

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 23 June 2010

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

MOUNT BARKER, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

The **Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:04)**: I move:

That council by-law No. 2 of 2009 of the District Council of Mount Barker entitled Moveable Signs Restrictions, made on 17 May 2010 and laid on the table of this house on 25 May 2010, be disallowed.

The arguments are similar to those that I have raised earlier in this session regarding some other councils that have brought in by-laws relating to moveable signs. Mount Barker by-law 10.2 states:

A person must not, without the council's permission, display a moveable sign on or attached to or adjacent to a vehicle that is parked on local government land (including roads) primarily for the purpose of advertising or offering for sale a product (including the vehicle) or business to which the sign relates.

As I have said previously, I want this issue to be focused on the two key elements: safety and damage to council property. However, what we have now is that the City of Onkaparinga moved a motion the other night. I think councillor Apap sought to have the by-law removed or rescinded, but the council chose to refer the matter to police for them to enforce it, basically.

I have already told the council that I spoke to Senior Sergeant John Illingworth, one of the police traffic experts, who told me that he regarded this measure as 'petty', and that was the word he used. He said the police would act in relation to any person parking a vehicle in a dangerous position or in violation of the safety code. They do that, anyway. So, I do not think that is the answer.

I have corresponded with the Minister for Local Government (Hon. Gail Gago) because I think she was fed some incorrect information, and I offered to provide her with the names and addresses of the people who contacted me who are just ordinary citizens doing simple things such as leaving a car out the front of their house while they are having renovations done.

She has said to me in a reply (and I am paraphrasing) that she will work with the LGA to try to ensure that a by-law is applied appropriately. I do not think that is the answer, either, because, if you have a wording there, an enforcement officer can use that to carry out what the wording actually says. If we have to have coaching schools or a special provision for people to interpret by-laws or other laws, I think that is not the answer.

What I want is for the LGA—and this is where I think it could take a leadership role—to develop a template by-law which is specifically focused on the two aspects of safety impacting on pedestrians and other road users and damage to council property. If someone parks on a council reserve and damages the reserve, they should be pinged for that. If someone parks a car to sell it and it is in a dangerous location, they should be pinged for that.

What I am trying to do with my opposition and motion to disallow these regulations is not to take away from councils the power to have a sensible enforcement. What I want is sensible enforcement. The same by-laws of these councils allow people to put up other signs. As I said last time we met, you can put up a garage sale sign but you are not allowed to sell what is normally in the garage by putting it on the side of the road. Land agents can put up signs and people in election mode can put up signs. I think in a democratic society we have to be fair and reasonable about this because the people who are getting caught at the moment and paying a fine of \$100 are not hardened criminals.

So, I move this motion, and I hope that in due course the councils, with the help of the LGA and the minister, can come up with a by-law—and this is where the skill of the drafting lawyer is important—that will deal with this issue. I was talking to a senior member of the Public Service the other day and he said something came to his attention where a council wanted to ban anyone who amplified music near a beach, and he said that meant no-one would be able to wear a hearing aid because that is what a hearing aid does. I am not trying to be cute about this, but it is a very difficult job to draft by-laws or laws. I was pleased to see that our Richard Dennis was acknowledged in the Queen's Birthday honours because he and the others are very skilful drafters of legislation.

I am asking that we go back to the drawing board for all these councils and get a template by-law drawn up that tackles safety and damage to council property. Let's avoid going down the

path of trying to follow in the steps of Mussolini and people like that. I move the disallowance of the motion.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:10): On behalf of the opposition in my role as spokesman concerning local government issues, in this instance we indicate that we will support the honourable member for Fisher in his motion to disallow this particular by-law. We have done some research ourselves on this issue, consulted with the LGA and other parties and, as the member for Fisher has outlined, the crux of the matter in relation to the by-law concerns the words 'primarily for the purpose of advertising or offering for sale a product (including the vehicle)'.

I drove past a car that I presume was immediately out on the road verge in front of the owner's home by the front gate and it had a for sale sign on it and a telephone number to contact. Under these proposed by-laws, the council could impose a fine on that person. I am with the member for Fisher in relation to this. I think it is too broad a brush approach, if you like, and as such—that is a bit of a play on words, isn't it?—we are prepared to support the member for Fisher's motion. We have consulted with the LGA, as I said, and I quote from some information that we received:

The LGA believes the wording of the by-laws could be improved to provide greater clarity, specifically 'primarily for the purpose of selling' needs to be defined, as well as what factors will guide Councils when they apply that test.

Whether the member for Fisher is accurate in terms of describing coaching of council staff and the like, I do not know. One of the LGA's roles in my opinion is to provide support to individual councils, and I see the LGA actually carrying out that function in relation to its view concerning this issue in terms of the by-laws.

When we come to debate the other motions for disallowance, we will deal with them obviously on an individual basis but, in this instance, we are prepared to support the motion of the honourable member for Fisher.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2010-11

Mr KENYON (Newland) (11:14): I move:

That the 72nd report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2010-11, be noted.

The Economic and Finance Committee has examined the minister's determinations in respect of the emergency services levy for the financial year 2010-11. The committee met with witnesses from the Department of Treasury and Finance, SAFECOM, the Country Fire Service, the Metropolitan Fire Service and the State Emergency Service in late May to hear evidence on the proposed levy for 2010-11. This is an annual function of the committee.

The committee notes that the total expenditure on emergency services for 2010-11 is projected to be \$218.1 million. The total expenditure for 2009-10 is estimated to reach \$225.5 million, which reflects the funding boost for the state's volunteer-based emergency services and the Prepare. Act. Survive. initiative. There will be no increase in levy rates for owners of either fixed property or motor vehicles and vessels in 2010-11.

The committee notes that the 2010-11 target expenditure of \$218.1 million on emergency services is made up of the following components: the ESL (inclusive of remissions) will fund \$214.3 million; private owners of property, land, buildings and motor vehicles are expected to contribute \$120.4 million; with a balance of \$93.9 million being met by the government. Net expenditure of \$800,000 carried over from prior periods will be funded by running down cash in the fund, and interest, earnings and revenue from the sale of certificates showing the ESL status of individual properties will fund an estimated \$2.9 million.

This marks the first completed report for the current Economic and Finance Committee membership, and I am pleased to relate that it was marked by cooperation and diligence on the part of my colleagues. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the committee and departmental representatives who have worked together to assist the committee in fulfilling its statutory obligation in a timely manner. Given the above and pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Economic and Finance Committee recommends to parliament that it note this report.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:16): I rise on behalf of the opposition to support the member for Newland, the Presiding Member of the Economic and Finance Committee, in the presentation of

the report to the house. This is one of the yearly obligations of the Economic and Finance Committee. Any member who has sat on that committee has no doubt enjoyed the opportunity of having some 15 to 20 public servants in the room with us. I must admit that it would seem to be a gross over-demonstration of need to be in attendance, but I respect enormously the fact that it is important that there is an ability to provide answers to any questions asked as part of the committee's discussions. That is why a reasonably large number of people are in attendance. My observation on, I think, three occasions has been that usually only five people (at most) answer questions.

A spirit of bipartisanship exists, because we all recognise the important role that is played with the funds that are derived from the emergency services levy. Much need exists in the community for a lot of support for our Metropolitan Fire Service, police, ambulance and emergency services people who have an enormous number of volunteers operating within those groups. The support they receive from this levy, which has been in place for some time now, is important. I know that, within my own community, whenever there is an initiative that results in, say, a new CFS station being funded from the proceeds of this levy, there is great rapture. The community always looks forward to that, because it is a sign of support for those people who volunteer many hours.

Some of the questions we asked related to the fact that the levy has been put in place now, whereas the state government is not presenting the budget until 16 September. Our questions were along the lines of: if this emergency services levy identifies the level of funding that the government will provide from resources to bring the fund up to the \$217.2 million in revenue that has been talked about, will that have an impact?

While my memory is sometimes a bit challenged, I am fairly sure that the member for Davenport's question to the panel of people who were providing the answers was that if that actually occurred, the Community Emergency Services Fund would actually increase somehow. I am not sure how that actually relates to that. There was a series of questions that tried to provide some detail on that. Admittedly, some of those questions were hypothetical, because they related to whether or not the government's contribution was less, and there is no knowledge about whether that will be the case.

However, given that the budget, as we understand it, will be under considerable pressure with the Sustainable Budget Commission trying to identify \$750 million in savings over the next three financial years, I certainly hope that this area of government support to the community is not affected by budget cuts but, potentially, it may be.

It might also be relevant to put on the record the break-up of some of the expenditures, and there is no criticism from any member of the opposition about where this money goes. The Country Fire Service will receive, as proposed for the 2010-11 financial year, some \$59.1 million, a slight increase from last year of \$1.2 million. The Metropolitan Fire Service will receive \$96.7 million, which is a reduction of \$1 million.

The State Emergency Service is receiving \$12.6 million, an increase of \$300,000; Surf Life Saving SA Incorporated is receiving \$2.5 million, up by \$100,000; and the Volunteer Marine Rescue organisations in SA—there are quite a few of those that operate throughout the state, and I have at least two that operate within the electorate of Goyder—are receiving \$800,000, which is identical to last year's allocations.

South Australia Police is receiving \$18.9 million, up by \$500,000 from the previous year; the SA Ambulance Service \$1.2 million, which is identical to the previous year; and the Department for Environment and Heritage \$2.4 million—from memory that was for the fire control operations within national parks and environment and conservation areas. The State Rescue Helicopters are receiving \$600,000, which is identical to last year; the shark patrol, which is certainly very important for metropolitan beaches, and a high profile and very visible sign of support to enable our community to enjoy our beaches, received \$300,000 (the same as last year); and Other Expenditure, which was only \$100,000, down from \$2.6 million the previous year.

However, we did note (and the member for Kavel picked up on this point in his questioning) that the payment to the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission has gone up to \$15.9 million, whereas previously it was \$12.9 million, a 23 per cent increase. We are advised that that is primarily about advertising, and the need to ensure that the community of South Australia is fire aware. With the terrible fires that have occurred over the past five or six years in South Australia and Victoria, the importance of educating our community is something we all support, as well as ensuring that every home has a fire management plan, that they are indeed ready, that they

have a collective knowledge within their family unit about when is the time to evacuate or stay, and what is the trigger point for each of those decisions being reached. So the opposition does respect the need for additional funds to go towards that.

I would like to thank all those who presented before the committee. Collectively, they are a group of people who are faced with some enormous challenges. From both a volunteer and professional sense, the people who support the 1.6 million people of South Australia with an emergency services response do a wonderful job, there is no doubt about that. Equally, we pay tribute to the volunteers and the people who work underneath them. We look forward to the swift passage of this presentation and report.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:22): I think the first thing to point out is that the emergency services levy was a big step forward when it was introduced. It is not perfect, but I believe it is better than what some of the other states have and I think it is preferable to what we used to have. I would like to make a couple of points. I do not believe it should be used as a substitute for funding which would otherwise have come out of general revenue. There is always a temptation for governments of any persuasion to say, 'Well look, here's another money source. Let's milk that for a bit and ease the pressure on the general revenue.' The concern I have relates to the cost of administering some aspects of this. I think that has been an issue since I was on the Economic and Finance Committee—which was a while ago, when Adam was a boy I think—so it needs to be closely monitored.

The CFS through what we call the Hills/Valley—that is Blackwood, Belair, Happy Valley and, I guess, right through to Tea Tree Gully—the ones in the Mitcham Hills area have indicated that they do not believe they are getting a fair share of the emergency services levy. That is an issue I am taking up with the minister. I am not arguing for an MFS service to replace the CFS—although I would have no problem if the MFS wanted to create a station further east from where they are currently. I am certainly not suggesting that we get rid of the CFS, but we want those volunteers to be adequately equipped, to have adequate uniforms, proper training, and so on. The CFS units in that general area, which also goes into Davenport, tell me that they are not getting a fair share, or are not getting enough resources to do what they believe is necessary. In essence, they say that people in that area pay a lot, pay the same as people who get a full-time MFS service, but they get a volunteer service and do not get the requisite amount of funding to go with it.

As I emphasise again, people are not arguing—and I am certainly not—for the MFS to replace the CFS, because they have two different roles, although the MFS and the CFS can support each other. They are arguing that those units from Tea Tree Gully through to Mawson get a fair share of the emergency services levy, so that they can do their job.

We obviously appreciate what they do, but we are currently relying on the goodwill of volunteers. Even the local paper this week gave recognition to someone who has been in the Blackwood CFS (which was my old unit when I was a youngster) for 27 years, or something like that.

Some of these characters put in tremendous effort, but I think it is unfair and unreasonable to expect them and their employers to give up their time if we do not support them adequately with the necessary resources. I ask the minister to have a look at that in particular; and maybe the Economic and Finance Committee, next time it looks at this issue, can make sure that the CFS units and the SES, throughout the Mount Lofty Ranges area, get a fair share of the levy collected.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:27): I want to make a few brief comments in relation to the 72nd report of the Economic and Finance Committee, of which I am a member, concerning the emergency services levy. I would also like to make a few comments as the shadow minister for emergency services, the opposition spokesperson on emergency services. I do not think I need to necessarily outline the statistical information—I think the member for Goyder did that extremely well in giving an outline of the information—but there are a couple of points that I would like to make more broadly, if I may, concerning funding for the CFS in particular.

I know that prior to the election the government announced a funding package of \$9.4 million, from memory, to assist with improvements in IT, pagers and some building maintenance within the structures of the CFS, particularly at brigade level. That was fine. There was some question over whether the direction of that funding was going to address the priorities that were paramount in the CFS, and in particular the IT component. Certainly, issues concerning pagers and the efficiency of the paging system and the paging units themselves had been raised

with me; so, the government was quite correct in channelling funding to improve this area of the CFS's operation. We all know that building maintenance is also a critical area.

The state Liberals, as part of our emergency services policy, announced an additional \$13 million on top of the \$9.4 million, totalling \$22.4 million. We pledged an additional \$13 million, as I said, to the CFS and the SES, particularly to look at addressing the shortfall in training needs within those two services. We know that there is a chronic need for meeting training needs within both the CFS and the SES. I think it is a deficiency of the government that it is not addressing those specific areas.

In addition, I am receiving information from the brigades, groups and the like that there is an ever-increasing load of paperwork and of red tape demands being placed on brigades. The volunteers are consumed with meeting the government's red tape requirements and are not able to carry out their volunteering duties, for which they joined the service. They are consumed by paperwork. They actually joined the CFS and the SES to fight fires and to maintain some safety and security in the community as a result of storm and flood damage and the like. This is an area that the government really needs to focus on and again adopt the opposition's policy of increasing funding to those two services to meet those ever-increasing demands.

In relation to the report that has been moved by the member for Newland, as a member of the Economic and Finance Committee I am happy to support the motion.

Motion carried.

YANKALILLA, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.B. Such:

That Council by-law No.4 of 2009 of the District Council of Yankalilla entitled Moveable Signs Restrictions, made on 17 September 2009 and laid on the table of this house on 11 May 2010, be disallowed.

(Continued from 26 May 2010.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:31): Again, as I indicated in the previous motion moved by the member for Fisher, the opposition is prepared to support this motion in relation to the disallowance of the council by-law. I would like to reconfirm the comments I made on the previous motion that, in our opinion (and obviously that of the member for Fisher), the by-law is perhaps a bit too far-reaching. It is not sufficiently specific to address the issue that the councils are facing, which is that parcels of council land are allegedly being used as pseudo car lots on the weekends and so on, with allegedly commercial dealers putting out signs advertising vehicles for sale.

I understand that is one issue that needs to be addressed and I think a by-law can be drafted, as highlighted previously by the member for Fisher, to address those issues. However, the by-law is—and we have again sought information from the LGA—a bit too far-reaching, because a private person parking their vehicle on the road verge or on the road in their own residential street with a for sale sign is captured by this by-law, and it is our opinion that that is perhaps pushing things a little too far.

I do not want to hold up the house unnecessarily as we have other business to move to, so with those few words we support the motion moved by the member for Fisher.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

ROBE, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.B. Such:

That council by-law No. 4 of 2009 of the District Council of Robe entitled Moveable Signs Restrictions, made on 8 September 2009 and laid on the table of this house on 11 May 2010, be disallowed.

(Continued from 26 May 2010.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:34): I speak in support of the motion for similar reasons to those I have previously stated on the other two motions that the member for Fisher has moved in the house. Again, the wording of the by-law is too broad and needs redrafting. I understand that the LGA will give some support to the councils in relation to these issues. The problem that the councils face can be dealt with; however, the by-law needs to be redrafted. On behalf of the opposition, I support the member for Fisher in this regard.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Thompson.

MID MURRAY, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.B. Such:

That council by-law No. 2 of 2009 of the Mid Murray Council entitled Moveable Signs Restrictions, made on 9 March 2010 and laid on the table of this house on 11 May 2010, be disallowed.

(Continued from 26 May 2010.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:35): The state Liberals have a different view in relation to this motion. We will not be supporting the motion for disallowance in relation to the Mid Murray Council because our research shows that the council's by-law does not contain the similar restrictive provisions, as do the other councils. As a consequence, we do not see any reason for the disallowance of the by-law of the Mid Murray Council. Perhaps the member for Fisher may be inclined to carry out a little more research in relation to that specific by-law of the Mid Murray Council.

By-law 10.2 refers to the provision of the District Council of Robe and the District Council of Mount Barker, 11.2 in Yankalilla, and 7 at the City of Port Augusta, so perhaps the member for Fisher may like to revisit the issue in relation to the Mid Murray Council. On that basis, we would not support the motion by the member for Fisher for the disallowance of that by-law of the Mid Murray Council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Thompson.

PORT AUGUSTA, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.B. Such:

That council by-law No. 2 of 2009 of the City of Port Augusta entitled Moveable Signs Restrictions, made on 22 February 2010 and laid on the table of this house on 11 May 2010, be disallowed.

(Continued from 26 May 2010.)

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:38): For similar reasons to those I have stated previously on the other three motions, the opposition will be supporting the member for Fisher's motion concerning the disallowance of this by-law. I do not need to hold the house unnecessarily, but for the reasons I have stated previously we are happy to support the member for Fisher in disallowing this by-law of the City of Port Augusta.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Sibbons.

TRUSTEE COMPANIES (COMMONWEALTH REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (11:39): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Trustee Companies Act 1988; and to make consequential amendments to the Administration and Probate Act 1919, the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993, the Legal Practitioners Act 1981 and the Trustee Act 1936. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (11:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

On 2 June 2008, the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed that the Commonwealth Government would assume responsibility for regulating trustee companies at the entity level.

On 12 February 2009, the Premier signed the 'National Partnerships Agreement To Deliver a Seamless National Economy' (the *NPA*). The *NPA* requires the Commonwealth, the States and the Territories to enact the legislation necessary to give effect to 27 deregulation priorities, including the regulation of trustee companies. The *NPA* provides for the payment by the Commonwealth to the State of 'reward' payments. These payments are contingent on the States and Territories meeting their obligations for the seamless national reform program, including the regulation of trustee companies. If South Australia does not meet its obligations for the regulation of trustee companies, the *NPA* reward payments are at risk.

The *NPA* Implementation Plan requires the Commonwealth and the States and Territories to enact the legislation necessary to give effect to COAG's agreement on the regulation of trustee companies.

The *Trustee Companies (Commonwealth Regulation) Amendment Bill 2010* implements South Australia's obligations under the *NPA* to give effect to the COAG agreement on the regulation of trustee companies.

A trustee company is a company under the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth (the *Corporations Act*) authorised, under State and Territory legislation, to perform personal trustee and deceased estate administration services (*traditional trustee company services*).

In South Australia, the primary legislation is the *Trustee Companies Act 1988* (the *Trustee Companies Act*). Only companies listed in Schedule 1 of that Act can provide traditional trustee company services in South Australia.

The trustee company industry is small. Currently there are 10 trustee companies listed in Schedule 1 of the *Trustee Companies Act*. Most of these trustee companies were licensed or approved under the legislation of, and have operations in, many jurisdictions.

Most trustee companies have expanded their activities into other areas of wealth creation, management and transfer. They now offer a range of financial services, including acting as superannuation trustees, acting as Responsible Entities for managed funds, providing custodial or depository services, and acting as trustees for debenture holders. They are regulated under Commonwealth legislation for these other financial activities.

Whereas a trustee company can provide these other financial services across Australia by dint of their licensing or approval under Commonwealth legislation, under the State and Territory regulated trustee company regime they also had to be licensed or authorised in each State or Territory in which they offer traditional trustee company services.

In addition to being subject to the respective trustee companies' legislation, trustee companies are subject to other State and Territory legislation when undertaking traditional trustee company services. For example, each State and Territory has a *Trustee Act* as well as legislation about wills, administration and probate.

The *Corporations Legislation Amendment (Financial Services Modernisation) Act 2009* of the Commonwealth commenced on 6 May 2010. Schedule 2 of that Act inserts a new Chapter 5D into the *Corporations Act*, and makes consequential amendments to Chapters 7 and 10 of the *Corporations Act*. These provisions (the *Commonwealth trustee company provisions*) implement the transfer of entity level trustee company regulation to the Commonwealth.

Under the Commonwealth trustee company provisions, traditional functions of trustee companies (administering charitable and other trusts, obtaining probate, acting as the executor of a deceased estate or under power of attorney) are deemed to be financial services for the purposes of the *Corporations Act*. Both settlors/testators and beneficiaries will be 'retail clients' of trustee companies for the purposes of Chapter 7 of the *Corporations Act*. Retail clients are afforded greater protection under Chapter 7 than non-retail clients.

The Commonwealth provisions provide that authorised trustee companies are—

- required to be an Australian registered public company or a wholly-owned subsidiary of a public company;
- regulated by ASIC;
- required to hold an Australian Financial Services Licence (AFSL) with an appropriate authorisation to carry out traditional trustee companies services;
- subject to the consumer protection, licensing and conduct requirements of the *Corporations Act* and the *Australian Securities and Investment Commission Act 2001* of the Commonwealth;
- to the extent appropriate—subject to the disclosure requirements of the *Corporations Act*;
- required to have suitable internal and external dispute resolution arrangements;
- in the case of charitable trusts—subject to fee regulation, in the form of 'grandfathering' of fees charged to existing clients, and capping of fees charged to new clients, with a review of these arrangements after 2 years;
- in the case of non-charitable trusts and estates—subject to deregulation of the fees that can be charged to clients (provided that the fee schedule is disclosed on the Internet and that no more than the fees specified in the published fee schedule at the time the administration of the trust/estate is begun are charged);
- subject to director and employee liability arrangements that are consistent with the obligations in place for other corporations under the *Corporations Act*;
- subject to a \$5 million capital adequacy requirement;
- subject to a cap of 15% on the shareholding of any single shareholder and associates, together with a divestment regime and a Ministerial discretion to consent to share acquisitions above the cap (for example, for wholly-owned subsidiaries); and
- permitted to hold common funds, which are able to continue to attract external investment.

State and Territory Public Trustees will not be subject to the new Commonwealth regulatory regime unless the relevant Government consents to this occurring.

The Bill amends the *Trustee Companies Act* to—

- delete the definition of 'trustee company' and substitute a definition that a trustee company is a licensed trustee company within the meaning of Chapter 5D of the Corporations Act;
- repeal provisions that are inconsistent with the Commonwealth trustee company provisions (Chapter 5D, 7 and 10 of the Corporations Act);
- facilitate the transfer of a trustee company's business to another licensed trustee company if its licence is cancelled;
- allow for the making of regulations to provide for the voluntary transfer of business between 2 (Commonwealth) licensed trustee companies; and
- allow for necessary transitional matters to be dealt with by regulation.

The Bill also amends the definition of 'trustee company' in the *Administration and Probate Act 1919*, the *Financial Institutions Duty Act 1983*, the *Guardian and Administration Act 1993*, the *Legal Practitioners Act 1981* and the *Trustee Act 1936* as a consequence of the proposed amendments to the Trustee Companies Act.

These amendments are necessary if South Australia is to comply with its obligations under the COAG agreement and the NPA about the regulation of trustee companies. All States and Territories have enacted, or will enact, similar legislation.

I commend the Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Trustee Companies Act 1988*

4—Amendment to long title

This proposed amendment is a drafting amendment.

5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

The amendments proposed to this section are consequential on the taking over of entity level regulation by the Commonwealth. In particular, a *trustee company* will, in the future, be defined as a licensed trustee company within the meaning of Chapter 5D of the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth (the *Corporations Act*).

6—Repeal of sections 9 to 12

Currently, sections 9 to 12 make provision for the fees, commission and other charges that may be charged by a trustee company in relation to the administration or management of an estate or perpetual trust. These sections are to be repealed as a result of the Commonwealth taking responsibility for the regulation of such matters.

7—Amendment of section 13—Investment of trust funds

This proposed amendment is consequential on the Commonwealth taking over responsibility for the regulation of common funds.

8—Repeal of sections 15 to 15B

Currently, sections 15 to 15B make provision for the establishment and management of common funds by trustee companies. These sections are to be repealed as a result of the Commonwealth taking over responsibility for the regulation of such matters.

9—Amendment of section 16—Power of trustee company acting in representative capacity to hold its own shares etc

This proposed amendment is consequential.

10—Repeal of section 16A

This section is to be repealed. It currently makes provision for the recovery of GST and will be otiose once the Commonwealth has responsibility for the regulation of trustee companies.

11—Repeal of sections 17 to 22

Currently, sections 17 to 22 make provision for returns, accounts, audits, prospectuses and other information required to be provided by trustee companies. The repeal of these sections is consequential on the regulation of trustee companies being assumed by the Commonwealth.

12—Insertion of Part 3A

New Part 3A makes provision for the regulation of the transfer of estate assets and liabilities under Part 5D.6 of the Corporations Act. The Australian Securities and Investments Commission (ASIC) will be the regulator of such matters.

Part 3A—Transfer of estate assets and liabilities

Division 1—Preliminary

25A—Interpretation

This section contains definitions for the purposes of this new Part. In particular, an expression used in this Part that is defined in the Corporations Act will, unless the contrary intention appears, have the same meaning as in that Act.

Division 2—Compulsory transfers

25B—Purpose and application of Division

New section 25B provides that the purpose of this Division is to facilitate compulsory transfers of estate assets and liabilities under Part 5D.6 of the Corporations Act.

This Division applies if ASIC—

- (a) cancels the licence of a trustee company (the *transferring company*) and makes a compulsory transfer determination under section 601WBA of the Corporations Act that there is to be a transfer of estate assets and liabilities from the transferring company to another licensed trustee company (the *receiving company*); and
- (b) issues a certificate of transfer under section 601WBG of the Corporations Act stating that the transfer is to take effect.

25C—Compulsory transfers of transferring company's estate assets and liabilities

New section 25B provides that, to the extent of the transfer, the receiving company is taken to be the successor in law of the transferring company. Details of just what that means are then set out in the section.

25D—Certificates evidencing operation of Division

This section makes provision for the issuing of certificates by ASIC as evidence of the transfer of ownership to a receiving company of specified assets or liabilities.

25E—Registration or record of transfer

This section authorises and requires the Registrar-General or other authority to register or record in an appropriate manner the transfer of assets and liabilities.

