

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 27 May 2010

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

RECONCILIATION WEEK

The SPEAKER (10:32): Honourable members, South Australians will be encouraged to 'be the change' as thoughts turn to reconciliation this week. Reconciliation Week starts today, and the theme of this week's Reconciliation Week is 'Be the change; I am the change.' Yesterday the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs said that it is important for leaders to be courageous in order to create change within their communities.

We all need to take responsibility as individuals if we are going to work seriously towards changing the disadvantage experienced by many Aboriginal people. Therefore, honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

CIVIL LIABILITY (CHARITABLE DONATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:33): Obtained leave and introduced an act to amend the Civil Liability Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will not hold the house long on this matter as it is the first day of private members' business and there are seven or eight items that need to be dealt with within the hour, so in fairness to other members I will not go into elaborate detail on this bill. For members who were here in the previous parliament I will not need to, because this bill seeks to introduce the same principles to donations of services and goods as the government introduced when it did the reform of law in relation to food donations.

With the support of the Liberal Party the government successfully moved legislation so that donors of food were exempt from liability, given certain conditions. The theory was that that would increase food donations. The conditions, essentially, were that the donations were made without expectation of payment or other consideration, were for a charitable or benevolent purposes, and with the intention that the consumer of the goods or services would not have to pay for them. They were exempt from liability on the basis that the person making the donation was not reckless about the donation. That was the broad principle of that legislation moved by the then attorney and supported strongly by this side of the house.

This side of the house during the debate moved amendments to extend that principle to donations of all goods and services. We argued: why should donations of food attract that reduction in liability; why shouldn't all donors of goods or services be encouraged to make increased donations of goods and services on the same basis—the basis that they are not reckless, it is done without expectation of payment or other consideration for a charitable benevolent purpose, and the intention that the consumer of the goods or services would not have to pay for them?

The government decided at that time in the debate that it would not support them but would put out a paper, seek public submissions and then make a decision. The government honoured that promise. It put out a discussion paper and received just six submissions. It only invited 30 organisations to make contributions to that discussion paper.

This bill again puts before the house amendments to the Civil Liability Act about charitable donations. It gives the government time to work through this issue. The opposition consulted with the Law Society, which agrees with the opposition on this matter.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: As about so much else.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Speaker, the ghost of defamation past is here. I have been walking around Adelaide noticing all the defamation lawyers looking so glum these days that there has been a change in attorney-general because they have all had to cut their budgets. It is good to have the former attorney here, and we welcome his interjection. The Law Society wrote to the opposition saying:

As a matter of policy, we support the notion of a reduction of legal liability of donors and distributors towards the recipients of donated goods. We suggest that the same structure and principles currently applying to the donations of food be used to the extent that this can be achieved.

So the Law Society agreed to the same principle. There are no politics in this for the opposition. This is a principle belief. We think that the government did the right thing on the food donations law and we see no reason why that principle should not be extended to other donors of goods and services. I will touch on one issue, because I know there are seven other topics members want to get up today in the hour.

In the response from the government, there was an argument that charities will have goods dumped on them as a result of the opposition's concept. That is a nonsense. The charities already have goods dumped on them regardless of the liability of the law. What this can do, we think, is give the charities stronger opportunity to reject goods because, in terms of electrical goods, for instance, they can say, 'Unless they've been checked we're not taking them.' We do not believe that it will impact some of the government agencies—and let us remember that, of the six responses, two of them were government agencies; so, of the community organisations out there, only four responded. We do not accept that argument from the government agencies at all.

The Liberal Party believes in volunteering. We strongly support the concept. We think that, by reducing the liability with the appropriate safeguards as per the government's proposal with the food legislation—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Why do you pay people to stand at polling booths instead of having volunteers?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: And the Labor Party has never paid people to stand at polling booths? Unions never pay them? No, right!

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: If we haven't got volunteers, we just go without them.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You had people handing out how-to-vote cards representing other parties.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The reality is, Madam Speaker, that we support the principle of this bill. We have a new Attorney-General and we have asked for a new set of eyes to look at this matter. I will say this to the government: if it thinks there is a way to improve the bill but still adopt the principle, then the opposition is open to working through those amendments to deliver an amended bill if that is what is required, but I do not think we should be turning our back on what is a piece of sensible legislation that will deliver more charitable donations and be an improvement to the volunteer and charitable sector generally. With those few words, I look forward to the debate on the legislation, eventually.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (10:41): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Freedom of Information Act 1991. Read a first time.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (10:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is introduced in part fulfilment of the promise made by the Liberal Party prior to the last state election that it would move to expand the transparency of the government. A number of proposals were presented at the election. In addition to the important scrutiny that we proposed via the establishment of an independent commission against corruption, significant legislative reform was also proposed not only under the Whistleblowers Act but also under the Freedom of Information Act.

The people of South Australia have access to information held by government pursuant to the principal act, namely, the Freedom of Information Act 1991, which essentially provides a legally enforceable right by members of the public to have access to documents held by government, restricted by the public interest exception and a preservation of personal privacy. A schedule in the principal act provides for exempt documents to include cabinet, Executive Council and intergovernmental documents and those affecting law enforcement and public safety.

That is the general principle. Except in identified exceptions in the act, the public should have access to the records of government; after all, that is what they are there for: to serve the people of South Australia. The premise of this whole legislation is to ensure that the public has access. The flow of information from government during the current government administration under Premier Rann has been utterly appalling. Freedom of information applications have increased over that time across the board, whether they be members of parliament, other agencies or the ordinary member of the public who wants to have access to such information, but the level of information released has not.

In fact, in the last financial year, 10 per cent of applications made to the state government were refused, and this is up from 6 per cent back in 2000-01. The trend has continued to increase in terms of the government's refusal to be open and transparent and to provide information. For freedom of information to work properly, interference cannot be permitted, and the Liberal opposition has been committed to ensuring that this flow of communication and information transfer is restored.

We are not alone in the importance of this. In the 2008-09 annual report the South Australian Ombudsman, Richard Bingham, referred to the over-application of the cabinet exemption rule for FOI applications. When this matter was raised publicly and concern was expressed by citizens and leaders in the community, by 12 August 2009 the Premier had announced that cabinet documents as recent as 1999 'will soon be available for release', and that as and from 1 October that year cabinet submissions and documents may be disclosed after just 10 years. He boasted, as he usually does, that he was not aware of any other jurisdiction in the world that made them available sooner and that his announcement in this regard was in some way to appease us all that he would be providing something revelatory, open and transparent to the citizens of the state. All it was really trying to do was to expose the decisions of previous administrations under the guise of his pretending to be open and transparent.

The curious thing is that, almost contemporaneously with that announcement, a member of his government (minister Gago) announced regulations issued by her that PIRSA and the Department of Planning and Local Government would be exempt agencies in respect of all documents relating to the Burnside council inquiry—even retrospectively. Within weeks we also witnessed the announcement of the SA Water and United Water litigation, claiming a breach of contract since 1995, with public threats to expose Brown-Olsen government cabinet documents. While the Premier is pretending that he cares about this issue, his own ministers are acting in a manner which continues to suffocate the flow of information.

I will say that, to its credit, the Rudd federal government made an announcement during the election campaign prior to coming to office that it needed to reform the Freedom of Information Act 1992 at the commonwealth level, promoting a pro-disclosure culture and more openness in government. There was some small legislative reform in late 2008 and, ultimately, the Freedom of Information Amendment Bill last year passed through both houses of parliament to follow up on that promise. Some would say that it was a superficial change in the sense that it did not go far enough, but at least the Rudd government was prepared to conduct an inquiry and investigation into this matter and say, 'Yes, it is inadequate and we in government will remedy it'—and it introduced those legislative reforms last year. I give the Rudd government credit for that and I urge the South Australian government to follow suit.

A number of reforms were proposed in respect of that federal legislation, but I will say in more detail at another time that those reforms will need to be replicated here. One idea was to have a national commissioner to deal with this so that, fundamentally, we protect the hapless (if I can say) freedom of information officers that sit in departments smothered with applications. They are expected to locate the documents and information under the Freedom of Information Act. They have a hugely oppressive list of guidelines, which is administered through the government, as to disclosure of information. So much material is delayed in being issued to the applicant because it must go through the minister's office to be checked.

I do not doubt that, in order to ensure we protect privacy and the documents which are listed in the legislation as requiring protection, these issues have to be checked, but in my experience this government has increased the delay and increased the denial. Even when they are told by the Ombudsman that the applicant is right, as they were in the case of the application for documents and correspondence between the Chapley Group of companies and the government over the proposed preferential land deal in the sell-off of Glenside Hospital, and they are told by the Ombudsman, 'She is entitled to look at those documents. I will issue a determination that they are

documents within the act which should be available,' what does the government do? The government, of course, rushes off to District Court to challenge the Ombudsman's decision. It is legally entitled to do so, but, as usual, consistent with the incredible—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Just like the Olsen Government.

Ms CHAPMAN: Different aspect altogether; that was a clarification.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That was a clarification.

Ms CHAPMAN: Of definition of the act. You had better read it. No wonder you are the former attorney-general. In any event, they rush off to the District Court to try to protect these documents. We are told that, at this very moment, the government is ready to sign the contracts with a nominated Chapley company to press ahead with the sale of that land, even though, as we speak, we are still waiting for a judgment of the District Court. That is the level to which the government will go to keep documents secret.

One of the very able arms of the community which is skilled at ensuring secrets are made public is the media. The basis of this bill is to give legislative provision for professional journalists to have access to information and, effectively, exemption from the fee to provide the documents under an application for freedom of information for up to five hours. We as members of parliament, of course, have the privilege of being exempt from the fee obligation, because we are elected members who act on behalf of our constituents and it is important that we have access.

So, too, are members of the media. At present, they are able to apply, but it is financially onerous, and therefore we consider that, with the cap of five hours, it is reasonable for them to have access. After all, they are also responsible for keeping the public informed. Under the terms of the balance of the legislation, they will still remain completely restricted from having access to documents which currently have cabinet protection, privacy provisions and the like, as are other applicants. All this bill will do is give their application an embargo against any account being issued for the first five hours for the provision of material pursuant to an application under the Freedom of Information Act. At the time of the election, the opposition made a commitment to move this amendment to the act. I urge other members of the parliament, including members of the government, who I am sure from time to time have had the frustration of the rejection of a freedom of information application, to support this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILD PORNOGRAPHY) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:54): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will not take long on this bill, because I reintroduced the same bill late in the last parliament and it was never resolved by the parliament. I hope the government will support this matter and support it quickly. The purpose of this bill is to deal with the gap in the law, which was brought to my attention by a serving police officer, in relation to child pornography.

Section 63B of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act has a clause that deals with 'procuring a child to commit an indecent act'. A child, in this particular provision, is defined as a person apparently under or under the age of 16 years, so, we are talking about 15 year olds or younger in relation to child pornography. The offence currently standing in the act under section 63B(3) deals with this issue. It provides:

- (3) A person who—
 - (a) procures a child—

That is, someone younger than 16—

- or makes a communication with the intention of procuring a child to engage in, or submit to, a sexual activity; or

- (b) makes a commitment for a prurient purpose and with the intention of making a child amenable to a sexual activity,

is guilty of an offence.

So, they are guilty of an offence, according to the current act, if the child is under 16. They are guilty of an offence only if the child is under 16. The age of consent is 17, so the gap in the law, brought to my attention by a serving police officer, is that, if you are seeking to procure a child who is 16, the offence does not kick in because 'child' is defined as a person under the age or apparently under the age of 16. What happens to the person who tries to procure someone who is 16½ to commit an indecent act? The age of consent is 17, the child is under 16; therefore, the offence does not stand. I hope the government will look at this bill quickly. It was unfortunate that the government did not take the time to look at the bill when I introduced back in November last year—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes. You should have at least looked at it and dealt with the issue. It is an important issue, member for Croydon. I wrote to the Law Society, who said that they are in support of attempts to legislate to prohibit adults from procuring young persons under the age of consent to commit an indecent act. That is the issue that this bill deals with. There is a defence, in the bill, which is a replication of the defence available under the current section 49(4) of the act. I will not hold the house long. The bill stands on its merits. I am hoping that the government will support the bill and fix that loophole.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE) BILL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (10:58): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Public Sector Act 2009 and the Whistleblowers Protection Act 1993. Read a first time.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (10:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Whistleblowers Protection Act 1993, in particular section 5, outlines immunity for appropriate disclosure of public interest information. A disclosure is made to an appropriate authority pursuant to the provisions of that act if it is made to a minister of the Crown or a number of other government agencies and officials. This legislation is consistent with balancing the need for protecting the business of government in its necessary work and, in particular, the need to ensure that employees in the Public Service, in their contractual arrangements, clearly understand and recognise the importance of the confidentiality of information that comes before them in their work.

We all know that from time to time it is important that events or information coming before a member of the Public Service be reported and, essentially, this legislation ensures that public servants know to whom that information can be reported and also that they are protected against prosecution or civil action that may arise as a result of their speaking out. That is particularly pertinent in the case of this government, where there have been many examples of this.

I will refer today to one of those examples, which I experienced when I was shadow minister for health. There was blanket suppression, a crushing of the right of anyone who happened to be employed by the Department of Health to have any say or make any statement contrary to the government's policy regarding its intention to bulldoze the Royal Adelaide Hospital and rebuild it down the other end of North Terrace. Employees were vilified by the minister, memorandums were issued, and threats were made regarding their future employment as a result of their speaking out as ordinary members of the community and daring to criticise the government.

The opposition believes that this umbrella of suppression over the ordinary people of South Australia, including public servants, needs to be remedied. The amendments in this bill ensure a public interest disclosure provision enabling greater opportunity to make a statement in circumstances where it is in the public interest and the disclosure reported.

These amendments provide a number of areas of extra protection. One protects disclosures made to the media where matters have already been disclosed internally or externally. That is, for example, where the public servant has gone to the minister or their boss within the department but that party has not acted within a reasonable time, having regard to the nature of the matter, and the matter threatens immediate serious harm to public health and safety. This is entirely consistent with recommendations put at the federal level in its review, and the Liberal Party considers it is absolutely imperative that this be included.

The annual report provided by each sector must include a description of the agency's public interest and disclosure and investigation system, and contain information about disclosure of

public interest information to the responsible officers, as well as the outcome of those investigations, as part of the mechanism to ensure that this is implemented. Of course, there are definitions of public interest information, with the insertion of the act of victimisation, to ensure there is immunity for appropriate disclosures under this provision.

The role of the Ombudsman is amended to provide for a practice or procedure relating to the handling of an investigation of a disclosure of public interest information, also providing that an act or omission in a response to the disclosure of public interest information is an administrative act. This enables us to utilise the Ombudsman's protection in terms of the supervision involved in ensuring this occurs.

There are in the principal act many other areas that we consider need some reform, but this is consistent with what has occurred federally. We consider that there is a high level of need in this state for this provision, and this bill will go some way to ensuring that we have that balance, in light of the conduct of the government to date on these matters. I urge members to support this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (BOUNDARY REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:06): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:07): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As members would appreciate, I have tried before to get significant reform in terms of metropolitan councils, and I will keep on advancing the reform agenda. I point out to members, who might want to follow up with their own research, that in New Zealand, where I think the Premier is good friends with several of the leading members of the Labor Party, they have had a significant reform process, and that reform process is continuing; they are currently reforming the Auckland City Council.

What is significant, and this is where members need to pay particular regard in terms of their research, is that people often say, 'Oh, you'll take the local out of local government,' which is a catchcry you often hear. What they have done in New Zealand, and I think it is a good model, is that, whilst they are making the councils larger overall, streamlining them and so on, they have created and have kept within them local advisory bodies, which ensure that there is a local component. I agree with the catchcry 'Keep them local', and you can do that, but you can still reform the overall structure.

This bill seeks to create a metropolitan council boundaries reform commission, headed by a former judge of the Supreme Court. That judge, through the boundaries reform commission, would report back to parliament no later than 30 June 2011—so, over a year away. The commission would look at and report on the appropriate number and configuration of metropolitan councils, taking into account the size and area of metropolitan Adelaide, the desirability of the efficient administration of councils, and other matters that the commissioner considers relevant.

When the commission reports to parliament, it would set out the findings of the commission's inquiry and it would make recommendations as the commission thinks fit as to the appropriate number and configuration of metropolitan councils. The boundaries commission in my proposal would have the power of a royal commissioner and, as a process, would have the power of a royal commission.

Once the report had been presented to parliament, the minister responsible would respond by 31 December 2011, making recommendations, if any, relating to what the commission has proposed, whether they are agreed to, whether they should be carried, and so on. It is quite a lengthy process, but it needs to be a thorough one because you obviously need to allow all interested parties to make a submission. People often say, 'Why do we need to change in the metropolitan area?' We have 19 councils from Gawler to Noarlunga. Business SA has argued for, I think, three or four; others have argued for different numbers. The Motor Trade Association has also argued for—

Mr Pengilly: How many do you want, Bob?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The member for Finnis asks what number I want. If I knew the number I would not be proposing an inquiry into the number. It is the role of the commission to look

at what is the desirable number. Others have suggested different numbers. The Motor Trade Association, as I indicated, is unhappy with the current arrangement, as is Business SA.

I will have a look at a couple of factors that need to be considered. There is the potential to save millions of dollars in metropolitan Adelaide with restructuring and reorganisation. The salaries of Adelaide metropolitan councils' CEOs—and I am not picking on them, I am just using this as part of the case—exceed \$4 million. The salary of the CEO of Brisbane, which has one council and a similar population, the latest figure we can get is \$410,000 a year. The CEO of the city of Adelaide's salary is almost that. If you could not save some money there, there would be something wrong.

Going beyond that, and more importantly, there are 19 council chambers, 19 works depots, 19 different approaches to things in the metropolitan area. The cost of that is enormous. As I say, I am not advocating one council, but if you use Brisbane as a guide, the Brisbane City Council has almost exactly the same number of employees as we have in all 19 councils in Adelaide (about 8,000), and its budget, which is more than double that of the metropolitan councils of Adelaide, is \$2 billion—bigger than Tasmania.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: There are one million people in Brisbane; in the area that the council administers there are about one million people, and its budget is \$2 billion (more than Tasmania), while the budget for the combined councils in Adelaide is just over \$1 billion. The elected members in metropolitan Adelaide, the volunteers, mayors and others, number approximately 300. In Brisbane they have just over 20 paid members, but the cost there is less.

As I say, I am not arguing for the Brisbane model, I am just pointing out that that council, with the same number of staff, runs not only the council functions that we have in Adelaide now, but they run the water and sewerage and public transport as well. So, if you could not save millions of dollars here through the cooperation and greater linkage of councils to a reduced number, then I would be absolutely amazed. We do not even have a joint waste collection in Adelaide—some councils work together—we do not even have joint tendering. The potential for savings is enormous.

I want to be brief to enable others to have some time this morning, but I would urge members to have a look at this. I have been in local government—not for a long time—and I have great respect for what happens in local government, but it is time to have a look at whether we have the most efficient and effective arrangement in the metropolitan area. I would be interested to hear what the member for Mount Gambier has to say, I think Grant and Mount Gambier might be a case that could be looked at, but apart from that I think that rural councils are a different scenario to what currently exists in the metropolitan area.

I urge members to have a look at this proposal objectively, put aside any prejudices they may have about some of the catchcries that are trotted out, and let us have a look and see if we can come up with a model, with input from councils and everyone else in the community, which serves the people of Adelaide effectively and efficiently but still retains the local character, which is what has happened in New Zealand. I would urge the Premier and others to travel to New Zealand to have a look at what has happened there and see the sort of model that I am talking about.

I commend this bill to the house and urge members to have an objective look at what I am proposing.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

ELECTORAL (VOTING AGE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:15): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985; and to make related amendments to the Juries Act 1927 and the Local Government (Elections) Act 1999. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:15): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This is a reintroduction of a bill I put forward last session, which would enable 16 and 17 year olds, if they wish, purely on a voluntary basis, to vote in state and council elections. Members may have noticed that, in the recent UK election, it was put forward as part of the platform to allow people of that age group to vote, and it should happen here.

As I have said before, we have led the world in terms of voting reforms relating to women, in part, but also in other aspects—the secret ballot, and so on. A good example is Jessica Watson, who sailed solo around part of the world—which is a great achievement—but, ironically, she was not considered capable of voting in a state or council election, or a federal election, for that matter, because she was 16. She just turned 17 last weekend. She is not regarded as capable or mature enough to exercise a vote. That is an absolute nonsense. People who want to vote—and, as I said, it would be optional—should be able to cast a vote.

The major parties allow people of that age to join now, so are they really saying that people of that age are not capable of making a considered judgment about joining a political party? If they can make a considered judgment about joining a political party, they can certainly cast a vote.

Without going into great detail, at the moment, we allow people over the age of 18 to vote, many of whom do not know what they are voting for, yet we deny a vote to young people who are quite capable and who want to vote. It is bizarre. We allow people who are on the verge of senility to vote, but we do not allow young people with an active mind, who take in all the issues relating to politics, to have a say.

Let's get fair dinkum about young people. Let's stop all the claptrap about how we value them. We will only value them when we give them some say and, currently, they do not have a real say in the running of their councils or in the running of the state. So, I urge members to support this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION BILL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (11:19): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish an independent commission against corruption; to define its functions and powers; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (11:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I move the second reading of this bill with great pleasure, having previously introduced a bill in very similar form in 2009. Indeed, recently the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place indicated that there have been numerous attempts to introduce into this state an independent commission against corruption, beginning with the Hon. Ian Gilfillan in 1988 and since then in 1990, 1998, 2005 and 2007. I moved a bill in here in 2008, Robert Brokenshire moved a bill in 2009, and here I am back moving a bill in 2010.

Members may have noticed also that, in terms of my own portfolio assignments as the leader, I have kept the position of shadow minister for the arts and shadow minister for multicultural affairs, but I have also specifically kept myself as the shadow minister for an independent commission against corruption, so important do I see this issue in this state.

We are one of the few states now that does not have or is not close to having an independent commission against corruption. New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia have had them for some years. In fact, I think in New South Wales it is now over 20 years since the introduction of that legislation. Most recently, in the run-up to the Tasmanian election—and Will Hodgman was ahead in the polls as the leader of the opposition down there—it was one of the clear differences between the two sides. At that point, in order to negative the differences, one of the things the government then did was to say that it would introduce an independent commission against corruption there, which leaves only South Australia and Victoria without an independent commission.

We believe that indeed it is necessary. In fact, I attended the first conference on anticorruption which was held in Australia some years ago—the year before I introduced the bill—and I was looking at the various ways they operated in the various states. When I attended, the conference was opened by the then Labor premier of New South Wales, Morris Iemma. In his opening to that conference he said, 'Any state that thinks they don't need one is crazy.'

This bill, like the previous bill I introduced, is based on the New South Wales model. That model basically looks at doing three things. First and most obviously, of course, the intention is that the independent commission against corruption (ICAC) is aimed at giving the opportunity for the investigation of complaints about corruption, not the prosecution of those; that is done by the DPP, but it gives people somewhere to go. If they believe that something corrupt is happening in local

government or in a state government department or agency, they have somewhere to go, somewhere to take that complaint that is independent of government, and there are various safeguards to make sure that it can maintain its independence. They can take their complaint there and it can be investigated.

That is the first and foremost thing that it does but, as I said, it does not include prosecution, as that goes off to the relevant prosecution authority. I am sure everyone have come across stories in this state and elsewhere of corruption, be it at local government or departmental level. We know that it occurs and, when you look at the history of the other states, it is clear that it does occur everywhere.

The second important thing for this ICAC to do is to actually look at the systems that apply. Nearly everyone in here will have at some stage served on some sort of sporting club committee or something like that, and in previous years, of course, the safeguard for the management of the financial side, particularly, of any of those clubs was simply that we had countersigning of cheques. So normally, if you were on the committee of a sports club, two people would have to sign the cheque. You might appoint three people and say that any two of the three could sign, but there was the safeguard that two people were keeping an eye on it, and it made it harder for one person to nick off with the funds.

That was all very well then, but of course the systems are so much more sophisticated now. Particularly when you are dealing with large government departments—large agencies that have multi-million-dollar budgets—we need people who are specialists in going into those agencies and looking at the systems to discover where corrupt conduct can occur.

Going back 35 years ago, I remember in New South Wales a situation where someone who was in charge of the payroll for the whole state Public Service simply rounded everyone's pay up or down to the nearest five cents. They kept the money that they rounded off and took that off to another account—that was corrupt. Further, in a particular department which I will not name, they had a system of clocking in and clocking out. The rule in that particular department was first in clocks everyone in; last to leave clocks everyone out—that was corrupt.

There are numerous examples. Part of the function is to have trained people who can go in and look at the financial systems in particular. I may have told this house before, but until recently I had spent 28 years on the Stirling Hospital Board. That hospital board employed as its financial officer a well credentialed and highly reputable—according to the references given—financial person. Within a week of starting, he began diddling us through the computer system and through the way the accounting was done, because it was all done electronically. We did not catch him until he had done this community hospital out of \$470,000 of the money that our community had generated through its hospital to plough back into health services. That guy spent two well-deserved years in gaol for taking that sort of money. The problem is that we do not have in place sufficient capacity at the moment to go and look at the systems.

The third thing that an independent commission against corruption will do is educate. It will educate the public at large about what corruption is and educate particularly the people in the Public Service, local government, state government and government agencies about what constitutes corruption, because many people do not recognise it even when it slaps them in the face. To give you a famous and most recent example, Gordon Nuttall, the minister up in Queensland, took \$10,000 a month and did not think it was corrupt because, after all, he was only using it to buy houses for his kids. What could possibly be wrong with that?

An honourable member: They were good kids!

Mrs REDMOND: They were very reasonable children, no doubt. I wish to make the point, therefore, that this is not just about investigation of corruption: it is about those aspects of educating the public and the people dealing with these issues. The major issues are education, investigation and looking at systems, because we know that, just like anything else, opportunity and desire reach a certain tipping point and, if you lessen the opportunity, then the desire has to be that much greater before someone will actually engage in a corrupt practice. Those three issues are the essential components of this bill which, as I said, we have based on the New South Wales model.

We based it on that model knowing that, when we actually introduced the original legislation, the cost in New South Wales was \$15 million per annum. Now we, I thought quite generously at the time, said that is the budget figure we will apply to it, even though we have less than a quarter of the population of New South Wales. To prevent the government criticising our

costing on it, we adopted the costing they had for New South Wales: it could not possibly be too little.

We said \$15 million, and for some reason this government decided they would double that, so every time they referred to it as wasting \$30 million: (a) it is not a waste; (b) it was not \$30 million. We have now increased our costing to \$17 million, or \$17.1 million I think it is, which is the amount that the New South Wales government now applies towards its Independent Commission Against Corruption.

One of the most regular criticisms of this proposal is that it can be used as an unfair weapon. In times gone by, and people particularly might remember that the then premier of New South Wales who introduced the commission, eventually fell victim to it and—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: He was exonerated.

Mrs REDMOND: Exactly, and that is one of the things that we have covered, because I was aware that it was to some extent a valid criticism of having an ICAC. If you allow people to say, 'I reported this person to ICAC', then mud sticks to some extent. An allegation like that can have an extremely deleterious effect, whether it be on a politician or on someone else. Being able to say you have made that allegation is not fair.

