premier. It looks as if he has probably upset the Italians so Rome is off the agenda, so he will not be the ambassador to Italy; I do not think they will send him there now.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Well, he just might get the high commissioner's job in the UK and go back to see his cousins in London, or he might be really lucky and get the ambassador's job in the United States—or even New Zealand; he could do that!

You wonder when this Premier will do a runner. Yesterday, when our leader was making his budget reply speech and mentioned that there were some issues relating to Mr Ashbourne, and also mentioned Mr Koutsantonis, with about 60 traffic convictions, being made a minister, the Premier was out of his seat and was gone. He could not be seen for dust as he went out the door.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Finniss will take his seat. The member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: There are two issues. First, it is disorderly to speak about people who are not here and, secondly, it is completely untrue—and the member for Finniss knows it.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr PENGILLY: I am sorry; I recognise that he is not there. A wet lettuce leaf again! It is disappointing to see what this budget has not done, and it is disappointing to see the squandering of the last 7½ years or so in South Australia during the term of this Rann Labor government.

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

[Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00]

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 205 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to support rebuilding the Royal Adelaide Hospital at its current location and to abandon all plans for a rail yard hospital.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

PRISONERS

In reply to **Mrs REDMOND (Heysen)** (25 March 2009).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs): I am advised:

The member for Heysen has asked several questions about an incident where correctional officers were seen at a family restaurant with a prisoner in handcuffs.

The former Minister for Correctional Services responded via email to the member of the public that wrote to the Premier about the incident. The former Minister advised that a full investigation into the matter was being undertaken by the Department for Correctional Services.

The Department's investigation has now been completed and the subsequent report was very recently forwarded to the Crown for advice.

Subsequently, the Department is currently awaiting the advice from the Crown to determine if the actions of the staff involved were in breach of procedures and the Public Sector Management Act 1995, and if so, to recommend and determine appropriate disciplinary action against the officers.

The current contract for Prisoner Movement and In-Court Management expires at the end of June 2009 and it would be inappropriate for me to comment on the status of any contract negotiations that may be in progress.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Parole Board of South Australia—Report 2007-08

PORT AUGUSTA PRISON

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As members are aware, there was a prisoner-led riot at Port Augusta Prison in October last year. It involved more than 30 prisoners who did extensive damage to two units of the high security Bluebush wing. Thanks to the professional, sensible and patient approach of staff at Port Augusta Prison and the work of SA Police the disturbance was resolved peacefully and without any injury to staff or prisoners.

The two affected cell blocks, which together accommodate up to 92 prisoners, have now been repaired, and prisoners have returned to that accommodation. The disturbance resulted in \$1 million damage to officer stations (including computers and furniture), windows, toilet bowls, televisions, security cameras, intercoms, cabling and roofing.

Repairs were completed by professional tradespeople, with painting work within the cells completed by the prisoners. In addition, \$500,000 of additional security upgrades are now being carried out, including installing extra razor wire on roofs, putting additional bars on outer windows, and upgrading windows and doors.

The former minister for correctional services, Carmel Zollo, gave in the other place earlier this year a comprehensive statement on the Department for Correctional Services' investigation. I refer members to that statement should they seek further information. In that statement the former minister outlined that an investigation by the Department for Correctional Services led to recommendations about how to further improve prison management and security procedures.

A committee comprised of managers, staff, union representatives and an Aboriginal representative is overseeing the implementation of those recommendations, including altering the prisoner mix, reviewing prisoners' services and refining emergency response procedures.

At the time of the riot, all prisoners accommodated in the damaged units of Bluebush wing were transferred to other secure facilities, including Mobilong, the Adelaide Remand Centre and Yatala Labour Prison, as well as other cell blocks at Port Augusta Prison.

The suspected instigators were relocated to G-Division of Yatala Labour Prison. To date, five prisoners suspected to be the ringleaders remain in that location, in the interests of good prison management and security.

I would like to take this chance to inform the house that there are two separate processes that are applied to deal with prisoners who engage in conduct such as a riot. One is a criminal process run external to the Department for Correctional Services. That process involves a police investigation that includes interviews and the collection of evidence. An assessment is then made by the police about what charges may be laid.

Depending on the severity of the charges recommended by the police, the police can either proceed through the courts, or, in the case of more serious charges, police can refer the file to the Director of Public Prosecutions to pursue. If criminal charges are pursued, the case will go before a court, like any other criminal case against any other member of the public.

The other process that is applied is an internal disciplinary process, which involves pursuing breaches by prisoners under the Correctional Services Act 1982. Under this process, a correctional services officer, acting as a prosecutor, appears before an independent visiting tribunal to make the department's case against a prisoner. The prisoner also appears before the tribunal. A single justice of the peace, appointed by the Governor under the Correctional Services Act 1982, presides over the proceedings.

Under the regulations of the Correctional Services Act the maximum prescribed penalty for a breach by a prisoner is \$75. The department can also seek reimbursement for damages of up to \$3,000 if specific damage can be attributed to a particular prisoner. The criminal process and the internal process are quite separate. Each process is independent of the other and they are not inter-reliant.

Following the October incident, the Department for Correctional Services pursued breaches of discipline against 26 prisoners under the Correctional Services Act, namely the offences of damaging department property and disturbing security and good order. In accordance with section 44 of the Correctional Services Act the matters were then referred to the independent visiting tribunal.

The chief executive of the Department for Correctional Services issued a clear direction to the general managers at each institution to formally charge prisoners with these breaches of discipline within the prescribed period of time of eight weeks from the date of the alleged breaches. The breaches were drawn up by responsible officers at Port Augusta Prison and then faxed to the general managers of the facilities that were holding the prisoners: Port Augusta, Mobilong, Adelaide Remand Centre and Yatala Labour Prison. Notices were served on the prisoners at Port Augusta, Mobilong and Adelaide Remand Centre on Friday 5 December 2008. This was the last day that such a notification could lawfully be served under the legislation.

At Yatala Labour Prison, the general manager failed to serve the notices on the prisoners held there until the following Monday. This meant that the notices were served one working day outside the prescribed time of eight weeks after the incident. These breaches were not pursued and could not have been lawfully pursued under the act. In February this year, the breaches that had been properly served on the prisoners at the other three facilities were withdrawn at the hearing of the independent visiting tribunal.

The prosecuting officer made this decision in consultation with the independent visiting tribunal. I am advised that the decision was based on a perceived difficulty in attributing specific damage or breaches to individual prisoners, as is required under the act.

The chief executive has expressed to me that he is deeply concerned about two aspects. Firstly, there appears to have been an inadequate understanding of the importance of serving notices on the Yatala Labour Prison offenders within a specified time and, secondly, there was inadequate consultation and consideration prior to the withdrawal of the breach proceedings given the gravity of the October incident.

The chief executive informs me that, when he became aware that the breach proceedings had been withdrawn and that notices were not served upon prisoners at Yatala Labour Prison within the prescribed time, he took swift action. The chief executive ordered an immediate investigation into the internal disciplinary processes after the October riot. As a result of that investigation, the Director of Custodial Services has completed a comprehensive, full-day education session with the state's eight prison general managers and some other senior managers.

This session covered topics such as the operation of the act, securing evidence, delegation of authority and proper processes for pursuing breaches under the act. Compliance with required processes is part of the performance management standards for general managers. A delegation schedule for general managers about their powers under sections 43 and 44 of the act has been developed and will be implemented soon.

This will mean that, in future, only the most senior prison managers can make decisions about issuing and withdrawing breach proceedings. The senior manager responsible for the failure to serve charges within the prescribed time frame at Yatala Labour Prison has been formally counselled by the Director of Custodial Services about his responsibilities. This constitutes a strong warning.

A performance review was also completed for the officer and this resulted in a direction for the manager to make an action plan for improvement. The prosecuting officer responsible for withdrawing the charges against prisoners who had been properly served with the breach notices was acting within his responsibilities and in accordance with procedures as they stood at the time.

I also wish to advise the house that a prisoner at Yatala contacted the office of the Ombudsman about a charge sheet being served on him on 8 December 2008—that is, past the prescribed time frame. The chief executive has provided a fulsome written response to the office of the Ombudsman. The Acting Ombudsman has made recommendations to review some

departmental procedures. The chief executive has indicated his support for such a review and is working on implementing the Acting Ombudsman's recommendations.

I am deeply disappointed by the oversights that have resulted in no prisoners being pursued for serious safety and security breaches under the Correctional Services Act 1982 but, to put the matter in context, if the full extent of action possible under the act had been carried out, at best it would have resulted in a fine of \$75 for the prisoners concerned.

For too long, maximum penalties under the Correctional Services Act have been insufficient and have not reflected community expectations. Many of the penalties that currently exist have not been amended since 1994.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is why I have introduced a bill to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Among the amendments is a proposal to increase penalties for prisoners who breach prison rules and procedures.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The minister has advised the house that he has already introduced this bill, therefore it is before the house. I do not think the ministerial statement can then argue why the bill is a good bill. It is sitting here as being distributed and he stated that he has already introduced it.

The SPEAKER: I understand the bill to do what the minister is referring to was introduced before the luncheon break, so the minister cannot anticipate debate by referring to the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that members opposite are trying to impress today. I know there is plenty on after question time, so I am sure there will be plenty points of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that South Australia Police have now finalised their investigations into last year's riot and have provided a report to the Director of Public Prosecutions. The government awaits the decision of the Director of Public Prosecutions in regard to criminal charges.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know the member for MacKillop is keen to impress today—very keen to impress today. I intend to monitor, through the chief executive, both the implementation of further improvements to Port Augusta Prison's operations and the action taken in response to the department and the Ombudsman's recommendations on improving internal prisoner disciplinary positions.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. I seek that the minister table the report which is identified on page 2 of the statement, which he has referred to in the ministerial statement and outlined, selectively, a number of recommendations. I ask that he table that report from the department.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:17): I bring up the 23rd report of the committee.

Report received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood) (14:17): I bring up the 335th report of the committee, entitled SA Water Thebarton Depot Decommissioning.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms CICCARELLO: I bring up the 336th report of the committee, entitled Adelaide Desalination Project 100 Gigalitre Expansion Works.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Treasurer. What arrangements has the government made to compensate consortia bidding for the now cancelled prisons PPP, how much will be paid to each consortia and when?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:19): I have been upfront and public about this. It was a very difficult decision to cancel the prisons, particularly given that a large amount of work had gone into the bids by at least three consortia, that I am aware of. As I said, in both the budget presentation in this house and other places, ultimately something had to give. A number of these capital works projects had been committed to prior to the global financial crisis and prior to the dramatic fall away in state revenues, and it would not have been a proper budgetary position to endeavour to do all the capital works projects to which we had committed ourselves; hence, we took the decision on the prisons as it was still some years away. We had already deferred the prisons in the midyear review, and the prison construction activity was still some years away, and, hopefully, by then the economy would be more than back to a robust state.

In terms of the Rudd government's requirement that we not substitute commonwealth capital programs for our own capital programs, we were unable to (nor did we want to, I might add) defer or delay (quite the opposite) the rail network. We wanted to bring that forward. The prisons were a clear target for cancellation in that budgetary sense. That was a difficult decision for a variety of reasons, none more important, of course, than the actual care of the people who are in these institutions, but also because in good faith we had entered into bargaining with consortia. What we have said—and we wrote to the companies—is that we acknowledge that we will have to pay—sorry, I will rephrase that. Under our contractual obligations, I am advised that we are not obligated to make any payment. We do have in our bidding documents a clause that allows us to terminate the process should we so choose without paying compensation.

I took the view, and the cabinet agreed with me, that that would not be fair and proper in terms of the way in which we have treated these bidding companies and that we should compensate fairly. We have written to these companies saying that we will consider submissions from them for reasonable costs. I will not give the leader a figure because that would be telling the consortia what they should put on the table, and that would not be a particularly clever way to negotiate our way through this. Equally, I have said that I will not be stingy in this regard. I think I have to accept that one must properly compensate these consortia. I saw in the paper a figure of some \$10 million floated by a consortia. I can assure members that that figure is a highly exaggerated ambit claim; I can certainly put that on the public record. It will be nothing of that order.

However, it will be in the millions across the consortia. I accept that that is the right thing to do bearing in mind that we are getting in excess of a half a billion dollar plus budget benefit out of this measure. As we enter into negotiations for PPP projects in the schools and with hospitals, you want to be able to keep the confidence of the market. By offering that compensation it is the right and proper thing to do. The deputy leader has a big smirk on her face. I am not sure whether she has other reasons to be happy, but these are the tough decisions you have to make in government. These are the tough decisions.

The easy decision would have been to continue the program of building them and had our credit rating downgraded. Had the credit rating been downgraded, the cost to our borrowings would have well exceeded the compensation payment. Ensuring that we retained the AAA credit rating and not paying more money for our borrowings is a better financial outcome for us than if we had proceeded and not paid compensation. It was a prudent financial thing to do. We are ahead of the game financially. I also think it is a proper acknowledgment to industry. If they deal with this government in good faith and they incur costs in that process and we make a decision to cancel a project, we should be fair and reasonable in our compensation.

As I said, I am advised contractually that, through our bidding documents, we are not required to make payment. In effect, this is an ex gratia commitment to them. I do not mean to use those Latin terms. Is it Latin?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Yes.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is. I just checked that it was Latin. I did not want to make—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is Latin. That is where we are at, Mr Speaker.

PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): I have a supplementary question. Is the Treasurer's answer an assurance that similar compensation will be provided to bidding consortia should there be further late stage cancellation of projects by the government?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:25): There will not be any, unless something quite extraordinary happens and the world economy totally implodes. We have no intention of doing that. I will extrapolate from that question. I have had representation—and I do not know whether or not the opposition was behind it—from infrastructure associations, or bodies that represent infrastructure companies, wanting me to put on the public record—and I do not know how one would do this, to be honest—if the Liberal government were to win office, I would sign up to a deal to compensate bidders on the hospital should there be a change of government and the Liberals were to rip up the contract. I have no intention of doing that. We are proceeding with the hospital.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is correct, Vickie, and I have just put it into context.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am glad that the deputy leader just made that interjection. When talking about expenditure, who heard the deputy leader on the radio this morning? In relation to the Chelsea Cinema, she criticised the minister, saying that a \$25,000 contribution was too cheap. She said words to the effect, 'We should dip into our pocket and chuck \$2 million at it.' The Deputy Leader of the Opposition would spend \$2 million to buy a picture theatre, for crying out loud.

Mrs REDMOND: I have point of order, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND: My point of order is relevance, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I draw the Deputy Premier back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. In the context of budgeting, we are supporting a film industry with a \$43 million development to employ actors, writers and directors for the creative industry—for culture, Mr Speaker—and the deputy leader wants to spend \$2 million on a film show. She wants her own little picture theatre. It's like communist Russia!

Mrs REDMOND: I have a point of order, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Deputy Premier has completed his answer.

POLICE RECRUITS

Ms FOX (Bright) (14:26): Will the Minister for Police advise the house about the latest police graduation?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:27): I am delighted to announce that 24 former

UK police officers with many years of policing experience will take to the streets following their graduation at Fort Largs Police Academy.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Those 20 men and four women are very welcome additions to what is the largest police force in the state's history. While recruiting locally continues to be our focus, recruiting from the UK has brought with it many benefits. We have had the opportunity to recruit officers who have previously held ranks in the UK ranging from constable to detective inspector, with some having more than 24 years policing experience.

I am told that SAPOL's UK recruits have adjusted well to work and life in South Australia, and the feedback we have been receiving indicates they are highly competent, professional and friendly. As skilled police officers they continue to bring a wealth of policing skills, knowledge and experience to communities throughout South Australia.

Today's graduation ceremony means 251 police officers have graduated from the academy this financial year, and we currently have an additional 121 cadets in training. Since 2002 we have recruited an impressive 550 additional police officers, and the fact is that we have more operational police than ever before. I am sure members will be interested to hear that South Australia has the highest rate of police per capita of any state. South Australia has 299 sworn officers for every 100,000 persons; the next closest is Tasmania with 277.

The Rann government and SAPOL are working together tirelessly to ensure our communities are as safe as possible, not only for the safety of the public but also to prevent property damage and other crimes. I remind members that our actions are in stark contrast to those of the previous Liberal government, which allowed police numbers in this state to fall alarmingly.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, sir: the minister is now debating.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will listen attentively to what the minister is saying. If I think he is entering debate I will pull him up. I think the minister has finished.

DESALINATION PLANT, EYRE PENINSULA

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Water Security. Will the commitment of \$160 million for the now cancelled Upper Spencer Gulf desalination plant still be made available to deliver water to the people of the Mid North and Eyre Peninsula and, if not, what will happen to the funding? On 19 February 2007 the Premier issued a media release which stated that he welcomed a firm commitment from federal Labor leader Kevin Rudd to a \$160 million contribution to the proposed desalination plant in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Chaffey—Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water Security) (14:31): It is a really good question, because the water issue in South Australia is a very important one, and water security is an issue this government takes very seriously. We have just made an announcement to increase the capacity of the Adelaide desalination plant from 50 gigalitres per annum to 100 gigalitres per annum, taking significant pressure off the River Murray, particularly in drought years. It is a very good decision and, in light of that decision, there has been a rethink of the other investment in this state in relation to desalination plants.

The \$160 million that was promised by the former government comes from the Rural and Regional Water Fund, and we have written to the federal government seeking support for other projects that we will be investing in in the future.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the government's plan for improving our public hospitals to provide better care for South Australians?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:32): I thank the member for Taylor for her

question. In response to the deputy leader's interjection, we intend to stay in office to implement our plans for a very long time—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: With your help!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —with your help. Two years ago the state government released South Australia's Health Care Plan, which was a framework for reforming our health services to ensure that they are sustainable into the future. We know that, as our population ages, demand will increase. We know that by about 2016, for example, the growth in that section of the population aged over 75 will be about 9 or 10 per cent a year. There will be enormous growth in the elderly within our community over the short term, so we need to create extra capacity within our health system. We also need to reduce demand, keeping people out of hospitals by looking after them to make sure that they are well, but we still need to increase capacity, and we are doing that by investing considerable amounts of money into the capital works program.

Since coming to power the government has committed \$3.6 billion to capital works programs to deliver improved health services for South Australians. This is made up of \$1.7 billion for the new RAH and \$1.9 billion on other works. Last week the Premier opened the new linear accelerator at the Lyell McEwin Health Service in our northern suburbs. I was pleased that the member for Little Para was able to be in attendance.

This high-tech machinery will deliver radiation treatment to hundreds of cancer patients in the northern suburbs. I understand that about 400 patients will be able to be looked after on an annual basis. That means they will not have to travel to Adelaide for their treatment. I gather that many people in this category have to travel up to 30 times to receive treatment. For decades, health services in our north have been the poor cousin of the rest of Adelaide, with patients forced to travel to the city for their treatment.

So, recognising the needs of northern Adelaide, this government is setting up the Lyell McEwin as a major tertiary hospital by practically doubling its size as part of a \$336 million redevelopment. Meanwhile, in the south, the Flinders Medical Centre is undergoing a \$153 million redevelopment, increasing its capacity as well and enabling it to offer more services to that growing region. At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital in the west, the \$127 million second stage of the redevelopment is underway, with the third stage in planning to provide that community with a modern general hospital.

As well, modernising works are being planned for Modbury Hospital in the north-east and Noarlunga Hospital in the south. In country South Australia we are redeveloping Berri Hospital, Ceduna Hospital and Whyalla Hospital, as well as doing sustainable works across a number of other hospitals. The linchpin in our strategy is the construction of the new \$1.7 billion Royal Adelaide Hospital, which will replace the ageing RAH on its current site.

Last week, invitations for expressions of interest for the new hospital were released, again confirming this government's strong commitment to making sure that South Australians get—

Ms Chapman: How many?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: How many expressions of interest? One expressions of interest document was released.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: What? If the deputy leader would like to ask me any detailed questions on any of these issues I would be very happy to receive them, but she does not—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The TV's gone already. Two questions and they have gone. I am sure it wasn't my answer that did it, was it?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It helped. Thank you; I will continue. Expressions of interest were released last week, and we are very confident that we will have strong interest in those.

Since the government announced its intention to build the new hospital in 2007, a great deal of work has happened. We have consulted on and developed a master plan and a model of care for the hospital. The new hospital site has also been rezoned for hospital use. The construction of the Dry Creek rail depot has started in preparation for clearing of the West End site,

and work is also underway to investigate and remediate the site before construction starts next year. We are on track to have a brand new state-of-the-art 21st century hospital to service Adelaide for the indefinite future built by 2016.

UNFUNDED LIABILITIES

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:37): Is the Treasurer concerned that debt and unfunded liability obligations facing the government are approaching \$20 billion across the forward estimates, a figure which equates to \$24,000 for every working South Australian?

The budget papers establish that the non-financial public sector net debt will peak at \$6.7 billion; unfunded superannuation liabilities have risen from \$4 billion to \$9.8 billion; WorkCover unfunded liabilities have risen from \$56 million to \$1.3 billion; and the government's own WorkCover scheme has a further liability approaching \$400 million, while the Treasurer has advised the house that the additional \$1.7 billion for the rail yards hospital will come onto the balance sheet.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:37): No, I am not concerned at all—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —neither are the credit rating agencies. What would concern me is if we had been put on negative watch or downgraded. Then I would be very concerned, but the credit ratings are quite comfortable.

Let us just go through the components because, as always, the opposition presents figures to suit its argument. The former Liberal government corporatised SA Water and the forestry commission and, of course, corporatised ETSA and sold it. When those entities are corporatised—particularly SA Water—they go off the government's general government sector into the non-financial sector. They are trading organisations which, as entities operating in the private sector in a corporatised model, are required to behave and operate as a publicly listed company would. They are required under the National Water Initiative and federal competition requirements to have an appropriately geared balance sheet, so that they are faced with the cost of operations as we would expect to occur in the private sector. That is important, particularly if we move towards open access regimes and allow competition into the system at some future point.

That was a decision of the Liberal government. SA Water went from being a department of water to a corporatised entity. That is why the accounting treatment of that entity's debt is different from other government agencies. The borrowing or the gearing level of SA Water is established through negotiation between myself as a shareholder and the minister for water and the corporation itself. We set a gearing ratio and a gearing limit, and it operates, to the best of my understanding, within those parameters.

Now, that is prudent and SA Water borrows what it needs for its capital program. It services that debt, then it pays for the state government tax equivalents, and a certain percentage of its profit—90 per cent or 95 per cent, I am not sure what the number is—to its shareholder. That was the consequence. We have modified it over time, but in essence that is what former minister John Olsen had put in place.

Similar applies to the forestry corporation, and we never hide that, but that is why they are not affected or not as part of the budget presentation on budget day because we are dealing with what I call the budget sector/the general government sector.

The issue of WorkCover: we have been up hill and down dale on that. The reforms that this government brought in, initially opposed by the member for Morphett—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Excuse me, can I answer the question please? The WorkCover Corporation, with reform legislation, is on track to improve its performance substantially and, in fact, if we look at the operation, I think I am right, minister, in saying that in the last trading period (the last quarter) WorkCover produced a very good profit result in terms of its operating position. Its unfunded liability is still large—

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And that is why we changed the law—which you initially opposed—to bring the levy down.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We have had a global financial crisis and we have seen the investment—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Schubert!