25F—Exemption from State taxes

This section provides that no State taxes are chargeable in respect of a compulsory transfer of estate assets or liabilities facilitated under this Division.

Division 3—Voluntary transfers

25G—Voluntary transfer of transferring company's estate assets and liabilities

This section allows regulations to be made to facilitate the voluntary transfer of estate assets and liabilities from 1 trustee company to another trustee company where ASIC has made a determination under the Corporations Act allowing the transfer.

Division 4—Relationship of Part with other laws

25H—Relationship of Part with other laws

This section provides that new Part 3A has effect despite anything in a contract, deed, undertaking, agreement or other instrument. In addition, nothing done by or under new Part 3A—

- (a) places a receiving company, a transferring company or another person in breach of contract or confidence or otherwise makes any of them guilty of a civil wrong; or
- (b) places a receiving company, a transferring company or another person in breach of—
 - (i) a law of the State; or
 - (ii) a contractual provision prohibiting, restricting or regulating the assignment or transfer of an asset or liability or the disclosure of information; or
- (c) releases a surety, wholly or partly, from all or any of the surety's obligations.

13—Repeal of section 27

Current section 27 provides that if a trustee company is guilty of an offence, the manager and each company director is also guilty of an offence. Deemed criminal liability is contrary to Commonwealth policy and thus the repeal of this section is related to the Commonwealth assuming the regulation of trustee companies.

14—Repeal of section 30

This proposed amendment is a drafting amendment.

15—Amendment of section 31—Regulations

This proposed amendment adds a new regulation making power to provide for the making of regulations of a saving or transitional nature consequent on the amendment of the principal Act by any other Act, or relevant to the interaction between the principal Act and an Act of the Commonwealth.

16—Repeal of Schedule 1

This Schedule currently lists the companies that are trustee companies under the principal Act. The Schedule is to be repealed as a consequence of the insertion of the new definition of *trustee company* in section 3 of the principal Act.

17—Repeal of Schedule 2

Schedule 2 is spent and so is to be repealed.

Schedule 1—Consequential amendments and transitional provisions

Part 1—Amendment of *Administration and Probate Act 1919*Part 2—Amendment of *Guardianship and Administration Act 1993*Part 3—Amendment of *Legal Practitioners Act 1981*Part 4—Amendment of *Trustee Act 1936*

The amendments to these Acts are consequential on the insertion of the new definition of *trustee company* in section 3 of the Trustee Companies Act.

Part 5—Transitional provisions

1—Interpretation

2—Transitional provision

The transitional provisions confirm that a company that was listed as a trustee company for the purposes of Schedule 1 of the Trustee Companies Act immediately before the commencement of this measure is a licensed trustee company within the meaning of Chapter 5D of the Corporations Act. Consequently, the repeal of Schedule 1 does not affect the appointment of a Schedule 1 trustee company made before the repeal as—

- (a) the executor of a will, or the administrator of an estate of a deceased person; or
- (b) a trustee, agent, attorney, manager or receiver; or
- (c) the guardian of a child; or
- (d) the administrator, committee, guardian or manager of the estate of a person who is unable to manage his or her own affairs.

Also, the Trustee Companies Act (as amended by this measure) continues to apply to a Schedule 1 trustee company and, except to the extent of any inconsistency with the Corporations Act—

- (a) any duties, obligations, immunities, rights and privileges of a Schedule 1 trustee company arising before the repeal of that Schedule are not affected by the repeal; and
- (b) the assets and liabilities of a Schedule 1 trustee company are not affected by the repeal; and
- (c) any action taken or notice given by a Schedule 1 trustee company before the repeal of that Schedule or the amendment of the Trustee Companies Act by this measure is not affected by the repeal or amendment.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Redmond.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 June 2010.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (11:41): It is my pleasure to at last have an opportunity to speak on the Supply Bill, which is a stunning bill really when it seeks to get permission from this parliament to apply \$5,220 million in order to pay the Public Service. Why? Because this government has not brought down its budget; it has not brought it down in time, and indeed we are not going to get our budget until the middle of September.

That is just extraordinary when you think about the fact that in the UK they have had an election very recently and they have just brought down their budget. It is a pretty tough budget. It has been brought down overnight actually. I saw the Chancellor of the Exchequer on the television

last night bringing down the budget and bringing some very bad news to a whole lot of people in terms of the regime that they are going to have to bring in over there because of their financial situation, but they did it. They brought in their budget, because they recognised the need to react quickly to their financial circumstances, and they did it on something like a \$1.3 trillion budget and they have done it within 50 days of the election.

Yet in this state we have a government that has been in office for eight years. We are now three months post-election, and they cannot bring down a budget until September—another three months away. It is just the most extraordinary thing. This government, having been here for eight years, last year brought down a budget that in itself was an extraordinary thing. They brought down a budget last year in which they said, 'Here is the budget, but by the way there is \$750 million in this budget that we have not figured out where we are going to make savings. We have to make savings to get this budget to come in where we have printed it as being. We still need to identify \$750 million worth of savings, but we are not going to tell any of the people in the state or the public servants who might be affected by our decisions in that regard, so how we are going to do that?'

It is just extraordinary. If you imagined a private enterprise CEO or financial controller coming in and saying to the board—and I know many of the people on this side have been in private enterprise, unlike those over there—'Here is the budget for next year, but by the way there is a whole swathe of it where we are going to make cuts, but we are not going to tell anybody where we are going to make cuts because that might upset people. We have got an election coming, so we will not tell anyone. Furthermore, although we have a department whose specific job is to manage the finances of the state, we are going to employ some people and call them the Sustainable Budget Commission and they can spend the time up until the election is past figuring out where to make the cuts within the budget that we have produced.'

Now we find that the Sustainable Budget Commission is not only out of time—it is overdue with its report—but it is \$2.5 million dollars over its own budget. Why would you trust a group of people who cannot even do the job within their own budget to do the budgeting for the state? It beggars belief, but this government has got away with it for eight years, and I am sad to see that in the UK the obvious thing is that Labour governments all over the world behave the same. They get us into financial doo-doo, and then we have to get in and fix it up. I expect that we will have to get in and fix it up in due course in this state. They have got us into a fair degree of trouble already.

The Treasurer thinks that the way to manage the affairs of this state in terms of the budgetary situation is simply to say, every time he gets to his feet over eight years, 'We are good economic managers.' Even though there is no substance to that statement, he has been, I will grant you, very good at getting up and saying, 'We are good economic managers.'

I am beginning to think that what we should have been doing was getting up every day and saying, 'You are appalling economic managers.' There is certainly more substance to that statement because this government has got us into situations that you would not believe. Our living standards, our service levels, our infrastructure and our economic position relative to other states have all declined. Our share of the national economy has gone down.

This is a government that has had a good opportunity. Over the first seven years that it was in office, up until the global financial crisis, this government was receiving more money because of increased land and housing prices. They had a massive boom in the money that was coming in from the property market and, on top of that, they had a massive amount of money coming in as extra GST.

They calculate the GST differently from the commonwealth government, so—surprise, surprise—every year they get a bit of a bonus in the GST. That is probably (or possibly) what is going to get them out of their difficulties over the \$750 million, because they have got a surprise bonus of \$2.5 billion in GST coming in. So, they are probably going to get themselves out of their problems. The point is that over the first seven of their eight years in office, this government had massive amounts of money coming in by way of property taxes and massive GST bonuses and surpluses.

What have they done with it? They have done nothing with it. This state is in a worse economic situation than it was when these guys got into office. Our share of the national economy has declined over their period in office from 6.8 per cent to 6.5 per cent. We have 25,000 fewer jobs in this state now than we would have had if we had but kept pace with the national growth. We have fallen behind the national growth.

When we talk about our exports from this state, they were always pretty good. In fact, under the previous Liberal government they were climbing quite significantly and there was a legitimate target. This government came into play in 2002 and—they are great at setting targets—they said they were going to treble our exports. Treble our exports! What has happened, however, over the eight years that the Labor Party has been in government so far, is that our exports have gone down.

When the Liberals were last in office, our exports—just in cold, hard dollars, not even taking into account inflation—were \$9.1 billion for the year 2001-02. They have now dropped to \$7.9 billion. In fact, our export growth is the lowest in the nation and our exports over the last 12 months alone have dropped by 23 per cent.

It is disgraceful that this government and particularly this Treasurer have the gall to come into this place and assert that they are good economic managers with a record like this. We have the lowest proportion of exporting businesses of all mainland states. What is more, we continue to lose residents to other states with four times more people migrating into other states than under the previous Liberal government.

Our share of the national population has declined under the Rann government. In fact, the week before last, I met with some people from the skilled migration group and they are most concerned at this government's lack of action in making sure that we bring into this state the people we need to fill our job vacancies.

The government boasted during the early part of the year about how they had the lowest unemployment. I do not think they addressed youth unemployment, specifically, which I think is about the highest in the country; they boasted about their low unemployment, but the question is: how many people have left this state looking for employment because they cannot get it in this state?

Mr Gardner: Too many.

Mrs REDMOND: Absolutely. This government has been just an appalling waster of money. They have wasted money and, by increasing our taxes by over 60 per cent in the eight years that they have been in here, they have now established this state as the highest taxed state in Australia, the highest taxed state in this country. What is that going to do to business in this state? It is going to have an appalling influence on business in this state. We have excellent business people in this state and, indeed, I have been out visiting businesses that are extremely successful overseas—we do not even know about it here. However, the government, by introducing this tax regime and becoming absolutely dependent on the tax regime that it now has, has put us in a position where our business people are unable to compete.

What is the consequence of that? The consequence is that when you look at those few things where we do have infrastructure being built, like the desalination plant, the tram extension and the Northern Expressway—which, by the way, is 80 per cent funded by the commonwealth not by this state—who is getting the contracts for them? Largely people from Victoria, not people from South Australia.

Is that because our businesses are not good enough? No, not at all; it is because they cannot compete with the tax regime in other states which favour those organisations to the point where they can tender at a lower price. This government says, 'Oh, not our problem, lowest price so that is where the tender is going.' Then the benefit of the tender does not come into the state either because, as everyone would appreciate, if the business which got the tender was based in South Australia and the people employed by it were in South Australia it would mean that the money was going around in our economy and, thus, helping the economy of the state. But, no, it does not matter to this government.

Indeed, we came out with a policy before the election about the way the Victorians address this because we know that you cannot simply make it an unlevel playing field. However, in Victoria they say—and I am just going to from memory on the figure—any government project over \$3 million has to have, as part of the tender process, a consideration of not just the financial bottom line but the bottom line in terms of the training, the intellectual property and the employment that it will generate as part of the social sector and what it is going to do to help the state. That becomes part of the assessment for the tender process in Victoria. So, not only do the Victorians give their own guys a bit of favourable treatment in that way, because obviously Victorian companies tendering in Victoria and employing Victorian people will get bonus points in their tenders but then they come over here, because they have got a better system, and steal the projects from here.

This government has led us into a serious decline in the state's economy and, yet, the Treasurer persists in getting up and saying, 'We are good economic managers.' As I started to say at the very beginning—

Dr McFetridge: Self-praise is no recommendation.

Mrs REDMOND: No; as the member for Morphett says, 'Self-praise is no recommendation.' Since it is the only quarter in which it gets any praise it is the only option it has for praise. But when you think about the things that his government has promised—and I will take you through a few of its promises over the past eight years: it was going to expand the Mount Bold reservoir. Personally, since the Mount Bold reservoir is in my electorate, when I first heard that I thought, 'That sounds like a good idea because water is clearly our number one issue.' That was until I found out that its plan was to double the size of the Mount Bold reservoir so that it could pump more water out of the Murray. It beggars belief that this government would think that it was a good idea to pump more water out of the Murray, given the situation with the Murray both as to our irrigators and as to the environmental concerns.

The government also promised that it was going to bulldoze bikie fortresses. Well, bulldozing bikie fortresses— isn't that amazing? It was also going to lower electricity and water prices. I can't wait until we start hearing from the government about what is going to happen to our water prices because it is obvious that our water prices are going up. Not only are they going up— there it is, the member for Finniss has a copy of Mike Rann's original pledge card. Oh, if only! If only the pledges had been kept maybe I would not wake up every morning so motivated to get rid of this government.

Lower electricity and water prices: has anyone here got lower electricity prices over the last eight years?

Honourable members: No.

Mrs REDMOND: Or lower water prices over the last eight years?

Honourable members: No.

Mrs REDMOND: In fact, I suspect that what is going to happen is that we are going to find out that not only are we getting a very significant increase in our water bills but the cost of the desalination plant is going to add even more to the water bills, especially if it turns out that in order to get the commonwealth money the government decides that it has to put the desalination plant on earlier. Of course, we had a better proposal but the government did not want to know about it. We had a way of actually reducing our reliance on the River Murray right away but the government would not do it.

The government was going to stop political government advertising. Does anyone remember that promise? Remember that Mike Rann made a comment that if you saw a politician in an ad it was basically a cheap way of doing paid political advertising. The government said it stopped political government advertising. In the first six months of last year, it spent \$23 million on government advertising.

Dr McFetridge: \$23 million!

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, \$23 million in the first six months. I grant you, some of that would have been legitimate. Some of it would have been to notify us about when we were not allowed to use our sprinklers or hoses, and all that sort of stuff. It would have been simple information. But what government needs to have paid advertising on television to advertise its budget? A budget advertisement last year! It is just extraordinary the money this government has wasted.

If only we could stop the waste, we would find that this is a very rich state. Indeed, when you look at last year's budget, my recollection is that it showed that the government was trying to get our debt—it is working hard towards it—back out to where it was at least in relation to the State Bank; so back to \$6.8 billion in debt. I will come to WorkCover and all those other things in a minute. My recollection is that the interest payment on that \$6.8 billion was going to be \$711 million a year, and that was before all the interest rate rises we have had over the past 12 months. My bet is that it was pretty close to \$2 million a day in interest. I was not in this place then but, when the then government got us into the State Bank situation, I seem to recall John Olsen, when the Liberals got in, having to fix up that mess and that it was \$2 million a day in interest.

I have this image of how this state would look if every day as the premier I could go out and say to each town, 'Here, you have \$2 million today; \$2 million for you tomorrow; \$2 million for you

the next day.' Imagine after just one year what that would look like around this state—if every community got that money. But, no, we are paying that money in interest because of this government's fiscal mismanagement over the time it has been in government.

Speaking about that, it is not just the state debt. If you look at WorkCover, we worked and worked to get the unfunded liability down and, when we left office, I think it was around \$59 million. Where has this government got it? Back out over \$1 billion. You would think that, having done that, at that point you would have a situation where you had the best WorkCover in the world. But, no, our WorkCover has the highest levy rates in any state and the lowest return to work rate. It has the highest work levy rate by more than 50 per cent. The highest in any other state is 2 per cent, and the highest levy in this state is 3 per cent.

By the way, with the federal government and its proposals at the moment, that is going to double. It will not be WorkCover, but imagine the impact of the 3 per cent extra in superannuation on small businesses in this state, and that is the majority of business in this state—and they are going to have to pay an extra 3 per cent. They will not actually get the benefit of any reduction in company tax—they are not structured as companies—and they will have to pay that extra 3 per cent in superannuation. So, an extra 3 per cent in oncosts for all the employees in this state. Talk about building in disincentives to growing businesses in this state.

This government just buries its head in the sand. This government has a Treasurer who thinks that land tax is important only for people who are rich so-and-sos who can afford extra houses. He does not recognise that, first of all, those houses provide rental accommodation and that the more the land tax the higher the rentals for all the young people and others out there who are trying to get into the housing market but are renting. It also affects every business that is renting accommodation—and that is the vast majority of businesses in this state. They work in rented premises, and that means there is a landlord and there is someone paying land tax, and ultimately it is passed on to every business owner and, therefore, to all the consumers in the state.

So, it is not just an issue for the high earning end of the town; it is an issue for every person in this state and, in particular, for businesses throughout this state. But it is a message that this government has chosen not to hear for the longest time.

I will go back to some of the other things this government has said it would do but did not: I refer to honesty and accountability in government. Well, that is a given; we do not have that with this government. The underpass along South Road beneath Port and Grange roads. The tramline extension to North Adelaide. I am not a person who is opposed to trams per se, but it does occur to me that, if you have a city where you have trams and you have removed the trams, before you decide to put them back maybe it would be a good idea to have a bit of a public discussion about the idea to see whether there is any legitimate basis for saying, 'Well, this is the way of the future, therefore we are going to go back there.'

They just decided, because they wanted an infrastructure project they could say was completed by the close of their previous term in office—their first term—to extend the tramline to North Terrace—and hasn't that made North Terrace a joy!

They also promised, interestingly, a solution to the Britannia roundabout problem. They promised a prison at Murray Bridge—the member for Hammond would recall that—and they also promised, famously, a redeveloped FIFA-compliant Adelaide Oval for \$450 million.

Mr Pederick: Or somewhere close to that number.

Mrs REDMOND: Well, not even close any more. They are a few of their broken promises. I could go on about broken promises but, obviously, there is a need to break promises when you do not manage financially. As I said, every time he gets to his feet the Treasurer's habit has been to simply say, 'We are good economic managers.' Clearly, they are anything but.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (12:01): That was an interesting tirade from the Leader of the Opposition. Her experience as a lawyer never ceases to be on display when she is in this chamber. She is a very good orator, but when you look at what she is saying it is nothing but shrill. The Supply Bill, as we know, is a necessary piece of legislation, given that without it—

Dr McFetridge: Why can't we have the budget?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett will allow the Treasurer to speak.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to address the issue of the budget. When the state went through the global financial crisis, having lost \$3 billion worth of state revenue over the forward estimates period—and we have recovered at least \$2 billion, but my most recent advice is that we are still in the order of about \$1 billion net down—it necessitated something that required more than the normal budget process. It required a structural assessment of our spending; that is, the greatest threat to the budgetary position of this state—as it is in any state but I think it is more acute in this state—is that the service demand far outweighs our capacity to fund it. That has been a historical fact in this state and it will be a fact going into the future.

What governments have done in the past is that they have funded increased service delivery by running consistent net operating deficits. We changed that when we came into office—and we were the first government to do so for decades—in order to get our budget into a position where our recurrent expenditure was covered by our recurrent taxation and funding sources, and our capital, where necessary, would be funded from either that same source of revenue or borrowings.

When the global financial crisis hit us, it knocked the stuffing out of our state's finances. In the last budget we moved to a situation—certainly with the support of the rating agencies—where we did what every government will have to do. Normally we have a two term government in this state—or a three term government in this instance—and after every eight years or so there is no doubt that you need a thorough forensic look at everything you spend and then as a government make decisions as to what expenditure can be supported and, indeed, what expenditure may have to stop because there are more compelling priorities.

With the Sustainable Budget Commission, what I have done in this budget is exactly what Dean Brown with Stephen Baker did on coming to government in 1993. It is what John Howard did in 1996 when he came into government after the Labor government. I have chosen to do it heading into our third term. I have chosen to bring in outside expertise to assist my government officers to do that forensic analysis of our expenditure. I asked that Geoff Carmody, the founder of Access Economies, was the senior economist who undertook this work or headed up the secretariat that undertook the work for John Howard. Geoff Carmody is a very good man and very good economist, and he knows more about federal and states' budgets than most, if not all, in Australia and I felt that he was an outstanding choice.

The Sustainable Budget Commission provided me with an interim report before the end of last year, before we went to the election, on its suggested timing of a good time to bring down the budget, which would allow it to undertake the forensic work it needed to do. It recommended that we do a budget later in the year, and we selected a September date, which is exactly what we did following the last election because the reality is that a March election coincides with the normal budget cycle.

There is no doubt in my mind that an incoming Liberal Government would have, quite rightly, needed time, and my guess is that it would have allowed this work to have continued because it is very good work, it is not political, and it is a good analysis and a good assessment as to what it is we can sustain in terms of our budget going forward.

The Leader of the Opposition talked about history. I was not going to do that, but given that she felt the need to do so let us reflect on where we were when this government came to office in 2002. When we came to office, notwithstanding the sale of ETSA and notwithstanding any other work that was undertaken, particularly by Stephen Baker (who I think was a good treasurer, notwithstanding the fact that I in opposition would rarely have given him that credit—

Mr Venning: Notwithstanding the State Bank.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And with the State Bank, absolutely, and I have said publicly that Stephen Baker inherited a nightmarish scenario that he had to deal with, but we do not want to go into the politics of that period.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Okay, we will. I was actually referring to the first Liberal government when Stephen Baker and Dean Brown, who were trying to do the best for the state, were torn down by the Olsenites, Joan Hall and others, and were not allowed the privilege of contesting the next election. I do not want to lift the scab on old Liberal Party infighting, which has been replaced with a fresh Liberal Party round of infighting.

When we came to office, despite the sale of ETSA, the budget position was that they had run four consecutive net operating deficits, so even with the sale of ETSA Rob Lucas and the then Liberal government were incapable of getting revenues to match expenditure. They ran four net consecutive operating deficits. We rebuilt the state's finances: that is an indisputable fact.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, Treasurer. Order! Member for MacKillop, I know that yesterday was exciting, and I know that you enjoy interjecting, but I am not minded to listen to these perpetual interjections all day long. Please do not argue with me. Let us have a little quiet time and let us listen to the Treasurer. Thank you.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. We had eliminated the general government sector debt. Let us remember that this government regained the state's AAA credit rating, and this government has focused on setting up a framework for a strong economy by focusing on economic development, jobs, sustainable industries, skills and careers for future generations.

Our infrastructure expenditure today is five times that of the last Liberal budget. The 2009-10 health budget is more than \$4 billion, which is a 100 per cent increase on funding provided to the health budget under the last Liberal budget. I can demonstrate—and we have had it said by both international rating agencies Moody's and Standard and Poor's—that this government's fiscal discipline was a major reason we regained the AAA credit rating and the major reason we have maintained the AAA credit rating.

When the global financial crisis (GFC) hit, we saw this destruction in revenue and, whilst we have not suffered anywhere near as badly as we thought, revenues have not bounced back and the consumers of Australia are not spending to the extent they were before the GFC; they are much more mindful of personal debt, much more mindful of their capacity to service their home loans. We have not seen the revenue come back to the strength that had been forecast before the GFC.

We had to do a couple of things: we had to cancel the prison; we had to make a number of other adjustments to our capital program; and I had to demonstrate to the rating agencies that we had a plan to ensure that we worked our way through the GFC. You only have to look at Queensland, which lost its AAA credit rating because, like us, it was hit with the realities of the global financial crisis. But they were not able to convince the rating agencies that they had a plan to deal with it; they lost their AAA credit rating.

I developed a plan; the government developed a plan. I went to New York and Melbourne where Standard and Poor's is based. I put the plan to them before I released it publicly to gather feedback and some confidence that this was a plan that they would be comfortable with, and they have agreed to it. What that means—and this will be the challenge for governments well beyond this government and well beyond a future Liberal government—is this state's capacity to meet the expectations and needs of the broader community in service delivery. How do we fund that?

If we can look beyond the short-term politics of a debate in this chamber, or the short-term politics of an election or even just the short-term politics of a four-year parliamentary term, in the years and decades forward these are the challenges that our community and our society face. Health expenditure is running, on the most generous assessment, at 8 per cent per year but, when one really looks at the wage inflation of the profession and the technical advancements that we are continually and thankfully making in health, health costs are running more in the order of 9 to 11 per cent compounding per year.

You only have to look at the fact that, since the last Liberal government (so, eight years ago), we were spending, say, \$2 billion; today it is \$4 billion. That is in eight years. That is so far in excess of inflation. If we can just for a moment put aside short-term petty politics on either side, this is the challenge our society faces. The national government has put a plan in place, and we support its involvement. I think it is very important that we have the commonwealth at least in the game now, but the reality is that issues such as child protection and social welfare for the young in our community are growing significantly all around the nation and around the western world.

At a time when society has never been more affluent, when society has never been better educated and when society has never had higher living standards and when you would think that the quality of parental care should be far higher and far better than it has ever been towards our young, the reality is that the abuse and neglect of our young in society is increasing. Part of that, of

course, is that we are identifying it much better today than perhaps we have in the past, and that could be a large part of the problem. It may well be that the quality of care has now reached a new level and brought a whole new cohort of kids into protection and care, but the undeniable fact is that it is an exponential growth right around the nation and the western world in excess of inflation. They are just two very large components of the budget sector that are growing well in excess of inflation. Combined, they make up probably half the budget, if not more. It is probably half the budget: close to it.

The point of the matter is, and I am coming back to the Sustainable Budget Commission, that there is no doubt in my mind that governments today and in the future will have to stop doing things we currently do to fund the things we need to do which we consider to be of higher priority. That is not going to be easy. It will not just be this government's challenge: it will be every treasurer and every government for decades to come. We will have to make hard, stark choices about what it is we can afford to fund and supply as a service and what we can no longer afford to fund. Unless the community has a larger appetite for taxation increases (and I do not think the community has that and I do not see that as the solution, ultimately), it really will be about what we as a society want from government for the level of revenue that we are prepared to give government.

Mr Venning: Stop wasting.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Schubert says to stop wastage. In relation to wastage in government in an enterprise of 70,000-plus people and a budget in excess of \$16 billion, of course there are issues of wastage, duplication and inefficiencies. Every time I have done a budget I have hit hard on those inefficiencies. We have taken 1,300 people—I think that was the last number I saw—out of the public sector in the last 18 months. We are doing Shared Services, for which I have got an enormous amount of criticism from members opposite.

Shared Services, as an example, is a way in which we can better deliver the core services of running an enterprise by eliminating duplication and, when it is bedded down, a more efficient way of doing it that will deliver \$50 million, \$60 million or \$70 million a year in efficiency savings. But, bear in mind that initiative alone, as difficult as it is and as frustrating as it can be, when it is bedded down, will give us an efficiency. That efficiency is almost a drop in the bucket in terms of the long-term future funding needs of the state.

One of the prime motivations for the new hospital was, again, to see where we could get a more efficient hospital operating with a better design, a modern design, and a design that is considered in the total, as against the current Royal Adelaide Hospital, which has been a very old hospital that has had additions and work done, but it is not as efficient as it could or should be. We may get \$50 million a year in efficiencies out of it or \$100 million; we will not know until we see the bottom line of the tenders. But, again, as good as that is, it is but a small proportion of the cost pressures we face going forward.

The hardest job you have as treasurer—it is the hardest job Rob Lucas and Stephen Baker had and that I am having—is the unavoidable cost pressures of government. They are a steamroller coming at you and it would not matter how hard, tough or vicious you want to be in stopping them, you cannot. They are the people rolling up to our hospitals. They are the kids we have to take out of neglect and harm's way. They are the realities of government. All we can do when we are in government is try to find ways to continue to improve and deliver better services. It is a difficult and, at times, onerous task.

