

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 22 June 2010

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (11:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I rise today to correct information I have previously provided to the house regarding the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. In the previous week of sitting, on Wednesday 26 May, I was asked a question by the Leader of the Opposition, namely:

On what date was the Treasurer first aware that the \$450 million funding contribution announced on 2 December 2009 was going to be insufficient to deliver the proposed FIFA compliant stadium?

In answering that question I responded to the leader that:

...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.

I also stated in response to an interjection that:

...I was not made aware in any way, shape or form prior to the election that the 450 [million] would not be sufficient.

The following day, Thursday 27 May, I gave a ministerial statement to the house providing further and more detailed information about when I was first advised that the costs of the redevelopment were estimated to exceed the government's contribution of \$450 million.

In order to prepare this statement, my staff conducted a search of office records to establish when I was first advised of this. The search of records and the preparation of that statement were done to establish for the house precisely when I was advised verbally, and subsequently in writing. This was done to clarify my earlier comments where I had said in the house 'reports I was given verbally' and 'about a week or so ago'.

I did not recall, nor were my staff aware, that I was in receipt of information prior to the election that the costs were estimated to be higher than the government's \$450 million contribution. My ministerial statement on that Thursday referred to a verbal update that I was given on 30 March. The update, which indicated escalating costs, was followed by written advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance on 1 April, which also indicated escalating costs for the project.

My statement to the house then outlined that I sought further, more detailed and up-to-date advice, which I received from Treasury on 18 May. My statement also addressed a further question from the member for Davenport regarding a meeting I had with the Stadium Management Authority on 3 March during the state election campaign. In that respect, I advised the house that:

This was an early [morning] meeting to show design concepts that were emerging from the work of the authority.

Given that the government was in caretaker mode during the election campaign period, in my view it would have been inappropriate to receive information regarding cost estimates or discussions about the government's contribution to the project. It was indicated at the outset of that meeting that cost estimates were not to be mentioned or discussed.

I can confirm to the house that the cost estimates were not included in that briefing. However, I can advise the house that I did attend another meeting with the Stadium Management

Authority with members of the government steering committee on 13 April, where further design concepts were shown and discussions about costs took place.

It was clear at this meeting that, based on those designs and the scope of the work being conducted, the total cost for both core stadium works as well as other project enhancements would exceed the government's contribution. However, it was further discussed that the work needed further refinement, and detailed costings and that accurate costings remained some time away. I raise this last meeting to put it on the record only.

In giving my ministerial statement to the house on 27 May, it was my honest and genuine belief that I had provided the most accurate information possible. I take my obligation to provide the house with accurate and complete information very seriously. Accordingly, it has always been my practice as a minister to check the record and come back to the house with revised information as and when appropriate. Indeed, that same day, on 27 May, I made a further ministerial statement following question time in order to correct an answer I had provided to the member for Davenport earlier on a related matter.

On the evening of the last parliamentary sitting day, on 27 May, where I had made the two ministerial statements, my chief of staff had a telephone conversation with a Treasury official to confirm the information that had been provided to the house. During this conversation, the officer pointed out that documents provided to my office included attachments to the Treasury advice of 18 May (and referred to in my ministerial statement on 27 May), which gave more detailed and up-to-date cost estimates of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment costs.

One of the attachments to this Treasury advice was a copy of the minutes of a meeting of the government steering committee held on 22 February. The minute notes Leigh Whicker's comments to the committee that he had met with me on 19 February, the day prior to writs being issued for the recent state election, and that he raised estimated costs of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. The following points are included in this minute, which state:

Leigh Whicker advised the outcome of initial estimates from consultants that indicated a cost of the project of \$469 million, excluding the costs of car parks, the Western Stand and the footbridge. This worked out to approximately \$10,700 per seat. Leigh advised that he had met the Treasurer and provided a briefing on those estimates. It was acknowledged that the costs were well in excess of the government's planned \$360 million investment after deducting the \$5 million design grant and \$85 million for the Western Stand.

It further states:

Discussion then followed that these estimates were preliminary only and should not/could not be relied upon.

I repeat:

Discussion then followed that these estimates were preliminary only and should not/could not be relied upon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will repeat that, Madam Speaker, for the benefit of the house:

Discussion then followed that these estimates were preliminary only and should not/could not be relied upon. The final design had not been determined and there were many variances which may have a material impact (up or down) on the final costing. This information will not be available for several weeks.

When I provided my answers to questions from the opposition during the last week of sitting, I did not recall this meeting and discussions that occurred. Following the conversation between my chief of staff and the Treasury official on the evening of Thursday 27 May, my chief of staff raised this matter with me.

On the following morning, I was shown the document. It was only when I saw the document that my memory was refreshed and I recalled the meeting with Leigh Whicker. It was then apparent to me that my earlier advice to the house was incorrect. Clearly, both my staff and I had overlooked this reference to the meeting in the numerous attachments to the Treasury advice. The minutes were one of 12 documents comprising four attachments of some 60 pages in total that were attached to the Treasury advice.

This oversight meant that I had failed to recall the meeting or the discussions that took place during it when I provided my advice to the house on Thursday 27 May or indeed in days prior to it. I immediately resolved to advise the house of this information at the earliest available

opportunity, as my obligation under the conventions of the Westminster system dictates and as I had done twice on Thursday 27 May.

As members would be aware, in fact I chose to admit my mistake earlier. On Wednesday 2 June I held a press conference where I outlined publicly my mistake. I did so for a number of reasons. The matter was the subject of continuing speculation in the media, and I felt it appropriate to set the record straight. Also, I felt that, given that there were three weeks between the sittings of the house, it was preferable to make the correct information publicly available sooner rather than later. I believed it was in the public interest to correct the record.

Madam Speaker, I hope you accept my intentions in making the information publicly available prior to correcting the record in the house; my actions were in no way designed to diminish the importance of the parliament or the house receiving this information in the first instance. Accordingly, I am now providing the correct information to the house.

The circumstances surrounding the meeting with Mr Whicker on 19 February, and my inability to recall it, have been the subject of much conjecture. My opponents have been quick to accuse me of deliberately misleading the house and saying that I should resign from the ministry as a result. Central to their argument is that it is inconceivable that I would not recall earlier the meeting or what was discussed at it. I strenuously reject those allegations and accusations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The meeting was held at Mr Whicker's office at AAMI Stadium, and I attended on my own on the way back from my electorate office to the city. Once I sighted the minutes referring to this meeting and Mr Whicker's reference to costs being discussed there, I recalled the meeting and that there was a discussion about the initial estimates of the cost of the redevelopment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is making a ministerial statement; he is entitled to be heard in silence.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: There were several matters raised at this meeting, which was primarily about the administration and future of football in this state. Members may recall that at the time there was much public debate about the future of the Port Adelaide Magpies and that the SANFL board had recently considered proposals to address the club's ongoing financial sustainability. My recollection is that Mr Whicker asked me to meet with him to discuss these matters, which also canvassed the broader health of South Australian football, including the Adelaide Football Club, the Port Adelaide Football Club and the SANFL clubs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Leader!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: My recollection is that the reference to the potential costs of the redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval were fleeting and that, given the preliminary nature of the work that had been done at that stage, the estimates lacked sufficient substance to them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I did not place much weight on the information at the time, because it appeared that the cost estimates—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Do members want to hear what the Deputy Premier has to say or not? If you do not, please leave.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I did not place much weight on the information at the time, because it appeared that the cost estimates were only at a very early stage of preparation, the

scope of the project had not been adequately determined and much more work needed to be undertaken on the design and costs.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Indeed, as the minutes to the subsequent steering committee outlined, the final design had not been determined, and further information would not be available for several weeks. Furthermore, the government had made it clear at that stage that its commitment was capped at \$450 million.

During a press conference held on 2 March during the election campaign I was asked questions regarding the redevelopment, and at that press conference I made reference to having met with Mr Whicker in recent days and said that I was meeting with him again the following day. My mistake in providing incorrect information to the house was in not recalling the meeting of 19 February whilst I was on my feet answering questions from the opposition on Wednesday 26 May and again in the preparation and delivery of the ministerial statement subsequently on Thursday 27 May.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This issue will be heard in silence.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As you could imagine, the meeting occurred on the day before the election was called. It would be fair to say that I had an expectation that the election campaign proper was about to begin and I was largely preoccupied with the impending campaign.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In conclusion on this issue, I sincerely apologise to both you, Madam Speaker, and the house for inadvertently providing incorrect information in the last sitting week and, accordingly, I have now corrected the record.

Lastly, yesterday the opposition has accused me again of misleading the house over the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval. The opposition has cited extracts of my answer to a question in parliament on 13 May where I said:

...but I can say today to the house that the upgrade of Adelaide Oval—if the opposition is trying to suggest that it would be an expansion of its footprint—will be built within the existing footprint of Adelaide Oval.

The opposition then contrasted that statement with a selective quotation from information provided in the fact sheet released by the Stadium Management Authority on last Friday 18 June. The opposition quotes the sentence below from the fact sheet:

At this stage of the concept design, the east stand will extend 9 to 15 metres further east.

However, the opposition neglected to include the sentence immediately after:

Current indications are there could be a significant overall net return of parklands and public spaces.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: My comments to the house were based on my understanding that the project designers were seeking to provide a net gain in Parklands from the redevelopment plans.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Norwood!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is clearly confirmed in the fact sheet from the Stadium Management Authority. The opposition has only quoted the first sentence in its attempt to misrepresent my comments in order to support its spurious allegation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The opposition's claim further lacks credibility in that it seems to allege that I have misled the parliament due to—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop will be quiet or he will be asked to go.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The opposition's claim further lacks credibility in that it seeks to allege that I had misled parliament due to my information over five weeks ago being inconsistent with that provided last Friday. My comments to the house are, in any event, confirmed by the information provided in the fact sheet. The failure of the opposition to include the SMA's comments in full—that there could be a significant overall net return of Parklands and public spaces—demonstrates the baselessness of the opposition's allegations. Whilst I do fully accept responsibility for inaccuracies given to the parliament relating to when I was first advised of possible cost overruns in the project—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Whilst I do fully accept responsibility for inaccuracies given to the parliament relating to when I was first advised of possible cost overruns in the project for which I have now followed correct parliamentary procedure and corrected the record, I totally reject the second allegation by the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:19): I rise on a matter of privilege. I believe that the Treasurer knowingly and deliberately misled this house in a way that materially affects the deliberations of the house. On 26 May this year, in response to a question from the Leader of the Opposition about Adelaide Oval, the Treasurer said:

—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.

Mrs Redmond said, 'A week.' Mr Foley responded, 'It became clear a week or more...' Members then interjected and you, Madam Speaker, called for order, saying, 'The Treasurer is answering this question.' Mr Williams then interjected and said, 'How many weeks before 20 March?', and you, Madam Speaker, called the deputy leader to order. The Deputy Premier then responded by saying, 'I can say to the interjection of the member opposite that I was not made aware in any way, shape or form prior to the election that the 450 would not be sufficient.' That statement is crystal clear.

The Treasurer reinforced that claim later in the same answer when he said:

As I said in the process over some weeks since the election it was becoming apparent that this was going to be a difficult one to land at 450. This does need—if I do say so, in terms of the context and fact—to be put on the public record.

On the same day, the Treasurer was asked whether he had had a meeting with the Stadium Management Authority in March, prior to the election. The Treasurer said:

I cannot recall exactly when I met the Stadium Management Authority. I will check my diary and let you know.

On the next sitting day (27 May), the Treasurer made a ministerial statement specifically addressing the issues raised the previous day. In the ministerial statement, the Treasurer advised:

After a thorough document and record search in my office, I am now in a position, as I said, to provide the house with more specific advice.

This statement of the Deputy Premier confirms a meeting of the SMA on 3 March 2010, prior to the 20 March state election.

On 2 June this year, at 2 o'clock, the opposition met with the Stadium Management Authority for a briefing on the Adelaide Oval project. At approximately 2.15 that day, the Treasurer gave a press conference. During the press conference, the Treasurer admitted meeting Leigh Whicker, the Executive Officer of the Stadium Management Authority, on 19 February, recalling that, in this meeting, Mr Whicker indicated that the initial estimates of the project costs were in excess of the \$450 million government commitment, and the Treasurer confirmed that today in his statement to the house. This statement is in direct conflict with the Treasurer's statement to the house, when he said:

I was not made aware in any way, shape or form prior to the election that the 450 would not be sufficient.

The Treasurer admits to a meeting on 19 February, before the state election, where the cost blowout was discussed with Leigh Whicker, the Executive Officer of the Stadium Management Authority. The Treasurer's media statement of 2 June made it clear that he took a deliberate decision not to tell anyone about the blowout. He said:

I did not consider the estimates were sufficiently accurate or sourced enough to relay back to government.

During the election campaign, the opposition raised at least four times the issue of a cost blowout in the Adelaide Oval upgrade, and every time the Treasurer denied the claim. This is important as it illustrates that the Treasurer has shown that he will deliberately hide the truth for political gain.

I draw members' attention to the Treasurer's media interviews, where he claims that he did not come across the meeting of 19 February with Mr Whicker when doing his 'thorough document and records search' in his office, because his diary was not checked. On FIVEaa, on 3 June, the Treasurer said:

I didn't recall and I should have—the diary was not checked.

I ask the house to reflect on that statement, given that the day before this apparent thorough document and records search he told the house that he would check his diary and advise the house whether meetings had occurred. On the minister's own evidence, he went to check his diary, but his diary was not checked. There is a second matter. On 13 May, the Treasurer advised the house:

...I am talking about my responsibility as a minister in answering questions. We do not as yet have agreement. We do not have the final design work; we do not have the final engineering work completed. The SMA, on my advice, do not have a final costs themselves but I can say today to the house that the upgrade of Adelaide Oval—if the opposition is trying to suggest that it would be an expansion of its footprint—will be built within the existing footprint of Adelaide Oval. The care, control and maintenance issue is about the parklands and onsite parking. The control of the precinct is a matter between the council and the SMA as to the appropriate boundaries for that.

On 27 May this year the Premier advised the house that, in relation to the briefing the opposition was to get from the Stadium Management Authority on the Adelaide Oval upgrade, he was:

...pleased that you—

that being the opposition—

will be getting the same designs that I will be getting.

In other words, we were getting the same brief as the government. At the briefing on 2 June, the SMA advised the opposition that the Adelaide Oval would be extending into the parklands precinct up to approximately 15 metres. The Stadium Management Authority also advised the opposition that day that the proposed 50,000 seat stadium could not be built without extending the footprint of the stadium into the Parklands.

On 18 June 2010 the Stadium Management Authority released the design for the Adelaide Oval upgrade. Under the heading 'Parklands' the design brief fact sheet states, 'The east stand will extend 9 to 15 metres further east.' This official document is in direct contradiction to the Premier's statement of 13 May 2010. The Treasurer's statement makes it clear that, although 'we do not have the final design work; we do not have the final engineering completed', he still gave this advice to the house. The advice he gave the house was:

...but I can say today to the house that the upgrade of Adelaide Oval—if the opposition is trying to suggest that it would be an expansion of its footprint—will be built within the existing footprint of Adelaide Oval.

The Treasurer's answer makes it clear that regardless of the design the new stadium will be built within the existing footprint of the Adelaide Oval. That is in direct contradiction to the documents released by the Stadium Management Authority.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to consider the above and rule whether prima facie the matter raised relates to privilege and should therefore be accorded precedence for a motion to enable the house to determine if there has been a breach of privilege.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I understand the matter raised by the honourable member. I will defer my decision and report back to the house at the first opportunity on whether I do consider it to be a matter of privilege prima facie. I ask the member for Davenport to supply me with any documentation that he has that I can look at. I will report back to the house at my earliest opportunity.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 May 2010.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:29): I rise in support of the Supply Bill, and I do that with some reluctance. We should not be here a matter of weeks after a state election having to move supply; we should be moving the budget. We have seen the British government come to power, and they have moved their budget; in fact, they are moving an emergency budget tomorrow, I believe, on some pressing issues because of the billions of dollars of debt that have been left by the former Labour government. We have seen the Tasmanian government bring their budget down. Their election was exactly the same day as ours, but they brought their budget down last week.

They can do it and the Brits can do it, but not this Treasurer who has been in the position for eight years. If he does not know the state of the books and in which direction this state is heading, then it is a very sad state. We know his memory has some holes in it, but I would have thought that the financial running of this state should be his utmost priority. To move a Supply Bill for \$5.2 billion today is something of which he should be ashamed, and it shows a degree of incompetence on his behalf. To try to hide behind the razor gang that has been set up to slash \$750 million in government spending and to say that they have not come back with their reports is a furphy and an excuse. It is a completely unacceptable position for this house to be in. We should not be debating the Supply Bill but, rather, the budget. We should be getting on with estimates. We should not have the budget being brought down in September during the footy finals and having estimates in October.

I know that in earlier times the budget has been brought down later, but to have it brought down in September (a quarter of the way through the financial year) is outrageous. For this government to try to wear the odium and the blame and shrug it off and tough it out, it is just not good enough. The people of South Australia deserve much better than this. They wanted much better, we know that—51.6 per cent of them said that they wanted a different government—but what have we got? We have a government that is showing its usual arrogance and the hubris that we have seen for many years.

I saw it on the first day of this parliament, even before members were sworn in. We saw the gang of four—the four horsemen of the apocalypse—sitting there with smug looks on their faces because they were still in government. I suppose that says it all about the arrogance of power that we have seen. We should not be debating the Supply Bill today; it should be the budget that is being brought down. It is an indictment on the Treasurer's distracted approach to his running of the affairs of state.

I am responsible for the portfolios of health, mental health and substance abuse, and veterans' affairs. Obviously, health and mental health are the biggest part of the state budget. They have been in the past and they will be in the future. The federal government says that it will put in extra funds for the running of the health system in South Australia, but now it is changing its mind. The federal government's priorities—as we have seen from the resignations of some senior mental health advisers in the past few days—are being questioned in a most sincere way by people who know exactly what they are talking about. I understand that in this morning's paper there was an article in relation to 50 mental health experts questioning the direction that the Rudd federal government is taking.

If I was the Minister for Health—and certainly if I was the Treasurer—I would not be expecting a bailout from the federal government. We have seen it in the past with massive elective surgery waiting lists. We have seen the state governments get bailed out by the federal government in order to take up, not the bulk of people on the elective surgery waiting lists—those

within the normal clinical time frames—but, rather, people who are overdue for surgery, suffering and waiting in pain, and most likely getting worse. At last they are being taken care of, but they should not have been in that position.

This government started with a budget in 2001-02 of about \$8 billion. The last budget was \$15 billion. We have the highest taxing government ever seen in this state. It will be interesting to see what the level of taxation income is, what is in the budget, what this government will spend and how it will spend it. We know the government is in crisis. We are hearing whispers and rumours about massive cuts in a number of areas, but one area that cannot be cut, cannot be touched, must not be touched, is that of health services: health, mental health and substance abuse. I will talk about veterans' affairs, as well, because there is a growing issue in veterans' affairs, which overlaps with the mental health, substance abuse and health areas.

My plea to the Treasurer is to look at this matter closely and listen to the Minister for Health, the advisers and the people who are working at the coalface on the front line. He should listen to them and not cut health spending. Health spending will not overtake the state budget, as the doomsayers are predicting. The Premier and the Minister for Health have been saying that—we even saw Kevin Rudd saying that—but the reality is that that will happen only if they continue doing things the way they have in the past. There are efficiencies out there, and some of those efficiencies are at the moment trying to be met by amalgamation and centralisation of the bureaucracy, but they are not real savings.

What should not have happened is the explosion in the number of bureaucrats in the health department. If you go to the Auditor-General's Report and look at the facts and figures, it is not just me trying to run a scare campaign: the facts speak for themselves in the Auditor-General's Report. There is an issue that needs to be addressed so that health spending does not continue to balloon out.

There is increased demand—there is no doubt about that—on spending in health and health services. There is increased demand for the latest technology, the latest developments, and we can all understand that. We have an exceptionally good standard of health in Australia, but it could and should be better in many areas. It needs to be looked at and targeted—not rationed, but targeted—so that you are getting the best value for the dollar and not what this government appears to be doing at the moment, that is, spending on more and more bureaucrats.

We have seen with the national reforms the Rudd government was to put in that eight different levels of bureaucrats were to be developed. It has cut that back with the top layer going, but still seven layers of bureaucrats are being developed. That is the big concern with the changes: that we will see more and more bureaucrats. The centralisation we have seen in South Australia of the Southern Adelaide Health Service and the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service has been touted as cost efficiencies and cost savings.

On my calculation, we spend about \$11 million a day on health. I heard Dr Sherbon say, if upon recollection I have the right figure, that the amalgamation of the Central Northern Adelaide and Southern Adelaide Health Services will cut back on the numbers of bureaucrats and save about \$3 million. If we are spending \$11 million a day in the health service, that is spent before lunch or even morning tea. It is gone, done and dusted, so there is a minuscule saving there. There needs to be a realignment and reassessment of where the priorities are: the priorities should be in front-line health services.

I cannot believe that there will be cuts to nursing staff at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. People at the Royal Adelaide are telling me that they have heard that 90 nursing positions will be cut at the Royal Adelaide, 10 being from the operating theatres. If that information is correct, it is an outrage. I heard one estimation that between the Royal Adelaide and the Women's and Children's Hospitals there would be up to 500 job cuts.

If that is the case—and I sincerely hope that it is not and that that information is wrong—this government really needs to look at where its priorities are. Its socialist roots, the light on the hill, and its foundation ideology seem to have all gone out the window and more and more they have become economic rationalists. They are rationing services and health, and it is just not good enough. In the last eight years of this government, when it has had the rivers of gold—everything from land tax, the GST (it has been pouring in)—we have not seen the improvements we should have seen in the health sector.

It is not only the elective surgery waiting lists that are a real issue—and there are thousands of people on those elective surgery waiting lists in the public health sector in South

Australia, and with the bailout by the federal government there was some tidy up of the tail end—but also the thousands more South Australians still waiting for both medical and surgical outpatient appointments.

The estimates vary from hospital to hospital, with 600 at Flinders Medical Centre, which is probably an underestimation, and 15,000 in the Royal Adelaide Hospital yet to receive appointments. They are on the Clayton's waiting list. The booking clerks at these hospitals should be able to tell you how many doctors fax, email or write requests for their patients for both medical and surgical outpatient appointments and then are told, 'You'll just have to wait. There are list after list we are trying to cope with.'

That is an outrageous situation for this government, which has been here for eight years now, not to have dealt with and treated that situation; efficiencies should have been put in place. That should not be happening. We should not be here today debating the Supply Bill: we should be looking at the budget, knowing what is going to be spent on health and seeing those waiting lists being reduced. We should not be looking at a priority where a new hospital in the rail yards is the be-all and end-all of health spending in South Australia.

We should not be looking at a possible cost blowout of many billions of dollars, if you listen to some of the financial reporters around the place. If the cost for that hospital is \$1.7 billion, well, I will be very surprised. Everything from reports put out by doctors is questioning the outpatient clinics that were going to be transferred from the Frome Road precinct, the Florey precinct, down to the rail yards. The rail yards hospital was dubbed 'RAH Light'. What is not going to be there? We know that some outpatient services will not be there.

The minister has said that there will be no reduction in outpatient services. What he has not said is where those outpatient services will be delivered. He has not said whether those outpatient services which are currently at the Royal Adelaide Hospital on Frome Road and North Terrace will be transferred if they build that rail yards hospital. I say 'if they build it', because from what I am hearing the costs are ballooning out. 'State Bank, mark 2', is how it is being described. It will be a real weight around the neck of the finances of this state.

We are concerned about not only the outpatients but also the pathology services down there. The Royal College of Pathologists (they are saying this; not me) is really concerned about the partial transfer of pathology services from Frome Road down to the rail yards. You cannot have a patient who has had a tumour removed waiting on an operating table while the surgeons send off that tumour to pathology for histology to see whether they have got all the tumour. You cannot send that through 13 sets of traffic lights down North Terrace, because that is what there are now with the tram down there—13 sets of traffic lights between the rail yards and the Royal Adelaide Hospital on Frome Road.

You cannot send that sample down, get the histologist to look at the sections, then phone up or email back, saying, 'Yes, it's okay', or, 'No, it's not; you'll have to take more', and then wait for another section to be sent through another 13 sets of traffic lights down to Frome Road from the rail yards. It is just not good enough. You need to have those sorts of services on site. There is no excuse for that; it has to happen. Patients deserve that sort of service, and the professionals deserve that sort of service, because pathologists do not want to have to leave their laboratories and travel west through 13 sets of traffic lights to talk to patients and clinicians about what is happening, where they think things should be going and variations on treatment patterns and treatment courses.

It is just a no-brainer to have the services on site. One adviser was reported in the paper the other day saying that there will be plenty of room there; well, I hope that is the case, but that is not the information I am getting, and that is not the information the AMA is getting. Even as late as this morning, I understand, Dr Andrew Lavender, the AMA President, confirmed our fears and the fears of the royal college about pathologists. It is a real concern for everybody that we are not getting what we expect down there.

The latest information I have got is that they will build this hospital, but it will not have a production kitchen. When you are running a big establishment such as the Royal Adelaide Hospital you must cook up food—and now it is not just dolloping food up to patients and 'be thankful for what you get'; there are strict nutritional and medical guidelines for nutritional requirements and individual serves for patients in a hospital. You still have to bulk up some cooking processes, so you have what is called a production kitchen. A service kitchen then dollops out the food as required and as directed by the nutritionist and the medical staff.

My understanding is that there will be no production kitchen at the rail yards hospital when it is built down there, if it is built down there. They will have a separate facility somewhere, at what cost we do not know (how many tens of millions, hundreds of millions; who knows what it costs to build a production kitchen), and then have all the logistics in place to transport that bulk food across to the rail yards hospital where it can then be served up to patients.

It is a real issue to have to trust a government that says, 'Trust us: we will be delivering a world-class hospital.' It will not be world class if there are failures in pathology services and the nutrition of patients, and it certainly will not be first class if this government keeps going the way it is: it will get smaller and smaller. I do not want to hear about pods, villages and health spaces: I want to hear about patient services and nurses being able to do their job.

We have seen the number of single rooms being reduced in this hospital. Initially, every patient was going to have a room with a view over the River Torrens. We saw the mock-up at the royal show: I think \$200,000 was spent on that effort. Where is that mock-up now? I have asked three times to go and look at that mock-up setup in the warehouse off Marion Road and to look at the technical suites that were to be set up down there for staff training. I have not been able to go down there because my understanding is it is just piled in a corner somewhere.

But we saw the wonderful views over the River Torrens out of the patients' windows. There was a scare campaign over the rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital on Frome Road because the patients were not going to have a window, but I think I would rather have a bed, a nurse and a doctor than a window if I was in hospital. I do not want to be there because it is not a holiday. I do not want to wait years to go there in the first place. I want to get the treatment I require that is needed to get me healthy and out of there, and I will be happy to enjoy the view from my own bedroom window at home, not the hospital window at the rail yards.

So, the funds that will go in to prop up the rail yards hospital is a real concern. I look forward to seeing what is in the health budget and finding out the nitty-gritty of what will happen between the transfer from Frome Road to the rail yards. Is it RAH-like, or will people get what they deserve, that is, a superior health service—which I still strongly believe could be delivered at far less cost at the precinct on North Terrace-Frome Road, where we have the IMVS, the Hanson Institute, the medical school and the dental school?

That is another issue. When people require dental surgery, dentists will have to go down to the rail yards and come back again, through 13 sets of traffic lights to get down there and 13 sets of traffic lights to get back: but, at the moment, they just walk down the corridor and are into the hospital. The medical students just walk down the corridor into the hospital for their training, which is absolutely vital. It will be very interesting to see what we are going to get in the consortia presentations. I understand they have already given the government briefings on what they are proposing, and I understand one of them is 'out of this world'. It will be interesting to see what we actually get, and it will be interesting to see what the government will channel off into the funds. It is a PPP at the moment. The Treasurer is saying that, if it is too expensive, it will be a government borrow and build. What impact will that have on the state budget? Is it going to be State Bank mark 2? In fact, WorkCover has already been State Bank mark 2. The hospital will be State Bank mark 3. It is a real concern.

