

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 October 2010

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

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, as we do at the start of every week, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

MARINE PARKS (PARLIAMENTARY SCRUTINY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 September 2010.)

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:01): I am glad to have the opportunity to say a few words on this bill. Marine parks, as we all know, are very important; in fact, they were a Liberal initiative in the 1990s. The then Liberal government went to the 2002 election with a plan, which would have had marine parks set up, in place and running by 2006. It is a shame that we are still working on this and that we are still trying to put it to bed, but I do have to say that, as a general rule, I am in favour and supportive of marine parks.

I have a view that, really, the outer boundaries are a little irrelevant. I would not mind if the whole coastline was a marine park; it would not make any difference to me at all. What I think is very important, though, are the zones. They are what really count, because they tell you where certain activities can be undertaken and where they cannot.

From a parochial perspective, the electorate of Stuart has a little over 100 kilometres of coastline in the Upper Spencer Gulf. It is a very important area of the state's waters and, certainly, very worthy of looking after, protecting and ensuring that it is here for hundreds—if not thousands—of years in the relatively good condition that it is in at the moment. It is a little unique in the Upper Spencer Gulf and, Madam Speaker, we share that section of coastline in our two neighbouring electorates.

As the minister might know, it is a hypersaline inverse estuary, which does make it a very special place and quite unique with regard to Australian coastal waters all over the place but, in particular, within South Australia. As I said, it is really the zones that make the difference, and there is no doubt that, whether you are a recreational fisher, a professional fisher or an ardent environmentalist—regardless of your take on this and if you have an interest in this—it is the zones that make the most difference.

The fishing industry has said to me clearly that it is very concerned about the fact that displaced effort regulations are not in place and are not going to be set up before the zones are identified. They have a very strong view, and I support them in this, that the way their displaced effort would be dealt with—the way they would receive potential compensation for their effort—is very important, and that should be established before the zones are set up. I think that is a very important thing to note.

I also point out that, as I understand it, the coastal waters around Adelaide are not part of the marine parks but that all the coastal waters around Port Augusta (which is the largest population centre in my electorate and, certainly, an important coastal Upper Spencer Gulf location) will be included in marine parks. That can cut both ways. I am not trying to be difficult on this issue but, certainly, there is nothing that is so special about the waters around Port Augusta that it should not be protected.

We have very clean water around Port Augusta. We have two resident pods of dolphins who live in the waters very close to Port Augusta. We now have regular visits by whales to the Upper Spencer Gulf—they come right up to the town of Port Augusta. All that needs to be protected, encouraged and supported. However, I am concerned that having the area around Port Augusta as part of the declared marine park could restrict development. Development is vital for the whole state but certainly for regional areas.

I am concerned about the possibility that we now have more rules, regulations and impediments to development. We have two cruise operators operating in Port Augusta and they work very well with each other; one goes south from the town on its regular route and one goes

north from the town. I have participated in both those cruises. The southern cruise has more of a hospitality focus and the cruise that heads north has a more environmental focus in regard to the information and services provided.

They are both tremendous examples of business and regional development and they support not only the Port Augusta area but also the outback, Flinders Ranges and the Mid North through tourism. I talked to cruise customers on one of those cruises the other day and two or three had come from Yankalilla—southern Adelaide, I think it was—purely to take this cruise. So, clearly, the environment and its protection is important, but I would hate to find a situation where another cruise operator, or even the existing cruise operators, are put under pressure in regard to the work they do and the important development and encouragement that they give to businesses throughout the Upper Spencer Gulf and, certainly, in Port Augusta.

Aquaculture is important in our area and, again, that cuts both ways. The people in aquaculture, perhaps more than anyone, need clean water, a clean environment, and the right flows and micro-organisms in the water, so they will not do anything to damage the environment. However, I would be very concerned and upset if these new regulations were to prevent that sort of development, which is very important for the economies of the Upper Spencer Gulf.

I am also concerned about the possibility of overzealous environmental protection. I think that is probably a good way to put it. Everyone in this room and the responsible constituents in Stuart want the environment and the special waters of the Upper Spencer Gulf to be protected, but not at all costs. There are a lot of activities in Whyalla, Port Augusta and Port Pirie that rely on using the water and using the local area for business and, in two of those three cities, for heavy industry.

The Upper Spencer Gulf needs that heavy industry, absolutely must have that heavy industry. We do not want to wreck the environment to sustain it, but I do not want anything to get in the way of maintaining and growing the jobs that those industries support in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

Getting back to the zoning issue, as I understand it, the declaration of the zones and any potential adjustment to them will be done through regulation and will have to come through parliament. I am most focused on those zones, because it is the zoning that will determine what, where, how, and what is in and below the water can be used. That is a very important part of this and I certainly support the professional fishers who have great concerns. I would have to say, minister, they have expressed to me very seriously and genuinely their disappointment with regard to the interactions that they have had with you so far.

The Hon. P. Caica: Me?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I have to put that on the record with you and your department with regard to having what they consider to be their current interests dealt with fairly. I encourage the minister as strongly as I can to look after the fishermen of the entire gulf—certainly the Upper Spencer Gulf—which is where that information is coming from. Their displaced effort regulations must be put in place before the regulations set the zoning.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (11:12): I thank all members for their contributions to this debate and I thank the member for MacKillop for his indication of support for this bill. I am pleased to see the progress of this amendment bill, as it demonstrates the government's commitment to carefully listen and, as a result, take action to address the needs of South Australians.

This bill was developed in direct response to the concerns of community members about any changes that may be proposed to future marine park management plans, and this bill will ensure that any future amendments to management plans will be provided to this place for the full scrutiny offered by the parliament.

The establishment of marine parks in South Australia is recognised in our State Strategic Plan, and is a target we have successfully achieved. In January 2009 the outer boundaries of a complete network of 19 marine parks were proclaimed across South Australia. As required under the Marine Parks Act 2007, these outer boundaries were released for public comment, and as a result of this comment amendments were made to the boundaries of seven parks. Approximately 44 per cent of state waters are now included in marine parks. I acknowledge the comment of the member for Stuart with respect to his views on the outer boundaries.

A number of matters were raised by members during their contributions on this bill, and I take the opportunity to address certain factors or issues raised within those particular contributions. The member for MacKillop asked whether the bill provides the power for either house to disallow the whole of what is before parliament or only part of it. I can confirm that the bill provides a process identical to that for approving regulations. Specifically, any future amendments to approved marine management plans would need to be either disallowed or accepted in their entirety.

Members opposite have also suggested that there has not been consultation during the process to date. This is simply not the case. Strong community engagement has been and will continue to be a key feature of the government's marine parks program. Between 2008 and 2010 the Department of Environment and Natural Resources officers have spoken with nearly 17,000 community members about marine parks.

This extensive community engagement program has included: 56 community events during 2009 that supported the consultation on the marine park outer boundaries; meetings with peak stakeholder groups, such as the seafood industry, recreational fishers, tourism and resources; meetings with community leaders, such as mayors, local government executives, Indigenous leaders and business owners; and, establishing 13 marine park local advisory groups comprising 180 volunteer community members.

For the benefit of members, I would like to briefly outline the next stage of the marine parks program which involves the development of the draft management plans for each marine park. As members are aware, the marine park local advisory groups were established to develop community proposals for marine park zoning scenarios. This phase is expected to take up to six months to complete. These zoning scenarios will be worked on over the next six months by the local advisory groups and key stakeholders such as the seafood sector and other relevant industries—tourism operators, local government and conservation groups—which all have, in their own way, important information to bring to the table.

Around mid-2011, I expect that draft management plans and impact statements will be released for a formal period of community consultation, as required by the Marine Parks Act. The marine park management plans will then be finalised around mid-2012. I am sure members are aware there is a diverse range of views about marine park zoning and, in particular, the appropriate size of marine park sanctuary zones. As was mentioned by the member for Stuart, this is the main issue that is concerning people.

For example, in respect of the diverse views, commercial fishers want minimal sanctuary zones. By comparison, the conservation sector is seeking sanctuary zones for up to 30 per cent of our state waters. That is equivalent to up to 70 per cent of our marine parks. I expect there will be much community debate as we go through this next stage of the marine park planning process. However, I do encourage the community and all key stakeholders—including our very important fishing industries—to work with us to help design our marine parks for the benefit of all South Australians now and into the future.

I note that the member for Finnis made comments relating to two fishermen in his electorate and the difficulties they are having. However, these difficulties as described by the member have nothing to do with marine parks as there have been no new restrictions to date on any of the activities in marine parks.

Members opposite also raised some old arguments about the marine parks program. Whilst these arguments have been refuted many times, I am pleased to put some information on the record again for the benefit of members. Marine parks are being established to protect and conserve areas that have natural value to ensure that these areas remain in place for generations to come. Marine parks are not about restoring areas that are already degraded. When we establish parks on land, we locate them in areas that have the natural values that we want to protect and conserve. We do not locate them on cleared farmland or in an urban environment.

This is a fundamental principle of protected area design on land and in the sea that underpins thousands of protected areas all around the world. Unfortunately, the areas closest to Adelaide have been impacted upon by a range of human activities that typically occur in metropolitan areas. There are many good programs underway to address these matters but marine parks are not one of them.

Fishing in marine parks is one of the most important matters that government must get right as marine parks are established. We have already invested considerable time and made a

number of commitments to help ensure that both commercial and recreational fishers can continue to enjoy their fishing activities.

I draw to members' attention the marine park policy commitments made by the government in 2009, in particular, that an assurance has been given to the commercial fishing industry that the outcome of marine park zoning will have no more than a 5 per cent economic impact as per the 2007 EconSearch report. The government has been working for over two years with commercial fishers to consider the best way to manage any unavoidable displaced commercial fishing effort, and while this may seem like a long period of time to some, the most important thing is that we get this right.

A working group looking into this issue has recently provided me with advice on a scheme for managing displaced effort and compensation, and I am currently considering this and other advice. The contributions of industry representatives to this work have been greatly appreciated. The government is committed to managing displaced effort in a manner that considers both the prudent use of public monies and minimises the impact on commercial fishers. I encourage the commercial fishing industry to continue to work closely with government so that we can ensure that the impact on fisheries is minimised.

The government also recognises the value of recreational fishing to South Australians across the state. I guess there is no need to remind the house, but I will, that as a dual gold medallist in the World Police and Firefighter Games in the fine sport of angling, I am about making sure that recreational fishers now and into the future will still be able to enjoy what it is that we all do enjoy about fishing. We recognise the value of recreational fishing to South Australians across our state and I understand that access to fishing areas that are accessible to all people is one of the most important issues for recreational fishers.

For this reason we have committed to ensuring that recreational fishing access will be maintained at key popular beaches, jetties and boat ramps across the state—and, of course, that will be the waters adjacent to boat ramps across our state. I can also confirm that the 13 marine park local advisory groups include both recreational and commercial fishers, and this will ensure that fishers' needs are well considered as zoning proposals are developed by each advisory group.

I refer to the member for Bragg's request for detailed information about the ecosystems, habitats and species that marine parks will protect, and advise that I have recently provided some correspondence to the member about this matter. I can also advise that the Department of Environment and Natural Resources has already made available a range of technical resources that explain the habitats and species that marine parks will seek to protect. The member for Bragg also inquired about the interaction between marine parks and natural resources management, and it is expected that planning, monitoring and implementation of marine parks and natural resources management plans will be complementary, to ensure that community and government resources are used in the most efficient and effective manner.

This government has put in place a thorough and inclusive marine parks program, which has focused on community engagement. I am confident that this process will ensure that South Australia will have a comprehensive, adequate and representative network of marine parks that both protects our precious marine environment and sustains our important regional industries and communities. Again, I thank members opposite for their contributions to this debate, and I thank parliamentary counsel and staff from my department for their work on this most important bill. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (11:21): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I want to reinforce a couple of the comments I made earlier, particularly—

Mr Williams: Out of order; most out of order.

The Hon. P. CAICA: You can rule me out of order, Madam Speaker, but it is particularly in relation to the contributions made by the opposition here. It is safe to say that this process has not been without controversy, and, of course, it is the objective of the government to work very closely not only with the opposition but also with the very communities who will be impacted by the decisions made.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CLASSIFICATION (PUBLICATIONS, FILMS AND COMPUTER GAMES) (EXEMPTIONS AND APPROVALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 September 2010.)

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:25): I am pleased today to speak on behalf of the opposition in support of the bill. This matter comes before the parliament as a result of a bill being introduced by the Attorney-General on 15 September this year. The history of the development of a national classification scheme, which now incorporates a joint commonwealth, state and territory legislative and administrative scheme, stems from a report undertaken by the Australian Law Reform Commission back in 1991. That was tabled in the federal parliament and, in summary, it provided amongst its major recommendations on the question of censorship procedure as follows:

- the rationalisation of existing Commonwealth, State and Territory legislation into a national scheme;
- the upgrading of the Commonwealth's existing 'voluntary' scheme for the classification of literature to a 'partially compulsory' scheme which focuses primarily on adult material;
- implementation of a compulsory classification scheme for computer games;
- the revision of the censorship fee sharing arrangements;
- widening the right to appeal against classification decisions to include members of the public but not 'mere meddlers'.

It should be noted that this last recommendation was not adopted by the existing commonwealth and state attorneys-general at the time but, nevertheless, a new regime came into effect circa 1995, when each of the state and federal parliaments dealt with the recommendations by introducing legislation consistent with a uniform national scheme for the classification of publications, films and computer games.

The national scheme also deals with issues of advertising, sale, demonstration, exhibition and, in particular, the regulation thereof. Under this scheme, the commonwealth act empowers a classification body, which is the Classification Board, to classify publications, films and computer games in accordance with the commonwealth act. Furthermore, a national classification code and classification guidelines operate to fulfil that objective.

Unlike other jurisdictions, South Australia has maintained a separate classification regime that can, if triggered, classify publications, films and computer games independently of the commonwealth classification and the Classification Review Board. Back in 1995, South Australia enacted its complementary enforcement legislation, the Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games) Act 1995, which determines how films, publications and computer games can be sold, hired, exhibited, advertised and demonstrated.

It is important to note for the purpose of the proposed legislation now before us that each of the enforcement acts of the states contains provisions allowing for films, computer games and publications to be exempt from the act and for organisations seeking exemptions to be approved for that purpose.

South Australia's powers of exemption and approval are contained in part 8 of the act. Under this part, the minister may, on application, direct that the act does not apply, to the extent and subject to any specified conditions specified in the direction, or in relation to a film, publication, computer game or advertisement pursuant to section 76; or may exempt organisations either in relation to the exhibition of a film at an event or in respect of all or any of its activities. That is under sections 77, 79 and 79A.

I note, with interest, the contribution made by the Hon. K.T. Griffin, attorney-general, in his second reading explanation on 27 July 1995 in which he outlines the background of the bill being considered at that time by the parliament, the national scheme, its history and the like. In that contribution he points out:

The State Bill contains exemption provisions in Part 8 to exempt a film, publication, computer game or advertisement from the classification process. This will be used only in certain instances such as film festivals. The State Bill also allows for the imposition of conditions as to the admission of persons to the screening of films.

So, I think it was very clear, at the time that our state legislation was introduced back in 1995—my understanding is that that bill (now our act) passed with the support of the opposition of the day—that this exemption application by a state body would only be used in limited circumstances.