What we have done is try to put some things into this bill to stop that from happening. In particular, I spoke to one of the former commissioners in New South Wales at another conference I attended, at which a particular commissioner spoke about their commission in New South Wales, and I also met another commissioner. What they used to do was, first of all they said they would tell the people who came in to make a complaint and make it very clear to them in person: 'If you go out and publicise the fact that you have made this complaint, expect us to make you just as much a target of our investigation as the person you are complaining about, or the organisation you are complaining about.'

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It didn't help Nick Greiner, though.

Mrs REDMOND: The minister across the way says it did not help Nick Greiner. It did not, and that is why we have built in protections, and indeed we are prepared to even accept amendments from the other side, who to this day have been the only ones opposing all of these various things. Let me remind the house, it is the eighth attempt to introduce an independent commission against corruption, and it is really, I think, fundamental.

Now the government's excuse has been—apart from saying 'Oh well, we don't have corruption in this state,' which quite frankly is a nonsense, and apart from saying 'Well, it's too expensive,' which again is a nonsense when you have got a government that has wasted the amount of money that this government wastes on an almost daily basis—that they are going to have a federal one. Senator Bob Brown has actually proposed a federal one.

I will just quote from what the Hon. Stephen Wade said in the other place, because, of course, we now have a new Attorney-General in this state. The previous attorney-general was favouring a federal independent commission against corruption, but he did not even put it on the *Notice Paper*. However, when the new Attorney-General was going to do something about it—he was supporting the government's position of only having a federal one—he said in a ministerial statement:

Prior to the recent state election, the government promised to push ahead with the Premier's plan to pursue the establishment of a national anti-corruption body. I am today travelling to Melbourne to a meeting of the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General to argue the case for a national approach.

Well, obviously he argued his approach so strongly that, to quote the Hon. Stephen Wade in the other place:

The Attorney-General has argued the case so strongly that the communiqué issued after the meeting did not even mention the issue.

In any event, Senator Bob Brown has now introduced a national anti-corruption proposal in the federal parliament, but the fact is that that will take care of federal departments. What we are proposing is a bill for this state to take care of the potential corruption in our state government departments, our state government agencies and local councils. With no offence to any of the members who have served on local councils, or served for local councils, the fact is that the vast majority of the complaints that come in actually relate to that. There is a huge potential there,

because it can fly under the radar very easily, and when you read the reports of the other states you can see that that is where the problem comes from.

The intention of the federal ICAC is simply to run alongside, and that is what Bob Brown said in his speech about having a national anti-corruption body, that it is for the federal parliament to run in concert with the various state bodies all around the place, so that, indeed, we do not have the problem that we have federal agencies that are subject to anti-corruption; we need to have it at every level of government to ensure that the people of this state, like all the other states that already have this, have confidence that the decisions made in this place are the right decisions, that the decisions made by the departments and agencies of this place are made in a proper, transparent, accountable and non-corrupt manner. People need to understand what that means. They need to have an independent place to go to make those decisions and they need to be confident in the correctness and the transparency of government in this state. With those few words I will conclude my remarks.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

NATIONAL HEALTH REFORM

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:35): Madam Deputy Speaker, before I commence my speech, I just want to take a second to remind the house of the absence of the Government Whip. I think we all know why that is. I wish her, on behalf of myself and my party, all the best; we are thinking of both of them. We do hope for a miracle and we want them to know that the house sends its respects and is mindful of what is happening there. We wish them both the best. I move:

That this House notes the federal government's National Health Reform Plan for all Australia, and, in particular, is concerned—

- (a) at the deal South Australia has signed;
- (b) that no direct contribution to the cost of the proposed Royal Adelaide Hospital has been offered;
- (c) that the Country Health Plan will be even further centralised with the neutralisation of HACs, which took over for the now abolished local hospitals boards; and
- (d) that the title deeds of country hospitals will not be held in the community that in most cases built and supports them.

At a COAG meeting on 20 April 2010, all states except Western Australia agreed to the federal government's national health reform plan. This plan proposes structural reform as to who manages the health system and how it is funded, with the federal government to retain one-third of the GST in order to directly fund 60 per cent of the building equipment and services in the 762 public hospitals across the country.

I have to say that, initially, I was in favour of this because I get dearly frustrated about what is happening in health in South Australia, particularly our inability to upgrade facilities, and I had some support for this concept because if the state government could not cope we would give it to the feds, but I am now very hesitant to support it. The federal government will take primary control away from the states in areas of primary care and aged care.

Premier Rann agreed to the commonwealth proposal to hand over control of South Australia's public health system based on a phone call from Prime Minister Kevin Rudd—just one phone call. Other premiers negotiated and managed to net their states a portion of the extra \$5 billion over the next four years that the Prime Minister pledged in a bid to get all states and territories to agree to his proposal. In other words, they leveraged their position in order to get a better slice of the cake. When you go to do a deal when you buy a car or property, you never just say yes, yes, yes; you always back off, consider and leverage for a better deal—you never race in. That is good business, and I do not know why we did not do that in this case. Why should we be the first cab off the rank?

Western Australia has still refused to sign and if they do not by 1 July the whole plan will be scrapped. On his return from Canberra on 21 April the Premier said,

We came to Canberra with one aim: to secure more money for an improved health system.

Well, did South Australia really get more money? Did we get a better deal? I think not when you compare what we receive to that of other states. Canberra agreed to New South Wales Premier Kristina Keneally's request for \$686 million in federal funds to help New South Wales meet national reform targets for emergency and elective surgery waiting times. Premier Anna Bligh told *The Courier-Mail* that:

After hours of negotiations Queensland is now more than half a billion dollars better off in the next four years for our hospitals and our patients. It has been a day of goodwill and real effort to overcome disagreement.

Victorian Premier John Brumby held out and managed to have \$1.3 billion promised in extra funding over four years for the state's public health system. That works out to 332 more sub-acute beds for 5,000 patients annually to relieve the pressure on public hospitals in Victoria.

What did South Australia get? We got \$264 million for more long stay mental health beds, more senior medical staff, expansion of acute beds in emergency departments and elective surgery capital works. Once the plan starts in 2014-15, we will receive \$1.1 billion up to 2019-20.

Our Premier was prepared to accept whatever was put forward by the federal Labor government. At this stage it is not even clear if the Rann Labor government's rail yards Royal Adelaide Hospital proposal will be 60 per cent funded under this agreement. The Premier, in a ministerial statement on 12 May 2010, stated:

As a part of this new package, the state government will begin negotiating with the federal government to ensure it pays its fair share of the capital cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

This indicates that, at this stage, the Premier has not secured any funding commitment from the federal government for the proposed Royal Adelaide Hospital. Wouldn't he have wanted to secure some sort of commitment for this major project before signing on to the deal? What a great leverage position that would have been—an opportunity lost.

I have previously commented that I would support the federal government's health plan if the Barossa was able to get a new health facility as a result of the new funding arrangement. However, if the Premier has not yet obtained a commitment for the proposed rail yards hospital then I very much doubt—in fact, I am certain—that the Barossa will not get a new facility funded from this agreement either.

The Rann Labor government abolished local hospital boards in 2007 and more is the pity. It was a move we, on this side of the house, very strongly opposed—and we still do. It established Health Advisory Councils (commonly known as HACs) as part of its revised Country Health Care Plan. Its Strategy for Planning Country Health Services in SA was released in late 2008.

The Rann Labor government would like to reduce the number of HACs even further and introduce regional HACs to oversee the running of Country Health. One idea is for only one regional board overseeing the whole of Country Health—talk about centralised management! I cannot understand how the Rann Labor government thinks that regional communities can be adequately served and catered for by the health service when all of country South Australia is being managed by one board.

The Rann Labor government's ideas with regard to the management of the health system is largely at odds with what the federal government envisages in 'A National Health and Hospital Network for Australia's Future' policy document which aims to decentralise the management and improve local input. Page 1 of the overview states:

These structural reforms will mean that the commonwealth government changes the way hospitals are run, taking control from central bureaucracies and handing it to the local hospital networks.

I cannot believe this. I cannot believe I am actually reading this. We would fully support that but let's see what comes out in the wash. Let's see how the state government handles it and what the final outcome is.

I would like to make it clear from the outset that I am in no way in favour of another layer of bureaucracy being created in local health networks but I am in favour of keeping the management local because it is more efficient, local and community focused. Management of health service is best when it is kept local. Local communities know what services they need.

I served on a local hospital board for eight years. We made decisions that were for the community and were focused on local health issues. We were not there to support bureaucratic structures or to further the duplication of bureaucracy. We attracted a lot of support for our hospital via volunteer workers. We also attracted a lot of local financial support from bequests, wills, donations and all sorts of things. My own family had such wonderful support from the local hospital (for both my late mother and father) that our family gave a sizeable donation to the hospital. In fact, it fully equipped one emergency room. This is the sort of thing you can get when you have a local community that owns and supports its hospital.

I recently learnt that the Country Health SA board (the HAC) mentioned a new Crown Lands Act in one of its documents relating to vesting of titles or the ownership of assets in HACs. This worries me very much as it appears that what we, on this side of the house, feared from the start (when hospital boards were first abolished) is true: that the Rann Labor government slowly wanted to remove any links and control that local communities have over their hospitals so it can close facilities in the future.

This is separation by stealth: get hold of the deeds; take the ownership out of the local community. After all, most of these communities not only built the hospitals but paid for them to be built on land which they donated. Why shouldn't they keep those titles? They belong to them. It is not another cash cow for the government to cash in on later.

When you take away the management of a local country hospital, or anything else for that matter (and we have seen it with St John Ambulance and its demise in many of our country communities), it ensures that the local support will fall away. Is that what the government wants?

The Barossa's two hospitals at Angaston and Tanunda have in the past been well supported and backed by very proactive local health committees and hospital boards, and I was involved with one of them in a minor way. Now the Barossa HAC has taken over, which I do believe is one of the more active HACs, like Crystal Brook Hospital, where as I mentioned before I served on the board for eight years.

If you want to see a hospital that is so successful, a hospital that is really doing it for its community, a model of what you want to see a community hospital do, it is Crystal Brook. Go and have a look at that; it is a fantastic example of what we would all wish for our communities mainly because of excellent management particularly by Dr Richard Mackinnon and a very supportive staff and a very supportive town community. I hope this house will recognise these urgent desires of our communities and support this motion. These issues are more important than crass politics. I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:46): The member for Schubert's fears are unfounded, and I rise to oppose the motion. South Australia has obtained a significant deal under the recent agreement at the COAG meetings in Canberra. Our hospital system in its current form provides a high quality level of care that is well run by dedicated health professionals, but there is always room for improvements.

No government should ever believe that it should not keep striving for a better health system and for continuous improvements, but now is a time of significant change if it is to meet the sustained needs and be responsive for the future population that is growing and ageing in our country.

South Australia is expected to receive more than \$300 million in additional investments to the state from this agreement. These monies will provide additional investments in the areas of emergency departments, elective surgery, subacute care, mental health and aged care. This includes \$120 million for subacute beds, which will allow extra beds in the Repatriation Hospital and more long stay mental health beds; \$47 million to improve access to elective surgery to contribute to additional procedures announced in the recent election campaign; and \$36 million to provide more senior medical staff working after business hours in our hospitals, which will improve access to emergency departments.

A further \$29 million in financial assistance for long stay older patients will ensure that fewer older people are placed in acute nursing beds while waiting for nursing home placements. There will be \$21 million for aged care to expand multipurpose services, which will allow us to provide more country hospital places and upgrade country facilities to commonwealth standards; \$20 million for emergency department capital works to expand the number of acute beds to relieve pressure on our services; \$17 million in flexible funding for emergency departments, elective surgery and subacute beds; \$13 million for elective surgery capital works, to be used for additional operating theatre equipment and the refurbishment of the Modbury Hospital; and \$3 million to expand early psychosis prevention and intervention centre services.

In addition, the commonwealth will in future years fund 60 per cent of the efficient cost of public hospital services. This is a major achievement, given that in recent years the investment split between the commonwealth and state for public hospitals has been closer to 40:60. At present the state government pays about 62 per cent of hospital funding, while the federal government picks up about 38 per cent.

There used to be a 50:50 funding split between the states and the federal government at one point. However, under the former Howard government, the proportion of federal government input began to slide because it refused to keep up its payments to meet the real cost increases in the health sector.

When the new system of funding for hospitals begins in 2014, South Australia will receive the promised 60 per cent funding federally and 40 per cent state funding, which will mean our health system will get a guaranteed minimum of \$1.1 billion in extra money for the 20 years up to 2019-20. In relation to the member's concern about no direct contribution to the Royal Adelaide Hospital redevelopment, or no state or territory securing specific funding for individual capital funding projects in the COAG process, what our government did secure was an agreement from the commonwealth that they would fund 60 per cent of the capital expenditure on public hospital services. As part of this new package, the state government will be negotiating with the federal government to ensure that it pays a fair share of capital costs for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

As many South Australians know, the new \$1.7 billion Royal Adelaide Hospital is being delivered through a public-private partnership, so the state government will not begin to pay for the cost of the building until it takes control of it upon completion in 2016. The new arrangements for health funding come into place in 2014-15. The details of the approach to be used for establishing the capital investments for the commonwealth are still to be worked through, and the heads of Treasuries have been tasked to advise COAG on the mechanisms for meeting the commonwealth's commitment to capital spending.

In closing, with regard to the title deeds for country hospitals, they are currently held by the Health Advisory Council, and there is no proposal to change this agreement.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

CHELSEA CINEMA

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:52): I move:

That the house condemns the Minister for Volunteers for supporting the Treasurer's abandonment of the Chelsea Cinema.

It is with heavy heart that I make this submission to the parliament today for a number of reasons. The Chelsea Cinema is on the border of the state electorates of Bragg and Hartley, only a few hundred metres from where the member for Norwood lives, and is precious to our respective communities. It attracted extraordinary public response when the owner of the Chelsea Cinema, namely, the Burnside council, announced during 2009 its intention to offer the property for sale. A proposal had been put up—not terribly well canvassed in the community—that the property was no longer required for the benefit of the people within the Burnside council area and that it was really surplus to requirements. The council stated that it was not in the business of running a picture theatre and that it would be sold.

The petitions, signed by well over 1,000 local people, which I received and took to the Burnside council, begged it not specifically to reconsider the question of sale but to properly consult with the community to ensure that everybody had a say about this matter. I used my influence in this respect, along with other members of parliament, including the member for Hartley, who appeared in the community and at our public meetings to be passionate about the importance of retaining the Chelsea Cinema, a cinema with an extraordinary history. It has not only accommodated an historic picture theatre and been used for the screening of films but has been the venue for public meetings and important events of dozens of volunteer organisations within the eastern region.

There seemed to be a coming together of the community, with strong advocates and parliamentary representatives from this place, including the new members for Norwood and Morialta and the Liberal candidate for Hartley, Mr Joe Scalzi (a former member) requiring the Burnside council to fairly reconsider this position in light of the imminent notice of sale.

In December last year the Burnside Council resolved that it would proceed with the sale of the property. Various events have interrupted or delayed that process, and I would expect that we will be past November before the council ultimately makes a decision.

Two things were fundamental to what the public was saying, overlapping our ratepayers and constituents. One was the importance of the property remaining a public asset. That is, the community is saying that whether it is in a trust, whether it is held by the Burnside council or

whether it is a state or federal government entity, it must be retained as a public asset for public use, and public money is necessary to maintain it and public sponsorship is important.

The second matter was that the main auditorium of that facility should be preserved, that is, it should not be petitioned off into some smaller function rooms or other activity facilities. There was a further aspect which I think was important but which has become increasingly important as time has gone by, that is, the volunteer organisations that have lined up (and I am sure they have seen the member for Hartley, as they have members on this side) for the opportunity to have access, for nominal cost, to enjoy that venue. Bear in mind that the access to public houses in the eastern area, as is the access to open space, is precious, and we as representatives must bring this matter to the attention of the parliament.

Notwithstanding all that history and the apparent interest by the minister in the principles that underpin those aspects, on 17 June last year, almost contemporaneously with the conduct of the member, the issue was raised in this parliament. During the course of the debate in respect of another ill-conceived idea of the government, which is to relocate the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the question of the use of public funds by the state government to acquire the Chelsea Cinema and keep it in public hands was met with a retort from the Treasurer when he said, 'You just worry about spending \$2 million on a picture theatre. I mean, have you ever heard of a worse priority for public expenditure?' It is fair to say that the Treasurer in the time I have been here has not appeared to me to be someone who is as passionate about the arts, picture theatres or historic buildings as he may be about other things. Nevertheless, each has their own priorities, and he is entitled to his view.

What was extraordinary was not his statement but a subsequent statement recorded in *Hansard* by Ms Portolesi (but I will properly call her the member for Hartley and Minister for Volunteers) about the campaign to buy. She says. 'I don't think so. We support the Treasurer.' That is a stunning admission, by the now Minister for Volunteers, back in June 2009 when she appeared to be masquerading as a great supporter of the protection of the Chelsea Cinema as a public asset and for it to be kept open for a group in the community comprising thousands whom she now represents in the state parliament as the Minister for Volunteers. That is what is so stunning about that contribution.

I bring that matter to the attention of the house because, notwithstanding that statement which, in my view, is a condemnation of the minister, there is an opportunity for the minister to plea for mercy on this. I have written, as the member for Bragg, to her, as the Minister for Volunteers, and asked her whether, if she is serious about her position that she made public last year to keep the Chelsea Cinema in public hands, she will commit in cabinet to ensuring that there is a provision of funding for the acquisition of the Chelsea Cinema by the state to protect this historic asset.

She is in a privileged position now as a member of the cabinet and she can have a say. The real test is to ask for that support. Given that the Premier has a published and proud claim of his passionate commitment to the arts—so much so that he is prepared to sell off 42 per cent of the Glenside Hospital site for private housing and supermarkets, and to accommodate precious new headquarters for the South Australian Film Corporation and to provide for filming facilities in lieu of maintaining an asset base for future needs in mental health—and film in particular, it would be exposed as a complete facade if his government, with the support of the Minister for Volunteers, is not prepared to present that submission in cabinet and seek that.

If she is not successful, so be it; but, if she does not even ask for it, it will show the shallow and insincere presentation that has been made to the public and to her constituents and to my constituents and to neighbouring electorates. I have not received a response, so I am assuming that she has not yet had an opportunity to present that submission to the cabinet. I hope that I get a letter back saying, 'Not only have I applied but I have succeeded, and the Treasurer will be announcing this in the 2010 budget.' That may not be the answer, but, if she tries and fails, I will at least give her credit for trying. In the meantime, she stands condemned.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (12:02): Madam Deputy Speaker, I love the Chelsea Cinema. To me, it is one of those great—

Ms Chapman: Ever been there?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes I have; the *Rocky Horror Picture Show*—water pistols and rice.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I was watching, not participating. My guess is that you would probably make a better Frankenfurter than I would. No, I doubt that the government will be providing financial assistance. I mention my beloved theatres in Port Adelaide and in Semaphore. The Odeon is still operating—sort of half bric-a-brac and half cinema—and it is good. With respect to the old Odeon, or the old cinema that is now the Semaphore library (which was a great theatre I used to go to as a kid), I had to accept that cinema's closure. It was not something that we were able to sustain.

I was just saying to the member for Mount Gambier that the reality is that there would be many great theatres in all our communities which we as kids used to go to but which no longer exist, not to mention the dear old drive-ins. The dear old drive-ins had so much of a role in the development of our social interactions as young people. I am sure that we have all driven out of a drive-in with the speaker still stuck in the window.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, I just forgot.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Treasurer, please return to the subject of debate. We are not interested in what you did in the drive-in in 1963.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, we are not.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: When modern technology entered the drive-in sphere and you had to click the thing onto the aerial, that was really confronting because my car never had an aerial. When I did get a car with an aerial—well, we won't go there.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is just getting too racy for me. Let's talk about the Chelsea Cinema.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: There is great technological change in cinemas today. They are a whole different experience.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You can get the gold chairs and you can lay back in them. These cinemas are everywhere. The reality is that the Chelsea Cinema's future is an issue for the local community and the local council, not the state government. It would not be a good precedent for governments to say, 'We will support the retention of a cinema in its full glory.' I could only imagine how many members would be queuing up if the local Eudunda cinema closed; or there would be a cinema in Pinnaroo that no longer exists.

Ms Thompson: Lockleys.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Lockleys.

Ms Thompson: There are lots of historical features in our electorates.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes. These venues are throughout our city in various forms.

Mr Venning: One opening in Blyth.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: One opening in Blyth, fantastic. I can understand the passion. I should put on the public record that the member for Hartley has been passionate about the future of the Chelsea. In her brief time in cabinet there has barely been a meeting when the issue of the Chelsea has not been raised.

Ms Chapman: And you have said no every time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Here we go. He has been here five minutes and he is an expert on everything. The reality is that the matter of the passionate support for the Chelsea has been raised in cabinet on a number of occasions, and I have to confess that some of my responses have

been along the lines I have given to the house—not so much about the drive-ins because I do not trust cabinet solidarity to share all my stories about the drive-ins without their somehow finding their way into the public domain.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Okay, too much information from the women on the backbenches.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, there used to be a hole in the fence at the Taperoo drive-in. We would all chip for one of our mates to get in and then we would file in through the hole in the fence.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: So why did it go bust?

Mr Pederick: No-one was paying!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, there was that. The member for Hartley has been a very passionate advocate for the future of the Chelsea, but we have explained to the member for Hartley—and I am not sure she is totally convinced—that it is not a priority or a precedent that we as a government can set for the very points I have articulated.

Ms Chapman: What about \$43 million at Glenside? How's that a priority?

The Hon. G. Portolesi: We stand shoulder to shoulder. I don't think we should buy it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member doesn't think we should buy it.

The Hon. G. Portolesi: No.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's right.

The Hon. G. Portolesi: And neither do the Libs, because it wasn't part of their election policy.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Of course it wasn't. I do not think the shadow cabinet would be with the shadow minister for community services on this one because of the very point—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you want to chat afterwards, member for Norwood, you can, but at the moment the Treasurer is talking.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will conclude my remarks with that informative and constructive contribution to the wider public and social debate.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Come down to the Odeon; it is open on Semaphore Road.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, and with that lovely invitation let us move on. Have you finished Treasurer? You have, haven't you?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have the feeling I am finished, whether I like it or not.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think you have; I feel it within.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

SURGICAL ROBOT

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:10): I move:

That this house requests the state government to purchase the latest model robot (the da Vinci Si) for use at the Royal Adelaide Hospital so that a wider range of intricate surgical procedures, with minimal patient impact, can be undertaken.

I do not know whether members are aware or know much about the da Vinci Si robot. I had the pleasure of being subjected to it about five years ago when I was diagnosed with prostate cancer, so I have taken an interest in the da Vinci Si robot. However, we have now reached the point where that model, which was installed approximately six years ago, will soon need to be upgraded. Unfortunately, it cannot be adapted to take the latest modifications. The minister has indicated to me that, from his advisers, he believes the current robot has four years life left in it. The surgeons who use it indicate to me that there is much less life in it than that. Of course, if the machine is

replaced with a more modern model, it does not mean to say that the existing model could not be used for a range of surgeries. In fact, it is almost certainly being used right at this moment.

Members may recall that the reason we have the robot at the Royal Adelaide is as a result of the generosity of Gordon Pickard and, I think, one of the Cooper family and a few others. We are talking about a machine which sells for just under \$2 million—not cheap. It was a very generous gesture on the part of Gordon Pickard. People might say, 'Well, he benefited from it.' He did not actually. He experienced the da Vinci Si robot at Epworth Hospital in Melbourne and he was so impressed, and I think thankful—and this is on the public record—that his cancer had been removed in good time and he is healthy as a result, that he donated one to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. One of the fantastic things about that donation is that it is in a public hospital where it is available to people irrespective of their financial means. It is not for the exclusive benefit of people who are affluent. Any person who needs that machine can have access, on a medical needs basis, at the Royal Adelaide.

Just briefly, the way it operates (pardon the pun) is that the surgeon watches a big screen—the surgeon is not next to the robot; he is in the same room generally, but does not have to be, he could be on the other side of the world—and controls the robot and its arms. It makes a small incision in the person, depending on the operation, and then the arms of the robot go inside and do whatever is required. One of the surgeons, Dr Peter Sutherland, has performed in excess of 800 operations alone using that machine. Apart from the reduced trauma—because people can walk out of hospital within a day or two after having the surgery because of its minimal impact, even though it is major surgery—the savings to the health system are considerable. Peter Sutherland alone has performed over 800 operations using the robot, and Dr Wells and other surgeons have also carried out surgery with it.

It has been used primarily for prostatectomies (the removal of the prostate), and it has been very successful in that regard. The new model, the da Vinci Si, is capable of doing things that the current model cannot easily do. For example, the new model can perform intricate throat cancer surgery and it can remove cancers from within the head, as I say, by going down the throat. Currently, some of those surgical procedures require the jaw to be broken, but with the robot that is not necessary. Just imagine the savings in time and trauma.

Likewise, with the new model robot now on offer people can have, rather than a major operation, literally with their throat cut, the cancer removed without the necessity for a major external cut to their throat or anywhere else. It can do gynaecological work, which is great, and it can do sophisticated kidney cancer surgery and major bladder surgery without the sort of impact that normally occurs with that type of surgery.

One of the great things about the robot is that there is very little bleeding. When the robot is working, it is actually pumping carbon dioxide into the body so that there is normally no need for a blood transfusion. Once again, the saving is enormous and the trauma reduction is also fantastic. The ear, nose and throat surgeons at the Royal Adelaide are doing excellent work with the current machine, but the new machine, which I am keen for the government to purchase, would give them the ability to carry out that work more expeditiously and with less impact.

The cost, as indicated—we checked with the manufacturer, and I am not an agent for them—is \$1.7 million. Just going back on the history of it, Lea Stevens, who did a lot of good things as minister for health, supported the robot when it was purchased years ago. These things cost a lot of money to operate. You need a technician in case something goes wrong, but the arms and parts, and so on, for the robot are quite expensive. Ironically, Lea Stevens' adviser—and I will not say his surname—wrote the brief for cabinet, suggesting that it support the gift of Gordon Piccard; then, ironically, he was able to get the benefit of the robot down the track. He did not know at the time that he would be a beneficiary of the robot. It shows how fate can have its own reward.

The current machine is good. It still works, but the new model on offer will be able to do things a lot better. Not only will it be a cost saving but, more importantly in my opinion, there will be less trauma for people. The robot is fantastic, and it is the way of the future in terms of surgery; that is what the surgeons tell me—Professor Willis Marshall, who is head of surgery, and others—because there is no vibration or shaking. Most surgeons do not tend to shake (apart from that one on the television ad who is supposedly consuming drugs): they are normally pretty disciplined sort of people. With the robot, there is no vibration, no shaking and less nerve damage because the surgeon can see better, as the tissues and so on are magnified; so it is a plus-plus situation.

I know that money is always tight, but when the government is thinking of spending \$400 million plus on a football oval, I would urge it to consider budgeting now to get the latest robot. The current robot can be still used at the Royal Adelaide or put in one of the other metropolitan hospitals, as it can still do good work, but the current one cannot be updated and nor can its parts be easily replaced over the short-term future.

I commend the motion to the house. I have met with the Minister for Health, and obviously he is looking at the business case. He did not make any commitment to purchase the latest model, but I am putting it before him, the parliament and the community as a worthwhile addition to the machine that already exists at the Royal Adelaide.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:20): I rise to amend the motion. I move:

That the house notes the state government is considering purchasing the latest model robot (the Da Vinci Si) for use at the Royal Adelaide Hospital so that a wider range of intricate surgical procedures with minimal patient impact can be undertaken.