Mental health is a huge issue. I would drive bulldozers through some of the buildings at Glenside because they are old and outdated, but I would not build an industrial centre there as a film hub and I would not put a liquor outlet next to Drug & Alcohol Services. I would be making sure that the community outreach services were there and that the elderly mental health patients were not being pushed out into private nursing homes and causing issues there, which we are finding out about. It is a disgrace the way this government just keeps saying, 'We are building this new hospital.' Is it going to be effective and efficient; and is it going to do what it is supposed to do for South Australians?

I would like to mention veterans' affairs, because we are getting a new battalion out north (I think 6 RAR or 7 RAR) with 1,200 troops. Some of those guys are brave soldiers who have done two, sometimes three, tours of duty in Afghanistan. We have heard of some tragic events over there lately, and they are coming back with severe psychological issues. They need all the support they can get. The already overloaded and overworked Lyell McEwin Hospital will not be able to provide those services. I just hope the government is aware of what it is doing. We want to support our troops to the very best of our ability. They are laying down their lives for this country. South Australians deserve better, and our troops deserve better.

Time expired.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (11:49): I rise to support this bill. However, whilst I support the bill, I will make mention of some of the areas that I certainly hope attention is being given to in the forthcoming budget, and areas that I hope are not in the firing line for reductions in cost savings.

As mentioned in my recent speech in reply, this state has a great window of opportunity to capitalise on the resource opportunities and also defence and other activities throughout the state. Madam Speaker, I congratulate you on taking the Mayor of Whyalla and other members of that community to Canberra to try to ascertain the details of the proposed commonwealth resource supertax. While this may not affect the state directly, the resource industry in South Australia does have a great effect on the budget going forward. We respect all the activity in the regions of South Australia and the more activity we have up there, the more we will get in royalties to this state. The resource sector is the window of opportunity that this state has been looking for, and we need to have a clear understanding or a complete revamp of this proposed commonwealth taxation going forward.

We must ensure that there are no cuts in opportunities for skills and training. We must not allow our infrastructure to continue to be run down to a degree that is detrimental to the growing demands that will be required in regional South Australia. In particular, I mention TAFE opportunities and training throughout regional South Australia. TAFE, over the past few years, has been wrongly targeted to reduce training numbers with the excuse that there is no demand, or a decreasing demand, for certain courses to be taught at various locations. This tactic can have a dramatic effect on regional people requiring more skills to re-enter or enter the workforce.

Recently I was contacted by a person within my own electorate who wanted to undertake a TAFE course in hospitality. This person attended the Port Pirie campus only to be advised that they only have front of house courses for commercial cookery and that the Port Augusta TAFE had all the facilities there to be able to train in the commercial cookery sector. This person then went to the TAFE at Port Augusta and the response was that this course was no longer available at Port Augusta due to the trainer having left the facility. The only locations that we could have this training was in the Barossa, Regency Park or Port Lincoln. The silly thing about this is that the facilities at Port Augusta are only a few years old and here we are not utilising all these facilities.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Mr BROCK: The member for Stuart indicates to me that he has the information that it is going to be dismantled. Here we have people looking to be up-skilled or to be retrained, yet they have to travel hundreds of kilometres and also have to stay three or four days a week away from their own home. I ask: how do we train or give unemployed people the chance of a job when they are already struggling to make ends meet? With the opportunities for cooks in the resource sector in the north of the state, it appears to be false economics that we are not utilising facilities and securing people to be trained in these facilities. This issue is a serious one, and I will be collecting the full data and arranging a meeting with the new minister responsible, the Hon. Jack Snelling, to voice my concerns on this issue.

Regional South Australia's health service needs to be maintained at the current level, not only with the services but also with specialist services. We should continue to provide more of these services closer to the people of regional South Australia. We cannot continue to locate these services in Adelaide. It is becoming more difficult for people in regional South Australia to access these services. We have just recently been trying to get renal dialysis machines in Port Pirie—and I congratulated the government. People in my area had to go from Port Pirie to Port Augusta or they had to go from Port Broughton to Clare. Both of these distances do not qualify for the PAT scheme. These people were not only going up there at their own cost three to four times a week but taking five, six or seven hours out of their day three to four times a week. This not only created financial strains on their budgets, but also it was an emotional and physical strain on their wellbeing. Again, I congratulate the government on establishing four units in Port Pirie that will make it easier for the people from Port Pirie to be serviced and also for those at Port Broughton to travel only 30 minutes up the road.

Another concern to me is the road system in regional South Australia. I will mention some roads in my electorate that are getting to the degree that there are many opportunities for an injury whether fatal or long-term. There are many roads in my electorate that have been neglected over many years. Yacka to Clare is a typical example, as is Port Broughton to Bute and then from Bute to Kulpara, which is also in the member for Goyder's area. These are just two of the areas in South

Australia that I could mention. We have recently seen that there have been quite a few fatalities on our roads. Whether it is from driver fatigue or road condition, we need to be very serious going forward and ensure that we maintain the best roads and all the rest stops across the whole state.

These roads are also utilised by our transporters, to transport our goods from their home locations to the market. I know for a fact that in Gladstone a new roundabout has just been put in, and this roundabout is well and truly overdue. About \$1.7 million has been expended on the roundabout and it will make the intersection far safer for general traffic. However, one of the things that I will be talking to the minister about is that this roundabout has now eliminated or basically destroyed a roadhouse adjacent to it. Transporters cannot get into that location any more because of the access coming through.

Also, farm machinery which has to traverse from the north side of that roundabout to the south side on the adjoining properties can no longer get through that roundabout. This double-wheeled farm equipment has to have an access of about 25 feet across, and the intersection has an entrance of 16 feet. It is an absolute nightmare for these people. If they want to get to the south side of Gladstone they now need to go via Caltowie, which adds another 70 kilometres onto their journey. Again, this is an issue that I am getting information on and I will send the documentation through to the Minister for Transport to have it investigated.

We only have to look at the road infrastructure being implemented in the Gawler and Virginia regions, and again I congratulate the government on that. It is absolutely fantastic. It is tremendous activity for people residing in the area. However, I hope that these road infrastructure improvements continue to move north to accommodate the ever-increasing demands from those residing in the north of the state.

I hear that my fellow member alongside of me, the member for Stuart, has been up to the north of South Australia and the Oodnadatta Track and the Birdsville Track. I understand that there has been a fair bit of rain up there, which is great, and those roads also need to be maintained. I will be working very closely with my counterparts adjoining my electorate on both sides to ensure that we all get our fair share of the budget coming forward to at least start the roads in the north of South Australia and regional South Australia. We need to place more money in regional South Australia. I agree that we need to provide the required recreational facilities within the Greater Adelaide area, but we should not forget the people of regional South Australia.

Another area of concern is the current land tax imposition. Whilst I understand that revenue needs to be collected by the state government of the day, I question how the system works. The tax is calculated on the capital value of the land in question. While this is the agreed way to go, there appear to be numerous instances in regional South Australia where, as the developers have established housing estates—and due to the economic situation out there—there are numerous blocks that have been serviced, ready for sale, only now to be unable to attract buyers.

These developers are not only paying council rates on those unsold blocks of land but are also levied land tax each year at the end of June, in some cases in excess of \$2,500 per block. This is an area that we need to have a serious look at in regard to ensuring that these developers are not penalised. We understand that when these estates were established the market was very buoyant; currently, it is dying. One of these developers has not sold a block of land for the last 12 months and currently has 22 unsold blocks. Therefore, at 30 June each year he gets a bill for \$2,500 per block, which takes away his ability to maintain his profit margin. At the same time, they have also reduced the price to try to expend these, but that has been unsuccessful.

Whilst we need to be very aware of what we have been spending, we must remember to create more employment opportunities and look at the resource sector and the production of not only our food produce but also our export agricultural needs. We need to spend more money on the correct areas to allow this growth to occur.

We need to make sure that our roads are safe and accessible to our rail, which needs to be of top quality. For the ever-growing mines that are emerging in the north and on the West Coast of South Australia, we need to ensure that we have accessible ports to be able to facilitate those products out of South Australia, or they will all go by rail up through Darwin and then be lost to the state.

For each job that we create in this state, one person comes off the social security system. This reduces the budget for the social security system but also creates extra revenue in taxation and spending by the now employed person. This, in turn, creates extra positions in the employment sector to cater for the increased demands. There is an argument that payments for the social

security system do not come from state coffers but from the commonwealth; however, this can only be explained by cost shifting.

I am fortunate that my electorate has opportunities for growth in the resource sector of our state, as has the electorate of the member for Stuart; however, if the infrastructure to accommodate this growth is not there, then we all lose. The more assistance we give to areas where people can choose a lifestyle and live will not only assist the issue of the Greater Adelaide plan that we will encounter for the next few years but also help people have a better and healthier life.

I request that regional South Australia not have any further cutbacks. We need to look at where our growth in revenue will come from. Export earnings and royalties will come from regional South Australia. I will work in collaboration with all my other parliamentary colleagues whose electorates adjoin the electorate of Frome to ensure that we all share in the funds being expended by the government of the day.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:03): I rise to speak to the Supply Bill 2010 and, in doing so, indicate that I will be supporting the bill. Obviously, this is necessary each year to keep the wheels of government grinding and, in particular, to fund the Public Service and the services provided to the people of South Australia. This year, of course, it is much larger than we would normally have before us because the Treasurer has decided that he is going to delay the publication of the 2010-11 budget into September and October estimates.

After eight years it seems that he still does not know what to do in relation to the annual budget. As has been indicated to the house, that is particularly disappointing, given that, firstly, he has been doing this for eight years; and, secondly, after the 2006 election, he said that the financial position of the budget was in such disarray he needed to get some help from somebody in Sydney. The health pressures on the budget were so monumental that he needed to bring over an expert. Of course, within nine months he announced a \$1.7 billion new hospital in June 2007, so it is hard to rely on anything he says as to the real circumstances.

Over the last two years we have had repeated statements by the Treasurer. When something goes wrong financially the global financial crisis is the problem; when it is something for which he has provided extra funding, it is his good management. This inconsistency is repeated on a daily basis. I am very disappointed, particularly as we have just heard that the Treasurer in Tasmania, which held a state election on the same day, was able to deliver their budget last week. The new Prime Minister in England, within 50 days of a new government—after 11 years of a government of another persuasion—was able to deliver his budget, even in the perilous financial and impecunious circumstances that Britain now faces.

One has to wonder about this, coupled with today's announcement by the Treasurer that he had given inaccurate information to the parliament. This is the first financial officer of the state who, frankly, does not deserve to keep his commission and who in any honourable way would resign, particularly over the acknowledgement today. Other judgments may pass on him, given the pending privileges application before the parliament.

What I want to highlight today is that, although every year governments have the opportunity in their budgets to set priorities, this government has failed repeatedly, and I will highlight a few examples. The people I represent are the people who are the hurt, hungry and homeless in this state. When it comes to the trickle-down and destitute amount of funding that is provided to them, it is shameful of this government that they come into this parliament and pretend to give a tinker's curse about the most vulnerable, the most poor and the most disadvantaged when they indicate their priorities.

Let us be clear: we have a \$14 billion to \$15 billion annual budget in this state. The government announced last year that it would set a task force in place to ensure that we cut back budgets, with the aim of saving some \$750 million. Its gazetted financial quarterly figures as of 31 March 2010 tell us that the tax collections for that nine month period will be \$2.5 billion, which is \$200 million more net than it had last year. That ought to tell us that the government is swimming in money.

I will highlight a few items in relation to the government's priorities. The new Royal Adelaide Hospital at the other end of North Terrace is under extraordinary financial pressure at the moment. I suspect we are going to end up with a skeletal hospital by 2016—if it is ever built—with far fewer services and a lot more money.

The opposition has put up an alternative, reasoned submission to the government over the last few years, but the government has rejected it and said that it will go ahead and build this great monument to the Premier down at the other end of North Terrace. I think it is a scandalous waste of money. Although we have an opportunity to rebuild and reinstate our premier hospital, our primary and tertiary hospital in the state, saving close to \$1 billion, they want to recklessly proceed with a new hospital.

Another example is the future costs of the Film Corporation redevelopment at Glenside Hospital. We have seen what I think is indignity toward the people who are underprivileged in this state—that is, the government, and particularly the Premier, announcing that they are going to spend \$43 million to redevelop a new home in the middle of the Glenside Hospital site and flog off 41 per cent of the rest of the site, which the Treasurer claims is necessary to fund a new hospital in that corner of the remaining property.

In addition, the Premier, out of his budget, paid \$2.5 million to buy the 2.5 hectares in the middle of the Glenside site. What is interesting is that the information now available on the website of the builder of the \$43 million new house and redevelopment for the Film Corporation, Hansen Yuncken, shows that additional expenditure beyond the \$43 million is already budgeted and will be required to completely renovate these heritage buildings. Hansen Yuncken's website states:

Part of this building [the main building]...will be upgraded for lease to businesses related to the screen and film industry. The balance of this building may be upgraded at another time with separate funding subject to screen and film industry future leasing interest. Other heritage buildings...in the Precinct are intended to be adapted at a later date.

Even Hansen Yuncken know what is going on. We are, of course, going to have to wait until September to see what extra funds the government is going to allocate for the new headquarters for the SA Film Corporation. Of course, if you look at the SA Film Corporation financials you will not have a clue what is going on there, because it has not even, through the Premier, tabled its 2009 annual report, which of course is accountable for the millions that this parliament allocates to it to maintain.

So we are all kept in the dark. It seems the builders know what is going on. At least they have put that on their website. Now it is time for the Premier, and the Treasurer of course, to come clean. I just want to place on the record that, although members will recall that at the time last year the Premier had fast-tracked his new home for the Film Corporation, clearly there was an intention to spend further money. Yet the patients, the families, and the staff who are involved with the mental health system must be sickened by the priorities of this government.

Just let me give another small example. Flush with money, as we now clearly understand, the Treasurer came out with his proposal recently that the government is going to add another \$85 million for the proposed redevelopment and building of a stadium complex at the site of the SA Cricket Association. That is under an umbrella, of course, and we have heard all the comments about 'not a penny more'; 'not a cent more', etc., in relation to an original proposal that we heard about during the election campaign.

I am mindful of the great quote of Joseph Kennedy when I hear the Treasurer run out with these statements about his promises about what is going to be spent and what is not going to be spent. Joseph Kennedy was once asked, 'What would you spend, Mr Kennedy, to put your son in the White House?' He said, 'Whatever it takes and not a penny less.' That is what we heard from the Treasurer before the election: 'Whatever it takes to win this election and not a penny less.'

The difference is this: Joseph Kennedy was talking about his money, that of a prestigious family in the political history of the United States, a very wealthy family. It is up to him; that is his money, but the Treasurer, the man under a cloud in this parliament now, is spending our money. It is our money that we have put together in taxes to ensure that it is equitably distributed for the important services to the state.

He attempts to spend even another \$85 million on this, when he stands here in the parliament and tells us that he is not even going to save the oval at the Glenside Hospital campus for the children to play on, for the activities of the local community, for walking dogs, for dog training, for Cricket Association activities, and for the children in neighbouring schools to use, not to mention for the open space that is precious to the patients. We have heard in select committee inquiry that it is necessary for the proper treatment and healing of those patients.

He stands here in the parliament and says 'No, no, no; we cannot afford this. I have to sell that piece off. I am going to sell it to the Chapley family. I am going to sell the other half off for

private housing, because we cannot afford to build the mental health hospital and drug facility in the corner unless I sell this off.' Yet he has another \$85 million extra to be able to provide a stadium. So I ask about the priorities of the Treasurer, when there is a complete abandonment of children, of the mentally unwell, of the vulnerable and the helpless and of the homeless. He is into supermarkets and private housing and selling off assets when he is flush with money, according to his own gazetted records. Here we have the priorities yet again exposed.

An extraordinary amount of stamp duty has been highlighted in this gazetted report, and even land tax is flushing into the government and making it awash with money. Just before the election I was out at the state seat of Light. I was approached by someone who had a concern about a stamp duty payment that she had been required by the stamp duties office to pay in respect of a property in which she had no legal title and for which she would have had to pay over \$1,000 dollars in stamp duty.

Oh, oh! The Treasurer then has to recognise that he has made a mistake, and the department has to refund it to her. But, instead of having the decency, even at this lowest level—the poorest people who cannot even afford to buy into bonds or housing or purchase their own properties; they have to apply for and seek the opportunity of a shelter by using a tenancy arrangement, the lowest level of security in accommodation for aged people—he does not even have the decency to say 'Look, I am sorry about this.'

He says, 'We'll give you an ex gratia payment' and sends her a letter as an ex gratia payment. There was no big media release on that. There was no big acknowledgement to other people who might have been caught by this attempt to grab all the taxes and put them into the coffers. The Premier and the Treasurer, in cahoots, have already outlined in their announcements their commitment to provide the big and boastful proposals, and yet they squander their responsibility in respect of those who need assistance.

To put this in some order of priority of what is needed, I do not need to go any further than Monsignor Cappo, when he recently said that the government gets one out of 10 for its actioning of programs for dealing with children—and teenage children, in particular—who are involved in crime. Some of these children are, of course, under the guardianship of the Minister for Families and Communities and some are at large and homeless, but they have been the subject of a specific inquiry of Monsignor Cappo and have generally been described as the gang of 49. It actually refers to a number of children in our state who are obviously vulnerable and at risk themselves but, it appears, are causing harm to others.

The government is quite happy to pay Monsignor Cappo \$100,000 a year—he only has to work for six months of the year to get that, and he might be doing a good job; some may judge that as being effective—but even he comes out and says that the government's attention to this issue gets a one out of 10.

I just want to highlight my concern about why that is also haemorrhaging in the sense of any capacity to bring those children to the point where they will be productive members of the community. It is the government's great initiative to now exclude children under 15 from the homeless statistics. I think that is not only a dishonest attempt to conceal the real level of homelessness in our community but they are all to be treated as potential child protection clients of the government and not homeless children, even if they are homeless. It is not my assessment. I note that the Guardian for Children, Ms Simmons, in her annual report to the parliament last year expressed her direct concern about this.

The government's attempt to deal with matters when it does not reach a target or when the trend is going the wrong way is to simply change the rules. So, in this instance, they just cut out the under 15 year olds, and the children who are aged 12 to 15 just do not count any more. That might artificially suppress the embarrassing figures for homelessness for this state, but it does not address the problem, and even Monsignor Cappo—the government's own appointed adviser—has expressed his disappointment.

Also in regard to homelessness, I will mention that there is another extraordinary level of responsibility that the government has in respect of affordable housing for the community generally. I just want to touch on homelessness because, obviously, those who sleep rough are those who are at the acute end, and there is significant media coverage on this. I just want to say that non-government organisations work hard to provide shelter, comfort and support to those in a homeless situation, and St Vincent de Paul is one organisation I want to particularly acknowledge today.

Many of you know that St Vincent de Paul has provided services for men for nearly 40 years at the Hutt Street facility, but they provide many other services.

Senator Don Farrell and I were both committed (and we publicly announced it, even though we are on different sides of politics) to supporting the recent sleep-out at the Zoo. I want to say that I appreciate Senator Farrell's support. He does live in my electorate, but I absolutely guarantee that he does not vote for me. However, he is prepared to at least line up and be the first donor. A number of members of parliament, including cabinet members and members of the government party, were supportive of that, and I thank them. I have thanked them individually, but I wish to acknowledge it publicly.

There were probably quite a number of donors from the other side of politics because they wanted me to freeze to death, but I am living proof that you can survive at the Zoo on a mattress. I recognise that there are a couple of other members who may also speak on this matter.

There are statewide issues that do not necessarily have a level of direct vulnerability at the end of the chain. When governments stuff up the management of money, it leaves less for those who need it at the end of the chain. Electricity and water, which are critical to our survival and advancement, let alone our economic health, directly affect the poor and vulnerable because prices go up.

The government has announced that it will build a desalination plant and that it will double its capacity if and when it ever gets the money from Senator Wong. I think she is in a bit of a time shift at the moment about whether or not she will give it. The government wants to spend close to \$1 billion to provide security of water for Adelaide. That may or may not be a good project. We actually suggested that it needs to at least have an initial project. The federal government has come in with the money, but only if it sorts out the detail of what the conditions will be on which we will get it.

When the government announced in 2007, through former minister Karlene Maywald, that it was going to build a pipeline between the reservoirs that service urban Adelaide (a \$403 million project) there was a huge public outcry about some of the disturbance that would cause. Late last year, minister Maywald announced that she was still going to spend over \$400 million but that they would dig up parts of the existing pipeline and put in a whole lot of new pumping stations, which she said were necessary given the expansion of the project and given that the production and capacity of the desal plant would be double the size and, therefore, it needed to be transferred.

The eastern area of South Australia, and a number of coalition councils, including Burnside, Norwood, Walkerville and the like, put together a submission for the government which said, 'With some commonwealth funding and us putting in a large amount of money, the balance of a \$35 million water project for the whole of that eastern area to reduce the reliance on the River Murray and the resource, we need \$6 million.' Do you know what the Treasurer said? He has just recently advised, 'No, you are not getting the \$6 million.'

He has \$403 million to put a pipe between two reservoirs, which at this stage—even though I have had a briefing from SA Water—I am not satisfied is even necessary. Already there has been an announced \$30 million for the design of the requirement to facilitate that, and yet he does not have a paltry \$6 million to make sure that we reduce what is critical: the water reliance for South Australia.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:23): I wish to speak to the Supply Bill, which demonstrates this government's continued disregard and responsibility for regional South Australia. How many times does this government need to be reminded that this state extends beyond the boundaries of metropolitan Adelaide? How many times does this government have to be reminded that the rural sector is a major contributor to the state's exports and economy? How many more excuses is this government going to make for its neglect of regional South Australia?

I refer specifically to regional health and particularly the unacceptable delay in the redevelopment of the Berri Hospital. Since this government came to office, regional health services have continued to decline. The people in regional South Australia have few doctors and fewer facilities, and many of them are outdated and run down. People living in regional South Australia are forced to travel great distances to Adelaide to obtain the sort of specialist medical care that used to be available locally. So, it was with some relief that the people of the Riverland welcomed the announcement of a \$41 million redevelopment of the Berri Hospital. This redevelopment was to have commenced in June 2009 and was due to be completed in June 2011. It is now May 2010 and not a sod of ground has been turned, not a single brick has been laid.

We now learn that this government intends to complete the redevelopment of the Berri Hospital in 2014, yet we have heard no reasonable explanation for this three year delay. Labor's candidate for Chaffey certainly tried to explain during the election campaign and his claim was that it was due to the global financial crisis. It was a convenient excuse but since the Premier's friends in Canberra have bailed him out with an extra \$1.2 billion this year alone it is a transparently poor excuse.

Either the government's well-noted skill in spinning a good excuse for a broken promise is slipping or it has decided that the population in the Riverland is not worth the effort. Perhaps it is because health spending by Labor is so out of control that it is beyond the control of the spinners in the Premier's media unit.

In the three years to June 2009, the health department overspent its budget by a total of \$308 million. SA Health is on target for a \$76 million overspend in 2009-10 and a projected \$318 million overspend over the next four years. I can only hope that the Berri Hospital does not get overlooked again but I cannot be confident that it will not be delayed once more. Why would the Premier care, since he once told me that Labor would never win the seat of Chaffey and he could, therefore, see no point in doing anything for the people there?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes, shame! In Chaffey we can see the results of that neglect. If this government was as serious about water security as it claims to be, Chaffey would not be suffering the deep economic hardship that it is today. Water security is of paramount importance to South Australia but this government is failing to deliver in both Adelaide and regional areas.

Water users are already paying more than twice as much for their water than they did before this government took office. Water bills have increased by 113 per cent. The government has announced that water charges per kilolitre will increase by a whopping 32 per cent from 1 July this year. It says that these enormous price increases are needed to pay for the desal plant but a lot of water price revenue goes to general budget revenue with little transparency.

The government will reap well over \$200 million from SA Water this year. It has stripped more than \$2 billion since 2002-03 but little has been spent on water infrastructure. The government is siphoning money out of SA Water unsustainably which is preventing SA Water from undertaking infrastructure projects that will truly guarantee our water security.

The state Liberals proposed the desal plant to enhance the state's water security but, in Labor's hands, it does not appear to be doing much at all. In particular, while the desal plant is supposedly reducing Adelaide's reliance on the River Murray, it is not going to manifest itself until 2050. There is little of the necessary diversity in water supply which will truly enhance water security in South Australia.

The state Liberals have shown the way forward with water. We have shown the way forward with a stormwater initiative which would supply one-third of Adelaide's water needs. If only this government had the will. It was the Liberals who demanded that all Murray-Darling Basin states hand over the constitutional powers to the commonwealth so that one single body can control the basin's water resources for the benefit of the nation as a whole.

Meanwhile, where is the joy for the irrigators in Chaffey who supply the state with fresh local produce and much needed export income? Not only are their livelihoods at risk from the federal government's proposed plan for the Murray-Darling Basin but this state government is rapidly gutting funding from primary industries. It is a process that has been happening for years under Labor. I understand that another \$22 million is to be cut from the Department of Primary Industries this year and that the government's drought response team is being scaled back. How are farmers and irrigators supposed to trust this government any more?

Irrigators remain on a 62 per cent water allocation while their interstate counterparts are rapaciously harvesting floodwaters that should be flowing into South Australia. Dryland farmers in the Mallee have lost income, thanks to the government's poor response to the worst locust plague in 10 years, and now PIRSA funding has been cut again. Drought response funding is being cut while the Riverland and the Murray-Mallee remain drought-declared.

The way this is going one day there will be no fresh local food produced on the Murray, there will be no more fresh food exports, there will be no more viticulture, no more horticulture, perhaps no more agriculture, no more rural culture. There will just be mines—and we all know that we cannot eat iron ore or uranium—and maybe not even those, if our federal government has not

scared off the miners with its new super profit tax or if our state Treasurer has not scared them off with his plans to double royalties.

I hope this government knows where it is going to site all the new Centrelink offices for the many regional people forced out of work and forced to move to Adelaide because their rural communities have died from neglect and from this government's inability to secure a fair water deal for the state. So much for the Premier's election campaign grandstanding on securing floodwaters for South Australia. So much for the 'historic water agreements', which appear not to be worth the paper they are written on, if the Premier's plan to challenge upstream states over their water rights is anything to go by. So much for this government's pledge to reconnect with regional South Australia. It is time for the Premier to make good on his pledge and visit Chaffey—it has been 926 days since he formally visited the region of Chaffey—because, if he did, he might get a glimpse of the effects of the real economic crisis and understand the impact of his government's neglect.

I fear this whole state is heading for an economic crisis, thanks to the Rann government. We have had record revenue growth from the GST, we are the highest taxed state in the nation, yet we have not seen much in the way of infrastructure. All we see is profligate spending that is rapidly spiralling out of control. Government debt will soon reach \$6.8 billion. The Premier and the Treasurer have put South Australia in a position where it is paying \$1 million per day, increasing to \$2 million per day, in interest payments on Labor's debt. We will probably be paying this debt off for decades. Furthermore, while regional South Australians pay their fair share of the state's high taxes they are not seeing their fair share of the state's spending. This is the situation in health and education, roads and other infrastructure, and in primary industries spending.

This government conveniently forgets the tremendous contribution made to the state's economy by the rural sector. It talks about a world-leading wine export industry continuing to generate international recognition and export income, yet we have not heard a word from the government about addressing the enormous difficulties currently being faced by wine grape-growers and their industry. Their contribution to the Riverland economy alone has fallen by 70 per cent.