Part 8 of the explanation of clauses sets out all the conditions that could be imposed for an exemption to be granted, which were certainly very general and very broad. I think it is important to note that a number of matters needed to be taken into account for the approval of an organisation for the purposes of gaining the exemption that we are talking about, whether the minister of the day or the national director were to approve that application for exemption. They were:

- (a) the purpose for which the organisation was formed; and
- (b) the extent to which the organisation carries on activities of a medical, scientific, educational, cultural or artistic nature; and
- (c) the reputation of the organisation in relation to the screening of films; and
- (d) the conditions as to admission of persons to the screening of films by the organisation.

That approval, of course, could be revoked if there were any change in the circumstances which were relied upon for the purposes of the initial approval.

I mention that because there have been applications made under part 8, at a state level, for events, and I can recall one in the short time I have been here in the parliament. My recollection is that it was an application for exemption to allow the screening of a film that had not been classified, but had been prepared in Israel, and it was to be screened in a public auditorium (in fact, at the Trak Cinema in my electorate) during the period of a celebratory festival of the Jewish community.

It is fair to say that the content of the film was very pro-Jewish—hardly surprising—and content which, I think it is fair to say, some in the community would have said was on the boundaries of propaganda and, therefore, they raised some objection to it. Nevertheless, the former attorney-general, under this government, made whatever decisions were necessary to approve its screening. I am not sure that it had a huge audience, but it was important for the festival that was being celebrated and it was duly screened.

So, there are circumstances when, clearly, the local minister would have more of a local understanding of the prevailing circumstances surrounding the importance or otherwise of an exemption being granted than, surely, a national director who does not sit here in Adelaide and who probably never will. So, I just make that point about the significance of retaining that local power.

For the record, I outline that, in South Australia, the power to grant the exemptions and approve organisations is conferred on the minister. All other states and territories, except Queensland, confer the power to grant exemptions and approve organisations on the director of the classification board, either alone or concurrently with the minister. Queensland has amended its legislation to confer the power on the director and the minister concurrently, but these amendments, at least according to the briefing I have at this stage, are yet to commence.

The advantages advanced by the Attorney-General in his presentation of having the director of the Classification Board make the exemption and approval decisions are: first, that the director has the relevant expertise and resources to properly assess films, publications, computer games and organisations seeking approval; and, secondly, decisions will be more consistent, that being more relevant to exemption applications for films. Many films that are the subject of exemption applications are screened in more than one state or territory, often being screened at several film festivals, and therefore it is suggested that it makes sense for the one decision-maker to consider all applications for exemption in relation to the one film.

I say this: first, it is important that we have a local assessment by a local person who will be familiar with it; and, secondly, it will make no difference, I suggest, whether a minister makes this decision or a director, on the basis of expertise/relevant resources. Each person in those circumstances will be making a decision after receiving a full briefing from whatever the resources of the department are. So, I do not actually accept that. What has happened, though, is that, under this bill, sections 76, 77, 79 and 79A confer the power to grant exemptions and approve organisations on the director, but the minister will retain a power to grant exemptions and approve organisations. Queensland, on our understanding, does not provide for that overriding power.

As I read these proposals, the executive of government steps back from the responsibility of making decisions—in this case retaining some role but not the primary role—and elevates chief executive officers or directors to undertake this role, for the reasons I have outlined. So, we end up with a hybrid situation. The director makes the decision—or he is the appointed person to do it (assuming that they do not go down the national director role, or, if they do, that they exercise the director's role locally as well); and then, if somebody does not like it, the minister may step in—'may'—and under section 79C, 'the minister may revoke the decision of the national director'.

So, we have this situation where, instead of having what I would describe as a clean and proper appeal process, we have a bit of a dog's breakfast. Of course, we are asking for some local flavour to be left in this, but we end up with a situation where a national director or a director (a non-minister as such) undertakes that role and then the minister may come in and deal with it.

The autonomy and relevance of the minister in these circumstances I think is very much diminished. It is probably a token offering that has been reached in an agreement at COAG to keep this small role for the minister, but I think it upsets the proper process of how we should be dealing with matters. This legislation is not unique to the extent that ministers retain a decision-making role. The immigration act is riddled with circumstances where the federal minister for immigration retains a lot of what I would call, for the sake of this argument, reserve powers to be able to make decisions that override what departmental people decide in the processing of applications, particularly for people who may be applying for a visa and/or migration status.

To identify something closer to home, we had very significant amendments to legislation under the public health obligations and the decision-making role when it came to outbreaks of contagious disease. The famous swine flu epidemic, which was apparently a pandemic, was the basis upon which the Minister for Health brought into this parliament (I still say) draconian legislation to elevate the power and decision-making role of the Chief Executive of the Department of Health—I think I anointed him as King Tony at the time—that could essentially shut down streets, stop traffic and stop people moving into certain areas in a situation where there was a major threat to public health and safety.

This is a role, frankly, that I still think should be reserved only for someone at the police level, but, in any event, should always be with the approval of cabinet and/or a minister. It is fair to say that, by the time we got through that hotchpotch of legislation, the minister had agreed that any decision by the chief of executive of health in these extraordinary circumstances would have to be backed up by having the approval of the relevant minister; the person who actually comes into this parliament and who should always have that decision-making role.

I do not suggest for one moment that this is on the same level as a terrorist attack or a public health and safety issue for the general public, but I think we should always move with caution in South Australia when we sign up to national agreements, allegedly in the interests of making things simpler, cheaper, easier, more accessible and so on, and that uniformity ought to be the prevailing panacea for legislative reform, only to find out later that it has some defect.

I indicate that, whilst the original proposals back in 1991 of the Australian Law Reform Commission had merit and were picked up in the proceedings, South Australia maintained its position. It will maintain a little bit of its position if this bill goes through, but I simply say that it should be moving with caution. At the very least, even though I think the Attorney-General's position has been relegated—and I think even described disrespectfully in the bill as an add-on—it does not sit well with me, but it is not one that we will be opposing.

It is fair to say—and I just say it for a procedural point of view—that the bill that we are currently considering is clearly structured not only to provide the national director to exercise powers under the state act but to encourage people to go to the national director rather than the minister. Applications to the minister need to be lodged 60 days in advance. There is no time limit on the national director. Applications to the minister need to be in writing and accompanied by specified information, whereas there is no such requirement with the national director. Applications to the minister are subject to fees, whereas there is no fee with the national director.

All of these, of course, are designed to encourage people to go off to the national director by putting up the barbed wire barrier of cost around the minister and, if you fail with him or her, then presumably you would have to jump a few hurdles and you could still get to the minister in this backup system that we are now going to have. In any event, we would say that what is important is that, when the Attorney-General is considering the regulations and guidelines that go with this legislation, at the very least if there is no fee to go to the national director, there should not be with

the minister. It is hard to imagine how you would not have to put a certain amount of information before the national director to have him or her deal with the matter, but the same threshold should surely be there for the minister.

If we follow this legislation, in the circumstances, limited as they may well be, an application to the minister could follow where someone is unhappy with the national director's decision, and we do not consider that those barriers of cost, time limit and prescription of applications in writing with specified information should impede the applicant in those circumstances. So we may look at amendments between houses to ensure that there is not that same impediment, barrier or barbed wire fence before the matter is dealt with in another place. In those circumstances, I give notice to the house that amendments may well be tabled in another place. I do not believe that others are stimulated to speak on this debate from our side of the house. It is a most interesting matter, but nevertheless I hope that that outline is sufficiently clear for the government to understand our position.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (11:49): I thank the honourable member for Bragg for her contribution. There are a couple of matters that the honourable member mentioned that I would like to address because I appreciate the thorough and considered approach that she has obviously given to this matter. The first one is that I assure the honourable member that my slavish adherence to COAG principles has nothing to do with this bill because, as the honourable member knows, I am one of the least enthusiastic people in this building about uniformity for uniformity's sake and always have been. I cannot stress enough how little COAG has to do with this bill. That is the first point.

The second point is that, as the honourable member pointed out, basically two reasons were advanced in the briefing for this piece of legislative change. The first one was that the Classification Board had the expertise and experience to be able to deal with these matters. The second one was that a uniform approach at a national level probably was not a bad thing. Both of those points are in fact genuine and serious points. First of all, as to the director of the Classification Board, can I say this: the Department of Justice, the Attorney-General's Department and indeed my office and I cannot really by any stretch of the imagination be described as film critics or indeed experts on the nuances between various classifications of film.

I cannot tell you or anybody in this chamber, for instance, how a particular cartoon winds up being G and another one PG. I am not quite sure where they drop that line. I do not know where they drop the line between PG and M or between M and MA, and when you start getting to the line between MA and R I am completely puzzled. I honestly do not know how one works that out. So, there is a genuine and real lack of expertise on my part as the minister and, believe it or not, I do have a lot of other things to do. Indeed any of those sitting opposite who in due course wind up occupying one of these positions will find that you have things to do.

To sit down and watch movies for days on end is not a productive use of your time and, even if you did, you would not actually know how to apply the guidelines because you are not doing that all the time, although I suspect you would be. You would be doing nothing else but watching movies. There is nobody in the Attorney-General's Department who is a film expert.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Croydon might be interested in this as a job. That is a good point and I confess that I have not raised it with him but I do not know whether the honourable member would be pleased or happier with me delegating this responsibility to the member for Croydon rather than the Director-General in Canberra. I am not sure, but I am happy to take her advice on that in due course. I do know that he would be very thorough if he were to be delegated that responsibility. I daresay there would be a fairly thorough examination of it.

That is a genuine point: there is in fact expertise reposed in the national body which does not sit within the state body. Therefore, as a matter of general principle, it seems to me that it would be better to take advantage of that central expertise as the basic default setting, if you like, and then say that, in the event that someone in South Australia for some reason has an issue about that default setting, they are welcome to come to the state minister and say to the state minister, 'Look, we think they've got it wrong' for whatever reason, make their case and then the state minister can intervene and override that default position.

Then, if I can emphasise this to the honourable member, it would be the minister focusing his or her entire attention on that one matter, that one film that has been the subject of concern among members of the community in South Australia. It would not be a matter of the minister

having to review perhaps hundreds of these things and find the needle in the haystack when the minister is not actually necessarily fluent in Farsi or Hindi or Iraqi or Pashtun or whatever other language these films are in, because some of the offensive material may not be entirely graphic material. It might be dialogue.

The honourable member mentioned the Jewish film. There may be certain members of our community not from that particular country who might have found that film annoying for one reason or another. I do not know; I did not see it. The point is again, when you start going into these foreign-language films, even if you think you are sufficiently skilled to pick the dividing line between M and MA and R, I can promise the member for Bragg and all those present, whilst I am reasonably fluent in English and passable in one other European language, I am not competent in any of the other languages that come by. I would not have a clue, and none of my staff would either.

Mr Kenyon: Why don't you learn them?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, I could quote Manuel from Fawlty Towers, but I will not go there. That is a genuine point, and I think it is one that I would urge the honourable member to think about between the houses. From that flows the point I was trying to make again about the importance of that default setting. It does give the minister an opportunity to consider, in a focused way, controversial matters rather than expect the minister to pick the controversy out of a maze of other possibilities.

The honourable member also talked about the particular provisions that provide the default setting, which include, as the member quite reasonably interpreted, some barriers; although barbed wire might be a little bit extensive, I accept there are barriers there. I want to explain why that is the case because honourable members may not be aware of how these things function, and I can absolutely confess that I was not either until confronted by it.

I can assure members that there are a lot of film festivals and that they are not once a year events—every community has them all the time. The people who are organising these are not necessarily your David Stratton-type individuals. They are just Mr X who is a bit of a luminary in the Afghan community, or whatever, and they bring these things in. They assume that, because a classification has been granted by the federal people and they have been allowed to bring them in, they are allowed to show them.

The consequence is that it is only perhaps on the Thursday before the Saturday, when the movie is on, that somebody tumbles to the reality that they do not have permission to show these films. They have already sold all the tickets, and they have already told 150 smiling faces that they are about to go and see a fabulous film in Pashtun or whatever it is. Unfortunately, it is illegal.

What happens then is that there is a mad scramble around the place. 'What are we going to do? How are we going to fix it?' The answer is: you have to go to the Attorney because the Attorney is the only person who can give you permission to do this, so woe betide them if the Attorney is away. If the Attorney is in Melbourne or somewhere at a meeting for that day when they need that signature, bad luck: they either run the illegal film or they call off the event.

I am not exaggerating when I say to the honourable member that that sort of time line is common—it is extremely common—and it causes very considerable difficulties. If there are a number of films, that then means the time for the minister, or any advice the minister might be seeking to obtain in relation to these films, is compressed into what might literally be hours. That is not a reasonable or a sensible way for decisions about these things to be made, particularly when the director in Canberra has plenty of time to look at these matters and consider them.

The reason for the time stipulation is so that, in the event of somebody wishing to depart from the default position, as we have described it here, they have to give whoever the minister is plenty of time to consider what their point is. They cannot just drop it on them the day before and say, 'You fix it.' They have to get their act together, explain what their point is and give the minister a fair opportunity to consider the complaint. Secondly, if the film is in Urdu, for example, they need to have a proper and accurate translation of the film. They might need even to include some cultural material about why it is important or unimportant that this will be shown and so forth.

The prescribed fee, I admit, is something that might be a bit of icing on the cake, but it might not be very much. We can talk about how much it might be, and we can talk about the regulations, but if it turned out that people were routinely opting for this, rather than another way of dealing with things, it might be necessary to make it something they would at least think about

before they did it. I can assure the honourable member that I do not have in contemplation that the prescribed fee be \$10,000 or something silly like that, but it may be \$50 or \$100 to at least take into account some of the time and effort that will be required to be set aside in order to consider properly the application that has been made.

I hope that those remarks are at least in some way informative about why this is coming forward. I encourage the honourable member please not to fiddle with section 79C too much between the houses because there are good reasons for it being as it is. I cannot emphasise this enough: imagine you are about to finish work on a Thursday and an urgent application comes in about one of these films going to run on the Saturday, 200 people or 150 people have bought tickets, the organisers are very enthusiastic and they say, 'Look, if you don't sign off on this thing we have to cancel the whole event.'

Then you receive a series of short summaries (because there is no time for them to give you the films or the full dialogue or anything) which go something like this—and I am not picking on one but this is a paraphrasing of them—two men meet in a bar; they discuss their early life; time sequence back to childhood; man in room with nun; nun talks to man; some nudity; people use various language; time travel, etc. This tells you absolutely nothing; nothing at all. Then you rely on—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It tells you a bit, and you probably would want to go and see it, wouldn't you? I have told you enough. I think that one might have been in Spanish so I do not know if you would have enjoyed it that much. The point is that, if you only have a very limited time, and that is all you know about it, you are relying entirely on the person who has prepared the précis—which may or may not be accurate. Then, at the bottom of that, sometimes if you are lucky, you get a little thing that reads 'Violence no; nudity no', etc. Again, there is absolutely no opportunity to consider that independently.

The paradox is that by retaining all of this authority entirely in South Australia these are being screened less thoroughly than they would be if they were run through the way that we are proposing here, which is that they are done in a place where people do have the time, the authority and experience to be able to look at these things, but we still preserve the right for people to say, for whatever reason, 'That film is going to be unacceptable, and here is why.'

Whilst I understand everything that the honourable member has said, you can be comforted in the knowledge that (a) this has nothing to do with COAG and (b) the reason for section 79 is to demonstrate that, if a person does have a consideration of this type, it will be thoroughly and properly considered. It will sift the films out into two different groups: those about which there is controversy, which will then have plenty of time for the minister of the day to look at; and those about which there is no controversy, which will be dealt with in the ordinary course by the national scheme.