However, the economy in South Australia has never been stronger—certainly not in the last 30 years. We have some of the lowest unemployment rates this state has ever seen. We are bringing people into this state at a level that we have not done since the surge in immigration in the postwar period. We are seeing a diversification and a broadening of our economy that we have never had before. These are good things. It is not without enormous challenges and not without areas of problem and fault, but we are establishing a much broader economy in South Australia where we are no longer as reliant as we have been in the past on the manufacturing sector or the agriculture sector to hold us up, or the services sector or the wine industry as a subset of the agriculture sector. We are seeing the development of a mining industry. It will not be the most dominant sector but it will be a very, very, very important balance in our economy as various other sectors go through their economic and seasonal cycles.

Our primary industry sector, which has been—as it has always been—the area where we have had the most competitive advantage in terms of an economic base, has great hardships. At any given time, at any given moment, there will be one or more issues compounding in that sector.

When they all collide—like the nightmare that has been the lack of water in the Riverland coinciding with poor and little rains for our cropping industries, or the attack of foreign product coming into Australia in our dairy sector or in our citrus sector or wherever—there are always pressures on that sector, but the broadening of the overall economy gives us the ability to look after some other sectors.

I know that the hardship that has been seen in the Riverland has been tragic and I know that we as a government have been the subject of criticism but because we have had balance in other sectors of our economy, we have been able to channel significant resources into the Riverland, into the issue of buying water and into the needs of a community under severe stress. That is because the overall budget position is strong relative to what it has been in the past.

On the issue of infrastructure, I said that we are now spending five times more than when we came to office. A lot of our infrastructure in this state has been allowed to deteriorate. When we came to office the amount of capital that the last Liberal government was expending was actually, from memory, below the depreciation of our capital assets so that meant that we were, through underinvestment, watching our capital stock depreciate.

We have reversed that quite significantly, and these projects are never easy but they are necessary. We are doing that in a way that we believe will best deliver a more efficient and more liveable city in Adelaide as well as doing what we can to improve the quality of life and infrastructure in our regional and rural areas.

I am very proud of this government's financial record. I am very proud of this government's economic credentials. It has not been without error or without mistake, but in eight years (or heading to 8½ years) it has seen our state become one of the strongest performing states in all of Australia, and many commentators say this whether it is Access Economics who once would have looked at South Australia as the rust bucket forgotten state—even Access Economics who are the harshest and sharpest critics now say that, or whether it is the chief economist from Westpac or the National Australia Bank or the Commonwealth Bank or ANZ. When these opinion leaders are commenting on South Australia, it is not always as positive as I would like but it is largely a very positive story.

That has occurred because, despite what errors or faults members opposite may wish to level at this government (and perhaps in some cases they are legitimate criticisms), taken in the overall context, I believe that this government has managed this economy very well. We have a stable administration that has not been beset with the internal tensions and the impossibility that was the last Liberal government where it did not matter who was leading, the powerful forces sitting behind those leaders just tore that government to pieces over eight years.

We have been a very stable government. We have delivered a better state and are delivering a better state economically, I would argue socially, and financially than when we came to office. That should always be the measure of whether you have been successful or not. Going forward, we have to do a lot more. We have a very large agenda to deliver on and we have a very significant budget challenge. This budget that I will bring down in September will be a very, very difficult budget. It will be a hard budget. It will be a budget of challenges that our government will have to meet. It will be a budget that will cause discomfort in some sections.

Mr Venning: Why so late, Kevin?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I've explained that, Ivan; you weren't listening. It will cause discomfort in some sectors, in both the public sector and in the broader community. It will be a budget that will demonstrate that, after eight years and with our ninth budget, we have the experience and the mettle to ensure that we do not look for short-term political outcomes from the budget but that we look at a number of decisions that will structurally adjust the budget to provide longer term benefits for the state. That will be one mighty challenge. It will be the hardest budget I have ever delivered, and very few treasurers have had to deliver a harder budget.

I will conclude on this point. My guess is that, probably after every seven or eight years in the future, a treasurer will be confronted with the same reality. To continue to provide the essential needed services of government, you have to—

Mr Venning: You'll still be here.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't think I will be here in eight years, Ivan.

Mr Venning: That's good news. Nor will I be, but I'm not 70, Kev.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: But, unlike you, I would like a life beyond politics at some point. Probably every seven, eight or nine years, you must do a major forensic analysis of your expenditure and decide what it is you can afford to fund and what it is you cannot fund, and that will be the challenge of every government. When the Sustainable Budget Commission report comes down, I hope it will show a process that is successful. It will be one that I would be surprised if future governments do not follow.

I thank all members for their contribution. As critical as I am sure they were, and as personally vilifying of me as I am sure many of them were, I take it in good stride. I am a tough nut and I can handle it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like it noted for the record that the member for Schubert is not 70.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (12:28): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (12:28): I rise to speak on this bill proposed by the government. The Treasurer has asked the parliament to authorise the supply of \$5.5 billion prior to the release of the budget in September this year. Today in the house he has told us how proud he is of the government's economic performance over his eight years, and now ninth year, as Treasurer. He told us about the accomplishments of the government. Of course, what he failed to tell the house was the economic backdrop under which he has been operating.

The past eight or nine years have been some of the most economically successful years in the history of the country and certainly in the history of this state but, rather than acknowledge this, the Treasurer takes all the credit for this performance based upon his running of the budget. Indeed, he talks about this government's fiscal discipline.

In my earlier speech on this bill, I very comprehensively—which I do not plan to do today—outlined the \$3.8 billion of revenue that this government has received over the period of time since it took office. I also outlined to the house that very little of this \$3.8 billion was actually within its control; the majority of it, of course, came from GST revenue over and above what was guaranteed by the federal government and, of course, what was budgeted by this state government. In that speech I also outlined the government's expenditure, and this cuts to the heart of it. This government, over the seven years to date for which we have the numbers, has spent \$2.742 billion in excess of its very own budget, which it set for itself. That hardly shows a government with strong fiscal discipline.

It is a curious thing that the parliament is now being asked to authorise expenditure without knowing what the funds will be spent on. Of course, in the commercial world this would never occur. You could not imagine a situation in the commercial world in which a chief financial officer would go to the managing director or the board and say, 'I would like to spend \$5.22 billion, but I don't actually have a budget.' It would never ever occur. However, this is what the Treasurer is asking us to do here today. Make no mistake; we are being asked to make a decision without a complete or, indeed, even a sketchy, picture of what the money will be spent on.

Today I would like to reflect on this theme, the theme of being asked to make decisions without complete information. This was developed into an art form by the current government leading up to the last state election. There is a growing trend within governments in South Australia, and indeed nationally, to promise before an election and to apologise after the election. This is a very disturbing development, and one we need to be very wary of.

I would like to give three specific and significant examples of this, which, of course, are of a financial and supply nature. The first example is that of the Adelaide Oval. This government was dragged kicking and screaming to the issue of a city stadium. The opposition presented a very clear vision for a city stadium and a cultural and sporting precinct to surround it. The people actually loved it. At first the government tried to rubbish the idea; however, unlike the opposition, its plan was not really very well thought through. It tried to rubbish the idea, but when the state government knew that it was very popular with the public, it switched over, and in December last year announced its own plan which it put to the people, telling us that it had been working on it for some time.

The guts of the issue, which I would like to reflect upon, is the lack of information that was provided to the people of South Australia prior to the election, because that is the theme I am developing here today. The voters were asked to make a decision without full and complete information. Yesterday in this house the Treasurer made it very clear that he had information relating to the costing of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment which was not provided to the people of South Australia, yet they were asked to make a decision at the state election without this full and complete information.

The second example I would like to give is that of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This project was originally announced as the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital in the June 2007 budget. By June 2008, one year later, the project had already been delayed by a year—within a year this government had made no progress, so it put it back by a year. By June 2009, we were promised, unequivocally, that tenders would be let before the March 2010 election. So, why were the tenders not declared until after the election? This is a very good question, and one we need to ask. Maybe the government did not want us to know the precise details of its mismanagement before the election. It is easier to promise before an election and allude to the tenders being received, but they will not be looked at until after the election. The government did not want us to have the full information before making a decision at the March 2010 election.

The third example I would like to give is that of the Sustainable Budget Commission. This was first announced in the May/June 2009 budget. This commission was designed to reduce public-sector spending over the forward estimates by \$750 million, but again, conveniently, this report was not required by the government until after the March 2010 election, after the people of South Australia were asked to make a decision on who should lead the state over the next four years.

It is not that the Liberal Party in any way, shape or form opposes the concept of fiscal discipline. In fact, I do not think that we as a party opposed the establishment of the Sustainable Budget Commission, but what we do oppose vigorously is the concept of the report coming down after the election, after the people are asked to make a decision.

The Treasurer in this house this morning spoke specifically on the issue of the Sustainable Budget Commission in his Supply Bill reply, and he said that this was a very important commission set up by the government to decide what it could fund going forward and what it was not able to fund going forward.

They are very lofty ideals, and it is a fantastic scope for this commission; but, again, why is that information not provided to the people before the election? Why were the people of South Australia not told what the government thought should be funded going forward and what should not be funded going forward before they were being asked to make a decision?

Each of these examples demonstrates the government's total and utter disregard and disrespect for the voting public. The voters in South Australia get a chance to elect their government only every four years in South Australia. It is therefore crucial for the public to have full and accurate information in front of them before they make their choice, just as it is important for us to have full and accurate information in front of us before we make a decision to give the government \$5.22 billion to run the state up to the time of the September budget. By delaying deadlines until after an election, the voters are denied crucial information so necessary to make their decisions.

At the moment, the government has asked the parliament to approve \$5.22 billion in its Supply Bill. It is asking us in advance and providing us with a budget for the next financial year. In fact, it will not be handing down the budget until 16 September. It is then going to take some time during estimates to evaluate what it offers us. Surely, this system is in urgent need of reform. In the commercial world, as I have said previously, we would certainly not ask for money in advance of developing a budget.

The Premier and the Treasurer went into the election asking us to elect them for a third term. A major plank of their election campaign was their economic credibility. Within weeks of the election we have already seen just how fragile these promises really are. Much of the last budget was framed around the \$750 million Sustainable Budget Commission. Will the Treasurer soon be issuing a statement on this matter? Will he be executing a backflip trifecta on the hospital, oval and Sustainable Budget Commission?

It is all too easy to make promises that cannot be kept. It is all too easy to make claims without substance. It is all too easy to make a promise before an election with an apology or update

later. What we need is full, accurate and timely information, something sorely missing from this Supply Bill discussion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Kavel.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:38): Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. I appreciate the correct pronunciation that you have given the name of the electorate I have the honour of representing in this place. I wish to continue some remarks that I finished with yesterday evening concerning the Supply Bill, and now we have an opportunity with a few more minutes to make some further comments in relation to matters that we believe are important to the safety, security and wellbeing of the good citizens of South Australia.

I was making some comments in relation to road safety issues in terms of making a comparison between the policy the state Liberal Party took to the election and the policy that the ALP took to the election. To be fair to the government, and to put some clarity around the issue, I mentioned that the government raised three or so issues in relation to that policy. To be fair to the government, it highlighted about half a dozen issues in its election policy. However, I stand by what I said, that our policy was significantly more comprehensive than what the ALP took to the election.

I note that the Minister for Road Safety a number of weeks ago, obviously during the sitting of the house—and I can check this—made a ministerial statement highlighting three issues that he was looking to progress from their policy document in the short to medium term. As I said, I want to put some clarity around that and to be fair to the government, because I think I am a reasonably fair person and I take a reasonably fair approach to my duties as a member of parliament and as a shadow minister.

Continuing my remarks in relation to road safety issues, as I said yesterday evening, I do not believe that the government's road safety strategy is working, because the road toll is at the same level, if not marginally higher (I think it may be one more than at the same time last year), which is 20 per cent higher than the previous year of 2008. So we are continuing on a graph where our road toll tragically is 20 per cent higher than it was in 2008. As I said, there are obviously a number of reasons for that. I also stated we have had four ministers for road safety in about 12 months.

Ms Chapman: They get rid of them quickly now.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: They certainly got rid of the—well, the member for West Torrens was actually forced to get rid of himself when his driving record came to light. He himself had to resign from the position of Minister for Road Safety. I can tell the house that that was an issue that was raised while I was campaigning up to and including the election. Several people spoke to me about that particular issue and how it was going to change their vote, that they had voted previously for the ALP but they were so disgusted with that level of offending that it changed their vote.

I would like to state that in the house: we had a Minister for Road Safety who, in the opinion of some members of the community, was not fit to hold that office. We have said on this side of the house that he is actually lucky to hold any front bench duties.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kavel, while this is all very interesting, I am not quite sure how this relates to the Supply Bill. I know it is a grievance but I think we are wandering a little.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It is a grievance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I am aware of the grievance but you cannot just—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Better than you are, mate! Better than you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kavel, don't respond to the interjection. Carry on.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you. In terms of supply and the direction of funding—I can certainly talk about that, Madam Deputy Speaker, in relation to the commitment by the state Liberals at the election of \$52 million in an effort to address the \$200 million backlog in road maintenance—we know that road maintenance and infrastructure has a direct correlation with road safety issues. We made a commitment, and obviously that commitment stands, that \$52 million in funding was to go to that specific issue of addressing the backlog of \$200 million in road maintenance.

I want to comment now on the most recent visit by a thinker in residence, being that of Professor Fred Wegman, who was a thinker in residence for road safety. Our policy is to abolish the Thinker in Residence program because, in my opinion, they are expensive consultants. In one of the latest developments within the government Professor Laura Lee has brought down a report saying that a commissioner position should be created—and, guess what? The Premier and the government appointed this person to that role of commissioner without advertising the position or going out into the public and seeing if perhaps anybody else out there in the community, or even further abroad, has similar, or even higher, qualifications and credentials. I think this highlights a deficiency in that particular process.

We also recall that, leading up to previous election campaigns—I think it was running up to the 2002 election campaign—the then leader of the opposition and other opposition members were screaming from the rooftops about the amount of money that the then Liberal government was paying out on consultants. Well, thinkers in residence are no different; they are consultants.

I do not dispute Professor Wegman's credentials or qualifications. He heads an institute in the Netherlands that is specifically focusing on road safety issues. He is highly credentialled and highly qualified, but why bring him out here for a three or four week initial visit a month or so ago? I met with Professor Wegman and had a good discussion with him. He is a very nice person and he said he is coming back to South Australia towards the end of the year—all at a cost to taxpayers.

I put this proposal forward: why can't the director of the Road Safety Secretariat—a section within DTEI, which has 150 staff with a \$50 million budget—get on a plane and go to the Netherlands, spend two or three days talking to the professor, get some information from him, then come back and incorporate it into the government's road safety strategy? You can get a lot of information about Professor Wegman's discussions from the website. I have that information. We have downloaded it and printed it off the system. In my opinion, this is excessive spending on consultants. The government, when in opposition, used to rail against the cost of consultants that the then Liberal government used to contract in.

There are other issues in relation to emergency services. Again, I think we had a quite comprehensive policy going into the election. Checking the ALP website, I cannot see an emergency services policy.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kavel. I believe that I owe you an apology. As you know, I am slightly new to this job, but if we wish to vote on supply, then apparently you can grieve about anything you like. I apologise for that. No taxation without representation.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I accept your apology.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:48): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will be grieving about anything I like. Some of you may have heard our Premier doing the rounds last week on morning radio, explaining away his reasons for his solo trip to the US and Europe. He gave us a lengthy discourse on those whom he met and the institutions he visited—through Twitter of course, there was no official itinerary. It was a well rehearsed message each time. I do not know whether anybody else went through this exercise, but I actually grabbed the transcripts of the 891 and FIVEaa interviews and compared them with each of the answers. It was amazing how, word for word, the answer was the same, regardless of the question. I will cover that a little bit later.

One institution of course that the Premier did not meet with was Carnegie Mellon University, although he did meet with its resident lecturer in architecture, Laura Lee, in both London and New York. That was not tweeted of course; that came out with the interrogation by both the radio stations FIVEaa and 891. He did not tweet that he was meeting with them. In fact, he said that he did not meet with any representatives of Carnegie Mellon. However, we did find out that he did meet with Laura Lee. Whether she is a representative of Carnegie Mellon or whether she is an employee, we can leave that to be established at some later stage. However, the Premier should have met with representatives of Carnegie Mellon, because of the drain it has become on the state's coffers.

Recently, the Rann government was forced to prop up enrolments to the tune of an extra \$3.8 million, resulting now in a total investment of \$43 million, or somewhere around the figure of \$236,000 of South Australian taxpayers' money for every student who attends the university.

It is interesting that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has consistently referred to the assistance given to Carnegie Mellon as being fixed at a figure of \$19.5 billion and that assistance ceasing in 2010. Yet, later on, after the election, of course, we were told that another \$3.8 million has been given in assistance to Carnegie Mellon.

Madam Deputy Speaker, you will recall that the Carnegie Mellon campus opened with great fanfare in May 2006. According to the Premier's press release, 71 local and international students were enrolled, with a promise of huge increases in enrolments in later years in courses in information technology, public policy and entertainment technology. Most of these students were from overseas and were funded under the federal government's AusAID scholarship program, and the local students were public servants paid for by the South Australian government.

Also, we have since discovered that not only South Australian public servants but also federal public servants are subsidised by South Australian taxpayers. So, those on the federal government's payroll are also subsidised to the extent of 75 per cent of their \$65,000 fee by the state government, with the federal government chipping in the 25 per cent. So, not only are we seeing South Australian public servants being subsidised at taxpayers' expense to attend Carnegie Mellon but we are seeing federal government public servants also being subsidised by the state government to attend Carnegie Mellon University.

Of course, there was always going to be two campuses. The Premier made a big song and dance about the fact there was not one but two Carnegie Mellon campuses. We found out recently that the second campus—the Entertainment Technology Centre—was closed two years ago—two years into a four year lease, with an option to renew on that lease. We believe that the break clause of that lease was exercised in September 2009—so there was no obligation for the government to take on the option of an additional lease—and that was being paid for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The Premier's own office has confirmed that it is \$142,000 a year in rent for around about 500 square metres. It has been empty for two years, and it is being paid for by taxpayers' money.

When the college opened, we were told that the Entertainment Technology Centre was going to be a very, very exciting project for South Australia. The Premier was very excited about the fact that the Entertainment Technology Centre would be providing students with Disney and Pixar training right here in Adelaide. What have we found out since then? We have found that not a single student graduated from Carnegie Mellon's Currie Street premises, the Entertainment Technology Centre. Two years after the launch, with great fanfare by the Premier, not a single student has graduated, and those students who were there were transferred to California to complete their courses.

So, here we have a university that was promoted by the Premier as being our gateway to more international students in South Australia, sending our students off to California because the model that the Premier had worked so hard on simply did not work. The interesting thing about the past five years is that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet was quite extensive about its commitment to Carnegie Mellon. Its executive summary states:

The department has an existing agreement with Carnegie Mellon University to establish two schools, the H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management and the Entertainment Technology Centre. The contract will not exceed \$19.5 million and the State Government's funding support will cease in 2009-10.

That is reported as late as the 2008-09 report, 12 months after the Entertainment Technology Centre had closed. We should not be too disappointed that the commitment the Premier made before the election has been broken—where funding would cease in 2009-10—because we were being told that the Entertainment Technology Centre was still operating, was still open, and was still running in the Currie Street location 12 months after it had, in fact, closed.

The Premier was asked questions about the Carnegie Mellon campus by Mike Smithson, filling in for Leon Byner on FIVEaa. He was asked, 'Did you meet anyone from Carnegie Mellon?' The Premier said, 'No...they're based in Pittsburgh and I was in New York.' Mike Smithson then said, 'The reason I asked that is that David Pisoni has been on this morning,' and the Premier said, 'Yeah, and he's wrong again, once again.' Smithson went on to say, 'He raised a question in parliament which didn't seem to draw a positive answer or any answer, any substantial answer last time it was asked. Are we pouring money into Carnegie Mellon for one campus that appears to have closed?' 'No, no,' said the Premier.

Smithson then asked, 'Or would you say it's combined with the University of SA, but are we throwing money away?' The Premier then said, 'The Carnegie Mellon campus at the Torrens

building—we've got University of London College.' Then he started talking about the University of London. It was a perfect opportunity to explain what is happening at Carnegie Mellon, but this is the sleight of hand that we have become used to over the past eight years of Mike Rann, regardless of the question that is asked. We see it here in question time and we see it in the media. The Premier will give the answer that he wants to give to a question, even if it is not related to the question.

He was specifically asked a question about Carnegie Mellon, and he started telling us about University of London College. He went on at some length to talk about where it has come from and that Cambridge in England is the No. 2 university. Yale, in the United States, for some reason gets a mention but, while we are talking about American universities, we are still not talking about Carnegie Mellon.

The question was about Carnegie Mellon and the Premier avoided the issue. It was the same when he was asked questions in this chamber about Carnegie Mellon, and his further education minister said, 'I have no idea.' In the end, with the persistence of Mr Smithson, the Premier went on to say, 'It's a slow start for Carnegie Mellon but it is now growing at 35 per cent per year in terms of student numbers.' That is what he said.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

[Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00]

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of three exchange students from Germany and the USA. Welcome.

JERVOIS FERRY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): Presented a petition signed by 235 electors of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to increase the Jervois Ferry to a 75 foot carrier to accommodate a greater number of vehicles crossing at one time.

DERNANCOURT SHOPPING CENTRE TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell): Presented a petition signed by 223 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the Minister for Road Safety to install traffic lights to regulate traffic entering and exiting the Dernancourt Shopping Centre.

FAMILIES SA FUNDING

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): Presented a petition signed by 60 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to review and upgrade funding to Families SA.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Health Service—Central Northern Adelaide Annual Report 2008-09

Patient Safety, South Australian—Annual Report 2008-09

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

Parole Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2008-09

POLICE NUMBERS

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Ensuring that South Australians are safe and secure in their homes and on our streets is fundamental to ensuring that South Australia is a great place to live and raise a family. Today I place on record the landmark achieved by South Australia Police in

recruiting more than 4,400 officers. By Wednesday next week there will be 4,403 full-time equivalent officers in South Australia—700 more sworn officers than when the Rann government came to office in 2002.

As Minister for Police I am honoured to be a member of a government that has delivered on a commitment to bolster police numbers to their highest level in the state's history—and we are not stopping there. Now that we have achieved our target of 4,400 police our focus will shift to recruiting another 300 officers over the next four years. This will mean that by 2014 we will have 1,000 more police on the beat than there were when the government came into office in 2002.

As I speak, 82 recruits, including officers from the United Kingdom and interstate, are graduating after having successfully completed 10 weeks of intense training. The recruits are aged between 24 and 44, with an average age of 36. Next Wednesday a further 18 cadets, all from South Australia, will graduate, leaving a total of 93 cadets still in training at Fort Largs.

I extend a warm welcome to the 24 women and 58 men graduating this afternoon who have previously held various ranks ranging from constable to inspector and who have a combined total of 780 years of policing experience. I can also announce today that 24 of those officers will join the eastern Adelaide LSA, which will coincide with major changes to policing in the Adelaide CBD. The 24 officers will bring to the eastern Adelaide LSA over 230 years of experience from the UK. Their presence will have an immediate impact within the city.

A new seven-week roster has been designed to meet the specific needs of the CBD. SAPOL's peak demand times are Friday and Saturday nights, and the new roster will ensure higher levels of coverage when and where it is needed. I applaud this new initiative by SAPOL, and I am confident that the extra officers will result in improved service delivery and will ultimately lead to a safer CBD.

Our police do an excellent job, and the extra officers will have an important role in helping to make South Australia a better and safer place to live; and, on behalf of the community, I thank them for stepping forward and taking on the challenging role.

Per capita South Australia continues to lead the nation having the highest rate of sworn police officers of any Australian state. South Australia has 303 sworn officers for every 100,000 persons. The next closest state is Western Australia with 287, and Victoria and New South Wales fall far behind with just 206 and 237 respectively. Furthermore, the 2009 report on government services showed that 89.3 per cent of SAPOL staff were assigned to operational duties, the highest in Australia and well above the national average of 83.9 per cent.

There is a clear link—more police and better resources equals a shrinking crime rate. That is why since 2002 the Rann Labor government has given the South Australian police service the officers, resources, equipment and tough laws they need to drive down crime, and we will continue to do so.

ADELAIDE PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL COLLEGE

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: On 11 May I advised the house that the Department of Further Education, Science and Technology (DFEEST), in accordance with the Training and Skills Development Act 2008 (the TASC act), carried out a monitoring audit in March 2010 of the Adelaide Pacific International College and 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. Those standards are available on line.

On 7 May the delegate of the South Australian Training and Skills Commission, the Chief Executive of DFEEST, Mr Raymond Garrand, served notice on the college of his intention to cancel its registration under the TASC act. The college responded to the delegate on 4 June. Yesterday I gave an update to the house on regulatory matters. Today I am able to inform the house that the delegate, Mr Garrand, has now advised me that he has fully considered the response from APIC and has arrived at his final determination.

I have been informed that, based on the original audit findings, the registration history of APIC and the response APIC made to the findings of the March audit, the delegate has concluded that APIC has breached its conditions of registration as a training provider.

I advise that under the Training and Skills Development Act it is a condition of registration that a registered training organisation must comply with the Educational Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) national code. According to the determination of the delegate, APIC has failed to comply with 12 of the 14 standards of this code. In particular, I can now advise that it has failed:

1. to adequately monitor the enrolment of students across the scope of courses and ensure that they complete their courses within the specified duration (Standard 9);
2. to adequately monitor the progress of students and provide appropriate intervention and support strategies (Standard 10);
3. to systematically and accurately monitor student attendance (Standard 11).

It is also a condition of APIC's registration that it comply with the AQTF 2007 Essential Standards for Registration. According to the delegate's determination, APIC has failed to comply with each of the standards. In particular, it has failed:

1. to provide quality training and assessment across all of its operations (Standard 1);
2. to maximise outcomes for its clients (Standard 2); and
3. to have management systems which are responsive to the needs of clients, staff and stakeholders and the environment in which APIC operates (Standard 3).

Under the Training and Skills Development Act it is an offence for a registered training provider to contravene a condition imposed through its registration as a provider.

Based on these findings, the delegate of the Training and Skills Commission has this afternoon advised APIC that its registration as a registered training organisation will be cancelled, effective from the close of business on Monday 28 June 2010.

I am told that from the date of cancellation APIC will be removed from the National Training Information Service. This action automatically cancels APIC's registration as a provider to international students. The commonwealth Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations has been advised of this action.

Owing to this action, the consumer protection requirements of the ESOS Act will be activated. DFEEST and DEEWR and the Office of the Training Advocate have measures in place to support students through this process. Every effort will be made to place students in alternative colleges or with TAFE as soon as possible. I have repeatedly stated that students' welfare is of paramount concern and all available steps will be taken.

As the majority of students are from India, I have just spoken to the Consul General, Amit Dasgupta, the President of the Indian Community, Major-General Vikram Madan, and the Premier's envoy to India, Brian Hayes QC, to tell them about the decision. Students will be provided with written advice as to their rights and obligations to the South Australian Training Advocate. Under the TASC Act the college has 28 days in which to appeal the decision.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:09): I bring up the 3rd report of the committee.