I should not need to remind the house that the Riverland is the engine of the state's wine industry. That engine is very much in need of a service, yet nothing is being done. It is all too typical of this city-centric government to neglect primary producers. This government wants to increase the state's population to two million people by 2050; how does it expect to feed them?

Labor's credentials with primary producers are at an all-time low, but Labor's reaction to this has been resoundingly negative rather than positive. Instead of doing what it must to restore rural trust in the state government by investing more funds and effort in the rural sector, by recognising and growing its contribution to the economy, and by ensuring the federal government's water plan does not cripple irrigators and their capacity to produce food, it ignores them.

We are sick of the excuses. From 2008-09 to 2009-10, the commonwealth grants to South Australia increased by \$8.45 billion. This has made the Rann government far better off in terms of net revenue. This bonus revenue should free up much-needed funds for the neglected rural sector, for the neglected regional health, for the neglected regional education, and for the neglected regional infrastructure. Let's have no more flimsy Labor excuses, like budget black holes and huge revenue losses. The South Australian public is not going to be missiled by this government for much longer.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Be what? I didn't quite get that.

Mr WHETSTONE: It's called misled. Regional South Australia will not tolerate being ignored by this government for much longer.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:35): I indicate that I will be supporting the Supply Bill, and of course we are here to debate the allocation of \$5.2 billion to keep the government going until September when the actual budget will be delivered.

For me, coming to this place as a new member, I find the whole process quite unusual. In most places where business is conducted and financial transactions are made, if one is going to make a budget for the financial year to come, one of course puts that budget in place before the financial year begins. Apparently, in this place, however, we need 180 days from election day to budget day on 16 September.

It has already been noted by a number of other speakers that in the UK an entire change of government with an entire new set of policies was able to take place within five weeks. However, where we have had a government that has been in power since March 2002 up until the election in March 2010, apparently the training wheels are still on and we need 180 days to prepare a budget based on the plans that this government has had in place for a long time and the election promises that they made in March this year.

I just want to reflect on the broader scope of the state budget first before going into some concerns that are very potent in the electorate of Mordialta. The state budget in South Australia has grown from \$8.4 billion in 2001-02 to \$15.05 billion this year. It has nearly doubled. In fact, if a similar bill to the one we are debating today were to be debated in 2001, and we asked for \$5 billion to keep the government going, the government could have waited until March the following year before having to deliver a budget and ask for new money because of the extraordinary rise in the amount of money flowing through the coffers of the South Australian Public Service.

'Where has that money gone?' was a constant refrain in my ears during the election campaign. If we have \$7 billion more—nearly a doubling in the size of the state budget in the last eight years—where are the extra services? Where are the extra teachers? Where is the extra support for disabled people in South Australia? Where is the extra infrastructure for our water security needs? The answer, of course, is that this government has failed dismally over eight years to provide for this infrastructure and these front-line services for the South Australian people.

We have almost 2,000 fewer public teachers now than we had in 2002, yet we have 10,800 extra public servants above budget costing \$700 million per year. They are not teachers. They are not policemen. They are not doctors and nurses, and they are not disability support workers. We have 10,800 above budget public servants costing \$700 million per year and a budget that has blown out beyond all recognition because this government has no fiscal discipline at all, as we have seen this morning. Apparently, the Treasurer thought that discussions saying that \$450 million would not be nearly enough to cover the cost of Adelaide Oval slipped his memory, of all things. This is the sort of fiscal discipline that this state is benefiting from under this government.

In 2002, South Australia had 7 per cent of national business investment. This has slipped to 5.3 per cent now, and it is not surprising given the extraordinary amount of tax that businesses in South Australia are forced to pay. The Institute of Public Affairs recently did a study, which found that South Australia's business tax liability is 69 per cent above the national average and a staggering 536 per cent above the tax liability faced by businesses in Western Australia.

Is it any surprise that businesses, when given the choice, would set up shop interstate rather than in South Australia? Is it any surprise that competitive tenders for South Australian government projects and infrastructure builds are being won by interstate companies, which do not face this incredibly stifling tax regime imposed on them by the South Australian government?

This, of course, has a direct influence on the capacity of the South Australian budget to pay for the government's extravagant spending. Taxes go higher to pay for the government spending out of control. However, I am pleased to note that this government does have a solution; it is, in fact, looking at ways in which to fix it. The government has instituted something called the Public Sector Performance Commission, which is designed to increase efficiency in the Public Service.

I see that in yesterday's *Advertiser* this issue got some mention, because it is a very important initiative, which, no doubt, will seek to bring the extravagant spending of this government under control. It took \$5.5 million to establish the commission. Documents found under FOI by Robert Brokenshire, a member of the Legislative Council, indicate that it costs \$2.7 million per year, including \$1.6 million in salaries for the commission's 15 staff, plus up to seven other public servants being seconded at times.

The point is that this body is supposed to find ways of making the Public Service run more efficiently, yet it has achieved nothing other than incurring an extra expense. We see that a former adviser to the Premier, who was also the Labor candidate for Sturt at the 1998 election, has had his salary increased substantially. I am sure it is a very important job that he is seeking to do and, if it was being done well, I would commend that. However, I am yet to see the advantage of the Public Sector Performance Commission, and I am yet to see its achievements. I am very concerned that it is just more waste and more bureaucracy delivered by this government.

The Treasurer, under this bill, has until 16 September to come up with his budget, which is fine. Public servants need to be paid and they need to continue to perform their duties, so we

support this bill. So, the Treasurer has until 16 September to come up with the budget, and there is some good news about that, because it gives us an opportunity to raise some important issues in the seat of Morialta that warrant some attention in this budget, and I will seek to do that now—to bring these matters to the Treasurer's attention to help him out in preparing his budget.

First, I raise the issue that was the most important issue across South Australia during the state election campaign, and I hope that it will be an important issue in the federal campaign and that it will deliver the same sort of results in Adelaide seats as it did in the state campaign: water. Even allowing for the government's scepticism—I dare to say Luddism—about stormwater harvesting, there is an opportunity for SA Water to make significant water savings by capturing stormwater to provide a secondary water source for councils in the eastern regions of Adelaide, including Campbelltown and Burnside councils in the Morialta electorate, plus the Norwood Payneham and St Peters, Tea Tree Gully, Prospect, Unley and Walkerville councils, which have come together to form the Eastern Regional Alliance.

The Eastern Regional Alliance has done some excellent work, particularly given that I know how hard it can be for councils to come together to achieve these things, to put together a fantastic project that would cost \$33 million and take three years to complete, but eventually it would collect 1.5 billion litres of stormwater a year. This would irrigate local parks and ovals and, importantly, it would be water that is not currently in the system that would be put into the system. So, SA Water would have 1.5 billion litres of water a year that could then go to critical human needs. The councils, of course, would then pay less for their water, which would deliver excellent results to ratepayers across the Adelaide metropolitan area and result in 1.5 billion litres of water that would not need to be drawn from the Murray.

The councils did not just go cap in hand: they put up more than half of the cost of this project themselves, that is, \$17 million. I dread to think about the negotiations that must have taken place between the seven councils to work out how much each would contribute, and it is a remarkable job that they have come up with \$17 million. We hope that the federal government will come to the party with \$10 million. All that was requested from the state government was \$6 million to deliver this thoroughly important stormwater infrastructure resource for the Adelaide metropolitan area. *The East Torrens Messenger* of 16 June states:

In a May letter, seen by *The East Torrens Messenger*, Treasurer Kevin Foley told the ERA the government did not have funds available to support the water-saving initiative.

The Treasurer said that the government did not have the funds to support this water-saving initiative. I will just put that into context. This is a \$6 million state government investment that would have helped save 1.5 billion litres of storm water a year—for \$6 million. I will not go into mathematics; it is not my strong suit, but it is 1.5 billion litres of stormwater a year for \$6 million, and the government says it does not have enough money.

Apparently, the government has \$85 million to cover increases in Adelaide Oval expenses—well above the budget, well above the election promise that was supposedly not a cent more—but it does not have \$6 million for 1.5 billion litres of water. It does not make sense to me, and it will not make sense to the residents of the eastern suburbs and, in particular, the constituents of the electorate of Morialta. I suggest that the Treasurer urgently reconsiders this decision in the framing of this year's budget.

Also important to the residents and constituents in the seat of Morialta are quality of life issues, and part of that is open space. We have already seen this government's attack on open space in the eastern suburbs. We have seen this government's almost seeming addiction to selling off land for more housing, so that they can meet their population targets that seem arbitrarily set and based on headlines and media releases, not on the idea of what would be a sustainable population for the eastern suburbs, what our infrastructure needs and abilities are. We have seen this through the current story, which, of course, is the Black Hill Pony Club, about which I will have more to say at another time. The point is this: the government has decided that it will knock down the Magill Training Centre, build a new facility for youth offenders at Cavan, and sell that land for housing.

I am thoroughly in support of the government's decision to knock down the Magill Training Centre. The Magill Training Centre has been a disgrace, a blot on South Australia's international reputation for far too long. This is an issue that I have been passionate about for years, and I have written in *The Advertiser* and other places about it. The fact is that the government budgeted to build a new centre that would meet human rights minimum conditions. It was this government that,

during the height of the global financial crisis, when the idea was that we were supposedly headed towards a recession, said there was not enough money to meet our international human rights obligations and build a new centre; so, they took it off the agenda.

They then reintroduced it under political pressure from the opposition and from all sorts of other people in the community, not the least of which was the UN, but only on the basis that, because there were rough economic times and we might be heading towards recession, it had to be paid for out of the land sell at Magill (or Woodforde, which is the suburb that it is actually in). For me, this is a false nexus. This is an inappropriate way to develop corrections policy. We should not be basing what we as a state need to do for our young offenders on the value of land on which an old, historically donated corrections centre happened to be built. And it hurts our local community even more than this.

I bring to the attention of the member for Hartley the fact that the part of the Black Hill Pony Club land is on the same title as the Magill Training Centre. It is on this basis that the government seeks to sell their land, and it is for this reason that the hundreds and hundreds of members of the Black Hill Pony Club—many of them kids who get the opportunity to use the club at a subsidised rate, many from single parent families—will be unable to do so because their land will be sold off from under them.

It affects the member for Hartley, and I urge her to raise this in cabinet. We have a petition that will be lodged in the house this week with over 3,000 signatures on it from local residents concerned about this loss of open space, this loss of quality of life, this loss of a community facility that is terribly important. Hundreds of those signatures are from the member for Hartley's constituency.

Further, in relation to open space the state government did a deal—I suppose that is the best way to put it—with the Campbelltown council several years ago to fix up Thorndon Park, and in so doing—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, I am probably being a little pedantic here but, under standing order 127, you cannot impute an improper motive to a member. When you say 'did a deal' I think you, as well as I, understand what that implies. I ask you to regulate your language in this instance, please.

Mr GARDNER: Certainly, I apologise. I meant no ill imputation. The state government agreed with the Campbelltown council that the state government would fix up Thorndon Park—it was a good thing to do—in return for some of the Thorndon Park land being sold off for housing. A large slab of Thorndon Park was sold off for housing and it met the cost of that project but, apparently, there is an outstanding debt of some \$700,000 that the state government is holding over the Campbelltown council. The plan is still on the books to sell more land for housing.

This issue arose during the election campaign. Both my opponent and I were asked about it in a debate at the Campbelltown Community Centre and we both agreed that it was improper for the sale to go ahead. The land sale that has already occurred was done in a manner that befitted the park and it did not end in the loss of too much space, but to create four more houses in the remainder of Thorndon Park would actually be a major blight on the park, so I urge the government to write off that debt to the Campbelltown council.

In the short time remaining to me I will comment on some other issues of great concern that were raised prior to the election. I know they were of concern to all my constituents because they were also of concern to the former member for Morialta prior to the last election.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: A very hardworking member.

Mr GARDNER: She was a hardworking member and she certainly had her finger on the pulse in relation to a number of local issues. My issue when running against her was never with her but, rather, her government.

The first issue relates to the Athelstone Country Fire Service siren, which was a big issue in the eastern suburbs. Some members of the local community were very concerned to wake up one morning in December to find that during the night there had been a fire within 50 metres of their house that could have ended in utter disaster. There was no siren to warn them about it. It was something to which the Liberal Party specifically committed in the election campaign. I had correspondence with the Minister for Emergency Services about this issue and he wrote to me last week, advising that the government was still looking at it.

I draw to the attention of members an article in the *East Torrens Messenger* of 3 March. It states:

Morialta MP (Labor) Lindsay Simmons said the siren was needed to warn locals and give them time to pack up their valuables and leave the area. 'It gives people the option to take control over their lives...whether it be to turn on their sprinkler system, whether to evacuate children, old people and pets...at least they've got some choices if they know there is a bushfire there'.

This is an issue I picked up when doorknocking and I convinced the Liberal Party to commit to. The *Messenger* reported that, whoever got into government, residents would get a siren. The headline is 'Residents to get siren'. I urge the government to actually deliver on that promise made by the former member.

In the *East Torrens Messenger* of 10 March, an article titled 'Gorge Road on an election win' states:

Gorge Road will be resurfaced regardless of who wins the state election. Both Morialta Labor MP Lindsay Simmons and the Liberal candidate John Gardner have vowed to upgrade the dangerous Gorge Road...Ms Simmons said the road was in a poor state because it had been 'patched up' over the years rather than completely resurfaced.

Gorge Road is an important road in the electorate of Morialta. It is our most significant commuter road. It is a South Australian government road. The Tour Down Under goes over it every year, and every year when those cyclists with their million dollar bikes and their million dollar personal insurance policies travel along the road I go with my heart in my mouth waiting for one of them to hit one of the potholes, one of the bumps, one of the little hills, one of the extraordinary traffic difficulties. Fortunately, it has not happened, but it is only a matter of time.

As the former Labor member said, it is in a poor state because it has only been patched up over the years. It is a very important road. The Liberal Party again was happy to commit \$7.5 million to fixing it up, as is appropriate, and I urge the government to follow suit. As a matter of routine maintenance, it would be nice to resurface that road as it is clearly needed.

Finally, in the very limited time available, I bring to the attention of the house another roads issue: traffic lights that are needed at the St Francis of Assisi church corner, at Newton Road and Graves Street, which many members would be familiar with. It is a very important corner and hub for the community: 10,000 people go there for the Montevergine Festa every year and for many other festas throughout the year. During the election campaign on 3 March, again a letter was sent from the former member to all residents of Newton saying that it would be fixed with traffic lights, and I urge the government to do so.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:56): I rise today to acknowledge the debate on the Supply Bill 2010 and note that we on this side of the house are supporting it. It is extraordinary that we have to approve over \$5 billion of funding because the Treasurer does not have his act together, quite frankly. We noticed earlier today where the Treasurer has not got his act together, has memory lapses, is not the sharpest tool in the shed, by his own admission in this place, and it is worrying that the state's finances are in this man's hands, quite frankly—very worrying.

We have seen budget increases in South Australia from around \$8 billion per annum when we were in office to where we are getting very close to \$15 billion budgets per annum under the current government. It is interesting to note that, while there has been record revenue growth from the goods and services tax and high state government taxes (and South Australia has been recognised as the highest taxing state government in the country), South Australians are wondering where the money has gone, where is the infrastructure, where is the build to match what is going on with record revenue receipts.

The reason we have nothing to show for this record increase in revenue is that the Rann/Foley Labor government has put South Australia in a position where we are paying \$1 million, increasing to \$2 million, per day in interest payments on Labor's debt, debt that is funding this government's everyday expenses. An amount of \$1 million per day in interest payments is what South Australians were paying when the previous state Labor government bankrupted the state, and here we go again. Government debt looks like it will soon hit \$6.8 billion. If it was not for the fact of the GST receipts coming in from the federal government and an extra \$1.2 billion in extra funding this year above what was provided last year, the financial position looked over by Labor would be worse in this state.

Also it is noted that Labor will reap an extra \$591 million in state taxation revenue over the next four years, including an extra \$156 million in land tax revenue above what was budgeted

seven months ago. Health budgets continue with blowouts exceeding \$300 million over the forward estimates—more mismanagement over time. Then we get to the Labor government's Adelaide Oval patch-up plan, which is all it is—a patch-up plan. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

RODDA, HON. W.A.

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) (14:00): Madam Speaker, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the late Allan Rodda, a former member of the House of Assembly and a former minister in this state; and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious service; and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Earlier this month I, like all members, was saddened to hear of the passing of Allan Rodda, who died on 27 May aged 92. Allan was regarded as one of the true gentlemen of the South Australian parliament who worked selflessly and devotedly for the betterment of South Australia; and, in particular, he championed the cause of rural communities and his constituents in the state's South-East. He was the self-acknowledged last of the Playfords, having begun his parliamentary career under Sir Thomas Playford in 1965 before retiring in 1985 as the last Liberal MP to have been part of the team led by this state's longest serving premier.

Allan Rodda was a man of decency and integrity who worked in a bipartisan manner to ensure that the best interests of South Australia were put ahead of party politics. Indeed, he claimed that one of the highlights of his political and ministerial career was being involved in the restoration of direct shipping links to Port Adelaide, a project that he happily pointed out resulted from 'good teamwork which began with [former Labor premier] Des Corcoran'.

William Allan Rodda was born in Tumby Bay on South Australia's West Coast in 1917, the year, of course, that the United States entered the Great War that had been under way in Europe since 1914, and also the year that revolution engulfed Russia. Following the outbreak of the Second World War two decades later, Allan enlisted to serve his country as a bomber pilot in the Royal Australian Air Force.

Upon his return from the war he relocated to the South-East under the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. Indeed, from 1947 to 1954 he worked as a supervising agricultural officer for the soldier settlement scheme based in Penola. He also established a successful sheep and cattle grazing enterprise at Struan located between Naracoorte and Penola. In 1965 he was elected as the member for Victoria, a seat which was once held by poet and horseman Adam Lindsay Gordon and which was later renamed as the seat of MacKillop.

His arrival in parliament coincided with the election of a Labor government, with Frank Walsh replacing Sir Thomas Playford as premier. It did not take long for Allan Rodda to come to the attention of his long-serving Liberal leader. In the first vote that he was part of in this place he crossed the floor to vote against his parliamentary leader, Sir Thomas Playford, on the coursing legislation, which was the precursor to the TAB.

In the aftermath of that decision, Allan Rodda recalled that Sir Tom did not speak to him for three weeks; however, it showed from the outset that he was prepared to stick to his principles, even in the face of persuasive and powerful opposition. He also displayed his bipartisan approach in his maiden speech to the House of Assembly when he warmly and sincerely congratulated the Labor government on its 1965 election win, and thanked his unsuccessful ALP opponent in the seat of Victoria for the way that he had fought the campaign.

When Steele Hall's government was elected in 1968, Allan Rodda served as the Premier's parliamentary under secretary for more than a year. Then, in March 1970, just before the Hall government was defeated at the polls, Allan was appointed as minister of works and minister of marine. In 1978 Allan Rodda played a key role in hosing down a planned leadership challenge from within the Liberal Party against incumbent leader of the opposition David Tonkin (who was also an extremely decent human being and, of course, will be remembered as the Premier who steered

through the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act and, obviously, the start on the Olympic Dam-Roxby Downs mine and the establishment of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission).

As a result, Allan Rodda's strong loyalty to Dr David Tonkin was rewarded shortly after. When the Tonkin Liberal government was elected in September 1979 following the defeat of the Corcoran government, Allan Rodda was in the unique position of being the only member in its ranks to have served previously as a minister. He was duly appointed to the roles of chief secretary (a position I think it is a shame has not been around for some years: I think probably Bob Gregory was the last chief secretary, from memory).

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: 'Bring it back,' I hear people calling out. The chief secretary's role included a whole range of different functions but at that time he had responsibility, under the role of chief secretary, for police and the correctional services portfolio, and was also appointed minister for fisheries. Despite being subjected to enormous pressure over reform of the prison systems and through various allegations about corruption within the police force, commentators regularly remarked on Allan Rodda's ability to remain calm and dignified, even under the most strenuous questioning. He described himself as, 'not a cut-and-thrust politician'. He said, 'I like to treat people the way I would want to be treated.' He returned to opposition following the election of the Bannon government in 1982, and the following year Allan Rodda announced his intention to retire at the 1985 election, after 20 years of service to the parliament.

1985 was the year that I was elected, but I know from my 7½ years here as a staffer that Allan Rodda treated everyone from both sides of the house, and staffers as well, with utmost kindness and decency. He had contested and won seven elections in the seat of Victoria. Upon revealing his intention to stand down from parliament at the age of 68 (that sounds like a good age to retire from parliament—and that is no reflection on anyone in this house), he said, 'I don't believe people should stay in politics until they have whiskers down to their boots.' That assessment was contained in an article written in 1983 by *The Advertiser's* political reporter, Matthew Abraham, who described Allan Rodda as 'the man whose gentle manner and softly, softly ways have earned him the title of the gentleman of South Australian politics'.

Allan Rodda remained true to the words he spoke in his valedictory speech to this place in 1985 when he declared, 'If you think I am going to retire, that is not true. I will go straight into action in another capacity.' Indeed, he returned to raising sheep and Hereford cattle at Struan with his wife Madge and son Bruce and continued to make a significant and enduring contribution to community life in our South-East.

On behalf of all members on this side of the house, I extend my condolences to Allan's surviving children Bruce and Pauline, to his grandchildren and great grandchildren, and to his family and friends. I know that many former members of this house who are now deceased, such as Don Dunstan, Des Corcoran and Jack Wright, held Allan Rodda in the highest esteem.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I mention that in the house today we have students from the Sunrise Christian School, Morphett Vale Campus, who are guests of the Hon. Rob Brokenshire. Welcome. The Leader of the Opposition.

RODDA, HON. W.A.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): I rise to second the motion in relation to William Allan Rodda, often described as 'the gentleman of politics'. William Allan Rodda, known always as Allan Rodda, represented the South-East electorate of Victoria, which is now known as MacKillop, for 21 years and served as a minister in two Liberal governments. As the Premier said, he was born in 1917 in Tumby Bay and passed away on 27 May 2010 aged 92. Mr Rodda was educated at Wharminda School and, upon leaving school, became a farmer, but he realised his civic obligations early and became secretary of the Port Neill branch of the Wheatgrowers Association while still a teenager.

Allan Rodda went on to train as a pilot in the RAAF air crew training corps and, on completing his training in 1944, spent the rest of the Second World War serving as an RAAF bomber pilot operating out of RAF Coningsby in Lincolnshire. In 1947 Mr Rodda moved to Penola to take up a position with the Land Development Executive helping returned servicemen settle on farms through the War Service Land Settlement Scheme. Allan Rodda travelled extensively throughout the South-East in this capacity and felt it a privilege to have been a part of

such a successful scheme; it was a position he held until 1954 after having moved his family to a farm near Naracoorte in 1952. It was here that Allan Rodda and his wife, Madge, raised their three children.

Allan involved himself in many local organisations and, in March 1965, was elected to represent the electorate then known as Victoria and went on to be re-elected seven times—quite an extensive career and incredible feat. Mr Rodda came into parliament in the same year that Thomas Playford lost office and he was often described as 'the last of the Playford-era politicians'. In his maiden speech, Allan Rodda highlighted how important he felt agricultural issues were. He spoke about the eradication of rabbits and footrot being made a notifiable disease as important advances for the state's agricultural industries.

Mr Rodda noted in his valedictory speech that, while he had spent most of his time in the parliament in opposition, he was nevertheless proud of the many things he had achieved for his electorate of Victoria. He served as a minister in the Hall government as well as the government whip. Most of his achievements were achieved during his three years as chief secretary and minister of fisheries and marine in the Tonkin government. On being promoted to minister of works and minister of marine in March 1970, Allan Rodda made schools and hospitals his priorities. A highlight of his ministerial career was the restoration of direct shipping links to Port Adelaide, which is quite a considerable achievement.

Interestingly, as a minister, he wanted to ensure South Australia received sufficient water to aid its development. Forty years after Mr Rodda was appointed South Australian minister of marine, it seems we are still struggling with this issue. In his capacity as chief secretary, Mr Rodda introduced many reforms to the state's correctional services, including legal representation from prisoners and changes to the censorship of prisoners' correspondence—all part of restructuring and modernising the state's prison system.

Allan Rodda was made a Commander of the British Empire in 1982 in recognition of his parliamentary service. He retired at the election of 1985 but promised he would not be slowing down, saying 'The Roddas don't retire, they die in harness.' On retiring, Mr Rodda said he was looking forward to looking after his 450 hectare sheep and beef cattle property at Struan near Naracoorte with his wife, Madge. The current member for MacKillop, Mitch Williams, has said that Mr Rodda is still fondly thought of around the electorate, and this is a testament to the high esteem in which he was held in the community.

Allan Rodda is survived by his son, Bruce, daughter, Pauline, seven grandchildren and four great-grandchildren. I had the great privilege of attending his funeral on 2 June. Although I did not know Allan Rodda during his life, what became apparent during his funeral service was how much he was valued by his family, his friends and his community and how much they in turn valued him. On behalf of the Liberal opposition, I extend our sincere sympathies to his family.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:14): I rise to join the Premier and the leader in offering my condolences in speaking to this motion. I first met Allan Rodda when I became a firefighter; in fact, it was some years after being a firefighter when I became the secretary of the United Firefighters Union. As the Premier pointed out, the job of chief secretary, which was a fine position, had within its responsibility what was then the South Australian Fire Brigade (SAFB).

I endorse the comments that were made previously. Allan Rodda was a gentleman, he was a decent human being and he was much loved by all those who came into contact with him. Again, I make the point that some 10 years after he left his role in parliament he still met with firefighters and socialised with them through the union, and it was because of the respect that firefighters and Allan Rodda had for each other that that relationship continued.

I also inform the parliament that when he was the chief secretary it was a very important stage in the evolution of the then SAFB into the Metropolitan Fire Service; the process that took it from being what it was into a world-class firefighting service that became the equivalent of anything that exists in Australia and hence the world. It was a tumultuous time and, whilst Allan Rodda was not there at the time of that final transition, it was the foundation that he put in place during his time as chief secretary that made that process successful.

I take the liberty, on behalf of the firefighters of South Australia and, in particular, those members of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, of providing our condolences to the family and friends of Mr Rodda.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): I thank the Premier for moving this condolence motion, which I support. I first met Allan Rodda when I joined the Liberal Party in the early 1980s. Even then he was known as the gentleman of the parliament. When I first met Allan—I was a relatively young man in those days and Allan was a relatively old man—I understood immediately why he was referred to as the gentleman of the parliament. In the times that I met him he was always the perfect gentleman.

His memory for people always fascinated me. A lot of us struggle with remembering people's names and, being a country member, it is always difficult when you move from one community to another, particularly if you come across a member of one community in a different country town—they are out of place and out of context. I really struggle putting the name to the person under those circumstances. Allan Rodda, in my experience, never struggled to put the name to the person. He had a fantastic memory and a most engaging manner.

I remember him going to Liberal Party functions. In those days, Liberal Party functions probably had considerably more members at them than today, but Allan would never miss anybody in the room. He would spend a few minutes with everybody, knowing not just their name but probably the name of their spouse and their children and what their children were doing. He took a great interest in everybody involved—a very endearing quality.

As others have said, Allan was born in Tumby Bay, but when I rang Graham Gunn recently, following the news of Allan's death, Graham told me that Allan grew up in Wharminda on the West Coast (Eyre Peninsula) where Graham's father grew up. He said that his father and the Roddas were friendly. Graham obviously spent considerable time (I think 15 years) of his career in this place with Allan, and he concurred with the sentiments and the memories that I have of Allan.