This motion deletes the original paragraph and replaces it with the paragraph above. The Royal Adelaide Hospital currently has the only Da Vinci robot in South Australia. It was purchased in 2004-05, as the member for Fisher has noted, and generously donated by the Pickard Foundation. The robot is used to address a number of urological, gynaecological, ear, nose and throat and cardiothoracic procedures, but it does not generate sufficient income to cover the cost of ongoing maintenance and eventual replacement.

Nearly 1,000 men with prostate cancer have been treated with the robot-assisted approach over the past five years, and all surgeons involved are required to submit outcome data on these procedures. The results compare very favourably with those achieved elsewhere in the world. Men now require only a 23-hour stay in hospital, and may be able to return to work within two weeks after the procedure.

While the robot does deliver good surgical results, it is very expensive to operate and maintain, and other surgical methods deliver good outcomes for patients at less expense. The Royal Adelaide Hospital has a maintenance contract for the existing robot until 2013 but it is not anticipated that a proposal to replace the robot will be considered until closer to this date. Any decision to invest in a new model will be considered on the merits at the time and in consideration of what other biomedical equipment is required as a priority from within the allocated budget.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:22): As I understand it the amended motion simply recognises that at an appropriate time the government will consider buying one, so I do not have a problem with the amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

PREVENTATIVE HEALTH MEASURES

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:23): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the growing cost of health treatment in South Australia and Australia; and
- (b) urges the state and federal governments to put more effort and resources into preventative health measures.

I am not suggesting by this motion that the state and federal government are not putting an effort into preventative health; that would be wrong. I have recently met with the state minister, the Hon. John Hill, and he is very aware of preventative health measures and of the cost of treating people, and the savings in terms of human suffering as well as in monetary terms if we can achieve a better outcome through preventative health measures.

I have written to the federal minister, Nicola Roxon, commending her for establishing the Preventative Health Agency; however, whilst there is a lot of focus and debate on medical treatments, hospital costs and so on, I think it is important that not just the government but the community—and all the components thereof—really get stuck into the preventative health side of things. As I have said in this place before, if we do not get a handle on the health and hospital costs, we will be spending every tax dollar in that area in the future. We are sitting on a time bomb in terms of what can and is likely to happen to us if we do not deal with the issues by way of preventative health.

Recently, the federal government put up the price of cigarettes. I personally think the price could have gone up even more, because smoking to me is a form of suicide and it is not something we should encourage. That is one aspect of preventative health, and I hope the recent increase in the price of cigarettes encourages people to give up smoking. It is a terrible thing, and it is a terrible way to die. My father, who was in the Navy, where they encouraged them to smoke, died from emphysema, and to drown in your own fluid is a horrible way to go. That is just one aspect of preventative health.

When I met with the Hon. John Hill, he indicated that his department had changed its stance somewhat. I have been arguing for a long time about in situ workplace health checks, and the department, I think, was not enthusiastic about it. The minister might have been, but the department has now come on board, and I am delighted about that. I want in situ health checks in the workplace for all employees, certainly in the Public Service. As I have mentioned previously in this place, some organisations, such as the ANZ Bank, and some councils, such as the City of Onkaparinga and the City of Marion, already do it. Many corporations do it. Ironically, Fosters Brewery does it in Melbourne, and Victoria Police and other agencies around Australia do it, but not enough do it.

A study done by Foundation 49 found that, if you reduce the health risk factors per employee in an organisation of 1,000 employees with an average salary of \$50,000 a year, the productivity gains are of the order of \$3.48 million. To me, the human aspect is more important, but just the financial aspect shows the benefit of having a healthy workforce.

Places such as Marion and the City of Onkaparinga not only do blood sugar and blood pressure tests but they also do skin checks and so on. A lot of people do not realise that with things such as melanoma, one Australian dies every six hours. A lot of people are unaware of some of the risks and have little understanding that you can have melanomas in parts of the body, even internally.

People are not aware of some of the risks they take even by failing to have basic checks, such as having their blood pressure and cholesterol checked, and so on, and that is without getting into areas such as mental health and related areas. When we talk about health, we are talking about a whole spectrum of health issues.

One of the lessons nowadays—and this is increasingly the message from medical professionals—is that you cannot just talk about heart disease, prostate cancer or breast cancer, you have to talk about all of the human body, because we are more than just a heart or some other part of the body. I have been heartened to hear medical professionals, who have their own specialties, talk about the need for an integrated, total approach to aspects of preventative health.

I mentioned in this parliament yesterday the initiative of wellbeing checks for young infants introduced when Lea Stevens was minister for health. I would like to see that initiative extended through the school system. Many of us can recall years ago when we had to line up to be checked. Nowadays, it does not happen in primary and secondary schools as it used to, and I think it should. It can be done in a way that is not embarrassing. We now have children developing diabetes, which was considered to be pretty rare years ago. There are a whole lot of other things in terms of body mass and so on that need to be addressed early on. So, I think it would be a good investment through the school system that we have regular checks. Some doctors do it off their own bat in terms of assessing children in some country towns, but it should be a universal thing.

The argument that people can go and see their doctor sounds good, but it does not happen, particularly for a big section of the male population—they do not have a tradition of going for a check-up. I would urge every person in this parliament, not just the men but anyone and everyone, to have regular health checks. That is what saved my life. If I had not been aware of the possibilities, I would not be around. I know of so many people whose lives have been saved because they have got onto preventative health early on.

There are a lot of aspects to this topic. I want to see things move more quickly. I am not saying the government is not doing anything, I am saying: let us all do a lot more. I even use my newsletters to put out health messages, and I find that people respond very positively. I am not preaching to them but I just put in something like, 'Have you had a check-up lately from your GP?' I have had recent letters from people saying that some of those health messages have saved their life, because people just do not think about these things. I have been amazed when talking to people high up in the state bureaucracy who have said that they have not been to a doctor in 30-odd years; I have been absolutely amazed that we have people in that category.

I do not have to press the point too hard. What I want to see is everyone on board: more awareness, more understanding of risk factors and, importantly, people doing something about it. Ultimately, we are responsible for our own health but some people need a bit of assistance along the way, a bit of a kick-along, and sometimes, especially men but not just men, need to be urged to have a check-up so that remedial action can be taken sooner rather than later, so that we can avoid the unnecessary suffering and early death which occurs, unfortunately, to a lot of Australians, and that need not be the case. I commend this motion to the house.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (12:32): I move:

After paragraph (a) delete existing paragraph (b) and replace with:

- (b) congratulates the state and federal governments on the additional resources into preventative health measures at both levels of government and through the recent Council of Australian Governments Agreement.

I rise to amend the member for Fisher's motion. More than half of South Australian adults and a quarter of South Australian children are either overweight or obese. Being overweight can lead to serious health consequences, as the member for Fisher has outlined, including type 2 diabetes, heart disease and some cancers. In fact, some health experts have warned that unless the obesity epidemic is addressed, the current generation of children could have shorter life expectancies than their parents.

A report on the prevention of chronic disease by Queensland's chief health officer undertaken in 2009, estimated that 16 per cent of premature death and ill health may be due to unhealthy diet. If left unaddressed, levels of obesity-related chronic disease will create a massive demand upon our health system in future years. In fact, the cost of obesity alone, including the burden of disease, is estimated to cost South Australia \$4.4 billion each year.

All levels of government are acutely aware of this situation and that it needs to be addressed. Since coming to office in 2002, the Rann Labor government has highlighted the importance of good health, especially in children. We have run well-known health promotion programs such as the Go for 2&5 campaign, encouraging healthy eating, and the Be Active campaign to promote healthy activity.

We have targeted initiatives in schools and preschools such as: banning junk food in public school canteens; working with preschools and schools to encourage children to swap soft drinks and junk food snacks for water and fruit; introducing the Start Right Eat Right initiative for healthy food in childcare services, which is now situated in over 100 accredited sites across the state; and introducing the Premier's Be Active Challenge, which is encouraging children to be more active, more often, with nearly 28,000 students completing the challenge in 2009.

We are supporting community projects such as the Community Foodies initiative. We have recruited 10 healthy weight coordinator positions across the state as part of the Do It For Life campaign. In 2009, we announced a five-year, \$22.3 million Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle (OPAL) program in partnership with the commonwealth and participating local governments.

OPAL is a groundbreaking program which has government and local communities working together to come up with community-wide solutions to health issues. We have also run programs targeted at adults, including the 'be active @ work' and the Active Transport programs.

Since 2002, the Rann government has worked hard to assist grassroots sports clubs to improve their facilities and equipment. We have introduced the Inclusive Recreation Inclusive Sport grants program for projects that create opportunities for people with disabilities to participate in sports and recreational programs. We have provided over \$36 million in funding for grassroots sports facilities and equipment and contributed over \$52 million to a variety of sporting organisations to help them run their sports.

The government has taken policy initiatives and actions to encourage a healthy and more active community. As a result of Thinker in Residence Professor Ilona Kickbusch's work on Health in All Policies, South Australia is leading the world in ensuring healthy outcomes are being considered across all levels of government.

The recently released 30-year plan recognises the importance of urban landscape on the health and wellbeing of South Australians. The 30-year plan also builds upon the more than \$60 million the Rann government has invested over the past eight years to encourage local government and community groups to develop public spaces in their local area for recreation. These open space grants, sourced from the Planning and Development Fund, assist and

encourage local government throughout the state to improve important public areas. Our government message on healthy eating and physical activity is being heard.

Measuring our Success, a report released in April 2009 as part of the parliamentary Social Development Committee investigation, found more than 990,000 South Australian adults reported seeing or hearing information about being active or the Be Active campaign and eating a healthy diet through 'Go for 2&5', and about 528,000 people (45 per cent) reported taking some action to change their lifestyle.

The Measuring our Success report also found that more than 184,000 students in South Australian public schools and preschools have increased access to healthy food and drinks as a result of the Right Bite Strategy and that almost 18,000 children are attending childcare centres with healthy food policies.

The childhood obesity rate has been increasing in the developed world, including South Australia, since the 1960s. As a result of greater public awareness and government action over the past eight years, the proportion of children who are overweight and obese in South Australia is no longer increasing. However, there is still much work to be done to reduce the proportion of overweight and obese children.

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare report, Health Expenditure Australia 2007-08, states that between 2002-03 and 2007-08 the average annual growth in recurrent health expenditure was 5.1 per cent for South Australia and 4.8 per cent for Australia. This report recognises that the ageing population and the ageing workforce, combined with the growing burden of chronic disease and demand for health services, necessitate change in the way that health care is provided, with increased investment in primary and secondary prevention.

Over the past three years, SA Health has allocated an additional \$25 million to the prevention areas. Over \$10 million per annum is allocated to support healthy eating, encourage physical activity and prevent obesity, as outlined previously.

Tobacco control investment is \$4.3 million per annum, and \$4 million per annum is allocated to the 'Do it for life' program, to address lifestyle risk factors and chronic disease. Funding through the Council of Australian Governments National Partnership Agreement on Preventative Health will provide \$24.58 million to be directed to the Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle program (OPAL) and to healthy workers initiatives being planned now, with a further \$23.5 million if targets are achieved.

The health investments announced in the recent federal budget include all previous announcements made under the recent COAG decisions, build upon the COAG national health and hospital package and provide an additional \$2.2 billion, which includes:

- \$417 million investment to establish a nationwide network of primary health care organisations, to be known as 'medical locals', to improve access to the after hours primary care;
- \$355 million to improve access to primary health care, by establishing an additional 23 GP super clinics, and provide an additional 425 grants to expand existing general practices and primary care, community health and Indigenous health medical services, to deliver GP super clinics style services;
- \$523 million to train support nurses, including aged care and in rural and regional communities. This also includes \$390.3 million to support the use of practice nurses in general practitioner clinics.
- \$467 million to modernise the health care system by providing personally-controlled electronic health records for every Australian who wants one.

The National Male Health Policy has also been announced, providing \$16.7 million to assist in addressing male health challenges in Australia, and this is badly needed. This includes funding for the Australian Men's Sheds Association and funding to establish the first Australian longitudinal study into men's health. Other key initiatives include aged care, mental health, substance abuse, Medicare and blood products, and the National Cord Blood Collection Network.

Mr GRIFFITHS: On a point of order, whilst I respect the sentiment conveyed by the member for Taylor, the copy of the amendment to the notice of motion from the member for Fisher

is incorrectly dated. It actually states it as being 27 October. Therefore, is the house actually able to consider it?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I believe that the actual date is incorrect.

Mrs VLAHOS: I am sorry, that is a clerical error.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is an administrative error. These things occur. I am sure that you meant 27 May.

Mrs VLAHOS: I do in fact mean that.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I will accept the amendment.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

KANGAROO ISLAND MEDICAL SERVICES

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:45): I move:

That this house condemns the Labor government on its failure to ensure that obstetrics, elective surgery and after-hours emergency service negotiations with Kangaroo Island doctors have been handled satisfactorily and that the residents of Kangaroo Island be assured all these services remain in place on a permanent basis.

This is a debacle perpetrated purely by the Minister for Health's failure to come to grips with this issue and deal with it appropriately. I have been talking with the doctors in private practice on Kangaroo Island since October-November last year about the ongoing negotiations. For the record, I actually agree with the minister and the government on bringing in a consistent contract price for doctors across the state for providing an after hours, on-call, emergency service.

What I do not agree with is this nonsense that has been going on for weeks and weeks, which has severely upset the medical practice for one. The people of Kangaroo Island are even more upset over this and the way it has been handled. The fact is that the minister has not, until almost the last moment, put in place a senior person to negotiate on this matter. The Rural Doctors Association has been involved, through Dr Peter Rischbieth and others, but this has just gone pear-shaped for week after week.

In this chamber this week we have witnessed, time after time, speeches from the Treasurer talking about the money that is being put into Adelaide Oval. Indeed, the \$450 million we started with that was non-negotiable is now running at \$535 million and we do not know where it is going to stop. Meanwhile, the people in rural South Australia are struggling to get the services they desperately need. In this particular case, where the government is quibbling over money with Kangaroo Island doctors under contract for providing after-hours emergency calls, we are fiddling around and the place is burning down around us.

Purely and simply, what happened here was that we had junior, or not so senior, officers from Country Health SA dealing with this issue from the outset. We have had the senior bureaucrats now stepping in, I suspect at the bequest of the minister, to try and negotiate this. I suggested some weeks ago that he get an independent facilitator in there. This would never have happened under former minister Lea Stevens, but unfortunately the current minister will not listen to anybody. He gets fed a lot of nonsense from his bureaucrats without dealing with the fact of what people in small communities need: they need the services they have always had.

What I say about this is, 'Yes, doctors have changed in the way they deliver services and in their lifestyles.' I put on the record, so that no-one is in any doubt and can accuse me of a conflict of interest, that my wife is actually a practice nurse with that medical clinic in Kingscote for a couple of days a week. We have some very good doctors over there who run a private practice and do the after-hours, emergency on-call work at the hospital, the obstetrics services and work in with the elective surgery when the visiting specialists come over to do that.

In relation to my friend the member for Hammond, for example, or the member for Goyder, if their constituents have a problem that cannot be treated at one of their local hospitals such as the Murray Bridge Soldiers Memorial Hospital, they can get in their car and be in Adelaide in 45 minutes or an hour. When residents on Kangaroo Island have something go wrong and have to be transferred to Adelaide, if they do not go by the emergency helicopter or the Royal Flying Doctor Service, they have to catch either a commercial flight or the ferry. Now, if you live on the west end of Kangaroo Island, it takes an hour or 1½ hours to get to Penneshaw to catch the ferry, an hour or thereabouts on the ferry to get to Cape Jervis; then another 1½ hours to get into the city. That is

just all fine and dandy if you are not all that sick, but if a woman is eight or nine months pregnant it is not a lot of fun.

Common sense should have come into this a long time ago. What has happened is that now obstetric and elective surgery services have about a month's grace and the government is providing a locum to do emergency on-call after hours. What needs to happen is: first, the obstetric services need to be maintained; secondly, the elective surgery services need to be maintained on a permanent and ongoing basis in the best interests of the residents of Kangaroo Island and the 180,000 visitors a year who come to the island (and that number is growing by about 6 per cent a year); and, thirdly, we need to come to an arrangement whereby the doctors on the island may do one week in three or one week in four on weekends and after-hours emergency in order to get some sensible outcomes. At the moment the locum doctor that the government provides is costing \$1,700 a day and the local doctors are sitting at home at night.

The local doctors want to lead their lives in a certain way. A lot of them have young families and are involved in the community. They also have other activities: one milks goats, another one goes fishing, another one goes surfing and another one lives out in the bush part of the time. That is the lifestyle that they have chosen. Doctor services in the bush have changed considerably from 10, 15 or 20 years ago. We want to keep the doctors we have on Kangaroo Island, on Kangaroo Island. We do not want them looking to come to the city or to transfer to other areas in the country; we want to keep them on Kangaroo Island. We want happy doctors—a happy doctor means a happy community, and that is what we need.

How we can spend \$535 million doing something with Adelaide Oval is beyond me when we cannot find the money to put into rural health. I do not need telling by the government or the minister about the cost of health service delivery in South Australia. I was involved for many years on local and regional boards and I am well aware of it. One of the failings of Australian society, in my view, is that people go to the doctor too often now. If they get a sniffle they go to the doctor. An old friend of mine (who passed away a couple of years ago) was talking to another friend and he said, 'I've got a cold.' He was asked what he was going to do about it and he said, 'Well, if I take something it will be gone in two weeks; if I do nothing it will be better in a fortnight.' The attitude in Australia now is to go to the doctor for everything—it is a failure.

I heard what the member for Fisher said earlier, and I support his words. People—men particularly—should have checkups. Doctors and health services are working on that, and I have no argument with that; however, we are what we are and that is the way Australian society is going. Therefore, the cost of health service delivery in this nation is appallingly high and will continue to be high. All I ask in this case is to get back to basics, to maintain and deliver services in rural and regional South Australia (and, more importantly, on Kangaroo Island) as they have always been delivered. Not so many years ago we had one doctor servicing most of Kangaroo Island and another doctor, Dr Mary McHugh, the wife of a soldier-settler, used to service the Parndana area. We had two doctors and they did all the work required on Kangaroo Island. We have had up to six doctors. These doctors do not know where they are going.

I also have an issue with Yankalilla and the Southern Fleurieu Medical Practice which I will raise at another time in this place because we had a problem there. We fixed the problem when we had regional boards, we fixed the problem when we had local boards, we could communicate with the doctors and we could work through these systems, but now it is all gone; it has all gone to this centralised bureaucracy in Hindmarsh Square. They do not know how the other half lives, quite frankly; they have absolutely no idea. They would be well served to get out and see what it is like to live in the bush—wherever that may be in South Australia—and find out how the other half live. People want to live in the bush; they do not all want to live in Adelaide. The last place I want to live is Adelaide, quite frankly, but I will happily come here in the course of my work. People do not want to come to Adelaide.

If you are ill and if you do have to come to Adelaide from Kangaroo Island, you face those hurdles that I spoke about earlier. Why on earth should Mrs Jones be brought to Adelaide for an emergency service or some medical procedure? If her family wants to come up, they then have to go through this enormous expense of travelling up, whether by sea or by air, and be dislocated. Why should the good residents of Kangaroo Island have to come to the mainland for elective surgery or to have their babies away from family, away from friends and, let me tell you, at enormous cost to the state? My understanding is that it costs \$10,000 per baby to have a baby delivered on Kangaroo Island. There are limited numbers of children born on Kangaroo Island.

Let me inform the house that the island community is absolutely stinking over this issue. When they get their heads together and decide to fight on something together, it is 'Look out!', let me tell you. I have borne the brunt of that over the years. We have a few fights over there between each other and when we have them they are ding-dongers, but when the island gets together and wants to take something on, look out!

There are only four and a half thousand people over there but they can make a lot of noise. It is very much a combined decision of all the people and groups and different communities on Kangaroo Island that this is a nonsense. They recognise the huge part the doctors play in the local community. Yes; they are a private practice, and for the minister to even suggest that the government will put in a public GP service at Kangaroo Island Hospital is an absolute nonsense. Quite apart from the fact that they will have to build new buildings and provide locums, nurses and everything else, what in heaven's name will that cost per year? It is absolutely ridiculous. That is a threat to the local community and a threat to the local doctors in the private practice. It is a threat we did not need. I thought it was most foolish of the minister to suggest that. It is not helpful. All it does is inflame the situation where cool heads should prevail.

I did suggest two or three weeks ago that a couple of good people may have been the former minister Lea Stevens or former minister Dean Brown. The minister has chosen not to do that. We now have the head of Country Health, Clare Douglas, involved and a couple of other officers. They are meeting again next week. I think they meet on Tuesday. I say to the house and I say to the government: you need to tell minister Hill to come to a compromise because I believe the doctors over there will come to a compromise. Maintain permanently our elective surgery, maintain permanently our obstetric services on Kangaroo Island and maintain some emergency after hours on call with the local doctors contributing to that. It is most critical. I urge the house to listen to what I have to say and I commend my motion to the house.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:58): I wish to speak in support of the motion of the member for Finniss. As a fellow regional member of parliament, I am very aware of the issues facing our communities when it comes to the provision of health services and this one was actually brought to my attention by one of my own constituents. It is not a person who has a property interest in Kangaroo Island. It was just a person who lives only about 15 kilometres south of me who contacted me when they heard about this on radio and said, 'What sort of madness is actually going on here, when you have 4,500 people living on Kangaroo Island who have no guarantee of their health services?'

It is appropriate that the member for Finniss brings this motion before the house and it is appropriate that the government does everything within its power as quickly as possible to sort the situation out, to ensure that the doctors that are there have the opportunity to continue to practise the skills that they bring to that community and, importantly, to ensure that obstetrics, emergency care and after-hours emergency care is available for the community and the some 180,000 visitors who go to Kangaroo Island each year.

Kangaroo Island is a very unique place. There is the real difficulty of travel to the mainland. There is a difficulty, probably, in some professions in recruiting the people that you need for that community, but it deserves the absolute best of care and it is important that we as a parliament enforce upon the ministers in charge of the departments that every effort is made to ensure that this level of service is maintained and that these people have continuity of care and are under no threat in the future.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Thompson.

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

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 312 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reinstate obstetric care, 24 hour paediatric care and re-open the intensive care unit at Modbury Hospital.

MOSELEY SQUARE POST OFFICE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 254 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to support the reinstatement of the Post Office at Moseley Square in addition to an agency at the Bay Junction Shopping Centre.

BICYCLE LANES

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 196 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to install bicycle lanes along Diagonal Road from Brighton Road to Prunus Street.

GOYDER INSTITUTE FOR WATER RESEARCH

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) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Securing an ongoing sustainable water supply is essential to underpin South Australia's future economic growth. As members would be aware, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority is currently preparing the basin-wide plan. Access to the best science will be essential for South Australia to argue for its fair share of water from the river for our communities, irrigators and the environment.

South Australia's mining boom will depend upon securing sustainable water supplies, particularly groundwater. The best science will be required to allow the mining industry to grow without threatening the state's groundwater supplies, and the best science will be needed to deal with the drier and more variable climate into the future. South Australia needs the best water science to deal with these challenges, and I can tell members that we will have the best water science in the nation.

Today, I am delighted to announce to this house the establishment of the Goyder Institute for water research. The Goyder Institute will provide independent expert scientific advice to the state government on South Australia's water system, improving the ability to forecast threats to water security and building an enhanced approach to integrated water management.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is entitled to be heard in silence. The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The result will be water policy that best reflects the values and priorities of the state, solidly informed by science. The institute is named after George Goyder, the former surveyor-general and creator of Goyder's Line. He is well recognised as a leader in water resource management at the time. The Goyder Institute is a five-year, \$50 million collaboration between the South Australian government, the commonwealth CSIRO, the University of Adelaide, Flinders University and the University of South Australia.

If members opposite want to oppose this \$50 million water science institute, let them say so now; let them knock back the CSIRO's involvement. Securing the Goyder Institute is a major coup for South Australia, to have it here in this state, because it will also strengthen our position as an international leader in water resource management. The Goyder Institute will be chaired by the state's Chief Scientist, Dr Ian Chessell, and will be located in the Royal Institution of Australia building in Exchange Place.

It is interesting. I just want to reflect, because I know that Dr Ian Chessell is here in the house today. I congratulate his son, Duncan Chessell, on his third summit to Everest just in the last couple of days—one of the great Australian explorers.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: A new Chair of Public Policy and Management at the Australian and New Zealand School of Government (ANZSOG), based at Flinders University, will also be established to focus on the development of effective policies and programs in the area of water resource management. Key areas of focus for the institute will include:

- identifying the location, quality and capacity of aquifers throughout the Far North of the state to facilitate long-term outback water solutions, and support the ongoing development of the state's mining industry;
- investigating requirements of wetland ecosystems in the South-East; and
- assisting the government to secure the best deal for South Australia out of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

The Goyder Institute will attract some of Australia's top water scientists to provide independent scientific advice to the government. It will help ensure that we extend our national leadership in all areas of water resource management, including environmental water. It will help underpin the growth of our mining industry.

Mrs Redmond: What growth?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'What growth?', she says. Four mines under the Liberals, 11 mines and 16 by the end of this year under Labor. What growth? Four times the number of mines under Labor because, for members opposite, mining was just a 'mirage in the desert' and we are making it happen.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: I believe that the Premier is entering into debate.

The SPEAKER: I do not uphold that point of order, because he was responding to an interjection from your side. Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: South Australia has long been a national leader in stormwater capture and reuse and wastewater recycling (where we easily lead the nation) and rainwater tank ownership (where we easily lead the nation). Above all other states, we recognise the value of our precious water resources.

Securing an institute of this stature, so that we base key future decisions about water use on well-researched scientific advice, will help keep our state in a leadership position on water management. I want to congratulate Professor Chessell. I want to thank the CSIRO for its involvement. The federal government's support is vital. I thank also the water minister, the Hon. Paul Caica, for this flying start in his new ministry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I rise to update the house on matters which were raised by the opposition yesterday in respect of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition asked me on what date I was first aware that the government's initial commitment was insufficient to deliver a FIFA-compliant stadium. I responded:

...over a number of weeks—in reports that I was given verbally, that there were concerns about the scope and the cost of the works. We continually requested that the SMA look at doing all it can to remain within the budget allocation that the government had provided, but about a week or so ago it was clear that that was not going to happen.

After a thorough document and record search in my office, I am now in a position, as I said, to provide to the house more specific advice. I am now advised that I was first verbally updated by members of the government steering committee on 30 March about the work of the Stadium Management Authority. On 1 April—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Deputy Premier is on his feet!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —I received advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance in connection with a cabinet submission on a separate but related matter which included references to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment proposal. This advice informed me that the latest feedback from the Stadium Management Authority was indicating that the potential redevelopment costs could significantly exceed the government's \$450 million commitment. I noted this advice on 7 April. It was following the receipt of this advice that I requested more detailed and up-to-date advice. This was received by the steering committee and communicated to me formally in an advice from Treasury, which I received on 18 May.

The leader and the member for Davenport also asked whether I met with the authority in the week leading up to 9 March in the election campaign period. I can now confirm that this meeting occurred on 3 March, and I also confirm to the house that, to the best of my memory, I was not advised of the potential costs of the redevelopment at that meeting.

Mr Pisoni: What were you advised of?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, just listen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This was an early meeting to show design concepts that were emerging from the work of the authority.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

COMPULSORY THIRD PARTY PREMIUMS

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:11): I seek leave to make another ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Today I wish to inform the house of the annual increase in compulsory third party premiums that will apply from 1 July 2010. As members would be aware, compulsory third party premiums are set each year in order to maintain the net asset position of the compulsory third party fund managed by the Motor Accident Commission to meet the estimated future costs of third party vehicle insurance payouts.