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The leader has said we have had the best seven years the state has ever had under this Labor government. Thank you, Mr Hamilton-Smith, for acknowledging—that would appear nicely in our election campaign, I think. The best seven years in this state's history: who said that? The leader of the Liberal Party.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Hear, hear! The deputy leader thinks it is the best seven years we have had as well. Excellent! But the WorkCover Corporation has taken a hit on its balance sheet, as has the Motor Accident Commission, from a dramatic loss in earnings and value of its stocks portfolio. We all know that because everyone has been affected by that.

As to the issue of the unfunded liability of public servants, that has doubled for two reasons. The growth in employment does not affect it because they are now in a defined contribution scheme. The unfunded component has—

Mr Griffiths: Accumulation.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Or defined contribution.

Mr Griffiths: No, the new ones are an accumulation scheme.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Goyder!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, I just said that the new scheme is a defined contribution, or an accumulation. It is the same thing. Defined contribution: a worker puts in 9 per cent. That is a defined contribution. Under the old defined benefits, there is a defined benefit. In the marketplace, they are referred to as defined contributions.

As to the unfunded defined benefit scheme, which is closed, the reason that has expanded in size is the result of two things. One is loss of earnings and loss of value in its portfolio through the global financial crisis and the collapse in excess of 20 per cent in stock markets year on year. Second is what is called the discount rate. I am happy to explain this in more detail for the shadow minister. The discount rate is the rate by which you—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader, order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You wouldn't even understand what I am talking about, Vickie; let's be real. The discount rate is the measure by which you value the unfunded liability—that is, the discount rate is the recognised earnings of the funded position of your scheme and how long it will take to pay that back.

What happens when interest rates have gone down rapidly around the world and you have seen a halving in cash rates, you have seen a substantial reduction in the 10 year bond rate. When the interest rates go down, it is assumed by the valuation people (the actuaries) that your earnings will go down accordingly. Where it might have been a long-term historical average of 7.5 per cent, you will have a smaller unfunded liability. At one point there it was as low as 4.2 per cent and it almost doubled your unfunded component, simply by an accounting measure. That unfunded liability number is irrelevant, to an extent, in terms of its exponential growth.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, we have increased our contribution from the budget to pay back the money; so, it has an impact there. But, when it comes to the rating agencies, one of the things that Standard & Poor's have done is look through the unfunded liability issue, in that they

have applied in their methodology to reviewing our state's indebtedness by not using the discount rate that is applicable. They look at what the discount rate or the earnings rate was at the time that we were AAA rated, and it was 7.5 of the long-term average. They still believe that the long-term average earnings of these funds will be positive 7.5.

The international world accounting standards that we have adopted—and we are one of the first states if not the first state to do it; we got ahead of the other states—has what they call a mark-to-market approach. You have to essentially account for your position on a daily basis. You mark to what the market is. That is an international accounting rule. I think it is a dumb rule, to be perfectly frank, and many people in public financing think the same, that it is a really unfair measure on states that have these liabilities. Therefore, the rating agencies apply a more appropriate number to it.

In fact—and I cannot be absolute on this—my understanding is that Moody's apply similar thinking. In fact, when they do their methodology I think they exclude the unfunded liabilities, to some extent, from their methodology reviews. All I am saying is that the \$9.8 billion referred to is a wildly exaggerated number, not by the member but by the fact that we mark-to-market using the current discount rate that is applicable.

Recapping that long but important answer: I think the \$2 million or \$3 million held by public corporations is appropriate debt, it is good debt, and it is required debt to run and operate and properly gear our trading enterprises. In terms of the unfunded liability, we have done nothing more than adopt the former Liberal treasurer's (Stephen Baker) decision to pay back our unfunded liabilities over 30 years. We are well on track to doing that. There is no increase in real indebtedness there other than the accounting treatment and the falloff in markets, which we hope will be quickly reversed.

WorkCover is a short to medium term package in play to bring that back to its full solvency. The Motor Accident Commission is still fully solvent (93 to 94 per cent), but to a large extent it is well placed. All in all, I am more than comfortable with the state's debt position. I am more than comfortable with the way our enterprises are managing their debt. I am quite comfortable with our funds management corporation, chaired by a pre-eminent Australian female director, Helen Nugent, who serves on the Macquarie board and is chair of Swiss Re, and we have a good number of very senior and serious business people on the corporation.

All in all, the government's indebtedness—this has been a long answer but it is an important answer—is well managed, fully under control, certainly better than states like Queensland, and, to reassure the member, that is why we made the AAA credit rating an absolute must in this budget. We have achieved that, and the rating agencies are more than comfortable with our debt position.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:49): My question is again to the Treasurer. If a full public-private partnership option for the proposed rail yards hospital fails to eventuate, resulting in the need for public debt to fund all or part of the project, in what financial year do you anticipate that debt would need to be identified in the budget if the 2016 completion deadline is to be met?

On 24 March the Treasurer told the house that the market may not be able to deliver \$1.7 billion in private sector debt and that the government was looking at:

...whether our financing authority plays a role in [that] provision, or, probably more likely, that we as a government may consider what contribution a government makes to lessen the capital requirement needed to be raised from the market.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (14:49): I just noticed a couple of people missing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Dream Team Mark III.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You just worry about spending \$2 million on a picture theatre. I mean, have you ever heard of a worse priority for public expenditure?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It's all about re-electing Vickie.

Ms Chapman: That will win the Hartley campaign, that quote, thank you.

Ms Portolesi: I don't think so. We support the Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: \$2 million to buy a picture theatre—you think that's good expenditure?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GRIFFITHS: Point of order, Mr Speaker: my question was quite specific and relates not at all to the commentary going on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps the member for Goyder might have a word to his deputy leader. The Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I know there is tension opposite.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, look at him. He couldn't get on the radio early enough to talk about leadership today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Perhaps the Deputy Premier might turn to the question which was about debt financing of the hospital.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I tell you what, when the member for Finnis becomes your cheerleader on radio you know you're in strife.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In fact, the expressions of interest have gone out for the hospital, and we have made it clear in that documentation that we are open to advice from the market as to what will be the best way to fund this.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: There's a little bit going on there. I'm not sure what's—five or six? Got the names? At this stage, we are presuming that it will be a public-private partnership. It is too early to tell. This bidding process will take at least a year as they go through documentation, design work and all of that. One would hope that the world capital markets have returned to some normality by this time next year or thereabouts and that access to private funding is both available in quantum and competitive in price.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Okay, I'm working through this with a diligent answer. You should try to learn diligence when presenting stuff. If that is the case, I think we take the keys in the 2016-17 budget year. That is when the PPP payment would come onto the budget sector, and the debt would be recognised on balance sheet. If we do a part payment or if indeed we choose to do what is essentially a DBOM—that will be the public sector financing it but the private sector taking construction risk and management and operational risk of the asset—I am waiting on some accounting advice, to be honest, in terms of just how that will be treated.

We would assume that you would start to account for that as and when you started to make payments to the project, but it just depends. If it is a part contribution from the state, let us say that the market puts \$1 billion in and we put \$700 million in, I would envisage that our \$700 million—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: At least we are enjoying it. Let's say for example we put \$700 million in.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Let us assume we put \$700 million into the project. I would envisage that we would do that by way of grant and that we would still want the project construction risk and all the risk to sit with the consortia, and we would grant them that money. We would probably grant that money at the end of the project, so that it would still be a 2016 hit or, if we fully finance it, I would assume that we would start to account for the money as we make those payments.

The grant concept is one where you acknowledge that it is prudent for the state to put a proportion of capital into the project. You make that as a capital grant to the project and that would then discount down your income stream to the value of that contribution.

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, let's say that the payment that we had to do for the PPP (if it was fully private sector provided) is X; then X minus the value of the \$700 million would become your monthly payment or your yearly payment. So, it does not affect the value of the project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We could go into a little bit more detail, if you would like.

Mr Pengilly: No.

The SPEAKER: Order!

DESALINATION PLANT

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Water Security. Is there sufficient wind power supply available to power the 100 gegalitre Adelaide desalination plant, as promised by the Premier? On ABC Radio on 19 May, the Premier stated:

The desal plant will be totally powered by renewable energy, by wind power, just as people can for their own homes, except this will be designated from particular wind power stations.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:56): I am delighted to be able to announce to the house today—in fact, I am disappointed that apparently the media are outside talking about what is going on with the Liberal opposition—that whilst the Prime Minister of Australia has announced that the nation must reach 20 per cent of renewable energy by 2020, I am advised that this state will reach that by 2013. In fact, by 2020 it will reach 33 per cent, which will put us into a leadership position, not just in this nation. So, there will be plenty of power to provide renewable energy to the desalination plant.

HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will he identify where the \$200 million federally funded health research institute is going to be built on the rail yards area, and is any remediation required to be undertaken for that part of the site?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:57): I thank the deputy leader for her question and for her acknowledgment that the research centre will be built on the site. It will not create enough room on the site for a football stadium or the Women's and Children's Hospital rebuild, which she seems to be advocating, but there will be plenty of room there for the new RAH as well.

When we approached the commonwealth government in relation to this, we said we wanted to build it and we needed to build it in close proximity to the new RAH, and we identified the railway site as the appropriate location. It will be built to the east of the hospital development; to the west of the skate park that is on the site now.

The issue of remediation is something which will be addressed. There are two remediation issues on the site. One is the level of hydrocarbons that are floating on top of the watertable. As I understand it, they are in the process of being removed. We need to do that by drilling and putting in an oil rig, really, to suck the hydrocarbons off the watertable. That would have to be done

whether or not there was any redevelopment on the site, because there is always a risk of hydrocarbons approaching the Torrens.

The second issue is the remediation of the soil on the site. Of course, the construction of the hospital and the research facility will largely deal with that, because when the hospital and the research facility are built soil will be removed and taken away from the site and then, of course, a concrete pad would be put down over the site. As I understand it, in most circumstances that would be sufficient. There would be some perimeter which would need to be cleaned up, and that will occur as well.

There have been some extraordinary suggestions in the media—I think amplified by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—that the clean-up of the site would cost \$1 billion or thereabouts. I inform the house, the media and the world that we budgeted for a maximum of \$40 million for clean-up of the site, and we anticipate the cost to be well below that. The exact price we are not releasing for commercial in confidence reasons. I can give the honourable member an upper limit, which is \$40 million, and the advice I have is that the remediation costs will be considerably less than that.

DISADVANTAGED YOUTH GRANTS

Mr KENYON (Newland) (15:00): Will the Minister for Youth inform the house about \$60,000 in grants that will target disadvantaged youth in South Australia?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:00): Why, yes, I can. The Rann government announced that it will deliver \$60,000 in grants to six groups that are working to improve the lives of disadvantaged young South Australians. The successful nominees identified that the programs promoted healthy living amongst young people and were to benefit young people living in rural, remote and regional areas. The decision to focus—

Ms Portolesi interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I did say 'remote'—on health in regional areas was developed from the 2007-08 'Tell It Like It Is' consultations. 'Tell It Like It Is' involved surveys and focus groups with 1,000 young people to help with the further development of South Australia's Strategic Plan. Each of the six groups is a very worthwhile recipient of \$10,000. The Streetlink Healthy Living program, run by UnitingCare Wesley, Adelaide, addresses health issues faced by homeless and at-risk young people and involves hands-on activities chosen by the participants, such as art, sport and recreation.

The Healthy Active Fun program run by Labs 'n Life involves young people at risk of unemployment, social isolation and antisocial behaviour. The participants will have a hands-on role working and training assistance dogs, such as labradors. David's Creations received the \$10,000 grant for the Indigenous Youth for Careers in Arts program. This project will help five young indigenous offenders from rural SA gain life skills and enhance their employment prospects. A three day health retreat for young African women was another program that received the \$10,000 grant. Active Health run by Multicultural Youth SA provides information on homelessness, health, drug and alcohol abuse, safe sex, education, domestic violence and settlement issues.

Austrdrive, which is run by Country Health SA. Eastern Eyre Health and Aged Care is a one day education session for young drivers from Cleve, Cowell and Kimber. The project aims to reduce road deaths and injuries, increase road safety awareness and give crash avoidance skills. The final program to receive funding was Youth Changing Habits run by the Independent Learning Centre. The member for MacKillop should be here to listen to this because the 22-week program for disadvantaged young Naracoorte residents includes a fitness program (which I know he is very keen on), motivational speakers, a challenge day and a two day outdoor adventure.

The health of young people is paramount to ensuring South Australia's future success. Without a healthy start to life and healthy habits it is difficult to build a prosperous and enjoyable life. Young people who have not had a chance in life deserve extra support, and the Rann government is extremely proud of its role in providing these opportunities.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): Has the Minister for Health received a report from Coffey Environments Pty Ltd on the level of contamination at the rail

yard site and, if so, will he table it, and does he have a revised cost estimate of the remediation of the site prior to the government proposed central hospital?

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Listen up; you listen. When asked about the cost of remediation on 28 February last year, the minister stated:

The figure of \$40 million sticks in my mind but, rather than be attached to that, I will get a response back to the member.

I have not had a response to that. Today the minister claimed that his estimate was less and that he was confident that it would be under that. He has not yet identified what it is. The estimated cost for site and soil remediation of the now abandoned Tasmanian rail yard hospital proposal was \$42 million for a rail yard half the size that exists in Adelaide.

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has sat down, so the cameraman in the gallery can now stop taking photographs of her.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Health has the call.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kairua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:05): The deputy leader asked me about a particular report. I am not sure about the status of that report—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I said that I am not aware of the status of that report, but I am happy to get advice in relation to it. The deputy leader asked about remediation. I thought I answered that. It is an absolute maximum of \$40 million, but I expect it to be well below that—that is the advice I have. I am advised not to provide the exact figure because it might affect whatever negotiations need to take place in order to have it done. I will look at the honourable member's question. It was a long question. If there is further information I can provide, I will provide it.

Can I say that because remediation costs so much on another site in another state it should cost the same or more in this state because the site is bigger is farcical. One would have to take into account what happened on the site, the nature of the land, its proximity to other materials and industries—a whole range of things. I do not see the relevance of that comment. It is just a foolish thing to say.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What do the latest employment figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics mean for South Australia?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:07): The latest job figures released last Thursday by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that a record number of South Australians are in jobs—indeed, 104,500 extra jobs since the government came into office in 2002. In trend terms full-time employment has grown by 14.7 per cent between March 2002 and May 2009—a solid achievement for this government. By comparison, full-time employment grew by a mere 1.2 per cent (or 5,800 jobs) between December 1993 and February 2002 under the previous Liberal government.

In May the total number of people employed in trend terms in South Australia increased by 1,600 to reach a record high of 795,600 individuals, and the headline unemployment rate decreased by 0.1 per cent to reach 5.4 per cent, bucking the national trend which rose by 0.2 per cent to reach 5.7 per cent. We worked against the national trend in terms of unemployment.

South Australia is the only mainland state to record a drop in its headline unemployment rate and the only state to record an increase in the number of people looking for work. Our participation rate in trend terms went up by 0.1 per cent to 63.7 per cent. This is equal to the highest ever recorded in October last year—which, I might add, was prior to the onset of the global economic crisis.

Participation rates are important because they effectively measure the level of confidence about the economy. The higher the participation rate the greater the number of people who feel

strongly that they have a chance of securing employment. It is pleasing to note that South Australia's annual average employment growth in trend terms has now exceeded the national rate for the past four months.

As the training and employment minister—and someone who has teenage children—I, like many others, was concerned to see that youth unemployment had risen to 24.9 per cent. However, this needs some clarification. It is a common misconception that an unemployment rate of 24.9 per cent means that approximately one in four young people are unemployed.

The youth unemployment rate is based on a smaller group of working age teenagers who are in the labour force. There are about 107,000 South Australian teenagers of working age, that is, aged 15 to 19, and last month there were 5,300 of these individuals looking for employment, which is an unemployment rate of 5 per cent. While one young person out of work is one person too many, our focus is on keeping teenagers in education and training to give them the best chance of winning a sustainable job. That is why we as a government have joined with the commonwealth government in announcing a youth compact which aims to ensure that all unemployed Australians under the age of 25 will have a guaranteed education or training place.

I reiterate what the Premier said last week: we are not out of the woods yet. There is still a great uncertainty internationally, and tough decisions need to be made at the state level. However, these figures are further evidence that the state economy is continuing to demonstrate resilience in the face of the global economic crisis, particularly since the March quarter for state final demand showed the state growing at a rate of 2 per cent, as opposed to a national fall of 1 per cent. South Australia was the only state or territory to record economic growth in the quarter and has recorded the highest annual growth rates across the nation.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:11): My question is to the Treasurer. Has a business case or similar document been completed by any government department or any external consultant regarding the construction of a hospital at the rail yards site since October last year? The Tasmanian government announced on Monday 19 May that it would no longer be proceeding with its construction of a hospital on the rail yards site in Hobart. The decision followed the production of a business case dated May 2009, which stated:

Treasury has advised that the investment required for the construction of a new hospital will not be affordable for the state within the foreseeable future due to the downturn in economic conditions.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (15:12): That is why we cancelled the prisons. I got the first question of the day as to why we cancelled the prisons, or to that effect. We cancelled the prisons, because it was a lower priority order and something had to give. The funny thing is that I met David Bartlett, the Tasmanian Premier, a couple of weeks ago at a Council of Australian Governments meeting, and he was saying to me that, yes, he had to cancel it, as we were considering the cancellation of our prisons, because they could not afford it. He said, 'You know what? We're getting belted around the ears by the Liberal opposition, who are arguing that we shouldn't be cancelling the new hospital and we should be putting in a new hospital in Hobart.' Over here, the argument is the other way around.

Does that not say a lot about politics? But guess who else has said, 'We might build a hospital over the rail yards'? The Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This is the weird twilight zone that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition operates in. She came out and said she wants to build, or investigate building, a brand new Women's and Children's Hospital. When she was asked where she would do that (apparently, there is a bit of land she thought she could find at the back of the Royal Adelaide Hospital), she said she would consider the rail yards. So, she is considering the rail yards for the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Ms Chapman: We're asking the people, unlike you.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That just exposes the shallowness and the opportunism of the opposition's position on the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What happened to the earthquakes?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's right. We can build a football stadium on the rail yards and put 60,000 people at risk once a week, but we could not build a hospital there, because of the risk of an earthquake.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Unless you're women and children; women and children keep earthquakes away.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, little people are immune from earthquake effects.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: Lower ceilings!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's it: lower ceilings. Now I understand the method in their logic. It could be a cheaper hospital, but a little tiny hospital.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: A baby hospital.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: A baby hospital.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not understand the question.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: For goodness sake, will you let me answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Can't you get the deputy leader to shush for an answer?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Is she like this in your caucus meetings?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What do you call it? Your party room then. Is she like this in your party room meetings? I cannot wait to see Isobel as the most senior female on the Liberal Party front bench.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Blame Thatcher. Vickie will go tumbling down. We did a business case at the outset of this project.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: For goodness sake, let me answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We did a business case to determine whether we would rebuild on the existing site or build the hospital on a new site.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop is warned.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It's not a good day to get named, Mitch; it's not a good look on your CV.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We did a business case at the outset.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If the question that the deputy leader has asked me is: have we done one since the Tasmanian decision—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, I would assume no. Why would we have done one? We have not done one, have we, minister? I do not understand what the deputy leader meant by that, because the decision of the Tasmanian government not to proceed with the hospital was not because it was not the right policy option but because it could not afford it.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They couldn't afford it; just like we have cut prisons.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

SCHOOL AMALGAMATIONS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:17): Thank you, sir.

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: I am glad to see that I was missed yesterday.

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Can the Minister for Education advise how much the government expects to receive from the sale of land and assets in Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla resulting from the planned closure and amalgamation of 44 schools in the region?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Adelaide—Minister for Education, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:17): I think the member for Unley is again trying to cause disharmony and grief in the community. The issues in regional South Australia to which he alludes involve the work being done around the Building the Education Revolution in schools in the regions, which I know members opposite do not support because they voted against it.

There are 250,000 schoolchildren in South Australia, which would tend to suggest that there are probably half a million parents or, allowing for a few merged families, maybe a few more, and those half a million parents probably have also about a quarter of a million grandparents. So, overall there are about one million people who are delighted that the federal government is spending \$1 billion on school infrastructure in South Australia. In fact, they do not complain about it, they are very grateful and delighted that it is occurring.

Regional schools have been considering re-aligning their services through amalgamations, because we know that the government's policy of a one-stop shop has been very popular in some areas. Parents love opportunities to drop off at child care, kindy and primary schools on the same site. Many regional schools are looking at Education Works initiatives. We are happy to look at those areas but, if they are involved in a Building the Education Revolution project, whereby there is a massive investment, we will negotiate to make sure that money is well spent. We do not want schools to amalgamate and have a massive infrastructure investment on sites that are no longer occupied.

Clearly, extra thought is involved in where those school investments might be. I understand that those opposite hate the idea of money being spent on public schools. They hate the idea that we have spent so much more over the last eight years. They have actively discouraged and tried to undermine—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I have been sitting here thinking—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —that the point of order should be about relevance.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr WILLIAMS: I was thinking it should be about relevance, sir, but as I was getting to my feet the minister started to debate. So, there are two points of order: one is about lack of relevance and the other is that the minister is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: The minister must answer the substance of the question.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The substance of the question is that, if schools amalgamate under a Labor Rann government, then it is because of their choice. They have decided to do so and they have voted. Those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —hate money to be spent on public education. They hate money to be spent on public schools. In fact, the spokesperson thinks that public education is rotten to the core. He hates money being spent and, unlike them, our government, the Rann Labor government, does not close schools. Unlike them—64 schools, I think, they closed in their term. They are the ones who closed the schools. We are the ones who invest in them.

LOXTON RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. How many jobs does the minister expect will be lost in country South Australia in the agricultural research and development sector as a result of the budget decision to relocate the Loxton Research Centre analytical crop management laboratory? Has a regional impact statement been completed?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for his question. He is right to identify that that decision has been made with respect to the soil testing that has been undertaken up there for an extended period of time. But the point I would make is that the Loxton Research Centre has a very positive future, and it is about what we are going to do there, not what we have supported for an extended period of time that has cost more money than should otherwise be the case.

We are doing three things. We are making sure that the service that is currently being provided up there can be provided to those people in a cost-effective manner. We are working with the community in respect of the level of services. We have a policy here in this state that we do not sack public servants.

BURNSIDE CITY COUNCIL

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Northern Suburbs, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:23): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Gail Gago.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

SWINE FLU

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:23): I would like to put a slightly different slant on the swine flu pandemic that the world is experiencing. As a veterinarian, I think I can put a slightly different point of view on the origin of the virus, the potential for the virus to become a far more serious problem than it has been and what we humans have to fear from this novel new virus.

To go back a little to talk about swine influenza as it affects four-legged creatures, swine flu in pigs is a highly contagious respiratory disease caused by a type A influenza virus and characterised by, as we are seeing in humans with this particular new virus, high morbidity but low mortality. In other words, lots of people are getting the flu but very few are dying from it.

This could change quite dramatically with this particular new virus. The swine influenza A virus occurs in most other countries around the world but does not occur in Australia. We are disease free when it comes to swine flu (as in the four-legged swine flu). In the same way that influenza A in humans changes a little bit and recurs every year, that is exactly what happens in pigs.