Allan involved himself in farming on the West Coast and joined the Air Force in 1943. He trained, I believe, in the first instance at Victor Harbor, then at Point Cook, and then was stationed in Britain flying, as a bomber pilot, Lancaster bombers. I never spoke to Allan about his war service, but I have spoken to a number of people who were bomber pilots and anybody who—

Mrs Redmond: Survived.

Mr WILLIAMS: As my leader says, survived—

Mrs Redmond: Their life expectancy was 40 hours.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes, their life expectancy was not very long at all. It was a pretty amazing career path. It did not lead, as the leader says, to a long life expectancy—sitting in a bomber in freezing conditions for eight, 10, or 12 hours at a time, flying across Europe and back, and then limping home after being under heavy fire. At the end of the war, Allan continued in Europe in the Air Force for a time, ferrying prisoners of war back to Britain.

Following that, when he was repatriated back to Australia he moved to the South-East. With the lands department he worked for a number of years, from 1947 to 1954, on the work that the lands department was doing establishing returned soldiers on soldier settler farms, and eventually in 1955 Allan was allotted a farm of his own. He took up farming Struan in the South-East, just south of Naracoorte.

One of the interesting things that came out of the speeches and eulogies given at the funeral service was the relationship that Allan had with his wife, Madge. Through what were tough times, particularly for returned servicemen, and in the ensuing years when they were establishing themselves on the farms and raising a family, the support that Madge gave him was obvious from what was said by family and friends.

Of course, being a country member coming from the town of Naracoorte in the days when transport was so much more difficult than it is today, it was a considerable task to get from Naracoorte to Adelaide for the sittings of parliament. It would have been a lonely existence and a lonely family life, being a parliamentarian during those times.

Allan Rodda, as others have said, served as a minister in two governments. In the Steele Hall government, he was minister for works and minister of marine in 1970. He then became, in the Tonkin government from 1979 to 1982, the chief secretary, minister of fisheries and, again, minister for marine. He had a very good career in politics. He survived 21 years and eight elections. The seat of Victoria was considerably smaller than the current seat of MacKillop. In those days the country seats were considerably smaller, and I think the change of name from Victoria to MacKillop

probably occurred at the 1989 election. Allan Rodda retired in 1985 and the seat was been won by Dale Baker, who became the member.

He had a great interest in agriculture and for most of his time in parliament was a champion of the farming community, not just in the South-East but right across South Australia. Having come from the Eyre Peninsula and worked for much of his life in the South-East he had a good understanding of the needs of agriculturalists right across South Australia. He never forgot his roots in agriculture and always advocated for the farmers across the state.

He talked of the incredibly good work that was done by the department of agriculture through the extension program, making scientific breakthroughs available to those pursuing farming across the state. Bear in mind that, in those times, a lot of those farmers, people like himself, were returned servicemen. A lot of those returned servicemen were not necessarily from a farming background. One of the things that he advocated for many years, as was mentioned in his valedictory speech, was the upgrading of the road from Keith to Mount Gambier. That would have been very important to him, enabling him to drive from Naracoorte through to Adelaide on a modern, sealed road.

In 1982, Allan was awarded the CBE, the Commander of the British Empire for his services, not only to his country but also to his state, his community and his family. I have known Allan's son Bruce for many years and I offer my condolences to Bruce, his wife Jeanette, his sister Pauline and their respective families. As I was quoted in the local press in Naracoorte, Allan Rodda is fondly remembered around Naracoorte. Quite often, as I am talking to people about politics in the South-East, Allan's name comes up. I know that he has been very fondly remembered and will be sadly missed.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:25): I consider it a privilege to support this motion and express my condolences to the Rodda family for the sad passing of Mr Rodda. It is evident from previous speakers of the outstanding contribution that Mr Rodda made to government in South Australia, to this parliament and, of course, to his state and country, and, very importantly, his lifelong advocacy for agriculture and the significance of that in the development, advancement and survival of the state's economy.

I also wish to place on record what may seem to be a sort of third-party, posthumous, retrospective apology. My late father used to occupy an office in parliament—now occupied by the member for Kavel—and Mr Rodda had the misfortune to share that office with him. It was a little like Oscar and Felix; they were certainly men of different proportions and character.

I can always remember one example when my father brought a flour bag into the parliament which he said had his lunch in it, and I was not sure whether it was dead or alive. Mr Rodda had a very neat, what we used to call the old Bessemer ware, lunch box, which I am sure had trimmed sandwiches and the like in it. This is some indication of the difference between the two men.

The reason I wish to record my apology to his family is that if he ever had a hearing problem, I am sure it was entirely due to the fact that Mr Rodda would answer his calls in a gentlemanly gentle manner, where he would succinctly outline his correspondence through that medium but, on the other hand, my father had a capacity to make a lot of noise. Most of the corridor thought he did not need the telephone to speak to whoever he was speaking to in the country.

They were very different men, but they were in the parliament together in a very different time. My memories of Mr and Mrs Rodda bring a smile to my face. I will say that Mrs Rodda must have been the very smart one in the family because, if she came to visit, she would just wait on a seat in the passage outside and not have to cope with all the noise.

One interesting occasion that I recall is my father telling me that Mr Rodda and he had been called up to the premier's office who, in this instance, was premier Tonkin (the late David Tonkin). At the time, Mr Rodda had been the chief secretary, as has been indicated, and one of his duties, of course, was to deal with prisons. It is a very difficult portfolio, as I am sure the current minister would appreciate. From time to time, people escape from prison and, during the short period of Mr Rodda's watch, there seemed to be quite a few. Not surprisingly, the media of the day were on to this and came to interview him.

Mr Rodda said to my father something to the effect of, 'What am I going to say?' My father said, 'You need to tell them that you're going to keep the people of South Australia safe, or

something. Get out there and just tell them, look, sure, there's plenty of them escaping. They're just like frogs jumping off a log.' Of course, that is exactly what he did and, suffice to say, it was all across the televisions that night.

They were good friends and Mr Rodda was a wonderful man. As I said, when I think of Mr and Mrs Rodda, it brings a smile to my face. If current members of this parliament in any way espouse to reflect the gentleman that Mr Rodda was, they will do a great service to this parliament. My condolences to the family.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (14:29): I rise to support this motion of the Premier, which has been ably supported by my leader. William Allan Rodda CBE was the member for Victoria from March 1965 until December 1985. He gave 20 years of wonderful service to this parliament. As has been said, in 1970, he was the minister for marine and works and in 1982 chief secretary and minister for fisheries and marine. He was admired by all, including Sir Thomas Playford, even though he often tested him. Yes, he was the last of the Playford era.

Allan Rodda was a close friend of my father and, as the member for Bragg has just said, they had many an exploit together and, with the member for Kavel's father, they often used to hunt in packs around this place. He was a close friend of dad's, and both he and his lovely wife Madge, who passed away 12 months ago next month, were friends of the Venning family and were often house guests at Montrose. As a younger person, he left a lasting impression on me. He was one of those people who, by example, made you feel proud of being a politician and wanting to join this profession. That was probably when I first had the first inkling that it may be that I might leave the farm one day and do this.

Allan always referred to his electorate as 'my people', and he always put them first and served them extremely well. I note and support the words of the Premier and my leader, so I will not repeat the long list of achievements that he made in this place. Allan loved to chat, laugh and tell jokes, and I can recall several, which I will not repeat, but there was one about the gastro attack which his cattle were afflicted with—you can imagine the stories. I will not go there, but he had a wonderful way of putting it.

When dad had problems with the Rocky River electorate, and we did have a few—these were the LM days, remember—dad would call in the cavalry, and it was usually Roger Goldsworthy and Allan Rodda first over the horizon to come and save the day. He had a very admirable ability to always see good in people; he was a very optimistic person, a gentleman and a thoroughly good bloke. Allan and dad had so much in common. He was brought up on a farm at Wharminda, on the West Coast, and had a very good grounding. The same age as my father, Howard, Allan was born on 8 September 1917, and had the same political objectives.

Allan married Madge on 8 April 1943, during wartime. On 9 April (the day after) he started pilot training with the RAAF. He graduated as a bomber pilot and in 1944 went off to the United Kingdom to fly the four-engined Lancaster bomber. As we said earlier, it is a very perilous job, particularly if you are the tail-end Charlie. I remember that he went to Canberra to see the tail-end Charlie that is in the museum there, and he could recall everything. He had a very distinguished flying career and returned home in 1945.

Allan engrossed himself in things in his community and industry, and we have heard about that. In 1947, he served on the Land Development Executive, assisting the settlement of returned servicemen on farms. Allan and Madge moved to their new farm at Struan, near Naracoorte, in 1952. He was very proud of it and really enjoyed working on his farm. He loved his sheep and his cattle. He and Madge had three children: Bruce, Beverly and Pauline. Bruce is a mate of ours and, as the member for MacKillop said, he has been active in politics and the community.

My last meeting with 'Rodds' was on the bowling green at the last interstate carnival here at Adelaide Oval. Yes, he had slowed down, but he was still the same: extremely positive and friendly and he recalled the distant past. He and my dad had the same affliction, and I could relate to him well.

In retirement he loved to travel and he followed horseracing. I have fond memories of this very fine man and his family. He was a great bloke, a model citizen, an excellent MP and a top family man. Allan died on 27 May 2010. I was pleased to be able to attend his funeral—there was a very good crowd at it. Did he make a difference? He sure did, and we will remember him. Vale Allan Rodda MP CBE.

The SPEAKER (14:34): I thank members for their contributions today. I did not know Mr Rodda personally, but I have heard nothing but good news and good stories about this man. He must have been a gentleman, and certainly someone who we can all look to as an example in this place. My sincere sympathy to the family. I ask that the motion now be carried in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 14:35 to 14:45]

YORKEYS CROSSING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart): Presented a petition signed by 3,084 residents of Port Augusta and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to upgrade the 'Yorkeys Crossing' route to an all weather standard road suitable for all vehicles.

SEAFORD AMBULANCE STATION

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts): Presented a petition signed by 2,155 residents of Seaford and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to provide an ambulance station and service to the district of Seaford.

LIEN HENG GROCERY STAND

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide): Presented a petition signed by 1,622 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the Adelaide City Council to preserve the Lien Heng Grocery Stand and to consult further on the future of the Central Markets.

WATER METERS

Mr BROCK (Frome): Presented a petition signed by 277 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to ensure all Housing Trust households are provided with their own individual water meters in order that they might monitor and control their own water use and pay SA Water for the accurate and appropriate usage.

TRINITY GARDENS PRIMARY SCHOOL RED-LIGHT CAMERA

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood): Presented a petition signed by 162 parents of Trinity Gardens Primary School Students requesting the house to urge the government to install a red light speed camera at the pedestrian crossing on Portrush Road, opposite the school.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY RURAL PROPERTIES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Presented a petition signed by 271 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to facilitate the proposed sale by Adelaide University of rural properties bequeathed to it.

CRAFERS SPEED CAMERA

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Presented a petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to install a fixed speed camera with adequate signage on Main Street, Crafers.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker (Hon. L.R. Breuer)—

72nd Report of the Economic and Finance Committee entitled Emergency Services Levy 2010-11 which has been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991
Register of Members' Interests—Primary Returns—Registrar's Statement June 2010

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Remuneration Tribunal—No 3 of 2010 Travelling and Accommodation Allowances—Revised Report

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Freedom of Information—Fee Increases
State Records—Fee Increases

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Mines and Works Inspection—Fee Increases
Mining—Fee Increases
Opal Mining—Fee Increases
Petroleum (Submerged Lands)—Fee Increases
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy—Fee Increases

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Emergency Services Funding—Remissions—Land
Land Tax—Fee Increases
Petroleum Products Regulation—Fee Increases
Public Corporations—
Distribution Lessor Corporation
Generation Lessor Corporation
Transmission Lessor Corporation

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Development Plan Amendment—
Proposal to Construct New Health Care Facilities at Lot 300 Alexander Kelly Drive,
Noarlunga Centre Report
Statewide Bulky Goods Development Plan by the Minister
Third Party Premiums Committee—Determination Pursuant to the Motor Accident
Commission Act 1992
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—Fee Increases
Harbors and Navigation—Fee Increases
Motor Vehicles—
Expiation Fees—Fee Increases
Fees—Fee Increases
National Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees—Fee Increases
Reduction of Fees—Temporary Configuration Certificates
Passenger Transport—Fee Increases
Road Traffic—
Approved Road Transport Compliance Schemes—Fee Increases
Expiation Fees—Fee Increases
Heavy Vehicle Driver Fatigue—Fee Increases
Intelligent Access Program—Interpretation
Miscellaneous—Fees—Fee Increases
Traffic Experiment Road Trains

By the Minister for Infrastructure (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fee Increases
Valuation of Land—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Public and Environmental Health—
Legionella—Fee Increases
Waste Control—Fee Increases
Local Council By-Laws—
Central Northern Adelaide Health Service Incorporated—No. 1—General
Children, Youth and Women's Health Services Incorporated—No. 1—General

Country Health SA Hospital Incorporated—No. 1—General
Southern Adelaide Health Service Incorporated—No. 1—General

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Death of—Mr Peter Ross Blunden Report
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances—
Pesticides
Pesticides—Fee Increases
Poisons
Poisons—Fee Increases
Prescribed Profession
Tobacco Products Regulation—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Police (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Firearms—Fee Increases
Hydroponics Industry Control—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fire and Emergency Services—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Families and Communities (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Adoption—Fee Increases
Building Work Contractors—Fee Increases
Conveyancers—Fee Increases
Land Agents—Fee Increases
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Fee Increases
Liquor Licensing—Fee Increases
Local Government—
Fee Increases
General—Local Government Sector Employers
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians—Fee Increases
Private Parking Areas—Fee Increases
Residential Tenancies—Notice of Termination
Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers—Fee Increases
Travel Agents—Fee Increases
Local Council By-Laws—
Wakefield Regional Council—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Local Government Land
No. 3—Roads
No. 4—Moveable Signs
No. 5—Dogs
No. 6—Bird Scaring Devices

By the Minister for Housing (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Housing Improvement—Fee Increases
South Australian Co-operative and Community Housing—Housing Associations

By the Minister for Ageing (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Retirement Villages—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. P. Caica)—

National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2008-09
Yellabinna Regional Reserve, Review of—2000-10

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—Fee Increases

Crown Land Management—Fee Increases

Dangerous Substances—

Dangerous Goods Transport—Fee Increases

Fee Increases

Employment Agents Registration—Fee Increases

Environment Protection—Fee Increases

Explosives—

Fees—Fee Increases

Fireworks—Fee Increases

Security Sensitive Substances—Fee Increases

Fair Work—Fee Increases

Heritage Places—Fee Increases

Historic Shipwrecks—Fee Increases

National Parks and Wildlife—

Hunting—Fee Increases

Wildlife—Fee Increases

Native Vegetation—Fee Increases

Natural Resources Management—

Financial Provisions—Fee Increases

General—Fee Increases

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare—Fee Increases

Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fee Increases

Radiation Protection and Control—

Ionising Radiation—Fee Increases

Non-ionising Radiation Fee Increases

Rules made under the following Acts—

Fair Work—Industrial Proceedings Rules—Rule 20

By the Minister for Water (Hon. P. Caica)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Fees Regulation—Assessment of Requirements Water and Sewerage—
Fee Increases

Sewerage—Fee Increases

Waterworks—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Gambling (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Authorised Betting Operations—Fee Increases

Gaming Machines—Fee Increases

Lottery and Gaming—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

Industry Fund—

Apiary Annual Report 2008-09

Cattle Annual Report 2008-09

Citrus Growers Annual Report 2008-09

Deer Annual Report 2008-09

Olive Annual Report 2008-09

Pig Annual Report 2008-09

Sheep Annual Report 2008-09

Wine Industry Fund—Adelaide Hills, Barossa, Clare Valley, Langhorne Creek, McLaren
Vale, Riverland, South Australian Grape Growers Annual Report 2008-09

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Branding of Pigs—Fee Increases

Brands—Fee Increases

Fisheries Management—Fee Increases

Livestock—Fee Increases
 Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—
 Citrus Industry—Fee Increases
 Meat Industry—Fee Increases

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

University of Adelaide—
 Part One—Annual Review Annual Report 2009
 Part Two—Financial Statements Annual Report 2009

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Associations Incorporation—Fee Increases
 Bills of Sale—Fee Increases
 Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fee Increases
 Business Names—Fee Increases
 Community Titles—Fee Increases
 Co-operatives—Fee Increases
 Coroners—Fee Increases
 Cremation—Fee Increases
 Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles)—Fee Increases
 Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Fee Increases
 District Court—Fee Increases
 Environment, Resources and Development Court—Fee Increases
 Evidence—Fee Increases
 Fees Regulation—Public Trustee Administration Fees—Fee Increases
 Magistrates—Fee Increases
 Partnership—Fee Increases
 Public Trustee—Fee Increases
 Real Property—Fee Increases
 Registration of Deeds—Fee Increases
 Security and Investigation Agents—Fee Increases
 Sexual Reassignment—Fee Increases
 Sheriff's—Fee Increases
 Strata Titles—Fee Increases
 Summary Offences—Fee Increases
 Supreme Court—Fee Increases
 Worker's Liens—Fee Increases
 Young Offenders—Training Centre Review Board
 Youth Court—Fee Increases

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

CHILD ABUSE REPORT LINE

1 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (18 May 2010). How many notifications of child abuse were received by the Child Abuse Report Line between January and March 2010, how many of these were assessed in Categories 1, 2 and 3, respectively, and how many of these were referred for investigation?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability): It is not possible to provide a detailed answer to the question until later in the year. However, what I am able to report at this point is that Families SA Child Abuse Report Line received 5,586 notifications of suspected child abuse and neglect during the period 1 January to 31 March, 2010. Of this number:

- 263 were assessed as Tier 1
- 3,289 were assessed as Tier 2

- 1,067 were assessed as Tier 3

The remaining 967 notifications were categorised as extra-familial abuse, or protective factors in place.

TIMOR-LESTE DELEGATION

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) (14:52): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to inform the house that a senior delegation from the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste visited South Australia this week as part of an official visit that will include Canberra and New South Wales. The delegation's two-day visit concluded a very short time ago.

Timor-Leste, or East Timor, as most Australians would know it, is a country of over 1 million people, with one of the fastest growing populations in the world, and the United Nations Human Development Index ranks this nation amongst the poorest countries in the Asian Pacific region and, indeed, the world.

Australia has been at the forefront of support for East Timor's transition to independence, which was formerly achieved on 20 May 2002 and continues to play a key role through extensive development and security assistance. South Australia has a very close relationship with Timor-Leste, and the state government has played an important role in providing Timor-Leste with targeted capacity building and skills development assistance.

The Timor-Leste delegation, led by the President, His Excellency Dr Jose Ramos-Horta, included the Ambassador of the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste, also Australia's Ambassador, Peter Heyward, the Minister for Foreign Affairs from East Timor, the Minister for Economy and Development, and the Minister for Tourism, Commerce and Industry.

The delegation's itinerary in our state was focused on both current and prospective partnership projects between South Australia and Timor-Leste. In partnership with AusAID, South Australia is midway through a three-year capacity building program to help with the development of vital infrastructure and employment in Timor-Leste. Our Basic Skills Project, designed to train approximately 600 young people in basic construction skills, has already graduated about 120 young people with work-ready basic trade skills in carpentry, stonemasonry, electrical work, metal fabrication and plumbing. Over 40 per cent of these graduates are already employed in local jobs.

The unemployment rate in the capital, Dili, is currently around 40 per cent amongst those aged 15 to 29. Programs that skill and engage youth are therefore critical and have been raised as a priority by the Timor-Leste government. Both Austraining International and TAFE SA are key elements in this training effort, and for that reason the Timor-Leste delegation today visited our TAFE SA facility at Marleston to meet with some of the educators who are involved. The South Australian government also assists Timor-Leste through the operation of a public sector capacity building program. This is a three-year mentoring program that provides professional development opportunities for eight senior level East Timorese public servants working mainly in the primary industries, resources, environmental and vocational education and training sectors.

To date, five government instrumentalities have provided mentors for this program, including the Department for Environment and Heritage, Primary Industries and Resources, the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure and SA Water. This is in addition to ETSA, which, of course, is not a government agency. The Timor-Leste delegation's visit provided an opportunity to discuss these valuable mentor relationships.

Timor-Leste is still faced with many challenges related to building a nation, including the need to address environmental degradation with a focus on long-term sustainability. Their environmental challenges are significant and likely to be further impacted by climate change. While in South Australia the delegation visited the Onkaparinga Gorge to view results of the state's Million Trees Program. I think that we are nearly up to the two millionth tree. To date, over 30,000 people have been actively involved in this program, and 1.9 million trees have so far been planted, I am advised.

The program can provide valuable insights to Timor-Leste, which is keen to introduce a reforestation program which addresses land degradation and which engages young people. The South Australian government is currently working on a partnership project with the United Nations to provide support in this area. Similarly, the delegation met with Events SA and tourism reps to learn from our experience with the Tour Down Under. In September Timor-Leste will run its second Tour de Timor, a five-day international mountain biking event. South Australia may be able to give advice based on our experiences in running a major event, such as the Tour Down Under.

I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition, ministers and business leaders joined me last night at a dinner to honour the delegation and the President of East Timor, the Nobel Prize winner Jose Ramos-Horta. We remain committed to a strong, ongoing relationship with Timor-Leste, and I am very pleased to have had the opportunity to welcome the delegation to our state this week.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:00): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Today I can announce the latest developments in the state government's campaign to build 21st century mental health facilities at Glenside. The government has now signed a contract for the sale of a portion of the land on site to the Chapley Retail Group for construction of the retail precinct linked to the Frewville shopping centre. Just over 2.1 hectares of land will be sold to the Chapley Retail Group for \$536 per square metre. Two independent valuations—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear you, minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you Madam Speaker. It's rudeness on the other side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear the minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Two independent valuations of the land sought by the government indicated values between \$451 and \$569 per square metre. The Chapley Retail Group will now face a range of challenges to be dealt with on the site, including heritage issues with the southern heritage wall intersecting the land, a number of significant trees across the site and a set timetable for planning approvals and development. The department of transport will purchase up to 0.16 hectares of land along Glen Osmond Road, currently owned by the Chapley Retail Group, for road widening purposes.

In total, the state government received more than \$10.6 million in net revenue through this contract. These funds will be reinvested in the \$130 million project to provide a state-of-the-art, brand new 129-bed hospital for some of the most vulnerable people in South Australia. In addition, this project includes:

- a 15-bed intermediate care centre;
- 20 new supported accommodation places;
- a drug and alcohol outpatient facility; and
- education, training and research facilities.

The Glenside site will also include the Adelaide Film and Screen Centre currently under construction, commercial facilities and a future housing development.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This project will transform Glenside from a patchwork of ageing buildings sprawled across an underutilised and unfriendly 30-hectare site into a hub for the whole community.

At the heart of the new Glenside site will be the hospital facilities caring for people with mental illness and substance abuse issues. The architecturally-designed hospital will replace the ageing and foreboding buildings currently on site with single bedrooms arranged around private, landscaped courtyards with a central shared garden open to the general public. Providing new facilities with landscaped gardens and surrounding the hospital with community activities, including retail areas, housing and an arts precinct, will add normality to Glenside, challenging age-old stigmas about mental health. Importantly, there will be about nine hectares of landscaped open space created on the site, including a community park, wetlands, walking areas and a junior soccer pitch.

To allow for the construction of the new hospital, some trees on site will need to be removed. However, the design team has gone to great lengths to ensure the design retains as many trees as possible. The rejuvenated campus will also see more than 600 new trees planted as part of the hospital redevelopment, ensuring that trees remain a dominant landscape element of the site. The new plantings on the campus will include trees and shrubs native to the Adelaide Plains.

Recently, there has been a move by a member of the public for the protection of one of the Glenside buildings, Eastwood Lodge, the former nurses' accommodation. I inspected the building myself about a month ago. Currently, a three-month period of consultation is under way by the State Heritage Council. Preservation of this building would mean a slightly smaller amount of open space on the site. If Eastwood Lodge is given heritage protection, of course, it will need to be used in some way. A number of possible uses for the building are currently being investigated ahead of a final decision on its heritage value. There are some concerns that Eastwood is suffering from concrete cancer and that there are some large cracks of concern. These matters will also be investigated. So there are some issues with the site but they are being addressed. However, I make it clear to the house that the government has no intention of managing this building or funding its redevelopment and maintenance so, if it is to be protected, we need to find somebody else who wants to take on those roles.

Since coming to office, the Rann Labor government has committed more than \$300 million towards providing additional and improved mental health services for South Australians as part of a massive health reform agenda. Within two years the new Glenside Hospital is expected to open, providing South Australians with the very best mental health and substance abuse facilities in this nation. Glenside Hospital will emerge as a national and potentially international leader in mental health and substance abuse services and as a centre for excellence for the delivery of treatment and care. On top of that, new mental health facilities will be provided elsewhere across the metropolitan area, and in country South Australia we have dedicated mental health beds for the very first time. This government is absolutely committed to caring for and supporting our most vulnerable in our community.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER (15:13): Earlier today the member for Davenport rose on two matters of privilege. In the first, the member for Davenport alleged that the Deputy Premier had deliberately misled the house in relation to the matter of when he was first made aware that the estimated cost of the redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval was going to exceed the then publicly stated government contribution of \$450 million.

The second matter relates to the Deputy Premier's statements made to the house about the size of the footprint of the proposed Adelaide Oval redevelopment and the allegation that the statements of the Deputy Premier are inconsistent with the information from the Stadium Management Authority in relation to the project's design.

I will address the second matter of the footprint first. A difference in the presentation of information about the size of the footprint of the redevelopment by the Deputy Premier that is not strictly in conformity with the words that the member for Davenport draws attention to in the Stadium Management Authority's design briefing fact sheet are matters of interpretation and points for debate. Such an inconsistency is not of itself a matter of privilege.

I return to the first allegation of the member for Davenport. The Deputy Premier, in response to a series of questions asked on 12, 13, 25 and 26 May and in two ministerial

statements made on the 25 and 27 May, confirmed that he had attended meetings with representatives of the proponents of the project before and after the state election held on 20 March, as well as having received advice on design aspects of the project from the Stadium Management Authority both before and after the state election.

However, the Deputy Premier maintained throughout that he had been provided with no advice by the proponents on the possible increase in the costs of the redevelopment prior to the state election. His ministerial statement, made earlier today, makes clear that he was informed of possible variations to the preliminary costs in the period prior to the government entering the caretaker period prior to the state election.

To that extent, it is reasonable to conclude that, in answering the questions put to him on 12, 13, 25 and 26 May, and in his ministerial statements of 25 and 27 May, that the house has been misled. The house is entitled to have an expectation that as an experienced minister he should know better.

That brings me to the Deputy Premier's ministerial statement made this morning to correct the record and the correspondence that I also received from him earlier. In both the ministerial statement and his letter to me, he has conceded that a serious but unintentional error was made.

There are three elements in establishing the contempt of misleading the parliament. They are:

- that the statement complained of must have been misleading;
- it must be established that the member knew at the time that it was misleading; and that
- it was the members deliberate intention to mislead the house.

Nothing the member for Davenport has put to me, and I thank him, would lead me to conclude that the error was, as he alleges, knowing and deliberate.

I have thought long and hard about this and done much preparation, but in the Chair's opinion, there is no matter of privilege, as the matter could not genuinely be regarded as intending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties. This is the standard in matters of privilege that the house has consistently applied. However, my ruling does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion.

QUESTION TIME

TREASURER'S REMARKS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): My question is to the Premier. Given that the Treasurer has admitted to the house that he knowingly misled the South Australian public throughout the election campaign, will the Premier now do the right thing and sack him?

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) (15:17): That really was not very inspiring. In fact, to use the words of Natalie Cole, it's pretty forgettable—or maybe to misuse.