Report received and read.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I warn members that I will be listening carefully to questions today and how they are worded.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am sure you always listen very carefully to our questions. What we want is good answers. My question is to the Treasurer. Is the reason that the Treasurer directed the Stadium Management Authority not to raise Adelaide Oval costings in a briefing on 3 March because on 19 February the Treasurer was told that the costs had blown out and, under the caretaker

provisions, it would have been necessary to provide the same briefing to the opposition which would thus have revealed the cost blowout during the election campaign?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:15): Yes; a quote from David Bevan. I gave a detailed answer to the house on this and all matters yesterday, and I have been very forthright and forthcoming.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have nothing more to add.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind members that they will see on our daily program today that at approximately 3:20 we will suspend and I will go over to Government House, and I will invite any members to accompany me. Just keep that in mind. The member for Light.

MULTICULTURALISM

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:16): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the house on a complaint to the Human Rights Commission concerning his advocacy for the proper recognition of Hellenic Macedonia?

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) (14:16): I thank the honourable member for this very serious question. I want also to acknowledge the honourable member's deep and ongoing interest in multicultural affairs. Members may recall that there was some publicity earlier this year when members of the self-described Australian Macedonian Human Rights Committee complained about criticisms I had made of the incumbent president and, indeed, government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. I received correspondence in February this year from the President of the Australian Human Rights Commission, Justice Catherine Branson QC. In part, her letter stated:

The Australian Human Rights Commission has received a complaint from Mr George Vlahov on behalf of himself and others. The complaint alleges racial hatred under the Racial Discrimination Act 1975.

Justice Branson went on to say:

Mr Vlahov states that, in 2009, you made a speech at a Greek community event and that during that speech you made certain comments that implied that ethnic Macedonians are thieves and that ethnic Macedonians are stirring up trouble.

I replied to the commission's president to refute the allegation. My response of 10 March 2010, in part, stated:

On Sunday 15 November 2009, I attended the Dimitria Festival as an official guest at the invitation of the Pan-Macedonian Association. I addressed the President of the association, Mr George Genimahaliotis, other members of the association, their official guests and members of the public who attended the festival.

I strongly refute any allegation that in my speech, or on any other occasion on which I have spoken on this issue, I said anything that could offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate any person or persons on the basis of their race, national or ethnic origin. The speech contained criticisms directed at the policies and decisions of the incumbent president of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia [also known internationally as] (FYROM).

My remarks were clearly directed at the conduct of a government and not of its people and moreover were not based on race, ethnicity or nationality. My views on the provocative actions of successive governments of FYROM are consistent with the criticisms also made by other European Union countries and the United Nations.

In my speech, I specifically drew a distinction between the conduct of the political leadership of FYROM and its people. I also referred briefly to the importance of not overshadowing the contribution to history of the people of FYROM. The allegation that my comments carry the implication that 'ethnic Macedonians' are thieves cannot be made out.

That was part of what I said in my letter. In my response, I went on to state:

In my public and personal life over decades, I have spoken out against racial and ethnic discrimination. I have supported causes and organisations that represent a vast range of racial and ethnic groups to promote multiculturalism and freedom from discrimination. I have abhorred racism as a former minister of Aboriginal affairs, a former minister assisting in ethnic affairs, and as premier I have been officially honoured by three overseas nations and South Australian and national community organisations for my commitment to multiculturalism.

My commitment to racial and ethnic tolerance is not diminished by my commitment to speak out on political issues, particularly when such issues are relevant to ethnic communities that have settled in South Australia. I have, for example, been very critical of the policy of successive governments of Great Britain over their refusal to restore the Parthenon Marbles to their rightful place in Greece. I have been critical of the policies of the Turkish government in maintaining a large military presence in Cyprus in contravention of UN declarations and thereby supporting an illegal regime. I was critical of the then government of South Africa for its horrendous policy of apartheid and other racially discriminatory practices. In the past I was critical of the French government for undertaking testing of nuclear weapons in the Pacific Ocean.

Of course I have a particular interest in this area—history—and, along with my friend Jeff Kennett in Victoria, have received the Philip of Macedon Award and, indeed, the Alexander the Great Award, again for my interest in this area.

So, I regard it as horrendous to be falsely accused of racism. There is absolutely nothing wrong with anyone criticising any government. People criticise the South Australian government but no-one accuses them of racism; people accuse the former Howard government, but they were criticising the policies and not their race.

I recently received a letter from commission president Justice Branson in which she informed me:

I am writing to you that it is my present intention to terminate the complaint under section 46PH(1)(c) of the Australian Human Rights Commission Act 1986 as I am satisfied the complaint to be lacking in substance.

I stand on my record of commitment to racial and ethnic tolerance, and that is in no way diminished by my commitment to speak out on political issues, particularly when such issues are relevant to ethnic communities that have settled here in South Australia. I will not be intimidated by anyone from speaking out forthrightly on behalf of historical truth—and indeed on human rights and justice.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is again to the Treasurer. Why is it inappropriate for the Treasurer to receive a briefing on the costings of the Adelaide Oval during the caretaker period, as he claimed in his ministerial statement yesterday?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:22): I have given a detailed answer to the house, and I do not intend to canvass issues that occurred in the election campaign.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That was a decision taken by me in what I believed to be appropriate and standard practice during election campaigns, and I stand by it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Little Para.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is finished; we are on to the next question.

INNER CITY HOUSING

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Can the minister please advise the house of recent developments regarding the government's new apartment complex in Waymouth Street?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:23): I am very pleased to be able to update the house on this exciting joint federal and state government housing initiative in Waymouth Street. In December last year cabinet approval was given for the development of an approximately \$50 million, 16 level, 138-unit apartment building behind the Queens Theatre, to be known as the UNO Apartments. This exciting project, South Australia's first truly integrated apartment community, will begin construction next month and will be completed by March 2012.

Today I am pleased to report that there is already quite an air of excitement about the project. It will deliver a six-star energy rating and locate residents close to transport, education, employment and other services. The building includes: supported high-needs youth accommodation, social housing, affordable rental and affordable purchase and general market purchase apartments. The market sales began on 22 March and already sales have exceeded the

\$10 million point. As at 11 June, 37 of the 54 apartments on offer for sale from the plan have been sold. The sales are comprised of 23 affordable apartments and 14 general market sales. In total, this equates to \$10.722 million or 45 per cent of the residential sales target of \$23.8 million.

In less than three months more than half of the apartments on offer have been sold. This is a massive vote of confidence from private buyers in this government's vision for socially inclusive communities. Achieving 37 apartment pre-sales so far is an encouraging result and one that demonstrates that there is real public interest in this form of building and nothing like the level of public resistance and price impacts forecast by some sceptics.

The sales performance demonstrates the public acceptance of integrated community developments, and Housing SA will continue to promote the success of the sales program to the broader development industry to encourage the development of more socially integrated communities in future projects.

Our UNO Apartments are being funded through the Nation Building-Economic Stimulus package, and proceeds from the sales will be used to build a second phase of social housing in the city, with a third phase then funded from those market sales. In total, this will deliver 121 homes for South Australians on top of 138 Waymouth Street.

The progress of this project is a great demonstration of this government's commitment to innovation, social inclusion and financial viability. The UNO Apartments are an example that I have no doubt will be followed by other states. We are incredibly grateful for the support that has been provided by the Rudd Labor government for this project, which has drawn great praise from the federal Minister for Housing, Tanya Plibersek, and for their real support for the provision of social housing here in South Australia. I very much look forward to updating the house further on the progress of this development.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:27): My question is to the Treasurer. Given the Treasurer received briefings during the caretaker period on GST revenues and the Chilean earthquake aid funding, both financial matters, and these briefings were also provided to the opposition, why has it not—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: the opposition persist today with something they were doing yesterday. Standing order 97 requires any explanation to be made with the leave of the house. Starting a question with 'given' and then going on to an explanation before you ask the question does not absolve you from the standing orders.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I certainly uphold that point of order. The first two questions were worded differently from yesterday but, member for Davenport, can you please keep that in mind and get to your question.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will change the question, Madam Speaker. Can the Treasurer explain to the house why the Treasurer receiving briefings during the caretaker period on GST revenues and the Chilean earthquake aid funding is appropriate, while the Treasurer receiving a briefing on the Adelaide Oval costing blowout during the caretaker period is not appropriate?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:28): That is a very simple answer, because they are two different issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will listen to the Treasurer in silence.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The development or redevelopment of Adelaide Oval is a policy of this government which the Liberal Party had said they would disband should they win office.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I don't think they were opposed to GST payments.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is appropriate, in my judgement, that matters such as that in terms of briefings to government should cease during the period of an election campaign.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: You were having a briefing.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'm sorry? Brief who?

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In matters relating to the finances as they impact on this government, I took the view that it would be inappropriate for those matters—and that was also the view of other advisers—

Mr Williams: Will you table that advice?

The SPEAKER: Order! There is one question at a time. If the member for MacKillop has a question, he can wait in line.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In the matter of the GST, in terms of advice to me as Treasurer at the time, my recollection is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That was a matter for the Under Treasurer to decide—

An honourable member: Let him take the fall.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The fall?

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will get on with his answer to the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It was a decision of the Under Treasurer to advise me of the impacts on the state. The Under Treasurer's advice to me—and ultimately it was my decision; I could have not done so—was that I should share that with the shadow minister, given the very nature of the advice as it affected government finances.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, because, by your own public policy position, should you have won government you were going to scrap the project. The Adelaide Oval redevelopment would have no impact on your finances, because you were not going ahead with it. I can't see the point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (14:31): I ask the Minister for Health: what is the government doing to provide medical—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Schubert!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I ask the Minister for Health: what is the government doing to provide medical services closer to home to South Australians living outside the metropolitan area?

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) (14:32): I thank the member for Croydon for that question. I know that he not only represents a city electorate but he has a strong interest in regional South Australia. He regularly visits country locations, and I know he is particularly interested in regional horseracing and other activities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Shall we listen to the Minister for Health?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Regional by-elections are a particular hobby of his. Since coming to office, this government has increased the range of services available in country hospitals.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Ask a question, member for Finniss. I will give you the answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Would you please listen to the Minister for Health in silence.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As a government we are very committed to providing more services closer to home for country patients.

An honourable member: You are joking!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The opposition said: 'You are joking.' I will go through the reality. We have provided a great deal more services in country health since we have been in office. There are two reasons for this: firstly, it is good for the patients to have services closer to home and, secondly, we want as few people coming to Adelaide to use hospital services in the city as we can manage, because if we can take the pressure off the city hospitals that means there are more places available in the city. We do not have to build extra hospitals, so it is a logical use of resources.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I welcome a question from the member, any time indeed. We understand the importance for country residents being able to access high-quality, reliable health care services without having to confront the additional inconvenience and distress of having to travel vast distances. This also helps alleviate additional demands on our busy metropolitan services, as I said. In 2009-10, \$630.4 million will be spent on public hospitals and health services in country South Australia. This is \$250 million, or 66 per cent, more than in 2001-02, the last year of the former Liberal government.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I can assure the member that there has not been an inflation rate of 66 per cent since 2002. Madam Speaker, the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, I cannot hear the minister speaking!

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Venning interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Schubert; behave yourself! You have an interest in country hospitals.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: He'll need one if carries on like that, Madam Speaker. The Rann government has also increased the capacity of country health services by doubling the number of country doctors. There have been 23 extra equivalent full-time doctors working through our services and an additional 663 nurses employed across country South Australia since 2002—663 more nurses working in country hospitals in the term of this government.

An important feature of improving services in country regions, of course, is ensuring that country hospitals have access to high-tech medical equipment. The member for Flinders would be pleased to know that the government has provided \$297,000 for a new cardiac and anaesthetic monitoring system for the Port Lincoln Hospital. I look forward to his positive press release congratulating me on that. This new equipment will ensure the safe and effective delivery of care for patients by providing a cardiac and anaesthetic monitoring system that is functional, reliable and meets the clinical need of an increasing number of patients.

Both nursing and medical staff at the hospital have had input into the requirements of the new equipment to ensure patients are getting the best possible care. The member for Frome will be pleased to know that we are spending \$140,000 to provide a new steriliser and replacement scopes for the Port Pirie Hospital. All surgical services are heavily reliant on safe and effective sterilisation and scoping services, and any failure in these areas will reduce the functional capacity across all service areas. This new equipment ensures a safe and effective delivery of care for patients in the Port Pirie region. While I am on Port Pirie, of course, we are in the process of planning a new renal dialysis service at that hospital.

The Peterborough Soldiers Memorial Hospital will also receive \$15,000 for defibrillators, and the Laura and Boolaroo hospitals will each receive \$20,000 for a ventilator, the Oxylog 2000 machine. This investment comes on top of the announcement that the Port Pirie Hospital will become a regional chemotherapy hub as well. This investment is about ensuring country hospitals

are maintained and improved so patients can have the best environment in which to be treated and to restore their health.

Madam Speaker, I know that you will be pleased to know that the Whyalla Hospital has received \$40,000 for two replacement scopes, which are used predominately for elective surgery. Elsewhere in the region, Coober Pedy will receive \$35,100 for a new X-ray machine. In addition, Roxby Downs Hospital will receive \$56,000 for a portable X-ray unit. The Murray Bridge Hospital has received funding of \$192,000 for a new cardiac monitor, and the Mannum Hospital will receive \$117,000 for a new infusion system. This comes on top of the recently announced \$200,000 for the upgrade of the Mannum Hospital Emergency Department, which is due to commence in 2010-11.

During the recent election campaign the government committed a \$22 million fund over four years to improve facilities and purchase new biomedical equipment to improve and expand services in country communities. In the first three years some of these projects undertaken will include \$200,000 on the Mannum accident and emergency upgrade; \$200,000 on the Cummins accident and emergency upgrade; \$400,000 on the Mount Gambier theatre upgrade; and over \$400,000 for emergency power generation at Angaston, Kapunda and Berri. The money from this fund will be drawn from SA Health's minor capital works funds, and close to 40 per cent of this fund will now be reserved for hospitals in country communities. Country communities are justifiably proud of their hospitals, and in many cases have—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Ask a question, member for Finnis.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Ask a question.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: You have an opportunity, ask a question. Country communities, Madam Speaker, are just—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Ask a question. I will not respond to interjections from you. Country communities are justifiably proud, Madam Speaker, as you know, of their hospitals, and in many cases have contributed to their hospitals through fundraising efforts, and I applaud them for it. The country hospitals fund, announced during the election, will ensure that country hospitals continue to provide excellent health care to country residence in South Australia. I invite all members on the other side, if they have issues to do with country hospitals, to please ask questions. I look forward to hearing from you.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:40): My question is to the Treasurer. Did the Treasurer have a duty as Treasurer to accept a briefing on the cost blowout on the Adelaide Oval upgrade at the Stadium Management Authority briefing on 3 March so that he could properly monitor a taxpayer-funded project? The Treasurer is the minister responsible for the Adelaide Oval project and went into the 3 March meeting knowing of a cost blowout as it was previously advised to him on 19 February.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:41): As I have said in my statement yesterday in relation to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —the meeting with Leigh Whicker, I did not consider that to be a formal briefing and I said as such in my statement yesterday. In a subsequent minute of the SMA meeting with the government steering committee, it was noted in that minute that these figures could not and should not be relied upon; they could either go up or down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The government, at that stage, until just recently when it changed, there was no increased financial exposure for government because our policy was a figure of \$450 million capped.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As we have said now and what we said then is that—and this is where the debate gets confusing in that we have never said—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The government was in a position to provide a capital grant to the SMA: \$450 million capped. That was not contingent upon the final cost. They are always able, should they wish at their discretion, to source other funding sources as they are now.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:42): I rise to ask a question of the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house about the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund and how it is benefiting country communities?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (14:42): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. The Regional Development Infrastructure Fund (RDIF) was established to address the general disadvantage faced by regional businesses and communities in incurring higher costs for economic infrastructure development. The fund is ongoing with \$3 million allocated per annum in three competitive rounds over the course of a year. Applications are assessed by an assessment board on the basis of economic and social impact, and recommendations are made to me for approval.

I have recently announced funding for two major projects. One was a \$213,000 grant to Port Lincoln council to fund pumping and associated infrastructure to allow use of recycled water for the beautification of the popular foreshore reserve. This project is stage 3 and the final stage of a greening strategy that will irrigate all public reserves and ovals in Port Lincoln with recycled water. I know the member for Flinders appreciates this investment in his community; in fact, I commend the member for Flinders. I met with him during my recent visit to Port Lincoln and he impressed me with his willingness to work constructively with the government on behalf of his electorate.

The Riverland has also been a significant beneficiary from the RDIF. Last week I announced \$120,000 in government support for a premium juice company, Charlie's Group Australia, to expand its processing operations in Renmark. The grant will fund a 350 kVA transformer which may also provide a benefit to Mirage orchards on an adjacent property by acting as a catalyst to increase its production capacity. So they are two possible benefits in the Riverland from that particular proposition. Charlie's itself will increase the number of full-time employees by eight positions to between 20 and 23 and increase the value of purchased fruit to \$3.4 million in the 2011-12 year. Charlie's is an Australian registered company employing Riverland people and purchasing Riverland fruit.

Its products are distributed in Australia and New Zealand where its parent company is based. Charlie's was mentioned in *The Advertiser* yesterday as a positive example of new employment in the Riverland against a backdrop of some hardship—of which the member for Chaffey is only too well aware. In the newspaper article, the Chief Executive of the Murraylands and Riverland RDA, Mr Brenton Lewis, endorsed what the company is doing. This stands in stark contrast to a comment on statewide ABC radio last week: 'Why weren't local brands supported before an overseas company was supported in the Riverland?' That comment was made by the shadow minister for agriculture, the member for Hammond.

This government does not discriminate when it comes to encouraging employment and investment, particularly in the Riverland. We are not going to send investors packing. I welcome interest from any company that wants to grow and establish its operations in the Riverland or

anywhere else in regional South Australia. The message from the Rann government is that South Australia is open for business.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:46): My question is to the Treasurer. Did the Treasurer authorise the press release of 8 March which states:

The government has received no advice from the Stadium Management Authority that the cost of the redevelopment has blown out.

Did the Treasurer authorise that press release, remembering that he had been briefed on 19 February about a cost blowout or had he already forgotten the meeting of 19 February?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:46): Again, I have canvassed this issue widely in my ministerial—

Mr Gardner: Have you checked your diary again this time?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Again? I have sufficiently covered this issue.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will give courtesy to the member for Florey.

WINDSOR GARDENS VOCATIONAL COLLEGE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Education. What support is being provided to students in the trade school base at Windsor Gardens Vocational College to ensure that they are better prepared for skilled jobs?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for her question.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I recently visited the college—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —at Windsor Gardens—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will listen to the Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Windsor Gardens Vocational College was visited recently by me and a range of other officials for the opening of the new trade school facilities. We saw an amazing commitment from the teachers, students, local employers, and community and training providers to the success of that enterprise. Funding of \$660,000 to upgrade this lead trade school for the future in the region is part of a series of upgrades in our network of trade schools across South Australia worth about \$11.5 million. Just last week my colleague in another place (Hon. Ian Hunter) opened a new facility at Kadina Memorial School.

These investments are important in helping young people lift their skills. However, the real success is in the teamwork and enthusiasm shown by the school staff to support students. Both staff and students told me how they are making real practical relationships with local employers, training providers and their communities.

Their goal is to make sure that young people learn real skills for real jobs; and, in doing so, the young people of these schools are getting a head start in apprenticeships, traineeships and experience in the workplace while they are still at school and completing their SACE. For example, I heard from students who are doing a great job in hospitality, with the cafe at the school their practical training ground. I also listened to students who are taking on automobile apprenticeship work. I was also offered a demonstration of the computer-aided design at the school.

At this trade school there are young people learning construction skills by renovating buildings for charities, young people running virtual businesses and students doing everything from sports coaching to graphic design. The trade school team is listening to what employers want for young people, including the so-called 'employability skills', and this is something we have been hearing employers say to us quite consistently. More than just the reading and writing, which, of course, are important, they also need the social skills. It is the skills that permit the employers to have—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is that irritating voice from the member for Bragg.

The Hon. M.J. Wright: From afar; from the backbench.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Don't worry; one more shift, you won't hear her anymore.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. The trade school team there is focusing on these employability skills, which go beyond the sorts of skills that are traditionally focused upon in schools. They are vital, because they are about the relationships that people form with customers and with fellow workers, which are critical to the success of those young people in work. The truth is that there is postcode discrimination amongst some of our employers because of the perceived lack of these social skills. These social skills are critically important to be developed, and these trade schools are focused very much on that.

I want to congratulate the team at Windsor Gardens and all the staff and the seven high schools which make up this Trade Schools for the Future network. These schools are demonstrating an outward-looking approach by working with employers and trainers to generate better skills and opportunities for young people. This is an important recognition of the fact that our education system needs to take more seriously the aspirations of the majority of students who do not go on to an academic institution.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I know that the member for Bragg is not interested in anybody who is not interested in going to university. I know that she is interested only in schools that send people off to get some highfalutin degree, but we are also interested in the vast majority of those ordinary men and women who send their children to school—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —wanting them to have a successful career. If we had been listening to those opposite we would still be stuck in this rut. For too long we have been addressing the needs of people who want to go to university and not the needs of those young people who want to progress to successful careers in trades and other very worthy professions. Along with the new SACE—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, there is precious little evidence of your efforts in that regard, I have got to say, if you look at the system. The new SACE, together with our Trade Schools for the Future, is part of the renewed school system that provides meaningful options for all our students that are really relevant to them and what they want to do in life. I know that those members opposite are interested only in an education system that reinforces privilege—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr GARDNER: Standing order 127: the minister continues to reflect and impute motives on members on this side.

The SPEAKER: I have heard far worse than the Minister for Education. Could the minister perhaps wind up his answer without winding up the members opposite.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This commitment to the Trade Schools for the Future represents the Labor government's commitment to a comprehensive education system that seeks

to provide opportunities for all, not just opportunities for the most privileged in our community. We know that those on the other side stand for privilege and the protection of privilege.

Mr PISONI: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: As a tradesman who grew up in Salisbury, I find that offensive, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Education, perhaps you could be a bit more careful with your word choices and finish your answer.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know that this touches a raw nerve with those opposite. I know that people such as the member for Unley feel a little out of place in this party of privilege—

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker: the minister has strayed well into debate now.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. The leader.

TREASURER'S REMARKS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. Does the Treasurer's decision to not disclose the cost blowout of the Adelaide Oval to the Premier, the cabinet and the public before the election meet the Premier's standard of open and transparent government?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:56): I answered this question yesterday. It is quite clear from what was said yesterday that Iain Evans wants me to do to Kevin Foley what his colleagues did to him and what he did to Martin Hamilton-Smith and what he wants to do to his current leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ashford.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. As many of us on this side have a background in the private sector and small business, can the minister advise what mechanisms the government has in place to effectively monitor issues facing small business, and are there any new initiatives to assist the small business sector?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (14:57): As I have said previously, the government recognises the important role that small business plays in contributing to the overall health of the South Australian economy. Most small business operators—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think it is a bit rich for the one political party that went to the election promising 24-hour deregulated trading hours to somehow talk about their support for small business. I wonder how—

Mr PENGILLY: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker: the minister is debating the question.

The SPEAKER: He has only just started his answer. I will give him a little bit of time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Most small business operators do not want to be told how to run their businesses and, indeed, it is not the government's job to provide direct advice. However, through the Department of Trade and Economic Development, the government does play a strong, support-based role for small businesses by providing a wide variety of information, assistance and workshops. These range from the introductory Starting Your Own Business workshops through the 45 topics offered in the half-day

better business series to the full day, in-depth business management skills development workshops. These workshops are offered throughout the state involving—

Members interjecting:

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

An honourable member: You're lucky.

The SPEAKER: I enjoy listening to the minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you for your protection. These workshops are offered throughout the state, involving the metropolitan Business Enterprise Centres and the offices of Regional Development Australia in regional South Australia. In the last full financial year over 3,900 small businesses participated in various workshops, and it is expected that this figure will be exceeded in the current financial year. A variety of issues facing small businesses are constantly monitored by business development officers within the BEC and RDA network. These offices have daily contact with small businesses and are constantly being made aware of the issues within the small business sector.

A recent example of this saw the need to develop a series of new special focus workshops which have been prepared and are being presented from this month onwards. The Office of Small Business and Regional Development within DTED has located appropriate presenters and arranged for the presentation of the following areas: franchising; the new industrial relations legislation; and preparing your business for sale. Franchising can be an excellent way to run a business but it still takes hard work and effort to gain rewards. Tony Lisacek, solicitor, will be presenting the workshop on the promises and pitfalls of franchising.

The workshop outlining the new industrial relations legislation will enable small businesses to gain a thorough understanding of the rights and obligations imposed on business owners by the new legislation. The workshop is to be presented by Karen Prevost, proprietor of Key HR Solutions. The 'Preparing your business for sale' workshop, member for Unley, explains how to maximise the sales potential of your businesses—whether the sale is voluntary or forced, member for Unley. It will be presented by Bevan Roberts, CEO of Dale Wood Business Consultants. These workshops have been made available to all BECs and RDAs—

Mr Marshall: Are you running through the whole program of workshops?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Ah, the member for Norwood. I love the member for Norwood. I was listening to radio recently—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and I heard the member for Norwood.

An honourable member: What did he say?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Norwood, apparently—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, Madam Speaker: the minister is starting to debate rather than answering the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. Minister, could you finish your reply, please?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I was listening to the Amanda Blair show and I heard the member for Norwood talking about his role as a member of parliament and the work he does in his electorate.

Mr PISONI: Point of order: this is not relevant to the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. Minister, could you respond to the question, please?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I will, Madam Speaker. I heard the member for Norwood talking about his role as a member of parliament (his electoral officer was with him) and about his involvement—

Mr PISONI: I have a point of order about relevance and debate.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: On a point of order: it would be interesting to find out if was relevant so that he could tell us what it was.

The SPEAKER: It would be interesting to be able to hear what he is saying. Minister, could you return to the question and give us your response? We really have a limited time left in question time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I will. The member for Norwood was talking about his involvement on the program with small businesses and of course he had his staffer with him and he wanted to talk about who he is and that he was interested in getting a date.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order. Madam Speaker: the minister has the answers to his Dorothy Dixers written out for good reason. I suggest you direct him to continue reading from his sheet.

The SPEAKER: No point of order there but, minister, we have 15 minutes and we still need to have another three questions.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Apparently, he is an Aquarian-Capricorn cusp. He likes to cook, he likes to walk and he has a house in Kensington. So, ladies, watch out—and he wants to know why they are not calling.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, Madam Speaker: there is no relevance to the question whatsoever. The minister apparently cannot even read the answer to his own Dorothy Dixer.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I think he is going for a record for the number of points of order in one answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Read about it on Facebook later.

The SPEAKER: Minister, could you please get back to your question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: These workshops are to be made available to all BECs and RDAs who will organise and promote them to small businesses in their region. I am advised that the June workshops have been in high demand and eight workshops alone this month are in metro areas. The Rann government will continue to proactively monitor and respond to the current issues facing small business and provide a range of services including new special workshops which are presented by experts in their fields. Instead of joining parliament, he should join *Perfect Match*.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister, and I hope we do not ask you any more questions today. The member for Norwood.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:03): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier know prior to the March 2010 election that the cost estimate of the Adelaide Oval upgrade had increased?