Each year the fund pays around \$450 million to South Australians who are injured as a result of road trauma. Members will also recall that, due to the impacts of the global financial crisis on the value of the commission's investment assets, last year the government capped the increase in premiums to 8.5 per cent. Although we appear to be emerging from the worst effects of the global financial crisis, its impact on government investments, including the Motor Accident Commission's investment assets, continues to be apparent.

As at 1 July 2008 the commission was in a strong net asset position of 115 per cent. Due to the financial crisis this declined to 103 per cent as at 1 July 2009. Even though this represented a net asset position it fell short of the higher, more prudent financial targets that I have set for the compulsory third party fund since coming to government.

On 17 May 2006 as Treasurer I established a higher, more stringent legal of solvency for the Motor Accident Commission called 'sufficient solvency level'. This comprises:

- The fund's liabilities; plus
- 10 per cent of the outstanding claims liabilities provision; plus
- 10 per cent of the premium liabilities provision; plus
- 10 per cent of the investments in equities and properties.

As at 30 June 2009 this higher, more prudent sufficient solvency level stood at 91.3 per cent. As at 30 April 2010 the level had improved to 97.6 per cent.

Improvements in the level are due to stronger investment returns than the previous year and a return of the bond rate to the long-term average, which the actuary has used to value the long-term liabilities in the scheme. Given the fund is yet to return to the government's sufficient solvency level target, a further increase in the average compulsory third party premium is required again this year. The government has approved an average increase of 7.2 per cent in premiums from 1 July 2010. I will give some examples of what the increase will mean in dollar terms:

- In district 1, Adelaide and surrounds, a class 1 vehicle (the average family car) will increase from \$440 to \$476.
- A class 15 vehicle (a 51cc to 250cc motorcycle) will increase from \$203 to \$218.
- A class 19 vehicle (an historic or left-hand drive vehicle for those who have them—

Martin, do you have one of these?

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Yes, two.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You do; two. The member for Waite, along with other members who have cars—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: I took out three years; I knew this was coming.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You took out three years; prudent. It is going from 119 to 128.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: You saved \$27.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That man should be the shadow treasurer.

Mr Marshall: Hear, hear!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Norwood just went, 'Hear, hear', when I said that the member for Waite should be shadow treasurer. He is following on, Madam Speaker, where—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He should be treasurer. What about the member for Davenport? What a revelation here just now. The member for Norwood is calling on the member for Waite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order, that being relevance. I believe it is standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: I fail to see how we can have a point of order on relevance when the Deputy Premier is making a ministerial statement. He can make a ministerial statement on whatever he wishes. However—

Mr WILLIAMS: I don't think he is. I think he is engaging in a debate with members over here.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, have you finished?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. Just following on from the praise from the member for Norwood for the member for Waite last night, he has now called on the member for Waite to replace the shadow treasurer. You are fantastic—the gift that keeps on giving mark II. Keep interjecting member for Norwood.

I accept that drivers are unlikely to welcome this increase. However, it should be remembered that, in the years when the financial performance of the fund has been strong, the government has been in a position to reduce third party premiums. This was the case in both 2005 and 2006. The government remains committed to ensuring the fund's long-term viability so that South Australians injured on our roads continue to receive financial assistance to get their lives back on track.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge today that we have in our gallery some members from Woodville High School, year 12, who are guests of the Minister for Education, and I also believe we have some members from Mary MacKillop College, who are guests of the member for Norwood. I believe that, this morning, we had some guests from Table College, but unfortunately we do not have a record of that. Welcome; and we hope that you do not learn any lessons from here about how to behave in the classroom.

QUESTION TIME

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm if either or both of the tenders received for the Royal Adelaide Hospital PPP project have come in at over \$2.1 billion?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:18): What an extraordinary

question. An extraordinary question, given that they have only just been received. What day were they received, minister?

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Thursday.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thursday.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Did you read the price?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, I haven't even looked at the document.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Speaker, it was the practice of the former Liberal government to inappropriately interfere in due process.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Ran out of film; late bids.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's right; late bids, ran out of film. We have a very serious probity protocol around these tenders. It would be improper, if not illegal, for me to view those documents until such time—this is how a government works, leader—

Mr Gardner: They've done some progressive business fundraiser.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Morialta has made a clear inference that the government is open to corruption on this tender. I take offence to that and ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, I did get that implication also.

Mr GARDNER: I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The process that is in play is that these tenders have been received in a secure data room. The secure data room, those documents—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Do you want to hear the Deputy Premier's answer or not? Or I will ask him to sit down.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Within the secure data room—and the minister has visually sighted the documents—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: How else can he sight them?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: True. Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If you don't be quiet, I'll suspend question time. Deputy Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As the Premier just said, the arrogance of loss coming from over there. Madam Speaker, the Minister for Health has seen the documents in terms of the boxes of the documents, but he is not allowed, and nor am I, to sight the documentation until a number of things occur. That is, that senior public officials, observed by probity auditors, will systematically, over the next X period of time (I assume weeks) begin the process of sorting through the data and start to compile a briefing for the minister, myself and cabinet as to what the bids contain in general terms.

But, you have to remember this: this is a public-private partnership in which an interactive process will commence with bidders; that is, the government, through this process, has been

interactive with bidders to ensure that they understand fully the government's requirements and they price that accordingly.

What will occur from here is that a detailed piece of work will be undertaken to determine the price that has been put forward in net present value terms, and it will also have to very methodically go through to see whether each bid is covering the scope of the project and represents fair value. It will be compared with the public sector comparator, and that information over time will be undertaken, and then, when the public officials, including my Treasury officers, believe it is appropriate for the government to be briefed, we will be. It would be, as I said earlier, both improper and, arguably, illegal for either I or the minister, or any elected member of government, to simply walk into the data room, go to the last page and have a look at the price.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'm sorry? I've just said that members of the government have not; correct. We have senior officials who are now working through. It would be improper, if not illegal, for us to undertake the level of perusing of documents as members opposite seem to think we should. That is why, in due course, when we are provided with that advice cabinet will consider it. When we are in a position to award, on recommendation of the steering committee of the senior official group, we will make that public.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I've just said, Madam Speaker, that we will receive the advice on the cost—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has an opportunity to ask questions later. The member for Newland.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

Mr KENYON (Newland) (14:24): Can the Premier update the house on the significance of the geothermal steam venting conducted last week by Panax Geothermal Ltd in the Otway Basin?

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) (14:24): I would like to recognise the member for Newland's passion for the mining industry—in this case it is mining hot water—which in recent days has been recognised nationally. I think people would be aware of my passion for geothermal renewable energy. In fact, when I was in Penola last week I was able to inform those who attended—and it is a shame that the local member was unable to be there—that I visited my first geothermal power plant 47 years ago.

I want to recognise in the house today a very distinguished visitor from New Zealand, the Right Honourable Darren Hughes MP, who, of course, has a very significant interest in renewable energy, in tackling climate change and, indeed, in geothermal energy, given that New Zealand is a leader in that area, starting many years ago at Wairakei, which is near Orakei Korako, which is not far from Lake Taupo near Huka Falls.

Last Thursday 18 May, I travelled to South Australia's Otway Basin to witness the successful steam venting of Panax Geothermal Limited's Salamander 1 well. This well is part of the Panax Penola project, which is currently the most advanced hot sedimentary aquifer project in Australia.

The Penola project steam release event was part of a series of flow tests being completed on the Salamander well. These flow tests are being conducted to clean the well bore and evaluate the flow potential of the aquifer. Proving flow rate is an essential part of determining the viability of geothermal projects. Completion of this test indicates further progress of the Penola project.

The Penola project is within an area along the Limestone Coast that is estimated to represent one of the nation's most significant geothermal resources. It targets a hot sedimentary aquifer that is within sandstones approximately 3,500 metres below the surface. This type of geothermal project relies on heat that is stored in water in an existing reservoir and thus enables relatively fast development using commercially proven technology.

The drilling and production testing of the Penola project has been moving at a rapid pace. The project was launched on 5 March 2010, during the election campaign, and as of 18 May the Salamander 1 well has been drilled to 4,025 metres and the second flow test has now been

completed. Due to the type of stone that this project is drilling, the process is benefiting from long-term expertise of the petroleum industry, which is accustomed to similar conditions.

Panax aims to ultimately generate an estimated 60 megawatts of emissions-free, baseload electricity from this project. The company has further estimated that the potential of their total geothermal exploration licences in the Otway Basin could be more than 1,500 megawatts of electricity. To put this into perspective, South Australia's peak electricity demand is approximately 3,490 megawatts.

In addition to the quality of its geothermal resource and ability to make rapid progress, the Penola project will also benefit from its proximity to existing transmission infrastructure. This has been one of the problems: we all want geothermal energy to be part of our baseload generation, but one of the problems that is hampering development, even though 94 per cent of the development in Australia is occurring in South Australia, is that, obviously, proximity to upgraded transmission lines remains an issue.

That is the advantage of the Penola project, that while many remote areas of our state offer world-class renewable resources—such as the wind resource of our Eyre Peninsula, which is the focus of the government-commissioned Green Grid Study—tapping those resources is a challenge because of their distance from the national electricity grid. The fact that the Penola project is located within a few kilometres of the major transmission grid will greatly assist the process of delivering its geothermal power.

A recent report completed by the World Wildlife Fund and the Australian Geothermal Energy Association outlined some of the potential long-term benefits of geothermal developments. The report estimates that an Australian geothermal industry capable of generating 2,200 megawatts of power would create a projected 3,800 full-time equivalent jobs. It also maintains that by 2050 geothermal energy could cut around 60 million tonnes of carbon dioxide per annum, which is the equivalent of more than 25 per cent of Australia's current emissions from electricity generation. The potential benefits of emissions-free base load energy, along with jobs creation, highlight why the geothermal industry offers such significant hope for the future.

There are now three deep geothermal projects in South Australia, each seeking to evaluate and demonstrate the commercial potential of geothermal energy. Geodynamics has concluded proof of concept at its hot fractured rock resource in the Cooper Basin. Later this year Petratherm plans to drill its second well at Paralana, near Arkaroola, in the northern Flinders Ranges. As I say, we are delighted that 94 per cent of the development, worth many hundreds of millions of dollars, is occurring in this state.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is again to the Premier. Given that the EPA documents show serious groundwater contamination at the site planned for the rail yards hospital, what is the current estimated cost of the clean-up of that contamination?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:31): As I have explained on innumerable occasions, both in here and in other fora, particularly in front of media at press conferences, there are essentially two kinds of pollution that we concern ourselves with on that site. One is the pollution of the watertable, which has occurred over a period of time from spillages and so on associated with running a railway set-up there at the railway site.

The second is the soil pollution. The management of that will be largely addressed through the building of the hospital, because once you put in a large building and you take out soil below it you are actually removing most of that. The cleaning up of the water pollution is more problematic, but I am advised—and I think this is the figure I have given once before, but I will check on it—that the cost of the pollution clean-up is well within the figure of \$40 million. I think I have given that to the house before, but I will see if there are any further updates in relation to that and let you know.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I ask a supplementary question. Given that the government is still working on this, can the minister confirm then that this is not included in the tender process for the Royal Adelaide Hospital located at the rail yards?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:32): As I said, I will get further information but, from memory, there are two essential issues to do with the clean-up, which I have just gone through. Some of it will be contained within the new RAH project; the consortium that is chosen will do it. Other work is being done by the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure. As I said, I will get a more thorough and detailed briefing for you. I have not checked the detail of this for some little time but, from memory, that was the arrangement that was in place.

RECREATION AND SPORT FUNDING

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on funding support provided by the state government to support the delivery of sport and active recreation in South Australia?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:33): I am pleased to advise the house that I have recently approved funding for streams 1 and 2 of the 2010-11 round of the Statewide Enhancement Program. The Statewide Enhancement Program (StEP) is the government's biggest active recreation and sports grants program. StEP provides vital support for the active recreation and sport industry to build active, healthy communities right across South Australia.

Nearly every sporting activity in South Australia is supported through this program, from well-known sports like swimming, football, basketball, cricket, tennis, athletics, soccer and netball, right through to more unsung sports such as table tennis, fencing and lacrosse. In this latest round of StEP, stream 1 and 2, organisations will receive funding of \$4.88 million to support the delivery of core services across the entire breadth of what is a very diverse sport and recreation industry.

The funding provided through StEP will assist sporting bodies and associations to implement programs and initiatives to get more people involved in sport and recreation. Some of the projects approved for funding in 2010-11 include talented athlete development programs, the continuation of the successful *be active* Field Officer Program in the states' regional areas, support for mass participation events such as the City-Bay Fun Run and Brighton Jetty Classic, and sport-based support programs for homeless adults, marginalised communities and youth at risk.

All of these organisations make a significant contribution to the community and each of them is incredibly worthy of these grants which will go towards helping them improve the outstanding level of service and activities they continue to offer South Australians. The government will continue to strongly support local community sporting groups and organisations that promote the benefits of participation in active recreation and sport.

CRICKET ASSOCIATION DEBT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:36): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the government had any discussions with SACA about the state government providing financial assistance to SACA to assist with its debt in the event that the \$535 million Adelaide Oval upgrade does not proceed?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:36): I can advise the house that we have. It was the Premier who was the lead speaker on this matter to reinforce that of the Treasurer and it was made abundantly clear that two things will be the result should this vision of our government not proceed, that being the Adelaide Oval upgrade. Two things will happen: not one dollar will be spent on Football Park and, second, not one dollar will be provided to SACA for their outstanding debt.

CRICKET ASSOCIATION DEBT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:37): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the government had any discussions with SACA regarding the government providing a loan to SACA to assist with its debt, even if the upgrade of the Adelaide Oval does not proceed?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:37): If we are providing a loan that would be, I assume, a subsidised loan which would be more than one dollar for us to service—so the answer remains the same: no.

POTATO INDUSTRY

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Can the minister please advise the house of any recent scientific achievements obtained by the South Australian Research and Development Institute in relation to the potato industry?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (14:38): I thank the member for Light for the question. I think the response is actually quite applicable to about five or six electorates on this side of the house so you might want to actually listen. It gives me great satisfaction to announce a ground-breaking scientific achievement of international significance to the potato industry by our state government funded scientists at the South Australian Research and Development Institute, which we know as SARDI. This achievement helps Australia's \$650 million potato industry to combat potato diseases. Damage and yield losses from potato diseases are the most significant production challenge faced by our industry, costing processors and growers more than \$80 million a year. That is the cost of around 12 per cent of total production. That is quite a significant margin.

I am pleased to be able to report to the house that SARDI scientists have developed DNA tests that can quickly and accurately measure major disease-causing pathogens on seed and soil before planting. The tests identify the major diseases that afflict potatoes, and research teams on the UK, South Africa and New Zealand are now partnering with SARDI to use these tests on an international basis.

It is common sense that you cannot manage what you cannot measure, so these tests represent a major advance that will enable growers to assess major disease risk prior to planting and give them the information needed to develop options to prevent or reduce losses. This translates into better disease management resulting in more marketable, appealing potatoes for processors and consumers.

This achievement is no accident. For more than a decade, SARDI scientists have developed an internationally respected profile in DNA and molecular diagnostics for primary industries and they have made great inroads into the grain industry, and I believe that Elders and Landmark use SARDI products right throughout the nation in relation to diagnostic work in the grain sector.

Today's achievement highlights the importance of this capability and has underpinned the state government's ongoing support of research and development South Australia and its SARDI scientists. South Australia is the largest producing state in Australia, contributing more than \$260 million in potato value—that is over 30 per cent of the nation's production—making development of potato DNA testing a great asset in protecting one of this state's really important industries. I note that the member for Mount Gambier is taking particular interest, and I will come to the place of his electorate in the overall scheme of things.

Potato production is carried out in the electorates of Light (the electorate of the asker of the question), Taylor, Chaffey, Hammond, MacKillop and Mount Gambier.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: And Finniss.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: And Stuart.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: And Stuart—I will add those to the website. Google let me down on this one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: The SARDI breakthrough will—and this is particularly important for the electorate of Mount Gambier—have a particular benefit for the South-East where potatoes are grown for processing in particular. This sector is under significant challenge from cheap potato chip imports, and being able potentially to cut production costs by 12 per cent will put the South-East, we hope, back into the game.

Trials will commence in the South-East, I am informed, within the next 12 months. SARDI has informed me that producers around the state are really eager to get their hands on this particular technology. I commend SARDI for this breakthrough.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Premier. Given that on Tuesday this week in response to my question as to when the public would get to see the design plans for the Adelaide Oval, the Premier stated:

In the next few days. I also understand that the Liberal opposition is being given a briefing next Wednesday.

Can the Premier explain why, in an email to my chief of staff this afternoon regarding that proposed briefing, Leigh Whicker stated:

We will not be in a position to present proposed plans on the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval as we are currently completing a comprehensive review of each component.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (14:43): And do you know why that happened? Because what we said—\$535 million—anything else in your plan, in your designs, you are paying for yourself. So I am pleased that you will be getting the same designs that I will be getting.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:44): My question is to the Treasurer. Why is it, Treasurer, that the new conservative government in Britain can deliver a \$1.2 trillion budget within 50 days of taking office after 13 years of Labour but this government needs 180 days after an election and eight years of the Rann government to deliver just a \$15 billion budget?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:44): The deputy leader road tested this line last night because if you read *Hansard* you can see he mentioned this line.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Because their global financial crisis was so much worse than what we had here.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, exactly. Anyone who understands financial markets and what is currently occurring—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: And David Cameron doesn't?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, he does.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Anyone who understands financial markets and what is currently occurring in the United Kingdom and in Europe—in particular, Greece, Italy, Spain, Portugal—and whether or not the contagion will spread, the urgency for swift fiscal action is enormous in Britain.

The time line for this budget has been known for the best part of seven or eight months. I did not notice the Liberals during the election campaign saying they would be bringing down a budget after the election. These things do take time, and I think it would have been very arrogant of this government to have prepared its budget prior to the election assuming we would win. As occurred back in 2006, a budget should be the priority of the incoming government of either side of politics. The piece of work that we are having done by the—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: An extraordinary excuse. I think this is budget number nine. I can be accused of a lot of things but I am experienced in bringing down a budget, whether or not you

like them. The time line for the Sustainable Budget Commission has been known publicly for eight months, and we cannot and will not confirm and detail our budget until such time as we have that report.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:46): I have a supplementary question for the Treasurer, Madam Speaker. Given the Treasurer's answer, can he explain why the Tasmanian government, which was re-elected on exactly the same day as this government, can deliver its budget on 17 June, three months earlier than this government?

The SPEAKER: I do not think the Deputy Premier needs to answer that. The Deputy Premier is not responsible for the Tasmanian budget but, if he chooses to answer it, he can.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:46): I will answer it because it is quite simple. It is because they are not undertaking the type of work that we are undertaking.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, you have not finished?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not going to continue to stand if I am going to be heckled the whole time. They either want an answer or they do not. The time line for the Sustainable Budget Commission has been well-known for seven or eight months. It is an enormously difficult and lengthy process—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —as we undertake a complete review of most government spending programs so that the cabinet can have before it the full range of advice as to what we may consider to be funding commitments of a lesser priority than others. It is a process that I undertook—in a different format, admittedly—when I came to office in 2002. It is a much larger process that I undertook post the 2006 election. It is consistent with what Dean Brown and Stephen Baker did in 1994.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is consistent with what John Howard did in 1996 and, in fact, I am using the same person John Howard used. We are a government that has been very prudent with our financial management.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not sure whether the deputy leader remembers, but there was a thing called the global financial crisis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: From memory, we lost some \$3 billion of revenue over the forward estimates period, and we have got back close to \$2 billion of that. We are still down, as I advised the house two or three weeks ago, by \$1.2 billion over the forward estimates than what we would have received.

You cannot replace that level of revenue without a detailed exercise and looking at your spending. That is what we are doing. We have the AAA credit rating. We are the government that got it back and we are the government that will keep it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Taylor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will hear the member for Taylor in silence.

COUNTRY HEALTH SA SCHOLARSHIPS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:49): I rise to ask the Minister for Health a question. How is the state government supporting future leaders—doctors, nurses, midwives and ambulance officers—to improve the quality of care to country South Australian patients?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:49): I thank the member for Taylor for her question; I know that she has a very strong interest in health issues. Tomorrow I have the great honour of presenting the Country Health SA Scholarships to a range of deserving recipients, an event that will be attended by their proud families, friends and members of their local health advisory council (HAC).

These scholarships, worth a total of \$1.32 million, are used by country students to further their skills and by established rural health professionals to improve skills and advance their careers. Health disciplines in these scholarships include nursing, midwifery, allied health, medicine, business and Aboriginal affairs. Providing students with financial support is another great way that we have to recruit and retain health workers in country South Australia, because we know that students who come from the country are more likely to return to the country to practise, particularly if they train in the country as well.

Studies show that retaining long-term health professionals in regional areas improves all kinds of health outcomes, particularly children's health. A stable health workforce inspires trust and encourages community members to seek out health care. It also means that treatment is close at hand for people living in the country. If you ask them, the local fundraising groups, schools and sports clubs are always thankful to keep young people in their towns and communities. I am very pleased that country communities, through their local HACs, had a say in determining the scholarship recipients.

Country health advisory councils were asked to participate in the selection process of their local recipients, and were also given the opportunity to joint fund with Country Health SA additional scholarships from the area, so if they put in a certain sum of money we would match it. It is a good example of how the health advisory councils are advocating for their community's specific health needs, and I am happy to provide members with details of some of those scholarships. In the collaboration between Country Health SA and the SA Ambulance Service, a scholarship is being presented to a rural volunteer ambulance officer to study towards a bachelor of health science in paramedics, and this year (and the member for the Riverland might be interested to hear this) it will go to Allyce Medcalf from Renmark/Paringa.

The South Australian Bonded Medical Scholarship Scheme assists South Australian students to study medicine and work as doctors in the state, and this year's intake of six students will study at Flinders University. The Rural Doctors Workforce Agency is providing a valuable support program to recipients of this scholarship. The six medicine students are Belinda Washbourne, Megan Cain, Matthew Crabb, Lionel Warren, Phillipa Treloar and Wendy Baker. I am sorry, but I do not have details from where they come. I am also pleased that the second recipient of our most recent scholarship initiative, the Country Health SA Aboriginal Professional Employment Program, goes to Clayton Dodd from Port Augusta, who is using the scholarship towards a bachelor of nursing degree.

In the long term, the scholarship will help to boost the number of trained Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health professionals working in our state. Also presented is the Country Health SA Professor Margaret Tobin Medical Health Scholarships established in 2003 to honour Professor Tobin's vital contribution to mental health in South Australia. These scholarships will go this year to Wendy Scott from Gawler (member for Light) and Valary Elliot from the South-East. I am not sure which part of the South-East but, certainly, from the South-East.

There are eight undergraduate scholarships jointly funded by local HACs and Country Health SA, and the recipients include Zara Plueckhahn, who will be supported in nursing studies by the Lower North, as well as Sarah Knight of Kadina, Tammy Petty of Renmark/Paringa (again) and Gwenhyfar Ferguson of Port Lincoln.

Alicia McCallum from the Mid North is pursuing a bachelor of physiotherapy. I am sure that the member for Schubert will be delighted that the Barossa Health Advisory Council is joint funding three scholarships. They go to Melanie Pearson, who is undertaking a bachelor of speech pathology; Maree Henderson, who is studying for a bachelor of nursing; and Patrick Markey, who is studying also for a bachelor of medicine.

There are 75 recipients in all, so I will not go through the list today, but they will be named in the press release tomorrow. I believe that providing scholarships such as these and improving career opportunities to our country health workers pays off. That is 75 country people who have got scholarships to study and, hopefully, return to their home communities. These scholarships are an investment in our present and future rural health workforce. Since this initiative started in 1995, 307 rural undergraduate students have been awarded scholarships, and that is a significant number of people who have gone on to make a difference in rural communities.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What was the reason for the closure of the second campus of Carnegie Mellon at 83 Currie Street?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:55): I have no idea. I have not been briefed on that. I will get a briefing and report back to the house.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:55): Again, my question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Why then did the government pay a quarter of a million dollars—

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: You don't like that, sorry. Why did the government pay a quarter of a million dollars over two years in dead rent for the closed second campus of Carnegie Mellon at 83 Currie Street and will the government now seek reimbursement?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker: questions should not contain opinion or comment and that did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can we listen to the minister's point of order.

Mr Pisoni: What number?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What number? The first number for the member for Unley is 131: don't interrupt. The number you are looking for is 97.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: I have a point of order—

The SPEAKER: You can't have one point of order on top of another point of order.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sit down, member for Unley, and we will listen to the point of order from the Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, the comment that we are paying dead rent is plainly comment and opinion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Why did the government pay a quarter of a million dollars over two years for the closed second campus of Carnegie Mellon at 83 Currie Street, and will you now seek reimbursement?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:57): I have already indicated that I will get a briefing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will hear the answer if it is such an important question to you.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: As I have already indicated, I will get a briefing and come back to the house.

WIRE ROPE SAFETY BARRIERS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:57): Will the Minister for Road Safety inform the house about a recent road safety initiative involving wire rope barriers?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:57): A new safety barrier aimed at reducing road crashes has won the 2010 SA Excellence Award in Road Safety from the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia. Wire rope barriers were installed last year along the centre of a 1.7 kilometre section of the Port Wakefield Road under a \$2 million road safety program. The median wire rope barrier installation program aims to improve road safety and is jointly funded by the commonwealth and state governments and the Motor Accident Commission.

The installation involved widening the strip of road to create a two metre wide sealed centre median section where the wire rope safety barrier was installed. This section of road was recommended for treatment following crash analysis conducted by the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure and the Centre for Automotive Safety Research. Many crashes and near misses were caused by vehicles crossing the centre line into oncoming traffic and, between 1990 and 2006, 14 crashes were recorded on this section of road, three of which were fatal.

The 1.7 kilometre long barrier has been closely monitored since March last year to determine its effectiveness and its potential application at other hot spots on arterial roads around South Australia. Since the installation of the wire rope barriers, there have been six reports of vehicles hitting the barriers but no injuries to drivers or passengers.

This innovative treatment is used extensively interstate and overseas, with evidence that it leads to a reduction in head-on crashes and other crashes involving vehicles crossing the centre of the road. The Port Wakefield Road trial was the first time a wire rope safety barrier has been constructed along a narrow, undivided median in South Australia. I congratulate all those involved on their award.

JOB CREATION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:59): My question, again, is for the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Can the minister clarify whether the government's election promise of an extra 100,000 training positions is included in or is in addition to the promise of 100,000 jobs promised over six years during the election campaign?

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) (15:00): The central commitment of the government—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You would know, wouldn't you? The man behind the dodgy documents. You will be famous for bringing down your leader, that is what you will be famous for.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. This is about debate.

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Dodgy debate, dodgy documents, forged receipts, all of that, up to your ears in it; brought down his own leader, but anyway—

Mr PISONI: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The Premier should answer the question about Carnegie Mellon if he is taking other answers for the minister. Tell us about Carnegie Mellon while you're at it. Come on tell us—

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down when you make a comment.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Can I just say that the central commitment of the government is to work with the business community to create 100,000 extra jobs in South Australia over the next six years. And why are we confident of doing that—because over the last years, I think 113,000 jobs were created, which was massively more jobs, both full-time jobs and in totality, compared to the eight years of the former Liberal government, because you were not interested in jobs—

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is both relevance and debate. I believe it is standing order 98. The question was quite simple: were the extra 100,000 training jobs the same extra 100,000 jobs that you are claiming to create? A simple question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The 100,000 jobs within six years will be underpinned by 100,000 training places—and do you know something, that is absolutely budgeted for. The one thing everyone knows about that side of politics is you don't give a damn about jobs for working people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell.