International outbreaks of spreading infections in people have been reported in the past; some have been associated with swine flu. I think the 1918 outbreak was associated with swine flu. No evidence was able to be proved at the time because there was not the standard of investigation available into virology and the origin of the disease. Rarely has swine flu (as in pig swine flu) been transmitted from human to human. In the same way as we have very occasionally seen bird flu transfer from birds to humans, so far it has not been transferred from human to human.

The point that I really want to make at the moment is that people think swine flu is a disease of pigs all over the world. It is not. Pigs in Australia are swine flu free; pork in Australia is safe to consume. In Egypt tens of thousands of pigs were slaughtered unnecessarily. It was completely ineffective in controlling the outbreak of this new virus that is being called swine flu.

The World Health Organisation has reported that there is a significant human to human transmission of this new virus. The new virus is a combination of two types of swine flu: an avian influenza and a human influenza—and this is the big worry. This is a serious worry. The Minister for Education, as a pathologist and with her training, has told me that she is very concerned about what could happen with this sort of a virus.

To the best of our knowledge we have not seen this sort of a virus before. The big issue with this virus is that pigs can get bird flu from birds, they can pick up human flu, and they have swine flu. We think this is how this virus came about.

My particular concern is now with the spread of this virus all over the world. At the moment it has high morbidity and low mortality; in other words, it is affecting many people but killing very few. What could happen is that this virus, particularly in Asian countries, where we are seeing a really nasty type of bird flu (H5N1), could recombine with the bird flu virus and produce a really nasty form of bird flu. It would be called swine flu, but you will not know the difference due to the genotyping. This is a real worry for me, and it is a real worry for all people in medical and veterinary professions.

I strongly encourage people to be alert to and alarmed by the fact that that this could happen. At the moment we have a very mild swine flu. Some people call it 'flu-lite'. I, personally, would not mind getting a dose of this because I think it might give me cross-protection from some other combination of a bird, pig and human virus. This will happen in pigs at some stage. I am very worried about it, and the medical profession and the government should be very worried about it, because when we do get the second wave, if it is the nasty wave, it will be very serious. It will cause serious numbers of deaths, the same as the 1918 influenza.

Time expired.

MODBURY SOCCER CLUB

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:28): One of the best things available in the north-eastern suburbs is the range of sporting clubs, from calisthenics to netball, basketball, hockey, cricket and all forms of football, including gridiron. However, it is the round ball that I would like to talk about today—the world game—and, in particular, the Modbury Soccer Club. The Jets have had a presence in Modbury since 1963, and although it was lost to Newland in the redistribution some years ago the club will return to Florey at the next election.

It has been my privilege to have had a relationship with the club since 1990 and to have witnessed many highs, particularly its grand-final tilt at Hindmarsh Stadium a few years ago. In what I guess could be called a rebuilding stage at the moment, last Friday saw another memorable evening at Jet Park in Ridgehaven—sadly, one of the coldest places I know.

A goodly crowd gathered not only to see the boys play the Western Strikers, but executive committee member, Matt Selby, who is also the managing director of e-football, had pulled off a bit of a coup by inviting living soccer legend Ian Rush to the club. Ian had been with the club officials since Wednesday and had given a training clinic earlier in the evening. He was particularly generous with his time and spoke with fans, posing for photos and autographing books and soccer balls, one of which I now have the privilege of owning.

Ian's soccer CV is remarkable. He is one of English football's most prolific goal scorers. I say 'is' because he still plays, although he declined to pull on a Jets' strip on Friday night. Luckily, we did not need his help in the end, but more on that and the match later. Ian Rush netted 346 goals in 660 senior outings for Liverpool despite being Welsh-born and a boyhood supporter of the club's closest rival, Everton. Ian won Europe's Golden Boot with 32 Premier League goals in 1984. His haul of 44 FA Cup goals was a 20th century record and he holds an all-time record of five goals in cup finals. He also played for Juventus, Chester City, Leeds United, Newcastle, Wrexham and Sydney Olympic.

Kick-off was at 8pm, so along with my colleagues the members for Newland and Makin, I had plenty of time to enjoy the club's hospitality. Chris Moon's great steak sandwiches and the usual barbecue extras and pasta were available for the fans. The club has a great committee and

volunteers to support their activities, and Phil Taylor, assisted by Ted Muldoon, looks after the grounds.

I wished seniors' coach Neil Henderson luck in his pre-match preparations as our year has been challenging and unlucky, but there is great resolve to avoid relegation and remain in the super league. As Lee Gagliardi said in this week's *Leader Messenger*, scores were locked at one-all at half time, with the Jets putting away a great goal only to see an equaliser within minutes.

The boys must have had a great pep talk at half-time because they came out flying, bagging three more goals and narrowly missing three others. Jets supporters were ecstatic with a 4-2 win, and goals to Matthew Kelly, Damien Morrell, Russell Clayton and Rhys Devlin ensured the Jets took all three points. Best on ground were Anthony Solagna, Scott Weidenbach and Damien Morrell.

Although I left not long after the players came out, I am sure people had no trouble staying on to celebrate. The club is supported by a great group of sponsors, amongst them: Burton Groves Tea Tree Gully, e-football, Infinity Signs, Moving Juice, Vision Security Services, Sportspower Golden Grove, Modbury Press, Zobel Finance, Bunnings at Modbury, The Gully Meat Service and Alan Cassin's Golden Grove Tavern.

The Jets have a great tradition and heritage and I would like to thank Judy Feeney and many others for always making me welcome at Jet Park. It has been a privilege to know the club heroes like Micky Dye, who I spoke about some years ago, and John Jacobs, both of whom have now passed away. Both worked tirelessly for the club. For JJ, no job was too small. A former youth state player, he was associated with the club for around 20 years and was well loved by all.

I was saddened to learn today that Bobby Dale has also passed away. Another club man, Billy Gray, is remembered with a memorial match every year and this year it will be on 3 July against Adelaide Hills Hawks at Jet Park. Billy's son Dwayne was a senior coach for many years, and I am fairly sure that one of his sons attended Ian Rush's clinic so the family tradition seems set to continue.

Soccer is growing as a spectator sport here in Australia and, following the spectacular success of Adelaide United in the Asian league and the Socceroos under Guus Hiddink and now Pim Verbeek in the World Cup, there is every reason for optimism. FFA is bidding for the 2018 and 2022 World Cup and, under chairman Frank Lowy, the future is bright. Many Australian players have done well with overseas clubs and, with initiatives such as the visit by Ian Rush, I am looking forward to seeing a Modbury Jet on the world stage some time in the not too distant future.

SERVICE CLUBS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:33): It is that time of year again when many of us have to attend a plethora of service club changeover dinners, and I would just like to mention the service clubs in my electorate, starting with the Hindmarsh Island Rotary Club, the Goolwa Rotary Club, the Goolwa Lions Club, the Victor Harbor and Port Elliot Lions Club, the Victor Harbor Rotary Club, the Victor Harbor Apex Club, the Encounter Bay Rotary Club, the Victor Harbor Zonta Club, the Yankalilla Rotary Club, the Yankalilla Lions Club, the KI Rotary Club, the KI Lions Club, the Western Kangaroo Island Lions Club and, last but not least, in no particular order, the new Leo Club at Yankalilla—

The Hon. R.J. McEwen interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I was about to say, member for Mount Gambier—and a host of Probus clubs. As I said, it is that time of year when we do the rounds and indeed last night I had to attend the Victor Harbor Lions Club changeover dinner and I saw Mr Bob Adams come in. Jan and I attended one on the island and we have just got them rolling through over the next four or five weeks.

I would like to acknowledge the enormous contribution that these clubs make to the community, not only in my electorate but across the state, across Australia and across the world, quite frankly. They do an absolutely amazing job, and wherever you go you see Lions and Rotary. The Apex Club in Victor Harbor is only a very small club. Karen Dutton is the current president of that club, ably assisted by her husband Chris and a group of other people. They are only small but they do their best.

A lot of these clubs have to work very hard to keep themselves going. I know that the Rotary Club on Kangaroo Island has only a dozen or so members. A couple of weeks ago, Jan and

I attended the changeover dinner for the Kangaroo Island Rotary Club. That is the first changeover dinner that I have attended at any of the service clubs on the island for three years; they generally clash with those on the mainland.

It was a good afternoon and a sign of community strength in that we had a considerable number of people from the mainland who came over for that, particularly the Barossa Valley Rotary Clubs, which are most supportive of the island Rotary Club. These dinners go on. Indeed, sometimes they do go on, but always with the best intent. Sometimes it is a bit of a problem to find different words to propose a toast to Rotary International and Lions International without going over the same ground, but the very fact that I am asked along and given the opportunity to say a few words is greatly appreciated.

I have a great deal of respect for those service clubs. I am an honorary member of the Victor Harbor Rotary Club. That club alone, with the commitment it has to the community, along with the other clubs, is quite remarkable. Its annual art exhibition in Victor Harbor is, I think, the largest art exhibition in Australia outside of the metropolitan area. It is enormous, and most of that money goes back into the community.

A few months ago, Jan and I attended the sheepdog trials at Yankalilla. The small Lions Club at Yankalilla was doing the gate, the catering, and rendering assistance. They were there all day, just a few people, and it was an enormously satisfying experience to go along.

A few months ago I attended the inauguration of the Yankalilla Leo Club. I do not know whether other members have Leo Clubs in their electorate. They are for children, and the Yankalilla Leo Club is very much supported by the Yankalilla Area School. The group of young children who were there were terrific. They handled themselves well, and I wish them all the success in the world.

In the time left to me, once again, I want to support the service clubs across my electorate. Jan and I get a great deal of pleasure going to not only the changeover dinners but a host of other things that are run by these community organisations. I know that if there is an issue and I have to go back to one of the clubs to see if they can help somewhere, they are always keen to do it.

Time expired.

LYELL McEWIN HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para) (15:38): I would like to make a few remarks today about the Lyell McEwin Health Service. The minister referred to an event that occurred last week when the new linear accelerator radiotherapy treatment facility was opened. As he said, I was invited as the local member but, of course, I have a great deal of interest in this particular facility, because the Lyell McEwin Health Service has been of great interest to me during all of my career as the member for Little Para but certainly when I was minister for health. In fact, the \$7 million for that linear accelerator, I think, came into one of the last budgets before I left that position.

It was a great occasion at the Lyell McEwin Health Service, firstly, to see the facility. It is state-of-the-art, large, high-tech. We saw a demonstration of how it would work. There was great enthusiasm by staff who are looking forward to being able to offer a very important service not only to the people from the north and within the immediate vicinity but also to people coming from further afield who live closer to the Lyell McEwin Health Service than the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

It was a good opportunity to reflect on just how far the Lyell McEwin Health Service has come over recent years. There was a time when it was considered—and it was—the poor cousin of the hospital and health services in South Australia. People in the north preferred to bypass the Lyell McEwin Hospital and go elsewhere for treatment. I am very pleased to say that that is no longer the case. This is just another addition to the fantastic changes that have occurred at that site. In particular, I would like to commend not only the current chief executive, David Miller, and the staff in the radiation oncology area at the Lyell McEwin Health Service but also the staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and those in the cancer care network who work together to ensure that this facility is as good as it is.

One of the most significant issues that came up in conversation was the fact that just as the residents of the northern suburbs have a generally lower health status than residents in other areas, the situation has also affected their access to treatment such as this. Cancer experts said that, because people in the north did not access radiotherapy treatment services, their cancer situations became much more serious because they did not get the early intervention treatment this

linear accelerator and associated therapies provide, and that meant, of course, worse outcomes for these people.

This is what happens in situations where people cannot get access. We know that, on average, it will save people 30 trips to the city. Not only will it save patients their time and discomfort but also it saves them in terms of travel, use of cars and other areas. It was a great thing to see. The improvements to the Lyell McEwin Health Service will continue to roll along over the coming years. It really will be a fantastic addition to health facilities in South Australia, as well as to the spine of the three hospitals that will then exist in Adelaide.

Time expired.

LINCOLN MARINE SCIENCE CENTRE

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (15:43): Today I congratulate all those people involved in the fantastic Lincoln Marine Science Centre expansion completed late 2008 and officially opened on 18 March 2009. In particular, I thank Dr Rob Lewis and Professor Chris Marlin who have supported since its inception this wonderful regional facility despite significant pressure to centralise facilities in Adelaide. The Lincoln Marine Science Centre is a state-of-the-art, modern, temperate marine species research and education facility that has provided the fishing and aquaculture industries in this country with countless benefits.

Many industry workers, marine biologists and scientists, students and teachers have passed through its doors, leaving with an extended knowledge and appreciation of our sustainable industries. In my inaugural speech in 1994 I spoke of my vision of a centre of excellence, particularly to provide tertiary education for the fishing and aquaculture industries of Eyre Peninsula in the future. In my speech I said that I would like to see Flinders University develop a full university campus in Port Lincoln offering a degree specialising in marine studies instead of losing our students to the cold-water facilities in Tasmania. Many students who leave for Tasmania never return to work on Eyre Peninsula.

The establishment of the Lincoln Marine Science Centre in Port Lincoln in 1995—a small research laboratory funded by the active and passionate local community, the federal and state governments and Flinders University, and now operated by the combination of Flinders University, SARDI, SA Museum, seafood industries and regional communities to form the Marine Innovation SA (MISA) campus—was an excellent start to my dream.

The recent \$6.6 million expansion funding for the MISA campus is another step closer to my ultimate goal of offering an internationally recognised marine science university degree at the centre. It makes sense to offer a marine science degree in Port Lincoln—the seafood capital of Australia—as we continue to lead the state in sustainable fishing and aquaculture industries, providing South Australia with millions of export dollars.

The Lincoln Marine Science Centre MISA campus is perfectly situated on the shores of the clean Boston Bay waters, in a region which provides the world with tuna, prawns, pilchards, abalone, kingfish, rock lobster, mussels, oysters, and more. Future expansion, planned over the next 30 years, would bring students from all over Australia and international students from around the world to Port Lincoln, allowing them to experience first hand how the marine industries operate and affect and benefit a community. While they are in Port Lincoln they will experience a world-class education in sustainable temperate water fishing and aquaculture. What better way to learn all aspects of the industry than to live and study in the town that houses one of the largest fishing fleets in Australia and is home to the first bluefin tuna farming and breeding programs in the country.

The Lincoln Marine Science Centre already hosts visiting scientists and students from interstate and overseas. The new facilities include a 45 seat lecture theatre, a 40 seat teaching laboratory, research laboratories, computer room, aquaria rooms and office space. The centre offers space for an extra 35 permanent and visiting scientists and educational staff, and caters for increased student numbers. With planned future expansion it is anticipated that 250 extra jobs will be generated by 2020.

Scientists at the Lincoln Marine Science Centre research lifecycles and growing requirements of farm species, nutrition and feed conversion requirements, breeding and genetics, and genetic influence on product characteristics. Wild fisheries research takes place, assisting industries with new technologies and monitoring systems. Research into aquaculture innovation, product quality and value adding, ecosystems and biosecurity is now underway in the expanded

laboratory facilities. Projects are run in partnership with the local fishing and aquaculture industries, providing them with the benefits of research findings.

With the recent expansion, research is said to have the potential to double South Australia's average annual value of seafood production by 2015. Our fishing industries remain the biggest provider of seafood export dollars to this state and require little from the government in return. Therefore, it is only just that the state government continues to fund the planned future expansion of the Lincoln Marine Science Centre. The return on its small investment provides exceptional value for taxpayers.

I am honoured to have been bestowed with a Fellow Membership of Flinders University, recognising my involvement with the Lincoln Marine Science Centre. It is a project that I have been proud to be part of since its inception.

Time expired.

OUTBACK ROADS

Ms BREUER (Giles) (15:48): Last week I had the great pleasure of travelling up north—which is not unusual for me. Once I head up the highway the world changes, so I went some considerable distance—probably about 5,000 or 6,000 kilometres, I am not sure—to the north-eastern side of the state, not my side of the state.

I was accompanied by an Aboriginal couple, and we were looking at a number of heritage issues, but I also used it as an opportunity to travel around and look at some of the issues in that part of the state which are relevant to issues in my electorate in my part of the state.

It is always a pleasure to visit anywhere in the Outback. I was thinking as I drove around that we have such beautiful country out there; it is remote but it is so beautiful, and I feel very privileged to be able to travel there as often as I do.

Today I want to discuss some of the issues that are important to people in the Outback and the remote parts of our state. There are three big issues: employment and the way of life out there are really all about tourism, mining, pastoralism and farming. That is what the big issues are about with employment. As a result of this, important day-to-day issues are roads, jobs and rain. These I had a good opportunity to look at.

The state of the roads is a really important issue for people who live in remote parts of Australia. We have a lot of tourists who go out there and who come back and whinge about the state of the roads, but they are not living with them day to day, as people out there are. I was quite surprised; I truly believe that in the eastern part of the state some of the roads are in far better condition than those in my part of the state, which concerns me somewhat, and I will be speaking to the minister about this. We do get a lot of tourism in that area, and we have the big Santos there, so there is a need to have good roads, but I was impressed with the standard of those roads and I felt quite concerned that we do not have as good roads in my part of the state.

It has an impact on tourists as they travel through there; it has to be good for the mining and pastoralism industries, which need to have good roads. I was interested to see that what we tend to do on my side of the state is patch up a lot rather than resheeting. We are talking about horrendous amounts of money here; this is a long term thing. I am not saying we can solve it next week, because I am realistic and I know that is not possible. It costs an incredible amount of money to keep our roads in a reasonable state.

I have asked on a number of occasions whether we can look at resheeting a lot of our roads, as seems to have been done on the eastern side of the state, so perhaps we are next on the list. In lots of areas in my part of the state the roads are so deep because they have been graded so many times that they do need resheeting and looking at.

One particular road I went on—I forget where it was, as I went on so many roads—was actually in sandhill country. I have driven through the Simpson Desert, and this sandhill was not quite as concentrated as in the Simpson Desert, but I noticed that some very good roads have been built through those sandhills, so there is a method and it can be done, and I am hoping we can look at that seriously for the Giles electorate also.

One of the big issues is deaths on roads. It is absolutely essential that these roads are safe. If people are using them not just to travel around sightseeing but also to travel from place to place for emergencies and so on, we have to make sure our roads are safe, so that is why I believe it is such an important issue for us.

One thing I found on the eastern side of the state is that there are a lot more toilets. One of the big bugbears in my life when I am travelling is that it is five hours between toilet stops. I found that they were better serviced on that side of the state, and I have had a discussion already with the tourism minister about this. When you travel like I do, you understand my concern as a woman about the lack of toilets in Outback areas. There is a long wait between stops.

One issue is also that there are no McDonald's out there or anything like that. People do not realise; I do not think tourists understand the distance between places. You have to make sure you have adequate food, fuel and water when you are travelling, so it is important to talk to people about these issues. Jobs are essential for our communities. I was pleased to see that a lot of training goes on for locals in the mining industry, particularly for indigenous workers in some areas. I would like to see a lot more rangers out there working and giving information to tourists being trained in those areas.

Time expired.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3221.)

Mr HANNA (Mitchell) (15:54): I respond to the Labor government's 2009 budget. To keep things simple, I look at it this way. Spending has increased by about \$1.3 billion, state revenue has decreased by about \$1.7 billion and we have a deficit, meaning we are about \$0.6 billion worse off than in the previous year in terms of the bottom line. The only way these figures make sense is by including the additional federal revenue that the state government has received, and in this budget about \$0.9 billion is coming in from the federal government in addition to what we had last year in order for us to balance the books.

In essence, what this means is that this budget is a pre-election budget. It is not the pre-election budget we are used to, where the Treasurer comes in like Father Christmas with goodies for all sorts of programs, but it is a pre-election budget because it avoids the pain that would otherwise be necessary, and will be necessary, even on the government's own admission, in the next two financial years. That is why the government has proposed a device called a sustainable budget commission which will take some responsibility for the political pain which will come from recommendations for massive budget cuts. But, of course, those recommendations will not come until after the March 2010 election.

Before I get on to some of the items which I think could have been better addressed in the budget, I will make some remarks about the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This is a question that I get asked about quite a bit as I go around knocking on doors and speaking to people in my electorate. The answer in terms of this budget is inconclusive. It is not actually the subject of funding in this year's budget. It remains a plan on the part of the Labor government, just as it remains a plan on the part of the Liberal opposition to upgrade the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital site.

I am in the possess of finding out more about the costing and proposals of both of the alternatives. I know that I need to know this and my community needs to know this before we go to the election in March. Labor's plan involves spending \$1.7 billion on a new hospital. The Liberal's plans, of which there are three, entail spending of \$1.4 billion, \$950 million, or \$800 million, depending on which option is chosen.

The Liberal Party puts forward the position that the existing site can be upgraded sufficiently to take account of increased patient numbers in the decade or decades to come. Essentially, it seems to me that, by building a new hospital, it must be a better hospital. It is going to have more modern facilities. It is going to have all the appropriate cabling for the expansion of computer and high technology medical equipment. The question becomes: which is the best value? I, for one, have no way of knowing at this point in time which one delivers South Australia the better option in terms of value.

The government has arranged a briefing for members of parliament, and Family First also arranged a briefing for members of parliament in relation to the proposals for retaining the current site. After hearing what was said at the briefings I am not any wiser because there are many aspects of both proposals, both alternatives, which are yet uncostered. The Liberal Party plan has the backing of several prominent Adelaide doctors, but, frankly, I would just as soon hear from prominent engineers as prominent doctors. We need a combination of medical knowledge and engineering knowledge, and financial knowledge, to work out which is the best option.

I will be addressing the issue of the hospital and which is the preferred choice closer to the election, but we, as will the community, will certainly need more information if we are going to partly decide the election on the basis of that project.

Now I turn to a number of issues which are essential, in my view, to the better management of South Australia, and the improvement of my local community. The first topic I address is in relation to water. As I go around the community, especially in the drier months, the number one topic is always water. What can we do to conserve water better? Where is the real vision for a plan to have all of the stormwater falling on the plains kept on the plains, rather than discharged into the gulf? Where is the vision for keeping the Murray River alive? It rather looks as if we are gradually letting the River Murray die, first by closing off the river at the point above Lake Alexandrina, and who knows what the next step will be if water continues to be taken out of the river at the current rate of extraction both in South Australia and over the border.

On a local level, the average residential water bill is set to rise from \$340.60 to \$387.50 per quarter under the new three tier usage charging scheme. I am in favour of tiers when it comes to water pricing, but I think it is essential that the bottom tier be extremely cheap water so that there can be no question that families without much income will be no worse off. At the same time, I think those people who want to have extravagant gardens or even use water for spa baths or other purposes inside their houses ought to be paying much more at the top end of the scale.

As a rough rule of thumb, I would like to see a pricing scheme which meant that average households would pay about the same, but those who use twice as much water would pay twice as much and those who use half as much would only pay half as much. It can be done, and I think it should be done. Ideally, I think we would do away with the supply charge for water. I am aware that the Productivity Commission has a view about that but it seems to me that we should go ahead in South Australia and move to a much more user pays system. For the pricing to be more elastic, we would do away with the supply charge.