An honourable member: Unforgettable.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Oh, unforgettable. The thing about this is that we have a Deputy Premier who, on my reckoning, 19 or 20 days before this parliament sat, went out publicly and highlighted his error. As long as I have been in this parliament, the rules in relation to privilege come down to intent. I have been here longer than anyone else in this chamber. It is about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is very interesting about questions of intent, because the following points were included in the minutes:

Discussion then followed that these estimates were preliminary only and should not, could not, be relied upon. The final design had not been determined and there were many variances which may have material impact up and down on the final costings. This information will not be available for several weeks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Would the member for Norwood stop waving material around. It is out of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: How can you accuse the Deputy Premier of misleading with intent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —when it was the Deputy Premier of this state who himself went out publicly nearly 3 weeks before he needed to, to come out and say, 'I misled the parliament.'? That is what he said.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It was the Deputy Premier himself who highlighted his error—and that is the nub of it and that is the rub of it.

DISABILITY SELF-MANAGED FUNDING

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:20): Will the Minister for Disability update the house on progress made in introducing self-managed funding for disabled South Australians?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:20): Yesterday afternoon, a significant milestone was achieved with the signing of the first of our disability self-managed contracts here in South Australia. We had a small ceremony here in Parliament House that was attended by a group of participants and carers involved in the initial phase of this initiative. Also in attendance were members of the Self-Managed Funding Panel and staff from the Office of Disability and Client Services. I would like to take this opportunity to thank them for their hard work and for making this a reality. Yesterday, they saw first-hand the impact and importance of—

Ms Chapman: Was David Holst there?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, he was actually. Yesterday, they saw first-hand the impact and importance of the work they have been painstakingly undertaking. For some time, South Australians with disabilities and their advocates have been calling for self-managed funding arrangements.

The first phase of our self-managed funding initiative aims to provide 50 people with the opportunity to transfer their current disability support services into a self-managed funding arrangement. Some participants will manage their own funding and support arrangements independently, while others will be supported by carers or non-government organisations to do so. Yesterday at the signing there was a mix of these participants. To date, 47 people have been approved to take part, and registrations of interest will continue until we reach 50.

Once agreements are in place, the department provides money to participants or carers to enable them to buy the services of their choice. For example, one participant has already arranged to do their grocery shopping online, freeing up two hours a week of personal support for other activities. Another carer's plan for their adult child has allowed them to negotiate a more flexible respite service to allow them to take a well earned break. One dad said to me yesterday that, after he had signed the agreement, he felt that for the first time in over 20 years they had their lives back.

Self-managed funding forms part of the Rann government's aim to provide greater choice and control to people with disabilities. It also emphasises our focus of putting people at the centre of services and empowering them. As this initiative is a major change, we want to be sure that we get this right during its developmental stage. Phase 1 is about learning through action and engaging with stakeholders about the way specialist disability services are provided, and an independent evaluation will further support this development.

While there is still a way to go, the foundations are now set for a better way forward for many South Australians with a disability, their families and carers, and this government is proud to have put this process in motion.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): My question is to the Premier. If a minister can knowingly mislead the public during the whole of an election campaign and not be sacked, what is the value of the government's ministerial code of conduct?

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) (15:24): I think we have made very clear that it was the Deputy Premier himself who went out publicly to identify that he had misled the house about 20 days—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think it was 2 June, or around that time—about 20 days before parliament sat. As long as I have been in this parliament—which is longer than anyone else in this chamber—the rule has been that you actually have to advise the house at the earliest opportunity.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Deputy Leader!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Not only did the Deputy Premier advise the house at the earliest opportunity, but he advised the people of South Australia nearly three weeks before parliament resumed to let them know that he had made a mistake. It all comes down to intent.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:24): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Minister, could you advise the house on recent international recognition confirmed on South Australia as a world leader in the area of waste management?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:25): I thank the honourable member for Ashford for her question and acknowledge her keen interest on all matters associated with the environment. Zero Waste is recognised as a leader in better waste management in Australia, and that reputation can now be said to extend internationally.

Zero Waste has been recognised internationally through its inclusion in the United Nations' UN-HABITAT publication *Solid Waste Management in the World's Cities*, and by receiving a Gold Quill award from the International Association of Business Communicators for its plastic bag ban communications campaign.

UN-HABITAT is the United Nations agency for human settlements and promotes socially and environmentally sustainable towns and cities. The UN-HABITAT report was compiled by more than 25 experts on waste management and it profiled 20 cities worldwide, ranging across developing, transitional and developed economies. The report addresses aspects of policy, as well as good and bad practice in the context of waste management.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am not going to succumb to their interjections; I am not going to do it. This is a very important issue and, clearly, members opposite are not interested in what it is that Zero Waste and the people of South Australia do well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: The Under-Secretary-General of the United Nations and executive director of UN-HABITAT, Anna Tibaijuka, explained that:

This publication looks at what drives change in solid waste management, how cities find local solutions and what works best under different circumstances.

Adelaide is featured as one of the 20 cities in the UN-HABITAT report, having been assessed by an independent expert using a comprehensive and detailed set of data. This data includes landfill surveys, annual recycling activity statements and achievements and strategies identified in Zero Waste South Australia's annual report, business plan and South Australia's Waste

Strategy 2005-2010. The report also notes that South Australians are highly environmentally conscious and states:

Adelaide and South Australia's waste and resources management system is in some respects global best practice. South Australia has demonstrated a high level of political commitment and willingness to 'stick its neck out' and implement some policies and legislation upon which other administrations take a more conservative position.

The report goes on to add that:

The Zero Waste Act and plastic bag ban are two excellent examples of SA's politicians showing leadership by putting in place the institutional structures, financing mechanisms, organisational capacity, and actions to support a major drive towards the three Rs (reduce, reuse, recycle).

In addition to Zero Waste's recognition by the United Nations, I am proud to inform members that last month Zero Waste received a Gold Quill award from the International Association of Business Communicators, in the Social Responsibility category of the Communications Management Division, for its plastic bag ban communications campaign.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Ma'am, I just cannot understand it. What is it about the opposition that it does not like good news that highlights what it is that we do here in South Australia that is global best practice. I just do not get it. The Gold Quill Communications Management Social Responsibility award recognises communications campaigns of an international standard that address sustainable development, economic, social or environmental issues. South Australia's—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —ban on lightweight single-use plastic bags keeps an estimated 400 million plastic bags out of the waste system every year. Madam Speaker, despite the opposition, these awards truly show that South Australia is highly regarded and recognised as being at the forefront of waste resource management anywhere in the world.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:29): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the Premier is yet to sack the Treasurer and given the Treasurer's obligations under the conventions of the Westminster system, as he raised in his ministerial statement this morning, will the Treasurer do the right thing by these conventions, and, indeed, the South Australian people, and resign?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:29): As I said to the house, I made a serious error and I have corrected the record at the first appropriate time. That does—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That differs sharply from former Liberal ministers, who in some instances did not volunteer information; that information was presented to parliament. There is a very significant difference. As my statement said I advised the house, in keeping with the Westminster system, at the earliest opportunity after I was made aware of the fact.

TRAINING ORGANISATIONS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:30): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Can the minister inform the house about any measures being taken to ensure the quality of South Australia's registered training organisations?

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) (15:31): As a matter of fact I can, and I thank the honourable member for Mawson for his question. Recent events about a college providing training for international students has highlighted the importance of a strong state and national regulatory system to underpin the quality of training provided by many training providers throughout Australia.

On 11 May I advised the house that the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (DFEEST), in accordance with the Training and Skills Development

Act 2008, carried out a monitoring audit in March 2010 of APIC, which found the college to be critically non-compliant with the Australian Quality Training Framework Standards. In addition, the audit found that the college was non-compliant with 12 of the 14 standards under the commonwealth's national code, which are available online.

On 7 May the delegate of the South Australian Training and Skills Commission, Mr Raymond Garrard, the Chief Executive of DFEEST, served notice on the college of his intention to cancel its registration under the Training and Skills Development Act. The college responded to DFEEST on 4 June, and the department is in the process of considering this detailed response. It is expected to make a final determination shortly. In addition, the commonwealth Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations suspended the college's registration as a provider to international students.

At this time, while proceedings are continuing in relation to APIC, it is not possible to give precise details to the house of the current audit or previous audits. I have been advised that matters may well be subject to legal proceedings and, in that regard, any detailed comments in this place may prejudice any future legal action. However, I can assure the house that much work has occurred to enhance both the resources and audit processes in South Australia over the last two years. This has been a focus in South Australia, as it has been nationally.

In response to an internal review undertaken in February 2009, the department, in conjunction with the Training and Skills Commission, implemented a number of reforms, including a restructure of the regulatory functions and processes in the agency. This was in recognition of the increasing demands that were arising in the regulation of training providers and the need to maintain high standards of quality. This review included the provision of additional resources within the audit area and changing the audit process to increase the level of industry participation involved in audits, hence giving expert industry views on providers' facilities and their processes.

Reforms and continuous improvement to regulatory processes in South Australia are occurring in an environment where there are important reforms to the regulatory framework in Australia. The most important of these reforms is the position taken by all states and territories and the commonwealth to establish a national regulator of training providers. This is essential given that many colleges operate over several jurisdictions, and it is important that regulatory standards are applied consistently across the country.

All jurisdictions have also agreed to the establishment of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. The new quality agency for higher education is expected to commence in 2011. In addition to this, the audit standards under the Australian Quality Training Framework 2007 that South Australia and all jurisdictions follow have just been substantially revised. At a recent meeting of the Ministerial Council for Tertiary Education and Employment the AQTF 2010 was endorsed and is now in the process of being implemented.

I am glad that South Australia has taken a leadership role in providing advice in many of these national reforms. Professor Denise Bradley, who chairs the South Australian Training and Skills Commission, has provided strong advice. South Australia has also chaired the development of a national/international student strategy.

I am keen to make certain that we continue to strengthen both South Australia's regulatory framework and also provide a valuable contribution into the development of a national regulator. I am particularly concerned that the current legislative frameworks at both state and national level are adequate to effectively monitor and enforce quality and provide adequate and appropriate protection to students in the unfortunate event of any college closures.

To this end, last month I asked Mr Warren McCann, the former CEO of the Department of Premier and Cabinet under the Olsen and Rann governments and now the Commissioner for Public Employment, to provide me with advice on further improvements to the current regulatory framework, in particular the current legislative framework and further steps that can be taken to avoid situations of critical non-compliance.

These matters will build on previous reforms and will help guide the transition to a national regulator and are aimed at further enhancing South Australia's reputation as a provider of quality further education services.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:36): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the Treasurer believes he can excuse misleading the public and make

inaccurate statements to the parliament by claiming memory loss, how can anyone dealing with the Treasurer—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order. The question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader can sit down.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The question was full of comment, the comment being—

Mrs Redmond: No, it wasn't.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, unfortunately for you, you are the Leader of the Opposition and not the Speaker. It should not be necessary for me to point that out. The question was full of comment, and the comment has gone to the Deputy Premier, as the three previous questions have, as deliberately misleading the people of South Australia. Now, you simply—

Mr Williams: He's admitted to it; it's fact.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And, can I say, Madam Speaker, the behaviour of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Listen to the point of order, please!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The behaviour is outrageous. Simply put, if they want an orderly answer to a question, they cannot ask disorderly questions alleging states of affairs.

The SPEAKER: I just wanted some clarification from the Clerk. It is getting very close to the line. I think I will listen very carefully to questions in future; but you have asked that question now, so I ask the Treasurer to respond.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:39): I will just make a couple of points. Firstly, I do recall, as I'm sure all members do, the published—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The opposition has asked a question; if you want to hear what the Treasurer has to say, please listen in silence.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The published comments of the shadow treasurer on the day before the election, where he publicly admitted to their costings for the Royal Adelaide Hospital being 'all spin', and—

Mr GRIFFITHS: Point of order. The Treasurer is referring to comments which were attributed to me, but what I am reported as saying is completely different to what the Treasurer is now referring to.

The SPEAKER: I don't see that as a point of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is not correct. The shadow treasurer publicly admitted that their costings throughout the election campaign—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: The Treasurer is entering into debate.

The SPEAKER: Rather like the question, I thought. The Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not want to exacerbate the tension on the issue: I just want to highlight a clear inconsistency in what the opposition is saying of me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The first part of the question was essentially about my integrity as a person and as a minister and how that relates to my function. What I said publicly was that there was no political benefit—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy Leader!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have a certain time to leave tonight. If members want to keep going all night, it is all right with me. The Deputy Premier will continue his remarks.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The point I was making is that for me to have deliberately lied some weeks ago would be, in my view, a very stupid thing to have done—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Had I deliberately done that some weeks ago the ramifications would be great, because, whilst it may not have been known, at some point this information always becomes public. It has never been my style. I have never, ever, ever deliberately lied to this parliament and misled this parliament.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have, as the record shows, repeatedly corrected the record when I have been of a view that I had made an error. As I said earlier, the sharp difference between those ministers who have resigned for misleading the parliament have been because, unlike me, they have not acknowledged the error publicly and to the parliament at the first opportunity. As I said, I do not want to continue the tension on this issue, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I can understand the opposition's excitement, but can I say that when it comes to my integrity as a person and when it comes to my integrity as a minister, I have been a minister of the highest ethical and moral standing—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —who has observed the highest standards of probity. I have adhered to a very rigid set of protocols to ensure that I undertake my job as ethically, morally and as professionally as I can. It has never been and never will be a feature of my operation as a minister to be one who deliberately misleads and lies in the administration of his portfolio.

REFUGEE AND MIGRANT SUPPORT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:44): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. What information can the minister provide to the house on how the government is promoting diversity in our community and supporting refugees and migrants who settle here in South Australia?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:44): Earlier this week I had the very serious honour of officially launching South Australian Refugee Week for this year. Refugee Week is very important because it gives each and every one of us the opportunity to pause and reflect on the plight of refugees, as well as the incredible contribution they make to South Australia. It also gives us the chance to reflect on our own responsibilities as individuals and governments towards displaced people throughout the world.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees estimates that at the end of 2009 there were 43.3 million people worldwide who had been forcibly displaced. In South Australia, in

the current financial year, we have in fact settled about 1,600 refugees. A recent Refugee Council of Australia report highlights the benefits of refugee settlement, including:

- opening up of new international markets;
- bringing in new skills;
- creating employment; and
- filling employment niches in both rural and metropolitan areas.

A large proportion of refugees are young, which means they make a positive net contribution to the labour market, a fact that is incredibly important for South Australia as we tackle the challenges of a rapidly ageing population.

Research undertaken on behalf of the joint Commonwealth and State and Territory Research Advisory Committee in relation to immigration and multicultural affairs found that, over the long term, the Refugee and Humanitarian Program leads to higher levels of employment, gross domestic product consumption and investment. Specifically, in South Australia, the research forecast that over a 20 year period refugees lead to a 1 per cent increase in employment and a .75 per cent increase in gross state product, as well as an increase in the labour force participation rate. These facts all bode well for our state. However, of course, the benefits go beyond the economic, as refugees add to the rich social and cultural tapestry that South Australians enjoy and have become famous for.

In order to create the foundation for refugees to reach their full potential and re-establish a sense of independence and belonging, the state government is undertaking its own initiatives to help our new and emerging communities. We have done this by creating a new position of Director of Settlement Services, who will work with refugee representatives, government and non-government organisations to ensure that the best use is being made of the available resources.

For instance, the director will work on issues such as: arrival reception assistance; accommodation; health services; financial counselling and emergency relief; community integration and orientation; children's and youth services; adult education; employment; and sport and recreation. There are preliminary discussions going on at the moment in relation to placing data about settlement services onto a mobile phone application, which is particularly important for young refugees.

These initiatives are helping us to achieve our ultimate goal, which is to provide the best possible conditions for refugees who settle in our state so that they can take their rightful place in our community.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:47): My question is to the Premier. Given that the Treasurer told the house this morning, 'I do fully accept responsibility for inaccuracies given to the parliament relating to when I was first advised of the possible cost overruns in the project', what are the consequences for the Treasurer of accepting that responsibility?

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) (15:48): I know that the Leader of the Opposition is new to her position, but those who have been in this house for a long time know that the cardinal sin in the Westminster system, as established by the mother of parliaments in Westminster, is whether there is a deliberate overt attempt to cover up. How can you accuse the Deputy Premier of a cover-up when he was the one who came out publicly and said he had made a mistake? And that is the difference.

CHINA DEVELOPMENT BANK AGREEMENT

Mr KENYON (Newland) (15:49): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Trade. Can the minister inform the house about the MOU he signed yesterday in partnership with the China Development Bank and also outline the excellent economic relationship that South Australia has with China?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (15:49): I thank the honourable member for this important question and his deep interest in all

things Chinese. Yesterday I was privileged to represent the state government for the formal signing of a memorandum of understanding between the President of the China Development Bank and South Australia. More than 250 Chinese delegates travelled to Canberra as part of a trade investment mission. The MOU was one of 10 that was witnessed by the Prime Minister and Chinese Vice President Xi Jinping in front of an enthusiastic crowd of Chinese and Australian media and a team of observers from both countries. The memorandum of understanding is a combination of intensive negotiations between the South Australian government and officials of the China Development Bank.

Its framework for cooperation will open more doors to two-way investment and trade with the world's fastest-growing economy. The sectors covered by the MOU include resources, infrastructure, clean energy, minerals processing and agriculture. The South Australian government, through the Department of Trade and Economic Development, has been working closely with the bank's commercial clients to increase investment and trade relations to boost Chinese investment in South Australia.

The resilience of the Chinese economy is one of the keys to South Australia and Australia's economic performance, and our state continues to cultivate strong and mutually beneficial ties with China. The Rann government also recognises the importance of attracting investment capital from China as a way of boosting South Australia's mineral production and export capabilities. Last year China was the second biggest export market for South Australia—exports valued at more than \$1 billion—with minerals and agricultural commodities such as iron ore and concentrates, refined copper, wool and barley featuring prominently. But increasingly, South Australia is also exporting high-value items such as wine, steel and paperboard.

ABS figures show that China ranks second behind the United States as an export destination for South Australia and first in importance as an import source. While in Canberra, I also witnessed the signing of a joint venture agreement between the China National Offshore Oil Corporation and Altona Energy in a project at the Arkaringa Basin near Coober Pedy—in your electorate, Madam Speaker. The MOU outlined a \$40 million feasibility study which took into account the production of high-value clean energy products in a potential \$3 billion project that is based on extracting coal and converting it into liquid fuels such as oil and power.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:52): My question, Madam Speaker, is to you. Given your ruling today on the privilege matter, can you please explain to the house how the allegation of a minister misleading the house does not touch on privilege? Speaker Lewis, in March 2003—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker: it is not open to debate your ruling in an explanation. There are standing orders.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, you can dress a duck up in a tuxedo, if you want, but it's still a duck. The truth is—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: We can't have two points of order at one time. Member for Unley, sit down.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I do apologise for responding to interruptions, which I shouldn't do. My point of order for this is—

Mr Pisoni: Give us the number.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I think it is 137, if you don't interrupt.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There are clear standing orders that protect rulings of the Speaker. One cannot dissent in a ruling of the Speaker, except according to the standing orders. There is no use dressing up a debate of your ruling, Madam Speaker, in a question. That is my point of order.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER (15:54): Order, member for MacKillop! As to the point of order raised by the Minister for Transport, as the member for Davenport was speaking, I was thinking along similar lines. I believe you are questioning my ruling. Normally a speaker is not asked to justify their reasons, particularly in question time. I am happy to talk to you after this, but I did set out very carefully the reasons why I had decided that this wasn't a matter of privilege. I am happy to discuss them with you afterwards.

ILLEGAL DRUGS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:54): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister update the house on the progress our valiant and committed police are making in seizing illegal drugs from our streets and any recent legislative changes that are assisting their work?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:54): Over the past 18 months the government has introduced a raft of improvements to strengthen our anti-drug laws, sharpening the teeth of special SAPOL operations and task forces that are achieving outstanding results. The intense 12-month covert investigation Operation Dactyl was recently brought to its conclusion, smashing a drug network by not just arresting street dealers but also following the chain all the way to the higher-ranked players. Fifty-nine people will face charges and close to 90,000 deals were stopped from reaching the streets, in a significant victory for police.

This is not a one-off success for SAPOL. The recently released Australian Crime Commission report showed SAPOL removed 152 kilograms of amphetamine-type stimulants from South Australian streets in 2008-09. The manufacture and trafficking of amphetamine-type stimulants continues to be one of the greatest challenges of law enforcement worldwide. SAPOL's increase in drug detections is a direct result of a strong and coordinated focus on drug manufacturing through operations like Dactyl and Mantle and sections such as the Crime Gangs Task Force, Organised Crime Investigation Branch and Drug Investigation Branch.

Across the board SAPOL has benefited from our continued work to strengthen drug laws. The latest addition to this list is the Hydroponics Industry Control Act. Following the end of a transitional period on 31 May it became illegal to sell prescribed equipment without a hydroponics equipment dealer's licence. On Friday 4 June police used our tough new laws to crack down on two stores illegally carrying on trade in prescribed equipment, leading to charges against the proprietors and the seizure of several thousands of dollars worth of equipment.

Additionally, SAPOL was involved in this week's Drug Action Week, with events in local service areas across the state as part of a national program to raise awareness about alcohol and other drug issues, aiming to stop our children and all within the community from becoming involved with drugs in the first place. I commend the men and women of SAPOL for their continued strong work in achieving results in this crucial component of law enforcement.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:57): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the Treasurer in his ministerial statement this morning admitted that he realised on Friday 28 May that he had made inaccurate statements to the house and the public, why did he not make his public statement correcting the matter until Wednesday 2 June, the same day and time as the opposition briefing from the Stadium Management Authority; and did Leigh Whicker contact the government or any departmental officer about the opposition's briefing on Wednesday 2 June in relation to the Adelaide Oval upgrade indicating that, if asked the question when he first notified the government of the cost blowout, he would not tell a lie?

The SPEAKER: I think there were two questions in that, Deputy Leader.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:58): That is a very serious allegation. What I can say to the house is that I have no doubt that my office or officers of government and, through them, my office were advised, and I think it might have even been a matter of public knowledge that the opposition were meeting with the SMA.

Mrs Redmond: That Leigh Whicker said he wouldn't tell a lie?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Leigh Whicker said he wouldn't tell a lie?

Mrs Redmond: Wouldn't lie if asked about the cost blowout, and you were notified.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I never spoke to Mr Whicker about this matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I can certainly say that, to the best of my knowledge and understanding—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: To suggest that there would be some conspiracy between myself and/or my office and Mr Whicker over this issue is a poor reflection on members opposite. As I said, this had nothing to do with Mr Whicker or the SMA: it was a matter of my honesty and my integrity. When I was made aware of the issue, I resolved on that Friday morning with my staff, and I think even with members of the Premier's staff—I can't be exactly sure on that, who we spoke to and when—to notify the parliament at the first opportunity, and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is answering your question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The protocol is that the parliament be shown the respect of being notified at the earliest opportunity and, to be frank, Madam Speaker, I was deciding as to when I should do it. As I have said publicly, as events transpired, particularly with radio interviews and such by Mr McLachlan, that the issue of who, when and how, under that discussion publicly, it was in the public interest that I notify ahead of time—some three weeks or so, I think, prior to the parliament—of my error and the honesty in that error, and it had nothing to do in terms of what the member just advised.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN REGIONAL CENTRE OF CULTURE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (16:01): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts. What is happening in Murray Bridge as it celebrates its title as the 2010 SA Regional Centre of Culture?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Health is quietly spoken and I would like to hear him.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:02): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I am very pleased to receive this question from the member for Mitchell. The South Australian Regional Centre of Culture initiative targets one regional centre every two years. There are both major investments in infrastructure to provide a lasting benefit for the community and a year-long program of cultural activities. It was introduced by the government in 2007, and the program is a partnership between state and local government with support from the private sector.

Port Augusta, of course, was the first regional centre of culture in 2008. Murray Bridge has the honour this year, and will benefit from \$1.5 million in state government funding, with a major contribution, too, from the local council.

Recently, I had the pleasure of opening a new performing arts space in the historic Town Hall in Murray Bridge—and a beautiful hall it is—and the extensive upgrade of the adjoining regional art gallery. The redeveloped Town Hall and art gallery represent the largest performing and visual arts infrastructure project that has occurred in regional South Australia over the past 25 years. I certainly congratulate—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —the district council of Murray Bridge for its commitment to this program. The new facilities will be a lasting legacy from the 2010 Regional Centre of Culture program for the community and will be the envy of many other regional communities, not only in this state but across the nation.

As a government, we contribute a total of \$750,000 towards the multimillion-dollar infrastructure project. The Rural City of Murray Bridge contributed the balance of funding to a total of in excess of \$4 million and oversaw the building project. The government has also provided a further three quarters of a million dollars towards the annual program of events. As part of the opening ceremony, the Welcome to Country was delivered by a choir of nine women—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You are being very rude today.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: They are, Madam Speaker. The Welcome to Country was delivered by a choir of nine women from the local women's association, Ngarrindjeri Minimar Kykulan. Their impressive performance was the culmination of workshops conducted by vocalists, Vonda Last and Trace Canini, local songwriter Catherine Sumner and Rita Lindsay Junior, who helped to develop a chorus for the song in a Ngarrindjeri language. I note that the local member was in attendance, and I am sure that he would agree with me that they did a superb job.

The benefits of the Regional Centre of Culture program will be long-lasting for the community, as the visiting artists are also training two choir members in how to conduct a choir. The performances, exhibitions, and sound-and-light spectacular that took place over the opening weekend are just a small part of the year-long program of arts and cultural activities.

The Adelaide Symphony Orchestra presented a twilight symphony concert at the local golf course on 20 March. I could not make it that evening, of course, but over 5,000 people found the prospect of a twilight symphony more appealing than the election results being broadcast on television that evening.

Over coming months, the SA Museum will be bringing its roadshow to Murray Bridge and History SA will be holding its 19th State History Conference there. There will also be an exhibition of works by eminent SA artist Robert Hannaford, a series of performances by the amazing Circus Oz, and contemporary dance programs, including *Ignition* by the Australian Dance Theatre.

Local artists will also benefit from Kurruru's performance of *Min Min*, which has been developed with the local community, and Sculpfest on the Murray, which will feature works from local artists as well as sculptors from across Australia.

I have no doubt that 2010 will be a memorable year for the Murray Bridge community and that in the future its impressive new facilities will help to entice arts organisations to exhibit and perform in the town on a regular basis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I take this opportunity to acknowledge the great work of Country Arts SA, which has run this program, in particular, Ken Lloyd, the general manager of Country Arts, who has announced his retirement.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (16:06): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's statement to the house on 16 May 2002 regarding his tough new code of conduct, when he stated that the new code would be:

...the toughest and most comprehensive honesty and accountability measures and standards of conduct. Setting the highest standards and meeting them will contribute to a renewed public confidence in the standing of government and, indeed, of parliament, and that is what our community in South Australia expects and deserves—

and given the Premier's support for his Deputy Premier, what behaviour of his ministers does the Premier believe warrants sacking?

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) (16:07): We saw what happened on the other side of politics when we saw the release of manufactured documents, the release of fake—

Mr PISONI: Point of order: this is about the Premier's code of conduct.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has just started to answer the question. I do not think he has gone far enough yet to have a point of order.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Apparently members opposite did not think that using faked documents, faked receipts—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order. I believe the Premier is clearly debating the issue.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold that point of order. Premier, can you stick to the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I do expect that when a minister makes a mistake he should come out and admit that mistake, and that is exactly what the Deputy Premier did and it is exactly what the Liberals and this opposition did not do when they were involved in a series of events that involved the use of forgeries, deliberate forgeries, and fake IT sites, basically a dirty tricks unit.