FAMILY BUSINESSES

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Can the minister update the house on the achievements of family businesses in South Australia and what support the government has provided to family business?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (15:02): I thank the member for Reynell for this question and I really appreciate her interest in small family businesses, as I am sure members opposite do.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Wow; that is really impressive. The government recognises the important role that family businesses play in contributing to the overall health of the South Australian economy. At the recent Family Business of the Year awards, recognition was given to a number of family businesses who exemplify the spirit of family-owned and oriented enterprises. These awards are conducted annually by the South Australian Chapter of Family Business Australia and were created to enable family businesses to benchmark themselves against a set of criteria identified as the most important characteristics of a successful family business.

Awards are given in the categories of first, second and third generation, and fourth generation or more. The peacock has returned! The first generation winner was Seeley International. Seeley International was founded by Frank Seeley AM in his garage in 1972. Family members joined the company over time, relieving Frank and his wife, Kathy, from holding nearly every position in the company. Today, Seeley International is the largest air conditioning manufacturer in Australia. The company is a global leader in the development and commercialisation of energy efficient climate-control appliances. Seeley International exports to more than 110 countries and has sales offices in the United States, the United Kingdom, Spain and Italy.

This year, no award was given to the second generation category. However, the winner of the third generation Family Business of the Year award was Rossi Boots. Rossi Boots is an iconic South Australian brand—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Absolutely; but I can count past three—with a product range that includes boots for work safety, bushwalking, hospitality—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Davenport, my favourite loser.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have you ever won a ballot in your own party? Have you ever one a single ballot, one ballot?

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In 2006.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: 98 and 141.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point of order. Minister, could you return to your response?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My deepest apologies. The year 2010 marks Rossi Boots' centenary, with notable achievements including their growth during both world wars and surviving the Great Depression, with a great note in that they did not retrench a single employee during the Great Depression. Established in 1910 by Arthur Edward Rossiter, today the company is run by third generation Dean Rossiter, who is the chief executive. He is supported by other third and fourth generation family members on the board and a loyal workforce and family shareholder group.

The winner of the 4th Generation and Beyond category was Bone Timber. Bone Timber is a fifth generation business that has enjoyed a successful working relationship with building industry over the past 90 years. It is most proud of its reputation as a supplier of the best quality fit-for-purpose timber products in South Australian, which are extensively researched and responsibly sourced both locally and from around the world. Founded by George J. Bone and Stanley Bone, the company is now run by fifth generation Andrew Bone, who is the managing director.

All three award winners qualify for the national awards to be announced at the FBA national conference to be held in September. I am sure the peacock will be there in full flight. I am sure that all members of the house will watch with interest to see how our fine South Australian family-owned businesses fare at the national awards.

The government has been actively supporting family businesses since coming to office. I remind the house that in 2007 the Thinkers in Residence program invited international family business expert Dr Dennis Jaffe to South Australia. His task was to examine the status of family businesses and outline what measures could be introduced to help them grow and succeed. Of course, the Thinkers in Residence program was to be abolished by the Leader of the Opposition had she been successful in running a decent marginal seat campaign, which she failed to do.

As a result of Dr Jaffe's report, a family business subcommittee reporting to the Minister for Small Business (which is me) through the Business Development Council was established. In addition, as part of Dr Jaffe's recommendations, the Department of Trade and Economic Development appointed a family business development manager to coordinate a range of activities.

I ask all members to join me in congratulating each of the family business award winners this year and thank them for their important and unique contribution to our South Australia economy.

MURRAY RIVER FLOWS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:08): Can the Minister for Water Security detail to the house the quantities of water which will be delivered into South Australia for the water year ending 30 June 2010 both as entitlement flows under the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement and as any additional flows?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:08): I thank the deputy leader for his question. To put it into context, I would like to take the house through a couple of issues, that is, that the government has recently implemented a number of measures to improve the condition—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, look, again, I apologise—

The Hon. M.J. Wright: Don't do it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Don't do it?

The Hon. M.J. Wright: No, don't do it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: All right; I'll stay disciplined.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, there is an answer. What we have had is a total of 486 gegalitres of additional water being delivered to Lake Alexandrina during 2009-10.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I do take on board the comments of the member for Chaffey about 'gigababble', which I think is the word he used, and its lack of meaning for those people operating outside the industry. We are working on that as well, about how we communicate about the quantity of water so that it seems relevant to the people who are hearing it. I think that is one of the challenges that we all have: communicating in such a way that it means something to people outside of this chamber and outside of the political sphere.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I beg your pardon?

Mr Gardner: Something Tom can understand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: Again, I'll match Tom's intellect against anyone's on the other side, Madam Speaker.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Any two.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Any two, yes. Actually combine them; that's right. So, what we have had is a significant additional quantity of water that has been delivered to Lake Alexandrina during 2009-10. That is in addition to 350 gegalitres annual flow that has gone down there. In total, that is over 800 gegalitres of water that has gone down into Lake Alexandrina during 2009-10. I know that, in the new bipartisan approach that is going to be embraced by the opposition with respect to the way by which we handle water in this state, they too will welcome that quantity of water that has been delivered to Lake Alexandrina. The other point I would make—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Sorry; I will slow down. I do get excited when we are talking about water, Patrick. What I will do is I will slow down and I will take a drink of this very precious resource. What I would also say, with respect to the bipartisan approach, is that I know that we will be at one when it comes to this state responding to the Murray-Darling Basin draft plan when it comes out, because the opposition, too, knows the importance of this plan to South Australia, knowing full well, as everyone in this chamber does, that on any fair assessment we have not, in any way, been served well by the existing way in which the Murray-Darling Basin has been managed. So, again, I look forward to the way in which we manage this in a bipartisan way going forward.

The Hon. M.J. Wright: You expect it.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I expect it, because it is in the best interests of the people of South Australia that we do operate in this particular way. To complete the delivery of that additional water by 31 May 2010, what we had in South Australia was an increase in the full entitlement levels for the remainder of 2009-10. Of that quantum of water to be delivered to Lake Alexandrina, we are also starting to flow extra water through our 170 reserve entitlement that we are putting away this year; that is next year's entitlement. So, we are going to have that flow as well. We know that the Lower Lakes are not in a good state of health. I have been down there on several occasions.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I have been down there on several occasions and I will continue to go down there in my capacity as the water minister.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: That is true. As the member for Finniss would attest, there is no doubt that the Lower Lakes have been suffering quite chronically as a result of the lack of water flow into South Australia in most recent years. What we have seen down in Lake Alexandrina is the water level being at its highest level since December 2008, rising to minus 0.9 metres mean sea level in January 2010.

Moving away from the figures, let's say that we have seen its level significantly increase compared to previous years, and that is a good thing. We are seeing it return to a level of health—not the level of health that South Australia or, indeed, the system requires, but enough to make sure that it lives to fight another day in the context of what will be the Murray-Darling Basin plan and how we manage the system as a whole.

We have also seen reductions in the EC levels, the salt levels, within Lake Alexandrina and, indeed, with respect to Lake Albert as well. So, the 480-plus gigalitres of water have provided significant benefits to manage key risks within that lake system. It has slowed down the rate of acidification, it has lowered the salinity in the Lower Lakes and it has, of course, pushed out any decision on the temporary weir for an extended period of time.

The other point I would make is in regard to what water is going to come from the floodwaters. There was some schnook—I should rephrase that: some person—at the estimates hearing in Canberra last night who made some assertion about the fact that there is not even enough water—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: No; this was in the Senate estimates. A person who is rather ignorant and does not know the facts believed that the amount of water coming down to South Australia was not even enough to open the Murray mouth.

An honourable member: Barnaby, that's why.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Barnaby, was it? That explains everything then. If it was Barnaby then that explains everything. It seems to me that at the very least a stupid question like that, or that assertion at the Commonwealth estimates, shows me a couple of things. One is they do not really know the extent of the deterioration of our Lower Lakes here in South Australia, and it will be good that they learn what that is about. The second thing is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, Barnaby French isn't part of the government. The last time I remember Barnaby—

An honourable member: French or Joyce?

The Hon. P. CAICA: He was your ruckman.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: That's right. No, Barnaby Joyce. That shows me that they do not know the significant deterioration—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are two minutes of question time to go.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Getting back to this very important issue, Madam Speaker, we have people up there asking questions in Canberra about certain assertions about what water is going to flow into South Australia. The important thing is that they do not even realise the condition of our lakes down here or the quantity of water that is required to remedy the Lower Lakes or, indeed, open the Murray mouth. Getting to the substance of the question—I am sure that is what you will be interested in—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: It's not Kevin Sheedy? The point here, deputy leader, is that we know and you have asked previously about what it is that South Australia has done in regard to raising issues with New South Wales and others about how they measure interception across flood plains. It appears to me—

Mr Williams: How much is coming into South Australia?

The Hon. P. CAICA: From the floods?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am about to get to that.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is contrary to standing orders to interject and really the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition should be setting a better example.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I will quickly finish the answer and get to the substance, and I will speak slowly as well for Mitch's sake. The difficulty in measuring the quantity of water is that there have been estimates that have been made by the authority that are not quite as accurate as they were when they made that estimate. We are awaiting more detail about what the quantity of water will actually be.

MURRAY RIVER FLOWS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): I ask a supplementary question. As a result of the answer, can the minister tell the house: has the promise made by the Premier during the election campaign that an extra 400 gigalitres of water would flow to South Australia as a result of the floods and a deal that he had made been broken?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order, that is a completely separate subject matter; it is not a supplementary question to that answer at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I refer to the issue of an alleged broken promise, which is of course comment and out of order as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister looks as though he wants to jump to his feet.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:17): The simple fact is that that question quite rightly should have been ruled out of order, but what I will say is that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. This is becoming a farce.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister has just reflected on the Speaker and should withdraw that remark.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I apologise.

The SPEAKER: He has already withdrawn that remark.

The Hon. P. CAICA: What I should have said is that he should have realised better than to ask a question like that. That was what I, of course, meant to say. I will finish off by saying that what we—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: That's right. The Steven Bradbury of Australian politics; the last man standing. What, of course, we have been able to achieve here in South Australia is a total of 486 gigalitres of additional water that has flowed into the Lower Lakes—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Additional to the 350 that is the normal flow—additional water that has flowed into the Lower Lakes, and I will tell honourable members this as well: I would much rather have a Premier in South Australia who is able to discuss and work out matters with his interstate colleagues, as opposed to an opposition leader, or anyone else, who might go over to Canberra, without making an appointment or, alternatively, others who will go over there and put a headlock on people or sit on those people. There are 486 gigalitres of extra water flowing into South Australia than would otherwise have been the case.

CRICKET ASSOCIATION DEBT

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:20): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: To clarify an answer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, I am a very diligent minister and I like to give truthful facts to the parliament. In the question from the Leader of the Opposition in relation to whether or not any loan facilities would be provided to SACA, I will advise the house on two points which are certainly known to all players in the SMA body. The agreement that we signed with the SMA includes a \$5 million initial grant to the Stadium Management Authority for detailed design and work. Any of that unspent money will be returned to the government.

Secondly, as is commonly known among cricket authorities, the state government has provided a \$30 million bank guarantee to the Westpac Bank in respect of its loan to SACA for the current western stand under construction. Should the new development not go ahead, that guarantee will convert to a full commercial loan that mirrors the full commercial loan facility provided by Westpac which is at a commercial interest-bearing rate and principal repayment. It is just simply a commercial loan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Just in case the shadow treasurer was going to misrepresent that, Madam Speaker, the \$30 million is part of the \$85 million.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

SEXUALISATION OF CHILDREN IN MEDIA

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:22): I would like to discuss the sexualisation of children in the Australian print and electronic media. Many members know that I come to this house after more than 15 years of owning and managing a modelling agency and training school. During this time, I have been entrusted with thousands of children and teenagers to build their self-esteem and give them life skills, including the skills used in the modelling industry, such as deportment and grooming.

Although not the parent of young models represented by my agency, I had a duty of care to ensure that the under-age models represented by my agency were protected and not exploited by our society. This has meant refusing work and sometimes holding back children from work that I believe would be detrimental to their development.

Body image and the sexualisation of children are huge issues and the media has played a big role in the problems we are now facing. Many responsible clients now have an age minimum of 16 or 18 years and even ask for identification. In 2008 the Senate Standing Committee on Environment, Communications and the Arts held an inquiry into the sexualisation of children in the contemporary media. The committee's findings outlined a number of recommendations to the Rudd Labor Government in relation to the inappropriate sexualisation of our children through our electronic and print media.

Thus far, the Rudd government has failed to act appropriately on such findings. Whilst it is acknowledged that primary responsibility for many purchasing decisions, such as clothing,

magazines and DVDs, falls to parents, it is both unreasonable and unjust to place all responsibility on parents to control access to the media. I believe there is a role for government to play in supporting and assisting parents and caregivers in managing young people's access to the media.

Extensive worldwide research indicates that tweens—by definition children generally aged nine to 13 years of age—are a vulnerable and impressionable group in our society. They are also a massive advertising and marketing group. Tweens often receive a level of independence from their parents to choose their own television viewing during children's television viewing periods, such as Saturday mornings. Many purchase with their own pocket money magazines such as *Total Girl*, *Girlfriend* or *Dolly*.

Popular viewing during dedicated children's television viewing times includes Saturday morning video clips. Video clips often portray females as being subservient to males and/or sexualized in the clothing they wear, including scantily clad lingerie.

The actions performed send mixed and harmful messages to the potential child audience. Children are exposed to clip after clip of scantily clad women such as the Pussycat Dolls, Britney Spears and now even Disney's poster girl Miley Cyrus in her new song *I Can't Be Tamed* which pictures her in a cage. What kind of messages are we sending our young?

I challenge the members of this house to watch an hour of video clips on a Saturday morning and report to this house if they are not shocked and disturbed by the overt sexuality and the portrayal of women in particular in a degrading light. Evidence suggests that the continual projection and exposure to children of highly sexualised images has a detrimental effect on the child's psychological and physical wellbeing. Research indicates that even 10 minutes of exposure to video clips affects a child's self-esteem.

Research also shows that girls who have greater exposure to magazines are less satisfied with their appearance, while other studies tell us that one in five 12 year old girls have vomited or dieted to control their weight. Magazines such as *Girlfriend* regularly include sealed sections which contain highly sexualised content in the guise of providing information to readers. Such sealed sections often include question-and-answer formats on issues including sexual issues. While this may be considered appropriate information for girls over 16, a reader's survey indicates that approximately 20 per cent of the readers are girls aged 11 and 12. Such magazines are not required to meet any classification requirements and, as a rule, are not observed by the classification board until a complaint is made.

South Australia is in a unique position to make a decision in relation to publications, films and computer games. Children are not mini adults; they should not be dressed or treated as if they are. The physical development of children is shooting ahead of both emotional and cognitive development. Girls are physically developing and menstruating at an average age of 11 years as opposed to an average age of 15 not that long ago. Kids are underdone and not ready for the bombardment of sexually explicit images. I call on this government to support a bipartisan approach to acknowledge that governments, whether state or federal, have a moral responsibility to assist parents and children to assess readily and critically the content of print and electronic media.

Time expired.

FLINDERS CENTRE FOR GAMBLING RESEARCH

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:27): I commend the member for Adelaide on raising the issue of the sexualisation of girls and, with her call for bipartisanship, I am sure she will be pleased to join with me in congratulating the Premier, the former attorney-general and the member for Ashford when acting in her former role as minister for youth for providing considerable grants to keep Young Media Australia alive at a time when the Howard government simply de-funded them and could not be interested in these issues at all, despite many representations from Young Media Australia. I am pleased that this matter is now on a bipartisan agenda.

The issue I wanted to raise today was to follow up on a question I asked earlier this week of the Minister for Families and Communities who was pleased to announce earlier this week the formation of the Flinders Centre for Gambling Research. I think many people know that another problem of the modern era is gambling although, unlike the sexualisation of girls, gambling as a problem has been around in our community for many years. Unfortunately, in my view, recently the focus has been on poker machines and the harm done by this form of gambling. However, in my childhood I dealt with many people who were impoverished as a result of their father's occupying

too much of their time at racecourses, and a considerable social deprivation and devastation occurred as a result of that.

About 1.6 per cent of our population has serious gambling problems and the importance of the Flinders approach is that they are dealing with the behaviours relating to gambling. I have been sad that recently so much attention has gone to having clocks on walls, putting limits on this and limits on that, how many machines operate in a particular venue, etc. and has not focused on why it is that people gamble, what form of gambling it takes, what social conditions might lead to the gambling, and what behavioural issues and mental health issues are involved. They have simply spent too much time focusing on the machine and whether they go *bing* or *bang* or *sing hallelujah*.

Flinders University, on the other hand, has been researching the behaviour relating to gambling and, on the basis of scientific research, has looked at how we can develop models to prevent problem gambling and how those who are unfortunately entrapped can be assisted to overcome the behaviour. As I said, it is the behaviour that they focus on. They use mainly cognitive behavioural therapy, with people being exposed to the gambling risk so that they learn how to reject it and move on.

Their mental health is assessed during this program and any support relating to their mental health provided. As we know, one of the reasons for bringing the treatment of mental health and physical health more closely into alignment is that many people with mental health problems also have physical health problems, and we are developing a much more unified approach to the treatment of people with mental health difficulties who, almost invariably, have physical health problems. The Flinders model, of necessity, also brings in any physical problems that might be present.

The figures that we have about the gambling revenue to the state show that, for many years, the introduction of clocks and limits on bangs, and what have you, really did not have any impact on the growth of gambling, let alone the amount of gambling. What did have an impact was the prevention of smoking in gambling venues, and we all knew that would happen. However, again, that was a temporary halt and things have moved backwards and the trend is again upwards.

So, the focus of this government, in conjunction with Flinders University and Flinders Medical Centre, on a treatment program that involves an individual in looking at their situation, engaging their family to help them overcome problems and moving on very successfully to a situation where they can avoid gambling, is to be commended.

Time expired.

BURNSIDE ROTARY AWARDS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:32): Last night I had the pleasure of attending a Burnside Rotary event which followed 26 years of the fine tradition of the Glenside Rotary branch annual awards for what was formerly known as the ranger of the park and volunteers of the park and has now become a leadership and conservation award. Our president David Dewar presided over the meeting and we were ably mustered by Mr Robert Cooper (affectionately known as Bob), who outlined the history of this award.

It is to be noted that on this occasion Ruth Charleson won the Volunteer of the Parks award. A commendation went especially to John Mellor. The Leadership in Conservation award went to an employee of the department of the environment in the parks area, Katrina Pobke, from the West Coast. Commendations went to Mr Erik Dahl and a senior ranger in the Outback region, Mr Darren Wilson. Regrettably, due to the floods in Innamincka, he was unable to attend personally, but all were applauded on the night.

It came to my attention through a senior representative of the department of the environment who was in attendance that there was a problem in the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972. I will just mention that, although the minister was not in attendance and unfortunately had another engagement, he was ably represented by Mr John Schutz, a senior officer in the department of the environment, who presented the awards.

Nevertheless, coming back to the matter that was raised, I was in the process of outlining to the gathering recognition of Mr Robert Cooper, who annually reported on the outstanding contributions and victories of the Magpies football team. He gave a presentation to explain why he was right that the Magpies were better than the Crows and that, in fact, it was reinforced by our legal system.

In any event, as members would know, we have a system of protection of our indigenous species, whether they be bird, reptile, mammal and the like; and a number of our species are in various categories depending on whether they are endangered, vulnerable or rare.

Some poor unlikely creatures are in what we call the 'unprotected' list, and they, of course, fall victim to being able to be disposed of, killed or trapped in any way by any one at any time. I was in the course of outlining the process by which we protect our wildlife whereby (and it is all in part 5 of the act for those members who might want to go back and check this) we punish people by imprisonment or fine if they are to take into possession a protected animal or their eggs.

I mention the observation made to me on this night, that is, that, within the definition of 'protected animals' is 'mammals', so that the phrase 'protected animals or their eggs' is, of course, inconsistent because mammals are creatures which have live young; so that is one matter to be remedied. During the course of the substance of the topic, I outlined the difference between the Australian crow and the Australian magpie, pointing out that the poor old hapless crow, which is a much more mild-mannered creature, is in the category in schedule 12 as an unprotected species and, as I say, can fall victim to anything.

On the other hand, the magpie has the exalted status, in section 54, of having a very specific provision just for itself. Only the Australian magpie is identified in subsection (1), which states:

It is lawful for any person without any permit or other authority under this act, to kill an Australian magpie that has attacked or is attacking any person.

There is also a special clause for poisonous reptiles, I might point out, which goes a little further. You can kill a snake, for example, provided it is poisonous, if you are attacked, being attacked, likely to be attacked, in the dangerous proximity of or in such proximity to cause reasonable anxiety. I am not quite sure when you ascertain from the snake whether or not he or she is poisonous, but, nevertheless, there is a specific provision for them.

There it is members: dangerous magpies, in very, very select circumstances, are able to be killed. They hold that very important mantle in the legislation on their own. They are clearly superior to the humble crow, notwithstanding their behaviour. I have to confess in this contribution that I am a magpie supporter!

COUNTRY SPORTING CLUBS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:37): I rise today to talk about country football and, for that matter, netball—those community sports in regional areas are so much a part of the fabric of society. I will talk today about the Glencoe Football Club, where I played my one and only game back in 1976 as a nine year old.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: Others in my family had much better records. We moved to Adelaide the following week, so I played only the one game, but I did get my participation medal at the end of the year, which I still have proudly at home I was down at Glencoe on the weekend for the celebration of the centenary of the football club, the Mighty Murphies, a team with a potato as its mascot in reverence of the local potato farmers of the area.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: It is great potato country down there. It is interesting. I got the book, entitled *Murphy's Lore*, which goes through the history of the club. I had no idea that so many of my family members were involved. I knew they were not much at football, but they played valuable roles and became life members. My grandfather, Henry Kennedy, is a life member, and I said, 'Well, you must have been on the committee?' No; he just stood for 40 years on the gate and took everyone's money as they came in, under the pine trees where he could not even see the game. It did not matter how wet it was down there: he took the money off people as they came in and wished them a good day. That was the sort of sacrifice they would make.

On the other side of my family, my grandparents, Lindsay and Susie Bignell, were also given awards at the club because they gave the land out the back of their general store when they sold that back in the early seventies to build the clubrooms on. It is interesting to go back even further. If you go back to 1911, my great-grandfather was a secretary of the club, and the captain of the club at that time was the grandfather of the member for Mount Gambier. In fact, the member for Mount Gambier's father, grandfather and two of his uncles also played for Glencoe.

As any of the members here who come from country areas would know, the footy club—and the netball club for that matter—is so much more than just about the sport. If there is a death in the community, it is the footy club and the netball people who get together and cook the barbie and go out and do the working bees to help the family that has been left behind. When there is a bushfire, it is the footy club boys and the netball women who are out in the trucks, and the CFS these days is also out there, then the rest of the community comes together, usually at the footy club, to make the sandwiches. That is what it is all about; it just ties the whole area together.

I really want to pay tribute to Craig Childs, the current president of the Glencoe footy club. Along with Kathy Finnis, he did a magnificent job in getting together the weekend celebration. It was great to take my 97 year old grandmother there. She sat there all day on Saturday and everyone called her Nan Bignell. Even though she was my nan, she was everyone's nan. They said, 'We could always hear you yelling out from the sidelines. You were the only voice we could hear. We really appreciated the fact that you would always put on the pie and pasty nights for us.' She said, 'Well, I always thought there were plenty of sponsors for the A grade and B grade, but the future of any footy club is the colts and the senior colts, so I always supported them with the pie and pasty nights.'

One of the great speeches was from the 1949 premierships coach, Bill Wundersitz, who was there on Saturday. He is now 98 years old. He told some fantastic stories. He said that the boys used to go out and have a big pre-season game at Beachport. One of the locals with a big truck would clear all the logs off the back of the truck and the whole team would get on the truck and they would drive from Glencoe to Beachport.

There would be grog on the truck on the way back, and on one particular day one of the fellows got a bit of motion sickness—as you do with a big log truck moving side to side—and he was feeling a little unwell. There was a bang on the top of the truck cabin and the driver was told to pull over because 'so-and-so has lost his teeth'. They turned the truck around and went back. All the boys were off the truck, looking around for the teeth. Someone said, 'Here they are, they're over here.' The fellow went over, picked them up, put them straight back into his mouth, got back on the truck and they proceeded back to Glencoe.

Bill said that he wishes footy was like it was back then, when people played the ball and not the man. Peter Ey was also there. He was picked up as a 21 year old and became the captain coach in 1965. At the age of 23, with much more experienced people in the team than him, he led Glencoe to premierships in 1966 and 1967. It was great that he could make the trip from Bundaberg where he lives now. He also told a great story. He said that in the days when everyone was a farmer and they would come in to play footy, a guy said, 'I saw that guy with his shirt off. He had muscles on his guts.'

Time expired.

RAILWAY CROSSINGS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:42): I am not sure how to start when the last word is 'guts' from the member for Mawson. I commend the honourable member on his contribution about country footy. Having played all my football in the country, and being lucky enough to play—

Mr Bignell: More than one game?

Mr GRIFFITHS: More than one game—in some colts, A grade and B grade premierships—sadly, not rising to the level of one of my uncles who won six Mail Medals in a row—I was lucky enough to perform at some level. Well done, member for Mawson.

I wish to speak briefly about rail crossings in the Adelaide Plains region, which is a rather important issue. I am glad the member for Mawson is still here as parliamentary secretary for transport. I commend the member for Taylor for becoming involved in this matter. She is also intending to meet early next week with constituents who have property on both sides of Light River, which are our northern and southern boundaries, depending on where one lives.

I met with these property owners early last week. They are farmers who in most cases are third generation in the area. They are very safety conscious, and that is the important thing that I took out of my discussion with them. They respect the fact that the railway line has been there for many years, but there is always a constant need for them to move machinery between their various properties.

Efforts are being made to improve the crossings as part of the National Railway Level Crossing Safety Strategy 2010-20, for which \$150 million has been allocated to the nation—and the parliamentary secretary might correct me—and between \$13 million and \$14 million is coming to South Australia to undertake rail crossing works.

The concern by these property owners, who are residents of the District Council of Mallala, is that the plans that have been discussed—and there has been negotiation between the District Council of Mallala and the property owners—will restrict them as to the direction in which they can turn, either left or right, when they come from their property and go over the railway line and want to turn onto either an unsealed road (which is part of the local government controlled network) or a sealed road (which is part of the state government controlled network).

These discussions have been ongoing for some time. The council has done some preliminary scoping work on what might be a solution. The property owners are concerned that that initial work will be restrictive. Some effort has been made to engage the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure via some form of meeting with property owners. I know the member for Taylor has spoken to minister Conlon about this matter and a briefing will be provided to the member for Taylor very soon.