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) (15:03): The Deputy Premier has already addressed that by saying that he did not inform me or the cabinet.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): That was the first question the Premier has ever answered in my experience. My question is to the Treasurer.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No, but we got the answer.

The SPEAKER: On with the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I know he has been here a long time and he has struggled to get where he is, but he does know that he cannot just launch into a little speech when he stands up.

The SPEAKER: Absolutely. I uphold that point of order. Get on with the question, please.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Treasurer. When did the Treasurer advise his staff to tell the media on 9 March this year, prior to the \$85 million increase in the Adelaide Oval funding, 'I promise on the soul of my grandmother we have not received any advice to say the \$450 million is not enough'? Was it before or after that he forgot about the cost blowout advised to him on 19 February?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:05): There are lots of dates thrown in there. I just remind the house that I gave a detailed statement yesterday, but I want to come back—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If you had listened a bit more carefully you might have been able to, instead of making so much noise.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The issue, as I have volunteered, is that I attended a meeting with Leigh Whicker on 19 February to talk about a number of matters, and towards the end of that meeting Mr Whicker made comment to me and—from memory—showed some figures relating to an initial cost. I cannot recall whether that was in a verbal briefing or whether it was a bit of paper; there were just a couple of figures. At that stage it was a very preliminary number. From memory, there were a number of other stages to go through in terms of the costings. I did not believe—and it was my decision—those numbers to be credible at that stage, given that it was so early in the process. As the minutes of the government steering committee meeting some weeks later demonstrated, it appeared to have a similar view when it said that those figures could not and should not be relied upon, as they could either go up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is answering the question, not the opposition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —as they could either go up or they could go down.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Speaker, this is difficult. I am happy to answer, but if members want to give me a barrage I will sit down, as simple as that. That minute of the steering committee meeting said that these figures cannot and should not be relied upon, as they may go up or down—or words to that effect—and that the scope of the project had not been completed. As we stand here today—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will take that question as answered. The member for Davenport.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:08): My question is to Treasurer. Why will the state provide a \$30 million commercial loan to SACA if the Adelaide Oval project does not proceed? SACA chairman Ian McLachlan stated on radio on 2 June this year:

If the deal does not go ahead with the SANFL our 25 year budgets show the debt can be handled just as we have handled the \$65 million of capital expenditure we have spent over the past 20 years or so.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:08): For the completeness of the exercise I will take that question on notice and come back to the house tomorrow with a detailed answer. I have referred to that loan previously in the house. In conclusion to the earlier question—to show that I am not avoiding the question; I just do not wish to be shouted at as I am trying to give an answer on an important matter—my mistake was that, when I rose in this house on

25 May, I think, and made the statement that I did, at that point I had forgotten about that meeting with Mr Whicker. I should not have, but I did.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: You remembered it for the whole election.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I stood in this place some three months after—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There has been a question asked.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Some three months after that meeting and when I was on my feet in full flight I did not recall that meeting. That is the honest truth. When my office, my staff and I, were addressing the issues raised by the member for Davenport and the leader, they were questions, from memory, relating to meetings that occurred in March. We went back and confirmed those meetings in March and records of those meetings, which were the basis of the ministerial statement the following day.

The error was compounded because we did not look and we did not recall the February meeting which was diarised. When it was brought to my attention on the Thursday evening that that meeting had occurred, I immediately realised I had made a substantial error and I moved as quickly as practicable and made the matter known publicly that I had, and I advised the house in this place at the earliest opportunity, consistent with the Westminster system.

SPOONER JUDGEMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:10): My question is to the Attorney-General. Following the accident on 1 June 2006 involving the death of Daniel Raphael, has the Registrar of Motor Vehicles used his powers under section 80 of the Motor Vehicles Act to review Neil Spooner's driving licence and its conditions? Under section 80 of the Motor Vehicles Act, if in the opinion of the registrar it is desirable that the ability or fitness of the holder of a licence to drive a motor vehicle should be tested, the registrar may require the person to undergo such tests or to furnish such evidence of ability or fitness to drive as the registrar directs.

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) (15:11): I have asked the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to look at the issue of the standards that apply to people who have some level of impairment and whether those standards at the moment are appropriate. As I was in the process of explaining to the house yesterday, those standards are national standards.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: actually that wasn't my question, but perhaps the minister did not understand. I asked whether he had asked whether a review had been done under section 80, not a review of the standards generally.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. There is no standing order that allows this member to reprise the question. She needs to take a known standing order, not simply stand up and repeat her question.

The SPEAKER: Minister, are you prepared to answer the question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I remind you, Leader of the Opposition, that there are standing orders that allow people to ask questions—97, 98—and how the answers should go. There is no standing order that says, 'If you don't like the way it's going, you just get up and ask it again.' There is no standing order that allows you to do it.

The SPEAKER: Point taken. Minister, can you respond?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I can give the information that I have to hand and, if there is anything I have missed or if I have misunderstood the import of the question, I will come back to the house. What I have done is ask the Registrar of Motor Vehicles to look at with what level of impairment someone should still be allowed to drive and whether those standards are adequate. As soon as that has been done, I will bring the information back to the house. If there is anything that I have missed in the member's question, I will be happy to come back to the house with a full report.

SCIENCE INITIATIVES

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. Can the minister advise the house about the state government's commitment to science excellence?

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) (15:13): I thank the member for Mawson for the question and his interest in the progress of science and technology in the state. I am pleased to advise the house about the South Australian government's strong commitment to science, technology, engineering and mathematics. As the Minister for Science and Information Economy, I am keen to promote these areas that are the foundation of the state's future prosperity, and as a government we are determined to promote science across the community so that we can position our state as a leader, an innovator and a driving force for change.

A few weeks ago, I had the pleasure of launching National Science Week at the Royal Institution of Australia. The institution itself is a world first and has proudly been established by the state government as a means of promoting science excellence. National Science Week will take place in August and is expected to attract more than one million people through science events and activities held across Australia. This year's National Science Week will feature a wide range of dynamic educational and recreational activities, which include Science Alive, an excellent example of hands-on science, which includes a family expo, a student careers day and an eco-living expo.

Scinema, a science film festival, is a medium that has huge potential to spark the general public's interest in science. An evening of mystery and intrigue will lead audiences through the role of modern forensics in solving complex crimes. For regional South Australians, there is the outback astronomy tour, which provides astronomy programs for students and local communities in outback South Australia. These are just a few of the many interesting and informative programs that will be on offer throughout National Science Week.

This year, 2010, also marks the fifth year that the state government has presented the South Australian Science Excellence Awards. In that time, almost 50 outstanding South Australians have been recognised in their various fields of excellence. These innovative people are bringing cutting edge skills to their fields of expertise covering health, the environment, food safety, molecular bioscience, marine biology and many new and emerging technologies.

These prestigious South Australian Science Excellence Awards recognise outstanding current scientific research and are a highlight of National Science Week. The state government's commitment is demonstrated by its investment of \$2 million in the awards in the last five years.

The awards recognise and reward excellence in all forms of science across industry, government and education. They include the South Australian Scientist of the Year, the South Australian Young Tall Poppy of the Year, various other rewards for research excellence which recognise commercial success, research that delivers social and environmental benefits and work that has emphasised collaboration by researchers and those who benefit from the research.

In addition, there are awards for Science Educators of the Year across the school, tertiary and community sectors. These awards recognise educators who help promote science, technology, engineering and mathematics at the grassroots level. An annual amount of \$125,000 is made available for these much prized awards.

The state government will also invest more than \$9 million to address the shortage of science and maths teachers across the state. This funding will provide high-level qualifications in science and maths for up to 155 South Australian high school teachers, providing an impetus for training, electronics, ICT and precision engineering.

Our state needs to inspire and harness young talent. By actively supporting the development of science, technology, engineering and mathematics skills, we will help secure a future that will deliver new and cleaner technologies, improve community health, enhance defence applications, streamline minerals processing and expand agricultural opportunities. I look forward to informing the house of future developments as they unfold.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

YORKEYS CROSSING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:17): I am here today to talk about Yorkeys Crossing. For those who do not know, Yorkeys Crossing is a currently unsealed dirt road. Many people on this side of the house know what it is, have been there and have travelled on it. I suspect that very few on the other side have. This road circumvents Port Augusta.

Mrs Redmond: Crossroads of the nation.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As people would know, Port Augusta is a major crossroads of the nation—thank you, leader—covering all traffic that goes north, south, east, and west across the nation. It is a very important piece of road infrastructure.

The important issue here is that all of the traffic that goes from Perth to Sydney and Adelaide to Darwin currently goes across the bridge and through the middle of Port Augusta. With one lane each way, this bridge is under extreme pressure with regard to traffic. As many people might know, Port Augusta is actually a city divided by the very top of Upper Spencer Gulf. People living on the east and west sides have to travel across that bridge. The west side of Port Augusta is growing all the time, but the emergency services (ambulance, hospital and fire station) are all on the east side.

I urge the government to look very seriously at this. Yesterday, a petition was tabled from 3,084 petitioners. At a quick glance, I would say that in excess of 90 per cent have a Port Augusta address, although I did not count them all. This is a very important issue. It is important from a transport perspective. This dirt road is a national piece of road infrastructure which goes around the top of the gulf and so precludes the need to use the bridge. It has been in use for many decades and, until recently, it was the alternate route for road trains. With mining throughout the north of the state growing, traffic through Port Augusta is going to grow and grow, with the expectation that road freight across Australia will double in the next 15 years. Again, that puts more and more pressure on this piece of road infrastructure.

The council has pressed and encouraged the government for quite a few years now, I am told, to invest money in upgrading and sealing Yorkeys Crossing, but to no avail so far, so I am working very hard to try to encourage the government to find funds for this. What has to happen is that the road has to be sealed and also slightly realigned, because the current alignment of the dirt road exactly where it is would not be appropriate for a heavy vehicle bypass, but it would take only a slight realignment down the south-eastern end of Yorkeys Crossing for it to become appropriate.

Another very important issue is that we do not want to take all the economic advantages of the heavy road transport that come through Port Augusta out of Port Augusta. It would require setting up a truck stop/heavy vehicle service station on the new road. Having spent 10 years working in the oil industry, I know that would not be a difficult thing to do as long as the land is available, but it does pass through a section that has lots of free land.

Another important aspect that also has to be noted is that we do not want it to be a bypass that encourages a lot of traffic in addition to the heavy vehicles to go around the outside of Port Augusta because, again, that would hurt the town and, very importantly, town businesses. Careful consideration has to be given to how this road would be sealed and upgraded, but I am confident that it can be done very well.

It is not a hugely expensive exercise. For such an important piece of infrastructure, it is not a hugely expensive exercise. To just seal the road as it is would have an estimated cost of \$30 million to \$40 million. It is a significant amount of money, but not when you are looking at National Highway 1 and taking all of the road freight from east to west, north to south, across the nation.

The other opportunity that we have, of course, is to double the size of the bridge to put another two-lane bridge over the top of the existing one or side by side. That would be tremendous, but we are talking potentially in the hundreds of millions of dollars there. So, I think the best thing is to do step 1 first and do step 2 when we get to it and when we can afford it. It is terribly important. It would not be difficult to make a strong case to bring federal funding into this piece of infrastructure, so it does not put all the pressure on the state government—National Highway 1, very importantly. It would also be easy to regulate that only double road trains and triple road trains would have

to use this road, thus encouraging other vehicles to stay within Port Augusta and also encouraging local traffic to keep using the road.

The SPEAKER: I draw attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I inform the house that His Excellency the Governor will be prepared to receive the house for the purpose of presenting the Address In Reply at 3:30pm today. I ask the mover and the seconder of the address and such other members as care to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the address.

[Sitting suspended from 15:25 to 15:59]

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the house that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the address adopted by the house on 25 May to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

To the Hon. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly: I thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the First Session of the 52nd Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray that your deliberations will add meaning and value to the lives of our South Australian community.

MEMBER FOR SCHUBERT

The SPEAKER (16:00): Before we continue with grievances, I congratulate the member for Schubert. I understand that today it is 20 years since his first election to parliament and I have to say that he is a very popular member of parliament on both sides. Congratulations.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

GEMTREE VINEYARDS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:01): On Sunday, it was my great pleasure to attend Gemtree Vineyards in the great electorate of Mawson at McLaren Vale to celebrate Arbor Day by planting trees with other volunteers, locals and people who had actually come from a fair way away to plant trees for the day.

We planted about five and a half thousand plants which included totem-poles, sticky hop bush, kangaroo thorn and mixed grasses such as wallaby grass, spear grass, windmill grass and tall wheatgrass. Drooping she-oaks and native daisies were also planted in the grassland areas although I did not plant any native daisies: I was in charge of the acacias.

It was a wonderful day and probably, I think, the fourth Arbor Day that I have celebrated in the Gemtree Vineyards over the past five years. Michael and Melissa Brown and Andrew and Helen Buttery run the Gemtree Vineyards and do a magnificent job. They are all about sustainability and biodiversity and I think that is the way of the future for the Australian wine industry.

These people set a fantastic example. Not only are they producing wine that is biodynamic, they are also making sure that the area that they own has a lot of native shrubs in it which then in turn makes a fantastic habitat for our native animals including, obviously, the birds but also the frogs. They have built six interconnecting dams on their property to bring back to the area the frogs that are under enormous threat through pesticides and other man-made forces.

Greening Australia is their major partner in this exercise and I also want to pay tribute to the Greening Australia chief executive here in South Australia, Mark Anderson, and Sam Catford, who is the communications manager. They did a fantastic job to get about 150 people out there on Sunday. It was a beautiful day to be in the Vale, very sunny. It was the day after some nice rain that softened up the ground so that it made it fairly easy to use our picks to dig our little holes to put the seedlings in.

Arbor Day actually started here in South Australia. The very first Arbor Day was held in Adelaide back in, I think, 1889. The Gemtree Vineyards decided about 1998 that they wanted to do something to make a statement about sustainability for our area and for the vineyards. They

contacted Greening Australia and I think they have been very happy with the partnership that has been formed.

When you drive along through McLaren Flat to Kangarilla you will just see all these fantastic native trees on the left-hand side of the road as you head towards Kangarilla. It really does stand out and it is something that I think our whole—

Mr Pengilly: Is Kangarilla in your electorate?

Mr BIGNELL: No; Kangarilla is not in the electorate. I will tell you later. It really does stand out particularly when you compare it to the camel farm, which is just a few hundred metres back down the road, and the barren land there. What a difference it can make if someone has the initiative to go out and plant all these native species and return some of the land to what it used to be.

The Brown and Buttery families also cleaned out a lot of the native creeks. People would know—as I do having come from a farm myself—that on farms old quarries and creeks have often been used as dumping grounds for old fences and things like that over the years. They went through and pulled out a heap of scrap metal a few years ago and really started that rehabilitation work on their property.

I really want to congratulate them for that because they are setting a fine example for the rest of McLaren Vale—a wine region that is already proud of its environmental credentials and an area that is working hard to make sure that we have generational farming for decades and decades to come. They are really starting to set the benchmarks, and we are already leading the way in the use of recycled water and other environmental benefits. I think the more we look at not just the domestic wine market but also overseas markets, people will look at markets that do things well environmentally not just in terms of producing the grapes but also in making the wines. So, I would like to congratulate them for the fine example they have set.

It was interesting talking to Mark Anderson, because as we look towards preserving the Willunga Basin, I think Greening Australia will provide a good template for us to make sure that we not only maintain the area and protect ecotourism and aquaculture but also protect it for biodiversity as well, and make sure that we have all those native trees and the animals that come with it.

MEMBER FOR SCHUBERT

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:05): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, for your words of congratulations in recognising my 20 years in this place. It is hard to believe that it is 20 years since I was a new boy sitting in the back row behind me, but it is the case; I was elected on 23 June 1990.

The SPEAKER: Did you have hair then?

Mr VENNING: I had hair and it was dark, and I was 15 kilograms lighter! It is amazing. I was elected at a by-election caused by the resignation of the Hon. John Olsen when he went to Canberra to be a senator. I was the member for Culance until 1997, and I have been the member for Schubert ever since (the electorate changed its name in 1997). Schubert, of course, is named after Mr Max Schubert, the famed winemaker.

In 20 years I have faced six elections and four boundary redistributions, two of which changed the electorate almost completely—especially in 1997 when Culance disappeared altogether. From 1993 to 1997, I represented both the Clare and the Barossa Valley in the same electorate, so is it any wonder that I am focused on the wine industry? I remind members that I was a teetotaller when I was elected in 1990—as I said, 15 kilograms lighter! I have certainly appreciated some wonderful times during those years.

I have been privileged to represent one of the best electorates in Australia and I have enjoyed the cooperation of local government and community leaders, as well as the local media, especially *The Leader* and Radio 639 ABC. I am very appreciative of the good local media in my electorate, as I have just said; it has been great to keep up with what is happening locally and get my message out. I am very pleased with the way I have been treated, and have had hardly a complaint in all my 20 years.

At the recent election I improved my vote substantially over the 20 years, despite a drop at the 2006 election. I got down to 52 per cent at my worst, but my margin has been 60 per cent fairly

consistently. I improved it again at the last election to an all-time high of 70 per cent two-party preferred, the third best in the state.

I want to thank all the people I have represented over the past 20 years for giving me the honour of representing them. I thank my colleagues in this place, on both sides of the house, and I thank the Liberal Party and my branch officials, especially Steph Martin and the late Margarete Hale, for their tremendous personal support over all these years. I would also like to thank my wife Kay and my family. They are the victims of many of the problems in this place; it is the family members who take the brunt of it when they are out in the community. People may not have the guts to take you on but they will certainly tell your family what they think about the situation—particularly a son, when he is in the local hotel. I pay tribute to my son Mark on that point, because he has copped a fair bit of that.

Highlights of my political career include \$19 million for the Burra-Morgan road (which is a story in itself); bituminising the Gomersal Road; assisting with the overall phylloxera act; the Barossa's filtered water; implementing the Barossa Infrastructure Limited (BIL) water scheme; a new Tanunda primary school; obtaining an initial government grant for the Brenton Langbein Theatre—and if you've been there you will know that it is a fantastic place; being inducted as a baron of the Barossa—something you cannot buy; and serving as the opposition whip and a shadow minister.

Joint highlights of my career have included hosting a visit to the Barossa Valley by Her Majesty The Queen, and the memorable event (which I recalled a moment ago) of a long lunch at Skillogee winery at Clare in 1994 with the then governor-general Sir William Deane, then state governor Dame Roma Mitchell, then mayor Bob Phillips, then minister David Wotton, me, and our partners. It was a wonderful day. It was supposed to be one hour on the appointment books, but 2½ hours later they were still there. I was amazed; it was such a great occasion. So I want to thank all those who have been part of this.

In particular, just the other day we buried Mr Harry Quinn from Burra. It was Harry Quinn who challenged me saying, 'Why should I vote for you for the preselection?' I said, 'Harry, because I'm going to do the job for you. What do you want, Harry?' 'I want the road bituminised from Spalding all the way to Burra and then to Morgan.' I said, 'It's a deal.' He said, 'You're a typical MP: all talk and no promises.' Well, it's there, Madam Speaker. We buried Harry last week and I went to the funeral. I said to Mrs Quinn, 'Remember the deal?' She said, 'Yes, I do. He never forgot.' So if you go in there for your constituents you can achieve.

I look forward to the future with anticipation. I want to thank all the people I have represented in the last 20 years; it has been an honour to be here to represent them. I congratulate my leaders. I have had some great leaders in this place and I think that maybe the best is still to come.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Schubert, and can I again congratulate you. I have enjoyed your friendship as well as the infighting across the chamber. You are a very good member and someone for new members to look up to.

PARENTAL LEAVE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:11): Paid parental leave was announced last week by the Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, and the Minister for Families, the Hon. Jenny Macklin. This wonderful development in family life and a giant step forward for mothers and fathers has largely gone without the rejoicing I feel and had anticipated was merited.

It is a giant first step for babies, making sure their parents have the security of income they need in those first vital weeks. It provides choice for parents in how they arrange to care for their new baby and it means women in particular have achieved a milestone already enjoyed by many mothers throughout the world.

Women's rights are hard-won and when I attended the ASU's Equal Pay for Women rally earlier in June it reminded me that the struggle continues on that front and on many others. Here in South Australia women enjoyed many firsts. Importantly, they were able to receive good education and go to university, and of course South Australia was the first place in the world to grant dual suffrage to women; that is, the right to vote and the right to stand for election.

While there is much made of the fact that two other countries had earlier granted the right to vote (New Zealand being one of them) no other place in the world thought women were capable of standing for election. Looking across the chamber I see Catherine Helen Spence, our champion, depicted on the five dollar note, on the tapestry—she stood for election for the Federation Convention—and Mary Lee and Elizabeth Nicholls are also on the tapestry. They and many other South Australian women fought for these rights and stared down defeat, only to see that South Australia was one of the last places in the world where a woman was elected.

The battle for enfranchisement was fought long and hard by our sisters in the UK and the USA and Australian women played a prominent assisting role in both nations. One in particular is a South Australian-born woman, Muriel Matters, who is largely unknown but holds a special place in women's rights history. This month sees the centenary of Muriel's return to Australia, for she left her birthplace in 1905 to further her career on the stage. While a gifted elocutionist and actress, Muriel soon found herself on the world stage as she used her artistic abilities to promote the message of how important the right to vote really is.

Women in Britain had begun the struggle to win the vote in 1863 and when Muriel arrived in London Mrs Pankhurst was just beginning to transfer her efforts and tactics from Manchester to the capital. Women wanted the vote in order to have a say in how their circumstances were handled. They knew that without this power their destinies were not in their own hands.

The government of the time said their views were not held by as many as necessary to see a change in the law and so the women, mostly educated and of reasonable means, engaged with the masses of working people living in difficult circumstances and often poverty in the Britain of the post industrial revolution. This reinforced more than ever the necessity of full enfranchisement and how important it was for people to know and understand the power of the vote. Muriel had already voted twice before she left South Australia and felt keenly the right to education, for she had a lifelong interest in education and the arts and soon wanted to use her artistic ability to change the world for the better.

Muriel had a strong sense of social justice and, with her clear voice and ability to explain while entertaining, soon became a motivational public speaker, advocating the cause of emancipation and better conditions for all. We know of her abhorrence of sweatshops, sadly still in existence even here in South Australia where piecework is still exposed by unions wherever possible. Muriel had the courage of her convictions and, when a minor example of civil disobedience saw her imprisoned, she added prison reform to her list of grievances as her first-hand experience had shown her how unenlightened incarceration methods achieved little.

Muriel's civil disobedience was taking part in a demonstration at Westminster where early in the evening of 28 October 1908 she had chained herself to ironwork in the ladies gallery of the House of Commons. Women were kept well back from the action on the floor of the house behind a grille, and by chaining herself to the grille, forcing its removal, Muriel found herself technically on the floor of the house and therefore became the first woman to speak in the House of Commons.

Through the Muriel Matters Society and with the help and enthusiastic support of my colleagues—the Hon. Steph Key and you, Madam Speaker, and former colleagues Jane Lomax-Smith and Lea Stevens—it has been possible to bring Muriel's story back to life and begin to find her place in history.

A wonderful production to commemorate Muriel's centenary visit was held in the exact venue, the Adelaide Town Hall, this time on Sunday 13 June. An exceptional creative and artistic team assembled with the help of Margie Fischer, saw actresses Teresa de Gennaro and Carol Young, directed by Catherine Campbell with visuals by Lisa Philip-Harbutt and lighting by Sue Grey Gardiner, bringing Sheila Duncan's script to life with original music by Jessica Monck and Carol Young. The play has enjoyed enormous success, and with it we hope to bring Muriel's story to life for a wider audience, particularly within the regions and in schools.

We know that Muriel's story will be a fine example to the young women coming up, to understand that if you do not like what you see the best thing is to do is to get active and work to change it. Muriel Matters, born in Bowden, is a daughter of South Australia who has much to offer us, and history does indeed teach us a lesson.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:16): Like many other mostly rural members in this place, I have considerable numbers of national parks, conservation areas and wilderness protection

areas—probably more of them than anyone else actually—in my electorate. National parks such as Deep Creek on the Fleurieu, Mount Billy to the west of Victor Harbor and the Bluff itself in Victor Harbor all come under the jurisdiction of national parks and are interesting and absorbing places. Deep Creek has its fair share of visitors, and it is not all that uncommon for the news of the day to talk about someone lost in Deep Creek or, from time to time, the odd fire down there.

However, last Thursday I was on Kangaroo Island visiting some national parks over there—a third of the island is national parks—and, unlike the Fleurieu parks which, like Deep Creek, raise a small but not considerable amount of income, the parks on Kangaroo Island actually raise enormous amounts of income. They are multimillion dollar exercises for the Department for Environment and Heritage. I like to have a look around occasionally and just see how they are all going.

After the disastrous fires of December 2007, I paid a visit the next year to the west end of Flinders Chase in particular and around some of the other areas to have a look at the damage and what was going to be required to get them back into operation. Fortunately, a lot of the major assets were untouched. There were areas that were severely damaged. Places like the toilets at Snake Lagoon and the Platypus Walk all suffered fairly major damage. You have to remember that the entire park at Flinders Chase got burnt out.

I might come to that in a minute; however, last Thursday I went back and the Regional Manager for the department on Kangaroo Island, Mr Bill Haddrill, kindly gave me a tour of the park, the facilities and many of the sites that visitors take for granted. To think that a couple of years ago it was a blackened mess and to see it now is absolutely amazing to people who do not understand how the bush regenerates.

The only thing that I would say is that our stupidity as land managers in the past has resulted in the entire park being burnt out in one hit, rather than sections of it at one time. The whole place is regenerating quickly and, if we do not get our act into gear and burn out parts, in six or seven years we will be burning out the whole lot again.

I believe that Mr Haddrill is an outstanding manager and that, with the formation of DENA taking over from DEH, he would be ideally suited to managing the whole island's natural resources and national parks, in my view. I hope he gets that chance, because he is very much into the community. He knows the community and listens to it—which a lot of them do not do—and is actively involved. I thank Mr Haddrill for that. I also thank the manager, Mr Mike Penhall, the regional ranger in charge at Flinders Chase, and his staff; and Mick Murphy, the maintenance boss, and his staff. Mick is a bit of a character and gets around the traps a fair bit and is also involved.

What they have done down there has been fantastic to see. They have resurrected the public infrastructure, the road system and places such as the toilets and the camp grounds. They are still looking at what they are going to do with the platypus walk. Some of that is opened up but there is still a way to go.

The first impression when you visit a tourist destination is a lasting impression, and I have to say that the first impression when you go into those places now—whether it be Snake Lagoon, the Chase, the camp grounds or even out on the roads—is one of freshness, and it is attractive. All the infrastructure looks good, so I pay tribute to those who have seen fit to get it back into full operation. It is a pity some of it took so long, but they are starved of funds. They run on a shoestring budget and do what they can whenever they can.