It in no way prevents a local person having an argument about these matters to bring a matter forward. I assure the member for Bragg that, if the prescribed fee survives elsewhere, it is not my intention that it be some sort of Mount Everest that nobody can climb but that it is some modest recompense for the time and attention that might be required for that application to be entertained in a fair and reasonable manner. I appreciate the opposition's support here and I can only add that I encourage you to please review your views about whether you need to further disturb the text between here and the other place.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC (USE OF TEST AND ANALYSIS RESULTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 September 2010.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:11): I rise as the lead, and I believe only, speaker for the opposition on the Road Traffic (Use of Test and Analysis Results) Amendment Bill 2010. The reason we are here is that this is a bit of an embarrassment for the government. The government made an error in legislation in 2005.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Did I?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You did, Treasurer. You might even have put out a press release about it eventually. The government made an error in 2005 in legislation, and, five years later, we are back here correcting the error of the government's own making.

This particular bill deals with the South Australian Motor Accident Commission (commonly known as MAC) and it deals, of course, with the state's compulsory third-party scheme. Prior to 2005, MAC had the ability to use and admit into evidence the readings of oral, fluid and blood samples taken compulsorily and the consequential certificate of analysis which is the report, if you like, of those readings. It could submit them in the evidence for the purposes of seeking reductions under the Civil Liability Act 1936 for intoxicated drivers or in recovery actions under section 116 or section 124A of the Motor Vehicles Act.

This was amended in 2005 by the government in an attempt to close possible loopholes of the samples being used in other forums outside of the Road Traffic Act and the Civil Liability Act. Regrettably, this change mistakenly resulted in the certificate of analysis, also known as the blood alcohol certificate (or BAC in the industry) not being able to be used in pursuing recoveries against drunk drivers under the Civil Liability Act 1936.

So, as a result of the change to the legislation in 2005, when the Motor Accident Commission went to seek recovery against a drunk driver, from 2005, it could not actually use the blood alcohol certificate as evidence of the person's drunken state and then try to recover the moneys as such.

The police could still tender the blood alcohol certificate as evidence under the Road Traffic Act but, for the purpose of recoveries, the Motor Accident Commission could not use the blood alcohol certificate by way of evidence. Obviously, that restricted the capacity of the Motor Accident Commission to recover moneys; therefore, that ultimately leads to less money in the fund, which ultimately leads to a reduced solvency level and which leads to a different premium outcome. They are not huge dollars, but it all has an impact.

The Road Traffic Act specifically prohibits the use of blood taken and the BAC for any other purpose other than an offence under the Road Traffic Act or the Motor Vehicles Act, or a driving-related offence. Prior to 2005, it could be used for purposes relating to the Civil Liability Act, which is the act that gives the MAC its capacity to seek recovery. Without this evidence, proving intoxication and degrees of intoxication is very difficult—if not impossible—in some cases. This has the potential to escalate significantly the annual cost of compensation to the CTP fund, thus placing pressure on premiums.

The amendments to schedule 1, part 4, clause 8 are being extended, again, for the purpose of bringing in proceedings under the Civil Liability Act. This bill seeks to reinstate the use of the blood alcohol certificates for the purpose of seeking reductions under the Civil Liability Act for intoxicated drivers or recovery actions under sections 116 or 124 of the Motor Vehicles Act.

It is important that people who have their blood taken have their interests protected. The blood alcohol certificate can be used only under this specific amendment of the Civil Liability Act. It cannot be used for other purposes outside of the specific clauses of the Road Traffic Act or now, as a result of this bill (if passed in the other place), the Civil Liability Act. I did contact the Law Society and the Australian Lawyers Alliance—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I wouldn't worry about them.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The former attorney-general says that you would not worry about them.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The latter.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The latter? I do remember the member for Croydon having a running battle with a president of the Law Society at some time. But, if the former attorney's advice is not to worry about them, I am sure that the Australian Lawyers Alliance will be pleased to read that in *Hansard*.

I did write to both those groups seeking their advice. The Law Society of South Australia has written to the opposition saying that it has no issues with the bill. I did seek some further information from the Treasurer and his officers. I should thank the officers for an excellent briefing, and the information is as follows. I asked whether they could provide the amount of money recovered or sought to be recovered by the Motor Accident Commission over the last three years and what had actually been recovered.

The advice is that, with respect to the reservation of rights activity (they are files that are referred for recovery action), for the financial year 2008 the number of files referred was 79 and the value of files referred in dollar value was about \$19.3 million rounded off, being an average of about \$244,000. In 2009, the number of files referred was 92 and the value of files was about \$29.3 million, the average being about \$318,000. For 2010, the number of files referred was 79 and the value of files referred was only about \$7.9 million rounded off, being an average of about \$99,800 rounded off.

I should clarify that, as the claim payments occur and recovery amounts crystallise, the value of the files referred for recovery in 2010 will further increase. When you look at the statistics for 2010, recovery of \$7.9 million looks low, but that will increase as further claim payments occur. In relation to the actual amounts paid, as distinct from claimed, I am advised that in 2008 the total recovered for reservation of rights was \$428,000 (rounded down); in 2009, \$674,000 (rounded down); and, in 2010, \$596,000 (rounded down).

The note explains that many of the recoveries were received via instalment payments and therefore comparing receipts against actual referrals will give a false performance outcome. I guess the point they are making is, for instance, in 2009, of \$29.3 million in claims we have actually only received \$674,000 and it is clear there is a time payment, or an instalment payment, process occurring there.

The opposition has no objection to the bill. We do not oppose it. We totally accept the government's argument that it made a mistake in 2005 and needs to come here and correct it. I cannot quite work out why it took five years to pick up this mistake. It may well have been a result of a court case.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We do not appear to be as insightful as you are.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I accept the member for Croydon's advice that they are not as insightful as the opposition. I am glad to have that—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, as you.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Not as insightful as the member for Davenport? I am happy to have that on the record. The opposition supports this bill and has no questions.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (12:21): I thank the opposition for its support, but I equally rebuff the suggestion that this is a mistake. This is a matter of unintended consequences from the original drafting. The member for Davenport and I, in our many years of debating in this chamber, have always agreed on one thing: we are lousy on the law—which is a bit of a problem because we are making them. But, on legal interpretations, the member for Davenport and myself are perhaps not the sharpest tool in the kit, together.

I am advised that, with all the best intentions when this law was drafted, it would have done what the amendment we are now placing before this house seeks to clarify. We have had senior counsel look at this. The matter arose in 2008, and MAC drafted the bill in 2009 to deal with it. Unfortunately, with elections and other matters before the parliament, it has taken a little longer to get to the house than we would otherwise have preferred. But, as we know—and the former attorney-general would attest to this—sometimes when we have the best crown law advice it is not quite perfect.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It is very good. It is the best advice.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is very good, and it is the best advice we have available, and of course there is no shortage of lawyers out there earning a handsome fee challenging laws all the time. Every now and again, unintended consequences occur and the government has to deal with them in this place. That is the context of this piece of legislation. I thank the opposition for its wholehearted support.

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

[Sitting suspended from 12:24 to 14:00]

STATUTES AMENDMENT (MEMBERS' BENEFITS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS (MUTUAL RECOGNITION) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DRIVING OFFENCES) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SA WATER**3 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010).**

1. What has been the total percentage and volume reductions in water consumption for the greater Adelaide Metropolitan Region since the introduction of water restrictions and how has this impacted on SA Water revenue?

2. What costs have been associated with each of the water conservation campaigns undertaken by the government?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water): I am advised that:

1. The actual impact of water restrictions on consumption can only be an estimate as there have been a number of demand management strategies running concurrently since water restrictions were introduced in 2003.

SA Water's investigation on the impact of restrictions is yet to be completed.

The indicative evidence is that permanent water conservation measures and water restrictions have had an impact on water consumption. Preliminary investigations reveal that the average state-wide sale of pre-permanent water conservation measures was about 230GL per annum, but for the last three years state-wide water sales were about 190GL or less. Note that SA Water does not segment its business by the Greater Metropolitan Region.

It is important to note that over this same time period the Government has implemented various demand management strategies that includes rebates for water saving measures, education programs and targeted audits on high usage companies, all of which contribute to reduced consumption.

SA Water has taken into account, for budget and pricing purposes, an estimate of the impacts of water restrictions on sales volume.

The 2010-11 Transparency Statement (TS) provides information on the estimated impact of water restrictions on total SA Water sales volume. The TS highlights that water prices are set based on 'normal' consumption and not the restricted volume.

The TS indicates that water restrictions are estimated to reduce total water sales by 27GL in 2009-10.

SA Water budgeted sales revenue for 2009-10 has been reduced by \$48m to take this into account. As a comparison, in 2008-09 the budget took into account reductions in water sales of 27GLs with an estimated reduction in revenue of \$36m. The actual reduction in water sales was subsequently determined to be 36GL with a reduction in revenue of \$45m.

2. Since the introduction of water restrictions in October 2003, SA Water has undertaken campaigns to advise the community of the restrictions in place, raise general awareness about the impacts of drought and encourage ongoing water efficiency.

The total costs of all water conservation campaigns to date has been \$5.658 million which includes advertising, printing, and educational literature and campaigns.

In 2009-10, SA Water also signed a memorandum of understanding with the then Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation to undertake communication and education campaigns relating to water security and conservation. To date \$0.55m has been contributed.

EXPIATION NOTICE REFUNDS

7 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). For each year since 2005—

- (a) how many expiation notices have been withdrawn pursuant to Section 16(1)(ac) of the Expiation of Offences Act as a result of a 'clerical error';
- (b) how many expiation refunds were issued as a result of a 'clerical error'; and
- (c) how much was refunded in each year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): The Commissioner of Police has provided me with the following information:

- (a) For the years 2005-09, 13,266 expiation notices have been withdrawn as a result of 'clerical error'.

2005	1,997
2006	1,981
2007	2,699
2008	2,485
2009	4,104

- (b) 494 refunds were issued as a result of 'clerical error' since 2005.
- (c) Refunds on a year by year basis are:

2005	11 notices refunded (total \$2,468)
2006	15 notices refunded (total \$3,783)
2007	132 notices refunded (total \$3,0415)
2008	61 notices refunded (total \$15,816)
2009	275 notices refunded (total \$80,864)

The difference between the number of notices withdrawn and refunds issued is due to the withdrawn notices either being reissued or withdrawn prior to payment being received.

CLAYTON WEIR

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (14 September 2010).

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water): I am advised that:

With the current predictions for inflows into the Lower Lakes, the trigger for the partial removal of the Goolwa Channel Regulator has been activated. The Government is currently undertaking partial removal of the regulator. The cost associated with the partial removal is approximately \$110,000.

Full removal of the regulator will be triggered when advice from the Murray Darling Basin Authority confirms that the water level in Lake Alexandrina will not fall below sea level for two consecutive water years, or the combined discharge from all barrages will exceed 15,000ML per day for more than 30 consecutive days.

While the water level triggers for full removal have not yet been met, the options for removal and their costs are currently being assessed.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Joint Parliamentary Service—The Administration of—Erratum—Annual Report 2009-10
Local Government—Alexandrina Council Annual Report 2009-10

Police Complaints Authority—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Development Act 1993—Proposal to remove four significant trees Angle Park

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

Health Service—

Coorong Health Service Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2009-10

Mallee Health Service Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2009-10

Millicent and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2009-10

Penola and Districts Health Advisory Council Inc Annual Report 2009-10

By the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

History Trust of South Australia—Annual Report 2009-10

Libraries Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2009-10

Windmill Theatre—Annual Report 2009-10

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

SA Lotteries—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Dame Roma Mitchell Trust Fund for Children and Young People—Annual Report 2009-10

Local Government Finance Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2009-10

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Liquor Licensing—

Dry Areas Long Term—Edithburgh Area 1

Dry Areas Short Term—Victor Harbor—New Years Eve 2010

Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—General—Variation

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

Fisheries Council of South Australia—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Construction Industry Training Board—Annual Report 2009-10

Playford Centre—Annual Report 2009-10

By the Minister for Science and Information Economy (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Bio Innovation SA—Annual Report 2009-10

INVERBRACKIE DETENTION FACILITY

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) (14:03): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On Monday 18 October, while I was at a community cabinet meeting in the northern suburbs, I received a phone call from the Minister for Immigration, Chris Bowen, informing me of the federal government's intention to open a low security detention facility at Inverbrackie in the Adelaide Hills. I am told that up to 400 asylum seekers—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will listen to the Premier in silence, please.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —assessed as low risk and therefore assessed by the commonwealth to be of no threat to the community, will be housed at Inverbrackie for a short time, during which officials will determine whether they qualify for settlement in Australia. The new facility will utilise the former Woodside Army barracks housing precinct—a commonwealth-owned facility.

A number of unaccompanied minors and 'at risk' families, including some of those initially housed at Inverbrackie, will be placed into community-based accommodation run by churches and charity groups, under the supervision of the federal Department of Immigration. The Inverbrackie detention facility is one of a number being planned across Australia as part of the Gillard government's long-term strategy on immigration detention. Other facilities include a new detention facility for 1,500 people near Perth, contingency plans for a facility near Darwin, and the expansion of the Melbourne transit accommodation facility. I am told that the Inverbrackie detention facility will be run by the private company, Serco.

I agree that a lack of notice, a shortage of detail and uncertainty about how the facility will impact on the local community in this area of the Adelaide Hills is fuelling community concern, and I have had discussions just a short time ago with the Minister for Immigration (but I will get onto that in a moment). That is why I have requested the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to convene a high-level group to coordinate and oversee the state government's position for discussions with both the commonwealth and the Adelaide Hills Council. All relevant government agencies have nominated senior representative to support the group, and its first meeting has been scheduled for tomorrow. Representatives of the commonwealth and Adelaide Hills Council will be present at the meeting.

I am informed that the commonwealth will have a particularly keen interest in the state providing services in schooling—and I will come back to that issue—along with services related to health, policing, English language classes, family support and, later, housing, disability and community integration services. I can assure the house that the full cost of all state services provided to these families will be borne by the commonwealth. There is much that must be discussed and negotiated before the asylum seekers begin arriving in December. Consultation with the local community should and must be an ongoing process.

I am informed that up to 200 children will be housed at Inverbrackie. The length of their stay at the facility could, I understand, range from between 12 months to as short as six weeks. This poses special challenges in the provision of education for the children, especially given that most of them, as I understand it, will not speak English. At a meeting between our state's education and federal immigration department officials on 22 October, we were informed that all children up to the age of 16 should be schooled and that those above that age should be provided with education support. The commonwealth has made it clear that it would fully fund the cost of extra teachers, equipment, school support officers' time, travel, demountable buildings and uniforms—whatever is necessary. However, I am told that schools would not be forced to take students.

It is especially important that while the children at Inverbrackie are provided with an education it should not be to the detriment of local school students. To that end, I spoke with the federal Minister for Immigration and Citizenship, Chris Bowen, earlier this afternoon, and he told me that there were a number of options being considered for the children's schooling. The federal minister said that the commonwealth government has been approached by a number of independent schools in South Australia that are generously offering to take Inverbrackie students, and so federal officials are happy to sit down and talk with them. There is also the possibility of other public schools with excess capacity that could be considered.

If none of those options is suitable, the federal minister told me earlier this afternoon that the commonwealth will pay teachers to come to the facility so that students can be taught on site. Whichever option is settled on, my view is that the local community should be fully consulted while being provided with accurate and timely information in a clear manner. Minister Bowen told me that, in addition, the commonwealth will arrange all necessary medical support that will have—and I quote the minister, just an hour or so ago—'zero impact' on the local community, with medical attention by doctors, specialists and nurses occurring on site, paid for entirely by the commonwealth.