I would certainly urge the house to understand that, yes, it is very important that safety is improved on our rail crossings, and I emphasise that all the property owners are very conscious of that. In some of the documents they gave to me, it highlights that there are 100 incidents throughout Australia each year. On average, 37 people die as a result of incidents at rail crossings. So, it is obvious that there is a need to do something, but we need to ensure that, wherever possible, provision is made for these property owners to be able to move around their properties. As they explained to me, it will mean not only an increase in the distance and travelling time for them to use alternative routes to reach their properties but also, in some cases, they might have to take some very large machinery through towns. That in itself creates an inconvenience and it will affect not just Mallala but Two Wells and the many communities along the rail line. Therefore, some level of compromise needs to occur.

I encourage the parliamentary secretary to become involved—and I thank the member for Mawson for nodding his head in agreement—because it is important that we have an outcome. The member for Taylor will inspect the area next week, as I did last week. I was driven around for about an hour by one of the property owners. We would approach a corner very slowly and he would say, 'Okay, we are in a four-wheel drive, but imagine you are in an articulated vehicle and you have part of the trailer hanging over the bitumen road, and you have to stop to see whether a train is coming in either direction.'

Tree lines impact on that vision. In many cases, some of these trees were planted 10 to 20 years ago. It was well intentioned, everyone understands that, and we need to protect the environment, but the size of the trees is now creating many problems. No matter how careful you are, you have to take a guess and, when that happens, there is the potential for an accident to happen, too.

There is a need for the parliament to become involved. I know the minister will be supportive of the member for Taylor in the briefing to be provided, but I hope that DTEI staff will make the effort to visit the area and to talk to property owners to try to find a solution that takes into account not only the interest of road safety and safety on the rails, but importantly that these businesses (which are very safety conscious) can continue without an undue amount of disruption. They are trying to make a dollar; they are trying to access their properties; they are trying to ensure that they can make it work.

Time expired.

HISTORY WEEK

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Light.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:48): I thank you for that wonderful welcome, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry; I celebrate you on every level, member for Light. Please carry on.

Mr PICCOLO: Can I have that recorded in *Hansard*; thank you? Last week, I was invited by the Gawler Branch of the National Trust to officially open History Week in Gawler and, in

particular, open the Willaston Migrant Hostel display organised by the trust. I acknowledge the work undertaken by the key researcher for the migrant hostel display, Mr Jeff Turner, and also draw attention to the work of Mrs Glenys Carse who conceived the idea for the project back in 1994. I also acknowledge the support provided by the library staff of the town of Gawler and the members of the Gawler history network because, without their selfless contribution, there would not be a successful History Week in the town.

Gawler is very fortunate to have a number of people who care enough about our history to bring it to life during History Week. I wish to commend their commitment to the town and its people. I was very happy to be invited to launch History Week in Gawler and officially open the Willaston Migrant Hostel display: first, because I have a strong interest and a love of history; and, secondly, I am also a migrant to this country.

Yesterday, the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts (Hon. John Hill), in response to a question, advised the house of the objectives, themes and breadth of History Week 2010. I do not intend to cover those points except to say History Week is very important because it brings to our attention and, in some cases, to life the history of various aspects of our state. It is very important that we have an understanding of our past because who we are today is very much a result of our history, whether it is cultural, social or economic. When we have an understanding of our past we have a better understanding of where society is at today. There have been a number of events and activities during the week where people can gain a better understanding of the built, social, cultural and environmental history of our state—in my particular case, the town of Gawler.

In addition to the Willaston Migrant Hostel display, events are being run by the Gawler Show Society, the Gawler Anglican Parish, the Gawler Environment and Heritage Association and the Gawler Uniting Church. The week in Gawler has a strong oral history influence or bias which recognises that not all history is in written form.

History is about the stories of individuals or communities that share something in common, be that culture, geography and so on. Importantly, there can be more than one version of history of a particular event or era. Different people bring different perspectives to their experience of events. The history of the Willaston Migrant Hostel will depend on the perspective of the writer of the history. The experience of the migrant is different from those who worked there or experienced it from the outside, that is, the townspeople. Neither is more or less valid than the other. Having said that, the migrants I met at the launch spoke of the warm and generous welcome they received in the main from the community, particularly those who volunteered their services.

The stories of migrants in this state are interesting because, despite some stereotyping to the contrary, they are not a homogeneous group. Some migrants started their lives in this country as prisoners of war. My family, for example, migrated to this country as a result of my two uncles being prisoners of war at Loveday. One of them liked the country so much that he and his family migrated here in the early 1950s.

The migrant experience is recorded through their stories. There are stories of the suffering they incurred in their homeland, of grief and sorrow as they left family and friends behind, of their hopes and aspirations of a new life in their new country, of loneliness and sadness as they adjusted to their new lives, in particular to language and culture, of success and pride as they built new lives and families, and stories of happiness and contentment when they befriended new friends and started to feel at home in their new country.

The Willaston Migrant Hostel display pays tribute to the people who chose to make Australia their new home. Australia is a nation of pioneers, and our migrants of the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s are no less pioneers than those who came in the 1800s. I urge all members of the house to make the time to experience the history of their towns or communities and to reflect on our history.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (15:54): 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 Bill amends the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991* to increase the number of members of two of the standing committees established by that Act. The Bill increases the membership of the Social Development Committee from six members to eight. It also increases the number of members of the Natural Resources Committee from seven to nine.

The Social Development Committee currently has six members—three from each House. Its functions are to inquire into a range of health, welfare, education, recreation and occupation-related matters referred to it by either House, by the Governor or of its own motion. The Committee has previously reported on a range of matters including gambling, prostitution, the South Australian Certificate of Education, supported accommodation, fast foods and obesity, bogus health practitioners, surrogacy and rural poverty.

The Social Development Committee also has review and inquiry functions under other Acts, including the *Statutes Amendment (Recidivist Young Offenders and Youth Parole Board) Act 2009* and the *Research Involving Human Embryos Act 2003*.

In respect of the Natural Resources Committee, section 15K(2) of the Act currently says: 'four members of the Committee must be members of the House of Assembly ... and three must be members of the Legislative Council'. The Committee is required by section 15L 'to take an interest in and keep under review' matters relating to the protection, use, management, enhancement, development and improvement of the natural resources of the State. It is further charged with a number of functions specifically relating to the River Murray. Other Acts impose additional functions on the Natural Resources Committee, the best-known being the consideration of levy proposals under the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*.

The Government thinks that both Committees would benefit from an increase in membership. While each appointment to a Committee is of course a matter for the appointing House, the Government expects that an increase in the number of members will correspondingly increase each Committee's diversity and broaden the range of experience the members bring to its inquiries. It is particularly important that these Committees be able to ascertain how the matters into which they are inquiring affect all South Australians, and to consider the views and needs of a wide range of people and groups. This ability will be enhanced by the Committees themselves having a varied membership.

The Bill increases the membership of these two Committees only for the life of the current Parliament. We do not know whether membership of later Parliaments will continue to be as diverse as it is now.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*

3—Amendment of section 14—Membership of Committee

The number of members constituting the Social Development Committee is to be altered from 6 members to 8 for the term of the 52nd Parliament.

4—Amendment of section 15K—Membership of Committee

The number of members constituting the Natural Resources Committee is to be altered from 7 members to 9 for the term of the 52nd Parliament.

5—Amendment of section 24—Procedure at meetings

This is a consequential amendment, and will provide that the quorum of a Committee consisting of 8 or 9 members will be 5 members.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (15:54): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable this bill to pass through all stages without delay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of members is not present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:57): This matter that is presented to us went through the other place last evening, I think, and is a result of some negotiations that have taken place. The standing committees of the parliament, I have always thought in my almost 13 years here, have provided one of the best opportunities for members of

this place to get their teeth into the real issues that concern the citizens of this state. There is a range of committees which concentrate on various policy areas.

With the recent election and addition to the other place of a member from the Dignity for Disability Party, I think it was right and proper that both the government and the opposition considered that it would be appropriate to accommodate that new member, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, to be a member of the Social Development Committee, that being a policy area that, obviously, is very near and dear to her and the people whom she represents.

The reality is that the two major parties were also concerned that they be represented from both houses on that particular committee. I think it has been a sensible set of negotiations to deliver the outcome that we have before us today, that is, that we would expand the size of the committee to accommodate that member and, of course, another member will be provided to the committee from the lower house.

It also came to the attention of both parties, with the election of the new member for Mount Gambier in particular, but also some other Independents in the lower house, that there was a strong desire, particularly from the newly-elected member for Mount Gambier to serve on the Natural Resources Management Committee.

Again, both the opposition and the government were desirous to ensure that they had a member in both houses on that committee as well to represent the interests of the people who are represented by those two major parties. The opposition was most keen that the new member for Stuart, Dan van Holst Pellekaan, was also representing the opposition on that committee and, once again, sensibly, the opposition and the government negotiated to the point where it was deemed desirable to increase the membership of that committee to accommodate that.

As we all know, with the vagaries of the electoral cycle, the bill that we have before us not only provides for an increase in the number of those two committees to provide for those events that occurred at the most recent election but it also recognises that circumstances may well change post the next election and, as a consequence of that, in both instances a sunset clause is provided so that the committees at the end of this parliamentary term will revert back to their previous status with regard to the membership and the numbers of members.

As I said, I think in both instances it is a very sensible outcome to accommodate the new parliament in both houses and the new membership of both houses and to allow newly-elected members and members returning here to represent the interests of the people of South Australia in those committees, and I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:03): I would particularly like to thank the honourable member for MacKillop for his very generous, courteous and cooperative remarks. That approach is very much welcomed by me and I am sure by all members of the parliament. For my part, it is my sincere wish that in the future, should I have the good fortune to bring any other bills to this chamber, the honourable member will get up and make similarly cooperative and endorsing remarks and that it will be dealt with as expeditiously as this matter appears likely to be.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure he will try to validate you in every way possible.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 May 2010.)

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (16:05): Madam Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What excitement do you bring us, member for Norwood?

Mr MARSHALL: Madam Deputy Speaker, I bring you great excitement from the electorate of Norwood; and it is a very exciting electorate. The exciting information I have today is, of course, the Supply Bill 2010. It is a large tome, all of one page, albeit printed on both sides. It says, 'An Act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending on 30 June 2011'.

What one immediately thinks when one hears what it is all about is the appropriation of money for the financial year, which is actually beginning in just over a month. It is going to begin in

just a month but we do not have the budget yet for this financial year. This money, the \$5.22 billion that we are being asked to approve today in this chamber, will be the money that takes us through to when the budget is actually presented to this house. It is a funny situation when we are being asked to approve expenditure for something that we do not actually have a budget for.

I am only a new politician, but I do come out of the commercial sector and I can say it is most unorthodox to approve expenditure before you actually receive a budget, especially a large number like \$5.22 billion. In fact, in the commercial sector you would never ask to spend \$5.22 billion without a budget. You would never ask to spend \$5.22 million without having a budget, but the Treasurer and, indeed, the government are asking us to approve the expenditure of \$5.22 billion without giving us a budget stating what they are going to spend it on. It seems incredible, but it is true. I raised this with my colleagues. I said to the member for Hammond, 'Surely, this isn't the way that the government runs.' He said, 'Steven, you have got a lot to learn in here. This is what they have been doing for eight years.'

But I digress. Nevertheless, we are now being asked to approve this expenditure, but before we do there are a couple of observations that I would like to make on this expenditure. I would like to start with the revenue and expenditure of this government. We call it in the business world a profit and loss statement, but here we call it revenue and expenditure. I am new, just getting the hang of it, but I have a couple of observations. In simple terms, in the business world, we call it 'money in and money out', and it is the same principle, they tell me, in this place.

The first observation I would make regarding 'money in' is that we have had a lot of additional money, which was never budgeted for, arriving in our state. In fact, over the term of this government we have had, would you believe, \$3.8 billion for the first seven years of this government. We do not have the eighth year's figures, of course; we are not going to get them until September. Anyway, for the first seven years we have had \$3.8 billion worth of unbudgeted revenue, which was never budgeted for by this government; it just arrived.

It begs the question, where is this \$3.8 billion? Most of this has come from non-guaranteed GST revenue—non-guaranteed, non-budgeted GST revenue. As you know, when we set up the GST system with the federal government, there was a guaranteed amount that was going to come from the federal government. Our state government, in addition to that, said, 'We are going to budget for this revenue. We have actually received a windfall amount in addition to this budgeted amount.'

The other area of unexpected revenue that we have had in South Australia is in the area of property taxes. Both of these items are outside the control of our Treasurer. GST revenue is not generated by the state government here in South Australia. The property values, which are the basis of our property taxes, are also not under the control of our Treasurer. But he would have us believe that he is a good treasurer—in fact, he would have us believe that he is a great treasurer. But he is not responsible for increasing GST revenue or increasing property values driving our property tax increases here in South Australia. In fact, the only thing which he is responsible for in terms of revenue and which he can take responsibility for is state taxes and charges.

In this particular area he is a leader, there is no doubt about it, because we are the highest taxed state in Australia. Under this government there has been a 66 per cent increase in state taxes and charges over the last eight years, taking us to being the highest taxed state in Australia. In that area he can say that he is indeed a leader.

So I will repeat: we have had \$3.8 billion worth of unbudgeted revenue. Where has it gone? With all this extra cash flowing into South Australia, we should be sitting pretty. This is what you do in the business world: if you get unexpected revenue or unexpected profit, you can use it to pay down your debt or use it to spend on infrastructure that your company may need to take you into the future. Of course, the member for Hammond said that it is very similar here and that is what we can do: if we have unexpected revenue, we can use it to drive down our debt or spend it on important capital infrastructure, because that infrastructure is what drives our economy forward in the future.

Instead of driving down our state's debt, we have increasing debt. When I look at the projections for our debt in the forward estimates, it shows that we will peak under this government (because we have it for another four years, now) at \$6.829 billion. We have not had that level of debt in South Australia since the financial year 1998-99. That was 12 years ago. We have all this extra money coming in but our debt is going back to levels that we have not seen in this state since 1998-99 when we were, of course, trying to recover from the State Bank crisis.

When we get to this \$6.829 billion worth of state debt, which is mentioned in the forward estimates—not in the budget, because we have not got the budget—it shows us we will be paying \$711 million per year in interest repayments on our debt. Does anyone think that is an acceptable level? It is almost \$2 million per day. What could we be doing as a state with \$2 million per day? I think we could be doing a lot.

With this \$3.8 billion worth of money you would think to yourself, 'It is good to have that extra revenue because we can spend it on a whole pile of projects that have been neglected for a period of time.' We could, for example, rebuild the Magill Training Centre, but that is not on the agenda. We could be investing in a whole pile of projects for our environment—

Mr Gardner: Britannia roundabout.

Mr MARSHALL: Britannia roundabout—a very good one. Are we doing that? The answer is: no. In fact, under this government we have had a lot of announcements—we have not had a lot of deliverables but we have had a lot of announcements—and I would like to run through a couple of them here today.

The first one, one of my favourites, is the Mount Bold reservoir expansion. Today we heard in the house about the importance of water. In fact, we are setting up a new group to look at this very important area—I think it is going to be called the Goyder Institute. The Goyder Institute will be set up because water security is such a crucial area. In fact, the government made a similar announcement several years ago about the importance of water and said it was going to double the size of the Mount Bold reservoir. Did it do it?

An honourable member: No.

Mr MARSHALL: No, it certainly did not. That was going to cost \$850 million of our \$3.8 billion, but it did not go ahead.

The next item that I would like to deal with is the prisons project. Everyone in this house has acknowledged that our prison infrastructure in South Australia is completely out of date. The government decided it would go ahead with the \$500 million prisons PPP—and I am going to have a lot to say in this house about PPPs going forward, but not today because I am already running out of time. Did this important project, with multiple ministerial announcements about the importance of corrections and corrections infrastructure in South Australia, go ahead? No; this one did not go ahead either. What about the tramline extension to Semaphore, West Lakes and Port Adelaide? This was reported in a ministerial statement at \$336 million. Did that project go ahead? No; that one got pulled. They love making announcements. Are members sort of seeing a bit of a theme developing here? Lots of announcements, not many deliverables.

I could go on because I have got a whole page of them here. I can show it to anyone later if they wish.

Mr Pederick: Keep going.

Mr MARSHALL: I will just mention one because I am being encouraged.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hang on, member for Norwood. I know that you are new and, in many ways, I am new, too, but I would encourage you for the future not to respond to too many interjections, because life is a highway and there are some speed bumps along the way.

Mr MARSHALL: Life is a highway and I want to drive it all night long—sage words from the chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not think I said that. I only said the first line of the song. Do not engage in debate with me. Carry on.

Mr Pederick: The Deputy Speaker is always right.

Mr MARSHALL: Indeed, and I will try to refrain. The member for Hammond has been encouraging me to give just one more—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, don't blame other people; just carry on.

Mr MARSHALL: I will carry on with one final note, the Britannia roundabout, which is adjacent to my electorate. The government, leading up to the 2006 election, announced that it would be spending \$8.8 million on that intersection. How much did it actually spend? Zero. That is a real litany, isn't it? It is a litany of budget blowouts, delays and, quite frankly, incompetence on the capital account. Let's take a look at expenditure. As we were saying before: money in, money out.

We have talked about money in. We have had a lot of it. Money out is called expenditure, both in the commercial world and, of course, in here.

Let's talk about how the Treasurer has gone in that area, because that is something over which the government has complete control. It does not have complete control over revenue, and I accept that, but it does have complete control over its expenditure. Let's have a look at the report card on state government expenditure over the life of this government. Let's go back to the year 2002-03. The expenditure in that year was \$184 million over the budget; in 2003-04 the expenditure over the budget was \$467 million; in 2004-05 the expenditure over budget was \$487 million; and in 2005-06 the expenditure over budget was \$370 million. These are all very large numbers.

In 2006-07 the expenditure over budget was \$374 million; in 2007-08 the expenditure over budget was \$304 million; and then in 2008-09 the expenditure over budget was, indeed, \$556 million in one year.

Mr Gardner: How much?

Mr MARSHALL: It was \$556 million in one year. In fact, in those seven years I have just spoken about (we do not have the eighth year at the moment) we have \$2.742 billion worth of expenditure over and above what the government had budgeted for—\$2.742 billion worth of expenditure over and above what it was going to spend money on. Those numbers were taken, of course, from the Auditor-General's annual report dated 30 June 2009. What happened when all this expenditure was completely out of control? The Treasurer, quite rightly I think, said, 'Enough is enough. This over-expenditure is too much.' So, what did he do? He said, 'I'm going to set up the Sustainable Budget Commission.'

My understanding is that this was announced in the last budget period, which was May or June last year. That commission was charged with the responsibility of seeing how we could reduce expenditure—not just bring the expenditure in line with the budget but actually reduce the expenditure, reduce the budgets. Okay; \$750 million. This group was announced last May. Has it reported yet, because it has been a year? Has it reported yet? No. We just had an election so it will have to report after the election. We are still waiting on that. In fact, we are going to be waiting until 16 September for the state budget.

We will be very interested to see its report calling for \$750 million worth of cuts. What about just delivering the budget as it actually stands? It is one thing to announce a whole pile of cuts in the next budget, but it would just be great if we could actually spend our money in line with the budgets that have actually been set by the government.

We have a government that prides itself on its AAA credit rating. In fact, the Treasurer again referred to the AAA credit rating in the house today, and indeed it is great that we do retain this AAA credit rating—there is no doubt about that—but it is not because of his prudent economic management. In reality, we have a government so drunk with arrogance that it believes the lie that it is a sound economic manager.

Far from being the state's best treasurer, this Treasurer has benefited from multiple free kicks, from windfall gains of revenue over the period of his tenancy, and I put him down as the luckiest state treasurer that we have had. How has he spent this windfall? On unbridled spending and failed infrastructure delivery.

We regret the delay in the release of our state's budget for 2010-11. As I said, it is most unorthodox for any organisation to release a budget three months into the next financial year, but that is what we are going to have in South Australia. We look forward with anticipation to its final presentation.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:21): I congratulate you on attaining your position; I do not think I have done that before. I want to say at the outset that I support the bill, as we all do, because it is necessary for the first few months of the 2010-11 financial year as it ensures that the government departments and agencies will receive funding to cover their costs until this year's budget is passed through the parliament later in the year.

As we heard in question time today, we did question why the budget is so far away. If the English government can bring it on a couple of months, why can't we in South Australia? This is much later than normal. The budget will not be handed down until 16 September, which is really inordinately late.

To hand the budget down so late is a disgrace and demonstrates again that this government is arrogant and out of touch. What is it trying to hide? We can probably make an educated guess: the fact that the state's finances are in trouble. Under this government and the leadership of the Premier and Treasurer, we are paying \$1 million (soon to reach \$2 million) in interest per day paying their debt. It sounds like the State Bank; we have been there before. It is the debt that is funding their out-of-control everyday expenses and the cost blowouts.

The 2009-10 revenues have increased by \$606 million since the 2009-10 budget, but this made little difference because, for the same period, the Rann government increased its spending by \$476 million. Despite the financial downturn as a result of the global financial crisis, which the Treasurer repeatedly referred to at the time as having a major impact, revenues actually increased by \$1.5 billion from the 2008-09 financial year to 2009-10 due to bailouts from the Rudd Labor government. Spending for this period again increased by \$1.5 billion. The Rann Labor government does not have an expenses problem: it has a spending problem, going \$2.9 billion over budget since 2002-03.

Despite the Rann Labor government having more revenue at its disposal than any other South Australian government in history, eight years after it was elected to power, it has built nothing, saved nothing and provided nothing for the future. A lot of projects are happening. Cost blowouts are the norm with this government. Look at what has happened with the government's much heralded stadium proposal. It was all smiles for the camera when the announcement was made prior to the election and the Premier and Treasurer were strolling across Adelaide Oval but already, before it has even started, the government's contribution has increased from \$450 million to \$535 million.

Members interjecting:

The member for Light has just shouted out—and he is now walking out—about not building anything. I was on the Public Works Committee for four years.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Schubert, you are a very competent member, and you should know better than anyone else that we do not reflect on the presence or otherwise of people in this chamber.

An honourable member: Shame!

Mr VENNING: Well, he has now left. What about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital? I remind the house that I spent four years on the Public Works Committee from 2002 to 2006 and there was almost a total lack of any major public work—almost nothing. That is the period we are now paying for—a hiatus period of total inaction.

The Minister for Industry and Trade was on that committee and he would remember that very little came across the desk. That is why we are paying for this now and that is why I am making these comments. There are projects in the making but for all those years with all that money we have very little to show for it.

What about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital on the rail yards? This is projected to cost \$1.7 billion but, based on the Rann Labor government's track record, this will certainly blow out and be a huge cost—another State Bank loss disaster. We heard today a figure of \$2.1 billion. Was that a deliberate leak? Can it be right? The Treasurer went into great detail talking about the tender process and how secretive it is, but how did that figure come out, if it is correct? We await that with great interest.

Under the Rann Labor government, South Australia has become the highest taxed state in the nation. In a bid to fund the government's out of control expenses and cost blowouts, what do they do? They increase taxes, of course. We heard it again today, with compulsory third party premiums going up.

Following our announcement to lower taxes if we were elected, the Rann government realised that we were onto something and we welcomed the fact that they copied our policy. At least some South Australians will now get some relief—but not for very long. We heard today about the huge increased cost to motorists—a 7 per cent increase is at least twice the CPI rate.

According to the Institute of Public Affairs, South Australia's business land tax liability is 69 per cent above the national average and a massive 536 per cent above the land tax liability in Western Australia. The Rann Labor government must rein in their out of control spending or we will continue to lose business and our brightest and best people interstate.

What did the Rann Labor government do to try to get their spending under control? They commissioned a razor gang to find \$750 million in savings. Where will the savings come from? Well, it was revealed last week that many of them will come from Primary Industries and Resources SA (PIRSA). Has the Rann government not taken enough from this area already? Will PIRSA continue to be a soft target for this government?

Under the current budget and over the next four years the Rann Labor government is set to cut \$10 million from research and development here in South Australia. It has already axed 106 jobs. Jobs had been cut before I came into this place and it will be tragic to see another 106 jobs go from an already stripped department. If cuts continue to be made there will be nothing left to cut at all.

Farmers in this state rely on unbiased, non-commercial advice on agricultural research, whether it be in the dairy, horticultural, dryland farming, irrigated farming or wine industries. Where will they go for advice when PIRSA is eventually wound down to nothing and is not there, when they have not got the workers and researchers in the field and SARDI is a skeleton of its former self?

This is what is happening, Madam Deputy Speaker. The minister would not talk on radio last week about the rumours going around that PIRSA's budget could be cut by as much as 60 per cent, on top of the cuts already made over the eight years of this government. The figure of 60 per cent is being circulated. Because some departments cannot take a 60 per cent cut but PIRSA can take a cut, I bet it is more like 80 per cent—because it is easy. Some other departments cannot take a 60 per cent cut so they are a soft target.

Flaxley Research Centre was closed, with Victoria now being given the primary responsibility for research into the dairy industry. What sector of primary industries research will be next? Will we lose the wine research centre from Nuriootpa? Will it go—because it is being stripped out? I know where it would go. It would go to the Yarra Valley in Victoria, because they already try to call Melbourne the wine capital of Australia. That is quite wrong. We let that one go too, but technically that is correct.

If we ever lose the Wine Research Centre from Nuriootpa in the Barossa I will be particularly angry, if I am not already. The Primary Industries Ministerial Council is overseeing the national restructure of primary industries research, development and extension, so with this restructure and South Australia's PIRSA budget being absolutely stripped it is only a matter of time before we lose even more of our research facilities. The library at Roseworthy agricultural campus has closed—it has gone. We know that there are many more research offices in Streaky Bay, Jamestown and Keith earmarked for closure. The Loxton Research Centre has been left decimated by budget cuts.

Has the minister of agriculture ever visited one of the research centres in our state and had a talk with the scientists and researchers undertaking such good work? Did he ever visit the agricultural library located at the Roseworthy campus? We are taking away the opportunities for our young graduates to pursue a career in agriculture. Why would a young agricultural graduate want a job with PIRSA with all these funding and job cuts and many projects only being funded for two or three years? Some of those projects are 10 year projects. What do you think you could do in two or three years? You would not even start! Who will invest money in projects like that? It will not happen. This does not offer them a career path.

So what is happening? We are seeing a huge drop-off in the number of people offering themselves for a career in this area. So they will take up opportunities in the private sector and that is what is happening. This is where we get this beautiful commercial advice from. Sometimes it is okay. I look at commercial advice, but it is great to put it against primary industries advice, and you can usually make a decision between the two.

I cannot understand the attitude the Rann Labor government has towards the agricultural industry. It is not only state Labor; federal Labor has the same attitude, with absolutely nothing in the budget for farmers. Farmers are getting increasingly angry that governments ignore them. I am surprised that treasurer Foley does not have more sympathy for our primary industries because when I first met citizen Kevin Foley many years ago he was a staffer and a consultant with the then minister for primary industries, Lynn Arnold. I was also a consultant advising him from the advisory board of agriculture before I came here. That is when I met him, and other people who shall remain nameless, and he began his career there. So, he would have a good background in primary industries, but you would not pick that now.

The primary producing sector has been doing it tough for many years: dryland farming because of the drought—and thank goodness we had good rain the other day; grape growers as a result of oversupply; dairy farmers because of low milk prices and deregulation; and high fodder prices during the drought. And now, South Australian farmers, in spite of the rain we have just had, are having to cope with their seed being eaten by mice and, on top of that, being hit with a locust plague.