We drove out to Cape Du Couedic to look at the infrastructure that has now been there for around eight or nine years, and right down the bottom it is starting to show fairly severe signs of wear and tear from the effects of the elements down there, which are extreme, to say the least. There were pretty big storms and winds over the preceding few days and when we went out there were a few tree limbs and bits and pieces over the road. By the time we came back—and it is an hour and a half to go out there and come back—Mick Murphy had been out with his loader and pushed them all off and you would not know he had been there. They take great pride in that national park.

So, in the time left to me, I want to ensure that members across the broad spectrum in the chamber know that everything is up and running again. It is a great place to visit. The infrastructure looks fantastic, and it is well managed. They also employ a lot of people. I will be the first to criticise when things go wrong but in this case they have done a good job.

Time expired.

SEXTON, MRS N.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (16:22): This coming Sunday, a Gawler East resident, Mrs Nora Sexton, is looking forward to celebrating her birthday at a low key party with family and friends. There is nothing out of the ordinary in that except that Nora will be celebrating her 100th birthday. Last week I had the pleasure of meeting with Mrs Sexton and her daughter Zeta Ward. Today I am proud to provide this house with a brief insight into the life of this wonderful woman.

Nora Sexton was born on this day in 1910 at the Jamestown hospital, 12 kilometres south-east of the Mid North town of Caltowie. The third child of six to Katherine and Peter McCarthy, Nora spent her early childhood going to school at the St Killian Convent School and helping with chores around the home. At school she excelled at sports and the piano. Later in life she was well known in the town of Crystal Brook as being a well accomplished tennis player, and she also played the organ in her local church. Nora said that for a while she was actually head organist. She learned to play the piano the hard way, and she still recalls the 'cracked knuckles' at the hands of the sisters.

Nora's mum and dad had a road making business in the early days, but the Depression and difficult times in the country meant work was hard to find, and dad went on to do labouring work and later qualified as a fitter and turner. After leaving school at about aged 14 years, Nora was apprenticed to a local tailor, where she helped with a great deal of sewing and general sales in the shop, a skill she was later to put to great use in life with her family.

Nora's mum Katherine died when Nora was only 17 years of age, so she had to leave her job and help look after the family. Nora still recalls the first family washing she had to do by herself. She says that, 'The copper was huge, and all the clothes had to be scrubbed by hand.' At the time, she was also head cook and bottle washer. Nora helped care for her older two brothers Jim and Charlie and younger sister and brother Katherine and Peter. Peter is the only remaining sibling. Aged 89 years, he now lives at Enfield.

Nora married a local lad, Michael Sexton, in 1932 in Georgetown, a boy she had known since school days but who, according to her, she had not 'taken any notice of really'. Asked if she could recall the day that Michael proposed, Nora went a bit quiet and said that 'You don't really talk about those things,' reflecting the values of a time when some things still stayed private.

She said, with a big grin, that she has many fond memories of her life with Michael. Michael was a farming lad, who had to work the family farm from an early age because his father died when he was only 12. The married couple moved to Crystal Brook to live, a place she still loves and misses to this day. Despite her strong connection to the town, she said that you have to move on.

Nora gave birth to her first child, Zeta, in 1933, followed by her son, John, in 1942. Zeta lives with her husband, Dennis Ward, in Gawler, while John lives in Para Hills. Nora spent most of her adult life caring for her husband and children, as she puts it, 'as you did in those days'.

While having fond memories of her life to date, Nora is reluctant to reminisce, as she finds it hard to recall some of the details, and prefers to talk about the good life she currently lives. Nevertheless, she is happy to talk about the dances she and her husband, Michael, attended, even after the children were born. According to her, 'They were great fun, and we looked forward to attending them on a regular basis.'

In 1989, Nora and Michael moved to Gawler to be closer to family, but within a year her husband passed away. Nora kept busy through her volunteering work at Vinnies, a role she fulfilled for 17 years, until an illness forced her to take a less active role in the community.

Nora now calls Southern Cross Homes in Gawler her new home, and it is a place she quite enjoys. Come Sunday, she will celebrate her birthday with her two children, seven grandchildren and nine great grandchildren and other family and friends. I wish her a very happy 100th birthday, and I thank her for the opportunity and privilege to be with her last week.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Madam Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

TRUSTEE (CHARITABLE TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the

Arts) (16:29): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Trustee Act 1936. Read a first time.

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) (16:30): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Bill addresses a relatively simple matter, but one that is of considerable concern to the country communities of South Australia.

During the passage of the then Health Care Bill, the Government made a commitment to the Parliament that incorporated Health Advisory Councils established by that Bill would continue to hold and receive donations and bequests previously held by the local incorporated hospitals on trust for the local hospital. This commitment was reflected in the provisions of the *Health Care Act 2008* which gave the necessary powers to incorporated Health Advisory Councils (HACs) to undertake these functions.

Donations and other gifts to an incorporated HAC will only be tax deductible if the HAC is endorsed by the Australian Taxation Office (ATO) as a deductible gift recipient (DGR) for the operation of its gift fund. The gift fund, in turn must be established and maintained by the HAC as a valid charitable trust. At the time the then Bill was being considered, the Department of Health advised the ATO of the proposed governance changes but had not received any advice that there may be an ATO concern about the DGR endorsement about the HACs and any gift funds they may establish.

Not long before the Act was to come into force, and as the Department of Health was preparing to progress the applications for DGR endorsement to the ATO, the ATO advised that incorporated HACs could not be DGR endorsed because they were not a public hospital or a charity. Further, a HAC could not be DGR endorsed for its gift fund because any trust established by the HAC solely for the purposes of distributing money, property or benefits to government institutions, namely public hospitals or public ambulance services, would not (in the ATO's view) be a valid charitable trust because of its connection to government. This view was based on statements in certain English and Australian cases that government entities could not be the objects of valid charitable trusts.

The ATO advice caused concern to the HACs, and the country community more generally, to whom the commitment was made that HACs would continue to be able to establish and manage gift funds, including any existing ones, in their community. This commitment is consistent with the decision of the Parliament at the time to pass the *Health Care Act 2008*.

As a possible solution to the problem, the ATO advised that a similar issue was addressed in New South Wales and Victoria by amendments to their respective Acts equivalent to the South Australia's *Trustee Act 1936* and that South Australia may choose to look to a similar pathway to address this matter.

The Bill before the House makes amendments to the *Trustee Act 1936* that will ensure that a trust does not fail simply because of its connection to Government. In effect, the Bill ensures that a gift fund established to hold donations or other gifts for the benefit of a government instrumentality, such as a public hospital or ambulance service, can hold the donations or gifts on trust without being at risk of becoming an invalid charitable trust from the perspective of the ATO. A fund established by, for example a HAC, would therefore be considered charitable despite its connection to government. DGR endorsement could then be sought, in relation to the fund and the gifts and donations in the fund utilised for the benefit of the local operations of Country Health SA Hospital Inc and SA Ambulance Service Inc.

The Bill will enable a gift fund to operate in a way that is consistent with the ATO advice as well as meet community expectations about who should be responsible for their donations and bequests to a hospital.

The amendments before the House will therefore enable the incorporated HACs to hold and manage on trust the donations and bequests and to utilise them without risk to the validity of the trust.

The amendments will also address a more general risk to bodies or trusts that was identified as arising out of the original ATO. opinion. Although the ATO's views specifically related to HACs and their gift funds, in principle the advice may put at risk any gift fund that is established that provides benefits to a government instrumentality.

The Bill will have an impact outside of the health sector by ensuring that any existing or future trust does not fail because of its connection to Government. In effect, it ensures the charitable status of a body or a gift fund established by a body that holds, on trust, donations or other gifts for the benefit of a Government instrumentality such as a hospital, an educational institution, a museum or gallery.

Once the Bill is passed, SA Health will progress the applications to the ATO for DGR endorsement. It remains of course ultimately the decision of the ATO to grant the DGR endorsement to a body or gift fund.

The Bill, apart from addressing a concern for HACs, also addresses a previously unknown risk for all charitable trusts that are associated with Government. It is essential to ensure the community can have faith that a donation or bequest can be utilised as intended without jeopardising its charitable or taxable status.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Trustee Act 1936*

3—Insertion of section 69D

This clause inserts section 69D into the principal Act. The inserted clause deems a trust to be a charitable trust if the trust provides money, property or any other benefit to or for the purposes of an entity that would, but for the connection of the entity to government, be a charity. The clause effectively permits a charitable trust to exist in respect of an entity that is a charity despite the fact that—

- (a) the entity receives government funding; or
- (b) the entity is required to implement government policy; or
- (c) the entity or the governing body of the entity is comprised of persons appointed by the Governor, a Minister or an agency or instrumentality of the Crown; or
- (d) the entity or the governing body of the entity is subject to control or direction by a Minister.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

1—Interpretation

This clause defines *principal Act* as the *Trustee Act 1936*.

2—Validation of acts under trusts deemed charitable under section 69D

This clause validates acts done or purportedly done under a trust of a kind referred to in proposed section 69D before the commencement of that section.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr McFetridge.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances (resumed on motion).

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:30): The 10 minute grievances that we have after the Supply Bill are a unique opportunity to talk about some of the issues which relate back to the Supply Bill but which are perhaps more pertinent to one's own electorate and other specific portfolio issues.

In particular I want to talk about my own electorate issues that have suffered under the eight years of hard labour in this place. This government has had truckloads of money pour in through Treasury doors, but in seats like Morphett—and I should say, in some cases, in some safe Labor seats, but particularly in the seat of Morphett—there have been a lot of issues that need attention, but attention from this government is conspicuous by its absence.

The electorate of Morphett is a very small electorate geographically. It goes from the beach back to Park Terrace at the back of the racecourse, down to Oaklands Road with a bit of Warradale and up around the tramline and a bit of Glenelg North across by the airport. It is not big; it is only 11.4 square kilometres, from recollection, if you do not include all the open space of the racecourse. However, there are nearly 24,000 people there and they are paying taxes to this state amounting to many millions of dollars.

These taxes are really pertinent to my electors and many businesses down there. I often boast to constituents and friends who come to visit us. Yesterday, in fact, our American friends, Dr John and Mrs Cathleen Carr from Oregon, were visiting us after a few years, so we took them down to Jetty Road, Glenelg. I said, 'I've got 106 restaurants and cafes within walking distance of my office.' That is a wonderful boast but the problem is that those businesses are paying huge taxes. The owners of those premises, in many cases, rent the businesses and pass on the business costs—and one of the big business costs is land tax. One of my near neighbours where I live at the bay was telling me that they own a business down there and they are paying over \$1,000 a week in land tax. The property is worth a lot of money but you cannot eat the property. They are having to pay massive land tax all the time.

Every time I go to the toilet in our place and push the button I think it is about \$8 a flush, when you work out the sewerage and water charges that are levied on the capital value of houses

down there. Sure, I live on the beachfront and it is a very nice house. The capital value has gone up and it is fantastic, but you cannot eat that—you have to live.

I am lucky in that I can afford to pay it. I am in a fortunate position but there are many of my constituents who cannot afford to pay the rates, taxes and levies that are put upon them because they have properties which now have gone up in value many times. The significant increase in those property values is recognised by some organisations and there are schemes where you can pay off your costs and charges but, in most cases, you have to pay upfront or, when the bill arrives in the post, you have a few days to pay.

Something that this government needs to look at is: what do you do when you have wealth taxes, for want of a better description? These properties have gone right up and the businesses are paying massive taxes on the value of the properties and the residents are paying massive taxes on water, sewerage and the emergency services levy. They have gone up because the property values have gone up. The percentage has not changed very much but the property values have gone up. They do not begrudge paying a fair share. Nobody in South Australia should begrudge paying their fair share, but they should not have to pay rates and taxes to the values they are at the moment.

At Glenelg at this time of the year in particular you see huge volumes of stormwater come roaring out of the culverts and empty out onto the beach. It is a tragedy that more money has not been put into stormwater detention and retention and more wetlands over the last eight years. Just along the Glenelg Beach at Holdfast Shores and the main tourist area mountains of dead and rotting seagrass have come up because thousands of square metres of seagrass are being affected by the stormwater run-off that just pours out from everything, including the Barcoo outlet, which came out of the Patawalonga beforehand.

It is not only coming out of the Barcoo outlet but also all the stormwater outlets along the coast. The government really needs to start doing something about that, because the damage that is being done to the marine life down there—the flora and fauna, I would expect—is something that we should not take for granted. It will not repair itself forever. It is pretty resilient, but it will not keep repairing itself forever. So, we ask the government to do something about that.

Of course, my little pet project—and it is going to be expensive—is to rehabilitate Sturt Creek back to a long linear park and to look at what Flinders University is doing in Singapore with rehabilitating their concrete channels back to these linear parks. It is not cheap, but we should look at something like that with environmental and social dividend, not just a triple bottom line. I look forward to having discussions with the government about that.

In terms of the transport issues at the Bay, the Glenelg tramline is famous. It has been there for many years now. We had the old red rattlers that used to go back and forth. They were produced in South Australia; they were built in Edwardstown. We do not see them very much now. The Holdfast Bay council, to its credit, has had them running as tourist trams on weekends, but even that is starting to fade out now. I would love to see those trams come back. You can maintain them as tourist trams and not just run the fantastic plastic trams that we have at the moment, those very expensive Bombardier and Alstom trams.

Just as a bit of an aside, if members have a look at the trams going to and from Glenelg, the signage reads: 'Entertainment Centre via the city'. Via the city; I would love to know where else they can go. If there is another track somewhere else, well, tell me about it. I know that there were plans to go to Semaphore, and they have gone, but I think every tram that ever travelled in this state for many years has gone via the city.

The cost of maintaining that tramline is going up, but it is proving to be of benefit to my constituents, and I encourage the government to think a bit more strategically about what it is doing. Just the other day, workmen at the Brighton Road tram stop were pulling up the dimpled pavers that allow blind people to recognise where the doors of the trams are. But, because they have two different types of trams now—and that is not including the old red rattlers on the weekend—they have different shapes and different sizes. One has three sets of doors and one has five sets of doors; so, you cannot have the dimpled pavers.

What does it cost to redo all the tram stops from the city to Glenelg to take away that now misleading information for people with vision impairment and blind passengers? We want to encourage people to use public transport, but if we are going to do it let's do it for the long term; let's do it properly. It really is something that this government did for political purposes, to buy those trams on both occasions, and we are paying the price for them now.

The King Street Bridge is a real issue in my electorate. It has to be rebuilt by the local government. This state government is putting three parts of stuff-all into rebuilding that bridge. The federal government, to its credit, is putting some money in, but even that is being rationed out over a number of years. The ratepayers at Glenelg cannot afford the millions of dollars to rebuild the bridge.

The taxpayers of South Australia built that bridge. It was handed to the local government, and it should not have been, but now it is costing millions to repair it. It is part of the strategic and emergency access plan for transport to the houses on the western side of the Patawalonga, yet the government will do nothing about it. Metropolitan buses use it as part of the public transport system, yet the state government will not put in a cent to help my constituents with the burden of having to pay for that new bridge.

The state government really needs to look at what they are doing down there, and see that there are not only the local residents down there but also many people from other areas of South Australia. There are also hundreds of thousands, if not millions—I think it is about 2.4 million visitors a year in Glenelg now—who want to use that infrastructure. It is not just for my constituents, it is not just for the South Australians. It is for the whole world that we should be improving the facilities down there.

I will just finish by digressing from my electorate to the job of a member of parliament which is quite onerous and arduous at times. It is also extremely enjoyable for the vast majority of the time. I would like to congratulate the member for Schubert for 20 years of outstanding service in this place. I would like to congratulate his wife, Kay, for having put up with him, not only for the wonderful bloke he is but also because, as most political partners will tell you, it is a pretty tough gig at times being the partner of politician.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:41): I thank the member for Morphett for his compliment, and I congratulate him on his good representation, and thanks for being a friend, which in this place is most important.

Recently, it was revealed that the average South Australian will be around \$200 a year worse off following the latest round of tax and charge increases announced by the Treasurer. The average family will have to deal with an average increase in the water price of \$84 per year, an increase of 21 per cent, a compulsory third party insurance increase of \$32 per year. Catching the public transport to work will increase by \$52 per year, a six-cylinder car registration will increase by \$7 per year, and learner permits will increase by 14 per cent. Sewerage charges will increase by 4 per cent, which is \$12 per year. All these charges total \$187 per year.

The household charges are increasing above the rate of inflation and putting pressure on family budgets. They are nothing more than a part of the contribution to paying for Kevin Foley's blow-out on things like the Adelaide Oval and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The Treasurer has said about the increases:

The pressures we are facing are ever-increasing so the financial requirements of this government to continually balance the budget are extreme.

The Treasurer must think we were all born yesterday. It will not be lost on the public that the South Australian taxpayer contribution to the Adelaide Oval has blown out from \$300 million to \$535 million, a blow-out that the Treasurer, who by his own admission is 'not the sharpest tool in the shed', conveniently forgot that he knew about.

He not only misled the parliament in this instance, and we have had that in the last few days, but he misled the people of South Australia, at the worst possible time, in the week before a state election. Really that is, I think, a pretty serious crime for a politician to do and for a government to be involved with. I think it is appalling and I do not think we have seen or heard the end of this one yet. I am fairly sure we haven't, because, with everything else, it is a pretty poor record.

The new RAH costs have also blown out over the original \$1.7 billion. It is taxpayers once again who will foot the bill. The Rann Labor government has lost control of both the Adelaide Oval project and the Royal Adelaide Hospital project. The only way that we can recover the money is through increased taxes and charges. He said that today in the house when he was talking about his razor gang. You either put the razor gang through or you increase taxes and charges. Well, they are anyway, and he tried to make excuses for that. It was a pretty feeble effort.

The average South Australian is paying for the Premier and the Treasurer's mistakes. They did not mention anything about cuts to government's public relations outfit, the so-called spin team, and the millions that costs the taxpayer. That has not been mentioned. I bet that does not suffer the same razor.

I shudder to think of the tax and charges increases that will be included in this year's budget—when it is finally handed down in September of this year. What a disgrace this is. We are the only state in the country whose state government has not released its budget. Tasmania went to the polls on the same day that we did and yet their government managed to release their budget this week. Why are we different?

What a mess! The Rann Labor government has been in for eight years and still they need more time. Is it because they need to find \$750 million in savings by cutting services and staff to balance out the budget after eight years of excessive expenditure and wastage? I think so.

We have to have a very good look at this credit rating. How do you get to maintain the credit rating we have with the problems this government has? It does bring the credit rating agencies themselves into question. I wonder—and I have looked at this over the years—what the terms of reference are for those people doing the credit rating, because I would think with the way things are generally with businesses—and we heard today about Elders having to lay off people—things are pretty tough out there, very tough, and yet this government keeps on spending. It thinks it can spend its way into oblivion. It is going to go into oblivion, but it should have been in March this year, not in 2014.

I am able to predict where cuts will be made—to areas like PIRSA (primary industries) and country health, areas that are already struggling to manage on minimal funding. These are areas of low political sensitivity for this city-centric government. They will stick primary industries, the old department of agriculture, out even further, to a point that it will hardly exist. Over the eight years, we have seen the Rann Labor government spending money in the city and incurring huge blowouts in costs and massive amounts in wastage, while country communities continue to manage with little or no government expenditure or investment.

Many rural and regional communities—my electorate—are forced to have to deal with fewer, inadequate or below par services. The Treasurer today talked about Shared Services—what a disgrace that is. It was an exercise of government which he thinks is going to save money. The government is already spending a huge amount of money on office space in Adelaide that is empty. How embarrassing is that? The jobs are being lost to the country already. It's a disgrace!

Look at the Barossa community. They have waited so patiently for a new hospital and are now waiting and waiting for the Rann government to release the business case. I spoke to the minister in this house yesterday briefly about that, and I will keep doing that. We all know the business case will recommend a new facility to be built in the Barossa, which is why I think there is such a delay in releasing it. My prediction is that it will not be released until after the budget is handed down; in other words, too late, wait for next year.

I did write to the Minister for Health some time ago, seeking an update on the business case and advice regarding a possible time frame for its release. The response the minister provided was a disgrace. The letter said that SA Health provided \$70,000 for the compilation of a business case and that the steering group, comprising representatives from the local GP division, the council, the Health Advisory Council and the education sector is overseeing the planning and development, which both the Barossa community and I are well aware of. The rest of the response said:

Final draft business case for the proposed new Barossa Hospital will be considered by the Department of Health within the context of South Australia's Health Care Plan. As part of the Rann government's election commitments, \$400,000 will be invested to provide emergency power generators at Angaston, Kapunda and Berri.

Thank you very much for the generators—we can keep the lights on—but we need a new hospital.

Whoever drafted that response for the minister must think that I and the Barossa community have no idea what is going on here. We know a business case has been commissioned and we want to know when it will be released. As the Barossa is not going to get any answers, let alone a new health facility, from the Rann Labor government, I will be going to make representations to the federal government. Federal government intervention and takeover from the state government worked in bringing the Mercy Hospital in Tasmania up to standard a few years ago. I cannot see why it would not work here in the same way.

Before I do this, I would like to give minister Hill the opportunity to finally go public with everything, including the Barossa Hospital plan. I want to work with him, because I do not believe in big brother Canberra controlling things we do here. I do believe in the state and federal system we have, but if everything else fails I will have no choice. There is so much waste, and I did say to the Treasurer today when he was making his final speech to the Supply Bill, 'If you could cut the waste you will save a lot of money.' They seem to be throwing money everywhere, including into government advertising, and a lot of the money that has been wasted would certainly build the Barossa Hospital, plus some.

I will continue to lobby for a new health facility in the Barossa. I congratulate the opposition, particularly my leader, Isobel Redmond, for coming to the Barossa. We promised that if the opposition was elected to government we would build a new Barossa hospital, and that lifted my vote, I reckon, by 10 per cent and is one of the reasons why I had a record vote.

Politics aside, I throw the invitation out to all members to go and have a look at the Angaston hospital. This is the Barossa's key hospital. The member for Bragg has been there. It is a disgrace; you cannot believe it. Nothing has been spent there, because it is not worth spending anything there. It is past its use-by date. So, I will continue to lobby for the new facility that the region deserves, and if that means making representations to the federal government then that is what I will do.

I will keep speaking to everybody, including minister Hill. I hope that he is able to give me a few comments in a couple of days' time. The Rann Labor government has treated the Barossa community with contempt for too long, and now to continue withholding the business case like this, without any indication of when it may be made public is just wrong.

Time expired.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:51): As the member for Adelaide, I rise today to speak on the Supply Bill and address this house about the importance of our central shopping precinct, the Rundle Mall. As the member for Adelaide, I am passionate about supporting our Rundle Mall to return to its former glory and importance as our premier retail precinct. This was an issue that I touched upon in my maiden speech.

For members in this house who are not aware of the history of Rundle Mall, the mall was originally a bustling street thoroughfare of horse trams, trolleys, cars and foot traffic. In its early days, Rundle Street boasted 11 hotels, cabinet-makers, saddlers and coach builders. Shoppers were jostling along the pavements from shop window to the gutter. Over the years, the retail mix changed and the mall became home to our flagship department stores of David Jones, John Martin, Myer and Harris Scarfe. Archival footage of the time shows a golden era of bustling enterprise.

In 1976, the western end of Rundle Street between Pulteney Street and King William Street was turned into a mall. This was Australia's first pedestrian street mall. At present, Rundle Mall experiences a collective turnover of \$800 million a year; 85 per cent of tourists who visit our city or our state walk down Rundle Mall; 45 per cent of cruise ship passengers travel from the docks by coach or taxi to see our mall. However, the needs of our Rundle Mall have been neglected by our state government instead of being nurtured and supported.

Rundle Mall is home to over 700 retail stores, 200 service providers and 15 unique arcades and shopping centres. Over 5,000 people rely on Rundle Mall for employment. In 1980, Rundle Mall was home to 30 per cent of the state's retail spending. Since this time, this number has steadily declined. By 1990, this figure had declined to 20 per cent and at present is less than 5 per cent.

Whilst you could come to the conclusion that there are a variety of reasons for this decline, such as the rise of suburban shopping outlets such as Westfield Marion, access or expense issues, including parking, or the mall's tired aesthetics, I believe the cause for the decline cannot be pinpointed to one concern. It is due to the years of neglect by the state government that have seen the mall become less important in the day-to-day lives of the majority of South Australians.

There has been no major state government reinvestment back into the mall since it was established as a mall in 1976. During the 1990s, the mall was refurbished in 1994 and 1995 under the Brown Liberal government. Despite still reeling from the disastrous financial position the new Liberal government inherited, due to the collapse of the State Bank which occurred under the

watch of the Bannon Labor government, the Brown Liberal government had the foresight to commit to improving Rundle Mall.

Works at the time included subsurface engineering infrastructure, which entailed plumbing and drainage and the installation of a canopy, and the mall was repaved. However, 1994 is 16 years ago, and Rundle Mall needs the attention and support of our current government. No matter what the reasons for the present decline in retail spending prominence, it is essential that collaborative efforts are made between retailers and local and state governments to ensure that the mall is addressed and does not become an irrelevant part of our great city.

The mall experiences 23 million visitors per year; however, less than 50 per cent of our city workers frequent the mall. We need to bring this space back to life. I believe that our mall needs the support of the state government to be designated as a tourist precinct. The fact that our mall is visited by 85 per cent of tourists, which is a greater number than those who visit our tourist precinct of Glenelg (which is currently at 3 million), and it is not yet able to be designated as a tourist precinct without the will of the government, is nonsensical.

I support Rundle Mall becoming a designated tourist precinct under the Shop Trading Hours Act. As one of our key tourist destinations our state would benefit from having Rundle Mall open on a number of the 11 public holidays that occur during the year. In so many ways our Rundle Mall is already a tourist precinct and it should now be formally recognised as such under the Shop Trading Hours Act. The mall should be supported and addressed in the state budget and not ignored for another budget or term of government.

I urge this government in the strongest of terms to show some leadership on this issue. Do not continue to be tied by the apron and purse strings of the unions: allow the desire of the people of this state, the retailers, tourists and visitors to proceed. Please support Rundle Mall by providing the zone the freedom to become a designated tourist precinct so that it may flourish again as a retail heart of our state.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:56): Thank you Mr Acting Speaker. Congratulations, member for Finniss, on your ascension to the chair. I also join others in congratulating the member for Schubert on 20 fine, excellent and contributing years in this place. The member for Schubert and I knew each other when I was in a previous life and have certainly been involved in some agricultural pursuits together, and I would like to think that under his guidance I will be in good hands in this place, so congratulations to him.

The leader made the point clearly today that Labor does not manage the economy well. Time and again, whether here in South Australia, interstate or at a federal level—indeed around the world—Labor are economic vandals. They demonstrate time and again their inability to manage the economy. Invariably the Liberal Party will have to come in again and clean up the mess.

The state budget currently is around \$15 billion, and the state's debt is approaching \$6.8 billion. For those of us prepared to do some simple mathematics, the state debt is roughly 50 per cent of the state's total budget, and members in this place with any sort of business background at all realise that this is no way to manage a business, let alone the state's finances. Those sort of figures give us real concern going forward.