Of course, the system I am talking about would need to make a number of exemptions for concession card holders and, depending on the numbers of people in the household—and there is no doubt that this can be worked out—of course, there would be an administrative cost to this. But it can be done and should be done so that we send a strong message to all water users who rely on the Murray, and indeed all water users in South Australia, that they need to conserve water inside the house as well as in the garden.

There are other ways we can approach the water conservation problem. I do not believe that rebates are sufficient, and we need to broaden the categories of eligibility for some rebates. For example, it makes little sense to me to provide a rebate for a rainwater tank that is plumbed into the household but no rebate whatsoever for a stand-alone rainwater tank which might be used to water the garden and the vegetables. It seems to me that a rainwater tank being used for the latter purpose is still going to mean less water drawn from the mains system, and that is what we want to encourage. So, it seems to me it would make sense for a rebate to exist for that purpose as well.

We need to have rebates for tap flow regulators, waterwise garden assessments, grey water re-use systems, swimming pool covers, and fixing leaking taps and toilets, even if this is just for very low income families, etc. There should be rebates in relation to certain garden goods as well, including the equipment necessary for subsurface irrigation, trigger nozzles on hoses, waterless car cleaning products, shower timers and so on. Many of these ideas are already being acted on interstate and it seems strange that, with our water problems in South Australia, we have not used best practice from interstate.

In relation to stormwater re-use, I note the state government's allocation of \$833 million towards the total \$1.8 billion cost of the desalination plant but only \$52.3 million, as I read the budget, has been allocated for projects to increase stormwater re-use. This is not sufficient when we have such vast potential for retaining our stormwater on the Adelaide Plains. Salisbury City Council will soon be harvesting 20 gigalitres of water a year, if it is not already, but the budget announcements do very little to add to that.

A blueprint for this has already been drawn up. We do not need further research. The Water Proofing Adelaide report several years ago set out a number of sites for stormwater retention. I believe that at least 10 of these sites should be established by 2014, and I would welcome a promise from either of major parties to do just this. I think the Liberal Party has an advance on the Labor Party in this respect at this point in time.

I will briefly run through the list of possibilities: the Gawler River; the areas within the City of Salisbury that are already being used perhaps could be expanded; the Barker Inlet wetlands; the Cheltenham racecourse site; Port Road; the River Torrens; the South Parklands; the Keswick-Brown Hill-Sturt Creek complex; the Brighton area; the Field River, the Christies river; the Onkaparinga and Aldinga creeks; and the Willunga Basin. These all have the potential to deliver many dozens of gigalitres to South Australians and remove the need for extracting that from the River Murray. We should also be talking to Adelaide Airport Ltd in respect of wetlands on its land.

I understand that the government will spend \$165 million in this budget and \$414 million over the next four years on upgrading and expanding wastewater treatment plants, including the one at Glenelg. This should include plans to have Glenelg wastewater come to the Adelaide Parklands. If we do not already have it we should soon have consensus across all parties that this should be done.

While I am on the subject of water, we also need greater regulation of the aquifer under the Adelaide Plains. I commend the government for taking steps towards this. My community knows that I support the High Court legal challenge in relation to caps on trading water interstate. I do not think we can afford to wait several years for existing caps to be removed. I feel quite confident that some of the restrictions in place breach our constitutional restrictions on interstate trade.

I move to the topic of poker machine reform. I am as passionate about this now as I was when I entered parliament some 12 years ago. The government needs a better plan to curb the problems that arise from gambling machines. I know they are called 'gaming machines' in the legislation, but I think the more appropriate name for them is 'gambling machines'.

About 1.6 per cent of the population now seeks help from the gambling helpline every year, I am told. The government collected over \$7 million from gambling revenue, I am told, and nearly \$300 million of that from the tax on gambling machines. Yet, such a small fraction of that is spent on those who have a problem with those machines, those who become addicted to them.

For every person who becomes an addict it is estimated that between five and 10 others are adversely affected—their friends, family and employers—at times. There are many thousands of high-risk gamblers who play poker machines, and we are certainly not doing enough to address this issue. In the end, it becomes an expensive issue for employers and for our social services. By spending a bit more on help services and actually changing the gambling machine regime, we could save a lot of money that is spent propping up people or fixing messes after they have arisen.

I am a firm believer that the hours for playing machines need to be cut. There should not be any alcohol permitted in gambling machine areas. Moves to reduce the number of gambling machines by the Rann government in the last parliament have proven to be a complete failure. Even the tentative goal of 3,000 machines to be cut has nowhere near been achieved, so that needs to be revisited.

There should be increases in the gambling tax for gambling machines, particularly for hotels. I think hotels and clubs should always be considered in a different category when it comes to policy in this area. There are also restrictions on those who are able to access the funds that are set aside to help problem gamblers, and I think we need to broaden those categories as some people are needlessly left out at the moment.

We need to work on the addictive features of gambling machine programs themselves. For more than six months now, I have been trying to research how these machines work and how we can change their features so that they will not be as addictive. It can be done and, before the election, I hope to bring in legislation that will show the way forward on this.

I turn to a couple of areas in my electorate where major spending needs to be done. Probably the most pressing is in relation to the Oaklands crossing. This is the point where Morphett Road, Diagonal Road and the Noarlunga railway line intersect. It is a major issue in my electorate for probably about 5,000 or more people who live in Warradale, Oaklands Park, Dover Gardens, Seacombe Gardens, Seaview Downs, and other areas in my electorate.

We need an overpass or an underpass to be built at this crossing. Sure, it will cost tens of millions of dollars, but I think it ranks up there with improvements to South Road in terms of the importance. This is so particularly because, for many people, it is a significant route to the Adelaide Airport. It is a significant route to get onto the Southern Expressway for people in the western suburbs, and it is also a significant route to Flinders University and the Flinders Medical Centre.

On top of this, of course, Westfield Marion, one of the largest shopping centres in the southern hemisphere, is just next door to this intersection. A state aquatic centre and a community health care centre are due to be built and finished next year. All of these will exacerbate the existing traffic problem. In the next parliament, I would like to see proposals drawn up, consultations made, the tendering process carried out and commencement of construction—and, certainly, I will be waving that particular flag as we approach the election.

Finally, I turn to the Glenthorne Farm site in my electorate. For about a decade, I have been working not only to keep this land as open space but to have it constructively used and available to the community. My vision for this beautiful stretch of open space next to South Road is something like Belair National Park. Why should only people in the south-eastern suburbs have access to beautiful Belair National Park? There should be something more convenient for people in the south, and I think Glenthorne Farm would be the ideal site.

Mr Bignell: Hear, hear!

Mr HANNA: I appreciate the support of the member for Mawson, Leon Bignell, as I make these comments. We need to have the state government take the land back from the University of Adelaide and declare areas of Glenthorne Farm to be a conservation reserve. Parts of the park need to be developed as a site for recreation with walking paths, cycling tracks and facilities. We should explore the option of a natural burial area on the site. This could be done away from residential areas and bring in some much-needed income to make sure that the rest of the land can be maintained.

In my remaining minute, I also mention that the Dover Gardens Primary School site is now available for other use, and I fervently believe it should be kept as an education department site. It would be ideal as a behavioural management learning centre. I have sought to set out a number of aspects where I believe the budget could have been better on the whole. It is a pre-election budget, and we will have more pain to suffer after the next election.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.D. Hill.

SWINE FLU

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:15): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: South Australia is now implementing a new pandemic phase to minimise the impact of the H1N1 influenza 09 virus. The federal Minister for Health, Nicola Roxon, and the Chief Medical Officer have either just completed or are in the process of completing a statement to the public based on decisions made across the nation today by all the jurisdictions.

The move to the 'protect' phase, as it will be called, is in line with the response announced by the federal government and other states, based on advice from the commonwealth and state chief medical officers. South Australia and Western Australia are moving to the new stage immediately, and all other states will be at that same place by Friday 26 June. Victoria has already moved to a 'modified sustain' stage, which I guess is the equivalent.

All the evidence so far shows that swine flu, in most cases, is a mild illness, and not everyone who contracts it needs to see a doctor, be tested or receive antiviral treatment. The growth in confirmed cases across the country and across the world is evidence that it is no longer possible to contain the virus in any particular geographic area.

The 'protect' phase will focus on identifying and treating those who are most vulnerable to developing serious complications from the virus. This includes people with existing chronic conditions, such as heart disease, chronic lung disease, diabetes, pregnant women and people who are morbidly obese. As part of the 'protect' phase of the response in South Australia:

- people with mild disease will be advised to stay at home until they are well, and over-the-counter medication (such as paracetamol) will be recommended to treat the symptoms of their illness. To make that plain, they will not be provided with Tamiflu or other antiviral material if they have a mild case of the disease;
- contacts of people confirmed with swine flu will no longer be asked to stay in home isolation unless they themselves develop flulike symptoms;

- only the vulnerable and those who are very unwell and need to be hospitalised will be recommended for testing for swine flu and treated with antivirals;
- SA Health will continue to monitor these results and collect statistics on the spread of the virus, and the spread of seasonal flu. We will not be testing every case, of course;
- the commonwealth government will discontinue its border measures.

School or class closures will no longer be routinely introduced, as this is not regarded as an effective way of stopping the spread of the virus now that it is more widespread in the community. Students will also no longer be asked to stay in home isolation if they have travelled to high prevalence areas. However, we will continue to ask parents to keep their children home if they are sick and keep them there until they are well.

Students from four schools who are currently in home isolation because of classroom closures are no longer required to stay at home until the end of the seven day isolation period. Parents should contact their school to discuss when students can return to classes. The best way to limit the spread of all influenza viruses is to practice good personal hygiene, such as washing your hands regularly and covering your nose and mouth with a tissue when you cough and sneeze. We currently have been notified of more than 450 cases of seasonal influenza and 107 cases of swine flu in South Australia. Good hygiene practices will help to restrict the spread of both seasonal and swine flu this winter. Antivirals from the national or state medical stockpiles will be provided to those people with moderate or severe disease or whose underlying conditions, after appropriate clinical assessment, could make them vulnerable to severe infection.

Members of the public who would like more information about human swine influenza should contact the swine flu hotline on 180 2007, or visit www.flu.sa.gov.au. Again, I would like to thank the officers of the health department and the medical officers and other officers in the Communicable Diseases Branch for their outstanding efforts over the past month, or so, in trying to limit the spread of this disease. I think we have done remarkably well given the proximity of a large outbreak in Victoria.

We now are at the practical point where we need to move to the next stage, and we have made the decision to do that immediately. That is called the 'protect stage'. The goals during the protect stage will be to protect those in our community who are most at risk of being made seriously ill by this illness as they would be from any seasonal influenza. We are optimistic, of course, that vaccine will be made available towards the end of July and, perhaps, in August. Until that time we will go through every possible effort to make sure that those who are in the vulnerable categories that I have described are looked after as best the system can look after them. I thank the house for its attention.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 3248.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:22): When I listened intently this year to the Treasurer's address of the eighth budget of the Rann Labor government, I could not help but reflect on two things: first, the overall gross neglect of women and children in this year's budget; and, secondly, how we had advanced, I think, quite significantly since the 19th century in this state in terms of our legislative reform for the protection and provision of women and children and those who are sick, particularly with mental illnesses. I could only think that the only other similarity between the Treasurer's speech and the orations of former members of this assembly in the 19th century as being his now ample girth, probably matching some of those at that time.

With that said, the very serious matter of either the deliberate act or the negligent omission of provision for South Australia's women and children is stunningly glaring. I can recall reading many legal text from the 19th century which applied in this state and which often had the phrase of identifying the legal incapacity of married women, infants and lunatics, often in the same phrase, in the same legislation. It was not just an era of legal incapacity for people in these categories. Although we have modernised descriptions, it is fair to reflect that, back at that time, women were clearly in the category of property rights—particularly if they married they had limited powers of inheritance.

Our children were discriminated against—depending on whether they had been married in or out of wedlock—in relation to the capacity to inherit. There were all sorts of aspects in relation to deprivation of any kind of proper treatment of children, not least of which was the provision of welfare, which even Queen Victoria addressed with the Poor Law in England and which we developed here in South Australia. Perhaps the most cruel at the time was the fact that in the original white settlement of South Australia, there was no hospital provision for people with a mental illness and they were held in our prisons.

Legislatively we have advanced in the development of protection for women's property and guardianship rights, and to no longer be excluded from the workforce upon marriage. We have developed children's protection, with mechanisms in both the legal process and prosecution of those who might offend, and we have ensured the provision of secure, safe and appropriate care in hospital environments for our mentally unwell. All this was shattered when I listened to the second reading explanation from the Treasurer, outlining the basis on which we should accept his over \$14 billion expenditure for the 2009-10 year and seeking the parliament's endorsement.

In relation to the matters I wish to raise, I would like to identify a number of factors which need to be kept in perspective. First, the government announced that it is persisting with its rail yard site hospital. This exercise will cost close to \$2 billion—as best we can tell because we no longer have any figures in the budget—for the clean-up of the site at the City West end of Adelaide, next to the Torrens Lake area, and, after the clean-up, a major hospital rebuild.

Notwithstanding the financial crisis which has been referred to many times in this house, the government is absolutely, without any reservation, continuing to proceed with it. Clearly, it will suck the financial life out of many other health projects, including not only the capital works slippage we have seen already in the health budget but also many other infrastructure and service provisions to which I will allude.

It is committed to that, along with a \$43 million film and screen hub development at the Glenside Hospital site—which is the pet project of the Premier. It seems to matter not a tink what is happening elsewhere in the world or in this state or the huge demand for services. The Treasurer and Premier are resolute on that.

This year we will see a massive expansion of money to be held in the slush fund for the Treasurer. He is keeping \$467 million this year, just in case he gets the budget wrong and needs to prop up something or provide for some other project which he does not want to specify and disclose to the parliament.

A massive sell-off of assets will continue, including drug and alcohol sites. These are service sites in areas of valuable real estate, such as Norwood and Joslin. Some 42 per cent of the Glenside Hospital site is proposed to be sold off. I want to identify that the projects to which I will refer today—in what I see as a gross neglect of children and women in this state—are projects that are being protected by the Treasurer and the Premier in this budget.

I also wish to point out that the parliament endorsed last year's budget, and the government approved via a cabinet decision to allow SA Water to proceed with a \$46 million refit or redecoration of new headquarters in Victoria Square. In the context of all this expenditure, even post the known financial limitations that we have at the national level, this government is persisting not only with those projects but also the rail yard hospital, which will suck the life out of other services and projects, as I have said.

Let me start with the Women's and Children's Hospital. This hospital, through the Queen Victoria and Adelaide children's hospitals independently, has served this state for over 100 years. It has provided exceptional statewide services for women and children. Quite frankly, if it were not for the volunteers, the charitable foundations, such as the McGuinness McDermott Foundation and the Women's and Children's Hospital Foundation, and auxiliaries—which provide millions of dollars and hundreds of thousand dollars respectively towards projects—we would see a crumbling of the Women's and Children's Hospital. It has really just kept it together, and I record my appreciation for that having occurred.

To date, the Rann government in the past seven years and, disappointingly, with no extra provision in this years budget, has provided an MRI scanner and an emergency department upgrade; these are both projects which were initiated and for which funding was provided by the former Liberal government. Through the announcement in the budget it has proceeded with a \$7 million upgrade of psychiatric services at the Women's and Children's Hospital, in particular, the Boylan Ward for psychiatric services for children and the Helen Mayo Services for women and

children, only for us to find that it was announced in one budget and then slashed in a subsequent budget, never to occur.

The only significant government funded capital project has been a federal government funded cancer initiative, which is at least under way at present. This is notwithstanding that between 2002 and 2008 the number of births per year at the Women's and Children's Hospital has increased by nearly 25 per cent. We have gone from over 3,000 babies a year to over 5,000 babies a year in the same space. During the same period the number of emergency department presentations has increased from 48,424 to 59,220.

Despite this major increase in patients, the hospital continues to be neglected and, disappointingly, in this budget there is no light on the horizon. This is particularly cruel when we see that the number of available beds has actually reduced over the same time period, so there is more service demand, fewer beds, almost zero contribution from the government for the capital infrastructure and absolutely no light in sight.

This is why the opposition has announced that it will proceed with public consultation on the future of the Women's and Children's Hospital, to rebuild and to renew the infrastructure that is desperately needed to be undertaken for the women and children of the state. That includes even smaller but very important projects, such as \$2 million for equipment to go out and do breast screening on country women; it was not even done last year. It has been announced again this year but, again, there is an abandonment of responsibility for the health care of women.

I think we do owe a responsibility to women during the periods of their pregnancy, confinement and subsequently. They are, after all, bearing and providing for the care, support, nourishment and nurturing of the next generation, and the government should hang its head in shame for not making some provision in this regard and then being quite dismissive when it comes to its failure to honour even prior commitments.

The women's prison is another classic example; it has disappeared off the project books. This is of concern to many people working in the field of rehabilitation. Frances Nelson QC, the Chair of the Parole Board of South Australia, is just one who has publicly confirmed the urgent need for a new women's prison, yet it is axed, with no provision, no promises and not even any priority with this government.

There is the children's prison. If ever there was a sick and sorry site to visit, I have visited it, as I am sure others have. This is a property which has now been in existence for some 40-odd years. I remember hearing the maiden speech of Joyce Steele, a previous member for Burnside who is pictured up there in Versace blue. Her maiden speech was about what we now know as the Magill Training Centre, that is, the children's prison, and she urged back in 1959 that it be rebuilt. She was successful in securing that. It was rebuilt in the 1960s; and here we are in 2009 with myriad people speaking about it, including even Monsignor Cappelletti.

This is the priest whom the government has seen fit to bring in as its expert adviser in relation to future budgets and yet, when he recently comes out and makes a public statement saying that this is a mistake and we do need to proceed with the rebuilding of the children's prison, where is the government? We had the Minister for Families and Communities come out and say, 'Oh, it would cost us \$100 million,' when in our own Treasurer's budget, when this was announced back in 2007, it was a \$79 million budget.

Let me say, too, that there is also the \$16.5 million which the government still needs to account for, because this government announced in 2005 that it would actually build the relocated Magill Training Centre, children's prison, from Magill out to Cavan, and they actually allocated \$16.5 million to do it. When it came to the announcement then that they were going to do other prisons in 2007 they just kept that \$16.5 million and said that they were going to go off and do a PP project. Now it is cancelled altogether, and what has happened to the children's prison? Completely evaporated.

We have up to 100 children out at the children's prison. They are aged between 10 and 14. It has been described variously by people, including Pam Simmons, who has been appointed as an advocate for children in this state, as being cruel and inhumane, and it is obviously totally inappropriate for the circumstances of these children. Any member who goes out there will appreciate the significance of the lives that some of these children have had. And sure, they are incarcerated because usually there has been a significant history of offending, and they are very serious offences in some cases, but these are children, and they deserve to at least have some reasonable accommodation, some chance of rehabilitation.

Members do not have to take my word for it. Monsignor Cappelletti, the expert there, has been appointed as a commissioner to the government. He has been appointed in this new budget's responsibility most recently, and yet the first recommendation that I heard publicly from Monsignor Cappelletti has been completely ignored.

I turn now to James Nash House. James Nash House is a facility that was built in the 1980s, under the then minister, Cornwall. There was significant land secured to deal with our forensic mental health patients. These are people who have usually committed what would otherwise be an offence under our criminal law but deemed medically unfit to either plead or stand trial and therefore be convicted. They are dealt with under our legislative umbrella in a manner which is to keep them secure, with the opportunity to have treatment, and to be able to provide for that setting.

To do that we do not keep them in prison. No. We have them in a totally separate facility. It is secure, no question about that, and there is an opportunity for treatment. It has a waiting list of over 20 people. Some of those people are waiting at Glenside, in a secure ward there. Some of them are actually in prison waiting for a chance to go in to have some medical treatment.

Over a hundred years ago, when this colony started, we had people with this sickness in prisons—and we have got them back there. It is a disgrace. Again, you do not have to take my word for it. Dr John Brayley, who is the Public Advocate, appointed in fact by this government, a former mental health director in the Department of Health, has been out and publicly expressed his concern about the lack of facilities, as inadequate as they are at the moment, out at James Nash House and that we need to have extra facilities and services.

So, I say to the parliament that it is important to appreciate the significance of what happens when we completely avoid the responsibility for women and children in this state. If it was a circumstance where there was no money left, if we suddenly did not have the 14 and a half billion—but in fact our budget is bigger than it was last year.

Plenty of submissions have been put to this parliament from other speakers about the fact that there has been a huge amount of money come in at the federal level, that has propped it up, but, notwithstanding that the government says that it is going to spend money, it is going to have a 750 razor gang attack after the state election. I have heard all that. But they are spending more, they have got more, and yet they are axing projects without any recovery. I am not talking even about the adult prison now. Even if they cancelled that they could still proceed to develop the facility out at Cavan for the children's prison. That does not have to be attached. It can be separate. There is plenty of money in the slush funds to do that.

They could proceed with James Nash House—for which the government had already budgeted \$16.5 million in 2005 to do, but which has slipped off the balance sheet. And they could certainly make some provision to start the rebuild of the Women's and Children's Hospital. That is a statewide service for the provision of birthing facilities and the major medical treatment of our children across the state.

The significance here is particularly because the obstetrics ward and some paediatric services at both the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Modbury Hospital have been spiralled down or axed altogether during the lifetime of this government, and there has been an expectation that people bring their children for services at, or pregnant women attend, the Women's and Children's Hospital or at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. That is to be the catchment area. It is all part of the Health Care Plan. We have read all that.

The truth is these services have to be provided somewhere. We have more demand on the Women's and Children's Hospital, more people presenting for services, fewer beds already, yet no provision in this budget. It is a woeful and shameful abandonment of women and children in the state.

The government has a slush fund here, much more than it has ever had before, and I ask the government to reconsider this. Eminent people have come forward and said that this is not acceptable and we need to change this. So far, we just hear dismissive remarks from the Treasurer about the contribution, for example, in relation to children. I was appalled the other day to hear the Treasurer make the following public statements:

Now it is a custodial institution, I can say this to you, I have higher priorities in government than the Magill Centre, yes Magill needs to be addressed but it's not number one priority.

He also said the standard of the centre is appropriate for the young people in remand. He further said:

Do you think they're in there because they jaywalked? They're in there because they've been a menace to society, unfortunately, tragically, that happens with young kids.

Yes, but what is he going to do about it? He has an opportunity to deal with these most damaged children, yet he is dismissive publicly in that regard. It is a disgrace.

Time expired.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (16:42): I am pleased to make a contribution to the Appropriation Bill. It is clearly a very important piece of legislation that looks to allocate and distribute funds to the various areas of government to ensure that the state runs in a reasonably good fashion over the budget period.

I intend to highlight some quite serious and significant deficiencies in this budget. The first point I would like to make is that the budget shows that Labor cannot manage its expenses. There have been numerous examples in the past eight budgets of the Labor government that have been brought down by the Treasurer of where the government has real issues with managing its expenses. The other point is that the government is certainly willing to break major promises and willingly raid the pockets of those who can least afford it.

On the state's most pressing need of water, the government has also failed by making no substantial commitment to stormwater capture and re-use. At the next election this will be one of the key differences between Liberal and Labor, and I intend to talk more about water related issues later in my contribution, if time permits.