This is a time when existing farmers need support—morale is low. We need to be growing our rural sector, not reducing it, to ensure our food security for the future. I say to you, Madam, a person with an open mind, what is most important? This country is flat out digging out all these resources—coal, iron ore, uranium, gold—but you cannot eat any of them. If you are going to continue to import more food, as we are from China—more and more every day—what will happen? We will not produce it ourselves and one day we will have a problem with supply and we will be short of food. Do not expect farmers to crank up overnight and grow food again. The most important thing for a country is to be able to feed itself, and we should always be totally self-sufficient with food because we cannot eat coal. It worries me that we do this. Food security is a big subject for another day. This is all linked to this whole area.

PIRSA and the old department of primary industries and agriculture has a fantastic record over many years—before I came to this place, and I was not young when I got here. I was an experienced farmer before I got here. Farmers rely on non-commercial, independent advice from scientific researchers. The department can be very proud of its record over the years—people like Mr Reg French, who did all the scientific research on root diseases. Most of our researchers were not looking under the ground for problems. Albert Rovira was another excellent scientist employed by the government. The work they did meant that we were able to increase our production and profitability by probably 60 to 70 per cent in five years.

These guys are folklore legend in agriculture in South Australia—government employees. I do not think the private sector could have put in the money that was invested in these people to do this work. So, we really do rely on this work. Research and development underpins our future. The South Australian Farmers Federation, sadly, is very silent; not totally, because we do see the president, Peter White, making some comment, but they are nowhere near reacting enough to this serious situation.

The government thinks that it can get away with this because there is little opposition out there. Well, I am just saying to people that it is time we cranked up. People like you, Madam, would understand. Just check out how much food is not being grown in Australia right now—and you are going to accept that; you are going to put up with that. It is not going to worry me so much because I am on the wrong side of 50, but these people on the other side of 50: it is your future, your children's future and your grandchildren's future. If you are going to rely on China, Chile and other countries for your food and everything else, well, you do it with an open mind. Think about it.

The government is hiding behind this Sustainable Budget Commission (SBC). On 19 September the Treasurer will just axe resources from Primary Industries and Resources SA yet again. In my whole time here, in my nearly 20 years in a month's time (on 23 June I will have been here 20 years), I have seen all governments—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Congratulations.

Mr VENNING: Thank you; I haven't made it yet. You take my breath away.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, congratulations in advance, anyway.

Mr VENNING: Thank you. I have seen this department's budget, and every budget I have been here for, and it has never been increased. It gets the chop every time, and now what we have is a department that is a shadow of its former self. It is a disgrace. We will pay for this, and we will pay dearly. If we want to reverse this trend, you cannot put your hands on scientists and researchers overnight because they are not there. They have been enticed elsewhere. I bet you the Victorians are not cutting back like we are on this research area, because it is very important.

Industry right across the board has to demonstrate to government, to everybody, that it needs independent research, independent development, independent biosecurity, independent advisory services and independent compliance services. I think it is an absolute disgrace that this is happening as we sit here and very little has been said or thought about it.

Our industry is still very competitive in the international market and it is still the envy of most countries in the world. We grow the best food, we provide it economically, and it is the best

food environmentally because we do not pollute it. But, it is getting tougher and tougher to stay viable in this climate, because other countries are bringing in food—and under crazy labelling laws they get away with murder. People are buying what they think are Australian vegetables and fruit in our supermarkets, and they are not at all. It is getting tougher and tougher.

I want to pay huge accolades and give thanks to all those researchers who, over all those years, have done so much. A lot of these people have now left the department—and they are leaving in droves, taking packages. One is Mr Rob Lewis, who headed SARDI. I do not know what is happening there, but he has been a wonderful supporter and leader in this area and of the South Australian Rural Development Institute. He has had a fantastic record there. I understand that apparently he is leaving; I heard that from somebody yesterday. If that is true, that is sad, indeed. He is not the only one.

Over the years, our own personal farm adviser has been Mr Alan Mayfield. Guess where he got his training? The ex department of agriculture. He has a fabulous brain when it comes to science and agriculture. Yes, we do pay this guy reasonably well, but he would have been a lot better left in the department where he could assist everybody, irrespective of whether or not you could pay for it. When you have to pay fee-for-service, it is all right for those who can pay for it, but what about those who cannot afford to pay? With the department of agriculture, everybody got the service.

Over the years, we have had a fantastic structure with our agricultural bureaus, our advisory board of agriculture. Can I say this: one of the better ministers I ever worked with was Frank Blevins. Remember Frank from the left? He was a good minister. He did not know a lot, but he had bloody good advisers and he listened to them, and we got results.

The SPEAKER: And he came from Whyalla as well.

Mr VENNING: And he came from Whyalla. The next best minister was John Olsen. John Olsen was the same. He was minister for primary industries for a short while, and he had good advisers and took advice. All I can say is that there have been some fantastic people in that department over the years; a lot of them are still around but some have gone on. There were so many of them.

Ms Chapman: Terry Groom.

Mr VENNING: Terry Groom was another good minister; if only he had stayed as minister, we would have had the department of agriculture moved outside of Adelaide. It should not be in the city. Fancy having the department of agriculture at the black stump. What is that costing? Is that cost effective? I do not believe it is. The Treasurer has just walked in. He could save a lot of money; move it out of there and put it out at least in the suburbs or the regions. In 1993 Terry Groom was going to move it to Clare. If you had won the election in 1993, that is where it would be today.

I just want to say that I will stick by the department of agriculture (now PIRSA) to the end, and I will be a strong advocate. I make a plea to this government: it is very wrong that it should target an institution like PIRSA, because it is an easy target. People will just resign and leave; all these wonderful young people who are coming on, who are in the system, will not stay. They will go. Please have some common sense and support our primary industries. After all, the second biggest industry in the state is our food industry—at the moment, cereal grains mainly—and what is the government doing to support it? It is going to strip out the independent advisory body that we have relied on for so many years. Do not do it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of the Hon. J.R. Rau]

CREDIT (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:43): 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.

Background

In April 2008 the Productivity Commission released a report on Australia's consumer law framework. One of the recommendations of the report was the transfer of responsibility for the regulation of consumer credit to the Commonwealth Government, to be administered by a single regulator—the Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC).

This recommendation was made on the basis of identified shortcomings in the State-based Uniform Consumer Credit Code (UCCC) regulatory regime. The Productivity Commission identified the existence of legislative gaps and jurisdictional variations which represented an increased cost to business. Moreover, given the involvement of multiple regulators, the Commission noted the existing regime experienced some difficulty in efficiently responding to changes in financial services industry practice.

On 3 July 2008, in response to the Productivity Commission report, COAG agreed the Commonwealth would assume responsibility for the regulation of mortgage broking, margin lending and non-deposit lending institutions, as well as the remaining areas of consumer credit.

An intergovernmental agreement supporting the implementation of the new national regime—the *National Credit Law Agreement 2009*—was signed at the COAG meeting of 7 December 2009. This agreement represents a significant step towards COAG's efforts to deliver a seamless national economy. Not only will this national credit regime provide clarity for business, but it will also provide increased consumer protections operating consistently across Australia.

The new national credit regime, starting on 1 July 2010, will enact a new National Consumer Credit Code based on the current UCCC as a law of the Commonwealth. The UCCC provides a number of consumer protections through disclosure requirements on credit contracts, and regulating the methods for calculating and advertising interest rates, fees and charges. It also provides powers for Courts to vary terms of unjust consumer contracts.

The National credit regime, reflected in the two Commonwealth Acts: the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* and the *National Consumer Credit Protection (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Act 2009*, will go further than the UCCC by closing a number of loopholes and extending its application to residential investment properties, thereby further protecting consumers.

Developed in conjunction with State and Territory representatives, including South Australia, the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* will introduce a national licensing scheme for those engaged in credit activities. This national licensing scheme will require credit providers, finance brokers and others who provide credit assistance or act as intermediaries in these functions to be fit and proper persons to engage in credit activities.

The new licensing regime will require license holders to be members of an external dispute resolution scheme, approved by ASIC. This will ensure that, where consumers are involved in a dispute with a license holder, the consumer will not have to immediately resort to legal action, but will be able to access an effective and low-cost dispute resolution service.

One of the most important inclusions in the national credit law is a new responsible lending conduct regime. In essence, these requirements, to be phased in from 1 July 2010 and fully functional on 1 January 2011, will ensure that Australian Credit Licensees assess the suitability of a credit product in terms of the consumer's financial circumstances and objectives and will be prohibited from suggesting unsuitable credit contracts to consumers. These requirements will be further bolstered by improving the disclosure regime relating to fees and commissions associated with credit contracts.

Overview of Bill

I now turn to the specific purpose of the South Australian *Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2010*.

The object of this Bill is to adopt the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth, as amended at the time of adoption by the *National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment Act 2010* of the Commonwealth, to adopt the *National Consumer Credit Protection (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Act 2009* of the Commonwealth, and to refer certain matters relating to credit and consumer leases to the Parliament of the Commonwealth.

The proposed Act will form part of the new national credit protection regime being established under Commonwealth law. It is to be enacted for the purposes of section 51(xxxvii) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth, which enables State Parliaments to refer matters to the Commonwealth Parliament, or to adopt Commonwealth laws that have been enacted pursuant to such referrals. In essence, the Bill provides the Commonwealth with the necessary Constitutional power it requires for the implementation and operation of the national credit regime.

The reference to support the enactment of the initial Commonwealth legislation was provided by Tasmania by the enactment of the *Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Act 2009* of that State, which commenced on 17 November 2009.

In view of the enactment of the Commonwealth laws, the remaining States, including South Australia, decided to adopt the Commonwealth laws under section 51(xxxvii) of the Constitution. The adopted laws are the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth (as amended at the time of the adoption by the *National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment Act 2010* of the Commonwealth) and the *National Consumer Credit Protection (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Act 2009* of the Commonwealth.

The *Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2010* also provides for the referral of certain matters relating to credit to the Commonwealth Parliament in order to support future amendments to the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth and the *National Consumer Credit Protection (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Act 2009* of the Commonwealth (an *amendment reference*).

Since the enactment of the initial Tasmanian legislation, the Commonwealth and the States have also agreed on certain exclusions (or 'carve outs') to the amendment reference. These carve outs are reflected in this Bill. They have also been recognised under the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth through amendments made to that Act by the *National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment Act 2010* of the Commonwealth.

These carve outs, which are also reflected in the *National Credit Law Agreement 2009*, ensure that the Commonwealth cannot override State legislative authority in respect of State taxes, the recording of estates and interests in land, the priority of interests in real property, and State laws relating to State statutory rights. To further protect State legislative autonomy, and while such action would not be taken lightly, the Bill also includes a provision which allows termination of the adoption or the amendment reference.

The significance of this Bill and the implementation of the national credit regime should not be understated. In a climate of global financial instability, these measures, while striking an appropriate balance between the rights and obligations of consumers and business, further enhance the integrity of the Australian financial services sector.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause sets out the name (also called the short title) of the proposed Act.

2—Commencement

This clause provides for the commencement of the measure.

3—Definitions

This clause defines certain words and expressions used in the proposed Act. The definitions reflect the fact that there is to be an *adoption* of the Commonwealth laws together with the conferral of an *amendment reference*.

It is also necessary to distinguish for the purposes of the measure between:

- the National Credit legislation, which means—
 - (a) the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth; and
 - (b) the *National Consumer Credit Protection (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Act 2009* of the Commonwealth, as in force from time to time; and
- the relevant version of the National Credit legislation, which means—
 - (a) the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth as originally enacted, and as later amended by the *National Consumer Credit Protection Amendment Act 2010* of the Commonwealth; and
 - (b) the *National Consumer Credit Protection (Transitional and Consequential Provisions) Act 2009* of the Commonwealth.

4—Adoption of National Credit legislation

This clause deals with the adoption, under section 51(xxxvii) of the Commonwealth Constitution, of the relevant version of the National Credit legislation.

5—Termination of adoption

This clause allows the Governor to fix a day as the day on which the adoption is to terminate.

6—Reference of matters

This clause refers to the Commonwealth Parliament the matters of amending the National Credit legislation (the *amendment reference*).

The amendment reference will enable the Commonwealth to make express amendments to its National Credit legislation about the provisions of credit to which the National Credit Code applies and about consumer leases to which Part 11 of that Code applies. The National Credit Code is set out in Schedule 1 of the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth.

7—Matters excluded from reference

This clause provides for the exclusion from the amendment reference of certain matters relating to the imposition of State taxes, the system for recording of estates or interests in land, the priority of estates or interests in real property and State statutory rights.

8—Termination of reference

This clause allows the Governor to fix a day as the day on which the amendment reference is to terminate.

9—Amendment of Commonwealth law

This clause makes it clear that the National Credit legislation may be amended on account of any reference or adoption, or by Commonwealth laws or instruments enacted or made on the basis of powers vested in the Commonwealth apart from any reference or adoption.

10—Effect of termination of amendment reference before termination of adoption of Commonwealth Acts

This clause makes it clear that the separate termination of the period of the amendment reference does not affect laws already in place. Accordingly, the amendment reference continues to have effect to support those laws unless the adoption is also terminated.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:44): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable this bill to pass through all stages without delay.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of members is not present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:47): I indicate that the opposition will support the Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2010. The Hon. Michelle Lensink, the shadow minister for consumer affairs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is very difficult to hear the member for Bragg. Could we please cut the noise down.

Ms CHAPMAN: —and member of another place, has fully briefed the Liberal opposition with respect to this matter, and we have agreed to her advice. I note, in the material that has now been tabled from the minister, that his advice to the house is consistent with what we are informed. In short, the Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill essentially adopts national credit legislation, specifies a number of exclusions and follows an agreement reached at a Council of Australian Governments, which had met, I think, in 2009 and executed an agreement that incorporates a recommendation of the Productivity Commission as published in April 2008. In short, it was considered that a national credit regime should prevail and be implemented on the basis that it would provide some clarity for business and increase consumer protection operations across Australia.

South Australia and its parliament can be proud that we have been a leader, as in many other areas of jurisdiction in this parliament. We were a leader in the establishment of consumer protection law in the 1970s, including the early consumer credit act that passed in the 1970s, in recognition of, firstly, the importance to protect individual consumers against what was becoming a growing corporate divide, a power imbalance, I think, if I can describe it as that, between the operators of business and the single, uninformed and often uneducated consumer.

As a parliament, the obligations that were really pioneered in this chamber were ones that recognised the need to protect the individual consumer and to require the parties supplying products and services to provide various sets of information to the consumer to enable them to make a wise choice in the selection of the services or products.

In addition, we pioneered consumer credit legislation. I can recall those early acts of this parliament under which, really for the first time, financial institutions were obliged to require the execution of credit documents as we moved from mortgage documents to the sort of rental payments required under a rental purchase agreement. It required such things as a full disclosure of not only the interest rate being charged but the amount that had to be repaid over the term of the debt, so that the prospective consumer of this credit opportunity fully knew what they were getting into, and that was quite pioneering in its time.

It was a far cry, I must say, from some of the financial documents that South Australians, particularly women, were required to sign up to if they wanted to join usually in those days with a father or husband to obtain credit. I can recall, even at a time when I was still at school, that women, if they were to join with their husband in obtaining a loan from a bank, had an obligation to identify what arrangements they had for having children in the future, what contraception

arrangements had been put in place, in order to give some measure of satisfaction to the financial institution as to their ability to comply, for example, with the mortgage payment conditions.

It was absolutely obscene, and they are standards that would never be tolerated today. However, we have to remember that that was in the late 1960s and early 1970s, and that was a time when female public servants were required to retire upon their marriage, as was the case in other areas of industry, such as air hostesses, as they were known in those days. So, times have certainly changed. We should be proud as a state parliament of the pioneering work we contributed to in those early days.

One of the people who was very conscientious about that advance of legislation was the successor to the lady in the Versace blue up here, Mrs Joyce Steele, and that is the Hon. David Tonkin, who later became a premier of this state and succeeded Mrs Joyce Steele as the member for Burnside, as it was then, to become the member for Bragg, and I pay tribute to them both.

The other point I want to make in supporting the government in the passage of this bill is that, if I may say so, this is the way to do things properly. During the course of this week, we have debated a whole new model in respect of the proposed registration for health practitioners at a national level—and it is a dog's breakfast. The debate on that legislation is continuing, so I will not distract myself by getting into the detail of that measure, but it is a shocking mess and it should never be replicated in an attempt to impose on this parliament a model of a transfer of its legitimate responsibility and right to determine its own future—referring, in that case, to the disciplining and registration of health professionals.

This bill is a good example, whereby the governments around Australia have got together and agreed with the Productivity Commission about the importance of, in this case, attempting to clarify the situation for business, and so on, and also protecting consumers through the existence of a national body. There have been a number of pieces of legislation since the mid-1990s to effect some of that.

This transfers a power to the commonwealth, which is one of the more common models of achieving a national system, but leaves with it the capacity for the representation of states, through their senators particularly, to have a say about how that legislation grows. It is a good model and I would encourage the government to go back, as it has on this occasion, to something that is well structured and well tested. It retains the capacity for South Australia to have a significant role in the growth of that legislation in the past and repeal it if necessary, not the alternative which was dished up to us in another form earlier in this week.

Lessons can be learned from this and I thank the government for following a good model in this circumstance, and it has the opposition's support.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am particularly grateful for the honourable member for Bragg's contribution and assistance today with the passage of this bill. I think there is much sense in the remarks she made about the way we should go about things. Perhaps in some cases things are not done quite as well as they appear to have been done in this case. So, again, I thank the honourable member for Bragg for her assistance and cooperation, I thank the opposition for their assistance in relation to this matter, and I commend the matter to the house.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

CREDIT (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (17:00): 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.

This Bill supports the *Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2010*, which has the object of adopting the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009* of the Commonwealth. As I have said, that Bill forms part of the new national credit protection regime being established under Commonwealth law and will provide the Commonwealth with the necessary Constitutional power it requires for the implementation and operation of the national credit regime.

Given the move from the State-based Uniform Consumer Credit Code (UCCC) to the national consumer credit code under the *National Consumer Credit Protection Act 2009*, a number of minor and technical transitional issues inevitably arise.

This Bill, the *Credit (Transitional Arrangements) Bill 2010*, seeks to address these transitional issues.

The Bill, which operates in conjunction with the *Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2010*, ensures that references made to the existing UCCC are amended to refer to the new National Credit Code.

To provide further flexibility, if any concerns are raised in the move to the new national regime, the Bill provides for the making of additional regulations of a saving or transitional nature. While not expected to be necessary, this provision provides further confidence to both industry and consumers that appropriate mechanisms can be put in place to respond to unforeseen issues.

Most importantly, the Bill repeals the existing *Consumer Credit (South Australia) Act 1995* and the *Credit Administration Act 1995*. These Acts gave effect to the UCCC in South Australia and are no longer required under the national credit regime. In repealing these Acts, and in passing both this Bill and the *Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill 2010*, we allow South Australia to embrace broad reaching improvements to consumer protection and credit law, and support the national seamless economy vision of the Council of Australian Governments.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The measure will be brought into operation by proclamation.

3—Interpretation

This clause sets out the definitions required for the purposes of the measure.

4—Pre-Code contracts

It is necessary to continue the regulation of certain contracts under the *Consumer Credit Act 1972* or the *Consumer Transactions Act 1972*. This preserves the situation that currently applies by virtue of regulations under section 10 of the *Consumer Credit (South Australia) Act 1995*.

5—Consumer Credit Fund

It is necessary to provide for the continuation of the Consumer Credit Fund for a transitional period. The Commissioner will be able to wind up the fund at an appropriate time and apply any remaining money for a purpose authorised by the Minister.

6—Provision of information and assistance to ASIC

The Commissioner will be able to provide relevant information to ASIC in connection with the operation of the National Credit legislation.

7—ASIC has certain functions and powers

The Minister will be able to enter into an arrangement with ASIC for the performance of functions or the exercise of powers as an agent of the State, even if those functions or powers are conferred on another body under a law of the State.

8—References

This clause provides for the effect of references to the current State legislation, the *Consumer Credit (South Australia) Code* or the *Consumer Credit (South Australia) Regulations*.

9—Regulations

The Governor will be able to make other provisions of a saving or transitional nature consequent on the enactment of this measure or the transition from the State scheme to the national scheme.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and repeals

This schedule sets out related amendments to other Acts. The *Consumer Credit (South Australia) Act 1995* and the *Credit Administration Act 1995* are to be repealed.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:01): As you know, I am here to speak about the Supply Bill 2010, for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for 2010-11. I would like to just take a moment to point out that, just before question time, the Premier mentioned

the ascent of Everest today by Duncan Chessell. I think it would have been equally important to mention Katie Sarah, who is the first South Australian woman to have made that same ascent. I recognise that great feat and congratulate her on that.

We have heard people from our side of the chamber speak today—the members for Davenport, Waite, Goyder—with regard to statewide issues. The member for Norwood gave us the exciting speech that he promised us, and the member for Schubert spoke very passionately about agriculture and the impact that the decline in funding for agriculture, particularly in research and development, has had.

I would like to really support the member for Goyder with regard to focusing on regional issues. It will not surprise anybody here that this is very important to me. It is very disappointing to me that regional South Australia has been so ignored over such a long time by this government. Dealing with regional issues is always difficult. I certainly will not oppose this bill. I am a realist and I understand the mechanisms. I understand that it is important to get the money through. I also understand that Adelaide will always be the centre of South Australia—there is no doubt about that—but regional areas should not be forgotten.

The government tells us all the time that money needs to be spent in the city because country people come to the city all the time to use those services, and that is very true, but the reverse is equally true: city people go to the country—to rural and regional South Australia and the outback—all the time and access services as well. I think that it is very important to recognise that the money needs to be divided equally.

Every single person in South Australia, regardless of where they live, has a vote. They all contribute to the government, they all pay taxes, whether they are payroll taxes, personal taxes or business taxes. We all know there are lots of taxes—far too many—and everyone in regional South Australia contributes in exactly the same way as other people.

Madam Speaker, I know that regional South Australia—Whyalla and the north-west of the state—is very important to you, as Port Augusta and the Mid North and the north-east is important to me. This is a very important aspect. Isobel Redmond said before and after the election that she wanted to be, and hopes one day to be, a premier for all South Australians, and that is exactly the sort of premier I would like to have. We do not have that at the moment. The current Premier would struggle to claim that for all South Australians. Isobel Redmond, before the election—

The SPEAKER: Member for Stuart, I just need to point out to you that you have made your maiden speech. From now on, it is not appropriate to refer to members by their name but by their seat or their position. I am not telling you off; I am just reminding you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you very much—the member for Heysen.

The SPEAKER: You can address her as Leader.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Leader of the Opposition, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Yes, the Leader of the Opposition desires to be and I hope very soon (in four years' time) will be a premier for all South Australians because that is sadly lacking at the moment.

Stuart, as I hope everybody knows, is a very large electorate. Almost everything that can be found anywhere in regional South Australia is found within Stuart. It runs from—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Almost anything, but no crayfish—not yet. It runs from Kapunda and includes a section of the Riverland—fantastic farming lands—all through the Mid North, Port Augusta and through the north-east pastoral district. People in those areas are visited very regularly by people from the city. Every road up there is not just for an outback person or a country person but it is for a city person as well and, very often, it is for an international person or an interstate person who has come here for tourism. So, it is extremely important.

I fear that this government is trying to shrink regional South Australia by stealth. By providing decreased funding year after year to communities in regional South Australia it forces small towns to contract as people go to the slightly bigger towns in their area. Of course, when that happens, in an unfortunate irony, then the services have to contract as well. It is quite a sneaky process that I object to dreadfully. I think that comes from a lack of funding across the region.

This government says that it spends more money in regional areas, and I do not doubt that that is true in many cases. Where that happens I give them credit for it, but I also think that a lot of

it is hidden with regard to inflation and other ways of hiding things: it might be spent more in one area and less in another.

What I can tell people absolutely is that regional people know that their services are diminishing, and they are the people who I listen to. When the government tells me that it is spending more money in a certain area, but the people of Stuart tell me that they are getting less of a result in that area (which is really what counts), that is the most important thing for me.

Regional people are not silly. Regional people are no sillier, no dumber, no less able to figure out what is going on in their communities than any other people anywhere else in the state or in the rest of Australia. They know if their roads are not right; they know if their schools are not adequately funded; they know if their hospitals are not adequately funded; and they send a very strong message that they are incredibly disappointed with the funding that is going to regional South Australia—and they know.

We have a situation at the moment in regional South Australia where a town of about 1,000 people is the break-even point. Towns below 1,000 people living in them are shrinking and this has been going on for about a decade. Towns in regional South Australia with a population of over 1,000 are growing. That is a trend from smaller towns to bigger towns because smaller towns are being starved and shrunken and they are really deteriorating. I do not believe that the government is not aware of this. I do not believe that the government is not doing this deliberately.

It is tough economic times, and I understand that. It is difficult and costs have to be cut, but they should never be cut more in regional areas than they are in the city. Every time there is cost-cutting, people in the country suffer more than people in the city. I will always keep reminding the government of that because it is absolutely not acceptable.

There are roughly 30 towns throughout Stuart. There were many more 10, 20, 30 years ago. I fear that there will be fewer in the next 10, 20, 30 years. The government has an opportunity to help. The government talks about putting money into regional services, but this is a very important thing. The member for Schubert talked about agriculture: if you cannot feed yourself, you are going nowhere. It does not matter whether you are a family, whether you are a town, whether you are a state or a nation: if you cannot feed yourself, you are going nowhere.

If we have this perpetual drain on communities, this shrinking of people living there, every time a person loses a job in a country area it is so much harder to find another job in a country area. If a person in the city loses a job, that is a terrible situation, too, as every job, every person, every family is important, but there are more opportunities to get yourself back on track and to find another job. In country areas, that opportunity is devastatingly small, and I think that one of the things that needs to be looked at is regional employment.

To its credit, the government has set some targets. The government has population growth targets in the South Australian Strategic Plan for regional South Australia, but I do not believe that they will be achieved, and I do not believe that the government is spending money, or planning to spend money, in ways that will allow it to achieve those targets so that regional South Australian population grows at the same rate as Adelaide's population grows. It is the government's own target, and it is a good target, but it needs to be taken far more seriously.

I would like to talk about health, and again I give the government credit. It has just announced chemotherapy services for some regional towns, including Port Augusta in the electorate of Stuart, and I think that is terrific. It is actually matching an election promise the Liberal Party made before the election—we made that promise. We said that if we were elected we would put chemotherapy services in town for the people of Port Augusta and the surrounding area. To its credit, the government matched it, and to its credit the government is now about to implement that, so I think that is absolutely fantastic.

I am extremely disappointed, though, that the government will not support the implementation of an MRI licence. I understand that the licence is provided by the federal government, but the state government is not supporting it. There is an operator capable of doing it, there is a site capable of doing it, there are skills, and there is even money available. The reality is that this would not cost the South Australian government anything or, at worst, very little. There is no reason for the government not to support the granting of an MRI licence; that is, the licence for the operator of the MRI machine at Port Augusta to have their patients claim Medicare rebates. It does not cost the state a cent.

There is an operator ready to go, and I am extremely disappointed that the government will not support it, because if it were put into place, it would support not only the people of Port Augusta but a whole fan all around Upper Spencer Gulf, including the outback, the Mid North and the closer Eyre Peninsula. I think that this should be a very high priority, and it should be in the budget, particularly since it is an incredibly cheap matter for the state government.

One of the most important things about the Liberal Party's policy to rebuild the RAH where it is at the moment is that the savings would have been spent on the health system throughout the rest of the state. We can all haggle about what the savings would have been, and there is plenty of argy-bargy to be had about the numbers, but there is not one person on either side of this house who does not know or admit that it would have been much cheaper to rebuild on the current site. The reason I supported it so wholeheartedly was that there was a commitment to spend the savings—the significant savings—on health throughout the rest of the state, and that would have included suburban Adelaide and regional and remote health facilities. I think that would have been a very important thing to do.