In terms of Inverbrackie being in a bushfire zone, the minister also told me today that emergency management plans were put in place, just as they have across other parts of Australia for detention centres, in consultation with local authorities. I am informed that all applicants whose claims to settle in this country are rejected will be returned to their country of origin.

I have made no secret of the fact that I was disappointed that the federal government did not properly consult the state government before making its announcement to commission the Inverbrackie detention facility. But I will make this point: in South Australia we have a tradition of welcoming refugees, including those who have been desperate enough to climb aboard leaky boats and arrive in Australian waters seeking re-settlement in our country. In South Australia we

have had asylum seekers living in communities before, including Kosovo refugees at the Hampstead Army barracks and Afghan women and children living in houses at Port Augusta.

Several decades ago, our own highly respected Lieutenant Governor, Hieu Van Le, was one of a small group of people from Vietnam who risked their lives to climb into a small unseaworthy boat and steer it in the direction of Australia to arrive in Darwin with nothing but the clothes on their backs. Mr Le and his wife, who was also on board that boat, have gone on to make an enormous contribution to our community in South Australia.

I am proud of the fact that he has become the nation's and the Commonwealth of Nations' first ever Queen's representative of Vietnamese descent. Yesterday, Hieu Van Le issued a statement reminding us that in the last 175 years South Australia has had a remarkable and enviable record of welcoming new arrivals from all corners of the world. He said he was confident that the asylum seekers will benefit from the same generosity of spirit that all new arrivals have enjoyed. He said this:

Our ability to welcome people from around the world, whether as migrants or refugees, has made our community richer; economically, socially and culturally.

I agree with Hieu Van Le, as I believe every member of this house would as well.

WELLINGTON WEIR

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) (14:11): I seek leave to make another ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to confirm to the house and the public of South Australia that a weir will not be built near Wellington in this term of government, and probably never. It will not happen, and we never wanted it to happen. It was only ever going to be a last resort measure to protect the drinking water supplies of over one million South Australians—city and country. For that reason, we make no apologies for undertaking the necessary preparations should the weir have had to be built if that worst-case scenario was realised.

Thankfully, it has not been realised. While the government was making preparations for the weir, we were also taking measures to make sure that it was not necessary. In 2009, the government announced that it would provide a 170 gigalitre Lower Lakes Environmental Reserve to manage salinity and also acid in the lakes. This was delivered in full earlier this year. During the election campaign we committed to another 170 gigalitre environmental reserve, which has already been accumulated.

While our efforts were important in pushing the need for the weir back for another year, we were extremely fortunate to have one of the wettest years in the history of the Murray-Darling Basin. The Lower Lakes have received many hundreds of billions of litres of water from floods in New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria—with more still to come. In fact, the Lower Lakes are full for the first time since 2005, and there has been a natural flow through the Murray Mouth for the first time since 2002.

These improved conditions mean that we will not need to build a weir in this term of government, and probably never will, even taking into account extreme worst-case scenario modelling. Beyond that, we look forward to the benefits of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, which will start to flow from 2014, because we should not have to rely on major flood events to save the Lower Lakes and protect our drinking water supplies.

We need a system that is healthy from the mouth up. That is why we fought so hard for an independent authority to manage the river, based on science rather than on state borders, politics or greed. That is why we cannot lose sight of what the basin plan will deliver: a framework that secures a sustainable river system that supports food production, drinking water supplies and an internationally significant ecosystem over the long term.

The Murray-Darling Basin Authority chair, Mr Mike Taylor AO, and the authority's chief executive, Rob Freeman, were in Adelaide yesterday as part of the authority's consultation process. I understand that they attended a forum at the National Wine Centre yesterday and today are holding a forum in Murray Bridge.

Mr Williams: Where were your ministers?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The deputy leader asks, 'Where were our ministers?' As part of their visit, the chair and chief executive addressed cabinet—addressed all of the ministers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I was impressed with their commitment to a genuine consultation process throughout the basin.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: For our part, I made it clear that South Australia expects sustainable diversion limits to be established, taking into account the efficiency investments and gains made by South Australian irrigators and, indeed, other irrigators elsewhere in the basin over several decades. We do not want to see our irrigators and our regions disadvantaged relative to those interstate by virtue of our good behaviour and investments. Can I just say this: it always pays, Mitch, because we have seen so many of your different statements on this issue, and you have members representing the Riverland saying different things to those down the other end of the river—get your facts right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to visitors in the gallery that it is against our rules for you to take photos in this chamber. Can you please put your cameras away. When we are sitting, it is not possible for you to take photos.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of ladies from the Marion VIEW Club, who are guests of the member for Fisher. I think we also might have some constituents who are guests from the electorate of the member for Hammond, but I am not sure where he is. We also have another group of people in the gallery but I am not sure where you are from. However, welcome to everyone and we hope you enjoy your time here today.

QUESTION TIME

PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATION

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's commitment after the state election to reconnect with the community, can the Premier explain why he has not agreed to or had any meetings with the Public Service Association since at least 2008?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:21): It is interesting that for years the Liberal opposition has accused the Labor government in this state, during the 30-odd years that I have been in this state, of being totally in bed with the unions. For years—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker: the question is why the Premier hasn't agreed to meet with the PSA for up to two years.

The SPEAKER: Sit down, deputy leader. He has not had time to answer the question yet.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Like everything else, you can't have it every way. For years, you have said that we do what the unions tell us, and now you are saying we should be meeting them more regularly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I do meet with the unions on many, many occasions when necessary and so do other ministers.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Leader of the Opposition, behave yourself.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

Mr KENYON (Newland) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house about the state's economic outlook in light of the analysis of the forecast issued today by Access Economics?

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) (14:22): I am very confident about the state's economic outlook, unlike those opposite addicted to gloom, desperately unhappy every time there are good employment figures, desperately unhappy every time a new mine opens, desperately unhappy every time we reach a deal to get a new defence project in this case.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Unlike those opposite, I have every confidence in South Australians, South Australian business and our economic capacity to grow and deliver real benefits. I have every confidence that we can build on the gains of the past 8½ years despite the opposition's talking our state down. The basic facts are that there has already been a major turnaround—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We are trying to hear the Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, they won't like the figures. We have already started—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leave the chamber if you don't want to listen.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —closing the gap between South Australia and the nation to which Access Economics refers. In the 8½ years since the government was elected, we have added 122,300 jobs to the state's economy. In the eight years prior to that date, a total of just 50,800 were added—so more than double the jobs growth under Labor. But the comparison is much better than that because ultimately it is about full-time jobs. In terms of full-time jobs, nearly 80,000 full-time—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Norwood.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is the Marshall plan: he wants the top job, he wants to be down the front. Look at them, Marshall and Gardner—that flying wedge, the machismo team. They are trying to get down there. They are muscling up to get down the front.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel will be quiet.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is the bit they don't want to hear. In terms of full-time jobs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You are on the first warning, member for Norwood. Member for Kavel, you are misbehaving. If you want the House of Assembly to have a proper question time, sit down and be quiet; if not, leave the chamber. Premier, we will give you one more chance.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In terms of full-time jobs, nearly 80,000 full-time jobs have been added since March 2002. That 80,000 in eight years compares to 5,000 in your eight years in government, and that is the difference. Business investment reached a near record high of almost \$11 billion in the year to June. Total jobs stand now at 813,400, the highest level on record, with full-time jobs at nearly 552,000.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is the highest ever, but you do not like it. That is because you are addicted to losing. Our workforce participation rate of 63.5 per cent is a near record high. Population growth of 1.3 per cent during 2009 is the highest since 1975. The CommSec economic report, released yesterday, notes that this compares with the decade average of only 0.8 per cent. During the full impact of the GFC in 2008-09 our state grew by 1.4 per cent compared to a national growth of 1.1 per cent.

Everyone knows that Access Economics is a conservative forecaster, only taking into account projects that are actually locked in. With \$71.5 billion worth of projects in the pipeline, South Australian prospects look strong. This pipeline of projects—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —is the reason why the Economic Development Board believes South Australia can outperform the national economy in coming years. It updated its economic statement modelling to take into account the smaller than expected impacts of the GFC, to incorporate revisions to major projects sizes and scheduling. For the six-year period to 2015-16, this modelling forecasts annual gross state product growth of 3.4 per cent and annual employment growth of 1.7 per cent.

The Access Economics report notes some challenges that will face the South Australian economy, particularly the exposure of the manufacturing sector to the high Australian dollar and interest rates. Of course, the Leader of the Opposition would lower the price of the Australian dollar, like her predecessor, putting people in a headlock. The report also notes that Australia's economic recovery is expected to strengthen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —supported by mining and associated engineering constructions. Access does agree that engineering construction has strengthened notably since mid-2008, with listed projects including the \$1.8 billion desalination plant and the \$860 million South Road upgrade. Residential approvals are picking up, with housing activity remaining solid.

While commercial approvals are somewhat down since the education stimulus, projects in the Access forecast include: the \$409 million Edinburgh Defence Precinct; the \$201 million Lyell McEwin Hospital redevelopment; the new \$1.7 billion Royal Adelaide Hospital; and the \$450 million Adelaide Oval grandstand enlargement. Of course, we have the Convention Centre—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and the \$200 million Westfield Marion Shopping Centre. Now, let's talk about mining. In 2002, South Australia was home to four major operating mines. Today, that number stands at 12, and in coming months it is likely to grow to 16 in construction or production—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —with around 30 more in line for development. Madam Speaker, I could keep discussing this further—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Oh, you want me to? Okay. In 2008-09, our state's mine gate production value reached a record level of \$2.87 billion, which is an annual increase of more than 9 per cent. In the five years to June 2009, the value of our exports more than doubled. In 2014-15, it is forecast that 40 per cent of our total commodity exports will be minerals. You can talk the state down; we will keep going, creating jobs.

LABOR GOVERNMENT

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain how his government is reconnecting with the public, given that no government ministers have bothered to attend the Save the Keith Hospital rally, the Save the Moonta Hospital rally, the Save the Ardrossan Hospital rally—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: —the two Murray-Darling Basin Plan consultation forums, the Woodside detention centre community meeting, the Save The Parks Community Centre rallies or the education budget cuts rally? At each of these large rallies, large numbers of the public were anxious to reconnect with you.

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) (14:30): It is interesting. I was—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader! I warn the deputy leader!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I was in Keith the other night—I had dinner in Keith the other night. Can I just say this: we did see the image, the wonderful image—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —of you last night in Salisbury, and we heard what the Mayor of Salisbury said about you today.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Have you finished your answer, Premier? I didn't hear any of that.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The member for Bright.

CRIME STATISTICS, CITY OF SALISBURY

Ms FOX (Bright) (14:31): My question is to the Premier.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms FOX: No; it's an excellent question. You're going to love this question. Can the Premier inform the house of the latest crime statistics for the City of Salisbury provided by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research and of the government's work to reduce crime in Salisbury and across the state?

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) (14:32): I was out doorknocking in Salisbury last week—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That's right—and I can tell you this: when a tornado hit Penola—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —I was there days before the local member, who was up at a race meeting in Darwin. So, I was very happy to be doorknocking in both Salisbury and Elizabeth last week. The Mayor of Salisbury phoned me today to express her disgust at what the Leader of the Opposition did in Salisbury yesterday and what she said about Salisbury yesterday, which wasn't true. So, here are the figures: the latest figures from the Office of Crime Statistics and Research show that the City of Salisbury is far safer today than it was back in 2002—it is far safer today than it was when you were in power because you don't give a damn about Salisbury or anywhere else. Yesterday, in a desperate attempt to distract—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You're on a second warning, deputy leader.

Mr Sibbons: That's almost as many as you got votes.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No; you got three votes. Yesterday, in a desperate attempt to distract from their lack of credibility on law and order, the opposition leader failed to acknowledge—

Mr PENGILLY: A point of order, Madam Speaker, on relevance: the Premier was asked a question on crime statistics, not about something the opposition leader may or may not have done.

The SPEAKER: I don't uphold. I am sure he is giving his full response.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: She failed to acknowledge that crime in the City of Salisbury has fallen considerably since 2002. The Office of Crime Statistics shows that crime rates in the City of Salisbury have fallen steadily every year since 2004. Total victim-reported crime—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: She won't stop talking.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Oh, the mayor is wrong. That's why she's just been elected unopposed. The Office of Crime Statistics shows that crime rates in the City of Salisbury have fallen steadily every year since 2004. Total victim-reported crime has fallen from a total of 23,100 offences in 2002 to 20,323 in 2009.

Even more encouraging is the fact you are less likely to become a victim of crime in the City of Salisbury today compared with when the Liberals were in office. In 2002, there were 199.5 offences per 1,000 people. That has dropped by a massive 22 per cent to 155.6 offences per 1,000 people in 2009. Homicide has fallen from 12 offences in 2002 to four in 2009; major assault has fallen from 157 to 101; sexual offences have fallen from 226 to 144; and robbery and extortion offences have fallen from 182 in 2002 to 147.

These statistics show that the greater police presence in the northern suburbs is having an impact. Can I tell you that the people of Salisbury know who it was who delivered a police station in the middle of the Salisbury shopping centre area. It is what I campaigned upon and what I delivered, plus a TAFE as well.

The latest South Australia Police statistics show that crime in South Australia has fallen by 35 per cent since 2001-02. The same statistics are utilised by the Office of Crime Statistics and the Australian Bureau of Statistics, so often referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. While the opposition consistently refuses to acknowledge that crime is on a downward trend, they also fail to acknowledge the hard work of our police force who work day in day out to fight and prevent crime in our streets.

This is a slap in the face for our officers and I would like to quote Deputy Commissioner Gary Burns who last week said:

To dismiss this significant reduction in crime as being merely the result of better security systems and more modern cars is, to say the least, being disingenuous of police efforts, particularly of those dedicated and committed officers who serve in the local service areas.

I am surprised that this dismissal of the Leader of the Opposition by the Deputy Commissioner of Police did not receive greater publicity. The deputy commissioner made these comments at the graduation of the latest 18 new officers from the police academy who are among the first of the additional 313 police we are recruiting to complement the additional 700 on our streets.

Of the 20 crime categories recorded, minor assault is the only category to have increased on a per capita basis in Salisbury. We know more work needs to be done, but you don't do that with stunts and talking good communities down. The Mayor of Salisbury is disgusted with what the Leader of the Opposition said yesterday. The Mayor of Salisbury knows that you were not telling the truth yesterday, and so do your members.

The difference is, apart from toughening up nearly 100 criminal laws, by 2014 there will be 1,000 more police on our streets than when we came to office. This is in stark contrast to when you were in office where SAPOL was demoralised and severely starved of resources, police numbers

were slashed, police stations shut down, including the St Agnes Patrol Base, crime rates hit record highs, convicted criminals were released more quickly, sex offenders were not prosecuted for historical crimes and victims were marginalised.

The leader's law and order stunt in Salisbury was a resounding flop. I am told the room was virtually empty, and of the few local people they were virtually outnumbered by local and state politicians and aspirants, their staff and a few journalists. The leader hardly got a welcome reception, with the Salisbury mayor denouncing the stunt which sought to denigrate Salisbury, its people and its police. Mayor—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. There are two things: the answer that the Premier is now giving has no relevance to the question and he has descended into debate.

The SPEAKER: I think the Premier is about to conclude his remarks.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Mayor Gillian Aldridge said the leader's characterisation of Salisbury was:

Very, very hurtful and very wrong. You have to look at the percent—crime per capita, not the crime as a whole because we are the second largest council.