Even Standard and Poor's, the international ratings agency, noted Labor's past failures on key infrastructure when it said the following in its budget report, 'South Australia has a history of capital expenditure under-spending.' We ask why it is that, despite record revenues up a billion dollars this year to \$14.4 billion, Labor has not delivered. The answer is simple: every year Labor allows its day-to-day expenses to balloon out of control. Despite international economic pressures this year, the Public Service grew by 1,485 positions above budgeted levels—and I will talk a bit more about public sector blow-outs later.

In a stunning move to avoid scrutiny a promised \$750 million in expenditure cuts has been offloaded to an external razor gang, whose recommendations will not be known until after the election. The budget makes no hard decisions for government; it passes on the hardship to families, small businesses, pensioners and carers.

Many fees and charges are being increased by between 4 per cent and a staggering 36 per cent, all above the inflation rate of around 3 per cent. Small businesses hoping to employ more people have had those hopes dashed by record levels of land tax, payroll tax and WorkCover levies. On every level, this budget fails South Australians.

I will highlight a point. The Liberals have spoken about these issues in every budget reply speech over the last two days. Yesterday in question time we asked questions about the budget, but we received no specific answers, which is the norm for the government. However, apart from us and apart from an article in *The Advertiser* today by Greg Kelton reporting the leader's response to the budget, I am not seeing much pressure being put on the Treasurer by the media. We are highlighting these issues but, unfortunately, the media is not picking up on the issues and reporting them through those different mediums: television, radio and newspapers. We are highlighting these issues; however, for whatever reason, the media is not reporting that as such.

I would like to talk about the fiscal position and outlook, in particular, deficits. In the 2009-10 budget, there are budget deficits on all three accounting measures. The first is a net lending deficit of \$1.541 billion this year, a cash deficit of \$1.540 billion this year, and a net operating deficit of \$304 million in this budget year.

The state's 2008-09 and 2009-10 revenue has strengthened by \$130 million and \$722 million, respectively, since the 2008-09 budget, mainly due to bailouts from the federal Labor government. The Rann Labor government has been telling the public that there are huge budget black holes; however, revenue has increased by massive amounts.

Moreover, the Treasurer counts one-off infrastructure grants from the Rudd Labor government as revenue. These grants are spent outside the government's operating account; therefore, the government's true deficit is even larger than that in the budget. Infrastructure

spending is classified as capital works and is reflected only in the 2009-10 net lending deficit of \$1.541 billion, a measure rarely published in the media.

Therefore, the significant grants, as part of the Rudd government's one-off stimulus package, mask the true position of the state government's budget, making it look better than it really is. We heard the leader yesterday, in his quite extensive and comprehensive response to the budget, highlight those issues in a very significant manner.

I will now talk about spending blow-outs. This is where the government has had problems pretty well over its almost eight years in government. Spending blow-outs, not falls in revenue, are the reason that the government's budget has slumped into deficit. Government spending blew out by \$556 million in 2008-09 and \$1.382 billion in 2009-10 above that budgeted in the 2008-09 budget. The Auditor-General's Report 2007-08, part C, page 25 states:

The projected current operating surplus for the four years of the 2008-09 Budget is therefore subject to highly constrained expenditure. This was the case in the past two budgets which forecast, but did not achieve, real terms decreases in expenses for those budget years.

For seven budgets, the Rann government has been running small surpluses as a percentage of revenue. Despite record revenue growth, spending blow-outs have caused the budget to plunge into deficit.

As the member for MacKillop highlighted yesterday, growth rates predicted over the next two years to return the budget to surplus are predicated on second year growth rates of 4.5 per cent. As quite accurately highlighted by the member for MacKillop, those growth rates have never existed in this state for the past 10 years; we have not had that level of growth for the past 10 years. So, the Treasurer's prediction to return to surplus after two years is based on a wing and a prayer.

I would like to talk about Public Service blow-outs. We have heard for many years about the level of the Public Service blow-outs and, today, there are approximately 16,000 more public servants on the payroll than were budgeted for. We hear that there has been an error in calculations and all sorts of excuses and all sorts of reasons why this has occurred. It is portrayed as some sort of accidental consequence of government's handling of issues, but I do not think it is an accident. I think it has been a conscious decision, a conscious strategy of this government, through its departments, to hire those 16,000 additional people.

I would not think you could get it so wrong that you hire an additional 16,000 people over the number you had initially planned. It has been a conscious decision by this government to hire those people, for whatever reason—probably to placate the PSA and other bodies such as that. I do not think it is by accident, certainly; I think it has been a conscious decision that that has taken place.

We will talk about revenue. We have talked about cost blow-out and deficits and the like, but we will talk about revenue. We on this side of the house maintain that the government has not really had an issue with revenue. We have had seven years of incredible revenue thanks to a federal Liberal government policy in terms of the GST. We have had rivers of gold flowing into the Treasury coffers, and I give credit to the media that have actually highlighted in some of their articles that they do recognise that there have been rivers of gold flowing into the government coffers as a consequence of the GST. I will give the media credit in relation to reporting that issue accurately.

However, the Premier and Treasurer continue to inaccurately underestimate revenue collections every year. From 2002-03 to 2008-09, the government will have collected a massive \$3.8 billion more than it expected. These revenue windfalls—actual receipts above budgeted receipts—are masking unbudgeted increases in expenses which have been highlighted by the Auditor-General. The 2007-08 Auditor-General's Report, part C, page 6 states, 'the state has received very large amounts of unbudgeted revenues'.

So, the government has not had a revenue problem: it has had an expenses problem. Anyone who knows about managing a business—and government is no different from managing a business—knows that you have to maintain your sales figures, your income, your revenue, whatever you produce, whatever you sell. In this state, in this example, the government obviously receives revenues from a number of sources. In any business, you look at your revenues, but you have to control your expenses. If your expenses are blowing out, then your profit is obviously significantly affected, running into a loss. That is what we have seen: a clear example of the

government not managing expenses so that we have run into a loss, a deficit position, for this year and next.

It is predicated on, I guess you could say, increased sales figures in that third year and the next of 4½ per cent but the state has never in the last 10 years achieved those revenues or, if you like, sales figures. It is based on a wing and a prayer to restore the budget to surplus in a two year period. We believe that it will take a lot longer than that.

I turn my remarks to state taxation. It is an unfortunate situation, to say the least, that we are recognised around the nation as being the highest taxing state in Australia. It is now official. Under the Rann Labor government, South Australia is the highest taxed state in the country. Total state taxation revenue in 2009-10 will now be \$48 million higher than in 2008-09. Tax revenue has steadily increased by 61 per cent since this government came to office.

I have said before in this place that it is a hallmark of all Labor governments, whether they be federal or state, that they are high taxing, high spending governments. We saw that commence back in the Whitlam years and it carried through the Hawke and Keating years: high taxing, high spending governments. Then, when the federal Liberal government came in, it changed the dynamic completely in relation to the way it managed the government finances and the economy, and we saw some real stability brought to Australia's economic situation providing tremendous opportunity for all Australians in the way they live their lives.

We see some glaring examples of taxation increases, particularly those on property, such as land tax. We have seen an increase since the 2001-02 budget cycle from \$731 million to \$1.428 billion and the percentage change in that eight year period is 95 per cent. I have constituents who talk to me a lot about land tax. They tell me that they have to sell their properties and their business interests here in South Australia and move interstate, to Queensland or New South Wales, where land tax is significantly less, to continue their business operations in those states. So, the Treasurer and the Premier's restrictive taxation regime, which is strangling the life out of business here in this state, is seeing them pack up and move interstate. What sort of reputation does that give South Australia? A very poor reputation.

I also have constituents in the earthmoving business. They talk to me on a regular basis, and I communicate this through my party structure, and the leader himself highlighted this yesterday. They are basically being shut out of the major infrastructure projects, earthmoving projects, here in South Australia; for example, the Northern Expressway and the desalination plant. I can tell you that they are extremely cross. They are extremely upset with this government and plan to do something about it leading up to the next election. What we see is that the taxation system of this government is squeezing the life out of business, to the extent where, to survive, it has to move interstate.

The next issue I want to talk about is that of water—and I can see that my time is running down—in particular the government's decision to abandon its plans for the expansion of Mount Bold. It was poor public policy in the first place, in terms of its initial decision to expand that reservoir, and I highlighted that in the house at the time that the decision was first announced, two or three years ago. The state Liberals recognise that a number of resources must be used.

Time expired.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (17:02): Again, I am tail-end Charlie, bringing to an end the addresses on the budget. This is the Rann government's last budget and it is quite appropriate that we assess it here today. This budget, to me, as a long-term country member, is very disappointing indeed. My electorate, and country South Australia generally, did not feature in this budget. It was totally overlooked and totally ignored, and yet we have a minister who represents a country electorate.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Chaffey was not ignored. The minister said that in her interjection. I hope that is on *Hansard*. Chaffey was not ignored; you are right, you got some money for your school. I did not get anything for any of my schools. I did not get anything for the hospital.

The Hon. K.A. Maywald interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Yes; it was happening. The minister responded that we did not get anything when we were in government. I would remind her that when we were in government we got a lot of projects up, particularly the Gomersal Road, which is extremely busy. We got filtered water under

the previous Liberal government. We got a new water scheme, the BIL scheme, and we were the first to have such a scheme.

We had a new primary school in Tanunda. The Nuriootpa High School was upgraded. I can go on and on. Go and have a look at the Barossa Convention Centre, which had government money. I could go on and on, and that was eight years of a Liberal government. What has happened since? What has Schubert scored since? The question needs to be asked, because it is not right and it is not fair that a section of the community can be completely ignored by our government—totally ignored.

This group pays more than its share of taxation. The Barossa (my region) and the Hills pay more than their share of income tax and yet we had to argue like mad to get the Mannum ferry operating again. It took nearly nine months to get it operating, and we are having a similar problem getting a new train to operate in the Barossa Valley, at least as a trial. We heard the minister say that country SA did well. She might think that but I do not think that her constituents would agree and I do not think that any of us have done very well out of this government. This government has shown that it is very much a city-centric one. Its priorities are obviously in the city.

As I said, the people of the Barossa pay more than their proportion of tax. The big concern that I have is that there is nothing for the roads, even though there was \$20 million for the Safe Road policy—nothing. Again, this morning there was another fatality. We are heading for a record. Yesterday an 80 kilometre speed limit has been imposed over the entire Barossa Valley floor. I think that is a disgrace. Rather than fix up the roads, a blanket 80 km/h speed limit is whacked on across the entire Barossa Valley. I know that the council may have had something to do with it, and I am opposed to that.

I certainly understand that the 80 kilometre zone, in places, could save some lives, but to put it over the whole valley, I think, is blatantly ridiculous and a vast overreaction, and I condemn those responsible for it. I am opposed to it. I have never had so much response on any issue in my 19 years here than over the last day and a half. I have been getting all sorts of messages in my office from very cross and upset people about this 80 kilometre speed limit.

The previous Howard federal government's Roads to Recovery program was working extremely well. Some of the funding that we got for the Gomersal Road and other projects came from that funding source. It has gone now. In this budget we have \$23 million promised over four years for rural road safety programs. Over four years that is chicken feed. It would not even paint the guard rails, let alone fix up roads.

I want to say on the record that a lot of these deaths are road related—not entirely, but they are road condition related. Young people, driving high speed motor cars, get off the side of the road in the rough. They overreact and, boom! We have far too many trees and obstacles too close to the road for them to hit. It is pretty sad; and, again, I express my condolences to the many families who are now grieving the loss of a loved one. That should not happen. We have got to upgrade these roads to make them safer. In the Barossa so many of these roads are narrow, but to put an 80 km/h speed limit on the lot, I think, is appalling. It is a huge overreaction, as I said.

Since coming to power in 2002, the Labor government in South Australia is now more than \$6.6 billion in debt. The state Rann Labor government has allowed expenses to blow out to more than \$1 billion. We also heard during question time today that the total unfunded liability of all this is getting toward \$20 billion. This is what the government is responsible for: the unfunded liability with WorkCover and everything else—\$20 billion. The Premier and the Treasurer said, 'We'll attend to this over the next 30 years.' What if I ran my farm like that? In other words, they are telling us that this debt is going to be paid for by our children, not us. We have done it. This government has allowed this total out of control debt to happen, but it is going to hand it to our kids to pay for it. I think it is absolutely appalling.

Despite the global financial crisis, revenue has increased by \$1 billion this year to \$14.4 billion. The federal government has bailed out the Rann Labor government with a \$3 billion hand-out. Money for schools was a part of it; and, in the panic to get it spent, you would not guess it but it has even put federal funding towards schools that are to be demolished. Hello! What is it telling you? What is the message here? What is the communication like between the two governments? They do not even know.

I now move to another very important subject, that is, that duplication of service between federal and state is causing waste and duplication. I think it is high time we had a very good look at the future in relation to the funding of schools and hospitals, etc., when you have both state and

federal funding. I notice that the Minister for Health is sitting here. I believe that federalism is coming under great threat. I am on the record some years ago saying that we really do have to smarten up government, cut down waste and give the taxpayer more value for their money.

Really, we must cut down the size of parliament. I have said on the record that consideration should be given to phasing out the upper house over a period of years. I have not said anything about that for some years now because I think, 'Well, why be unpopular for the sake of it?' However, I will expand that comment to say that, in time, all state parliaments should consider whether we have a future, full stop. In your term, Mr Speaker, as one of the younger members of parliament, I think you will see a move to expedite the process of government in Australia. I believe that you will see the states rapidly becoming superfluous to the process.

This sort of thing is causing duplication and waste. I know it is controversial, but look to the future. I think that is where we are going. I believe that I will not see it but you, sir, might see that we will move to two levels of government, that is, federal government and, hopefully, a much revitalised and refreshed local government. I do not think it is capable of doing it yet but I am sure that, if we threw out the challenge, they could do it. I think we should throw out the challenge and some people should start talking about it. I am happy to be controversial about that because I do believe that now, with a modern Australia and modern communications, we do not have to represent the regions like we do.

It happened in this state when we went to one vote one value. This is now a city-centric state. The regional people miss out anyhow, so I do not believe we would be any worse off under a federacy of main government and local government to look after the communities. The 2008-09 state tax revenue will increase by \$48 million, GST grants are up by \$2 million and overall commonwealth grants are up by \$858 million—a lot of money. Extra and unexpected federal payments ease the need for the state government to use its own revenue for state programs and services relating to health, education, infrastructure, environment, housing and so on.

Ongoing references to the budget black holes and huge revenue losses is misleading to all South Australians. Also, \$750 million expenditure cuts have been announced, and an external razor gang will make recommendations as to where the cuts will come from. However, these will not be made public until after the election. Great idea; wonderful idea! How cynical is that? 'We will make the promises now and we will tell you how we will pay for it after the election.' Will the South Australian public fall for that? Of course they will not. But with the media like it is, they probably will. With a huge spin team pushing it, they probably will again.

It is up to us to reveal that we will not put up with that and we will highlight that. According to the budget papers for 2001-02 and 2008-09 public sector employment numbers will increase by 16,393. Up to 11,979 additional public servants have been employed in general administration under Rann Labor; 4,400 of these are nurses, teachers, doctors and police officers. I do not have any problem with that, or them, but what about the others? Are they all administration or office staff? The government is now trying to reverse its indulgences during the boom years and announced that 1,600 public sector jobs are to be axed, chopped, got rid of.

Government spending has blown out by \$556 million in 2008-09 and by \$1,382 million in 2009-10 above what was budgeted for in the 2008-09 budget. This government is a government of waste. The new ad campaign on the television and radio with the Premier selling the budget to South Australians is ludicrous. This is taxpayers' money being used to promote a government that is doing nothing. Remember what Premier Rann said as leader of the opposition on 3 June 2001 on Channel 9. He said, 'When you see a politician in an ad, then you know basically it's about politics.' What are we seeing now? In January this year it was revealed that the Rann government deferred \$9 million in cuts to government advertising, which the Premier announced in the 2006-07 budget.

In early March the Treasurer was questioned about the matter on the ABC Radio. Along with saying that he was not familiar with the issue, he said, 'I'm going to drive the Public Service very hard in terms of savings. I am not going to be popular.' Why is it that the Rann Labor government expects all its departments and agencies to deliver large savings and cut public sector staff, when it does not do the same with its own staff? The phrase, 'Do as I say, not as I do', is very pertinent in this case.

Under the Rann Labor government, South Australia has become the highest taxed state in the nation. I know that because I pay more than my share; some would argue that is fair enough. This budget sees hundreds of government charges and fees increase by between 4 per cent and

36 per cent—well above the inflation rate of CPI of 3 per cent. Total state taxation revenue in 2009-10 will now be \$48 million higher than in 2008-09. The tax revenue has increased by 61 per cent since this government came to office.

The state Rann Labor government has imposed the largest tax burden on business of all states. Land tax has increased a staggering 292 per cent under the Rann Labor government. The number of land tax payers has almost trebled in his time, increasing from 69,000 to 188,000. The harsh land tax regime impacts on the owners of commercial or private property and the costs are passed on to commercial and residential renters. We have crises in all these areas. On 5 June, following the release of the budget, in an interview on radio the Treasurer said:

We have issues with tax. Land tax is a problem. There is a burden felt by a number of people in the community, for which I would like to provide tax relief. Not possible in this budget setting.

This is a cop-out to all South Australians. Despite record revenue, the Treasurer maintains that it is not possible to provide any reform of the land tax regime.

Besides Victoria, South Australia is the least cost competitive for stamp duty, as well. I know because I pay these duties. I pay it on my house in Adelaide because it is not my principal place of residence. Along with other country members, I know the impact of these duties. It would be cheaper for many members to stay over the road in a hotel than in their own house because of these huge imposts.

These two taxes alone make South Australian companies uncompetitive. We all see interstate companies beating South Australian companies for contracts. I have seen it. We see it in roadworks and buildings and all sorts of projects. Interstate companies can be here—as our leader said in his speech yesterday—without paying all the high taxes and overheads our competing companies have to pay. It is deplorable.

I want to talk about the government spin team—a favourite subject of mine—which is the biggest growth area of this government.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Which one? The spin team? In June 2008 there were 4,073 public servants earning over \$100,000 per year compared with only 782 when the Liberals were in office in 2002—an increase of 3,291 staff or 421 per cent. That is too high on any account. Even when we were in government it was too high. I am not running away from that fact. It was too high then and it is even higher now. It is a disgrace. We must put the lid on it.

It was revealed in September last year that the Rann Labor government is spending nearly \$19 million a year on its media and public relations advisers, with 157 employees on top of the 18 media managers and staff working in the Premier's office. This is South Australia, this is just our state. That is not the whole country but, rather, just South Australia. I wonder whether the numbers have increased since then? I bet they have. I bet other members in this house would agree with me.

Will they have to suffer the same cuts as those with which the rest of the Public Service has been threatened in this budget? We all know that they won't. It is appalling. No wonder people are cynical about members of parliament. I disassociate myself from it in this government, as I did in the previous Liberal government.

I believe that government ministers are entitled to one media officer and the Premier is entitled to have probably four or five. That should be plenty. A good government should not need to market or spin everything that comes out of the office. It should not need to monitor everything that happens in the media, including those of us in opposition.

It is a gross waste of taxpayers' money—then the government says that it cannot afford to upgrade the Magill reform centre or build a new gaol at Mobilong. But it can afford this. How much is it again? It is \$19 million. Look at the level of salary. It puts us in the dark.

This is why, when one tries to get a story over in a one paper town, it is hopeless, because most of these media people have mates in the media or they hope to be working for the government one day. Of course, one wonders why they are soft. This is why nothing happens and it is like this. It is appalling. It is the saddest thing about having a one paper town. We need to have two papers in this town. When *The News* was operating, one could work one against the other in order to get a fair go.

I now refer to the cuts to PIRSA. Despite the rural sector earning \$5.2 billion in 2007-08, aided by a 313 per cent increase in crop production and strong grain prices, this budget fails to provide any measures to assist the agricultural sector.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What nonsense! What poppycock!

Mr VENNING: I acknowledge the interjection from the Treasurer. Did I miss something?

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Drought relief.

Mr VENNING: The budget slashes a further \$1.7 million in funding from PIRSA, cutting 101 jobs over the next three years—75 to go next year and the remaining 26 over the following two years. At a time when farmers have had about eight years of poor return, the state Rann Labor government slashes research and development funding. It is ridiculous. It was already skun out from the previous numbers. It is a soft area for Labor governments to attack—and you are doing it.

The provision of professional, independent, non-commercial advice is more important today than it ever was. It should not be left to private chemical companies to do all the research and, hence, provide advice—because it always comes with a commercial tag on it. Could you get independent advice from a chemical supplier? Of course you can't! We need the department there—and I am a strong supporter of the department—whether it be under a Labor or Liberal government. I am a supporter of them because we need them there. Over the years we have had some great scientists, paid for by the government—people such as Albert Rivera and Reg French. These guys have made modern farming very effective and efficient.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (17:22): I do not intend to speak for long but, depending on interjections, the level of annoyance and sarcastic remarks from both sides of the house, I reserve my position. The agrarian socialist over there, my old mate Ivanovich, the member for Schubert, always says the government has to provide the scientists and has pay for them. I find it amusing but consistent that, through half the speech I am attacked for allowing the Public Service to grow too large and having too many public servants, then the second half of the speech attacks the government over the fact that we have made savings and cutbacks and reduced expenditure and services. It really is quite a contrary argument put forward by members opposite.

One of the other reasons I will not speak for too long is that I would like all members opposite to make sure they see the TV news at 7 and 9 o'clock tonight on Channels 7 and 9 and the ABC. It is in the budget context. I do not know whether my colleagues want to hear this, but I noted that, when asked whether or not he could rule out a leadership challenge, the member for MacKillop said, 'Er—um—I don't think so.' Then there was the member for Heysen—funny that they were the only two people who want out in the media today. That was the first interview the member for MacKillop has done on prisons, I am told, since he has been the shadow minister for prisons. He went out halfway through question time and, when asked whether he would rule out a leadership challenge, he said, 'Er—I don't think so.'

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No; you are right. Thank you. The question was, 'Will you rule out a leadership challenge?' and he said, 'I think so.' That is right, is it not, Mitch? The question was, 'Will you rule out a leadership challenge?' and the response to the journalist was, 'I think so.' How good is that?

An honourable member: Will you rule one out?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Absolutely. Then the member for Heysen also went out and, when asked, 'Will you rule out a leadership challenge?' she said, 'The golden rule in politics is: you never say never.' I just hope that, when members of the Liberal Party are considering the context of my budget—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Absolutely, and I intend to be the longest serving Treasurer this state has ever seen, including Tom Playford. It is important.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Unley, the great strategist, whom we can thank for his contribution to the Liberal Party instability—

An honourable member: Found any more buildings to donate and sell yet?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is a hilarious line, isn't it? This is the real political genius you have in Unley. I did not realise that the Church of Scientology document had an Adelaide postcode on it. What kind of 'Duh' is that? The member for Unley prides himself on being some political heavyweight and political get-to man and bovver boy, but he is actually quite politically incompetent. I just wonder whether at any time he has reflected on the damage he has done both to his leader financially and also to his party. That was a tremendously clever moment by the member for Unley. Never mind; these things happen, and all I say is: watch the news tonight because, clearly, the members for MacKillop and Heysen are counting and preparing themselves as Dream Team Mark III. It is sensational.