It is a sad thing to say, but people in the country—people in my electorate—do not trust the government in regard to the health plan. It is an indisputable fact. The government is saying that it will do the best it can, and I will do everything I can to help the government do the best it can for health in country South Australia. However, in all my travels, both within and without Stuart, people do not trust the government on that. That is one of the first things the government has to rectify, and it has to do whatever it needs to do to get people to believe them, to get people to trust that they are not trying to shrink the health system in country South Australia.

Hospitals in country South Australia belong to the communities. They do not belong to the government. The government should do the best it can by them with funding and resources and training and all that sort of thing, but they actually belong to the communities. In country areas more than anywhere else, people know that and people believe that, and people raise money for the hospitals and do everything they can. Without a hospital in a country town, you do not have a GP, you do not have a pharmacy, and you do not have an aged-care facility. The hospital is so much more than just a place where people need to go for some quick service as day patients or perhaps even stay for a couple of nights. It flows onto everything in a country town, and you lose all those other terribly important services.

With regard to education, again there is this shrinking by stealth issue. A very important issue going on at the moment in my electorate is the Melrose kindergarten. People may not understand how important a kindergarten is, but for a family, for a child, for a community, it is everything, even if it is only 10 or 15 or 20 kids who are going to go to that kindergarten.

If they do not get to go there, they have to go to the town down the road. Now, the town down the road, if you are lucky, might be 25 or 30 kilometres away. It may be further. If you do not go to that kindergarten, and you go to the kindergarten in the next town down the road, well then you probably stay with your friends and you go to primary school in the next town down the road. And guess what? A few years after that, the primary school in that first town is not needed any longer, and it is just disgraceful. It is a stealth issue. I think many people opposite just would not have thought about it, understandably; it is not part of their electorate, not part of their work. I am so concerned that there be some people opposite who would have thought about it and it is a deliberate plan to save money, shrink regional communities and just move on because it is not a high priority.

Shared Services is a mess, an absolute mess. Sixty million dollars was meant to be spent to save \$137 million over five years by contracting services. Now, I am a realist and I come from a business background. I understand how important it is to save costs, but why do those costs have to be saved in the country? The only reason this is possible is because services can be shrunk. We do not need to pass a piece of paper from one person's desk to another person's desk right next to them in the same office, and have that happening absolutely everywhere. Technology allows us to effectively work and communicate remotely.

It does not have to be in Adelaide. We could have the Shared Services payroll for all government departments in Whyalla, Madam Speaker. It could be absolutely anywhere. It could be in Port Augusta, it could be in Mount Gambier, it does not have to be in Adelaide. Why is it that everything has to shrink back to Adelaide? If people would open their eyes, they would say that what allows the shrinking could also allow some growth out into regional areas; harness exactly the same technology and send it out to the regions instead of trying to pull it away from the regions.

On the matter of infrastructure, we need infrastructure to develop the very important mining industry, and tourism is also a terribly important industry. The regional development infrastructure, which was put in place by a previous Liberal government, has only had funding withdrawn from it every single budget over the last period since that happened. We went to the election saying that we would put a share of mining royalties—25 per cent—into that.

That would have taken that funding in the regional development infrastructure program from about \$2.5 million to about \$42.5 million overnight and, because it is a percentage-based program, that would have grown and grown and grown as our mining grows, the mining that our Premier and Treasurer keep telling us is on the way. We hope it is, and, as that grows, that 25 per cent would have grown. Hence, the money available for regional infrastructure, which has an extraordinarily high multiplier effect—I think it is 100 or 200 times—so for every dollar that is spent through that regional infrastructure development program it amounts to \$100 or \$200. You cannot get that kind of growth, you cannot get that kind of multiplier effect in just about any other way.

The silly thing is that, if we do not do it, we will not be able to grow mining or tourism. We will not be able to grow all of the other very important programs that both sides of this house know are important for regional South Australia. And we will not be able to reverse the population decline. If population declines, then communities decline and it is a negative multiplier effect. When a business closes because there are not enough people in the town, then even fewer people will stay and live in that town. It is absolutely disgraceful. If you have a town like the one I live in, Wilmington, of about 250 people, if one of our service stations or one of our shops were to close, then all of sudden the town would shrink even further. It is not just about Wilmington, it is about all the towns throughout regional South Australia, but particularly the towns in Stuart.

I would like to challenge this government to spend money in the budget. They have a long time, a long lead-up with regard to putting this budget in place. We talked about it in question time. The Treasurer has explained to us why he needs so much extra time to deliver his budget. I challenge him directly to spend the money equitably between South Australians who live in Adelaide and South Australians who live in the country. 'Equitably' is not saying, 'We will spend the majority of it in Adelaide and country people are welcome to come and use those services anytime they like.' That is not equitable because we know that is not how it works. That will only perpetuate the shrinking of regional communities.

I challenge this Premier to spend the money in his budget equitably across all South Australians. Everybody has a vote; everybody is a real person; everybody contributes to their communities; everybody is responsible for choosing their government; and everybody deserves equitable treatment by the government, whichever government it is, when it comes to handing down the budget.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:20): It is a pleasure to stand and speak on behalf of the people of Adelaide about the Supply Bill, which I support, but ask that the government give due consideration to some of the most important and pressing issues facing the electorate of Adelaide. The government's own media release on 24 March 2010 states:

Following the departures of the former Attorney-General Michael Atkinson, Education Minister Jane Lomax-Smith and Minister for Water Security and the River Murray, Karlene Maywald...this reshuffle of portfolios means Cabinet Ministers will be able to take a fresh look at important portfolios and bring to the table new and invigorated ideas.

When will the people of South Australia see the fruition of such invigorated ideas?

I note that, according to the government's ministerial directory, we no longer have the title of minister for water security nor do we have the title of minister for water and water security; just the Minister for Water. One could presume from the change in title that security of South Australia's water supply has, in the government's view, diminished in importance since the election. If so, this is a sad reflection of the government's failure to realise and act accordingly on South Australia's water security needs.

I call on this government to act and commit to the innovation of stormwater harvesting by supporting the Eastern Regional Alliance, which is a cooperative of seven suburban city councils: Burnside, Campbelltown, Norwood, Payneham and St Peters, Tea Tree Gully, Prospect, Unley and Walkerville. The Eastern Regional Alliance seeks to create a scheme for the capture, storage and distribution of urban stormwater within the eastern metropolitan region of Adelaide to enable a secondary source of water and to reduce the council's reliance on mains water. The Eastern

Regional Alliance is seeking funding of \$6 million—which is just 18 per cent of the total cost of the project of \$33 million—to make stormwater capture a reality.

I now turn my attention to the needs of the Adelaide electorate's only public secondary school, Adelaide High School. Thus far, since the pledges of action by this government during the election campaign, the Minister for Education has been silent on the expansion needs for Adelaide High School. The silence is deafening. Adelaide High School has had significant pressure for many years from parents wanting to enrol their children, so much so that at some stages up to 500 students have been on the waiting list and now even sibling rights have been removed for special entry students to curb demand.

Under the government's 30-year development plan the Adelaide city population will increase by 11,000 people; this will only exacerbate the problem. Currently there are six public primary schools and only one public secondary school in the Adelaide electorate; this is not satisfactory. How will the government's proposed extra 250 places solve this problem? This is a piecemeal, half-hearted attempt to address this issue.

On Tuesday 16 March, only days before the election, in a last-minute effort to save the seat of Adelaide, the government announced an expansion of Adelaide High School of 250 students by 2013. I quote:

By expanding the schools, we can relax the zones—so students from Prospect or Walkerville, for instance, will be able to attend Adelaide High School.

I call on the government to look to the future, not to the short term. An extra 250 places for Adelaide High School will not even bring it into line with the state asset management plan benchmarks that were given to DECS in June 2001. These benchmarks indicated at the time that the building area identified as 10,471 square metres equated to a shortfall of space for approximately 226 students. Based on current figures this would now be a shortfall of 329. As Adelaide High School is already over capacity by 329 students, and the numbers are increasing yearly, adding Prospect and Walkerville could increase the demand by up to a further 650 students.

Thus, by 2013, Adelaide High School will require around another 800 places. The people of Prospect require another public school option. Every child is entitled to a local education. The proposed super school in Gepps Cross is not what the people of Adelaide want, and the people of the electorate let the previous member for Adelaide know of their displeasure with this idea at the recent state election.

I refer to the statement by Jay Weatherill on the front cover of the school post, which says: 'By listening to what communities have to say, I believe we can together build a responsive school system.' Will the Minister for Education honour this pledge? This is not about Liberal or Labor or which party holds the seat of Adelaide; this is about the needs of our children, our future and the clear and defined, unquestionable need for a second school in the inner north city area.

I also believe we should be investing in the reinvigoration of Rundle Mall, as there has been no major reinvestment back into the mall since it was first established in the 1970s. The mall received a minor facelift in the mid-1990s, with repaving, the erection of the Gawler Place canopy and various subsurface infrastructure improvements. I believe this should be given a high priority, given that it is visited by 85 per cent of tourists to South Australia, has the highest point of pedestrian traffic with over 23 million visitors a year, has annual sales of approximately \$800 million and employs around 5,000 people.

Rundle Mall is the premier retail centre in the heart of Adelaide, home to over 700 retail specialty stores, 200 service providers and 15 unique arcades and shopping centres. As mentioned, the precinct employs around 5,000 people and is visited daily by thousands of the 110,000 city workers and 50,000 students who earn or learn in the city, as well as thousands of tourists each year. I believe it needs the assistance of the state government to return this important tourist attraction to its former glory.

At present, I am advised there are around 80 shop vacancies from the corner of Hindley Street and West Terrace to the end of Rundle Street and East Terrace. Historically, this connection of streets has been the premier shopping district of Adelaide. Whilst I believe one could argue that a significant factor for the high vacancy rate is the lack of state government commitment to Rundle Mall and Adelaide, other factors such as the government's unfair tax regime are hurting South Australian businesses, making South Australia an uncompetitive place to conduct business. I ask this government: why would a new business choose to start an operation in South Australia? What

incentive does the government offer for businesses to grow and prosper? How many businesses are we going to lose to other states due to our unfair, uncompetitive and punitive state tax regime?

Finally, I ask this government to consider this: if we are successful in our World Cup bid in 2018 or 2022, will the government put the \$800 million-plus commitment for the Adelaide Oval (being last year's state government commitment of \$450 million, and not a cent more; a further commitment of \$85 million; the footbridge commitment that has been estimated at anywhere from \$20 million to \$38 million; and the federal government's contribution of up to \$250 million) into building a purpose-built stadium with an enclosed roof and adequate parking? Please do not destroy our beautiful Adelaide Oval and turn North Adelaide into a car park.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:28): I rise at this late hour on a Thursday evening to indicate my support for the Supply Bill.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Hear, hear!

Mr PENGILLY: I am glad that the minister is happy about that, and I will continue my remarks. In supporting the motion, I would also like to say that I also support the Rann government, and, indeed, on this rare, rare occasion, not so much the Rudd government but minister Ferguson and minister Holloway for their announcement about issuing licences for exploration of oil and gas off the west end of Kangaroo Island and also off Margaret River in Western Australia.

It is absolutely critical to this nation that we get on and explore and find what resources we have on land and, equally, in the waters surrounding our mighty nation. I noticed in the local Kangaroo Island press this week, and I have noticed in some emails and correspondence that have been put about, that there is a degree of emotion coming into the opposition to the announcement by the two ministers, and that concerns me. Let me make very clear that, as a lifelong resident of Kangaroo Island and of South Australia, I want absolute assurance that there is no threat to the fishing industry; I want absolute assurance that there is no threat to the tourism industry; and I want absolute assurance that there is no threat to the marine environment. However, let me also assure the house that I want to make sure that my children, my grandchildren (should I have any), all Australians and our descendants, in 100 to 200 years, have those resources available.

Quite clearly we must look now. It worries me that an emotive campaign is launched. Of course, I do not want any spills—of course I do not want that. But to try to put together a fear campaign based on a spill in America and what happened off north-west Australia last year is simply beyond the pale as far as I am concerned in opposition to the announcement of this exploration licence. Purely and simply I say to members and to the parliament that I do not believe—and I believe that I am right—that there has been any semblance of a spill of oil or gas offshore in South Australia in the last 50 years. Of course, we must be exceptionally careful.

It worries me that an editor within the Fairfax newspaper group—under Rural Press, in this case *The Islander* on Kangaroo Island—has chosen to get emotive about the subject. It is no good being emotive. We must look for these resources; we have to see what we have got to provide for the future.

You even have the Premier, who called a certain mine a 'mirage in the desert' 25 years ago, now boasting about having all these mines and looking for uranium. I join with the member for Newland, an advocate for nuclear power, in saying that this is the way we have to go in Australia. We have this old continent. We have the capacity to bury nuclear waste and we should be looking to develop a nuclear power industry as it eventually happens. These are my personal views. I know there are differing views in the house, and I respect that.

However, we have a nation, a very stable continent, and it does not matter now how much fear and anxiety is brought into people's minds. The reality is that in 150 years when there is no oil and no gas, they will still be looking for it. Uranium will be one of the major sources of power, along with, I suggest, the wind, the sun and the waves (because we will get that technology going as time goes on), and we do need to look for these things.

You simply cannot hide it way and say, 'No, no, no, we can't do this,' because generations to come will curse the day that the generations now occupying Australia rejected that as something to be scared about. I want to know that, in the future, these things are put in place to cater for those generations. We will have terrific technology. Wind is exceptionally expensive to put into place and it has a fair degree of impact on carbon production and whatnot in terms of constructing the turbines and everything else, along with the environmental aspects of wind power. Wave power is

used in Europe, and there are areas around the South Australian coast that have enormous currents where that wave power could be harnessed, and I look forward to seeing that.

Indeed, some years ago, Professor Brian Kirk from, I think, Flinders University made a presentation about solar power that I witnessed. However, until we find better ways to store that solar power we have a long way to go. We cannot have fear and trembling and great concern without balancing it up with reason and looking forward to the future, because we do have to look to the future; we owe it to our descendants to do that. Having got that off my chest, I will move on.

Clearly across my electorate, there is an enormous demand for funds from federal government. Councils need it all the time; there is never enough money. The five councils in my electorate—Onkaparinga, Alexandrina, City of Victor Harbor, Yankalilla and Kangaroo Island—are all screaming out for money to deal with the roads. It is simply beyond them to do it.

Some of them are unsustainable and we wonder where that is going to go. I note a bill that was introduced today in reference to local government. I think we have to have a debate in this parliament about where we go with local government, how much we want of local government and how we assist them. However, in assisting them we turn around and ask the federal government to assist us.

I have an enormous network of roads, as indeed do other rural members in this place. For example, the members for Stuart, Hammond and Flinders alone have countless thousands of kilometres of road and I join them in that. I get constant grumbles from all my councils about road funding. We have seen the problems that Kangaroo Island Council has had and its suggestion for a tourism levy (which I do not support and I have made that quite clear). However, we have to find a way out.

Are we going to get more money from the feds? I do not know. Are we going to get more money from the state? Let me say that, if we can find \$535 million or whatever it was for Adelaide Oval, we should be able to find a bit of money to do something around the state and in other places for the health, welfare and the betterment of our community.

I love football and cricket. I love going to it, but where are we going with this expenditure? Where is this money going? We have such a list of social ills: mental health, Aboriginal health, rural people's health. The list goes on and on. My colleague the member for Chaffey has enormous problems in his area. It does not matter much where you go. I say to the parliament and to the government: where on earth are we going with all this expenditure?

Similarly, our education system is struggling for funding. We have an excellent education system, I believe, in this state, both private and public. We are very lucky. The public system continues to have a demand on funding. We are seeing the 'Julia Gillard memorial halls' go up around the state. They are being welcomed gladly by schools—there is no question about that—but ultimately we are going to have to fund the maintenance of them, so the state will have to find more money in due course for maintenance on these facilities.

A variety of them are going up in my electorate and some schools are most grateful to get them, but once again I say, with the debt that has been incurred by the federal government, our children and our grandchildren are going to be paying for this debt for decades to come. Whilst they are welcome, they have to be paid for—the buck stops here. That is a concern.

I mentioned yesterday that there is a demand for preschools and that brings me, of course, to the health sector and the enormous demands that are put on the state budget by the health sector. The minister has said—and he is not definitely right but possibly right—that, in due course, the health budget alone in South Australia will devour the state budget. That is a frightening thought for the future. How do we split that up between schools and the transport needs and everything else?

What we have to do in this state is advance the cause of the industries we have. It is probably worth remembering that far and away the most important industry in this state is agriculture. It is still the biggest industry in South Australia. It is feeding and clothing the world. My electorate has an enormous capacity to produce food and fibre on the Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island and that is under threat. I notice with interest that we are having a change to the Department for Environment and Heritage. It is disappearing, and we will have a new department of environment and natural resources.

What concerns me is whether the bureaucrats in DWLBC will be sucked into the new department and continue business as usual or whether there will be a strength of purpose by the

government—and I sincerely hope the minister rips these people into gear—in order to get common sense prevailing across rural South Australia.

Farmers know what they are doing. They know how to produce food and fibre, but what they do not know how to do is deal with increasing numbers of bureaucrats telling them how to operate. This is a common occurrence. The former member for Stuart was loud and clear with his views on certain bureaucrats. He was quite forthright in this chamber over nearly 40 years about what should happen to some of them.

I want to see them pulled into gear and I want to see a good working relationship between the farming community and the bureaucrats. In some cases that is happening, but normally that does not happen. You cannot have bureaucrats dictating to landholders, people who have purchased their properties. Sometimes these properties have been in families for over 100 years. You cannot have these people telling landholders what they should and should not do.

It is fine to give assistance. The government is there to help. If a farmer needs help and goes to Primary Industries and Resources SA or the Department for Environment and Heritage, or some similar organisation, to ask for assistance, that is one thing, but to have these people running around in shiny government-plated cars telling everyone how to run their life is totally alien to rural people and farmers. I would like to think that we could see some change.

Along with the agriculture sector, another couple of areas in my electorate get forgotten regularly, including the fishing industry. The fishing industry is critically important to my electorate. We have professional fishermen operating on the Fleurieu Peninsula and on Kangaroo Island. We have scalefishing, rock lobster fishing, abalone fishing and net fishing. We have a host of industries which, once again, are in very well managed fisheries—and have been for decades.

The northern rock lobster zone fishery has been through the quota system over the past couple of years. This year the biomass is up considerably. They had filled their quotas by the end of February this year in many cases, even the end of January, whereas the southern rock lobster zone is in dire trouble—I recognise that—but it may be because of a variety of seasonal reasons with cold waters and upwells. We need to protect the fishing industry.

I go back to my first words. One of the things that worries me is these minority pressure groups and extreme greenies who want to stop the world. Well, if they want to stop the world to get off, they can get off and we will keep going, quite frankly. That is my view. They are now floating around the marine park stuff, which has been messing around the parliament for eight years without anything happening.

They are now saying, 'We don't want any oil and gas exploration until such time that the marine park is put in place.' I will tell you what they do not want. They want the marine parks in place so we can do nothing. They want to make it difficult for companies to look for minerals, oil or gas—or whatever. That is what they are about. They are selfish, foolish people. They are living in another world, they are living in a bubble. They want to get out and join the real world.

Clearly, the vast majority of members in this place are interested in looking after the environment to make sure we leave it in good condition or a better condition when we depart this earth. That is an important part of life. The farming community lives with the land, works with the land and understands the land. Some 99.9 per cent of landholders do the right thing; there is no question about it.

There is always a renegade element in any industry that does the wrong thing and I acknowledge that. Similarly the fishing industry wants to protect its fisheries. It does not want these minority pressure groups running around trying to create chaos. I am seeing it again with the marine parks. The minority pressure groups are trying to pressure the government into creating zones where you cannot do anything or catch anything. It is a frightening wonder, so if I get a little extreme in this place from time to time its because we have to balance up the extremity the other way—it is simply not good enough.

The other industry is the forestry industry. I am concerned over the future of the blue gum industry and where it is going in my electorate. Both Adelaide Blue Gum on the Fleurieu and Great Southern Plantations on Kangaroo Island are in receivership. These trees are continuing to grow, and with something like 1,100 hectares of blue gums on the Fleurieu nothing looks like happening. More importantly, with 13,000 hectares of blue gums on Kangaroo Island it appears that nothing will happen with them in the long term either. It is a major worry. Forestry is a good industry and I know that the members from the South-East of the state—the members for Mount Gambier and

MacKillop—have enormous areas of forestry (radiata and blue gums) in their electorate, and there is quite a bit of discussion and debate over where the industry is going down there.

One of the issues is where you plant things to ensure that they can be harvested. It is a major issue with blue gums on the island and on the Fleurieu Peninsula. We have to have primary industry. I am hopeful that the new minister will quickly pick up and understand, as he has a business background. I think he is the only member opposite who has any knowledge of running a business. I look forward to him picking up on the agricultural, fishing and forestry sectors and putting some well meaning things in place to continue to help in those areas.

It is an interesting time in the future of South Australia as many of these mines will come on stream. I know the Premier likes to promote the view that they have done everything and we have done nothing. I suspect that he will not be around as Premier to see much happen. I do not think he will be here much longer, quite frankly. If this week is any indication of the way the government is travelling, I cannot see anything much but a puff of smoke every now and then. They seem to have lost their way, have no energy left, have no reform areas and have forgotten what they are here for. So, I think we will see a change in the top end of the current government. There will be a number of ministerial changes, the Premier will change and we will have a different leader sitting over there by the time we come up to the next four-year cycle and the election. I am concerned about where the state will go over the next four years. It is a great worry to me and to rural people.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:49): I rise—

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: I thank members opposite for their encouragement. I am always very pleased to contribute in this place. I stand to speak in favour of the Supply Bill because we all want to ensure that the state runs, people are paid and small business people's accounts are paid on time—we would not want to see any delays there. It is necessary to do this because we are not actually handing down a budget in June as we usually do in South Australia but, rather, in September, well into the new financial year. The reason we have the Supply Bill, of course, is to keep the money flowing; an amount of \$5 billion-odd is what we are debating here today.

It is important that we look at how the government spend its money and how it wastes money as well.

This week there was a blowout of the '\$450 million, not one cent more' Adelaide Oval development, with \$85 million being added. We also revisited today that on top of the \$25 million that was given to SACA initially for the western grandstand several years ago there is \$5 million to set up the Stadium Management Authority, so that they could come up with a cost. Then we find out that the extra \$85 million is to compensate for the debt that is held by SACA for a grandstand that, now, is \$85 million plus \$25 million; so, we are up to \$110 million, plus another \$25 million that came from the federal government. We are up to \$135 million for a grandstand that is valued on the SACA books at \$90 million. A \$135 million investment is valued at \$90 million on the SACA books.

Then, we heard today from the Treasurer that he forgot about a loan arrangement that he had made. He is having all these negotiations, all these briefings, but he forgot about a key issue, that is, that he is already in for \$30 million regardless of what happens in the way of loan guarantees and lending money. It is interesting the way this government is managing money.

We all remember that one of the big catchcries of the 2006 election was that an American university was coming here to South Australia—Carnegie Mellon from the Heinz family, one of the wealthiest families in America, I believe. I do not know whether or not they have got some connection to the Kennedys. Maybe that is why they are here. We know that the Premier is attracted to anybody who has even farted next to a Kennedy. The Premier will want them here in Adelaide, so that he can put his hand around their shoulder and say, 'I know this guy, he knows the Kennedys.'

We know that the Premier likes to do that. We had one of the Kennedys here speaking for about \$250,000 (I think that cost) on an environment program a couple of years ago. One of the Premier's dear friends, who unfortunately passed away just recently, was another strong connection to the Kennedys. I am not sure if he was there when they dragged Edward Kennedy's car out of the lake, but I know he had some connection to the Kennedys, and that was good enough for Mike Rann to bring him to Adelaide.

We have Carnegie Mellon University. In the Premier's own press club lunch before the election, on the day the election was called on 20 February, he told us that Carnegie Mellon was part of the future of South Australia. Don't worry that we are losing our manufacturing industries, don't worry that we have lower jobs growth in South Australia than the rest of the country. Don't worry, we've got new industries happening, we've got mining. Remember mining? 23,000 jobs poised in 2005—'poised', look it up; it means 'just about to happen'. And here we are, five years down the track and we still do not have any confirmation of what is happening with the expansion of Roxby Downs.

Let's get back to Carnegie Mellon. The big announcement was that there would be two campuses of the American university in South Australia. It was a first for Australia, another historic deal for Australia. I am not sure whether he used that word. We could accuse him of repetition, because we hear that word so often, an historic arrangement to bring Carnegie Mellon to South Australia.

What was the cost of that? \$39.25 million to get them here; \$19.5 million to pay public servants to go to their \$65,000 a year courses, because there is no demand in South Australia through the marketplace for that type of product. Then, of course, the second campus was going to be the entertainment technology centre. What Mike Rann told us about the entertainment technology centre was that students—Adelaide students and students from around the world—who go to this college would be working at Pixar and Disneyland creating great animation and other entertainment technology. What did we find out today? We found out that half the Carnegie college has closed down, and it has been closed down for two years—and the minister for further education had no idea! What did he say? He said, 'I have no idea.'

This is a pet program of the Premier; the Premier branded this with his name all over it. It flows really well: Carnegie Mellon, Mike Rann; Carnegie Mellon, Mike Rann. Yet we find that for two years the government has been paying rent for an empty building. What was the government's statement for Channel 10 news? 'Yes, but they shared it with some other people; we let them be there for free for a while' was the government's excuse on Channel 10 news. No-one would front the cameras. We will see what Channels 7, 9 and 2 have to say.

We have 500 square metres at \$250 a square metre for two years. That is a quarter of a million dollars, yet this government tells us that it cannot bring down a budget because it has to find savings in schools, savings in hospitals, savings out in rural South Australia; it has to save \$750 million because it is not managing the economy here in South Australia; 'We don't know what we are doing so we have to get the experts in.' The Premier boasts that he gets the experts in; he talks to experts. He is saying that we need to do this because Howard did when he came in in 1996, but Howard was there after 13 years of badly managed Labor government.

Dean Brown and Stephen Baker had to do it when they came in in 1993. They were there to fix up the State Bank mess that Mike Rann had a hand in developing, and they had to bring in a budget to deal with that very difficult situation. We have here the Treasurer telling us that it is his budget but he does not know what is going on, so he is getting some outside help—and, by the way, it is going to take longer. Tasmania got its budget out on time and it had an election on the same day, but here in South Australia we have to employ others to do the Treasurer's job—and I have been led to believe that their budget is blowing out.

It is an interesting scenario that we are here today discussing the Supply Bill because the budget will not be ready, and this government has been in office for eight years. In fact, if members want to get some idea about why we in South Australia lag behind the rest the nation on just about all the economic points, I point out that, by the end of this term in 2014, Labor will have been in government in South Australia for 33 out of 44 years. What that says is that the state of this economy is all Labor's fault. It is no good saying that governments are the same; it is Labor's fault. At the end of this term Labor will have been in power for 33 out of 44 years, so it is no good saying that both parties have been at fault, because the Labor Party has its stamp all over South Australia. When your children leave to get jobs elsewhere, just remember that it is the Labor Party. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Tuesday 22 June 2010 at 11:00.