I remember the Leader of the Opposition saying she would not knock back Parole Board recommendations for the release of deadly murderers such as McBride and the rest.

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Madam Speaker. Surely now you would have to concede that the Premier has strayed into debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think the Premier has now concluded his remarks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

JULIA FARR ASSOCIATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:40): When was the Treasurer first made aware of the \$5.1 million that had been transferred to the Julia Farr Association—in contravention of funding approvals granted by cabinet—in order to avoid the carryover policy? In this year's Auditor-General's Report, he has identified that \$2.92 million and \$2.15 million in disability equipment funding was paid to the Julia Farr Association in June 2007 and June 2008, respectively. The Julia Farr Association did not, and does not, provide disability equipment. The Auditor-General has identified that one of the factors for transferring the money to the Julia Farr Association was the risk of not retaining the funds through an approved carryover process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:41): I will come back to the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is entirely within the Treasurer's rights to do that.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you want to let me finish? Look at them smirking. Look at them.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I had not finished the answer, Isobel—calm down.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You are very jumpy today, Isobel.

Mrs Redmond: No, I'm not.

The SPEAKER: Order! We will not have quarrels across the house.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I think that column by Greg Kelton on the weekend must have spooked her a little bit. Iain Evans is now grooming himself; he has had a haircut.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What are you suggesting?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader will behave! The Treasurer will answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you want to have a debate about fashion style, Isobel?

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Treasurer not to call people by their name.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will come back to the house with a detailed answer, but what I will say is this: I was made aware of that matter some months ago. It is not in any way, shape or form comparable, in my view, to the stashed cash affair. The money was used for the purpose for which the budget appropriated it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What initiative is the government leading that will strengthen natural resources management processes and deliver enhanced economic, social and environmental outcomes for South Australia?

Mr Pengilly: You should have come to the briefing.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:43): She couldn't make the briefing. I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge her commitment to all matters regarding the environment.

On 1 July this year, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources was established, bringing together the former Department for Environment and Heritage and the majority of natural resources management activities that were previously supported through the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation. Holding the portfolios of environment and conservation, the River Murray and water, I have the unique opportunity of leading the development—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Ask me the question afterwards, if you like. I have the unique opportunity of leading the development of a more integrated approach to ensuring a whole-of-landscape approach to natural resources management. The government has today released 'Improving natural resource management in South Australia', a regional integration plan for NRM. I thank the many members of the opposition, and those from this side, who were at the briefing held between 1 and 2 o'clock today. I have created a situation where, when members of the opposition would like more information, they need only ask.

In the area of natural resources management, a range of priorities for this term of government has emerged. These priorities include: development of a new state NRM plan; completion of marine park zoning; management of fire across the landscape; implementation of a visitor strategy for our many parks; increasing involvement and support for NRM; and contributing to our state's sustainable development agenda.

NRM boards will continue their pivotal role in working with local communities, governments and all stakeholders in managing the use of natural resources. A key to integrating these services will be to enhance collaboration and understanding between landholders and their local communities.

Over the next 18 months a challenging task will be undertaken to implement this integrated model, and I am pleased to inform members that significant progress has already been achieved. Over the last three months there has been extensive consultation with a range of NRM participants,

including local government, conservation groups, the SA Farmers Federation and NRM board members and staff to clarify the new departmental supporting arrangements and to discuss an NRM reform agenda. For this process to succeed it will require communities, with their capacity for local expertise and their ability to deliver local outcomes, to continue to be the focal points of natural resources management. It is the government's belief that the new model will allow us to build on the excellent work previously conducted by NRM boards and their networks.

A regional integration plan has been developed to guide NRM reform over the next 18 months, as several members would be aware through the briefing I mentioned earlier that was attended by members from both sides of this chamber. The plan outlines the way forward to providing a single integrated regional face for NRM, shifting the focus to landscape approaches, increasing the emphasis on collaborations, partnerships and better engaging local communities. The relationship with local government, including the LGA and the various regional local government groups, is recognised as being critical to further improving the way we manage and deliver NRM services.

The plan involves a three-phase approach, with phase 1, between now and June 2011, being the integration of regional services for the appointment of regional managers and, where practicable, the establishment of single points of contact for regional communities. Phase 2 will align NRM and DENR business operations into the new model, and should occur from June 2011 through to June 2012, with phase 3 bringing full regional integration for NRM and DENR services by July 2012. Regional integration of NRM will address six broad issues which are critical for strengthening NRM processes and improving outcomes. These issues are—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, I will not—

The SPEAKER: Minister, do not respond to interjections.

The Hon. P. CAICA: As I said, Madam Speaker, I will not respond to interjections. These issues are:

- the alignment of regional boundaries;
- the redesign of organisational structure;
- continual improvement of community interfaces and relationships;
- clarification of governance and intergovernmental relationships;
- integration of planning and investment; and
- the streamlining of corporate and business services.

A great deal has been achieved since the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 came into operation, and through the implementation of the regional integration plan further successful outcomes will be generated.

I acknowledge the commitment of members on both sides of this place who have supported the important work carried out by their regional NRM boards, and I urge all members to take an active role in the transition to the new model of NRM planning and delivery.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before we go to the next question, I draw the attention of the house to the presence in the gallery today of the former premier Rob Kerin. Welcome back; it is good to see you here—and I am sure some of us wish you were still here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Welcome back, Kotter!

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The SPEAKER: I also draw the attention of members on my left to the fact that following question time today we have the examination of the Auditor-General's Report, and we have the Minister for Health, the Premier and the Treasurer. I am sure none of the members on my left

would want to be suspended from the house today, I am sure they will want to ask questions. I think the deputy leader, in particular, should keep that in mind, because he is getting very close.

QUESTION TIME

JULIA FARR ASSOCIATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Education. Did the minister, in his capacity as Minister for Disability, authorise payments for disability equipment totalling \$5.1 million in June 2007 and June 2008 to the Julia Farr Association, an organisation which does not provide disability equipment? In this year's report the Auditor-General has identified these payments as being made, and the evidence provided by the current Minister for Disability during budget estimates identified and confirmed that all grants for payment of disability equipment valued at \$1.1 million or more must be authorised by the minister.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for her question. If the accusation is that towards the end of the financial year we found ourselves in a position with a—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: A question which implies an accusation. If at the end of the financial year—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Can you let me say a few words and you can then work out what you want to say.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Treasurer!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If the contention is that towards the end of the financial year this government, finding itself with sufficient resources to do so, decided to apply some of those resources to one of the most vulnerable sections of our community, that is—

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. The member is clearly impugning improper motive of another member by asserting what he interprets the basis of this question to be. The question is very simple. The question is: did he authorise these payments? That is the question.

The SPEAKER: I will listen very carefully to his response. A minister can answer a question in any way they choose. Minister, can you think carefully about what you are saying.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am coming to the member's point, and she will get a full answer. If the contention is that somehow finding ourselves in a position to do so we decided to apply \$5 million of resources to one of the most vulnerable—

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. The minister has started his continued answer by saying, 'If the contention is,' etc. That is clearly reflecting, in breach of standing order 127. If he is not going to answer the question, then let him sit down.

The SPEAKER: Sit down, member for Bragg. There are always contentions in every question, otherwise why would you bother to ask them?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If the contention is that this Labor government decided, as the end of the financial year approached, that it had the capacity to apply \$5 million to one of the most vulnerable sections in our community, that is, people with disabilities, and that it sought to apply to that group in the community \$5 million to meet a whole a lot of needs that exist in relation to disability equipment—and that money was actually spent on disability equipment—then I must say that we have to say, yes, that is right. We take responsibility for that action. I must say that we would—

The Hon. M.J. Wright: We are proud of it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Not only are we proud of it, I am sure that we would do it again. The other part of the answer is that not only was it a matter that I promoted, it was a matter

that was decided by cabinet. I understand that there has been some criticism of the process that was used in the Auditor-General's Report, and I understand that that has since been remedied, but let's be clear about what happened here: \$5 million was found because we had the capacity to find it, it was applied to disability services equipment and spent on disability services equipment.

FORESTRYSA

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Forests.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Does the minister stand by his comments made last week following a forestry stakeholder meeting in the South-East, and reported in local media, regarding the sale of the state's forests? He said:

We've made our decision, it's the reason we've retained our AAA credit rating and that's the fact of the matter.

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) (14:54): Thanks for the question. If you go back to the 2008-09 Mid-Year Budget Review, page 11, Reducing Net Debt, ForestrySA, it was stated that the government intends to explore a range of options for the up-front sale of ForestrySA harvests—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Do you stand by your promise?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes, I do; so that is very specific. We have that very much encapsulated in the review. Then there is a media statement from the Treasurer following that dated 19 December, in which he said, 'This is purely the up-front sale of the timber—nothing more.' That is fairly plain, isn't it? Then we go to Budget Paper 3 for this year: 'A significant improvement in net lending is forecast in 2011-12, mainly reflecting'—and I will miss out half the sentence because it refers to another asset—'and the proposed sale of ForestrySA assets'. Very, very plain: 'Proceeds from the sale of ForestrySA's harvests have not been disclosed so as to avoid prejudicing the sales process.' That is very, very plain, and that is backed up in my statement. I think my statement is flawless and basically accords with—

An honourable member: Flawless?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Well, it effectively is.

FORESTRYSA

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:56): My question is again to the minister for forests. Minister, who should the people of the South-East believe regarding the sale of the state's forests? The minister was reported in the local paper as saying:

The State Government has made a decision and some people may be unhappy with it, but the decision is made.

Further:

It's been in the budget papers since 2008 and it has always been clear that the Government will go ahead with the sale.

Or should the people of the South-East believe the Treasurer, who wrote to the South-East Local Government Association just two weeks before the minister made those comments saying that no decision had been made. To quote from the letter:

Currently the Government is reviewing the report prepared by the Department of Treasury and Finance. Once the Government has made a decision on this matter, then I will be in a position to provide you with more detail.

Should they believe you, minister, or the Treasurer?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Davenport!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:57): What a pathetic question.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: It was so pathetic he wouldn't take it!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. You have asked about a comment by the minister, which he has reconfirmed, and you are introducing a comment that I have made in a letter. It is appropriate that I answer.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If you would like to be quiet, I am happy to give you the right answer.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. Madam Speaker, what the minister has said is correct: it is in the budget; it is in the bottom line; it is in three successive budgets; it is what was shown to the rating agencies. That sale of the forward rotations—that decision has been taken. What we have not taken is a final—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Are you listening?

Mr Williams: Absolutely.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We have not taken a final decision on the method and the manner in which we will do that.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What is she giggling about?

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Have a look at the member for Bragg. What a stunning political career she has had. A stunning political career she has had, the member for Bragg.

Mr Marshall: Tell us about your phone bill.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We want to start asking some questions, do we? I have a few interesting numbers in Treasury from expenses of members opposite. Would you like me to reveal those as well?

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Pardon?

Mr Marshall: Thirteen per cent.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thirteen what?

Mr Marshall: Per cent who believe you should be the premier.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That's not bad given I am not seeking the position.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Have you ever seen a bloke with bigger tickets on himself in such a short space of time as this bloke? He has been here about eight months—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood, I warn you for the second time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What a goose!

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker: I believe that calling a member of parliament a goose is unparliamentary and I ask that the Deputy Premier withdraw.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Treasurer. I just point out that the member for Norwood could have called that. Treasurer, back to your answer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As I said, Madam Speaker, it is a nonsense question. We have already made the decision. It is factored into the forward estimates. It would be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, don't respond to interjections. Finish your answer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is a very simple matter. The government has made the decision to sell the forward rotations. We have not finalised as yet or taken the decision on a number of rotations on the way in which we will sell. There are a number of matters in a process such as this that require a significant body of work. That work is being undertaken as we speak. It should be concluded shortly, and we will then make a final decision. There is an issue on the number of rotations. There are issues associated with it and those decisions have not been taken. Until such time as they are, the sale of the forward rotations is a matter that is in the budget and, once the final decision is taken, it will be announced.

STATE EXPORTS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Trade. How will removing funding from the Council for International Trade and Commerce SA, the organisation that supports 40 chambers of commerce, removing all of the department's trade officers and cutting the payroll tax rebate for exporters, enable the government to reach its export target for \$25 billion by 2014? South Australia's annual exports have actually fallen from \$9.1 billion to \$8.6 billion since the Rann Labor government came to office.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (15:02): The members opposite are so outraged, so disgusted, so enraged by these cuts that they voted for them. That is how outraged they are—they voted for them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is the budget. If you don't like the budget, don't vote for it. It's very simple. The Liberal Party has been raised on the knee of: 'We believe in the rights of individuals and no member of parliament is ever told what to do by the Liberal Party.' If you are opposed to these cuts, vote against them.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The question to the minister was: how are these cuts going to increase our exports? That is what the Liberal Party is actually concerned about—exports.

The SPEAKER: I won't say yes on that point in question until I hear the rest of the minister's answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is like I said, Madam Speaker. They are so outraged that they voted for it. They are so enraged with these cuts that they went out and voted for them. But the truth is that DTED is being restructured—no doubt about it. It is something members opposite never had the courage to do, and your comrades, your colleagues at Business SA, are the ones who were saying that cuts to DTED are the canary in the coal mine, that unless cuts were made to DTED this government is not serious about saving its AAA credit rating. Well, we were serious; we did make the cuts. We have made sure that DTED is a slimline department that can deliver these outcomes.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will be quiet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Of course, it will be focused on attracting, retraining and fostering investment in South Australia while the revised DTED will be instrumental in delivering solid economic growth. This will be achieved by targeting important sectors that include clean-tech, advanced manufacturing and knowledge intensive services. The state government, through DTED, is focusing specifically on working with key industry groups and companies to ensure that South Australia has a solid base of sustainable industries, jobs and sustainable growth. As I said earlier, if

the opposition is so outraged, they could have voted against it. I am interested to hear how many members opposite raised the sector cuts in their addresses on the budget. How many?

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly! Members opposite made a big deal about no member of government being in the house—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order. The minister is obviously incapable of answering the question, but that does not give him an excuse to debate.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has answered the question. The member for Unley.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:05): Will the Premier now provide answers to questions I asked him in July and September 2010 regarding new enrolments and Chinese accreditation at Carnegie Mellon University? On 1 July 2010, I asked the Premier a series of questions relating to Carnegie Mellon University's Adelaide campus.

I asked the Premier to confirm whether there were fewer than 20 students enrolled at Carnegie Mellon for the 2010 midyear enrolment and whether the two degrees offered at the Carnegie Mellon University campus are accredited with the Chinese ministry of education and training. The Premier would not answer the questions but promised to report back to the house. I then asked the Premier the same questions again on 16 September 2010, and again the Premier did not provide an answer. Since then, media reports have suggested that Carnegie Mellon is at threat of closure.

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) (15:06): I would be pleased to answer this question. It is one of those eureka moments. Carnegie Mellon University's Heinz college has graduated over 180 students since its inception in 2006, and the largest cohort of 64 students graduated in August this year.

Enrolments have been increasing at an average rate of 20 to 30 per cent per annum, in some instances even higher. Enrolments fluctuate due to a variety of factors, and I have been advised that the Heinz college midyear intake was lower than expected. However, I am advised that there is a prediction for increased numbers of students for 2011-12, so you will be disappointed. In a press release issued last Sunday—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think that number has been revealed publicly. In a press release issued last Sunday 24 October, Carnegie Mellon stated that it is 'committed to the long-term development of our operations in South Australia', so you would be very disappointed. It is not like the eureka business. The release also stated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and I quote:

There are no plans to close the operations in Adelaide and no truth that a closing in 12 months is imminent.