MINISTERIAL CODE OF CONDUCT

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:09): My question, again, is to the Premier. Has the Premier asked the Treasurer to explain his expletive laden tirade of abuse of a newspaper editor, and does the Premier concede that the Treasurer's personal conduct was unacceptable and in breach of clause 2.2 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, which provides:

Ministers must ensure that their personal conduct is consistent with the dignity, reputation and integrity of parliament.

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) (16:09): I think the deputy leader has already addressed that publicly as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We still have two questions to go before question time is finished. Member for Bright.

TEACHER RECRUITMENT

Ms FOX (Bright) (16:10): Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms FOX: I am sorry; hell hath no fury like a woman scorned! My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What new steps are being taken to give school principals more say in recruiting teachers who suit their particular schools, and to give greater certainty to contract teachers, who make a positive difference for children?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education and Children's Services; I hope you stay awake long enough on your feet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have no idea what is wrong with the opposition at the moment. It must be a private joke, obviously.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (16:11): It is a kind welcome back to the country, I must say.

The SPEAKER: I think it must be. At least you are awake.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I thank the honourable member for Bright for this question and acknowledge her expertise as a professional educator as well as her obvious and deep interest in the topic of the education of the children of our state, especially those children in her electorate. I have actually been out and about visiting schools within not only the member for Bright's electorate but also the member for Bragg's electorate, I think. In each of those schools I have met a number of teachers, as well as students and parents—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and the feedback I have received from those teachers, including young teachers on contracts, is that there are many wonderful things happening in our schools. However, one thing that concerns both the principals and those young teachers who find themselves in the less permanent positions, the contract positions, is that they feel there is a degree of insecurity about their employment. The principals have also been saying to me that they would like a greater capacity to offer those bright young teachers continuing employment.

Ms FOX: Point of order; sorry, minister. The minister is a notoriously low speaker, and I am on his side of the house, but I cannot hear him.

The SPEAKER: I agree with that; I uphold the point of order. Would the opposition please be quiet! There is still a question to go. If members want to stay here all day I do not mind; we can extend question time, but we do want to hear the minister's answer. I know it is an exciting and wonderful answer that he is giving us, but don't get too excited.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Principals have been telling me that they want a stronger say in selecting teachers that are the best match for the needs of their particular school. I have also heard principals say that they want a greater capacity to take on those young, brighter students who are coming straight out of their studies and ensure that they are offered permanent employment rather than a series of contracts.

They also know that, when teachers are on a series of contracts and do not know whether they will get employment from one term to the next or how for long they will be in a particular classroom, it has a quite detrimental effect not only on those teachers but also on the school environment. That uncertainty has an effect on a teacher's ability to build relationships with the students in their classroom.

We know that an incredibly important determinant of the results in our schools is the quality of our teachers, and a great deal has been achieved already to improve the recruitment of teachers locally while ensuring that we are still able to run an equitable public education system to ensure that we have the teachers we need in the more remote and difficult-to-staff areas of our state.

However, within that I believe there is room for us to give more autonomy to principals and a greater capacity to offer more permanency to some of these young teachers who have been on a series of contracts. As such, I have asked the department to review teacher recruitment so that there is more selection of teachers on a local basis and more teachers eligible for local selection. I also expect that this will lead to greater employment stability for teachers on contracts, recognising that they are both valued and vital to a dynamic and innovative public education system.

I am pleased for the support the opposition has voiced for this proposal, and appreciate that they have, for once, set aside partisan politics to demonstrate their commitment to the plan, although we will see how long it lasts, because the member for Unley is prone, I think, to playing politics in this area, but, hopefully, he will—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, no, this is a sensible policy. He said it is a good idea, and I hope he maintains that position. This particular initiative, as I said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —has grown out of the discussions I have had at a local level with each of the schools that I have met. I have been incredibly heartened as I have moved about the schools to see not only the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —diversity of the offering in the public school system, but also the excellence that has been presented. I look forward to visiting many more schools across the state and looking at ways in which we can further improve our public education system.

SPOONER JUDGEMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:16): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given the level of public concern at the verdict of R v Spooner and issues in relation to the conduct of the trial, has the Attorney-General sought a brief from the Director of Public Prosecutions as to the opportunities

for and prospects of an appeal in this District Court case? The opposition understands that, firstly, the prosecution's medical specialist had not even examined the defendant. Secondly, the defendant's medical witness was overseas at the time of the trial and, therefore, did not attend. The judgement indicates that the court relied on interstate medical specialists for its assessment on the fitness to drive under South Australian laws.

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) (16:17): There are two aspects to this question: one deals with fitness to drive. That is a question which I have asked of my department, whether the standards of fitness to drive are adequate. Those standards are done on a national level. They are presently being re-examined, aside from the issue of Spooner, to see whether they are adequate.

SPOONER JUDGEMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:17): Notwithstanding that the minister's information may be very important in due course, my question was actually as to whether a case has been sought from the DPP on this matter.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:18): Yes, I am happy to answer that aspect of it. The honourable member asks an important question, and I have asked for advice about the matter.

PUBLIC INTEGRITY

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (16:19): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement in relation to an update on the public integrity issue. As I have previously informed the house, the government has sought both to drive the creation of a national anti-corruption body as well as reviewing and improving our own state structures. As I told the house in May, I wrote to my ministerial colleagues on the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General on 15 April this year seeking to raise the matter of a national anti-corruption body. I travelled to Melbourne for a meeting of the standing committee on 7 May and outlined the government's view. I will not comment on what was said at that meeting; however, media reports of comments made by other ministers indicate that there is little support for establishing a national anti-corruption body in the foreseeable future.

I have given consideration to the current climate South Australia faces in relation to the prospects of a national anti-corruption body. I accept that our efforts to establish a national body are most unlikely to be successful. In my statement of 6 May, I also informed the house that I would review the operation and effectiveness of South Australia's public integrity system with a view to improving any imperfections that this review may identify.

On 12 May this year, I wrote to a number of interested parties to seek their views about the public integrity framework here in South Australia. These parties included a number of statutory officers and bodies which play a role in the system. I invited parties to make a submission about any improvements or changes they believe would strengthen and enhance the public integrity structures in South Australia and aid public confidence in the system.

The closing date of 14 June for the receipt of these submissions has now passed and my department is considering the content of the submissions received. I expect that some late submissions will be received and these will also be considered. I recognise that there may be contributors who may not wish their submissions to be put in the public domain for a variety of legitimate reasons. I respect this and I do not consider that it is for me or my department to release these submissions or identify contributors, particularly as I do not know to what extent, if at all, these submissions were prepared on a confidential basis.

After considering these submissions, taking advice from my department and further consultation, I intend to report to cabinet and this parliament about my conclusions and any proposals for improvement that may arise. I will not now pre-empt the outcome of this review by speculating on what proposals will arise. As I have indicated, my review of South Australia's public integrity framework is now well underway. Any recommendations I take to cabinet will be based on the need to maintain and enhance public integrity and community confidence in public administration in South Australia.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (16:22): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Burnside council made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Gail Gago.

DON'T CROSS THE LINE

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (16:22): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Don't Cross the Line website made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Gail Gago.

PRIVILEGES COMMITTEE

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (16:22): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to allow me to move a motion to establish a privileges committee to investigate whether the Treasurer has deliberately misled the house in relation to his knowledge about the cost increase of the Adelaide Oval upgrade prior to the 2010 state election.

During the proceedings of the house today the opposition raised a matter of privilege, and in your response to that matter of privilege, Madam Speaker, you invited the opposition to take up the matter by substantive motion having ruled that there was not a matter of privilege associated with the issue. The opposition is doing that, Madam Speaker, at your invitation through this mechanism.

The reason standing orders should be suspended so that we can debate whether a privileges committee should be established to investigate whether the Treasurer has deliberately misled the house is because this matter goes to whether the truth has been told to the parliament. It is important that standing orders be suspended so that this committee can be established as early as possible so that the truth can be established as early as possible.

Madam Speaker, the government would have you believe that standing orders should not be suspended because the Treasurer has given a response to the house, but the difficulty the house has is that the Treasurer has consistently told the house, through a number of ministerial statements, that what he tells the house cannot be relied upon. He continually corrects the record; in fact, I think on three different occasions in relation to this matter this Treasurer has had to correct the record.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. The member for Davenport will sit down. The Minister for Transport.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Shall I get you a book? It is 401. Standing order 401 requires that the debate on the suspension of standing orders be addressed to why they are being suspended. I recognise the cleverness of the member for Davenport, but he is seeking to stray into the substantial matter for debate, that is, he says, whether the Deputy Premier is telling the truth. They have quite a number of opportunities under our standing orders to give proper notice of such a substantive debate, but he cannot debate the substantive matter in—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 401. You must debate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Madam Speaker, can I deal with one Speaker only?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is required that the debate on the suspension of standing orders be about the need for the suspension of standing orders, not the substantive motion you wish to move if you succeed. Let me read it to you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Standing order 401 says 'limited to ten meetings' and, in the debate, 'in stating the reason for seeking the suspension'. Okay? Have you got it? It is 401. Now, I can get you a book. It says there in 401, 'stating the reasons for seeking the suspension'. You cannot debate the substantive matter.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, you have made your point. I uphold that point of order. It is about the suspension. If we agree to that, the member for Davenport can go on from there. At this stage we are talking about the reason for the suspension.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The reason the opposition argues that we need to suspend standing orders so that we can debate this motion today is so that the parliament and public can get to the truth of the matter as early as possible. That is the reason the standing orders need to be suspended today, so that the parliament can address this issue as a matter of urgency today.

This principle of urgency of the issue, to reinforce my point why the standing orders should be suspended, was highlighted in the minister's own statement when he claims to have made the statement to the parliament at the earliest possible time so that the parliament could deal with it. It follows, therefore, that, if the parliament is going to deal with this issue, we should deal with it at the earliest possible time. Therefore, the opposition is bringing this to the house at the earliest possible time, at your invitation, Madam Speaker, following the raising of the matter of privilege this morning, so that the parliament can deal with the substantive issue about establishing a privileges committee to establish whether the Deputy Premier told the truth.

The reality is that the opposition believes standing orders should be suspended so that we can debate the motion so that the public can get the truth of the matter about what emails were sent, what staff were told and what briefings were given to the minister. None of that information can be tested as well as by going through a privileges committee. It is in the interests of the parliament. It is in the interest of the Deputy Premier, who is the second-most senior minister. It is actually in his interest that this be cleaned up at the earliest possible time. It is in the cabinet's interest that this be tidied up at the earliest possible time. It is in the parliament's interest that this be cleaned up at the earliest possible time.

This is a government that came to the public and parliament after the election promising to be open and transparent, and we are seeking to suspend standing orders so that it can show at the earliest possible time that it indeed believes in those principles or whether it was simply rhetoric.

Madam Speaker, you invited us to move this by substantive motion, and we have done that. The public deserves to know at the earliest possible time the actual truth of this matter. The problem the parliament has is that, unless we suspend standing orders today and establish a privileges committee (and the intention of the standing order is to allow the debate about establishing it), how does the parliament establish the truth at the earliest possible time?

We cannot establish the truth at the earliest possible time unless we suspend standing orders so that we can have the debate. This motion that we are moving goes to the credibility of the government and whether they will support the suspension of standing orders—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I think the member for Davenport has made his point actually. Would you like to wind up?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Let me reinforce it one more time: this is the earliest opportunity the parliament has to deal with this issue. It is in all the cabinet's interest—and, indeed, all the caucus' interest—to have this matter cleaned up at the earliest possible time and, therefore—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We know caucus has an interest in this, minister, because they moved a motion about this very matter to try to control the Treasurer. The parliament should deal with this at the earliest possible matter, and I seek the government's support.

The SPEAKER: Before the Minister for Transport replies, I point out to the member for Davenport that I didn't actually invite the opposition to move this: I merely pointed out that it is within the realms of possibility to pursue it by substantive motion, but it wasn't an open invitation. Also, was that motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, Madam Speaker.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (16:32): The member for Davenport, in seeking to suspend standing orders, either demonstrates a regrettable misapprehension about the standing orders or, instead, is using subterfuge to subvert your ruling, Madam Speaker. The reason I say that is all this talk about dealing with it at the earliest possible time. The standing orders deal with that and, in fact, the original motion of the member for Davenport did deal with that. He wants two bob each way. He asked the Speaker to rule on whether there was a prime facie case, and why do you ask for that ruling? So that the matter will have precedence. Having failed in that, he is seeking to subvert your ruling, Madam Speaker, and say, 'Even if you don't think it should have precedence—'

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker: the leader of the house is reflecting on the comment that you made to the house when you said that there are other avenues open to the opposition and he is reflecting on your ruling and the comments that you made to the opposition.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold that point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Let me come back to it. I've got to say, you're not allowed to use this to debate substantial matters, and you are also not allowed to create massive inventions like that last little jibe about some motion in caucus—a massive invention.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I think I'm entitled. You want to invent it, I'm entitled to respond. Let me come back to this.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: The motion in caucus, was that an invention?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What motion in caucus?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport will not respond to interjections from the other side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Let me explain again. The member for Davenport came into this place and what did he do? Did he put this motion on the *Notice Paper*? No, he asked you, Madam Speaker, to rule.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They have been discourteous all day and it remains. He asked you to rule on whether there was a prime facie breach of privilege. I repeat: why do you ask the Speaker to rule that? So that the matter will be given precedence over other items of business. It is all there in the standing orders. What I say to the member for Davenport is having sought to go down one path and get precedence one way, it is now not open to him to subvert your ruling by seeking—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is open to you to try. What it is not open to you to do is to succeed. Can I say, Madam Speaker, the only reason I do this is because of regard for the orders of this house because, let's face it, if we were going to have a debate on a substantive matter, I reckon this is the perfect time for it. Have a look. There is no-one here. Let me say: the only reason that I oppose this is to uphold the proper use of standing orders in this place. You cannot go down one path and, being unhappy, then go down another. We do note that they have already set up their kangaroo court in another place anyway. It is not open to the member for Davenport, having decided to play one game, to try to play another one. We will oppose this suspension of standing orders even though it breaks my heart, but what a lovely time for a substantive debate it would have been.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (17)

Chapman, V.A.
Goldsworthy, M.R.

Evans, I.F. (teller)
Griffiths, S.P.

Gardner, J.A.W.
Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.

AYES (17)

Marshall, S.S.
Pengilly, M.
Sanderson, R.
Venning, I.H.

McFetridge, D.
Pisoni, D.G.
Treloar, P.A.
Williams, M.R.

Pederick, A.S.
Redmond, I.M.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES (26)

Atkinson, M.J.
Brock, G.G.
Foley, K.O.
Kenyon, T.R.
O'Brien, M.F.
Piccolo, T.
Rann, M.D.
Snelling, J.J.
Weatherill, J.W.

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Fox, C.C.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Portolesi, G.
Rau, J.R.
Thompson, M.G.
Wright, M.J.

Bignell, L.W.
Conlon, P.F. (teller)
Hill, J.D.
Koutsantonis, A.
Pegler, D.W.
Rankine, J.M.
Sibbons, A.L.
Vlahos, L.A.

PAIRS (2)

Whetstone, T.J.

Geraghty, R.K.

Majority of 9 for the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE**VITERRA**

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:41): As a consequence of the prolonged and severe drought and the effects of the global financial crisis, followed by other disasters such as locust and mouse plagues, many South Australian farmers are hard up against the wall. In general, farmers are good, honest, hard working people, in many cases working properties that have been in the family for generations. They understand better than anyone the vagaries of agricultural life. These difficult times have stretched many of them to their limit, and some of that pressure has unavoidably been transferred to their creditors, who also have to make ends meet.

For the most part, creditors have been helpful, patient and realistic, but a situation has been brought to my attention that shows that at least one supplier is prepared to be bloody-minded in its dealings. A farmer found himself unable to pay a substantial debt to a fertiliser supplier, ABB Grain. By the time the debt was due in December 2008, high input costs, poor seasons and low grain prices had stunted his ability to pay the debt. The farmer and his wife offered part payment three months later, but the company refused to accept it.

Over the ensuing months, the farmers endeavoured to reach an agreement with Viterra—a Canadian grain company who had acquired ABB Grain in the meantime—for a payment arrangement that would be manageable to them and acceptable to the company. Despite more meetings involving counsellors and negotiators, no agreement was reached, and the matter is now in the hands of the courts, which is bound to further increase costs.

While this is happening, the farmer's 2009 delivered grain in a local Viterra silo was effectively seized by Viterra, which suspended the farmer's trading account, thereby denying him access and the opportunity to sell the grain and repay at least part of the debt. What is more, that grain was already under a lien to the bank. Attempts by the bank to access the grain it owned under lien were subsequently also denied by Viterra, an action challengeable by law.

The legality of Viterra's actions is highly questionable; its intent is clear. Worse still, the farmer continues to pay holding costs for the grain, access to which Viterra continues to deny him. The matter drags on; debts are building, interest is accruing and solicitors' fees are accumulating. Doubtless there are other farmers around South Australia facing similar difficulties with meeting their debts. It has been a tough few years.

The farmers involved in this action know of no reason why they are being treated so brutally. Therefore, there is no reason not to think others are suffering, or will suffer, the same bullying intransigence from a company whose reputation in Australia is still in the formative stage. I can understand that farmers might be very wary in their dealings with Viterra, whether warehousing grain or dealing in fertiliser, financial services, wool trading, seed supply or crop protection products.

In closing, I will repeat that advice to me is that Viterra has no legal right to withhold the grain, over which the bank has a charge. Based on this experience, farmers should be aware of the lengths to which Viterra appears prepared to go to achieve its own goals.

MINDA INCORPORATED

Ms FOX (Bright) (16:45): I rise to speak on a matter which relates to Minda Incorporated. I was informed yesterday that Mr David Holst, former spokesperson for Disability for the Disabled, has most egregiously misrepresented me in a leaflet that he has distributed in the electorate of Bright today. A number of untruths have made their way into that leaflet and I will be seeking legal advice on the contents of that leaflet. In that leaflet, Mr Holst and his supporters accuse me of being 'anti Minda' and 'attacking Minda'. I need to respond to this to protect my reputation.

Firstly, I am not anti Minda; far from it. Mr Holst accuses me of attacking Minda's 2,000 plus clients, which is simply untrue. I have never, ever questioned the excellence of Minda's services. My concern is purely about their potential footprint. I have supported Minda for many years, both personally and professionally, as have members of my family. It is interesting that no-one from Minda, and certainly not their self-appointed spokesperson, has bothered to point this out.

Secondly, there is currently a public consultation period occurring and my comments were made in the context of that very proper process. Thirdly, my public comments about the Minda master plan have been generally positive, a fact that Mr Holst has wilfully ignored. I have some doubts about one aspect, I repeat, one aspect of a very large plan.

Lastly, I have raised concerns about one element of the Minda plan because I have been contacted by many constituents who were worried about it. I am not a lone voice on this. If I cannot come to parliament and express my concerns and those of my constituents without a nasty personal attack, then there is something very wrong. Our system of democracy demands that I represent my constituents in parliament and I will not be bullied and I will not be silenced by anyone, no matter how many threats they make as I attempt to do that.

CENTRAL OVAL, PORT AUGUSTA

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:47): I rise today to speak quite passionately about the oval, and by 'the oval' I mean the Central Oval in Port Augusta, a very important oval for not only Port Augusta but for a large part of the Upper Spencer Gulf, the outback, the West Coast and the Mid North as well. It supports that entire region, so it is a very important sporting precinct for not just Port Augusta, and one of the many important ovals in South Australia.

Leading up to the last election, the Liberal Party made a promise of \$5 million to contribute towards a revitalisation of the entire precinct that works with grassroots sports, all the way through to the elite. It is not just about the oval and not just about football, but bringing in netball and basketball, and helping lots of other sports. When we made that promise, I said to my colleagues and people in Port Augusta, lots of people that I dealt with, 'I hope that the government, I hope that the Labor Party makes the same commitment and matches that commitment,' and to its credit it did, which is great, because even back then before the election, when none of us knew what the result would be, we all knew that Port Augusta would get \$5 million towards that project. So, I congratulate both sides of the house on supporting that project.

What I would like to talk about is the fact that the other oval down here in Adelaide, which has turned into a real disaster for lots of reasons, but certainly most importantly with regard to the financial management of the program: \$300 million dedicated to that program to begin with, not a cent more; \$450 million dedicated to that program, not a cent more; now we are up to \$535 million dedicated to the upgrade of the Adelaide Oval, not a cent more.

What I want to do today is to challenge the government to increase the funding that it has promised to the Central Oval at Port Augusta. To Port Augusta and the surrounding region, the outback, the Upper Spencer Gulf, the Mid North and parts of the West Coast, that oval is just as important as the Adelaide Oval is to Adelaide and surrounding districts.

The last increase in funding that came from the government was \$85 million, a 19 per cent increase from the previous \$450 million that was promised, and I challenge the government to provide a 19 per cent increase to the funding that it has on offer for the Port Augusta project. That would take \$5 million up to \$6 million; a drop in the bucket as far as the state's finances are concerned but very important for the Upper Spencer Gulf region. It would be a huge increase for this project which, as I said before, is just as important to our region as the Adelaide Oval is to the southern region.

Another very important aspect of this 19 per cent increase—or, rounded off, a 20 per cent increase—is that the whole increase would go to the project; all the money would be put towards the project, including the additional money. It would go towards this development, not to anyone else's debt, as is the case with the Adelaide Oval. So, there is a challenge there for the government. I think it is very fair to ask this, and I believe it would behove the government to do it. I think the government would be considered in a very good light if it did; I think it would be extremely fair and show that the government considers all the people of South Australia to be just as important as each other.

It is true to say that just as people from the country come down to Adelaide, people from the city would come up to use this improved Port Augusta Central Oval sporting precinct. This project will get the Central Oval in Port Augusta up to a standard that would enable it to have pre-season matches for the Crows or the Power held up there; lots of sporting events at the state level, and potentially some at the national level, could be held at this oval, and people from Adelaide would then travel to Port Augusta to participate in those events.

As I said before, this oval is not just about football. It includes volleyball and basketball, with the very important desire of bringing in netball so that netball and football can run coincidentally together—which, I hope most people know, is a very important step to take in country sports. It also works with grassroots sports all the way through to elite sports; men and women, young and old. I challenge the government to make that change and show support for the region.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (16:52): I rise today to draw the attention of the house to an important publication, entitled *Understanding Educational Opportunities and Outcomes: A South Australian Atlas*, which was published recently. It was supported by the government of South Australia and the Smith Family, and produced by the Public Health Information Development Unit of the University of Adelaide. It complements a series of social atlases that have been produced by this unit, but I am particularly interested in this one because it shows the educational outcomes for people in different areas and identifies a range of factors which have been said to contribute to good and poor outcomes for young people.

Unfortunately, the atlas shows that the electorate of Reynell is not faring at all well in terms of educational outcomes. The key figure of full-time participation in secondary school education at age 16 shows that Reynell was in the lowest group; at the time of the census in 2006 less than 73 per cent of young people in that electorate were still in education at age 16. That compares with the more advantaged areas of Adelaide, particularly around the Hills through to Norwood, Bragg, and the eastern suburbs in general, where 85 per cent and above participated in education at that time.

As we know, the impact of that is quite clear for young people. Those with poor educational outcomes have difficulty not only in the job market but also in accessing information needed to operate effectively in our complex society. It happens to be associated, as this atlas shows us, with lower levels of access to the internet. They just do not have access to the wealth of information that is available to so many people. It is associated with poor health outcomes, and I have also seen some research that indicates that, particularly for boys, poor levels of education, in particular not achieving year 12, is highly correlated with a poor rate of long term emotional attachments and relationships. In fact, my recollection is that boys who do not have year 12 have less than a 50 per cent chance of being in a long term relationship at age 40.

I find that, as I have been going around and discussing this with parents in our governing councils in the schools in my community, the fact that their children are going to miss out on life's riches through relationships is one of the key things that makes them think that we have to do things differently.

I have been talking with the Smith Family about how we can harness the energy that is present in the governing councils in my electorate to try to change the way our schools operate. We know that there are many factors that impact on children's successful educational outcomes. They go right back to their birth weight, their mother's health and well-being in pregnancy, and their opportunity to participate in play groups and kindergartens.

In our schools we cannot change all those. There are many government programs, particularly the emphasis of the Minister for Early Childhood Development on giving kids good starts at the beginning, but we can make things operate differently in school. We need to give principals more flexibility in funding, and we need our funding formulas to be more flexible so that they recognise that where children start with considerable advantage perhaps they do not need the same resources as children who start with very few advantages and who have parents living very complex lives.

One of the matters that have come up frequently in my discussions with schools is the need for schools to help the parents, help the parents to help the children, enable the children to have the fun of doing homework with their parents, and enable the parents to have a better understanding of the complex world that is around them and the many life and job opportunities that are available, which they have not experienced themselves.

CHELSEA CINEMA

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (16:58): I rise to speak on the continuing calamity that is the botched handling of the Chelsea Cinema sale. Of course, I am very glad that the member for Hartley is in the chamber at the moment, because the Chelsea Cinema falls—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me; I think you'll find that in this place we do not reflect on who is and who is not here; we just carry on.

Mr MARSHALL: We just carry on.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We do.

Mr MARSHALL: I have heard that we carry on, Madam Deputy Speaker. I note that the member for Bragg has given notice in the house to move a motion condemning the member for Hartley for not doing more to save the Chelsea Cinema. I will be speaking on this motion, because I believe strongly that the member for Hartley has been disingenuous in her concern for the plight of the much loved Chelsea Cinema. She is forever writing to constituents—

The Hon. G. Portolesi: Of which you were one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Hartley! Member for Norwood, I draw your attention to standing order 127, which, of course, as you would know, asks that you do not impute improper motives. I think the use of the word 'disingenuous' is a little dodgy.

Mr MARSHALL: Yes, well, I will retract that. Today I would like to concentrate on the incredible and ongoing mismanagement of this important matter. It is important at a local level, but it is also important at a macro level. In Australia we have three layers of government; each has specific duties and responsibilities.

Within the Local Government Act 1999 the state government has provisions to order investigations and take action when it believes there is some form of irregularity at the local government level. The Minister for Local Government believes that there were adequate grounds to commission an investigation into the Burnside Council and its alleged corruption. This report was to run for 12 weeks. The state government appointed former auditor-general Ken MacPherson to conduct this investigation and report.

We do not know whether any irregularity and/or corruption has occurred, but what we do know is that Mr MacPherson has had two separate time extensions so far. The 12 week report is now in its eleventh month. Mr MacPherson has concluded his report and it is now in the natural justice phase. I understand that this natural justice phase started way back on 11 May. It is also interesting to note that the Minister for Local Government Relations made a ministerial statement in another place earlier today in which she said that, despite the two granted extensions, she was granting a further extension, and advised the other place that indeed the report will not now be received until mid to late August—not particularly finite but mid to late August.

She also outlined the cost of the investigations, which rack up to \$800,000 in this financial year so far. This includes Mr MacPherson's services of approximately \$340,000 (based on a daily

rate of \$1,200), costs for supporting staff in the vicinity of \$350,000 and materials and operating expenses in the vicinity of \$110,000. On the basis of these estimates, the costs for the remaining two months of the investigation is likely to be in the vicinity of a further \$150,000.

Whilst this is going on, the Burnside council continues to operate business as usual—this is despite massive and continual public condemnation of the council's plan to sell the Chelsea. The Burnside council has recently held multiple closed-door meetings to determine how it will evaluate the tenders already received for the sale of the Chelsea Cinema. The cinema is now in imminent danger of being sold before the government takes any action to stop it. The government commissioned this report, it set the terms of reference, it engaged Mr MacPherson to conduct it and allocated resources to support it. In short, the government has complete responsibility for the delays that have occurred and continue to occur.