To return to the budget, it has been constructed under the most difficult of financial and economic times. I am proud of this government's achievement, the discipline that has been shown by government and the courage taken by government ministers to make the hard decisions, many unpopular but all necessary.

I look in particular at the state of Queensland and its budget outcome today. By 2012-13 Queensland will have \$85 billion of debt, with an interest servicing cost of \$16 billion-plus every year going out the door to service its debt. It has lost its credit rating.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is not right; it is \$8 billion. I apologise, that is what was in the paper. It is \$8 billion, depending on the maturity of the loans involved, but it is a substantial amount of money. It actually did say \$16 billion, but it is a sizeable interest bill, whatever rates they are paying, servicing \$85 billion of debt with at least \$6 billion to \$8 billion a year of lost revenue.

If you want to compare what we do in South Australia and why we have been so serious about maintaining a low level of debt, that is the reason why we will continue to maintain a low debt burden for the state, which gives governments flexibility into the future in terms of expenditure and potential revenue cuts if and when we are in a position to provide them.

I thank again my parliamentary colleagues for their wholehearted support and, notwithstanding the criticisms of Liberal members, I thank them in anticipation of their wholehearted and unanimous support for the budget, as is their tradition and as is the tradition of this place. I note that the shadow treasurer is not with us in the chamber today. It is unfortunate; I would have—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He is on the phone, counting.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You ought to know; nothing is happening. How come Mitch is out there saying he doesn't think so? That is not very decisive. Or Isobel Redmond, why is she out there saying that you never say never. It's interesting times in the Liberal Party.

Mrs Geraghty: It's exciting.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It's exciting times. But I all I need to say is that it is ancient history. All I need to say is that I thank my colleagues. I look forward to the Liberal Party continuing its internal meltdown, which has been a permanent position for the Liberal Party for the past 20 years. It is quite an extraordinary—

Mr Venning: Kevin, where did the dodgy documents come from?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Pardon?

Mr Venning: Do you know anything about the dodgy documents, where they came from?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Nothing at all. What are you suggesting?

Mr Venning: Does the Attorney-General know?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Are you suggesting something? I would be very careful. Whenever you make interjections about dodgy documents, they come back to haunt you. I have no knowledge, nor do I care. I never in opposition made that type of clanger. We always were meticulous in checking our sources. Most often we knew the source because they gave them to us personally. I think we know who we are referring to there, member for Schubert. Anyway, I—

Mr Venning: The brown paper bag?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, it wasn't a brown paper bag. There was a black suitcase or a brown suitcase. That water contract I got leaked to me. You never say never: the member for Heysen. I said, 'Vickie, you need to watch tele tonight. You might be a little bit surprised with the member for Heysen. When asked whether she will challenge the leadership, she said, "The golden rule in politics is that you never say never".' The member for MacKillop, when the deputy leader also asked whether he would rule out a leadership challenge, said, 'I think so'—after a long pause. I look forward to the 6 o'clock news. I am sure all Liberals will be glued to the television tonight to see how each and every one of their colleagues is positioning themselves, who is lining up with whom; it is fantastic to watch. I love watching Liberal Party infighting. It has been—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is ancient history. But I have watched with great amazement (over 20 years) Liberal Party leadership stoushes in this place. You can sense it in the air. You know when there is something happening, and the past 48 hours in this place has had that embryonic sense of leadership challenges arising. Then when you saw the terrific performance of the member for MacKillop and the member for Heysen, both rushing out during question time. They never do it at any other time. I have never seen them leave question time to do a press conference.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Did you? Yes, you did do that, didn't you? Yes, you are right. I am losing weight. I am down two kilos. I am losing a full 10 kilos off the tummy.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Low carb, exercise. The deputy leader is correct; I have put on a few kilos.

Ms Fox: Is it the CSIRO diet?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It's not the CSIRO diet; no. It is a simple low carb, low fat, exercise diet.

Mr Pederick: Are you preparing yourself for a challenge?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, I want to keep myself healthy.

Mrs Redmond: Not the lycra! Please, not the lycra!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No; I won't go there. I think I have probably said enough.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exercise bike. I don't like riding on the road because it is a bit dangerous.

Mrs Geraghty: How many hours a day?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Forty-five minutes in the morning.

Mrs Geraghty: Is that better than walking on a treadmill?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is better than walking. I conclude my remarks.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (17:35): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (17:35): I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting the Minister for Urban Development and Planning and the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Federal/State Relations) (17:36): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:35): Each year when the budget is announced I try to be helpful to the government as to what projects might be usefully added or removed. With disappointment, yet again, I read the eighth budget of the government which tells us about the poor old Britannia roundabout. It was fleetingly added for a little while when the member for Adelaide (then minister for transport) went to the Britannia roundabout next to the hotel and we stood side by side and supported the announcement of the Britannia roundabout upgrade—what a great day that was—only to be snatched away in the subsequent budget when she had been toppled and the new minister for transport had taken over the portfolio. He, of course, axed the project.

This would be a beautiful time for the upgrade to occur when there has been a proposed demolition of a number of the structures at Victoria Park on the corner of that site. On average, 2½ accidents a week occur at that intersection, and I think it is still on the RAA's list as the second most dangerous metropolitan intersection. but clearly it has been overlooked again.

The second issue—and I have raised this matter a number of times in the parliament—is the carnage on the Waterfall Gully Road after the major floods several years ago. I use the word 'carnage' deliberately. It was cleaned up by local people, including the council, who still have not been paid by the government for that clean-up. We have had the death of a cyclist and numerous other accidents involving people walking or cycling or undertaking recreational activities in the Waterfall Gully area, particularly on that road. The road surface is a disgrace. It has killed someone already; not someone who lives in my electorate, but a gentleman from Unley. It really does need to be addressed but, yet again, that has been overlooked.

We have a water problem in this state, probably the single biggest issue in the state. And what do we have from the government? Apart from a proposed stormwater project at Cheltenham, which is subject, of course, to what happens in the Supreme Court, here we are: we have offered projects to the government, and the Brownhill Creek/Keswick Creek proposal is just one of a number.

The Liberal Party has presented a number of different catchment options that are available. We have published papers on this, and we have put this matter out there for the government to be able to pick up. It picked up the desal plant. When it comes to one of the biggest issues in this state, the government has an opportunity to do something—and we have packaged up these projects for it. About \$105 million would do the Brownhill Creek/Keswick Creek proposal.

On a current estimate, enough water runs off the Bragg electorate—the good people of which electorate I represent—to water the whole of Adelaide, yet this option has again been completely ignored. We can serve this up as a project that would detain some water in dams further upstream, aggregating that through a pool system at the bottom end of the Glenside Hospital site, and pumping it underground into the aquifers along detention dams and aquifers in the South Parklands.

Even the member for West Torrens was excited to hear about this project at one stage, because it will help in relation to the flooding problem that his constituents, along with those of the member Unley, suffer as a result of not harvesting the water that runs through those electorates. The projects that I have mentioned so far—Britannia, Waterfall Gully upgrade and the Brownhill Creek/Keswick Creek provisions—would all be well within the Treasurer's slush fund—the \$467 million that he has kept in his back pocket ready to use in an emergency—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Where?

Ms CHAPMAN: It's in your budget, darling. The Treasurer can use that money just to do these projects, but he does not have to pick these. We are not particularly precious out in Bragg, and we are used to looking after ourselves. We have got nothing in the last eight years, and what we have got we have had taken away from us in the subsequent budget. So we are used to that. In fact, there are people who live around me in Norwood, Hartley, Morialta, Unley and in the leader's electorate who have a high level of need but who are constantly ignored.

I will conclude by talking about the Glenside Hospital. This is a statewide service providing acute mental health services, including forensic and detention areas for the whole of South

Australia. It is an area which is subject to a redevelopment proposal by the government in which they say they will rebuild the hospital. That was great and we welcomed that initiative.

We then had the Treasurer announce, in December last year: 'Not enough money—world financial crisis. We are going to have to put it off for two years.' Well, that's fine, but what about the \$43 million project that the government is still proceeding with for a film hub in the middle of that site? They have plenty of money for that. They could be building that hospital right now but, oh no, they have decided to proceed with the film hub with money from the Premier, who also has a slush fund—he has his own Premier's fund—for discretionary projects. He has already used \$2.5 million of his fund to buy the 2.77 hectares in the middle of the Glenside Hospital site, put it into his department and redevelop it for his pet project.

So, I do not want to hear any nonsense from the government about not having adequate funds available. They are selling off that land, they are selling off the Norwood Osmond Terrace Drug and Alcohol Centre, and they have sold up dozens of Housing Trust houses and dwellings in my area. They are quite happy to come in, conduct a fire sale, rape and pillage the assets in my area, and deliver nothing back to the people of Bragg.

Can I say, finally, that we asked for just a pittance, when we asked for the \$2 million, which I presented to the government as an option, to come in and acquire the Chelsea Cinema. I am not doing it because the Burnside council is betwixt and between as to whether it is going to sell it or not. It is a state heritage listed asset. It is a listed asset under state legislation. Surely we have some obligation as a parliament to ensure that our state government makes provision to ensure this is secure and is maintained. So, it can buy it off the council, if it wishes to. If it does not want to do that it can assist in its support, because it is a state heritage listed asset, and that diminishes, as we know, the commercial value of a property, regrettably, but that is the reality, because of the limited capacity to utilise that facility or redevelop it for alternative use.

We understand that, but we cannot have it both ways. We cannot impose from this legislature rules about the protection of our heritage—and I disclose my interest as a member of the National Trust of South Australia, the headquarters of which are soon to be up in Beaumont House in my electorate, and I look forward to welcoming them—and then, on the other hand, say, 'We're just going to ignore this and leave this asset to rot or to be sold off,' by a council on which there are some members who are arguing that it is necessary to do so.

The people of my area have spoken. The people in the areas of Norwood, Hartley and Morialta, the city of Adelaide, and people who live further south, also use this facility for all the community activities that they undertake in the area. The Chelsea Cinema is well loved. The public and my constituents, both as voters and ratepayers, have spoken. I have delivered thousands of petitions to the Burnside council in relation to this project, in particular urging it either not to sell or, at the very least, to retain it for both community access and use, and as a cinema.

Other people in the parliament have been active in trying to engender some support, and that is fine. We have welcomed that. The problem is that the Treasurer has not listened. He has a Premier who sits next to him and says, 'I want to put \$43 million into a film hub,' and the only contribution we get from the front bench is the minister for environment who says, 'Look, I'll kick in \$25,000.' It is a joke. It is totally inadequate, given that this is a state heritage asset. The government will hear, well and truly, from the people of Bragg at the next state election, come 20 March 2010.

I hope that the Treasurer knows what day the election is. I did note the other day that in the paper he was quoted as giving the date of 10 March 2010, and it is the 20th. I hope he remembers that just in case he sort of misses it or something, and thinks that he can go away on a holiday after the 10th—after, of course, he has lost government.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:45): I am hoping, in the 10 minutes that I have here, to touch on some issues in my electorate where, I could say, we have seen no action. I should start with the Unley Road upgrade, and I will quickly run through the history of that project. A feasibility study was started in about 2000 for upgrading Unley Road and a substantial amount of money was spent on consultation, with engineers, coming up with several concepts.

It was a pretty difficult task, I must say, because we needed to achieve a situation where we had ease of traffic flow in peak hours, and we also had to ensure that we preserved the character of the strip shopping on Unley Road because it is one of only half a dozen or so streets in the metropolitan area that has a substantial amount of strip shopping. It is something that you see, obviously, in the Eastern States a lot more often than here because, obviously, the cities are

bigger. One of the reasons that Unley is a desirable place to live is the strip shopping, so that was a major consideration.

If I cut to the chase, the end of the consultation period and the engineering period saw a plan that was approved. One of three plans was put forward. A plan was approved by the community, and I believe that preparations were being made to take it to cabinet for funding at the time. It was actually the cheapest of the three options. It meant that we could have two in-bound lanes and one out-bound lane in the morning, and the reverse in the afternoon. At off-peak times, we were to have dedicated right-turn lanes, which is an important thing for Unley Road because traffic is held up enormously at off-peak times, particularly when cars are turning into suburban streets.

That happens a lot, of course, because people like to cut through our suburban streets to try to get off the main congested areas of Unley Road, Goodwood Road, Fullarton Road, Glen Osmond Road and Portrush Road. So we see a lot of people cutting through our side streets and that is another bone of contention with the residents living in and around my electorate.

The bottom line is that all the work was done, and a substantial investment of volunteer time from the community and traders, government advisory time, consultants' time and ministerial time was put into moving this plan forward. Unfortunately, with the change of government, the plan was put to the then minister in the new Rann government who decided that the government would not fund the upgrade.

Since that time, we have seen the average speed drop on Unley Road. I think the average speed in kilometres per hour is well in the 20s now and, at peak hour, it can sometimes take nearly 20 minutes to drive that 2.7 kilometre strip of Unley Road. Hopefully, the South Road underpass might do a little bit to alleviate that, but the bulk of the traffic that comes down Unley Road obviously comes from the Hills suburbs.

Of course, when the eastern suburbs are cut off with the Clipsal 500 race, Unley Road is an absolute nightmare where you can often sit for five or 10 minutes and only move a few metres. An upgrade is long overdue, and I am very keen for the government to show some interest in dealing with this project. I was surprised that, with the amount of federal money that was being thrown around, the few million dollars that was needed for this job was not forthcoming.

We are still waiting for our black spot funding for the corner of Young Street and Unley Road. It is a notorious corner on Unley Road and, certainly, Parkside residents are very keen to see some traffic lights put in there. We do have some pedestrian lights just down from the corner but, unfortunately, they do not do the job of allowing people to get in and out of Parkside which is boxed in by a number of street closures. It is a bit of a maze at times getting out of Parkside, and Young Street is one of the ways to do that. However, not having traffic lights there does make it very dangerous, particularly if you are turning right heading into the city in the morning.

Another concern, of course, is the lack of action on stormwater. I know that it has not rained and, consequently, it has gone out of the government's mind, but we did have some terrible flooding in the lead-up to last election. Several houses were engulfed by flood waters that rushed quickly down the creeks that run through the electorate, in particular, Parkside Creek and a couple of others that are quite close to people's homes. Of course, those creeks have been there for many years, as have the homes, but what has changed is that we get a lot more run-off moving faster, because of the increase in urban consolidation, resulting in less uncovered land.

Many houses are now built from boundary to boundary on a concrete slab and so we are seeing a lot less water falling into the ground and running into gutters and then into our streams and out to sea. Fortunately it happens at a rapid pace but we have not seen any stormwater projects either for harvesting for future use or even for moving it out to the sea to protect homeowners. A large slice of north Unley, in particular, is a designated flood zone.

Then, of course, there is the disappointment of Glenside where we are seeing a hospital redevelopment that has been delayed—a development that is only being funded with the sale of land that the hospital is using which is also community land. It is used by many people in and around Glenside. There is a cricket oval there. There are schools that use the sporting facilities there and, of course, the patients at Glenside enjoy the wide open spaces. I was speaking to one particular constituent whose wife has reason to attend Glenside periodically. One of the things that helps his wife is the fact that she can walk the dog around the grounds while she is recuperating. That is just one small story about the closure of Glenside that is disappointing.

We have very little open space in Unley. With open space you get trees, birds and other forms of wildlife, and as we lose our open space, both private open space through urban consolidation and public open space through government sell-offs like this, there is less opportunity to enjoy the benefits of open space.

One issue I raise that has been concerning some residents in my electorate is the speed and also the lack of consultation with the Building the Education Revolution program, where we are seeing one-size-fits-all halls, in particular, being dropped into schools, where they fit, and with no obligation whatsoever for consultation with neighbours.

There is one private school in particular in my electorate that has had a long-term plan to put in car parking and tennis courts, knowing full well that it would have to consult with the community, doing it through the council process, but it used the opportunity of the BER money to help fund this development, which knocked down three historic homes, and then gave it the automatic stamp of approval from the commissioner of works, Rod Hook, which meant that it did not need to go to council and consequently did not need to have consultation with residents. This is a big change to the amenity of the area.

We are seeing a similar situation with a government school in my electorate, with a very large school hall, that is predominantly Colorbond, going up in a heritage area, on the boundary near another home, which would severely restrict their ability to have solar panels. Again, there is no obligation whatsoever for the school to consult with the neighbours.

Time expired.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (17:55): I want to speak about the No. 1, 2 and 3 issue in this state, and that is water. The big issue that we have at Glenelg is the amount of stormwater that comes down through the Brownhill, Sturt and Keswick creeks and then into the Pat. The Barcoo Outlet has solved many of the problems down there, but the problem is that we still have millions, perhaps billions, of litres of stormwater coming down and going out to sea.

This should not be happening. What should be happening is more wetlands being developed, and retention and detention on-site as often as we possibly can. There is a classic opportunity at Sturt Creek to develop wetlands at Marion at the road safety school. I understand that the Department for Environment and Heritage has given land to the City of Marion. The department of transport wants \$3 million for its bit, which is holding things up, and there are also wetlands being developed at Adelaide Airport.

If we had the money and the opportunity we would do what they are doing in Singapore, and that is turn these concrete channels back into pristine creeks, with the help of some groundbreaking technology from Flinders University, some sol-gel filtration, through Professor Stephen Clarke. It is absolutely brilliant. I suggest to people in this place that they speak to Professor Clarke and have a look at what they are doing in Singapore. This is what could happen to our stormwater, and our creeks could be turned from concrete canyons back into pristine linear parks for South Australians.

I want to talk about the Glenelg Waste Water Treatment Plant. It does stink every now and again, and I assume they are working on that, but I have a real issue with the fact that there are still billions of litres going out to sea. Even with the \$60 million pipeline coming into town, they will still only be using between 12 and 15 per cent of that water—that is all, and that is during the summertime when they are using that water for irrigation here.

The rest of the time this A grade water, water which you could just about drink, is going out to sea. It is killing the seagrasses, and that is another issue. Funding was put up by this government to help Flinders University and SARDI redevelop the seagrass beds, but that funding was pulled. I spoke to the minister and I understand that that funding is back in place.

The water going out to sea from the Glenelg Waste Water Treatment Plant is a tragic waste. It was being used by the Glenelg golf course and some other facilities around the place such as Adelaide Shores and the councils, but SA Water, in its wisdom, put the cost up by 1,200 per cent. So, what happened? Glenelg Golf Club, Kooyonga and, I think, Grange, have gone onto aquifer storage and recovery systems using stormwater, funded by the federal government.

There are billions of litres of good quality water going straight out to sea. It should not be happening. The problem is compounded by the fact that the cost of that water is now being charged at a percentage base. I understand that the Adelaide City Council is paying 75 per cent of potable water price for that water.

So, when the desal plant comes on and the potable water price doubles, what is the Adelaide City Council going to be paying for the water to irrigate the Parklands? That price rise will cripple the budget for the Parklands watering. What is the alternative? It is all going out to sea. It is a disgrace. It should not be happening, and it should be stopped by this government.

We should be doing everything that we can to make sure that every drop of water in South Australia, whether it is treated wastewater or stormwater, is going to be recycled and can be re-used over and over again. It is part of the hydrological cycle. There is no doubt that it can be done better. This government needs to do it better. It should be happening now, not waiting for promises in the future. It is an absolute priority.

It is the No. 1, the No. 2 and the No. 3 issue for this state, and it is not going to go away. This government needs to act now. It needs to do something about this, not just talk, not just empty promises, not just dam expansions which disappear and not just relying on federal government bail-outs to achieve what is an absolutely critical issue for this state.

[Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30]

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (19:30): I wish to use my opportunity tonight to talk about issues that occur in my electorate as they relate to the budget. Certainly, I will put on the record in the first instance my appreciation that a commitment of \$7.1 million has been given over the forward estimates for the Kadina Memorial High School; \$5.9 million of that is in the last financial year of the forward estimates, but it is very pleasing to see that some very necessary work has been done at that school. I have been there a few times, and it is obvious that a little more work needs to be undertaken, but it is fantastic to have \$7.1 million committed to it.

In fact, there are 27 schools within the Goyder electorate, 22 being public schools and five private schools. All of them have needs to some degree, and it is pleasing to see that all of them have received quite substantial amounts of money from the federal government through the Building the Education Revolution fund. It is interesting, though, because I was at a local football game on Saturday and a few people commented to me that there was a level of concern about the fact that those funds were being used to build facilities that might not necessarily be appropriate in the longer term. They quoted to me an example of a three-quarter size gymnasium that is not big enough on which to play netball or basketball.

It would be ideal to use as a community facility but the fact that it is too small means that that is prevented. Let us hope that some negotiation will occur to ensure that there is an opportunity to make better use of those very important funds to which taxpayers around the nation will be contributing for many years. Again, I put on record my appreciation for the Treasurer's and the Minister for Education's support for the Kadina Memorial High School, and I hope that other grants flow through to other worthwhile projects within the Goyder electorate.

The road network, though, is something that I want to talk about for some time, because, being a regional member of parliament I have no or a very limited public transport option. The necessity for people in my electorate by virtue of where they live is to be on the roads. Much of the road length is a Transport SA controlled facility, and I think it is fair to say that much of the road length is the topic of a lot of the concern—very much in the negative sense—that I have within my electorate office. People are quite concerned about it. Some areas were done up, and I do acknowledge that, about five years ago, when the Hon. Michael Wright was the minister responsible for that area, some funds were expended to improve the road from Ardrossan going towards Federation Park, towards Port Wakefield.

Some shoulder widening was put in and a passing lane, which has improved that enormously, but hundreds of kilometres within the Goyder electorate certainly do need an investment to take place. I want to concentrate on three roads in particular. One road is going from Kulpara through to Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta. It is a very high traffic area. It is a community that is expanding enormously. Moonta, Moonta Bay and Port Hughes currently has a population of about 4,000, projected across the next 15 years, or so, to grow to 16,000 people. The area is becoming increasingly popular with a far greater number of transport actions on that road network; and, sadly, sections of it are quite dangerous.

Some speed restrictions are in place, but there are areas of the road where I can see very little work has been undertaken. Terrible and quite shocking instances, I am told, have occurred. It has been reported to me third-hand that, when they are going towards each other, trucks are

coming across very poor sections of the road, causing them to shimmy across the road, and the trailers of these trucks are touching each other as they pass. That is an accident waiting to happen. We have a vast number of people who travel that road with caravans and boats, and all these people are quite fearful of the condition of the road.

They do slow down but it is a 100 km/h road, and I think it is in urgent need of funds being spent there. I know that the District Council of the Copper Coast has been quite diligent in its contact with the Minister for Transport (Hon. Mr Conlon), trying to get recognition for a significant upgrade in the road network to occur there. I offer my full support for that, especially in terms of the ferry that travels between Wallaroo and Lucky Bay, which is further increasing the road network needs. Let us hope we get some money in the future.

In terms of central Yorke Peninsula, the road that comes from Kulpara, goes through Maitland, Minlaton and down to Yorketown, Edithburgh and Warooka has some very poor sections where the shoulders are quite pronounced. It is quite a skinny road network, too, so there is a lot of trouble when heavy vehicles travel towards each other. You do find instances where it is necessary for one truck to get one side of its wheels off the road to give each other plenty of passing room. I know that the travelling public is concerned about it.