The latest enrolment trend released from Education Adelaide (market update March 2010) states that from June 2009 to June 2010 international student growth in South Australia was 9.3 per cent, while it was only 2.4 per cent nationally. It also states that SA's market share of the national total is 5.8 per cent, up from 5.4 per cent last year. These solid numbers point to the fact that South Australia has done well with our international student growth and has exceeded national trends.

Mr PISONI: Point of order. I have asked the Premier to provide enrolment numbers. I have not asked questions about other universities. I have asked questions specific to Carnegie Mellon University. It is the third occasion that I have asked the Premier to confirm new midyear enrolments at Carnegie Mellon and Chinese accreditation.

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: But you're hiding it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: You know the answer to the question—

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Unley! Sit down!

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sit down, member for Unley! The Premier has been answering that question, because I have been listening very carefully. I do not expect the Premier to know the number of enrolments without coming back to us, but he does have figures there indicating an increase.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No, it has been in the newspapers that their midyear intake was seven and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —that they have 64 students graduated, an increased average rate of 20 to 30 per cent, and then expecting—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —much bigger in next year's intake. Do you know something? Carnegie Mellon in Adelaide is in a lot healthier shape than your business operations.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, it is time for you to ask another question, but I am reluctant to let you. Get your question out and get it over and done with.

Mr PISONI: It is interesting that the Premier would refer to my business. He walks past my piece of furniture in the dining—

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. It is not open to the member for Unley, no matter how bad tempered he is, to stand up and engage in debate. He may merely ask a question and he may seek leave to explain it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There will be no quarrels across the floor. Member for Unley, do you have a question?

Mr PISONI: I do, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Then ask your question and sit down and don't engage in debate.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:10): Thank you very much for your instructions. My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier verify that new students confirmed for the commencement of Carnegie Mellon for 2011 are currently only 26, or around 45 fewer than the January 2011 target and well below financial viability?

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) (15:11): It is very interesting. We know that the member for Unley fell into forged documents. He was the one who was convinced. He said, 'Oh, my God—'

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order, the deputy leader.

Mr WILLIAMS: Relevance. This is a very straightforward and simple question.

The SPEAKER: Premier, give us a straight answer, please.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If the Carnegie Mellon was going to close and they had come out and said that was wrong—he didn't bother to check, just as he didn't bother to check when he was handed a lot of receipts and forgeries and won't reveal who forged them. I will get an answer for the honourable member.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, you can have one more.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:12): Thank you. My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier been advised of a closing date for Carnegie Mellon University?

The SPEAKER: The Premier—I think you have answered this.

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) (15:12): No. This is what I have been advised: Carnegie Mellon stated that it is 'committed to the long-term development of our operations in South Australia'. If you had listened to the last question—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't listen; you just listen to yourself talking. The release also stated:

There are no plans to close the operations in Adelaide and no truth that a closing in 12 months is imminent.

This is a bloke who has believed what he is told. This is a bloke who sees a forged document and thinks it is real.

ADELAIDE WEST SPECIAL EDUCATION CENTRE

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (15:13): Can the Minister for Education update the house on progress towards the opening of the Adelaide West Special Education Centre?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (15:13): I am pleased to say that considerable progress has been made. In fact, next Thursday the Adelaide West special school, a new school, will open. It is part of over \$200 million of investment in six new schools across Adelaide's metropolitan area. I was there this morning to get a better sense of exactly what will be happening at that school. It is an enormously exciting project.

I want to thank the principal, Sylvia Flato, and the students and staff for warmly welcoming me to that school. The school does a number of important things. It is a cutting edge school for Disability Services. The whole of the school is accessible under cover, which is really important for students who are particularly vulnerable to temperature changes. These are quite profoundly intellectually and physically disabled students.

The whole of the classroom network has hoists throughout it so that children can be easily moved out of their wheelchairs. There is a state-of-the-art gymnasium, a new maze and a new playground. There is a very important innovation, an independent living unit, which will allow these young people to gain independent living skills, and that is something that is very important for them and their families, that is, to know that they can gain the skills to go on and make a success of their community.

I suppose one of the most exciting things about the new facility, apart from its being state of the art and including things such as interactive whiteboards, is the fact that it is right next door to the Ocean View College. This will enable the special school, which was quite isolated in its previous location at Regency Park, to be part of that school community. There was a wonderful moment at the school today where we had students from Ocean View College whose brother was at the special school, and they were able to be with him as they were celebrating the pending opening of this new school. That is the sort of thing, the interaction between people with disabilities and the broader community, that is important.

One of the great challenges in disability education is: how do you provide for the special needs of people with disabilities, but, at the same time, not isolate them so they are not part of the broader community? This school, I think, achieves that balance beautifully—a special school next to a mainstream school. The community is very excited about forging those links.

One of the opportunities we had was the students decided to make a video of their journey from the Regency Park school to the new school. It was an idea of one of the students to film and record the whole exercise. They were involved in interviews, presentation to the camera. It was wonderful to see the look on the faces of the young people as they saw themselves on the video talking, expressing themselves and being part of a presentation of which they are entitled to be very proud.

It is a great new school. It is one of six new schools we are rolling out as part of the Education Works package. The remaining schools will be on soon, and if they are anything like this one, it is going to be a very successful enterprise.

EDUCATION FUNDING

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:16): My question is also to the Minister for Education—a popular fellow in some quarters. Can the minister please advise the house if funding guaranteed for schools given by the former chief executive officer of the Department of Education and Children's Services, Mr Chris Robinson, will be assured following Mr Robinson's dismissal? The governing council of Kangaroo Island Community Education has been informed by the Acting Chief Executive Officer of DECS, Mr Gino DeGennaro, that the three-year funding arrangement concluding on 30 June 2013 will not be guaranteed, despite a formal letter from the former CEO guaranteeing the funding.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (15:17): I do not have any particular detail about that. I am not aware of the particular detail of that arrangement. In a general sense, I would say that, arrangements that have been entered into should be honoured, but obviously I need to consider precisely what it is that was agreed to and what the circumstances are of any changed arrangements. The departure—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I do not know the specific answer to the question. I am trying to help you as much as I can by making some general points. In a general sense, the departure of a chief executive should not disturb arrangements that are entered into by the agency. The agency has an existence that continues beyond the tenure of any one chief executive, just as it would in the case of a commitment entered into by a minister or the government. That is the general point. Whether or not the commitment was in the precise terms that you suggest is something we would have to look at carefully. I will bring back an answer to the house.

COMMONWEALTH GAMES

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:18): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier tell the house about the achievements of South Australian athletes at the recent 2010 Commonwealth Games in Delhi?

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) (15:18): I am pleased to answer the member's question as someone who used to be a sports journalist in this state.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am nursing a sports injury at the moment. The 2010 Delhi Commonwealth Games proved to be a great showcase for many of the world's elite athletes, as well as for India as a whole. Despite a few anxious moments in the lead-up to the event, the games proceeded without incident and Australian athletes took the opportunity to shine. In fact, I met with the Chief Minister of Delhi shortly before the event and Sheila told me that she expected it to go off as well as it did.

In particular, our 22 South Australian athletes must be congratulated for the outstanding results they achieved. An impressive 13 South Australians returned home from the Delhi games with medals. That is more than half the entire squad of athletes from our state. Three South Australians broke Commonwealth Games records and swimmer Matthew Cowdrey broke a world record. Cyclist Anna Meares dominated on the track, with a clean sweep of three gold medals in the women's sprint events, breaking the Commonwealth Games record in the 500 metres time trial.

Endurance cyclist Jack Bobridge demonstrated the impressive form that made him the 2008 under 23 men's road time trial world champion by winning gold in the 400 metres individual

pursuit and clocking a new Commonwealth Games record time. Jack and fellow South Australian Dale Parker also won gold in the 400 metres team pursuit. There are so many members on this side who are—I would not call them elite—athletes in terms of cycling, and I know they would be very proud of their fellow athletes.

Gymnast Sam Offord backed up his gold medal on the rings at the recent Pacific Rim Championships in Melbourne, with a gold on the rings and a gold in the team event at the Commonwealth Games. In the pool, there was no more inspirational effort than Matthew Cowdrey's gold-medal swim in the 50 metres freestyle. Despite the difficult conditions, Matthew also managed to break his own world record, which was a fantastic effort.

Also in the pool, Sophie Edington broke the Commonwealth Games record in the 50 metres backstroke, while fellow backstroker, Hayden Stoeckel took silver in the men's 50 metres backstroke before, unfortunately, being forced to withdraw from further competition due to a stomach illness.

Walker Claire Tallent took a silver medal in the 20 kilometres walk and, in one of the most poignant moments of the games, was congratulated by her husband and training partner, Jarred, who had just won a gold medal.

Three South Australians—Natalie Von Bertouch, Natalie Medhurst and Lauren Nourse—brought home a silver medal for Australia in the netball. The Diamonds versus Silver Ferns final will go down as one of the greatest contests in netball history, going to double extra time, only to see New Zealand take the gold.

Badminton player Kate Wilson-Smith, at her fourth Commonwealth Games, broke the 12-year medal drought for Australian badminton with her bronze medal in the women's doubles. In the shooting—and I know we also have shooters on this side of the house—Mid North farmer David Chapman claimed bronze in the pairs 25 metres rapid-fire pistol. South Australia performed particularly well in cycling, contributing significantly to the team membership and providing more than its share of the medals.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am told that the names Jack Bobridge and Dale Parker, in particular, are the ones to watch out for in London in 2012. We are also hopeful that Jack will once again line up for the 2011 Santos Tour Down Under, alongside Lance Armstrong. South Australia continues to be a focal point for cycling excellence in Australia. We are proud to host the AIS Track Cycling program at the Adelaide Superdrome and are delighted with the partnership and support received from the SASI Cycling program and the sports science team.

South Australia has also produced some of our nation's finest swimming talent, and I have no doubt that the imminent completion and opening of the new world-class State Aquatic Centre at Marion will provide a world-class environment to provide a massive impetus to our high-performance swimming programs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

KANGAROO ISLAND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:23): A few minutes ago I asked a question of the Minister for Education. I have a copy of a letter sent to Mr Ian Kent, Principal of Kangaroo Island Community Education (KICE), from Mr Chris Robinson, former CEO of DECS, confirming supplementary funding of \$159,500 on an annual basis from the period 2009-13. The three schools—now one—have a chequered history of financial problems over the years and, in 2009, were technically insolvent.

KICE is a unique three-campus school that was formed to create efficiencies, be more effective in the delivery of the curriculum and enhance student outcomes. There have been two reviews into education on Kangaroo Island. The most recent, in 2007-08, recommended that the current leadership and multicampus model be maintained, with a principal at a PCO8 level overseeing the three campuses.

An agreement was reached with DECS that supplementary funding would be provided to employ a principal for a period of five years. This supplementary funding was vital for the governing council to attract and employ a principal, restructure the operation, create efficiencies, sort out the finance, and build on the capacity within the staff and community to provide better educational opportunities and outcomes for students.

The governing council was fortunate enough to attract a very experienced and committed principal, who has worked in an open and transparent way with the council, the staff, students and wider community to do that. The Speaker herself can attest to the skills and abilities of that principal, Mr Ian Kent, as he was principal of Stuart High School, and took that from one of the worst schools around to become one of the highest performing, best practice schools in the state.

Since taking up his appointment in 2009, Mr Kent has done an amazing job as an educational leader. After many years of financial problems, the school finally has a budget that is moving towards financial solvency and a financial management policy that is understood, and the governing council has confidence in the processes and procedures in place to maintain and slowly improve its financial position so that it can deliver a curriculum that meets the needs of all children on Kangaroo Island. The governing council has worked with the principal on meeting the target, as per the agreement with DECS, to operate under the same model without the supplementation by the beginning of 2014.

The whole school community, over the three campuses, has taken ownership of education on the island due to the strong partnership between the governing council and the principal. However, over the years a culture of mistrust has built up between DECS and the school due to red tape and a lack of communication with the bureaucrats in Flinders Street. The school has listened to the rhetoric and the promises, but unfortunately this government and DECS have let it down time and time again.

This latest decision, without any consultation, is another broken promise. How can this government or DECS be trusted? The principal has worked with everyone to build a more positive relationship between DECS and KICE; unfortunately, the latest decision by the minister and DECS to terminate this agreement for funding has left people in my electorate feeling absolutely betrayed and wondering what on earth can be done when a CEO gets slotted and another one, put in an acting position, betrays contracts.

As the principal has tenure for the period of the agreed supplementation funding (until 2013) he still has to be paid, and if the minister withdraws this funding where does the money come from? There is no flexibility in their budget at this time to cover the shortfall, despite what bureaucrats in DECS say. The school is working with DECS finance personnel to meet the expectation of covering this supplementation in 2014, as per the original agreement. The agreement must be honoured, as it will be the children who suffer once again—this time on Kangaroo Island—as they have done in the past due to broken promises, red tape, poor communication and a lack of understanding of the complexities and costs associated with living on Kangaroo Island.

The chairman of the governing council for the island, Mr Mark Griffiths, spoke to me at length over the weekend on this matter. They are worried sick about it. There was an agreement put in place that the school would be funded until 2013, by which time they were hoping to be able to absorb this cost into their budget. It was a basket case. Mr. Kent turned it around. Mr. Griffiths and the governing council want it fixed; they want that to remain in place. Mr DeGennaro and his cohorts had better get their act into gear and review this foolish, stupid decision and let education on Kangaroo Island proceed normally as it should.

The member for Reynell was herself over there several years ago as part of a plan to put this in place. As I recall she got an earful at a meeting at Parndana and disappeared without trace, but she knows what had to happen. It was put in place and it is working, but it will only work if the government continues the funding to maintain Mr Kent's position and if these bloody-minded bureaucrats in Flinders Street get their act together about what they are really meant to do and stay in touch with the community through agreements that were put in place by the former CEO of DECS, Mr Chris Robinson.

ITALIAN MIGRATION

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:29): On the 17th of this month I had the great pleasure of launching the book *Terra lasci, terra trovi*:—a very rough translation of which means 'the land left behind, the land found'—from *Molinara to Adelaide* at the Molinara Social and Sports Club at

Windsor Gardens. The book is the history of migration of people from the village of Molinara in Italy to Adelaide, and, as I said at the launch, I was very pleased to see that it is already listed in the catalogue of the National Library.

In November of last year, the club approached me about this project that they were undertaking to produce a history of the migration of Italians from the town of Molinara to Adelaide. They were seeking some financial support, so I wrote to our Premier, Mike Rann, requesting some special assistance so that the club could undertake what I thought was a tremendously worthwhile project. I was extremely pleased when the Premier advised me that there was a grant of \$4,000 to be given to the club to assist in the production of the book. I can see the member for Morialta nodding because I have to say that it is—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes. It is truly an exceptionally excellent book, I think is one way of describing it. It is quite large and it is just beautiful. By way of some background, Molinara is a township of approximately 1,900 people in the province of Benevento in the Italian region of Campania. It is located about 80 kilometres north-east of Naples and about 20 kilometres north-east of Benevento. The book traces the history of migration from Molinara to Adelaide.

As we can imagine, in the post-World War II era, South Australians saw a significant inflow of migrants from Europe, and, quite truly, these migrants have enhanced our Australian culture with their traditions and customs. I have a great admiration for the migrants who left the security of their homeland to travel halfway across the world to start a new life here in Adelaide.