During the state election campaign issues that I covered at a local level were water, infrastructure, health and education—issues that were important to me, my electorate and the regions generally. It is the government's responsibility through SA Water to honour its 2002 commitment to establish a desalination plant on the Eyre Peninsula. That commitment was made in 2002 and eight years on still nothing has happened. Water security remains one of the key issues on the Eyre Peninsula and indeed in the rest of rural and regional South Australia. It is not that difficult, I do not think, to find a solution to this. The government simply needs to do what it has said it is going to do, namely, to establish a desalination plant on the West Coast, provide water security for our current population and industries and also potential future growth.

Our Treasurer spoke in this place today about making hard choices, particularly around the funding of projects. Surely the extravagance and waste we have seen by this government for the last eight years must come to an end. We cut the waste and we balance the budget: it is quite simple. I refer back to those of us who have been involved in business. When things are tight you make cuts. In this state we cut the waste, the extravagance, and we balance the budget.

Investment into infrastructure has been sadly lacking. Surely investment in infrastructure that actually encourages and facilitates growth in the real economy, the economy that generates

exports and wealth for the state, is where return on investment will achieve. I mentioned earlier the Port of Thevenard on the West Coast—a dynamic port, currently the second busiest port in the state—crying out for some investment for a deepening of the channel and the expansion of the port facility. That is just one example of where investment is sadly needed.

Mr Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr TRELOAR: Thank you, member for Schubert. I do not suggest for a moment that we need to outlay more in total expenditure. What I am suggesting very strongly is that we need to keep our eye on the ball, be aware of the real drivers of our economy and understand the economic realities. What this means is a careful and dutiful redirection of funds from those projects that do not generate further income, and we have seen plenty of those recently, particularly in the City of Adelaide.

So, what I suggest is a redirection of these funds, as I said, from those projects that do not generate further income. Where government spending has been going of late is merely to placate the masses. They used to say in the times of ancient Rome that bread and circuses were the stuff of life, and it seems to me that this government has taken on that attitude and that approach.

Ms Sanderson: Look at Adelaide Oval.

Mr TRELOAR: Look at Adelaide Oval; yes, it's a circus. One of the platforms that the Liberal Party took to the last election campaign was to quarantine and direct 25 per cent of mining royalties, which are derived from the regions, back to the regions. I still believe that this is a wonderfully simple manner in which to ensure adequate funding back into the regions. Might I add that it had great support from those in the regions. It was a wonderful policy and it is still party policy to support that. I believe that it is only when funds are quarantined for this express purpose that our state's regions will be properly recognised and rewarded for their collective contributions to the South Australian economy.

The 25 per cent investment of mining royalties back into the regions can be enhanced thoroughly through funding partnerships with local governments and federal government and, as is increasingly the case, with private enterprise. Of course, if we are prepared to invest in the rural and regional economy, we will be in a much better position to provide those essential services that are ultimately the responsibility of our state government—and I am talking about health and education. It is the provision of these essential services into our regional, rural and remote areas that are of the utmost importance to South Australians.

I recognised the challenge of providing these services. It has been talked about time and time again here today on both sides, but if we are to maintain the regions as a productive sector of this state's economy, then we must be prepared to provide the services. Nothing upsets country people more than not having the equivalent services available to them as their city counterparts.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (17:03): Yesterday, the second stake was plunged into the heart of the Glenside Hospital with the government's announcement that it had signed a contract with the Chapley Group of companies—or a nominated company of the Chapley Retail Group—to purchase the premier portion of the Glenside Hospital adjacent to Fullarton Road.

The government has announced that it has executed a contract consistent with a price within the valuation range that was obtained, which will recover for the government \$10.6 million net for that property. On my calculations, it is just over \$11 million. In any event, it is a lot of money, but it is a drop in the bucket of what is spent on health in this state, to which the government claims to have a commitment. In fact, today we heard the announcement from the Minister for Health of his commitment to country health. Yet we heard the announcement the day before, under the umbrella of the scandal going on in respect of the Treasurer, that the contract has been signed.

We have now been waiting for three years for information in respect of the government's proposal. We have questions like 'What are you selling? When are going to sell? How many trees will go in any redevelopment?' etc. There have been issues relating to the mental health of patients in South Australia, particularly as the Glenside Hospital site provides the only acute mental health facility in this state designated for country people. Yet there is an announcement today of some trinkets of money that will be spent in country areas' health services; we spend billions every year on health, and what has been announced today is just another insult.

Yesterday's announcement follows the preceding budget announcements when, members will recall, the Premier said that he would, through his department, acquire 2.5 hectares in the middle of the Glenside Hospital to become the home of a film hub, in particular, housing the

relocated South Australian Film Corporation. Of course, and typical of form in that regard, when we had the GFC we heard the government's announcement that it was under such financial pressure that it would have to delay the hospital rebuild but that it would progress the film hub redevelopment. That again indicates the priorities of this government.

I want to deal with the issue of the sale of a large portion of this property to the Chapley Retail Group. It is well known to members that the opposition has been keen to identify a number of aspects in relation to this development. Back in 2007 an announcement was made that a preference arrangement would be given to the Chapley group of companies on the basis of co-location and the development of supermarket facilities, allegedly consistent with recommendations made by Monsignor Cappo in his mental health report 'Stepping Up'. I might mention that that report has a number of pages relating to Glenside Hospital, but it does not mention one word about selling off anything and having a supermarket development.

Nevertheless, Monsignor Cappo says that a number of things have to happen. First, the government has to be able to present to us a design and proposal that is consistent with what we published in our 2007 document, to facilitate the expansion but also obviously to connect the site, and various other motherhood statements about a development that would help the mental health people. With the announcement yesterday that the contract is signed, have we ever seen this development? Have we ever seen the design specifications? Have we had one word from the minister yesterday about what this facility will comprise?

We were told that it would need to be approved before the contract was signed, apart from the financial component. Have we seen the valuations; have they been tabled? Do we have answers to the questions we have asked, such as whether there has been approval, or will the former minister and former member for Adelaide tell us whether she will approve a bottle shop going into the site? Where are all the answers to the questions we have asked for the last three years about the development of this site? The minister comes in yesterday to stab into the heart of this hospital, with the sale, without any answers to those questions. We are still completely in the dark.

The government has always indicated what it will do, but to actually answer the questions and come in here and give us that information—no; we are not allowed to know that. We still do not know which trees will be bulldozed; we still do not know which buildings will go to facilitate this. From inspecting the site myself I do know that there is a dirty great big trench through the middle of the oval, which has already been destroyed for the purposes of the children of the district as well as other schools and neighbours using it as an open space. Do we get told? No; we are not allowed to be told anything. What we are told is that they have signed a contract.

What I think is absolutely obscene is that we are still in the District Court on an application regarding the government, which is refusing to comply with a direction of the Ombudsman to give us documents relating to correspondence between the Chapley Retail Group and the government. We have asked for that material under FOI and the government have refused to give some items. The Ombudsman has directed that they do, and the government has appealed. All that has happened up to last year. In November, we had the hearing in the District Court and we are still awaiting a judgment from His Honour.

However, the government do not want to wait for a decision on that. No, no! They do not want to show us anything, but they are going to proceed anyway. They have signed up the contract and told you—under the cover of the scandal brewing over the Treasurer yesterday, the Minister for Health comes in here and drops down this contract.

We need to know whether the government will now show us these documents. Will they comply with the FOI direction? There is no need to keep it a secret now as they have signed the contract. Finally, will they give us the design concept that they say was necessary to approve before they would give the Chapleys the first option to purchase this valuable piece of property.

We need to know all of that and we are entitled to know it. However, all we are getting from the government is the usual silence and the expectation that we are not even entitled to know. The people of South Australia are paying for this and are having to put up with the government carving up a public asset, on which public money is to be expended.

It is completely unacceptable and for the absolute pinnacle of unbelievable conduct from this government, what we heard—the Minister for Health might want to be clear about this—during the Public Works Committee hearings, chaired by the former member for Norwood, was that the government had not even secured a lease over land that they needed on the proposal that they put

to the Public Works Committee. They had not even secured a lease back from the Chapley Retail Group for the part of the development of the hospital which is going to traverse the land that has been transferred to the Chapleys.

I raised this at the Public Works Committee, as did the member for Unley, who sits on that committee. For all the criticism that the opposition had in government, for building and proceeding with the building of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium on property that was still owned by the local government and was not in the government—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Charles Sturt Council.

Ms CHAPMAN: It was owned by the council. We had all the flak in the world from the opposition, as they were, of the day for progressing our project, spending millions of dollars, on land that is not even owned by them—I think the former member for Bragg was involved in that issue. Yet here we are with clear notice that the plans we have got there, that are approved by Public Works—they have never gone back to Public Works to change them—are going to traverse the necessary drug and alcohol facilities that are going on and the Chapley land.

Where is the lease? There was no announcement yesterday or indication from the Minister for Health about whether he has bungled this completely and not done the lease. The departmental officers of the time said that they would deal with the contract. Why haven't we heard about this yesterday? We want some answers, minister, and we want them now.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (17:14): I am happy to speak in this Supply Bill grievance debate. I would just like to mention a story that relates to a meeting of my sub-branch that I attended on Monday night.

Mr Griffiths: Of the Labor Party.

Mr PICCOLO: Yes, of the Labor Party! I was referring to what happened at the last parliamentary session and I pointed out what I thought the Liberals were doing in parliament—I was trying to keep it civil and well behaved, etc.—and they said, 'Well, that's what the opposition does.' I said that that was partly right but that the opposition also wants to establish themselves as an alternative government. The problem with this opposition is that they think only about opposition. They oppose, without actually creating or providing an alternative program. Interestingly, during the last election, in my electorate there was a lot of generalisation but it was a policy free zone, short of one policy. Then they wonder why they did not win the seat.

They made all these sort of generalisations, which they applied right across the state, but they ignored the electorate itself. They made no policy commitments to the electorate, apart from saying, 'We will look into; we will investigate; we will listen to what people have to say.' They made no commitment because they had no commitment to this electorate, and I think that is part of the reason why I was re-elected. I was able to establish the government's commitment to the electorate and also my personal commitment to the electorate.

I will give members some examples of those commitments, which are the bases of the Supply Bill, because the current Supply Bill will now fund these initiatives. For example, electrification of the railway line, in conjunction with the federal government. This government is part of the \$2 billion investment in public transport. We are spending quite a bit of that money in my electorate, particularly with the rail upgrade, which will see an electrified line come into Gawler. It will provide a cleaner, faster, more reliable service. Basically, we will probably have one of the best, if not the best, public transport systems in the country as a result of that initiative.

Others initiatives include the upgrade of the Gawler and Munno Para railway stations, introducing the \$1 ride service to Angle Vale and the John McVeity Centre, which will start shortly. They are all the things in which this government has invested in this region. In July 2011, we will introduce buses to built up parts of Gawler and Hewitt for the first time in this region, which reflects a huge investment by this government in public infrastructure in this community. Then there have been a whole range of road improvements around the town, which I have been able to lobby for and which the government has accepted.

On top of that, the Northern Expressway, which is a project with the federal government, will revolutionise road transport for that region. That is something that is supported by industry in that region, whether it is the farmers to the Mid North or the wine industry to the north-east, etc. They see this as an integral part of reducing their transport costs and getting things to the port. That is obviously going to spur on investment in that area, and it has. We now have investors from interstate who are prepared to invest in the industrial land in that region because of the Northern

Expressway—and that has been published. So, the government has actually invested in this area and, in turn, the private sector is investing, which, again, is leading to more jobs and growth in the area. So, they are some of the things around public transport.

If we look at education, that is another good news story. Roseworthy Primary School has been redeveloped, costing over \$4 million. We are investing over \$1 billion over the next 10 years in the Playford Alive project. We are rebuilding that community from the ground up. As part of rebuilding that community, we have two new schools: the Mark Oliphant College, birth to year 12 school; and the John Hartley School, birth to year 7 school. They are brand new schools, with the latest technology for kids in that area. Those schools are an investment for the future. We also have more than a \$14 million investment in the merger of Gawler School, Evanston Primary School and Evanston Preschool to make this school probably the pre-eminent public school in the region.

These are all things the government has used the Supply Bill dollars to fund to support those communities in that electorate. It is a huge investment—they are not only our young people but our future workers, teachers, lawyers, etc. in this community. So, it is an investment for the future of this state.

In addition, we have the children's centres. There are three children's centres, which are collocated with the three schools I have just mentioned. An additional children's centre will be created at the Elsie Ey Kindergarten. This is about two things. It is about supporting parents to ensure that they have the skills and resources to support their children to make sure that their kids achieve the best they can in their life. Not only are we supporting the parents but also the early intervention programs, through these children's centres, to make sure that kids who, for whatever reason, have some disability or some learning difficulty get early intervention and support to make sure they achieve the best they can.

In addition, we have the home visiting program, which was introduced, I think, by the former minister for health Lea Stevens. This program provides that, on going home, every child gets a home visit to ensure that we can intervene as a community at an early stage if a family needs support, which is a wonderful program. All these early intervention programs are supported by the Supply Bill—supported by this government—to make sure that young people in our community have a good and meaningful life.

In addition, the government, together with the federal government and the university, has also invested in the Roseworthy Campus of the University of Adelaide, which is in my electorate. It is an important investment in the VET program there, which has generated a lot more investment in the college and attracted some world-class researchers and academics. This is probably one of the best VET schools in the country. It is no accident to have hundreds more applications than positions available for that VET school. It is an investment by this government and the federal government not only in that community but in this nation in terms of providing the sort of skills they need.

We then come to health. This government has invested enormous amounts of money in redeveloping the Lyell McEwen centre, the GP Plus centres and, in my own town, ongoing support for the Gawler Health Service. These are public investments to support this community. If you had listened to the opposition over the last few days you would think the whole state was a ghetto. You would think that nothing was happening in this state. I realise that the opposition has to oppose as well, but the opposition also has to provide an alternative government. I have not seen that; I do not think that any of us have seen that alternative government, that alternative vision, besides the carping that we have heard from the other side.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Fifty-one point six per cent of the population did see it.

Mr PICCOLO: Yes, and 55.3 in my electorate. I even beat that. In addition to that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We've heard enough of whose is the biggest.

Mr PICCOLO: In addition to that—

Mr Griffiths interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: I think we might do that in private, member for Goyder. In addition, we have issues of community safety announced today about the number of police and where this government has invested in the redevelopment of the Gawler River CFS. I could go on and on and list all the wonderful things that this government is doing in partnership with the federal government to support my electorate and the people in the northern communities. It is not only in my electorate but also in the regions generally. The point I am trying to make is that this government has a proud record of supporting the community in health, education and jobs. They are things that Labor governments are quite proud of, and I am proud to be a member of this government.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (17:23): I am grateful to have another 10 minutes to talk about the Supply Bill. The reality is that we have heard a lot of people from our side talk about the great sadness that it gives all of us that nearly 30 per cent of the financial year will be finished when the budget is handed down by the Treasurer. I am not going to dwell on that other than to say that it is very frustrating. The flip side of that, of course, is the reality that the government does need money to keep operating and to do its work, so we will support the Supply Bill.

As you know, we on this side of the house have some different priorities. With regard to health, I do not underestimate the size of the challenge of the minister's work or the government's work in regard to health in this state. My job is to stand up for the people of Stuart and more broadly for regional South Australia. I am disappointed that I do not see the focus on regional health nearly as strongly as it should be, but it is a big challenge; there is no doubt. With the ageing population and the growing health bill, I recognise that it would be a difficulty for any government. I am disappointed that the people of Stuart and regional South Australia do not get as much support as I think they should, but it is a big job, as I said.

If I heard the Treasurer correctly when he was speaking earlier today, he said that the current government has doubled spending on health from where it was when the government came in eight years ago. It is very—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: On health across the state is what I was referring to; what the Treasurer said. The inflation rate on health is approximately 10 per cent; I think the Treasurer said between 9 per cent and 11 per cent. Inflation of between 9 per cent and 11 per cent over eight years in itself would account for approximately a doubling in health spending. I have no doubt that the numbers are accurate. He would not have said them if they were not, but that is probably a nominal doubling in the dollars. However, by his own admission, in real terms it is essentially the same amount of money to do the same job; so I do not think there is any room to be claiming too much credit.

There are lots of priorities—and obviously there is education and roads, and some very specialised things where we miss out in the country with regard to special needs education and mental health. It is, of course, very frustrating that people from the country continually have to come down to the city to access a lot of these services.

The difficulty is not just for the specific families who incur the cost and disruption to themselves but also more broadly to the community. If you happen to have a child with particular circumstances and needing particular help, and you are travelling back and forth to Adelaide all the time, then naturally you will be tempted to leave the rural community and come down to the city. That is hard enough for that family and for that family's friends and relatives, but it is a great drain on the regional community as well, because every single family in a regional town counts, and every single family that moves on decreases the critical mass that supports the businesses and the schools, and then, by a sort of a sly stealth of hand, supports the requirements for the services. So then there is a self-fulfilling prophecy that the school can shrink or be closed, that the hospital can shrink or be closed. It is a cruel situation that people in the regions find themselves in.

I would like to spend a fair bit of time focusing on the state government's dealing with the federal government's mining super profits tax. Certainly I have a great deal of concern on any tax that identifies success. I do not mind the fact that, in relation to royalties or some form of repayment for the physical assets that belong to the crown which are being removed and which go forever from our country, there may need to be some adjustment there. I am happy to consider that.

I am very uncomfortable with the concept of a super profits tax, given that we have a percentage-based tax system already. It really does take a lot of incentive away from people to be successful. I understand that that is a federal government initiative. What I would like to talk about

is the state government's handling of that, and I would like to commend our Speaker, who, as the member for Giles, went to see the federal government and advocate particularly on behalf of her electorate. I thought that was a responsible, brave, courageous move, and I cannot see why the Treasurer and the Premier cannot do exactly the same thing.

I cannot see why we do not hear on the radio, see on the television or read in the newspaper that the Premier is leading a delegation to Canberra to talk to the federal government about the dreadful impact that this mining tax will have on the state of South Australia. So I credit our Speaker, as the member for Giles, for doing that. Why cannot the Premier lead and represent the whole state in exactly the same way that she has done?

Most economic and commercial realities come down to common sense. There are some very basic common sense facts that are the substance of most commercial issues. I am sure it was very tempting for the federal government to implement that tax because they looked primarily at Western Australia and at Queensland, where mines are already up and running. They are already successful and they are already going very well, and they cannot slow down. If they are in full swing and they get sluggish with a tax, they cannot shut down or slow down production or make too many adjustments. Once a mine is running, it takes months or years for them to make adjustments.

But this is a very cruel thing for South Australia, where the majority of our mines are still to come. We hear the Premier talk all the time about new mines on the way. The reality is, as our deputy leader said last night, that all but one of the mines that have come on stream lately were explored and the resources found long before this government came to power. The real fact is that all governments support mining. It does not matter whether you are Liberal or Labor, all governments support mining (as they should) because it is one of the best industrial and export opportunities that our state has. So, governments, whether Liberal or Labor, would always support mining.

However, for South Australia, where we are looking at new finds coming on stream, this tax is potentially devastating. It does not matter whether you are a family just getting by and you are contemplating trying to buy an investment property, suddenly, if the return from that investment property is to be slashed by 40 per cent, hang on, that decision is on hold. That decision is on hold for quite a few reasons: maybe you cannot afford it now; maybe it is not an attractive option anymore; or, guess what, maybe the bank will not lend you the money anymore.

The reality is that large mining companies, even mining companies as large as BHP, are in the exact same situation. One of the greatest impediments for the potential expansion of Roxby Downs is the fact that they may not be able to finance it now. BHP may decide that it is still attractive, it would still like to go ahead, but the banks, the international finance options that they have, might just vanish. They might say, 'We were happy to lend you the money before on the plan and the scope of works and everything that was in line before, but we are not happy to lend you the money now. We will not give you that finance.' That reality is exactly the same for the family who is trying to buy an investment property to expand what they do and create some wealth for their kids and grandkids. The principle is exactly the same for a large international mining company.

I think it was our deputy leader who said that exports are the very best form of revenue that we can get, because it is other people's money that is coming in. Circulating money and transactions are fantastic, and selling within a state or within a country certainly stimulates the economy, and it is a critical part of our economy, but you cannot beat exports when you are trying to grow your economy. So, why would anybody put our exports—and I mean ours as in South Australian exports—at risk? That is the best opportunity we have.

If mining does not continue to grow in South Australia, we are in big trouble. I do not think there is anybody in this house who would disagree with that. We are in big trouble if mining does not continue to grow. So, I challenge the Premier, the Treasurer and everybody in government to get up, get moving and publicly say, 'We are going to Canberra. We are taking a delegation to Prime Minister Rudd. We are going to fight against this tax with the federal government.'

I give great credit to the member for Newland. He was certainly not saying anything against the government, but several weeks ago he was talking very rationally regarding his views on this mining tax. The government has to go to Canberra (as the member for Giles did on behalf of her electorate) on behalf of this state and say, 'This is not good. This is no good for this state.'

I hope that some work is going on in the background. We are told that some work is going on in the background, but there has only been one person on the government side who has said, 'I'm not working in the background; I'm working in the foreground. I am going to fight, on behalf of

the people that I represent, against this for the good of my electorate,' and I challenge the Premier to stand up and say that he is going to go to Canberra to fight for the people whom he represents on the same issue.

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

ADELAIDE OVAL

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) (17:33): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There has been some idle speculation and conspiracy theories and malice circulating this afternoon following question time. I was asked during question time whether I knew about the increased costs for the Adelaide Oval redevelopment before the election. I responded that the Deputy Premier had already addressed the matter by stating that he had not told me, nor any other cabinet minister.

I was not told by any person of any increases in the cost estimate. To make it perfectly clear, I had no knowledge of any increases to the cost estimates for the project prior to the election on 20 March this year.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on motion to note grievances (resumed on motion).

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (17:34): I commend the Premier on coming in and clarifying the situation, but I am still rather perplexed by this. If I could just take a moment during the debate to ask this question: all members here would recollect that a lot of media scrutiny occurred in the four weeks before the election about costings and, being part of that process, I was asked many questions.

I am very aware that the Hon. Rob Lucas, early in the process, spoke about an overrun—I think the figure quoted was \$90 million—on the Adelaide Oval that he had been reliably informed about, and we put that before the media. I am rather surprised that the Premier can now come in and say he did not know about it. Surely—and this is what truly surprises me about how government process must work—if that sort of media speculation exists, the Premier must have been asked the question by the media, so is the Premier not then responsible to actually ask a question of the Treasurer about this media speculation and whether it has any basis? If that did not occur, I am flabbergasted by how the process works.

Others will take up questioning on this matter, no doubt, but for a government to exist in a situation like that, where one person knew about a significant additional cost the day before the writs were issued, chose deliberately to keep the information, not only from his own parliamentary colleagues within cabinet but also from his leader, the Premier, and from the people of South Australia, is very disappointing to me. The Treasurer has provided an answer on that, and there is no need for me to go into more detail, but I am sure a lot more questions will be asked in future about it.

I will take up the matter of the Supply Bill. I acknowledge that the member for Light in his contribution talked about great things happening in his community; no doubt about that, but, honestly, it is clearly the role of government to invest in services and infrastructure. While it is very true that we on opposite sides of the chamber have different priorities and different opinions in some matters, there is an overwhelming desire from all of us to ensure that investment occurs in the communities we represent in this chamber.

I commend the member for Light on his victory. I would like to have seen a different result in the election, with Cossie Costa in this chamber, but the member for Light put up a great campaign and had tremendous support. However, it is important to reflect upon the fact that what he talks about are exactly the sort of things that we on this side of the chamber want to see in our communities also. It is the frustration we display sometimes that brings out the negativity in us. When I came to this place I was a positive person; someone who always tried to see the optimistic side of things, where opportunities lay, where the good things were occurring, and to recognise them and to applaud those decisions when they were made.

My frustration in having to sit on this side of the chamber is that you suddenly have to have a very negative aspect in your mind and have to look at any opportunity to criticise any component of a decision made by the government. Personally I find that hard to do, because I recognise when the right decisions are made. Political reality does sometimes require other opinions to be expressed.

We all want to stand up here and talk about the great things occurring in our communities, and I will take a few minutes to do that. I am grateful that SA Water is part of a Yorke Peninsula long-term water infrastructure planning group that has been meeting for probably 18 months. I am grateful that the minister provided me the opportunity to sit as an observer on that group and take part in the discussions. I hope, now that the report is nearly finalised, that it leads to significant investment occurring in water infrastructure on the Yorke Peninsula area, because it needs it. There are 16 communities that do not have a reticulated, potable supply. Those communities rely totally upon rainwater for all their water needs. Some cannot cart water from standpipes, admittedly, but it is important that that infrastructure investment take place. I hope that in future years a significant investment will occur.

I also recognise that in the last two months I have had investment occur in my CFS. The Balaklava and Hamley Bridge brigades have gleefully reported back to me that work has commenced on their new structures, and that is wonderful for those communities, because these are volunteer people who come together and have done so in many cases for a lot of years. I attended a function at Balaklava probably six weeks ago: a dinner in recognition of people who have given 10, 20, 30 and, in one case, 40 years service to the CFS. It is wonderful that not only is their effort recognised, along with that of their partners, who are also important contributors, but also indeed that the CFS is investing, with state funds and with emergency services levy dollars, in the infrastructure required for that.

There is a significant need to invest in all our communities, because we all want where we live to become great places. They are, in many instances, tremendous communities, but there is always a need for an investment to occur. Now, \$15.05 billion creates a tremendous opportunity for the expenditure of funds in appropriate areas that allows not only the economy of our great state to move forward but, importantly, for the social needs of our communities to be met.

Social needs form a variety of issues: the hospitals, the roads, the water network, the telephone, the broadband connections, the schools, the kindergartens—everything comes into that. Like many members of parliament, we are constantly contacted in our electorate office about the needs of a particular sector or person in a community who want a lot more things to happen. It is important that we do that, and \$15.05 billion has to be spent appropriately. There are tremendous competing demands.

I take some heed from the words of the Treasurer when he made his second contribution to this bill this morning—and I might be mixing the words up a bit—that, basically, community expectations will never be able to be met within the resources of government. Regrettably, I have to go by that principle, too, because there will never be a willingness to pay the taxation required to ensure that everything the community wants, in every possible way, can be met. That is why governments are faced with difficult decisions.

I think it was very unfair of the member for Light to say that the Liberal Party did not present an alternative vision. It was clear to us on this side of the chamber that, in the period approaching 20 March, that vision was well and truly put to the people of South Australia. Isobel Redmond—the member for Heysen and the Leader of the Opposition—managed to connect with the community of South Australia in such a way that it frightened the life out of Labor. In that last week, they were very desperate for anything. Isobel, through sheer effort and will, made South Australians believe that there was an alternative.

We all feel frustrated—and certainly many people who not only supported us but those who believe in the principles of democracy—that, with 51.6 per cent of the two-party preferred vote going to the Liberal Party, we were unable to form government. I have to reflect upon the fact that democracy gets it right, but our job over the next three years and nine months is to ensure that the government is held to account in every possible area. That is why the Supply Bill debate has been an important one.