The locals understand the condition of it and travel accordingly, but for the visitors that we have—and we have hundreds of thousands of visitors to the Yorke Peninsula each year—it is a great concern. That is a very long area of road network that really does need a significant upgrade. One road within the Wakefield or Adelaide Plains area is the road that goes from Balaklava across to Hamley Bridge. They are great little communities with wonderful people. They are farming communities that have been very supportive and that have done wonderful things in the past, but the road network from that stretch of road is quite poor.

Some work has been done on Nine Mile Corner Road to upgrade that area but, beyond that, heading towards Hamley Bridge, it is in a poor condition. The speed limit is 100 km/h and it is desperately in need of an upgrade. As is my wont for as long as I have the great opportunity to represent the people of Goyder, I will continue to bring this issue forward and hope that, in future years, an investment takes place there. One other issue I wish to talk about is the water provision for Yorke Peninsula. It is a difficult issue to raise given the desperate situation of the Murray and the continuing drought.

The minister has been quite proactive in this and there has been an investment of SA Water resources physically with some very good people doing work on a Yorke Peninsula long-term water supply plan. I understand that, in past years, a similar exercise has been conducted on the Eyre Peninsula. I know that some preliminary planning is also being done for a similar exercise on Kangaroo Island. I have been invited, with observer status, to attend meetings of this group, and I appreciate the opportunity the minister provided to me.

I also attended three of the five forums that were held after preliminary work was done when the public was invited to attend to understand some of the issues involved and to create some preferences in terms of where they wanted the effort to go. It was good; we got feedback. Five of those meetings were held on the Yorke Peninsula and one meeting was held in Adelaide. I went to that one also. It was not big in numbers, it is fair to say, even though something like 600 submissions were received, which was an outstanding effort from the people of the Yorke Peninsula in the Copper Coast council areas in terms of putting their fingers to the typewriter to write letters and to put in their comments.

It really has proven to me that this exercise has to be more than words. I know that the people who have gone to the effort to put in submissions and attended the forums want to see outcomes. They want to see some outcomes which will give them a greater opportunity to grow their region; and they know that, in order to do that, they need an improved water supply.

It is an emotive issue, but it is appropriate that it be addressed. The Minister for Water Security when answering a question in parliament today talked about the response by the state and federal governments to withdraw a \$160 million contribution towards the BHP plant. She said that the action in Adelaide to create a 100 gigalitres plant means that country South Australia is quite secure in its water supplies. I know that the country licence is 50 gigalitres of water. I think it has been downgraded to something like 31 gigalitres because of the ongoing dry conditions.

It is obvious to me that the network, too, is a problem. The study on Yorke Peninsula has highlighted the fact that we have 1,850 kilometres of pipeline network that SA Water controls and owns. The majority of that pipeline network is over 50 years old. I am told that it is designed for a

100 year life—and I am quite surprised by that, given the physical condition of it and the apparent lack of maintenance that is occurring—but part of the challenge is to get the pipeline network of a sufficient size with sufficient storage in order to have the capacity to supply the growing needs of the communities on Yorke Peninsula and the Adelaide Plains and to have some option to give a water supply to the 16 communities in the area that do not have a potable reticulated water supply. Part of the vision must be to improve it.

My closing comment is about broadband funding, on which there needs to be a greater emphasis. If business is to have the opportunity to locate in regional areas and if regional people are to have the opportunity to have access to broadband technology, we need to ensure a combination of state and federal government effort goes into it. In previous years the federal government has contributed vast sums towards it and the state government within my area has supported projects, but lots of areas of the state need an improved system; and I hope the government chooses to work actively on that issue.

Stormwater opportunities for capture and reuse in the regions do exist. It needs a lot more support. Federal money to some degree has apparently dried up. Local communities are taking a proactive response to this issue. They are trying to work out opportunities, engaging their councils and challenging their communities to come up with a solution to capture the rainwater, store it in dams and pump it to a reticulated network. Let us hope that the government supports it in every way possible.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders) (19:40): I spoke in my second reading contribution about economic issues. I will now provide a few words in relation to mental health, disability funding and the plight of volunteers from a regional perspective.

Funding has been dropped for James Nash House, which is used for high risk patients who are a danger to themselves and/or to others—despite it having a long waiting list of around 20 people and being in severe need of an expansion to provide at least 60 to 65 upgraded beds and better facilities. Perhaps this delay will provide time to reconsider the ill-conceived proposal to move it to Murray Bridge, away from professional support and where patients, their family and friends, would have the greatest difficulty in maintaining adequate contact. This facility should be located in Adelaide, as close as possible to existing mental health professionals and facilities where qualified staff and services are nearby, and access for family and friends, particularly those from regional areas, is reasonable.

The optimum situation would be for James Nash House to be rebuilt on the existing site with expanded services. Instead, sadly, there is no funding in this budget. In addition to the James Nash House debacle, in the past year 75 patients have been shunted out of the Glenside mental health facility. The surrounding land, which allows green spaces and provides room for a hospital redevelopment, is being provided, along with \$43 million by the Premier, to become a film hub. I cannot believe the government's skewed priorities.

I will quote Dr John Brayley, Public Advocate, who used to be the head of mental health in South Australia. In relation to James Nash House and the high need in prison populations for the services it provides, he said:

The other group who go through are prisoners with a mental illness who need short admissions and because people with mental illness are over represented in the prison population a common figure is up to 50 per cent. It's very important to be able to have facilities for prisoners, as well as get acute treatment.

I note at this point that there is no capital funding in the budget for Port Lincoln Hospital upgrades—promised last year—despite its being identified as a regional general hospital. A major priority at the Port Lincoln Hospital is for a mental health unit, both for community admissions from across the huge region which it services and which has been drought affected in some places for up to six years—putting huge stress on communities, some of whom are still recovering from the bushfires—and the prisoner population.

The Port Lincoln Prison has been promised funding in this budget to provide an additional 36 beds. This will add to the existing need for mental health professionals and specialised facilities in the region. Some prison inmates and their families take up residence in Port Lincoln after they are released.

The difficulties faced by disabled people living outside the metropolitan area are magnified by distance and isolation, increasing personal costs in time, money and the general accessibility of services. When one combines these problems with the total inflexibility of the government to review

rules to suit the different circumstances, the pressure on disabled people and their families and carers is immense.

The case that best illustrates this amazing lack of flexibility of the Labor government to cope with regional differences and their ramifications on an individual family and the community is the case of the Richters. The Richter family lives in Ungarra, approximately 90 kilometres from Port Lincoln. For seven years their autistic son, Rodney, caught the education department funded bus—which passes their door—to travel to Port Lincoln to attend the special school.

When Rodney turned 20 (in chronological years) suddenly it was decreed that he could no longer catch the bus. His father Steve, who is a school bus driver and a highly qualified volunteer ambulance driver, runs a computer business from home. He now has to drive Rodney to and from Port Lincoln every day to enable Rodney to access the Moving On employment program at Bedford Compass.

As a result, Steve can no longer reliably service his computer customers, is no longer available to drive the school buses and is very often not available when ambulance emergencies occur. The latter is life threatening, as an ambulance has had to be sent from the paid ambulance service in Port Lincoln to patients in Tumby Bay and beyond, causing unacceptable delays.

The ministers for education and disability were both contacted by me to help fix what I thought at the time was just a glitch in the system. Since then emails, letters, questions and speeches in parliament, radio interviews, newspaper articles and even a segment on *Today Tonight* have not managed to sort out the problem for this family. Steve recently advised:

I started asking the disability Office about this 13 months ago, in all this time I have only received 2 emails. In the last 4 months I started pushing a bit more for a response. I asked for an explanation to a very simple statement put forward by the minister, 'what are the "complex issues"?'

Finally on 29 May Steve received a response from the Minister for Education. She acknowledged that this is a difficult situation for the family and confirmed that the 'adult' program Rodney attends is supported with funding through the Department for Families and Communities. However, there are no shades of grey.

The bottom line is that adults are not eligible for access to school buses, and heaven forbid that a precedent is set to accommodate one living in a remote regional community and his family. Rodney, who has the mental age and ability of a child, would create legal problems. The minister went on to state that she has asked her ministerial colleague the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, the Minister for Families and Communities, to re-examine how best her department may assist. The minister had been silent in this whole sorry saga, which will not go away. I am advised that next year another student who has been travelling on the 'school bus' to the special school will be in the same situation.

It is stunning that in this day and age some common sense and compromise cannot be applied. Here we have a chronologically aged adult but mentally aged child living in isolation being denied opportunities while a government funded bus drives past their farm gate every school day of the year. Can I ask the ministers involved to perhaps ask a medically qualified professional to assess Rodney's mental age to ascertain whether he could be considered a child for the purposes of bus travel? Then his father can work for his family and he can be available to volunteer for his community and help to save lives.

From what I am hearing in my community, volunteers are feeling used and abused by this state government, too. Despite all the rhetoric by the government about valuing our volunteers, they are feeling undervalued and overworked, expected to submit volumes of paperwork before undertaking activities, not adequately reimbursed for expenses and all the time being treated like imbeciles by the paid professionals.

This discontent was reinforced by a letter to the editor in today's *Advertiser* by Ken Schutz of the CFS Volunteers Association, Regency Park, who stated, 'It's time for successive governments to stop treating emergency services volunteers like unpaid public servants.' This view is supported also in today's *Advertiser* by Andy Fryar, who said:

The group members are highly community minded and want short-term assignments that allow them to make an immediate difference—and not loads of extra paperwork and after hours of training. Seems the problem is the system and not the volunteers.

However, this government's actions appear to reinforce the statement of one former union CEO, who said, 'If a job's worth doing it's worth being paid for.' The rest is for suckers, which is exactly how many of our regional volunteers feel.

Recently a review of emergency services funding that was looking for savings within the volunteer services referred to SES groups as 'social clubs'. I am also reliably advised that SES volunteers have no idea what, if any, funding they are to receive in the 2009-10 financial year, as they are considered to be starting with a \$300,000 debt.

We cannot do without our CFS, SES and volunteer ambulance services in this state. This government will not be putting in paid services to replace the wonderful volunteers, as it would cost many millions of dollars to cover our regions. However, these people need these services that our city cousins take for granted.

The emergency services levy was, I understand, meant to help fund these voluntary services, but I am now told that the levy funds are being diverted more and more to pay for police, MFS and paid ambulance services that were traditionally paid for by the government from our existing state taxes. For a supposedly socialist government, a government that purports to govern for all, it seems this metrocentric government cannot see beyond the CBD.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (19:50): The member for MacKillop will not have to wait long, because I am going to speak about things in the budget for the electorate of Davenport. Other than the usual health announcements for the Flinders Medical Centre, which is a state facility on the very border of my electorate, there is essentially nothing in the budget for all the road issues I have raised over the past eight years. The rail matter, of course, as announced last year is continuing. That is the resleepering of the line, but there is no commitment to electrify as such, and there is no decision as to what will be done with the passenger line with regard to the tunnels; because of the electrification we would need to do something with the tunnels is my understanding.

The only school projects were the ones which were announced last year and which are continuing. We welcomed those last year, but this year there is nothing new. So, there is not a lot to comment on in the budget as far as the electorate of Davenport goes, other than to say—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I would back the battleship if I were you. In relation to the budget, there is one item that is missing, and I have been looking for it. It is the front page announcement during the last election campaign about the Sturt Road/South Road overpass. It was on the front page—

Ms Fox interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Member for Bright, your government announced it was going to build an overpass on Sturt Road/South Road.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Mawson confirms that it is going to be built (and I thank him for it): it is just not in this budget.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It was announced four years ago to commence this year, member for Mawson. So, if you have now confirmed to the house through your interjection that it is going to be built but not this year, I thank you for the interjection. The preliminary work was the election announcement four years ago—

Mr Bignell: It'll go both ways, too, not like your stupid expressway.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It will go both ways, not like our stupid expressway. If it is so bad, member for Mawson, you would not use it, would you? The expressway. Do you use it?

Mr Bignell: I use it all the time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You use it all the time, but your government will not commit to duplicate it. In fact, the Minister for Transport is saying that he will not duplicate it.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Can you give me a year?

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The other thing that is missing is the new CFS station for Eden Hills. Not only was it promised in 2002 and 2006, but even the head of the CFS suggested to a parliamentary committee it would be built in 2010. This budget is an act of wizardry because lots of things have disappeared, including the Mount Bold reservoir, the Sturt Road/South Road overpass/underpass, and now the CFS station has disappeared as well.

I have previously brought to the house's attention that the traffic is such through the main street of Blackwood that the Blackwood roundabout will be blocked all the time with an increase in traffic, and the government has absolutely no plan to deal with it, which is regrettable. So, the budget has served the electorate of Davenport very poorly. I will continue to advocate for expenditure both in relation to election promises from my side and from the government to try to improve conditions for the electors of Davenport come March 2010. With those few comments, I will hand over to the member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (19:55): That was most revealing, particularly the interjections from the member for Mawson, who stood up in the second reading of the Appropriation Bill and said words to this effect, 'the AAA credit rating is so important; we worked so hard to gain it'. That proved one thing to me: the member for Mawson has no idea. If he goes back and reads Standard and Poor's reasons why we got the AAA credit rating back in South Australia, he would understand that it was because of the good work of the previous Liberal government.

The member for Mawson just confirmed what the member for Davenport said about the lack of expenditure in his seat and the broken promises. The opposition has highlighted a number of broken promises. It is the hallmark of this government. This government has come into this place—and not only at budget time but almost on a weekly basis—and made grandiose announcements and promises.

Mrs Redmond: They make the same ones over and over again.

Mr WILLIAMS: They do make the same ones over and over. They usually make them three or four times. The sad thing is that they deliver very few of them. One of the promises that has been made both by this government and by the federal Rudd government in Canberra was that, when Kevin Rudd borrowed hundreds of billions of dollars to hand out in largesse to the states to save all the broken-down state Labor governments, none of the money would be used to replace state projects which should have been funded by the state governments.

About six weeks ago, I had a phone call from one of the schools in my electorate saying, 'We have been working for two years on a project in our school and we have just been told that that project is now on hold. We have to go back to square one and apply under the BER scheme.' I am referring to the Building the Education Revolution (BER). That is Kevin Rudd's name for his borrowing billions of dollars and handing it out.

Here is an exact example in my electorate of the state government putting on hold its program and taking the largesse from Kevin Rudd to substitute and subsidise state finances. This is why we have been saying on this side that this government has been bailed out by Kevin Rudd. It is not Kevin Rudd who has bailed out this government: it is the long suffering taxpayers of this nation because every one of those dollars will have to be paid back.

About a fortnight ago I was invited to visit one of the primary schools in my electorate and they said, 'We are so lucky. We have been promised a new gymnasium and we have been screaming out for this sort of facility for many years.' Not only has the school community been screaming out for this facility but the wider community has been screaming out for it because it will be used, not just by the school but by the local community. I said, 'That is really good. That is great news.' The principal of the school said to me, 'No; it is not quite that great because we have been told that we have to accept project A—the gymnasium as per plan A.' The principal explained to me, 'That is not what we have been asking for and it will not serve either the school or the wider community. What we want,' they said—

Ms Fox interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, just listen. They said, 'We want this type of gymnasium which has been built several years ago in the school down the road. We would like one of those.' I said—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Just wait. I can see that the members of the government have had the same problems in their own electorates because they are pre-empting what I am going to say. They have had the same problem. I asked them, 'How many extra hundreds of thousands will you need to build'—

Ms Fox interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —'what you want as opposed to what you have been told you are going to get?'

Ms Fox interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bright.

Mr WILLIAMS: Lo and behold, the answer came back: 'It would cost less to give us what we wanted than what they were proposing to give us.' I was told by the school principal—and for obvious reasons I am not going to reveal the school or the principal's name, because I know the way this government works, and I was asked specifically not to reveal the name of the school or the principal—

Mrs Geraghty: That's outrageous!

Mr WILLIAMS: It is not outrageous. I have told the school principal that if they cannot get any sense out of this government to contact me, to get the school council, the governing council, to contact me and we will take it up, and they are still negotiating. But they have been told: 'It will cost less but, sorry, this is what you are getting, and you cannot have that.' That is the reality, and that is what is happening right across the state.

I have a grandchild who started school in another part of the state outside of my electorate last week. That school has eight children in it. It is on the brink of closing down, and the school community are scratching their head as to how they might spend \$267,000—an absolute waste of money.

Like the member for Davenport, I can name a plethora of projects in my electorate which should be funded by either the state or federal government, but they will not be funded and they are not being funded. My electorate, like the member for Davenport's electorate, has got diddly squat out of this budget. What we have got is a number of school communities that are being frustrated. What we have got is a number of hospitals across my electorate that are being squeezed, and the money being taken out of those to fund a hospital at the rail yards here in Adelaide that nobody wants.

We have good people four hours by land transport away from Adelaide; they do not want a hospital down there. They want basic medical care in their own backyard, and it is being denied to them. It is being denied to them because their hospitals are being squeezed. They have been cut to the bone—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: They have been cut to the bone. I turn to another issue in the last couple of minutes available to me. The minister for corrections came in here today and landed us with a ministerial statement which covered the tabling of the Parole Board's annual report. The Parole Board's annual report is delivered to the minister, under the legislation, no later than 31 October each year, and, under the legislation, it should be tabled this year within 12 sitting days. It was tabled today.

I can understand why the government would not want to table the report of the Parole Board, because it is damning of this government. This government professes to be tough on law and order and says that it is locking up more prisoners than ever. But, the Chair of the Parole Board, Frances Nelson QC, says:

The work of the Parole Board has almost doubled in the last few years...undoubtedly due to the increase in the number of discretionary releases.

We might be locking a few more up, but we are letting a lot more out. She goes on to say:

In terms of preventing further or repeated offending it is necessary to deal with the causes of criminogenic factors.

There's a word I have never heard of before. She continues:

They are many and varied and include drug and alcohol use, mental health issues, unacceptable levels of literacy, lack of working skills and/or experience, child sex abuse and general background deprivation.

We have an issue, which a number of my colleagues are raising, about the education system in this state. The chair of the Parole Board clearly states that 'unacceptable levels of literacy' is one of the causes for people being incarcerated in our prisons. Even when we put them in our prisons and lock them away, we still do not rehabilitate them. One of the best ways we can rehabilitate people incarcerated in our prisons is to give them basic skills in literacy and numeracy. We do not do it at primary school, it is too late when they get to secondary school, and we do not do it in our prisons.

It is no wonder that the minister came in here and made this nonsense of a ministerial statement, trying to cover up the inadequacies and the underfunding of our prison system. If the minister was proud of what is happening in our prisons, he would release the report into the riots last October in Port Augusta Prison, and the people of South Australia could judge this government on exactly what happened.

Time expired.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen) (20:05): I welcome the opportunity to make another brief contribution on this matter.

Members interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: I wish that those on the other side would actually stand up and put their thoughts on the record instead of trying to yell abuse at people on this side of the chamber while we are trying to put some thoughts on the record in relation to this budget. Usually, of course, I would use this 10 minute grievance as an opportunity to speak more about my electorate and the impact of the budget on it, but, sadly, there is so little done in my electorate under this budget that it is hardly worth the effort of going there.

Besides that, when I was talking on matters yesterday, I really had not finished my comments in relation to those matters touching upon the other portfolios that I have under my watch, namely, attorney-general and justice, the arts, ageing, and road safety. In relation to the attorney-general and justice portfolio, of course, less than two weeks ago a judge's report once again indicated the lack of facilities in our courts.

I think I got to the point in my comments yesterday about the lack of facility in our courts and trying to make the government aware that, although this government hates lawyers, judges and, generally, anyone associated with the legal profession, courts are also places where victims and people who have been involved in accidents, and all sorts of other things, end up. We need, in the matter of appropriate facilities, to improve what is in our courts. The government this year has promised, for example, to have an early opening of the Sturt Street courts when, in fact, it was supposed to be opened last year, according to the budget.

I also mentioned yesterday the fact that we are still confronted with this dreadful situation in relation to our Coroner's reports, where people who have an unexpected death in the family have to face not only the trauma of that but also being told by the Coroner's office that the autopsy may be done fairly quickly but that they will not get a final death certificate until some 12 months, potentially, after that death.

I had got as far as talking about the fact that there had been a 19 per cent increase in the number of matters lodged with the District Court, and yet, the budget increase for that court was less than 10 per cent. Indeed, there has been an utter failure of this government in terms of addressing our courts generally and the Coroner's Court specifically, because although the government may have gone to the trouble of making a great big splash announcement about increased DNA testing facilities, the reality is that the Coroner's Court program generally has been reduced from \$5,185,000 to just over \$5 million—a decrease of more than \$100,000 in its budget for this year.

The things that I wanted to get on to are those touching on the other portfolios that I have under my watch. I will say this: I have two good marks for the government. My mother always told me, 'If you can't say anything nice, don't say anything at all,' and I will say something nice. There are two good issues in ageing. I congratulate the government on its introduction of free fares for seniors card holders in off-peak times and I also congratulate them on, at long last, removing the land tax on aged care residential facilities.

I point out to the house that, whilst I congratulate the government on that, I think that thus far we have failed to address what are going to be the real issues in the area of ageing. We are all ageing and I can tell you that it is far better than the alternative of not getting older. I have mentioned these figures before. We already have in this country some 3,400 people over the age of 100.

Ms Fox interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Yes; the member for Bright says, 'Wow,' because everyone thinks that is an amazing number of people over the age of 100—a lot of letters that the Queen has already signed. However, the fact is that, by the year 2055, it is anticipated that there will be 78,000 people over the age of 100 and, furthermore, that is going to mean that, because we baby boomers have overindulged our children and our children are expected to be the first generation not to outlive their parents, it is our grandchildren who are going to be confronted with having not just elderly parents in their 80s but very elderly grandparents in the post-95 and post-100 year age bracket as well as children to raise who then do not become independent until the age of 25. So, if you think we have problems now, you ain't seen nothin' yet.

We have huge issues in that area. We already know, for instance, that the single person household is the fastest-growing demographic in the housing sector, and yet we keep moving further and further out into the suburbs and building bigger and bigger houses when in fact we should be focusing on what we are going to need in the next few years.

I do not think that the answer is going to be building more and more nursing homes, because 90 per cent of us never live in a nursing home. Indeed, 90 per cent of us never want to live in a nursing home and we have to focus on ageing in place. So, whilst I congratulate the government, I think that we really need to be thinking in terms of the big issues that are going to confront us in that area.

Mrs Geraghty: But we are doing good things in this area.

Mrs REDMOND: The member the Torrens says that we are doing good things. I think fundamentally we have failed thus far to address the issue of the fact that the particular generation that we would classify as our older generation now are often asset rich and income poor. They are not a group, like the baby boomers, who may have been prepared to borrow against the increasing value of their house to pay their rates.

We have that increasing problem that I do not think is going to go away for the next 15 or 20 years probably, and I do not think we have confronted that well enough. As I said, I congratulate the government on those two bits that it did introduce, but I think that we need to have a bigger discussion in the broader community about how we confront those issues for our ageing community.

Moving on quickly, I was made the shadow minister for road safety only at the end of April, of course, and I have to say that it has been a fairly busy introduction to the portfolio. It was lucky for me that I had spent some 10 years on the Road Safety Advisory Council for this state, so that I do have a fair idea of the issues in the portfolio. Generally, it can be said all over the world that in road safety there are three main elements.