The member for Hartley is a member of cabinet. If she cared so much for the Chelsea Cinema as she claims then she is in position to do something about it. She can prioritise this matter in cabinet. She could ensure that all resources were brought to bear to ensure an expedited outcome. This matter relates to alleged corruption. If the claims prove unfounded then those under a cloud deserve to be exonerated. If the claims are founded, the council needs to be dismissed and an administrator appointed when fresh elections are held.

If the latter is the case it is intolerable for delays to action on this matter. For a report concluded six weeks ago, every day that goes by through a drawn-out natural justice period is another nail in the Chelsea Cinema's coffin. Less than three weeks ago the member for Hartley again went on commercial radio. She claimed that, as the local member, this was her No. 1 issue, yet nothing has happened. We are therefore left with two alternatives: first, she has not raised this with her cabinet colleagues and it is therefore not her No. 1 issue; or, secondly, she raised the issue in cabinet but was ineffectual in convincing her colleagues about this issue, which she repeatedly claims is so important. Either way, the government's delays in action could very well result in the loss of this great asset to South Australia.

Time expired.

GENERATIONS IN JAZZ

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:03): Every year in May hundreds of young musicians make their way to Mount Gambier for the annual Generations in Jazz. It is a pilgrimage I look forward to each year to support one of the great schools in Florey, Modbury High. Through their participation, my involvement with Generations in Jazz now spans some ten years. I have seen many students join the school's music program over that time, and some are still happily involved with music at a professional level. A previous musical director at Modbury High, Reg Chapman, first alerted me to this great opportunity provided to young musicians—a tradition now carried on by Mr John Duncan and Ms Joan Baker.

I have seen great changes over the years with Generations in Jazz. We once all fitted into the Barn Palais (admittedly very snugly) and used different venues around the town. Now we all pack into a giant marquee on an adjoining property and use four on-site venues for competition. The board, organisers and volunteers who make this event possible—under the energetic Karyn Roberts—are to be congratulated for their fantastic work and continuing improvements. It is an enormous logistical exercise and gets better every year. The number of meals they serve is quite mind boggling.

This year, 53 bands and more than 1,000 musicians from South Australia, Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland travelled to Mount Gambier. We also welcomed for the first time a band from the Northern Territory, students from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College. Bands compete over four divisions and learn much from the experiences they are exposed to over the three days. Generations in Jazz enjoys enormous support from arguably Australia's finest all round musician, master of many instruments (his favourite appears to be trumpet followed closely by trombone), the inimitable Mr James Morrison.

His joy of music is infectious, and he is a world famous musician and jazz legend and still not yet 50 years of age. With his encouragement, elite musicians and vocalists come to Mount Gambier and share their great knowledge and inspire the musicians of tomorrow. James adjudicates division 1 and heads a wealth of jazz greats who adjudicate the other divisions. Some of us will remember Graeme Lyall as a household name in Australian music through his work, first, on the *Don Lane Show* and then on the first incarnation of *Hey Hey It's Saturday*, whose host Daryl Somers is, in fact, Generations in Jazz patron.

Ed Wilson is also involved. He was from Australia's great Daly/Wilson Big Band of the 1980s. Ross Irwin is involved, as is my own constituent Mr Bill Broughton, a recent arrival and now Australian citizen. Bill has worked with all the greats of music, including many of my favourites—Aretha Franklin, Liza Minelli, Barbra Streisand and Frank Sinatra. He began as a studio musician, working on TV shows such as *Gunsmoke*, *Bonanza*, *Little House on the Prairie*, *Hawaii 5-0* and many more. His movie credits include: *The Godfather II*, *Jaws II* and *Miracle on 34th Street*, to name only a few. His impressive and extensive CV leads me to believe he may have almost done it all in music. It was great to meet Bill and speak with him and his wife Jan, who were most generous with their time.

There are many awards and sponsors also to be commended for their support of Generations in Jazz: the City of Mount Gambier, District Council of Grant, James Morrison, the Evans family, and Generations in Jazz through their support of scholarships, Yamaha, Future Music, Maurie LeDoueff (the Perpetual Music award was named in his honour), Pat Corrigan's Musicians Scholarship Trust, Warrnambool Cheese & Butter, The Barn, O.G. Roberts, Stuckey Electrical and Michael Cleves Productions.

Along with the competition during the day—a set piece, a ballad and a choice of item from each school—we were treated to a fabulous evening concert showcasing acts associated with James via his musical travels, and previous winners of the major prizes each year. This year we were treated to the voice of Emma Pask and The Idea of North returned. This talented group features two chanteuses who began their careers at Marryatville High School, an education department school here in Adelaide.

The Generations in Jazz All Star Band is under the musical direction of drummer extraordinaire John Morrison, and we also marvelled at the talent of the six vocal and six instrumental finalists. I must mention Mr Chris Neale, a drummer who won the Florey Music Award some years ago, who competed in that section; and Harry Sullivan, who won the award, a young man I first saw play the piano eight years ago. The vocalist section was won by Kate Kelsey-Sugg in a very tough competition.

Modbury High School competed in division 2. Their performance in a year that saw many young musicians make their first trip to Mount Gambier was admirable and will see them well placed for future years. Unity College in Murray Bridge also travelled to Generations in Jazz. My attention was drawn to them through my sister, Mrs Westermann, a dedicated educator whom I admire greatly in both her capacities. They competed for the first time in division 3 and will be back, I am sure, next year.

I commend to all members Generations in Jazz. Many of your schools will be participating in it. I know it is a well-kept secret about the South-East. The people down there always welcome us. It is a very cold spot but the music is fabulous, and I have nothing but praise for the organisers and the way they handle this great event.

CREDIT (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 May 2010.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (17:09): This matter was adjourned from 27 May and the Hon. John Rau, Attorney-General, had briefly spoken. I indicated in respect of the Credit (Commonwealth Powers) Bill that the opposition supports the same, and on this bill I simply indicate that it is necessary to set out the definitions and powers under which there is referral to the national legislation, codes, etc., and provide for linkages between the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs and ASIC and repeal of the necessary redundant references to the consumer credit provisions within South Australian acts.

For the reasons I outlined in respect to the previous bill, this is really a machinery bill to deal with the transfer. However, the matter I would like to foreshadow, which may already be known to the minister, is that when this matter was in the Legislative Council the Hon. Michelle Lensink asked about subclause 3 (there are only four clauses in this bill, I might say), which makes provision for the winding up of funds and how the remaining money is applied.

Minister Gail Gago of another place indicated that, as of 1 May 2010, the fund contained \$27,684. She also indicated that she could not give any history of what had happened and the outgoings of this fund. This is the Consumer Credit Fund and, under this clause, the money standing in it may be applied for any purpose authorised by the minister. She indicated that she

had sought advice from the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs as to what appropriate consumer protection options there would be for the application of this money and that she would then consider those options.

Given the efflux of time, I would ask if this minister is able to inform the house as to what will happen to that \$27,684 and, if there is nothing specific, whether it is the intention of the government that it will be applied to the pursuit of protection of consumers in the consumer credit world. I know that is very general. Maybe there will be a new set of pamphlets put out or some funds put aside for compensation to people who are aggrieved. The fund will no longer have any capacity to receive money. There will be no flow of income coming into it once the transfer of this responsibility goes to the commonwealth. However, the opposition is interested in finding out what is going to happen to that money. So with those few words and an invitation for the minister to respond, if she is aware, she may wish to respond, which I can foreshadow will obviate the need to go into committee.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (17:13): I thank the member for Bragg for her contribution. In checking the information that I have been provided with, it appears that as of 1 May there is \$27,684 in the fund. As the member for Bragg indicated, any remaining money in the fund can be used for purposes authorised by the minister. I do not have the information that she seeks, so I am happy to take advice from the department and bring it back to the house at a later date if she so wishes.

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

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:15): In my remarks earlier today on the Supply Bill, I indicated that we, on this side of the house, support the bill. I was discussing the Labor government's Adelaide Oval 'patch up' plan and, if this proposal goes ahead, I believe it will give us a facility that will be 30 years out of date before it is constructed. When the Liberals went to the election, we had a far better plan to build a covered stadium (a full entertainment precinct) on the rail yard site. Suddenly, the Labor Party went into overdrive—'What are we going to do? We have to do something to match this'—because we had the best proposal and they saw that. They saw that Adelaide and South Australians were invigorated by the proposal we put up for the entertainment precinct, including a covered stadium on the rail yards, which tied in also with rebuilding the Adelaide Hospital at its current location. From memory, on Adelaidenow, 83 per cent of people who logged on indicated their support for our plan. So desperate measures were undertaken.

The Labor Party rounded up a few people to come over for a big announcement. Sadly, if the government's plan goes into play, Adelaide and South Australia will be short-changing themselves because, as I said, it will be 30 years out of date before the upgrade on the Adelaide Oval has started and, after seeing the western grandstand going up, it will destroy the iconic nature of the ground. In saying that, I reflect on what happened when retractable light towers were put in. The light towers that are there now bear nothing to what will happen if Labor, by some miracle—and I say that because I don't believe cricket and football will come on side by the end of August—move this project ahead. It will be a great shame not just for Adelaide but this state because we could have built an iconic covered stadium for multiuse events and use it all year in conjunction with the Adelaide Oval for cricket, etc. The costings of this have been quite interesting, and it is interesting that the Treasurer has faced a barrage of questions not only today but other days on what he knew about the costings and how accurate these costings were.

The Labor government went to the people on 20 March saying that it was \$450 million and not a cent more for the stadium. Then it came out that it was \$535 million, and \$85 million of that is to help the South Australian Cricket Association out with a debt problem. 'We will leave out the \$38 million footbridge and we will get someone else to build a \$35 million car park.' This plan has so many holes in it. I believe that it will blow out well over \$700 million, and possibly as high as \$800 million or \$900 million, when we on this side of the house put up a proposal for a covered stadium, fully costed at \$800 million. So, it will be sad if it goes ahead.

As the leader on this side of the house has said, she would congratulate the government if it went ahead with our plan, but we will see what happens. I think we will still have the chance to

build the covered stadium. It is interesting to note that there is no rock solid guarantee that the commonwealth will kick in any funding for this proposal.

I also want to make the comment that the government's Sustainable Budget Commission that has been tasked with fixing the state budget has, ironically, exceeded its budget significantly and will cost the taxpayer an additional \$2.5 million over the next two years. If the commission cannot stick to its own budget, how is it supposed to fix it for the whole state?

I will make some comments about the fiscal position and outlook from the Mid-Year Budget Review. For the 2009-10 budget, there are deficits in all three accounting measures: the net lending deficit, the cash deficit and the net operating deficit. The net lending deficit is \$1,551 million; the cash deficit is \$1,654 million and the net operating deficit is \$174 million. It is interesting to note that the revenues in the state have increased by \$606 million since the 2009-10 budget was delivered, but spending has also increased by \$476 million.

Despite the downturn, revenue income increased by \$1.5 billion from 2008-09 to 2009-10 due to the bailouts from the Rudd Labor government. We note that spending has also increased by \$1.5 billion in the same period. This signifies that the government, in the eight years it has been in government, has been unable to control its spending, going over budget by a total of \$2.9 billion since 2002-03.

Spending blowouts and not falls in revenue are the reason that the government's budget has slumped into deficit. As I and other people have said in here before, the interest bill that the government is paying is close to running out to \$2 million a day, which I believe surpasses even the infamous State Bank debt.

I will just comment on land tax. It is interesting that the Labor Party would not have gone near land tax. In fact, the Treasurer has talked about it in this place when discussing bills. He has made it feel like you are part of some wealthy blue ribbon elite set if you are paying land tax. I have certainly spoken about this issue in this place before. The Treasurer does not understand that people are paying land tax because they have invested in property for their superannuation. Whether it be migrants who came out here in the 1950s or 1960s, people who have built this state and nation, or whether it is people who have done well in business and want to make a future for their family, they have invested in property or housing to make money.

The Treasurer scoffs and says, 'If they don't want to pay land tax, they can sell it.' That is not the point. That is absolutely not the point. It is interesting that, when we came out with land tax cuts prior to the election, Labor came out with the same proposal. It did increase it slightly, and we immediately matched it, because if the money was there for them it would be there for us. Thankfully, that legislation is going through the parliament, and that will help out many thousands of people paying land tax.

It is interesting to note that GST revenue has increased markedly over time as well, but still we do not have enough money in the coffers. I mention briefly the Adelaide Hospital, and it horrifies me that we will spoil the opportunity to built a decent entertainment precinct in the rail yards instead of rebuilding most parts of the Royal Adelaide Hospital where it stands and save \$1 billion that could be transferred back through to Country Health and other metropolitan hospitals, and make far better use of the moneys so that other health services could access some of that money that Labor is going to spend (the \$1.7 billion) on the rail yards hospital.

I also mention the desalination plant, which at \$1.8 billion is just an unbelievable amount of money. If Labor had acted when we brought out the policy in 2007, I am sure it could have saved at least 40 per cent of that costing if it had got on with the job of building a desalination plant back then.

We have all the discussion at the moment, not just in this state but throughout the Murray-Darling Basin, on sustainable diversion limits, and it is a very big issue, not just for this state but for all states involved along the Murray. Water will come from irrigators. There is talk, and Senator Penny Wong had it in the weekend's papers, that they will put pressure on Adelaide's licence. I was of the understanding (but you learn something new every day) that critical human needs licences may not be pressured for cuts.

It seems ridiculous that, from what I can gather, when the desalination plant in Adelaide is running and if there is plenty of water in the Murray, they will switch it off. As a businessman, I cannot see that that makes good business sense. If we are paying the water rates, which we will be, to pay for this plant, then that plant should be running.

We are told by the Premier that it is on 100 per cent green power. He must think that the windmills turn when it is not blowing, and there are also issues when it is too windy for wind turbines to operate, so you get the carbon offset there. I think that is insanity, especially with the strain on the river. When this plant is fully operational it can put out 100 gigalitres of water; we should be operating it 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and if the river has any excess flow then that can go through to the environment or, equally, 50-50 between the environment and irrigators.

Just in mentioning irrigators, agriculture has taken unprecedented cuts in the previous budget and in the coming budget I believe that \$22 million in cuts is coming. I already know of several long-term employees who have worked under PIRSA and the various departments under PIRSA. In fact, I was talking to one the other day who had many years of experience—decades of experience—working with primary industries, and the thanks he gets is that a few weeks ago he is called and told, 'It's all over. You're going to be reassigned.'

This government is putting all its eggs in one basket, mining. I support mining, but the government will pillage the long-term wealth of knowledge that we have in primary industries through the South Australian Research and Development Institute, and the people working through the outreach group with Rural Solutions. It is a disgrace to the people on the land, who produce about \$4 billion worth of primary production every year, depending on the season.

I urge this government to take a harder look at agriculture and work out where our food comes from, because if it is not careful we will be importing a lot more from China and other places. We already import far too much food, and we are seeing jobs in the agricultural industries disappear through drought and hard times, whether it be irrigated or non-irrigated agriculture. We are also seeing the effect of mice on agriculture; farmers are collectively spending millions of dollars on mouse-baiting programs just to try to get their crop out of the ground. I was talking to a farmer near Penong who told me he had decided not to even bother sowing a crop because the mice were that bad, and were tearing the grain out off the ground.

Speaking of plagues, I believe we have already had a plague of locusts throughout the Riverland stretching in a band down towards Pinnaroo and around Parilla, right down through that section of the Northern Mallee to the Southern Mallee. These locusts caused a lot of harm by delaying crop sowing, and forcing some people to resow crops one or two times so that they had a crop once the conditions got a bit better—once it got a bit colder to get rid of the locusts and a few sprays went out. I know that one operator went to the shop to buy his chemicals to spray the locusts, but by the time he got back to the farm the crop was gone.

I will continue my remarks in my grievance when I have the opportunity; however, I do commend the Supply Bill, although I still say that it is outrageous that we have to move for the \$5 billion of funding because the Treasurer could not recall that budgets are due in June.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:33): I rise to support the second reading of the Supply Bill. I will keep my contribution relatively brief because I do not want to rehash what my colleagues on this side of the house have already said; however, I would like to echo the sentiments of the shadow treasurer and others in regard to the state budget. It is quite unbelievable that the Tasmanian government delivered its budget last week when it also went to the polls on 20 March this year, yet this government cannot get its act together and will bury the budget in the midst of the football finals in September.

It also concerns me, as someone who comes from a small business background, that with an annual budget of some \$14 billion the state is running a debt approaching \$6.8 billion. Anyone who has been involved in business, who has run a successful business, will know that when your debt approaches 50 per cent of your operating budget it is some cause for concern.

It was interesting to hear the condolence motion early today for former member Allan Rodda, who represented the seat of Victoria for many years and who was, in fact, born close to where I was born and lived on the Eyre Peninsula of South Australia. He was recognised today for his stand and proposition regarding the regions and country areas, and the importance of agriculture, and I would like to take this opportunity today to put on the record my funding priorities for regional South Australia and also the electorate of Flinders.

What has really been borne out by this government over a period of time is the lack of investment in infrastructure. It has been sadly lacking for a long period of time and is really beginning to show itself, particularly in the regions. I will give some examples for the house and for the public record.

The port at Thevenard is currently the second busiest port in the state. It is exporting gypsum, salt, grain and, now, mineral sands with the development of the minerals sand project by Iluka, north of Ceduna in the state's north-west pastoral district. This has led to an increased tonnage out of the port at Thevenard, and, as I said earlier, it has become the second busiest port in the state.

What Thevenard desperately needs is some investment, some upgrading and an injection of funds. This government has relinquished that opportunity, and, unfortunately, what we are now seeing is a port that is expected to handle five ships a fortnight in very confined spaces and expect to meet the markets in a very busy and competitive world. A fishing fleet also operates out of there and makes it difficult.

Roads, of course, are always a priority in regional areas. One that I need to highlight from my electorate is the Wirrulla to Kingoonya road. For those of you who are unsure of the exact location, Wirrulla is located about 100 kilometres east of Ceduna, and the Wirrulla to Kingoonya road heads north-east from there towards Kingoonya, which is on the east-west railway line. Hopefully, that clarifies it for you.

Another road that I would like to highlight—and this is going to get better, Madam Deputy Speaker—is the Tod Highway from Karkoo to Kyancutta. You have heard of Kyancutta, I am sure. It is a distance of approximately 150 kilometres. It is now a major highway, a major transport route, and it is often traversed by road trains carrying large loads of grain, in particular, but also other products. That road has now got to a rather sad state, where it is no longer wide enough for that freight transport to be undertaken in a safe manner. My concerns are not just for the lack of infrastructure and the lack of investment on roads, but also for the safety of those operating under those conditions. It is also disappointing to see this government's lack of spending in essential services. Those essential services, responsibilities of the state government, include health and education.

As far as country health goes, I believe the spending priorities are all wrong, and I would implore the government to dispense with the rail yards hospital, to revisit rebuilding of the Royal Adelaide Hospital on its existing site, and also to no longer cut services and staffing in country hospitals. This has happened right across the country regions, it is also happening in the city, and it really compromises the delivery of health services purely and simply for the sake of saving funds.

The Patient Assisted Transport (PAT) scheme, on which I will elaborate, is a very important part of delivering country patients to specialist services in the city. When specialists are no longer available in country areas the PAT scheme comes into play. It is very important that that funding be kept up and increased so that country patients have the opportunity to travel to have their health requirements dealt with and so that they can be properly reimbursed for that very necessary travel.

It is important for the state government to maintain the levels of spending in our schools: area schools, primary schools and high schools. It is an investment in the future of our children. Last week I attended a meeting of concerned teachers and parents at the Port Lincoln High School, and their concerns included the air quality in a number of classrooms. This poor air quality was brought about, in my belief, by a lack of ongoing maintenance and a lack of investment in infrastructure over a long period. What has happened in the Port Lincoln High School is that the roof has leaked, and moisture has come into the ceiling and wet the straw. Pigeons have also got in somehow and created a health issue with regard to air quality in the Port Lincoln High School.

My understanding is that remediation will take place during the upcoming school holidays, and I am sure that will alleviate the concerns of the parents and teachers and repair the problem. My point is that this has been brought about as a result of ongoing lack of investment in maintenance and infrastructure.

While we are on schools, I believe I need to mention school buses here. Access to buses to transport children to school is something that is taken for granted here in Adelaide, but I can tell you that after some good research that I have requested from the Parliament Research Library I have discovered that the fleet of school buses here in South Australia, which essentially operate in country areas, is in fact the oldest fleet in the country.

I have some average ages here. In the ACT, the average age of school buses is 14.5 years; in New South Wales, 11.5 years; in Queensland, 10.5 years, almost 11 years; in Tasmania, 17 years; in Victoria, just nine years; and Western Australia has spent \$22 million replacing the public, school-owned buses without seatbelts. In South Australia, sadly, the average age of our school buses is between 20 and 22 years.

We desperately need a project and some investment and spending into the renewal of this bus service, particularly with regard to country children, their safety and their comfort and health. Air conditioning and seatbelts will need to be a priority in these country school buses, particularly out west, as the country children are heading home from school in the middle of summer during daylight saving in what is the hottest part of the day.

I touched on this in my maiden speech and I will not dwell on it too much, but much has been made of the Premier's so-called mining boom. Unfortunately, mineral exploration in Flinders has been just that—just exploration. We have had an exploration boom, but we have not yet seen a mining boom by any means. I think everyone is very nervous about the proposed super tax on the mining companies, because there are many companies in the start-up stage operating on the Eyre Peninsula.

The Eyre Peninsula offers great potential, I believe, for the mining sector. The latest estimates put the iron ore reserves at between 5 and 10 billion tons. My concern is that the lack of infrastructure, the lack of state spending into infrastructure and the proposed mining super tax will actually kill the mining boom before it has even begun in the seat of Flinders.

The thing about a mining boom is that it really does offer the opportunity to broaden the regional economy. Our economy is very much based on fishing, aquaculture, agriculture and, to a certain extent, tourism. My belief is that, if we encourage that mining boom the least little bit, then we will do so much to broaden the economy of the region and give jobs and some security to the people who live out there.

I have already spoken about roads and how the road maintenance programs are lagging behind where they should be. Roads are important. I have mentioned two already, but they are critical in bringing the produce of the regions to market to export. It is critical for me to put on the public record, and for the house to understand, that 80 per cent of the state's export income is generated in the regions. People need to remember that. Successive governments have chosen to ignore that or not understand it, and I think it is time we revisited that and understood their export income does come from the regions and that it is a vital part of the state's economy. This is new money. This is not money going around and around: it is new money and, really, the state's economy depends so much on it.

I guess what I am asking for is a greater slice of the pie when it comes to road infrastructure, rail infrastructure and port infrastructure in the regions. This is what the electorate of Flinders and the rest of regional South Australia require.

I would also like to talk about water security; again, I mentioned it in my maiden speech. I believe that the water situation on the Eyre Peninsula in the seat of Flinders is precarious to say the least. SA Water has had on the table the proposition to build a desal plant to supplement the supply of water on the Eyre Peninsula for some eight years. Nothing as yet has happened. I understand that there is a short list of potential sites. I would encourage the government to hasten this project, because at the moment we are drawing 80 per cent of our water from the southern basins, and at the current rate of extraction it would seem that those resources are unsustainable.

We have already had a couple of basins on the West Coast collapse completely due to extraction rates. It makes me very nervous to think about the water security and the future for the Eyre Peninsula. What we need is to supplement that supply not only for the current population and industry but also looking to the future population and industrial demands of the region.

It is interesting that a very topical subject at the moment is food security. I do not disagree that a critical and important part of our responsibility as a region and as primary producers is to ensure that this food supply is adequate and that the quality is such that it is acceptable for the markets.

However, one thing that does put food security in this state at risk is drought. We cannot do anything about that, but another thing that does put it at risk, I believe, are plagues. The city media and most of the population in metropolitan Adelaide are well versed with the fact that there is a locust plague potential in the coming spring, and the government certainly has taken steps in order to counteract that plague should it develop.

Another plague we are experiencing on the Eyre Peninsula at the moment is a plague of mice—a mouse plague—and in many regions it is the worst that has ever been experienced by landowners. I believe that this also is a threat to our food security. It is a threat to the viability of the landowners, the producers and the farmers, and it affects seriously the economic wellbeing of the

of the seat of Flinders. The government thus far has taken very little action. We have made the state government well aware of the situation on the Eyre Peninsula with regard to mice, but very little action has been taken thus far.

The government just does not seem prepared to take a position on this, and certainly it does not seem to be prepared to spend any money on the control of this plague. This is a plague of biblical proportions. Not only is it eating the plants as they emerge from the field but it is also eating people out of house and home. Many of my constituents, quite seriously, are at their wit's end on this one, and I will speak about it more another day. It is a very serious situation. I believe the government needs to take a position on this and be prepared to spend some money at least to assist the landowners in the control of this because, unfortunately, the plague will not go away by itself. It will be ongoing and many landowners are really very nervous about what could happen in the spring time. The region's crops could be decimated or worse.

That leads me to another topic related to agriculture, that is, the cuts to the Department of Primary Industries and Resources in South Australia, which is responsible for delivering services and extension work to primary producers in agriculture, aquaculture and fisheries. In recent times, there have been many cuts across this department. Once again, I think the real advantage we have had in Australia, and here in South Australia, is that producers have had the opportunity to take advantage of the latest technology and implement that technology in their own businesses and production systems.

I think cuts to departments such as primary industries and research in South Australia have a detrimental effect on the extension of that technology by our producers. Really, that is the advantage we have. In a world market and a globalised competitive world, the one advantage we have is our technological advantage over our competitors. If we do not have the opportunity to implement and take on board those technologies, we are at a disadvantage.

The people in Flinders certainly realise that Adelaide commands projects, such as the stadium, as it has the critical mass as the capital city. However, many people in Flinders find it abhorrent that such a huge amount of money has been pledged for a patched up Adelaide Oval when essential services and infrastructure in the country are under threat. This also ties into the rail yards hospital debate. How on earth can the government ignore the will of the people? People in Flinders do not want billions of dollars spent on the rail yards hospital and the government to go further into debt when country health services are in such dire straits. Evidently the egos of our leaders in public life take precedence over what is good for the state.

Finally, I remind the house of the contributions the regions make to this state's economy and urge this state government to recognise that contribution, invest in the regions and properly reward the regions for the contributions they make.

[Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.M. Rankine]

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell?

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (17:52): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am not surprised that you are surprised that I am speaking, because I am surprised also. I do so in a spirit of bipartisanship and cross-party cooperation, and things like that. Apparently there is a difficulty and we need to continue the debate so that the Leader of the Opposition can participate in it, she having absented herself.

I do have a few things to say in relation to the challenges facing all governments at the moment in managing their budgets. We have several Kevins to be proud of in this community, and I name Kevin Rudd and Kevin Foley as among those. Another is the Kevin who was formerly the coach of the Essendon Football Club and who has now moved himself to the western suburbs of Sydney. He was recently on one of those panel shows on the ABC where he said that he believes Australians have simply failed to grasp the magnitude of the problem of the global financial crisis and the devastation that it has imposed on people in Europe and the United States. He said that Australians have been remarkably cushioned from that crisis, and that was done by the actions of the two other Kevins I talked about—Kevin Rudd, our Prime Minister, supported by Wayne Swan our federal Treasurer, and Mike Rann, our Premier, and Kevin Foley, our state Treasurer, who moved quickly to respond to that crisis.

While people in my area are doing it tough, they have not lost their jobs in great waves. Our schools are being built and enhanced rather than losing staff, and I cannot imagine that that is happening in Greece where the whole of the public budget has been cut back savagely. We have the biggest public housing building program in 20 years, and I remember when I was sitting on the other side watching house by house being sold off—it was not house by house; it was tens of houses by hundreds of houses being sold off—and there were queues of people trying to get housing. I know we have queues of people still trying to get housing, but the stories I get in my electorate office are nothing like what I had during the period from 1997 to 2002.