As a young girl at primary school, most of my friends were Italian because of the community around Croydon, where I lived. I recall the difficulty for a lot of their mothers, in particular, whose command of English was extremely limited because they were at home caring for the family. Communication was very difficult. Today we hop on the phone and chat away to people, send emails and all the rest of it, but in those days, of course, you would write a letter back home, it would take weeks to get there and then a long time for a response to come back.

Many of those people who came here at that time probably believed that they would never return to their homeland again, nor have the opportunity to see their families, so the loss of that contact and family support led to the creation of clubs such as the Molinara Social and Sports Club, which was established nearly 40 years ago to encourage the cultural, social and sporting activities of Italian migrants, particularly the Molinaresi community.

The club moved to its current rooms in Windsor Gardens in 1973, and they have made a great contribution, not just to my community but to the wider Italian community. They have a great commitment to enhancing the cultural knowledge of young members of their community, which is to be commended—it is very hard to engage younger people these days, as we all know.

Before I run out of time, I want to congratulate everyone involved in the book. As we have said before, it is absolutely fantastic. A special mention must go to Don Callisto, who is the convenor of the Molinara Club's Cultural Committee, and Don Longo, the editor, who has done a fantastic job under great duress at times.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:34): My grievance is directed to the Premier, the Minister for the River Murray, in fact every member of this house today, and even every South Australian. The Murray-Darling Basin Plan will affect every South Australian, not just the food producing irrigators and the river communities which rely on the River Murray. The 'Guide to the proposed Basin Plan' is supposed to be an important step in changing how the Murray-Darling Basin is to be managed, but from South Australia's perspective, very little has changed.

Through consultation meetings in Renmark and Adelaide, and Murray Bridge today, South Australia is still not being recognised for its efficiency gains, its compliance with the cap and its equity in infrastructure investment over the last 40 years. The Murray-Darling Basin Authority's community information sessions at Renmark and in Adelaide were packed out. I want to relay a point raised by an irrigator at the morning session in Renmark: many people remember what they were doing in 1969 when man landed on the moon; in Renmark, they were putting pipes underground, and this was one of the first steps in South Australia's irrigation modernisation program.

Efficiency is measured at the point at which water is extracted from the river system. In this regard, South Australian irrigation is the most efficient in the basin. We know how much water is being used, when it is being used and how it is being used. This is because there is accurate metering at the point of extraction and at the farm gate. Water savings at the infrastructure level cannot be made in South Australia, and that is evidenced by the fact that only a fraction of the federal government's money intended for upgrading the efficiency of South Australia's irrigation infrastructure has been taken up.

Why has this efficiency been ignored by the authority and the federal government? The authority argues that it was confined by the Water Act, but this excuse is as facile as its responses to the same question in Renmark. Why are South Australia's efficiencies not being held up as a model for emulation by those who argue the Murray-Darling system must be saved at any cost? The authority and the federal government must go back to the drawing board.

More water must be returned to the basin's environmental assets and the river must be made healthy again, but let's get some balance into this solution. The way to do this is to look where water can be saved for the environmental flows without compromising South Australia's water users. There are massive savings to be made instead of proposing divisive and crippling diversion limits.

The authority and the federal government must undertake a thorough audit of the basin to explore these potential savings. Some of those would be: water users can only manage what they can meter (there needs to be equity right across the basin); address the investment delivery systems and make them efficient; and undertake large water infrastructure savings, as well as those small infrastructure projects. There is currently no balance in the 'Guide to the proposed Basin Plan'.

My final message to the Premier is that the river communities are united, contrary to his ministerial statement today. South Australia must have a united message to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. In saying that, it has been evident over the last four consultation meetings in South Australia that we lead by example—something that the authority continues to ignore. South Australia is not being given any consideration. They are high-security water users, unlike many of their Eastern States counterparts. It is not a blame game; it is all about saving the basin and getting back into health, with the balance of keeping food production and the river communities that rely so heavily on the Murray-Darling Basin's water security.

It is time that every South Australian, including the Rann government, made a clear point that we are an example right across the Murray-Darling Basin. To date, this government continues to ignore the achievements of every South Australian water user, irrigator and community. Today, I ask not only the Premier but every member of this government to relay the message that South Australia has led by example.

FRANCIS, MR C.W.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:40): I rise this afternoon to pay tribute to Colin William Francis, who died on 15 October. The Premier, the Minister for the Southern Suburbs and the member for Mawson join with me in acknowledging Colin's work for the community of South Australia but particularly for the South Adelaide Football Club.

I do not think a greater tribute could be paid to anyone than the words of Colin's son, Greg, during his eulogy when he said that Colin was a true son of Adelaide. He was interested in sport, art, music and the community. He worked hard, he inspired his children, especially through his boast of getting 11 out of 10 for reading.

Our sympathies are extended to Colin's wife, Judy, his children, Greg, Christopher and Robyn, and all his family and the many people who are part of the South Adelaide Football Club community and who greatly value Colin's work, his friendship and his dedication. The tributes to him in the paper paint a brief picture of his life, particularly that from Greg:

To my Dad, thank you for your love. [Our] maximum respect to a man who combined all of his talents and resources with hard work. Always with us.

That was from Greg and his family. The tribute from South Adelaide Football Club also says in a few words many things:

The board, staff, volunteers, players (his boys), coaches, members and sponsors of the South Adelaide FC are deeply saddened by the passing of Club President Colin Francis. Col has been a key figure with the Panthers since the early 1950's as a player and administrator including the key roles of Chairman and Vice-Chairman, and

President. Following constitutional changes, Colin will go down as the last ever President of the South Adelaide FC. Our thoughts are with Judy and the family at this sad time. It won't be the same at South without Col.

I certainly agree. It will not be the same at South without Col. You could always expect that he would give you a warm welcome, his warm friendship, and his inclusiveness is a role model for us all. To put some more of the works of Colin and his position in the community on record, I draw on the words of Peter Alexander, former chair of the South Adelaide Football Club. I quote from Peter's eulogy:

Colin was a city boy. He lived near the Green Dragon Hotel on South Terrace when 40,000 people lived within the CBD. The two city clubs were South and West with King William Street being the boundary. The South Adelaide Football Club would always play a significant part in Colin's life, first as a player and then administrator throughout his life up until the time of his passing.

Col's loyalty to the club was complete. He was no fair-weather supporter, he was a true club man. It takes a lot of ticker to be a Southie and Col never lost the passion for the club regardless of how hard it got. His positive attitude was an inspiration for all. Colin was always optimistic regardless of how black the situation seemed to be. Colin always had a great affection for the players and took an interest in them individually and became a father image to many of them. Colin showed respect for people, members, players, opposition—he was always the same regardless of who he was dealing with.

During Colin's life, South won only three premierships, two when he was a child during the 1930s and, of course, the 1964 flag. Colin had a great respect for, and was respected by, the players of that team. In fact, Colin had a love of all who wore the blue-and-white. He had great memories of the talents of Jimmy Deane, Peter Darley, David Kantilla and Mark Naley in particular.

Many of us—

and I add myself here, too—

myself included, had the benefit of Colin's wise counsel. During my time on the board, Colin was always alongside at meetings with government ministers, local councils or special interest groups. He was always supportive and objective; always prepared to reach a win-win outcome and able to put people at ease and inject an element of humour.

Vale, Colin Francis.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:45): Why are some children worth \$6,000 and others worth \$300,000? That is the question I pose to the Minister for Families and Communities. The minister is responsible for children who have parents or guardians who are unable or unwilling to care for their children, and they are placed under the guardianship of the minister. Essentially, that means that they are placed under the direct responsibility of the government to look after and provide for these children.

Although the minister now says we do not have children in motels in emergency care any more, we only have them in serviced apartments, as though there is really some big difference to that, it would not have escaped the attention of some members that in this year's budget the cost for accommodating children in what we call motel-like accommodation the minister has budgeted \$27 million to provide for children.

If one reads the Guardian of Children and Young People's annual report, you will see that sometimes between 80 and 100 children a year are in this category. A couple of years ago that was on average about \$270,000 per child on current estimates of what is likely to be an increase, we are told by the minister, for this year for children who have to stay in motel-like accommodation, sometimes for months and months at a time; on average it is something closer to \$300,000 per year. If we are on current tracking rates, that could be as high as half a million dollars per child in care.

Clearly, these children have been sometimes abused, abandoned, they are in very vulnerable situations, they have come from very fractured environments, and they need absolute care. Whilst it is important to maintain motel accommodation for emergency situations, it is unconscionable to me that the government can continue to throw millions of dollars providing emergency care when they could buy motels for that price and go into the accommodation business themselves, but, nevertheless, they insist on doing this.

This will not be so callous or insensitive to the needs of those children if it were not to compare with what happens to children in the country. Let me give you one example. Mrs B, as I will describe her for the purposes protecting of her children, who has authorised me to raise this issue in the parliament, is a senior-aged person who lives in Ceduna on the West Coast.

Last year, she and her husband took responsibility for their five grandchildren, who are all now at school. Some of them had come to her with very high needs and health issues. After they had spent their own retirement savings to take action to protect these children and seek custody of them without any help from the department, ultimately what happened was that the natural mother apparently had attempted suicide, the children were put at risk, and there was a situation where the department then came to the grandparents, amazingly, and said, 'We want you to take them.'

Of course they were willing to take them, but they only had very tiny accommodation. The department said, 'Well, we'll help you buy the materials to line your shed so that we can provide a house for these children.' They provided the materials, that is true. The family built all the lining of the shed, and they provided them with immediate accommodation. Obviously that was not at a standard that was good enough, and everyone would expect that children should not be living in that environment, that they needed to acquire a home. They searched the state.

Mrs B locates a \$180,000 transportable home with all costs included, which means that they can bring it to Ceduna to house these children. In addition to that, they paid for the furniture and all the things they need. They go to department and ask for \$30,000 contribution—that is the equivalent of \$6,000 per child—to provide for these children. Ultimately, after months and months of negotiating to get this, they get the money, but it is on the basis that they get nothing for the car, which they need to make sure the children get around and get to school; so they are now left with a car debt.

They have used their savings to build this home for their children. They are committed to providing for their grandchildren, and they will keep doing that, but it is a scandalous, callous disregard for the children who are out there out of sight of the minister, who does not give a toss about these children. It is quite unacceptable that this government throws up a report to us, through the budget, to say it is prepared to spend \$27 million on hotel accommodation, hotel-like accommodation, for children who are in these circumstances in the city. That is nearly \$300,000 per child, and yet they leave their children out in a lined shed.

When eventually the grandparents got together the money for the children to have a home, they had this appalling lack of commitment from the government because they are out of sight and out of mind. Well, I will keep speaking about this matter until the government does something about it. The minister has been written to; she has obviously ignored it. There have been pleas put on behalf of the fabulous new member for Flinders, who has taken up the cause of this case. We will keep fighting this. We will keep exposing this complete disregard for these children.

Time expired.

MURIEL MATTERS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:50): Today, I advise the house and the Premier that a significant anniversary will take place this Thursday: it is exactly 102 years since South Australian suffragist Muriel Matters became the first woman to speak in the House of Commons.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: This Thursday. Muriel was born in Bowden in 1877 and travelled to England in 1905 to further her theatrical career. A gifted elocutionist and musician, Muriel became involved with London's arts community, many of whom were actively involved in the cause of women's suffrage. British women had been seeking franchise since 1863 and, at the time of Muriel's arrival, the Pankhursts had just moved their activities from their base in Manchester to the British capital.

Muriel had already voted twice and soon became involved in the suffragist activities—and I say 'suffragist' because suffragettes who were violent had not yet entered the scene. The suffragists had many tactics to draw attention to their struggle: they chalked pavements, sold penny postcards and held meetings, rallies and demonstrations and chainings; usually, chainings were to the railings of prominent buildings, often outside No. 10 Downing Street. Muriel took this form of civil disobedience to parliament on the evening of 28 October.

With her friends Violet Tillard, who was armed with an A3-size proclamation banner, and Helen Fox, Muriel was escorted into the ladies' gallery by an unsuspecting MP sympathetic to women's suffrage. Helen and Muriel had belts attached to their bodies under their clothing, with chains and padlocks attached to them. The chains had been wrapped in wool and wound around their waist, under cloaks so they would not be detected.

During the licensing debate, which took place around 7.30 that evening, Muriel and Helen attached the padlocks to sections of the grille that separated those sitting behind it from the view of the MPs on the floor of the house. The grille had become a strong symbol of the exclusion women faced from the political process. At the pre-arranged signal, Muriel rose to her feet and spoke at the top of her voice about why votes for women was such an important issue.

Violet had the proclamation banner, which she lowered on a piece of string into the view of the Speaker's chair below. As she was not chained to the gallery, she was removed rather easily, but Helen and Muriel were attached by their chains and could not be taken out. As they could not have the chains removed, observing the conventions of modesty at the time, it was necessary to unscrew the partition from the wall, and that placed Muriel on the floor of the House of Commons, effectively making her the first woman to speak there.

Muriel and the grille will be reunited here in Centre Hall on Thursday. Through the wonderful work of the Clerk of our house, who approached the Westminster people, we now have a section of the grille here in Adelaide. We hope also shortly to have a set of chains from the Museum of London on display. However, on Thursday, we will be unveiling a display, and the Speaker has graciously agreed to officiate.

We will also have Muriel in attendance, because the play, *Why Muriel Matters*, which was commissioned by the Muriel Matters Society, will take place in the Old Chamber on Friday evening. The historic significance of the venue cannot be overlooked for it was in that chamber in 1894 that the vote was taken to allow South Australian women to have dual suffrage—something we claim as a world first.

Fabulous Adelaide actresses Teresa DeGennaro, as Muriel, and Carol Young, as Violet Tillard, will recreate the Cabaret Festival Fringe success of the re-enactment of Muriel's visit to Adelaide in 1910, which was held in June earlier this year. So, we will have here on Friday night Muriel reunited with the portion of the grille she has not seen for 102 years. We are very excited to be able to put this on display for visitors to Parliament House to have access to, and we very much look forward to having schoolchildren and members of the public at large come through to see the display, which will also highlight the many different depictions of the grille that was in the press at the time, a *Punch* cartoon and some caricatures of how suffragists were viewed by the public.

I think Muriel's role and legacy to this state mean that people who have a grievance can do something about it, take a stand and make a change to society. We know civil disobedience is something that causes great discomfort to a lot of people, but it is a way of bringing to your parliamentary leaders your dissatisfaction at anything that you see. I urge all members of the house and their staff to attend the play and look forward to seeing them at the performance.

WILSON, MR G.I.

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) (15:55): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I really want to acknowledge today—and I am sure a number of members opposite and behind me would agree—the passing of Mr Garnett Ian Wilson, a prominent Ngarrindjeri and Kaurna elder, well known to many people in South Australia. I also acknowledge the family, close friends of Mr Wilson, and all those who hold memories of him. On behalf of the government, I would like to express our sadness at the passing of Mr Wilson. Mr Wilson's funeral took place yesterday at the St Francis Xavier Cathedral and today I understand that a committal service has been held at Raukkan, where the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has been representing the South Australian government.

Born Garnett Ian Wilson on 7 January 1928, Mr Wilson was the first baby born at the Point McLeay hospital (now Raukkan). At the age of 12, he suffered a serious injury which developed into a painful and permanent disability. Through tough family love, he turned away from bitterness and self-pity towards a lifetime of achievement and service. Garnett Wilson (who was known to me as Garnie) was the first Aboriginal wool classer in South Australia and served for 28 years in this industry.