We are talking about \$5.22 billion out of a budget that will probably exceed \$15.5 billion. It will no doubt have challenges, but it is important that every one of those dollars that come out of

the pockets of Australian residents—and a lot of borrowings by the sound of it when it comes from federal money—is spent in the most appropriate way. That is why debate has to occur.

The Supply Bill debate is an opportunity for members on this side of the chamber to ensure that the real gaps in service delivery and infrastructure delivery that exist in our communities are brought first and foremost to the attention of the government, to the ministers and to this house. This is the place for that debate to occur. We try to have meetings one on one and we try to put issues forward but, in opposition, you are very much left on the outside, without being given a real opportunity to put issues before the people. Parliament provides that, because it is a forum in which every word that is said can be reviewed, and let us hope that it is, because we need that investment to occur.

The member for West Torrens (the Minister for Small Business) today talked about initiatives that are being created for small business, and I commend him on that. Small business is clearly one of the important drivers of the economy of South Australia. It has faced a lot of challenges in the last two years, especially with the global financial crisis. These people are working as desperately as they can to ensure their profitability so that they can provide for their own families and, indeed, ensure the continued employment opportunities for their very dedicated and loyal employees and their families. We need to ensure that the policies of government—and I will talk about this constantly—actually support business enterprise and effort.

When we have taxation policies in place or overly harsh levels of regulation that create tremendous imposts on businesses of all levels, but importantly for small business, where quite often there are only a couple of people who work 80 to 90 hours per week, these people need an enormous amount of support. So, I hope that the Minister for Small Business considers the needs of those people who work very hard to ensure in their own way the economic viability of the community and the business that they operate, as well as the community of South Australia and the community of our nation. We need to make sure that we get it right.

Finally, I want to comment briefly on a driver awareness seminar at Two Wells about three weeks ago. It was supported by the Motor Accident Commission, I believe. It was a tremendous function and I learnt an enormous amount from it. There were probably about 40 young people in attendance, and it was hard not to become emotional when hearing stories about the impact that car accidents have had on them. I commend the government on its support.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:44): The Supply Bill is providing \$5 billion to keep the government going through until the budget is delivered. One of the important groups that will benefit from that continued supply is, of course, our Country Fire Service. As a member with a number of CFS brigades in my electorate, I am very proud of them, and I know that a number of others are, too. I see that the member for Finniss, the former presiding member of the CFS board, is in the chamber, and I know that the member for Goyder has very strong CFS communities in his electorate and that he works very hard for them.

With the budget still some months away, this is an excellent opportunity to talk about a few issues that relate to the Country Fire Service that I think the Treasurer would do well to take on board. I particularly draw his attention to a wonderful document entitled 'Emergency Services: Creating a Safer Community through Effective Emergency Services', authored by the member for Kavel. During the South Australian election campaign, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kavel put together an excellent document and a set of policies that, I think, would benefit the Country Fire Service—particularly through increased emphasis on support for volunteers in the CFS.

The first point was that a state Liberal government would provide an additional \$13 million over four years to the CFS and SES to provide additional front-line resources for the protection of our community. It would also maintain the CFS, MFS and SES as three distinct services, and, importantly, ensure that SAFECOM focuses on coordination and support and does not usurp control of the operational agencies or undermine their distinct roles.

I note the presence in the gallery today of the Liberal candidate for Adelaide in the upcoming federal election, Luke Westley. I congratulate Luke on attaining that position and, in particular, given that before the end of the year Luke will go to Canberra to represent the people of Adelaide, I draw Luke's and our federal representatives' attention to a further issue in the Liberal Party's emergency services policy; that is, we would seek to lobby the commonwealth government to allow out-of-pocket expenses as a tax deduction for emergency services volunteers. I commend

that policy to Luke and to the commonwealth government. It is certainly something that I believe the government would do well to support.

The Country Fire Service exists because of its volunteers, and the work of those CFS volunteers keeps many country communities alive in all sorts of disastrous situations. To reflect a little on the history of the Country Fire Service, it is a very proud history and one of significant change. It started off with farmers and rural residents in regional areas forming ad hoc firefighting groups, and it has now developed into a significant organisation which benefits from a lot of volunteer and community work. If the state government had to pay for everything that the CFS does, it would cost a great deal more than the \$57.9 million that the emergency services levy provides, so we have a lot for which to be grateful.

Originally, of course, councils were responsible for the equipment and appliances of the CFS' predecessor organisation, the EFS. I am informed that back then the knapsacks they had—effectively, glorified water pistols—were the main firefighting tools used. They say that things were tough back then; that saying is heard often, but as far as our country firefighters are concerned that could not be closer to the truth. The risk from fire has not changed, but thankfully some of the equipment has. Those pioneers, ill-equipped as they were, did their part for their communities with great courage.

Today we have a bit more bounty in our society so we must ensure that our volunteers are suitably equipped and resourced as they go about their important work. In South Australia we benefit from 15,000 volunteers doing as their predecessors did and, when called upon, they drop what they are doing, whatever it may be. They leave work, they are disturbed in the middle of the night, and they protect their community.

No longer do the volunteers listen for fire sirens to be called to action. Pagers do that job now, and they may chime at any time—rain, hail or shine. Volunteers respond immediately. It can happen in the middle of the night, as we saw in Athelstone last year in December, when Black Hill went up. The Black Hill fire, at about two in the morning, highlighted an issue that may not have been anticipated in relation to the turning off of sirens. While the existence of the sirens might, in the first place, have been a call to arms for the local brigade to come to help, there was also a secondary function of the siren that clearly was important in a case like this: the sirens serve as a warning to the local community that there is a fire in the area. That was why it was very important, as part of the Liberal party's policy for the election, that it have a distinct policy of turning the sirens back on where they had been turned off, and of building new sirens where they need to be built. I urge the government to take that up.

At Athelstone, the Black Hill fire in the middle of the night came to within 20 metres of some suburban backyards. The fact is that residents were sleeping inside and got the shock of their lives when they woke up the next day to find that there had been a fire 20 metres away. Thanks to the great work of the CFS volunteers who answered the call of their pagers (and I am proud that one of my staff members is a member of the Norton Summit/Ashton brigade, one of the local brigades which worked so hard on that fire; congratulations to Scott Kennedy), there was no loss because of that fire.

It is not surprising that the local community wants a siren, given those sorts of circumstances. The *East Torrens Messenger* conducted a poll which, I think, for one of these polls, had a very high response rate. A total of 380 people voted, of whom 83 per cent were calling for the siren to be reinstated for the first time since it was turned off. This is not as simple as just flicking a switch and turning on a siren because, with the way that housing has been built up in that area, the siren is currently pointing into somebody's backyard. They would get the shock of their lives if it was turned on on Saturday morning.

However, there is ample scope to work with the Campbelltown Council and also the Athelstone CFS in particular. Its Captain, Eero Haatainen, and the Deputy Chairman of their Management Committee, Mr Peter Monkhouse, and other members of their committee have been working hard. They have identified some suitable sites where the new siren could be built. One at Wadmore Park is, I believe, favoured and suggested by the council. The DEH also has a site at the top of Addison Avenue which could be appropriate. For a very insignificant cost, I think we could set a lot of people's fears at rest, and this would provide an excellent safety measure for the people of the Athelstone community.

The correspondence I have had with the Minister for Emergency Services on this has been helpful. To start with, the minister seemed to want to move the station entirely, which had not been

sought by the council nor the local CFS brigade. On my informing him of that he has now written back to me saying that the CFS is currently undertaking an audit of fire sirens across the state. The fact is that the former member for Morialta promised her electorate, which is now my electorate, that this would be sorted out immediately after the election. I now seek the government's assurance, and I hope that the Minister for Emergency Services and the Treasurer will deliver this very minor sum so that the Athelstone community can have their fire siren, as they deserve.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest the member for Finnis and the member for Croydon go outside if they want to have a conversation and let the member speak in silence.

Mr GARDNER: Thank you for your protection, Madam Speaker. It is of some concern, more broadly, that the average age of a CFS volunteer today is 51, and that is rising. Over the last eight years of the Labor government, some 2,000 volunteers have been lost and not replaced. We have gone from 17,000 to 15,000 in South Australia and, if something is not done soon to make volunteering more attractive to young people, then areas of the state will be at risk because of the lack of service here.

Living in a fire danger zone myself, in Rostrevor, it pleases me to know that many of the CFS brigades in my electorate, including Athelstone, Basket Range, Cherryville, Montacute and the Norton Summit/Ashton Brigade, are young and vibrant and have many younger members. The Athelstone CFS sometimes has to turn away potential volunteers because it has become so popular. However, in saying that, I pay great tribute to the earlier generations who are still there to watch over the new, young ones and share their experience. I pay particular credit to Sandy Taylor of the Norton Summit/Ashton Brigade who recently celebrated 50 years service and who was awarded an Australian Fire Service Medal. Congratulations to Sandy, and thank you for the work of all of our CFS volunteers across South Australia.

[Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.D. Hill]

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:54): I appreciate the support of the minister in giving me the extra five minutes after six o'clock. I rise to support the Supply Bill and raise a few issues pertinent to the state and also to my electorate. When I was up in my office, I heard a member speaking down in the chamber just a while ago, talking about driving and road accidents. I would like to put forward my support for, hopefully, some budget funds for driver training.

I have down in my electorate a gentleman called Bill Jerram at Mount Compass. Bill is a retired school teacher, who very tragically lost his teenage daughter some years ago in a motor vehicle accident, and he has done everything possible since then to educate children. He has a great proposal for driver training in schools, and I think it is out of ideas such as Mr Jerram's that we get things proven out in the field. So, yes, I do support that.

I know this whole subject of driver education and the age at which people drive encourages some discussion. I am probably fortunate that I started driving around the paddocks when I was about seven years old, like many of the country members. One member told me today that they used to steer the vehicle while their father fed out hay on the back. We did these things because we had to do them; that is just the way of country life.

I find many of the younger drivers quite responsible. Unfortunately, those in the minority who are irresponsible make it difficult for everybody else. I see plenty of older drivers around who are far more dangerous on the road than some of the younger drivers. However, when we have the hoon drivers out doing foolish things and something tragic happens, as it did a week or two ago, it then becomes headline news. We can regulate all we like but we will never stop stupidity. We can pass as many laws in this place as we like but we will never stop stupidity. So, I support funding for that area.

I also want to briefly comment on the BER funding that has gone into schools across Australia, in particular, South Australia and what is happening there, with the state attempting to rip money out of the federal BER funding to do jobs that should be funded by the state. In particular, I am talking about my area at the moment and I refer to the Yankalilla Area School, which has had to find \$103,000 out of its BER funding to put in firefighting tanks.

I point out that we are becoming bureaucratically crazy in this nation, for example, when you have a local CFS brigade that says, 'No, they don't need it', when you have a mains system

that goes through, when you are identified as a high risk area and sometimes you query how high that risk is, but then centralist bureaucrats step in and say that, no, you have to have these things. It just makes people shake their head in disbelief. It has happened at Yankalilla and it is now happening at the Parndana campus on Kangaroo Island where they are finding that they have to put \$60,000 of their BER funding into providing tanks and additional firefighting components. I point out that they also have mains water.

We have lost touch with reality in this nation about how we can do things. Of course, we have to take appropriate measures to protect our communities, our children in schools and everyone else. However, we are going to ridiculous lengths, in my view, and putting additional costs on the taxpayers to do things that you seriously have to doubt sometimes.

I now turn to the subject of tourism in South Australia and tourism funding. Like many other departments, my understanding is that under the Sustainable Budget Commission, the tourism budget is about to be given a savage cut. Just recently, we had the Australian Tourism Exchange in South Australia, which is a major showcase for Australian tourism. We were very fortunate to get it in South Australia, and it was very well done. I commend the South Australian Tourism Commission on its presentation at the ATE and its South Australian display, the way it fronted up and the way it carried out the whole ATE.

I was fortunate enough to go through there one day when the ATE was on, and I was fortunate enough also to attend a function one night where I dined with buyers from the United States and New Zealand. I had the opportunity to have a lot of discussion with some of those people. It is a great thing.

However, just being perfectly parochial and talking about my electorate, the Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island, we have two marketing bodies as regions in the state. The Fleurieu Tourism Board marketing body is chaired very capably by Lucy Willson of Bremerton wine fame, who has been there for some years, who does an excellent and outstanding job in promoting the Fleurieu. We had this bizarre nonsense about changing the name in the lead up to the election, and it has caused a great deal of angst in the tourism fraternity during the last few months. I believe I am correct in saying that it has referred to Fleurieu Tourism—

Mr Pederick: Has it?

Mr PENGILLY: That is my understanding, and so it damned well should have, quite frankly. It never should have changed. It was another plot to try to salvage the political career of the member for Mawson, to change its name. We have all the respect in the world for McLaren Vale wineries, Southern Vale wineries, but it is Fleurieu Tourism that markets the Fleurieu, and that is the brand name that goes around the world. South Australia, in its own right, is recognised as a major wine region.

This Friday night the tourism awards for Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island are being held at Currency Creek. Unfortunately, I cannot attend due to a commitment to attend a Rotary changeover dinner, and I am sure other members in this place will be doing similar sorts of things; but it will be a great night. The shadow minister for tourism, the Hon. Terry Stephens, is representing me. I am unsure whether the member for Hammond is attending.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I hear voices from the back bench, from the extinct attorney-general. I can hear it.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Of blessed memory!

Mr PENGILLY: Of blessed memory—who, whilst in government for eight years, still failed to get Barton Terrace West open.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Watch this space.

Mr PENGILLY: 'Watch this space', he says. We'll watch this space, but he is consigned to the back bench. I do not know what he is doing while he is back there, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I reckon he is creating chaos.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: He's keeping the bastards honest.

Mr PENGILLY: He is too; that's exactly what he's doing. It was a perfect delight to read what the former attorney-general had to say about the government and where its priorities are. Now, I am sure other members in this place picked up on it, and we were absolutely delighted to

hear about it. I do not know what else he plans to do over the course of the next four years, but, my word, he will be creating maximum mayhem in the Labor Party. I reckon the knives are out with the cloak and dagger stuff. He will be cycling between—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Whoa! Hang on, member for Finniss! There's a bit of excitement here. Point of order. Let's all calm down to my left.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, is there any requirement on the human vuvuzela opposite to be relevant to the bill before the house, or are there no boundaries of relevance?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, this is a very interesting point you raise, member for Croydon. I am noting the time and you will get your time, member for Finniss, don't worry. No taxation without representation, I believe, is what is called upon here, and we are discussing a supply bill and, as a result, whether we all like it or not, the member for Finniss can pretty much say what he likes.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you very much for your ruling. It is highly relevant of the former attorney-general to raise it. Indeed, in talking about the priorities, he is implying that the money being spent by the Rann government should be going to health, education, schools, and so on; so, he is, as the member for Waite said, keeping the bastards honest. I look forward to seeing him pedalling around—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me—point of order from me: I know that it is a very famous quote, of course, member for Finniss, but I do not think we are going to chat about the 'bastards' because that is unparliamentary language.

Mr PENGILLY: Well, the sods then, Madam Deputy Speaker, and in this case the sods are the members of his own side. What you are going to see is the former attorney-general pedalling around between—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Of blessed memory!

Mr PENGILLY: Of blessed memory—pedalling between electorate offices on his pushbike, encouraging all his members to not only get rid of the current trio running the state but to put the money in the right place. Have I run out of time?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Fully; you have run out of time and you are taking up the time of the member for Waite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (18:05): Madam Deputy Speaker, it is a pleasure to rescue the house from my colleague and friend the member for Finniss and bring the house to the question of the government's investment in defence. I do so with a particular emphasis on plans to build future submarines here in the state. During the election campaign, the Premier was out there promising that at least \$30 billion would be spent on the submarine project and implying that that investment would be spent here in this state. Recent revelations in Canberra have shown us that investment could be as little as \$9 billion.

It was in the Rudd government's 2009 Defence White Paper that there were indications that the government intended to:

...acquire 12 new Future Submarines, to be assembled in South Australia. This will be a major design and construction program spanning three decades, and will be Australia's largest ever single defence project.

Sadly, the Defence White Paper did not put a dollar figure on the total spend required to build the submarines, but, as I mentioned a moment ago, that did not prevent the Premier from claiming in his election policy that he had secured the project for South Australia—he himself—at an estimated value of \$30 billion.

I regret to inform the house the defence estimates hearings in Canberra have led to revelations that the Rudd Government may now be looking at off-the-shelf purchases of new submarines from up to four foreign submarine builders, raising questions about Australian content and participation. Evidence given by senior defence officials in Canberra confirmed that the Rudd Labor government is dealing with companies in Germany, Sweden, Spain and France for early design work. I note the following statement on page 6 of the 2009 Defence Capability Plan:

While Australia will not design a submarine from scratch, the ability to adapt an overseas design, or utilise 'best of breed' technologies to meet Australian requirements will be critical to the development of an effective submarine capability. There is also a repair and maintenance capability to maintain operational availability of submarines and to undertake some selected upgrade, overhaul and rebuild activities.

I recall in 1990 that it fell to me as a lieutenant colonel in headquarters Special Forces to walk from G Block of Russell Offices in Canberra to the RAN's Collins class submarine project office to coordinate Special Forces capability needs in their vessel. I must say that I was very impressed with what I saw.

Here was a bold and significant defence project that pushed us towards the 21st century. We had taken a leap of faith. Such endeavours do not unfold without trials and challenges; so it was with the Collins class submarines. There were problems, but, in the end, as a nation we have created a first-class capability.

The Rudd Labor Government must now ensure that we build on this success with the 12 new submarines envisaged in the SEA 1000 Project, which, as I mentioned, forms part of the 2009 Defence White Paper. Members may be interested to note that there has been a considerable amount of discussion on this in recent weeks through the work of the Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) and its papers under the name of 'Strategic Insight' by Sean Costello and Andrew Davies. They note that the project could include up to \$36 billion worth of submarines if we design and build our own vessel, or as little as \$9 billion if we buy a less capable off-the-shelf submarine from an overseas supplier.

There are already signs that the Rudd Labor government is getting cold feet and looking for soft options on the submarine project. Is this because the money and the surplus we once enjoyed has been spent many times over by this reckless federal Labor government, or is it that after a series of recent bungles, from home insulation to the BER project, the government is becoming risk averse?

It is worth noting that the government has three possible pathways forward. Firstly, it could purchase a submarine from overseas for fit-out in Australia, as has occurred with the LHD project, that is, the helicopter capable ship. Secondly, the government could buy an off-the-shelf design for production in Australia under licence with limited modifications, as has occurred with the air warfare destroyer program, where we went for the Navantia design ahead of the modified Arleigh Burke design that had a higher degree of Australian design content. Thirdly, the government could significantly modify and redesign either the Collins class submarine, though there are some intellectual property issues linked to that, or another overseas submarine design to produce a new Australian vessel.

The first of these options would be the least expensive for the commonwealth but would offer the least benefit to Australian, and therefore South Australian, industry. The last of these options would be the most expensive for the commonwealth, offering the best prospect of Australian involvement. Ultimately, the final decision will rest with the commonwealth, but I say to the Rann Labor government and to the Treasurer that it is a decision in which the state government should participate—and, indeed, a decision which may need to be taken to COAG—for there are both risks and opportunities.

Economist Henry Ergas recently argued in an ASPI *Special Report* in favour of off-the-shelf buys from overseas. Ergas, whose views I regard very strongly and respect enormously, in this case dismisses the benefits of the Australian design and build which include capability and infrastructure development, self-reliance in time of conflict, and workforce and taxation benefits to broader economic growth. I disagree with his views on the submarine project.

Sooner or later, Australia needs to stand up in areas other than mining and primary production. With a manufacturing sector under challenge from emerging economies, the pathway to success is through science, innovation and entrepreneurship. If European nations can establish and maintain first class shipbuilding design capabilities, then why can't we?

The first thing Australia needs from its 12 new submarines is a war fighting capability so that the RAN can defend us and our interests. The second thing we need from the SEA 1000 project is a good old-fashioned dose of nation building. How could any Australian government commit so many billions of taxpayers' dollars on such a project without maximising the benefits across the Australian economy for the long term so that Australian workers, Australian business and Australian families benefit?

The expensive part of modern warships is the smart technology on board, and it is here that the SEA 1000 project may prove to be the foundation upon which a smart naval shipbuilding super highway can be built right here. We must ensure that the Defence, Science and Technology Organisation, our universities, our centres of excellence and Australian industry are fully engaged with this project and leverage opportunities for growth from it. This has particular implications for the ASC in Adelaide and for companies in other states that form part of the consortia that build vessels.

It makes sound strategic sense that we further develop our collaboration with the United States on naval ship design because that is where the science and technology originates, particularly for war fighting systems which are the expensive part of any build. It also deals with security of information best managed on a nation-to-nation basis. A good start would be for us to look beyond the Defence White Paper to the third generation of submarines.

We last built a Collins-class submarine in 2001. The first of the SEA1000 vessels will roll off the line in 2022. The 21-year gap has been unfortunate. We should roll out the SEA1000 submarines over a period of time that enables a third generation of submarines to be built as follow-on for the CEA1000 vessels. In this way we can provide deal flow for industry and a sustainable future.

It is my view that the Rudd Labor government, as openly contemplated in defence estimates in recent days, should not wimp out by failing to invest in designing and building our own submarine rather than buy purely off the shelf. We have an opportunity here. Labor governments both federal and state must pursue it. It is a test of our resolve as a nation to think big.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (18:16): I rise to add a further contribution to the Supply Bill and to comment further on the water—or lack of it—for this state. I refer briefly to the recent floods on the Darling River earlier this year. We had one around Christmas time and one a bit later than that. The second flood was record flooding and exemplified how the northern Murray-Darling Basin is so mismanaged. There is mismanagement in the southern Murray-Darling Basin, but there is massive mismanagement in the north.

While we have the Murray-Darling Basin Authority trying to work out sustainable diversion limits in getting environmental flows through to the Murray mouth, how can we get accurate data when we have such a valuable asset that we do not measure? In these northern flood plains, it is flood plain harvested and captured by major irrigation groups with no real accountability for that water. In fact, with the first flood we had the initial amounts of water that were to flow past the Menindee Lakes, because the first two lakes were to fill up, because they are the only ones that have been operating for the last eight years—until recently. There was a great carry-on that the Premier had negotiated extra water to come past. That water was to come past the top two Menindee Lakes—Lakes Wetherell and Pamamaroo—anyway.

So that was a furphy for a start with all the talk about what water we would get down. New South Wales did not want the shared water resource to get up to the limit where it would have to come under tri-state controls through New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, with the 640 gigalitre limit where they would have to open another lake. What happened with the second flood? Instead of managing it better we had a great wasted opportunity where more water could have been sent down earlier. There is a certain limit—I think about 20 gigalitres a day—and if more than that goes down it floods out on the anabranch and out on the flood plain below Menindee and there are some losses.

The sad thing is that we have also had eight years where the bottom two lakes—Lakes Menindee and Cawndilla—could have been re-engineered to make more water savings. Money was made available under the Howard government—\$400 million—to re-engineer the lakes, and we had Penny Wong coming out the other day saying that she had done a report worth multi-millions of dollars. That is really handy! Now we have put hundreds of gigalitres of water into these two lakes and there will be hundreds of gigalitres of dead water, and we have lost a real opportunity to manage our water in this part of the Murray-Darling Basin. We will get a share of that water, but so much will be dead water and dead storage that we cannot get out. The opportunity to redesign the lakes, cut a channel back to the Darling from Lake Cawndilla—the bottom of those four lake systems—and put a weir between Lake Menindee and Lake Cawndilla has been lost for now.

I was very pleased that the Broken Hill city council invited several members, including the deputy leader from the other place, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the member for Chaffey and me,

and we had very good dialogue. A real opportunity was lost there. So, there needs to be a lot more work done right throughout the system. This affects the irrigation sector and the critical needs sector right throughout South Australia, and especially my electorate. We have lost whole irrigation sectors down at Meningie and Narrung; they have run out of water. People are trying to work out the sustainable diversion limits that will come in and whether or not they get rid of water now.

I believe that the federal government is unfairly forcing the price of water down and it is making life very hard for people in the agricultural scene who are stressed out. I have mentioned before in this place the issues with mice and locusts and that this will need further management. The government needs to get further involved in these issues and get on with the job.

As far as water is concerned, another issue that has come up recently is the proposed dry-dock at Mannum which, sadly, the federal government has not funded. It is a project worth nearly \$2.5 million. I call on the state government to get on board and get on with this project so that we can help save and make the tourism industry prosper in South Australia. We have four vessels along that stretch of river that contribute \$125 million to the economy of the Murraylands. We have had no proactive action from the federal government, so the state government needs to come in and foot the bill so these boats can be dry-docked and surveyed so they can get on with the job.

Mr Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr PEDERICK: I note the voice from the background of the member for Schubert. There are massive issues moving forward. I note that I have limited time, but the mining super profits tax threatens all the mining in South Australia, not just the 20 billion-dollar expansion at Olympic Dam but also the \$20 billion of further mining investment elsewhere.

We have seen the health minister do a backflip today when talking about bringing services closer to country members. I have heard the minister say previously in this house when the Labor Party was trying to get the original country health plan through that 90 minutes from a hospital was close enough. We saw the outrage with that proposal from country people, and rightly so.

We have issues with fisheries and marine parks. The government is trying in a backhanded way to manage fisheries with marine park legislation which needs far more thought and input before we have a workable solution. We see issues with the federal government and its Building the Education Revolution. It has been out of control with its funding. If the federal government had put the money into private schools, it would have been able to get full value for the dollar. It could have built decent venues with its BER money but, sadly, public schools have been shafted by state education departments basically charging double for gymnasiums or, in some cases, three quarters, when they could have built quite a structure for the very same amount.

In winding up, I just want to make a quick point about natural resources management. I am very concerned about the money that is spent on administration. I note the ad that was in this week's *Advertiser* for the rent on the natural resource centre in Murray Bridge. It has a yield of \$312,766 a year in rent. That is not bad for an office, and there is no personal reflection on anyone who works there. There is a lot of work that goes into administration there, and I think it is outrageous that we have to pay that much rent for that many people. I wonder how much money really hits the ground in worthwhile projects. It has become another huge bureaucracy under this government. We do have to manage our natural resources, but I think there are far better ways to do it.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the 20 years that the member for Schubert has been in this place. I have worked with him for over four years. When I came into this place, I was offered the job of deputy whip. I had a great time working with the whip at the time (the member for Schubert) for 2½ years. We had a very good working relationship. He was my mentor, and I was pleased to have the opportunity of taking on the Whip's role in this new parliament and having the member for Schubert help to guide me a lot at times. I really appreciate that.

I spoke about the former member for Stuart, the Hon. Graham Gunn, when he left this place after nearly 40 years, and the member for Schubert has given 20 years service and will have nearly four more years. I congratulate him on his service and wish him well for the future.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to add my congratulations to the member for Schubert, an august member of this house. Here for 20 years, but only 64—not 70 as some have suggested.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (18:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:27 the house adjourned until Thursday 24 June 2010 at 10:30.