Another challenge facing all governments around Australia at the moment is the challenge of enabling the people who care for those in our community who have disabilities to be paid decently. The whole issue of pay equity for women lingers on. It lingers particularly in those areas that most resemble the work that women have traditionally done in the household. I was very pleased to learn yesterday that premier Brumby made some important comments about that over the weekend. These comments followed on from a rally that I was very pleased to attend on 10 June in Adelaide.

Premier Brumby has responded both to the rallies that were held around Australia and to the logic and fairness in the case that is now being taken for pay justice for community service workers. Premier Brumby said on Saturday 19 June:

Today I am proud to announce that a re-elected Labor Government will back Fair Work Australia's decision on this pay claim.

Meaning the pay justice for community sector workers.

We will factor in any wage increases to our service agreements with community service organisations and ensure those wage increases are passed on to workers. This emotionally taxing labour—often performed by women—is critical to the fabric of our community. And the value of this labour is not always reflected in the pay they receive. In partnership with the community sector, we will work over time to provide the level of funding the sector needs to pay its invaluable workers, and get on with the job of caring for the most vulnerable people in our State. It's a commitment that will impact on our budget—but it is what we believe in. We believe in a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

The hearings will take place in September and October. Budget capacity exists in the forward estimates and once Fair Work Australia has made its determination, it will be fully costed and factored into Labor's Financial Statement for the 2010 State Election.

That is, the Victorian state election. Mr Brumby continues that their commitment to supporting the most vulnerable Victorians has run into billions of dollars since being elected and this is an important part to continue their commitment to a fairer Victoria through a fair deal for Victorians most in need of support from the community.

The Victorian government has made this announcement; our South Australian government has to work out how it is going to deal with it. So as I have sat here and listened to request after request after request from members opposite for more money, more money, more money, I want to place this request on the table as well. We need more pay to enable particularly the disabled members of our community to be cared for by people who are themselves receiving a fair pay.

As I referred to earlier, on 10 June I was very pleased to attend a rally organised by the Australian Services Union down in the Pioneer Women's Memorial Gardens. This was just one of many events being held across Australia on that day, from Cairns, Townsville, Rockhampton, Toowoomba, Mackay, Moranbah, Brisbane, Lismore, Inverell, Canberra, Nowra, Melbourne, Hobart, Adelaide, Perth and Darwin. Community sector workers gathered to give force to their claim for equal pay.

I was also pleased that I was among the long-term fighters for equal pay who were recognised at that event and christened as an ambassador for equal pay. As an ambassador, I think it is important that I take up that cause and advocate it where I possibly can. I was presented with a beautiful rosette to mark my appointment as an ambassador and I was honoured to be in the company that was there—among them Deborah McCulloch, the first women's adviser ever appointed in this state, and a plethora of names of women who have fought long and hard for equal pay.

We were reminded by Katrine Hildyard, the Secretary of ASU, in addressing the gathering, that it was way back in 1972 that women formally won equal pay for equal work where it was enshrined that if a man and a woman do the same job, they should get paid the same amount. This had the effect of crunching the gap between women's and men's pay from 75 per cent to

82 per cent. However, for the past 15 years the pay gap has not moved; in fact, over the past 10 years, it has grown. The reason there is an 18 per cent gap today is because those occupations that are dominated by women are undervalued.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Bedford): Order!

Ms THOMPSON: Work that is in industries dominated by women, especially that work that has a caring dimension or is seen as women's work, is seen as being less skilled and less valuable than other work. This is not acceptable in our community. The community sector has within it the highest number of multiple tertiary degree holders. Eighty-five per cent of workers in the community sector are women. Their work in this sector provides one of the starkest examples of the shocking undervaluing of industries dominated by women.

For example, a disability support worker like Tracie who supports, cares for and is the person who ensures that a person with a disability lives with dignity and is socially included, generally earns the same amount as a person who stacks supermarket shelves. We know that stacking supermarket shelves is important to everyone of us; however, the emotional load is not quite that of Tracie supporting somebody with a severe disability nor is the complexity of the job.

A caseworker, like those who were present on the day from St John's Youth Service and other organisations that provide professional counselling and support for young people who have experienced severe abuse or neglect such that they cannot live at home, gets paid just over the minimum wage. That, to me, does not seem the least bit appropriate. A community worker, like Maria and Sandra who were present, who supports women and children when they are in crisis and who ensures that they do not end up living on the street, generally earns about \$25,000 a year less than a worker doing similar work in the public sector—again, that is simply not appropriate.

Like Katrine Hildyard, I place on record that I am in awe that when community sector workers are asked why they do the work they do, 100 per cent of them reply that it is because they care, because they want to do something worthwhile and something that actually makes a difference. But the words that were used at the rally afterwards remind me so much of the situation with nurses so many years ago when nurses ran a slogan to the effect of 'Grateful thanks don't pay the bills' and today the community workers are in a position where they say that care and commitment can no longer be taken for granted. While this commitment, care and wanting to make a difference are to be resoundingly applauded, it does not buy groceries and it does not pay the rent. Workers in the community sector are continuing to say that they simply cannot afford to continue to work in that sector.

Fifty-two per cent of workers in the community services sector now report that they do not intend to be in this sector in five years' time. I hope that I will not need anybody from the community sector in five years' time but in 25 years' time, just on the most selfish level, I want to see that there are skilled, well-paid and dedicated workers there to care for us.

As a member of the community and as a parliamentarian who has worked hard to advocate for the needs of members in my community with disabilities, I want to see that these people are cared for now. Today, the minister announced important reforms in terms of giving people with disabilities more power to choose how they need to be supported. However, at the same time, they need to be supported by people who are appropriately paid and recognised for the work they do.

Clients of the sector already report how hard it is for them to access a service, build a relationship of trust with a worker and to tell their story to worker after worker, often pouring out their heart and soul about private issues that they have experienced in their lives, only to find that the next time they need that service or a support worker, that person has left the industry because they can get far more pay for their skills in other areas.

One of the arguments advanced for why people who take on women's work are so poorly paid relates to the way that this was previously done in the home or done by volunteers, most of whom were women. So there is one part of our community's headset that still sees this as domestic or charitable work and not something that deserves proper pay and proper recognition.

The pay equity case now being taken by the ASU is a step towards moving that work into proper recognition within the community by both pay and respect. In turn, it recognises that the most disadvantaged in our community, those with the most difficulties, people living day-in and day-out with severe disabilities, should have their needs recognised and respected by being

supported by professional care workers, not by people who are doing it as a semi-paid charitable act.

The national pay equity case for community sector workers follows hot on the heels of the 2009 Queensland pay equity case, where the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission, after comparing wages in the community services sector with wages in sectors dominated by men, and comparing wages in the community services sector with those in other comparable sectors, were shocked at the inequity and awarded wage increases of between 18 per cent and 37 per cent to Queensland community sector workers. This is an outstanding result and finally gives some recognition to the value of the work performed by community sector workers, but it now has to be implemented around the country.

That brings me back to where I started. Already, an increasing proportion of the state budget is being allocated to disability support. This will require another further increase in the allocation to disability support to ensure that the workers are paid appropriately.

At the rally, it was very pleasing to see that the employers of these community sector workers recognised the need for change and are working constructively with the union to determine how any pay increase might be implemented. However, they also recognise that they will not be able to do anything much at all unless there is a change in the budgetary allocation to the community services sector. The vast majority of these organisations' funds comes from government.

So, without that pressure on the budget to which I referred in the budget response, all that will happen is that some of the most vulnerable people in our community, in addition to the disabled, whom I have mentioned—often, women escaping domestic violence, children who can no longer stay with their families for various reasons, people who have just got out of gaol and are needing help to re-establish their lives in a way that enables them to live as a full member of the community and not to offend again—all these workers perform a range of remarkable tasks, from house cleaning and shopping to very complex counselling and support for people when they are at their most distressed.

The people who employ those workers need the government to address their funds so that they are not robbing Peta to pay Pauline, because otherwise different services will go in order to give the workers a decent pay. This is very clearly a major stress that is facing governments all around Australia at the moment. It is probably a stress that is facing governments all around the developed world, where many of these support activities have moved away from the family and into the community sector.

Fortunately, because of Australia's excellent response to the global financial crisis, we are more in a position to address it than, I suspect, are countries in Europe and North America. However, we have to remember that when we want more roads, more hospitals, more other things all over the place, the many requests that have been made by members opposite, we have to pay the workers who care for our most disadvantaged fairly. They cannot be paid as though they are unskilled workers. They cannot be paid 15 to 18 per cent less than equivalent workers in the public sector. They are not doing it for charity.

Time expired.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (18:12): I am pleased to make some comments in relation to the Supply Bill. It is important that we debate this piece of legislation and that the effective flow of moneys continue for the services and other provisions of government out into the respective areas of the community. There are some issues that I specifically want to raise relating to services and infrastructure, and we heard the member for Reynell speak about those issues.

The issue I would like to raise specifically about service and infrastructure concerns the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide and the manner in which that plan affects a significant proportion of my electorate, and I speak about the townships of Littlehampton, Nairne and Mount Barker, because those three townships will be affected by the government's 30-year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

It was only a week or so ago that the government released the development plan amendment (DPA) relating to rezoning a whole tract of land in Mount Barker and Nairne, so much so that we are seeing over 1,000 hectares of land, which is really prime agricultural/horticultural country, being rezoned to residential. The projected population increase is in the vicinity of 25,000. The collective combined population of those three towns at the moment is 16,000.

So, what we are going to see is a more than 150 per cent increase in population within that tri-town district of Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne. I share the real concerns of the community that I represent in those towns as to how the government is actually going to provide the services and infrastructure and all the other requirements needed to support that increase in population.

The government is not actually providing the necessary level of infrastructure and services to meet the demands of the current population of 16,000. I have spoken about this on many occasions and I will continue to raise it in the house until we see some definite action from the government in terms of providing that necessary infrastructure and services to meet the current level of demand.

Those of us on this side of the house have made our position quite clear on the issue of development in that part of the Adelaide Hills, but I will enunciate it again so that it is clear. I have made statements at public meetings, in the local media, on the radio, and in the broader media regarding our position, and I state it again: the opposition does not support any expansion of the current town boundaries until services and infrastructure are provided to meet the current level of demand. Once that is achieved we will consider some modest growth in full consultation with the local council and the community. Full stop.

That was the policy, that was the position that I took into the election on 20 March. It was a big election issue in those three towns in that particular section of my electorate. The election was fought basically on that issue—Liberal versus Labor versus Greens versus Family First and the other minor parties—in those three towns, and I am confident in saying that the vote reflected the community's opinion of the government's plan for the towns; that is, a significant and marked swing to the Liberal party because of the position it took.

I conducted a survey last year—in April, I think—when I sent out 9,000 communication forms to every resident and business in those three towns. I had an outstanding response to that survey of over 15 per cent; from memory, it was around the 3,000 mark. That is an outstanding response to a survey, because people who run surveys usually look for about a 3 to 5 per cent response; that is regarded as a reasonable level of response to a survey. I had a 15 per cent response.

I kept it relatively uncomplicated and asked only four questions, and the overwhelming response from the community was that residents were not 100 per cent opposed to development but definitely not the scope of development that the government proposed in its 30-year plan. The community wanted the retention of prime agricultural farming country, and did not believe that the government was providing the services and infrastructure—nor would it in the future—to meet the community's needs.

I am not making that up; they are the cold, hard facts and the cold, hard reality of the response from the community. As I said, that was a big issue in those towns as we went into the election, and the response from the community was significant in terms of the vote for the ALP versus the vote for the Liberal Party. I won the Mount Barker booths collectively on primary vote, the Littlehampton booth on primary vote, and I was just shy—by a couple of points—of winning the Nairne booth on primary votes. That is an indication of the level of concern in the community regarding the government's 30-year plan.

As I said, the government is planning on rezoning over 1,000 hectares of land and looking at an increase in population of 25,000. I hope they come to their senses, reconsider and scale back at least the level of development. I have read the DPA, and it is full of motherhood statements. I can tell members that it is vague at its best and negligent and irresponsible at its worst. I have read through the DPA document, and it makes motherhood statements in terms of, 'We'll investigate the capacity of the existing school sites to cater for the increase in school population.'

I can tell members that the current school sites are landlocked. They have very little if any capacity to expand their footprint in particular, let alone their built structures to accommodate the increase in student population. If the government pushes along with this negligent and irresponsible plan, we will need brand-new schools. You cannot increase the population by 150 per cent plus and not build new schools, brand-new schools at brand-new sites. If the government thinks that it can get away with doing it on the cheap and in a half baked manner it will have to think again.

We will need new schools, and we will need a new hospital. The hospital at Mount Barker is at capacity in some of its areas. The maternity section is over capacity. Each year 350 women

give birth in that hospital, and that is over capacity; so, we will need a new hospital. Any woman outside of that 350 has to travel to the city, to the Flinders, the RAH, the Women's and Children's, or the Lyell McEwen if they are in the northern part of the hills (because they have pulled out the maternity section of the Modbury Hospital) to have their children. That is wrong.

If a local woman wants to have her child, and it is a healthy pregnancy and there are no complications, she should be entitled to have her child at the Mount Barker Hospital, and not be forced to travel to the city. Her family should not be forced to travel to the city to visit her while she is in hospital after the baby is born. I am telling you that we will need a new hospital if the government pushes ahead with this plan to increase Mount Barker's population by 25,000, which is over 150 per cent more. I want to make those points clear.

In addition to that, we need a second freeway interchange at Mount Barker to meet the current level of demand, and the government makes some vague reference in the DPA about trigger points. The development will occur, and that will trigger infrastructure and service provision. That is half the problem that the town is having now. The developments are taking place in an incremental manner, and these trigger points have been met but not recognised, and then some more development takes place. We then see ourselves in the current situation, where, as I said, the maternity section at the hospital is at capacity, if not over capacity, and we need a second freeway interchange to meet all the traffic that comes out of the Nairne township and has to funnel down through Littlehampton on the freeway interchange at Mount Barker.

What this plan of 25,000 additional people will mean is that we will need a third interchange. There has been no mention in the DPA report about that. It gives some vague reference about these trigger points and, and as I said, when we reach a certain point it will trigger the construction of a second freeway interchange. I am telling the house that we will need a third interchange.

If members look at the map of where the rezoning is to take place, it is to the south and a little bit to the east, but the majority is around the south of the town, and to the west. If you think all that traffic is going to funnel down through to Adelaide Road, the main arterial road in the centre of the town, and on to the existing interchange, or else funnel out through along what we call Bald Hills Road out to the proposed second interchange to get on to the freeway, you have to think again.

As I said, we are going to increase the population by more than 150 per cent, and if the government thinks that all the vehicular movements will be catered for by those two interchanges, well, the government is wrong. I envisage that there will be a requirement for a third interchange there, and it has not given any consideration to that, because that is not talked about in any way, shape or form.

There is another issue that I want to raise in the house this afternoon. It is something I have spoken about before, and it is a consequence of the development we have seen take place in that part of the Adelaide Hills—specifically, this time it is in the Nairne township. I am talking about the continued traffic congestion in and around the Nairne school crossing.

Eighteen months ago, the government completed some work where it moved the school crossing from one side of the Woodside main road intersection to the other side. We were told by DTEI and other public servants, 'We have done some modelling, Mr Goldsworthy, and we will see the traffic flow extremely well, and there won't be any congestion at the intersection like we see now.'

I can tell you now (and at the time I predicted this) that it did not fix the problem because it was a half-baked cheapjack solution to the problem, that is, moving the school crossing from one side to the other. It cost the best part of \$1 million. It was not completed within the time frame, either, which caused some consternation within the community.

I can tell you that it has not worked. There are still long lines of traffic banked up at the intersection right down Woodside Road (and the local people know what I am talking about), across the railway line again, just as was the case before the million dollars was spent. It was a total waste of money and a total waste of time. It was something I predicted, and I wrote a letter to the local paper and it was published. I am more than happy to furnish that to the house.

What has to happen is that the government needs to bite the bullet, and that was identified by a consultancy completed under the previous Liberal government by the local member at the

time (the premier, the Hon. John Olson). A consultancy was undertaken, and what is required is a set of traffic lights at that intersection.

The intersection of Woodside Road and Saleyard Road, which runs next to the primary school, needs to be straightened out. There may need to be some compulsory acquisition on the intersection of one of the homes. The government has to bite the bullet and do the work properly once and for all, not these half-baked cheapjack solutions that do not work. All it does is add to the problems of the district.

I want to turn my focus to some issues in relation to my shadow portfolio responsibilities, in particular that of road safety. I believe that the government's road safety strategy is not working because the road toll is at the same level as it was 12 months ago. It is actually one more. Tragically, the road toll is at 66 this year. This time last year I understand it was at 65. Compared with the 2009 road toll figures, we are 20 per cent higher than the 2008 figures. We have seen no improvement in reducing the road toll as a consequence of this government's road safety strategy.

There may well be a number of reasons for that, but can I say that in the last 12 months or so we have had four ministers for road safety. The Hon. Carmel Zollo in the other place was minister for road safety. Then we had the member for West Torrens—

An honourable member: Turbo!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: —Turbo Tom with his 60-plus traffic offences and, when that was exposed, he had the difficulty of trying to explain it away. It got to the point where that was impossible, and he resigned from that portfolio responsibility.

In my opinion, before the Premier was forced to sack him, obviously behind closed doors there was some pretty heated full and frank discussion, and we saw the member for West Torrens resign from that portfolio. Then we had the member for Napier assume the role of minister for road safety for a matter of only—I do not know—five or so months, perhaps, and then, post the election, we have the member for Playford as the road safety minister. I know that it may be slightly disingenuous of me to reflect on the way the incumbent is dealing with the issues, but listening to radio interviews and the like I think that the current minister is on a steep learning curve in coming to grips with the issues and the nuances of the portfolio. I want to make those points.

When we compare the road safety policy documents that the Liberal Party took to the election with the government's policy, there are some stark differences. I like to think that we took quite a comprehensive road safety policy to the state election. If one looks at the government's policy, basically it highlights three issues: it wants to increase punitive measures against P-plates; there is some talk about increasing some road maintenance funding by \$3 million; and the other aspect of the policy escapes me because, I think, it was of relative insignificance.

Compare that to our policy in which we looked at four areas of importance, being the regulatory regime and policing, road maintenance and infrastructure, driver behaviour and training and vehicle design and manufacture. I met the latest Thinker in Residence for road safety, Professor Wegman, and discussed those issues with him.

Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (18:32): It is my pleasure to address the question before the house, the matter of supply. We find ourselves in interesting times. We have a government that is tired, old and struggling. We have a Treasurer who is—I do not know about old, but he is certainly tired and he is certainly struggling.

Mr Pederick: And lacking recall.

Mr WILLIAMS: And he is having problems with his recall. I have a genuine issue with a Treasurer who has such a problem lacking recall that I will not say it borders on incompetence: it is actually incompetence that the Treasurer can be given a briefing on one day and less than three weeks later can totally forget all about it and go on speaking on the matter for a number of months and still not be able to recall the briefing he had. It is rather amazing. It does not augur very well for the future of this state if the Premier is going to continue to support that level of incompetence, and it seems that the Premier is going to continue to support that. That seems to be his wont.

The books of the government of South Australia are not very healthy at the moment. We find that, over the last eight years (the term of this government), a significant number of turnarounds have occurred which have caused the sad state of affairs in the books. One of the hallmarks of the previous Liberal government, having inherited a basket case economy and having

inherited a virtually bankrupt Treasury, was that in eight short years it turned the South Australian economy around into a vibrant, well-run economy which was starting to catch up to the position it should have been in.

One of the shining examples of the work that was done by the previous Liberal government was in the area of exports. We know that one of the best ways to drive an economy is to export. Every time you export something you are getting somebody else's dollar into your economy. You are exporting goods and services and importing dollars, and that is growing the economy and growing it rapidly.

We increased exports in South Australia from something like \$3 billion a year to just over \$9 billion a year at the time of the change of government in 2002. It is an absolute outrage that the most recent figures show that our level of exports has actually decreased in real dollar terms since the Labor Party has been in charge of the state.

The government tends to use a number of excuses for the changes; it talks about droughts and global financial crises, etc. What it fails to acknowledge is that, as a government, it has not been supporting exporters. When we were in government one of the keys to increasing exports out of South Australia was that we actively worked with businesses (small, medium and large) and showed them how to export, how to engage with businesses and clients outside of South Australia. We grew the export of goods and services out of South Australia substantially.

One interesting thing we did (and we were castigated for this for many years) was to outsource the maintenance of the old water supply (the E&WS) and now SA Water. We outsourced a maintenance contract for SA Water. In doing so, we said that we were going to build a new business, a new industry in South Australia, a water industry.

Today the water industry exports out of this state on an annual basis in excess of half a billion dollars' worth of goods and services. That is the sort of initiative that needs to be taken by the government to drive the economy. The Premier says that we are going to reach a population of two million before 2050. We will never have a sustained population growth in this state unless we can build the sort of businesses that I have been talking about and developing a new water industry.

The Premier continues to talk about the mining sector. He says that when he came to power there were only four operating mines in South Australia and today there are 11. He said that was due to his fine work and the program he calls the PACE initiative (the Plan for Accelerating Exploration). The reality is that the PACE program is merely a rebadged TEISA, the program which was established by the former government called Targeted Exploration Initiative South Australia.

Mr Goldsworthy: We were serious about mining.

Mr WILLIAMS: We were very serious about mining. The reality is that of those 11 mines that are operating in South Australia today (and it might in fact have grown to 12) to the best of my knowledge (and I think I am absolutely correct on this statement) all but one of those deposits which are now being mined were discovered before the Labor Party came to government in South Australia. The reality is that they were discovered as a result of the work done when the Liberal Party was governing this state and putting serious money into the Targeted Exploration Initiative South Australia (TEISA). The Premier is very good at claiming credit for other people's work.

Mr Goldsworthy: He's a fake.

Mr WILLIAMS: You are not going to get a fight with me over that one: I happen to agree with you. Every time the Premier gets up and says that there are 11, and today there might be 12, and there were only four when he came to power, he is fudging it. The only one of those projects that is now an operating mine that is the result of a mineral discovery made during the term of this government, whilst the PACE program has been in operation, is Iluka's Jacinth-Ambrosia mineral sands deposit on the far west of Eyre Peninsula. That is the only project that I am aware of, out of all the operating mines in South Australia, that was not discovered in the time the previous government was in power.

I cannot name one industry in this state where this government has been responsible for its growth—not one. It claims the air warfare defence destroyer project at Techport. Sure, the government has put significant money into Techport, but we would never have had that project in South Australia, we would never have won that project, if it was not for the Howard Liberal government and the fact that we had four very senior ministers from this state in that government.

On top of that, the Howard Liberal government in Canberra recognised, at the time that contract was awarded to South Australia, that the South Australian economy was in decline. I am sure it took into account when it awarded that contract to South Australia over other bids, particularly from Victoria, that it had to do something to save South Australia.

The commonwealth government continues to save South Australia on a regular basis. The current Rudd government has poured significant additional dollars into this state to underpin the state's budget. We are talking an extra \$1.5 billion from the commonwealth between the 2008-09 year and the 2009-10-year. Did that help South Australia? Well, it did help South Australia because it provided employment, but it has not helped the bottom line of our budget because, at the same time, our Premier and his Treasurer managed to spend an extra \$1.5 billion. So the additional money coming out of Canberra, just like the growth in state taxes, is all being spent.

The Auditor-General has been pointing out for a number of years that the budget of South Australia keeps being saved because there is significant underestimation in the expected revenues. This has been going on ever since this government has been in office, but it cannot control its spending. It goes up and up. That is why we are finding ourselves getting to the point where our daily interest bill is going up from \$1 million a day, and the forward estimates predict that it will most likely hit \$2 million a day. That is \$700 million or \$800 million a year. It is outrageous that that has happened.

The government claims that it has increased front-line services and that it is putting money into front-line services. The reality is that a study of the budget papers shows that between 2001-02 and 2008-09 the public sector has grown by some 16,393 employees. If we look at the front-line services, which are the ones that the Premier likes to quote consistently, we see: nurses, an additional 3,220; teachers, under the Education Act, an extra 671; doctors, an extra 1,053; and police officers, an extra 638, giving a total of 5,582. That leaves a total head count of 10,811 additional public servants who are not delivering those front-line services.

What is even more frightening is that a significant number, particularly of nurses and doctors, came back into the public sector through the retakeover of the Modbury Hospital, so the numbers are even worse when you take that into account. We have a state budget that is now paying on an annual basis an extra 10,800 public servants doing some sort of administrative work and an extra 5,500 front-line workers, and the Treasurer wonders why his budget is in a mess.

Madam Speaker, I know you share my concerns in this area. I come back to the mining sector and the federal government's so-called super profits tax. It is really a resource rent. To my mind, it is a piece of economic theory—and a very poor piece of economic theory—that is driving this particular proposal from the Rudd government. With a little bit of luck, there will be a change of government in Canberra and South Australia's future may well be saved.

However, Madam Speaker, as you and I both know, if the tax as proposed by the federal government is imposed on South Australia, your hometown, Whyalla, will probably disappear. It is an ill-conceived and ill thought through tax. It will have a dramatic impact on OneSteel and consequently on the whole of Whyalla. You and I know that, Madam Speaker. I would like to think that the Premier and the Treasurer could get their head around that, but they certainly have not been of a mind to stand up for South Australia the way that premiers in both Western Australia and Queensland have for their respective states.

I talked about PACE and TEISA. South Australian governments, in a bipartisan way, for over 20 years have been pouring South Australian taxpayers' funds into encouraging exploration for mineral resources in this state. We have invested greatly to try to build a mining industry in this state because we have seen the benefits that have flowed to other states, particularly Western Australia, over the past 30 to 40 years of having a vibrant mining industry.

We know that there is significant mineral wealth in South Australia, but what we also know is that to discover ore bodies in South Australia is a more risky operation than it is, for instance, in Western Australia, because we have a thick layer of overburden over most of our mineral wealth, particularly in the north of the state, and it is much harder to find and identify an ore body. Having found and identified an ore body, it is much riskier to then mine it.

If the Olympic Dam expansion does go ahead, there will be something like four years of moving a million tonnes a day of overburden before BHP Billiton even gets to the ore body—four years of pouring money in before they get to the ore body. Yet the Rudd government would impose a tax burden which would see that BHP Billiton could not go ahead with that project.

Notwithstanding that our Treasurer has said that this is a 'must happen' project for South Australia, when it is absolutely threatened by the federal government, what have our Treasurer and Premier said? Well, they have said, 'We've been working behind closed doors.' Quite frankly, I am not too sure I believe that. I have no idea what they have been doing behind closed doors, but I do know that they have not done what their counterparts in Western Australia and Queensland have done.

In my opinion, the only way to save the state's economic future, if it is so dependent on a viable mining industry—and I agree; I think it is—is to see a change in government in Canberra. That is a pretty sobering thought, because we all know, as keen political observers, a change of government after only one term is a very big ask. I think it will be a very big ask to change the government in Canberra after one term, but it is my opinion that South Australia's economic future absolutely depends on it.

I see that the time is very quickly running out, but I want to very briefly talk about water. Some of my colleagues—the members for Hammond and Chaffey, the shadow minister for the environment in the other place—and I toured the Menindee Lakes a couple of weeks ago. We were aghast to see the way in which those lakes operate and that the \$400 million, which was earmarked to upgrade the storage system in the lakes way back by the Howard government, still has not been spent, yet the water that is now stored in those lakes is being utilised and released for use downstream, including in South Australia.

Because none of that upgrade work has been done, all four major lakes are being drained at the same time, which means that, as we take water out of the lakes, we do not reduce the total surface area and we are having the maximum losses due to evaporation and seepage. It is an absolute outrage. We did learn while we were up there that the federal government has spent \$25 million on consultancies and still does not know what to do.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G. Portolesi.

At 18:53 the house adjourned until Wednesday 23 June 2010 at 11:00.