One element is driver behaviour, and we have for many years, for instance, encouraged 'Don't drink drive' and I can guarantee that the generation that my children represent is far more conscientious about never drinking and driving, about having designated drivers and all those things. They are extremely conscientious, far more so than the generation that I grew up in, so I think that message has got through. Regarding speeding, also, for the most part, the message has got through, although too many people are still speeding.

The next element is that of vehicle design. Over the years, we have created much safer vehicles so we have done a lot towards creating ABS air brakes, airbags, seatbelts, and all those things that have made the vehicles themselves and especially the little cocoon within which we all travel when we are in a car much safer. Those two aspects have been covered.

The third element is where we have fallen down, and I point to the government very markedly in this area because it is one the government can have a major effect in, and it has failed to address it. I refer to what is called roadside furniture and the road itself. Let me tell you what this budget does. On the Rural Road Improvement program, the budget for 2008-09 was over \$8 million. What was spent was about \$7.75 million. The budget for this year is \$760,000. Less

than 10 per cent of what was spent in the 2008-09 year is being spent on the Rural Road Improvement program.

Rural roads are a major issue because a lot of our accidents happen on rural roads. I have said before that some of our problems, I am sure, is because of driver knowledge. We grow a group of drivers in the city, young drivers who know about traffic but do not necessarily know about road handling, and we have another group who grow up in the country who are used to paddock bashers who grow up with a lot of road skills and driver skills but they do not have the traffic skills. We need to make sure that each of those groups gets the skills in the other areas, but they will be unsafe as long as our roads and our roadsides remain unsafe.

The overtaking lanes program is so important because people get impatient often behind slower moving vehicles and they take risks that they should not and that is when you get these terrible head-on collisions. The actual expenditure on the overtaking lanes program in 2007-08 was \$5.75 million. The budget for 2008-09 was \$1 million, and the actual expenditure was just over \$589,000. The budget for this year is zip. Not one penny has been put towards that program.

So, although there are budgets there in some areas, the budgets have been so decimated that we are falling further behind, instead of getting ahead in terms of our roads and what is called 'roadside furniture'. As I said, that is the third element. There is driver behaviour, vehicle safety and the roads, the road design and the roadside furniture, and that is the area where we could have the biggest impact and it is the one where we are doing the least.

Time expired.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (20:15): I, too, wish to make comments in relation to my electorate of Kavel in the Adelaide Hills. There are a couple of pieces of pleasing information in the budget relating to educational facilities and, like the member for Heysen, if there is some positive news then I do like to speak about it. The Birdwood High School has received some funding for stage 2 of its next redevelopment program, and we are pleased—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No, not at all, minister. I am actually highlighting it as a positive outcome.

Mr Pederick: They are whingeing about that.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: She is whingeing about me saying it is a good thing. For goodness sake! As I said, it is stage 2 of the redevelopment project and I am sure that the school community is very pleased with that announcement. The local media ran an article on it a week or two ago, and I know that the principal is pleased to have received that next tranche of funding.

I can say that it was not without need, certainly, for the upgrading of that high school campus. I raised this particular issue in the house a number of years ago and helped the school and the school community campaign for the redevelopment project, along with my colleague the member for Schubert.

There is also funding in the budget for a feasibility study at the Nairne Primary School. The poor old long-suffering Nairne Primary School community has been through a considerable amount of turmoil, really, in relation to this government, particularly with the school crossing on the main road. For years and years that has been a real issue for the school community, and the ever-increasing population within the Nairne township has placed a further demand on the existing facilities at the primary school campus. I congratulate the government for recognising the need to fund this feasibility study, and that information was well received by the school as well.

I have endeavoured to establish very close relationships with all the schools in my electorate, and I would like to think that I have that type of close relationship with Birdwood High School—even though that township has been in the Schubert electorate it is now coming back into Kavel—and also the Nairne Primary School community.

Talking about matters relating to schools, I referred a minute or so ago to the school crossing issue at Nairne Primary School on the main road in the township. I have spoken about this ad infinitum in this place and finally we have received some funding from the federal government, the state government and the local government. Even though it is a state government responsibility, the federal government chipped in some money and the District Council of Mount Barker also came to the party to help fund an upgrade of the school crossing.

What DTEI has proposed is to move the school crossing from one side of the T-junction intersection with Woodside Road to the other. I have commented publicly that I do not think that is going to achieve a tremendous amount; actually, I do not think it is going to achieve much at all, because you will still have that traffic congestion at peak hour in the morning at that T-junction with Woodside Road and the main road in the township.

I have had meetings with council staff and they believe that they will see some improvements, but I am yet to be convinced on that, and I have made those comments publicly as well. The issue was also highlighted in the local press, which does not believe that positive outcomes will be achieved from the roughly \$1 million being spent at that site.

The government knows what to do. The previous Liberal government undertook a consultancy, and this government has to bite the bullet and fund it satisfactorily to make that junction a crossroads, not a T-junction, but line it up with what they call Saleyard Road, which is the road that runs up to the school site.

An additional issue that I will keep on raising in this place and outside this place until we see a satisfactory result achieved, is that of the second freeway interchange. I will not give up on this issue while I am here as a local member. I will keep on highlighting, as loud and as hard as I can, the need for the second freeway interchange at Mount Barker.

Again, the District Council of Mount Barker has done an extensive amount of work in planning the whole interchange project, not so much the structural engineering side of things, but the approaches, the run-offs, the exit/entry points and how they might connect with the existing local road infrastructure. I congratulate the Mount Barker council for the significant work it has done on the issue.

We were very hopeful—'we' meaning the local community and myself as the local member, and the mayor—that the project was supposedly put on the short list for the latest round of Infrastructure Australia funding. I wrote a letter to the federal minister for infrastructure (Hon. Anthony Albanese) supporting the project and recommending it for funding, because the freeway is a federally administered highway. I got a fairly nebulous response, which did not really surprise me but, basically, the message that came back to the council was it was on the short list and everyone was hopeful that it would be funded. Unfortunately, the news has come through recently that is not the case, but we have seen the federal government fund all the state government pet projects such as the O-Bahn and the doubling of the capacity of the desalination plant; and all the other things it has poured money into, basically to bale out the state government from its infrastructure responsibilities.

So that specific issue of the need to build that second freeway interchange goes to the next issue that is at the forefront of what I call the tri-town district of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne, and that is the government's will to significantly increase residential development in that part of the Adelaide Hills. If the government wants to fill that part of the Hills with houses, it has to commit to improving the level of services, in particular, the road and transport infrastructure; and, as I said, a vital part of that is the second freeway interchange. If the state government wants to fill the hills with houses, it has to commit to these vital projects. It cannot ignore them. If it does, it does so at its peril.

That also relates to a whole range of service delivery such as health and transport—not only road infrastructure but also public transport. After a long battle, the government committed to the Park'n'Ride facility at Mount Barker. Almost at day one after the opening it was at capacity. People tell me there are no car parks after about quarter past or 20 past seven in the morning so people have to find other car parks around the town and walk to the facility to catch the buses to the city to work. So, there is a real need for a second Park'n'Ride facility somewhere within that tri-town district.

We had only a recent announcement by the Minister for Urban Development and Planning that the government is about to embark on a plan amendment report process to look at land that may well be redeveloped for residential use. I can tell it that the local community is extremely irate about that issue.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (20:25): I also rise to add some comments to the initial speech I made in this place yesterday in regard to the budget. I left off yesterday when speaking about agriculture, and I will continue with another of my shadow portfolios and make a few comments about what has happened in relation to fisheries. I will quote from the budget in regard to licensing arrangements, and it goes like this:

Completed innovative solutions projects in order to optimise decision making in relation to regulations, licensing and monitoring.

I wonder how many bureaucrats it took to work out that quote, because it is as confusing a quote—

Mr Bignell: A suite of bureaucrats.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, thank you, member for Mawson.

Mr Bignell: A tranche of bureaucrats.

Mr PEDERICK: A tranche of bureaucrats, because that is bureaucratic gobbledegook, and it reinforces for me why there have been so many license stuff-ups—I will say it in plain English. There is no gobbledegook in that term. It is a stuff-up. We have the whole cockle industry—the Goolwa and mud cockle industries—essentially in chaos. Fishermen do not talk to each other because the quota system was brought in and people are saying, 'This is unfair,' or, 'That is not right.' Essentially, it has just been an absolute disaster from day one. I believe it is because of a lack of consultation, but this government is expert at that. I have been dealing with this issue as a local member, and now shadow fisheries minister, for a couple of years, and still there is no solution on the table.

Also, in regard to oyster growers, the former minister was using the wrong figures as the base for calculations, and he was indicating that their fees had only doubled whereas, in fact, he had almost quadrupled their licence fees. With that sort of management, it is no wonder the government decided to appoint a new fisheries minister.

The problems regarding oyster licenses will go on, because I believe the government is still keen to charge on a per lease basis and not on a per hectare basis. I know this helps other sectors in the aquaculture industry but, because there are so many small oyster leases, it impacts on them extremely hard. I hope there are some good outcomes for them in the future.

Also in regard to fisheries, and I believe fisheries are very well managed under the Fisheries Act, the government is imposing marine parks and has decided to 'fence off' 45 per cent of the state's waters and work out what is going on after that. The new minister for the environment, minister Weatherill, started touring the state, and I will give him credit for going and consulting with people—after the announcement—and then he decided to try to fix the issues. Since then, the government has set up local committees to work out how to progress the marine parks issue. Fishermen, rightly so, are concerned that at any time the government can make regulations relating to the inside of that outer perimeter of 45 per cent of the state's coastlines and restrict fishing practices, with no guarantee of compensation.

From what I can pick up around the sectors, that is not progressing well at all; and, if the government had only talked to the fishing industry beforehand and worked through it, I am sure the situation would have been much more amicable, instead of doing a typical job and picking off people one by one. I move on to mineral resources. We keep hearing about how much money this government pours into mineral exploration, etc. How much money is coming forward to assist mining exploration to become profitable? Exploration has actually dropped by \$43.3 million to \$36 million in the March quarter of 2009, compared with \$79.3 million for the same quarter of 2008. I do not see that those numbers are anything to brag about.

Only \$10.3 million of that funding was spent on new deposits, even under the much-touted plan for accelerating exploration, the PACE plan. Then you get to royalties: \$143 million in 2007-08 and \$163.45 million budgeted for 2008-09. We then have a drop. The estimated result for 2008-09 is \$150.772 million and for the 2009-10 budget it is \$143,819 million; so, royalties are down to 2007-08 levels, and this is a government that believes it is riding on the boom of mining.

I support one item I found under 'mineral resources', namely, a Materials and Mineral Science Learning and Research Hub to be set up with commonwealth funding of \$40 million. That is a good initiative and I do applaud that for mineral resources. I note that five projects have come into production recently: Project Magnet; Prominent Hill (and I went to the opening of that the other day and they are doing great work up there); Beltana; Angus (the Terramin mine in my electorate); and Mindarie, Australian Zircon, also in my electorate, and that started production this year.

Yes, the mines in my area have had their problems along the way, but they have worked through a lot of the issues with their communities and things are going reasonably well. There needs to be more action on the proposed export port at Port Bonython. This is included in a raft of things where the government needs to support more infrastructure for the mining industry with local

desalination plants, ports and roads and power supplies. I do applaud the foresight of BHP in putting out its expansion plans and I wish it all the best in the future.

There are a few concerns about the issue of round log. I would like to know the real answer to this. The government tells me that it is exporting 100,000 tonnes of round log because the saw mills do not like the smaller round logs, so they have to go overseas. Then we hear the union man on the radio this morning saying that the mills are crying out for some of this timber and that 100,000 tonnes is equivalent to 100 jobs. I would really like to find out the truth on that.

I wonder where the government is at this stage with its forward selling program of three life cycles of timber that could equate to 90 to 100 years of timber and selling our assets to offshore interests, which I do not agree with at all. I want to speak about the much vaunted prison projects on the front of *The Advertiser* three years ago. That is the way the Mayor of Murray Bridge (Alan Arbon) and I found out about them. The phones started and, as is typical, there was absolutely no consultation. I applaud the local council which tried to have meetings with the government and, yes, we did have some meetings—and I went along to some of them—to work out a way forward with the women's prison complex, the men's prison complex and the redirection of James Nash House as a forensic facility at Mobilong.

The community around Murray Bridge and Mobilong wanted to make sure that they got the best value they could for the town because, yes, not only would it have brought a lot of jobs into the town but also it could have brought some social issues. Those jobs are gone and the prisons have all gone—and that includes the new youth detention centres—to save the government's AAA credit rating. My what about the land now? Why does the government not realise that land and get on and use that money in projects for, perhaps, prison expansion in Adelaide, which I believe is probably a better site? I believe that the government will hang onto that land. Hopefully we are in power, but if for some reason we are not, in four years, post estimates, the gaols will bob up again.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (20:35): Like the other speakers, if I spent the time to discuss what the Schubert electorate got from the budget, I might as well sit down now. I will use this time to speak on another matter. I want to raise two things. In the house yesterday it was announced that moneys were headed for black spot funding for rail crossings. I have one notorious rail crossing in my electorate. There was a fatality there two weeks ago, and that is the third or fourth I can recall there. This one, again, misses out. I do not know how you divvy up the money. This crossing is between Nuriootpa and Angaston. It is on an S-bend. It is a shocker and surprise, surprise, there is still no funding. I am very concerned about that. We must address that.

Also, finalising my comments this afternoon, I express my grave concern about the severe cuts to primary industries. The minister is here, too. I have to say that I am confident that, with this minister, we can redress a lot of the problems that we have in primary industries, because I think this guy is very genuine in what he does. I think that we can do a lot in primary industries on a reduced budget. We need to do some work because morale is at a low ebb. Minister Caica is the person to get out there and meet these people. I have extended an invitation to the minister to visit my electorate, but I have not yet heard back from him.

The Hon. P. Caica: I'm coming, Ivan.

Mr VENNING: Cheers; that's good. I will make sure that the minister has a fruitful, productive day. That is what it is all about: my providing service to the electorate through the elected government and its ministers.

I am also very concerned about cuts in the budget to many things in relation to the minister's portfolio, including FarmBis and other education projects which are on a backburner because no-one cares about the poor old farmer who is trying to get educated. It is not good; it is not smart timing at all.

I believe that the previous Liberal government's final budget forecast revenue was \$7.4 billion in 2001-02. Revenue in the 2009-10 financial year is forecast to be almost double that—some \$14.4 billion. The Rann government has received \$3.7 billion in unbudgeted revenue over the past seven years. The question is: where has it all gone?

In the rest of my time tonight, I want to talk about government waste and efficiencies at all levels. I am critical of government efficiency and delivery of service at most levels. Where does one start in a discussion such as this? I want to start right here in Parliament House. I have been here for 19 years and I have tried for many years to change a few things. I am not on the Standing Orders Committee, but I probably should be. I have never coveted being there.

I believe the efficient use of our time here is a disgrace. We are told ad nauseam by the media and the public generally that we do not sit long enough. Well, I think that is rubbish. It is not the length of time we sit but, rather, what we achieve in the time we are here. I drive for two hours to be here, and some of my colleagues drive further than that. Along with most other members, I feel that once we are here we should achieve more.

Let us start with question time. We have one hour, and half that time is taken up with Dorothy Dixers from members of the government to ministers, usually prepared by the minister to whom the question is directed.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Torrens interjects. I understand that the opposition is guaranteed 10 questions. I am not blaming this government, in particular. I have been here through five or six governments and they all could be tarred with the same brush. I think it is high time we had a bloody good look at what we do here. It is a nonsense.

Most of the questions from government members to ministers have been prepared by the minister. It is a total nonsense and a laughable joke. It is crazy: we all know the answer. Ministers have plenty of opportunities to make a comment with a ministerial statement or to make a project public. They do not need to use question time. They can use many other avenues. After all, they are ministers. We could save 50 per cent of our time during question time and make it only 30 minutes. That is common sense.

In relation to sitting times, procedural debates, such as debate on the Supply Bill, should be extended through lunch and dinner breaks. Not many members are in the house, anyway. I stress that should only be on occasions when all members want to contribute; for example, on the Supply Bill and Appropriation Bill when we all want to have a go. I feel sorry for government members because I know that the Government Whip does not encourage them to speak because we want to finish the debate. I believe all members of the government should have the right to speak.

Mrs Geraghty: They do.

Mr VENNING: If we sat through lunch and dinner breaks, we would have so much more time. The time taken by lead speakers can extend to four or five hours—and we have seen that occur.

Mrs Geraghty: Only yours.

Mr VENNING: It is a tactic used as retaliation to bully government ministers who try to ram through legislation. I am not being judgmental here.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I know who the last two culprits are—I don't have to look far—but it does not make it right. I believe we should address this issue. I believe that a maximum time of 40 minutes for lead speakers should be allowed, with 20 minutes for everyone else. I am trying to be fair and use common sense.

Committee reports presented to the house should be debated within five sitting days, the same as any other legislation. What a waste! Committees spend a lot of time—sometimes five or six months—preparing submissions and reports. They are presented to the house and sit on the *Notice Paper* for weeks, sometimes months. Some are never debated. It is a disgrace and it would not withstand scrutiny from any business efficiency expert. We would be a laughing-stock.

Is there a historical requirement for the way we do things? We do not have to do it this way. It is just slack. Governments find it convenient to leave it the way it is. As individual members, all representing individual electorates of approximately 24,500 people, we protect our right to bring to the parliament issues relating to our constituents. We can do this by private members bills and private members motions. Well, this process is totally unworkable. Motions get moved. A member can pick a day in the future and it can be moved. It then ends up in a logjam and surfaces only occasionally, if at all.

If one looks at today's *Notice Paper* and tomorrow's business, especially in relation to private members time, many of the motions have been on the *Notice Paper* for the whole of this session, with no hope of being debated. There is no ambition to remove them. They just sit there.

The government and taxpayers pay the cost of printing the bloody things—yet they sit there. We do not even read them. They just sit there. It is a disgrace.

There are two reasons for that. Some members do not want the motions to be dealt with. They put them on the *Notice Paper* in order to get some publicity and then just leave them there. Other members want their motions debated and voted on, but they bogged down with all the others in the logjam.

I believe that these motions should have a life on the *Notice Paper*—say, four sitting weeks—and then they must be debated and voted on. If there is no attempt to continue the debate, after the fifth week they should automatically fall off the *Notice Paper*. Does this work? Yes, it does, because in the last parliament I successfully moved to have a system of symbols marked on each of the motions and bills, and after four symbols they disappeared. Amazing! The *Notice Paper* was several pages thinner. Too many games have been played by governments deliberately using tactics to prohibit motions ever getting debated.

I also believe that a lot of the legislation that comes to parliament could go to various parliamentary standing committees before entering parliament and, if there is no dissent, they should be presented to the parliament and passed quickly. Estimates need to be more efficient, with questions only from the opposition and the time cut in half, and all the MPs should be used, including the MLCs. What a farce it is that we have ministers from the other place who sit in here, but we cannot use the backbenchers to sit on the cross benches. We need video connections to our offices so we are able to watch proceedings in this place and follow them with some efficiencies.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development) (20:46): I thank all members for the contributions they have made during this debate. In the short time that I have been here I have been particularly disappointed by the negativity that has been displayed by members of the opposition. I do thank the member for Schubert for his kind words about me, but what I would say is that the budget that was presented by our Treasurer and government is a sound budget for the times. It is a budget from which our state will spring out of these most uncertain economic times, and I commend the budget to the house.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development) (20:47): On behalf of the Deputy Premier, I move:

That the proposed payments for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Thursday 2 July 2009, in accordance with the following timetables:

APPROPRIATION BILL
TIMETABLE FOR ESTIMATES COMMITTEES
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A
25-30 June & 1 July 2009
THURSDAY 25 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Premier

Minister for Social Inclusion

Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change

Minister for Economic Development

Minister for Arts

Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts

Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management

Legislative Council

Joint Parliamentary Services

House of Assembly

State Governor's Establishment

Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Arts SA
Auditor-General's Department
Treasurer
Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

FRIDAY 26 JUNE AT 10.00 AM

Minister for Industry and Trade
Treasurer
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Defence SA
Minister for Youth
Minister for Volunteers
Minister for Correctional Services
Minister for Gambling
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (part)
Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Department for Correctional Services
Independent Gambling Authority

MONDAY 29 JUNE AT 1.30 PM

Minister for Housing
Minister for Disability
Minister for Northern Suburbs
Minister for Families and Communities
Minister for Ageing
Department for Families and Communities
Administered Items for the Department for Families and Communities
Department for Planning and Local Government (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning and Local Government (part)

TUESDAY 30 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Industrial Relations
Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
Minister for Forests
Minister for Regional Development
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)

WEDNESDAY 1 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Urban Development and Planning
Minister for Mineral Resources Development

Minister for Small Business
Department for Planning and Local Government (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning and Local Government (part)
Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Minister for Emergency Services
Minister for Police
Minister for Recreation, Racing and Sport
Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
South Australia Police (part)
Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B

25-30 June & 1 July 2009

THURSDAY 25 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Transport
Minister for Energy
Minister for Infrastructure
Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
TransAdelaide
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Minister for Health
Minister for the Southern Suburbs
Department of Health (part)
Department for Planning and Local Government (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Planning and Local Government (part)

FRIDAY 26 JUNE AT 10.15 AM

Minister for Environment and Conservation
Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation
Minister for Early Childhood Development
Department for Environment and Heritage
Administered Items for the Department for Environment and Heritage
Environment Protection Authority
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department of Education and Children's Services
Administered Items for the Department of Education and Children's Services

MONDAY 29 JUNE AT 1.30 PM

Minister for State/Local Government Relations
Minister for Consumer Affairs

Minister for the Status of Women
 Minister for Government Enterprises
 Department for Planning and Local Government (part)
 Administered Items for the Department for Planning and Local Government (part)
 Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
 Administered Items for the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)

TUESDAY 30 JUNE AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Education
 Department of Education and Children's Services
 Administered Items for the Department of Education and Children's Services
 Minister for Multicultural Affairs
 Attorney-General
 Minister for Justice
 Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
 Electoral Commission SA
 Courts Administration Authority

WEDNESDAY 1 JULY AT 9.00 AM

Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse
 Department of Health (part)
 Minister for Tourism
 South Australian Tourism Commission
 Minister for Tourism
 Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education
 Minister for Road Safety
 Minister for Science and Information Economy
 Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology
 Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
 Administered Items for Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
 South Australia Police (part)
 Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)
 Minister for Water Security
 Minister for the River Murray
 Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
 Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development) (20:47): On behalf of the Deputy Premier, I move:

That Estimates Committee A be appointed consisting of Ms Ciccarello, the Hon. I.F. Evans, Mr Hamilton-Smith, Mr Kenyon, the Hon. S. W. Key, Mr Pederick and Ms Thompson.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development) (20:48): On behalf of the Deputy Premier, I move:

That Estimates Committee B be appointed consisting of Mr Goldsworthy, Dr McFetridge, Mr Piccolo, Mr Rau, the Hon. L. Stevens, Mr Venning and the Hon. P.L. White.

Motion carried.

At 20:48 the house adjourned until Thursday 18 June 2009 at 10:30.