He was recently inducted into the hall of fame for his contributions to the shearing industry and the role he served as a wool classer. Much of his service and work in this industry was performed on Kangaroo Island, where he started working with his father. I know from many years

of associations with both Garnie and the late Ted Chapman that they had a close friendship and worked together over many years on Kangaroo Island. Indeed, Garnie shored sheep on Ted Chapman's property.

Ms Chapman: Wool classed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Sorry, wool classed on his property. On 8 December 1966, His Excellency the Governor of South Australia appointed four people—Garnett Wilson, Tim Hughes, Natasha McNamara and John Millar—as the foundation members of the board of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the first Aboriginal landholding body in Australia. That was the start of Aboriginal land rights. In 1977, Mr Wilson became chair of the Aboriginal Lands Trust and this appointment was to last incredibly until 2001.

In 1975, the Fraser coalition government rebadged and reformed the National Aboriginal Conference (NAC) and Mr Wilson was to become the state chairman and served from 1977 to 1985. In his second term, he served on the national executive as deputy chair for 12 months. The NAC was the forerunner to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission (ATSIC), which was established in 1990.

When Mr Wilson represented the NAC at the national level, he became the first Aboriginal to attend the United Nations to talk about the Treaty for all Aboriginal Peoples in Australia. Mr Wilson was involved in a number of Aboriginal organisations, having also chaired the State Aboriginal Heritage Committee. His involvement in a number of forums, boards and committees earned him the affectionate nickname of 'the Chairman'.

On 26 January 1984, Mr Wilson was acknowledged with a medal of the Order of Australia for his services to Aboriginal welfare. He received a letter from the former South Australian Premier, David Tonkin, offering him an MBE but, true to Mr Wilson's nature, he refused this award and was eventually persuaded to accept the OAM.

Mr Wilson made an outstanding contribution to this state and lived a life that was extraordinary and remarkable. He was dedicated to advocating the rights and interests of Aboriginal people, and his passion and vision for the Raukkan community was inspirational. Mr Wilson was widely respected for his strength of character. He warmed the hearts of all who knew him. He was considered a kind and gentle man who had time for all. He has left a lasting impression on the many organisations he chaired and represented.

I was a member when I got to know Garnett Wilson, the first time being when I worked for Don Dunstan, then for Des Corcoran and John Bannon. I got to know him better when I was a member of the Aboriginal Lands Committee of this house. I also got to know him extremely well when I became minister for Aboriginal affairs in late 1989, and I worked very closely with him over the next three years. He was head of the Aboriginal Lands Trust. We actually moved the lands committee from working only with the Pitjantjatjara lands and the Maralinga Tjarutja lands to including the Aboriginal Lands Trust as part of the committee's purview.

I think Garnett Wilson was a quiet achiever, someone who did a huge amount for his people, both by way of example and also through the huge role he played in the decades of service to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. My sincere condolences to Mr Wilson's family for the loss of your beloved family member. Garnie Wilson will be sadly missed.

SEAFORD HEIGHTS DEVELOPMENT

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) (16:02): I table a ministerial statement made in another place.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (16:02): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2010 to be referred to a committee of the whole house and for ministers to be examined on matters contained in the report in accordance with the circulated timetable.

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

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

Motion carried.

In committee.

The CHAIR: Before we begin I remind members that the committee is in its normal session, so any questions are to be asked by members on their feet and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Part B, Agency Audits, Volume 2, page 589. I would like to ask the minister about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and the costs—there are no secrets about where we are going today. Even as late as March, the minister was saying that the cost of the hospital was \$1.7 billion yet, according to the Auditor-General's Report, cabinet signed off in November 2009 on a nominal value of \$1.8 billion. What is the final, publicly-stated figure for the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital? Is it \$1.8 billion, as it is in the Auditor-General's Report, or is it another figure? If it is another figure, how do we know that figure if no-one has seen the tenders?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thank the member for his question; essentially, it is the same question he asked during the budget process and similar to one asked of the Treasurer during question time a few weeks ago. I will say what I said in the budget estimates process and what the Treasurer said: the advice we have is not to comment on these figures as we go through the process in relation to the public-private partnership. That is coming very close to fruition now. The analysis of the bids is very actively underway, and we expect that we will settle on a preferred tenderer sometime in the next four to six weeks. After that time, it will be easier for government to comment on the figures.

However, I just make the general point that we are very confident that we will get the hospital through a PPP process in a way that will provide good value to the state. All the figures that the government determines, in terms of its exercise, refer to what it might cost if it were to be built by the public sector, as a comparison for the actual costs for the private sector. So, these are in the nature of estimates or projections. The final amount will be known soon, and I am very confident that we will get a good deal.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On the same reference, in the minister's response during estimates he quoted the Treasurer as saying that, as it relates to the capital costs of this bid, the taxpayer will certainly be very pleased with the outcome. That is the capital cost; what about the range of services? Will you reduce the scope or the size of the hospital, the range of services and facilities, to keep it within what might be seen as an acceptable cost?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I guess there are several parts to that, but I am confident that the operating costs will come in in a way that will be of good value to taxpayers as well. The range of services, the scope, is as was put to the tenderers back in late last year or early this year, whenever it went out (I cannot actually remember now). We put the tender documents out, and a number of players expressed interest; two were finally chosen to do the detailed work. As I understand it, the scope might change at the margins as the planning processes go through, but the scope is as it was. There is no reduction in the anticipated size and throughput of the hospital. We need a hospital that is able to do certain things, given the projections that we have for the health demands of our population, and I am very confident that we will get a project delivered which will provide good value but, more importantly, very good medical services for our community well into the future.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Same reference. Are you aware of any other predictions of the cost of the hospital? I understand that there are ever-increasing costs with this hospital and the only way that it is going to be capped is by reducing the scope. I say that because the Premier stood up at the Blue, Yellow and Pink Ball that was held on Saturday night and told the 900 people there that we are getting a new hospital that is going to cost nearly \$2 billion. So, is it a \$2 billion hospital now or is it a \$1.8 billion hospital that was a \$1.7 billion hospital?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not sure how that relates to the Auditor-General's Report, to be perfectly frank. As I have said multiple times now, we are very confident that we will get a hospital that we need of the size that we need and with the throughput that we need for the future population of our state at a price which will be good value for the public. You will only have to wait a few weeks (six weeks or so) before we settle on a final tender, and we expect that contract finalisation will occur in the first quarter of next year. So, we are very close to finalisation. I can

assure the member that this hospital will deliver the kinds of services that we have said it would, it will have the number of beds that we said it would, and so on and so forth.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I am still concerned that you may deliver the hospital, but will it be on budget and on time? I say 'on budget and on time' because Dr Sherbon told the Budget and Finance Committee in August that the hospital construction—not the site clearance—would not start until early 2013, you told the estimates committee that it was going to be a five to six-year build, so that makes the hospital a \$2 billion hospital being delivered in 2018, and possibly 2019 now. What are we getting, minister?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I suppose it is understandable that the member for Morphett has trouble understanding some of these issues, they are quite complex. The reality is that the tender process will deliver a hospital by 2016. The construction will start pretty well as soon as the finalisation of the contract, which is, as I say, in the first quarter of next year. The preliminary works have already begun in terms of some of the site works, road entrances and the like. The first part of the process of building the hospital will be excavation and the construction of the frame of the hospital, if you like, and, while all of that is going on, detailed work occurs over the internal design. I guess it is a fairly standard process that occurs. So, the process begins as soon as the contracts have been signed.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I think I am a reasonably intelligent bloke and I think I have a reasonable level of comprehension, and that is not how I understood it, but I have listened to the minister. Let us move on to another area that we did raise in estimates and which is very pertinent to this afternoon's 30 minutes, that we have half a billion dollars worth of health spending, and that is the non-operating funds. This is the third time that the Auditor-General has asked questions and raised issues about the special purpose accounts, the non-operating funds in our hospitals: in 2008, 2009 and again in 2010. I am referring to pages 587, 588 and 589 in that same reference, Part B, Volume 2. I understand that finance managers in hospitals were told that they were to manage all cash as consolidated accounts. So, you are mixing your non-operating funds with the operating funds. How do these financial managers report on the consolidated accounts and separate the non-operating funds from the operating funds?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The advice I have is it is done through the general ledger and standard accounting practices. The member raised questions in relation to the operating funds in estimates. There have been issues raised by the Auditor-General in relation to it, and I can assure the member and the house that matters are being attended to, both in relation to the individual officer, who was counselled and has now been formally counselled. That involves a written statement to him and to a number of the officers, I think—two or three, from memory.

What we are attempting to do in the health portfolio, which—I have to make a political point—has been opposed every step of the way by the opposition, is to develop an integrated approach to the management of the resources of the health portfolio. Rather than have a whole range of individual boards who make decisions, have their own accounting systems, their own industrial systems, their own recruitment systems, their own procurement systems and their own clinical systems, we are getting a consolidated set of arrangements in place. The transfer from the arrangements which were in place before I became minister to the arrangements we are putting in place now does take time. There are transition issues, and from time to time you find bits of the system are not as they ought to be. However, we are heading in a direction to make sure that we have a very good set of integrated standards.

In relation to the error, that was made by the officer. There was no attempt to convert the cash of the department for personal use and there was no attempt to apply the funds for a purpose for which they had not been provided for in budget or for which they were not created. What the officer was trying to do was apply, I guess, what the business sector or other sectors might see as standard cash management; that is, he was trying to make sure that the amount of cash that was held received the highest return through moving it around the banking system. That was not in accordance with the standards, I suppose, that should appropriately apply, but we will make sure that those standards are introduced and that the operations in future are appropriate.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It was an error, and I have said so during estimates, but you can keep asking questions about it.

Dr McFETRIDGE: As the member for Norwood keeps reminding us, and I have tried to remind this place, it was not a once-off; it was 2007, 2008 and 2009. It is not just a rogue operator;

this is an issue within the department. As the Auditor-General says on page 589, 'managing the periodic liquidity challenges that the total cash of the region has'. Why is that so, minister? What is wrong with the timing of the cash flow in the department? Why are we having to manage periodic liquidity challenges?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I would have thought any organisation, whether it is a government department or a personal bank account, has liquidity issues. You have to manage the flow of cash to meet the demands on your purse, so you have to manage that in an appropriate way. There are always cash management issues, as well as budget issues. A department or an agency is given a budget of this amount, but they are not given all of that cash on the first day of the budget year, as I understand it; the cash flows through. Part of the job is to make sure that you manage the cash in an appropriate way. You do not want to have too much cash sitting around, because that obviously comes at a cost, nor do you want to have too little, because that comes at a cost.

The role of government and Treasury generally is to make sure the supply of cash to the agencies is at a rate that the agencies need it to acquit the demands on them, and then the agencies—the central agency, like SA Health, and then the outer agencies (the regions and the other parts of our system)—have cash going to them in an appropriate way. Managers of funds within those sections manage the cash flow in such a way as to maximise the benefit for the system overall and for the public purse. I think that is obvious, and that is what happens here. We have to manage liquidity and that is what the officer was trying to do. He stepped outside the prescribed boundaries for doing that—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Morphett, would you like to ask a question or does the member for Norwood want to keep on saying things? If you want to say something, member for Norwood, you can stand up. It was such a vigorous interjection that I thought it was—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The CHAIR: Don't roll your eyeballs at me.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

The CHAIR: No. Do not roll the eyeballs. Carry on, member for Morphett.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I just say to the member for Morphett: get your backbenchers in line and I will not sit down and stop answering the question. The point I was making was that any organisation has to manage its cash. Our department is increasingly doing that in a coordinated, integrated way with higher standards. There are still some parts of the operation which were not at that point, and the issues in each of the previous three were different issues, though they did relate to that one area of activity.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that, does the executive director of finance and administration not set the drawdown limits on the cash for the hospital? Is that person setting those drawdown limits then not forcing the hospitals to seek other sources of funds so that they can manage their liquidity challenges? In this case, this person at the Lyell McEwin was pulling money out of the non-operating funds without approval. These people are the meat in the sandwich, and it appears to be higher up the chain where the drawdown limits are being set. Would you like to comment on that, minister?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I think the member perhaps needs to have a little lesson on how the portfolio works. It is a bit different from other portfolios.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is hardly worthwhile standing here then.

The CHAIR: I am very conscious of the time, but can I just say that you, the members on my left, seem to be tripping yourself up with the interjections. That is just a reflection.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am happy to answer the question.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: Do you want him to answer the question? Minister Hill.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I was about to explain how the portfolio works because it is important to understand this in terms of that question. Unlike other agencies, where the department and the

agency are effectively the same thing so the money flows from the centre right through to all of the units, in health we have regions which have their own responsibilities. The Department of Health gets money from Treasury and then distributes that to the various regions, which then have their own budgetary processes and their own responsibilities. They report separately through the various budgetary processes and are inspected by the Auditor-General separately.

What my colleague on the left does, the senior finance officer, is to make sure that cash is provided to the regions in accordance with the requirements. If they say 'We need so much cash' for whatever the budget purposes are, he supplies it. In this particular case, the individual officers at that hospital were obviously trying to manage the cash at a local level in, and it seemed to be sensible, but it was not within the parameters that they should have operated. They have now been formally counselled, and the systems have picked up the issues that the Auditor-General identified, and it has been corrected.

Dr McFETRIDGE: So 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010—let's hope it does not happen in 2011. On page 588 there is a reference to the Lyell McEwin Hospital transferring \$4 million from the South Australian Finance Authority cash management account on 18 May, then on 19 May an additional \$3 million was paid from this account, and this left a \$1.1 million cash deficit for the operating funds, which were topped up by the private practice funds and non-operating funds. That is \$7 million. To move that across from the cash management to the South Australian Dental Service, I would not have thought that would be a rogue operator. That would have been a senior management decision. I would have thought that the chief finance administration officer, the executive director, would have known about that, Dr Sherbon would have known about it, and possibly you would have known about it, minister—a \$7 million movement like that.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As I have been advised—I was just clarifying what I thought was the case—when this occurred we had a regional financial structure in place. We are now moving away from that to have a centralised financial management structure. Of course, I think I was subject to criticism from the opposition for cutting jobs in regions by doing this. A number of opposition members asked me questions about how appalling it was that we were centralising all these functions, and now the member for Morphett is asking why it was not centralised before. Well, it was not.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, if you think that the chief finance officer and the CE of the department would be aware of all of that detail, that would imply that it was a centralised accounting system, which it was not; we are moving to that now. I will also point out that we have a budget in health of \$4.5 billion, that is \$4,500 million. While \$7 million is a large sum certainly to me (I do not know about the member for Morphett), within the overall health portfolio we would go through \$7 million on an average morning, I think, from memory.

I will just give you some of the detail. The A-G identified that there was a \$4 million transfer from the Lyell McEwin SAFA cash management account to statewide services within the South Australian Dental Service. The balance of the Lyell McEwin operating funds in the SAFA account was \$1.9 million. An additional \$3 million was paid from the Lyell McEwin operating funds in the SAFA account on 19 May 2010. This resulted in a \$1.1 million cash deficit by the LMH operating funds in the SAFA account. This cash deficit was funded, in effect, by private practice and not NOFs.

The LMH operating cash in the SAFA account returned to a positive cash position on 20 May 2010 with a return transfer of \$4 million. The transfers are in relation to meeting cash flow requirements within the then Central Northern Adelaide Health Service region, and we have processed to manage the issue of timing in regards to cash flow funding from the department. No funds were inappropriately used—I think that is the important point. That is the detail of what happened. The general point that I made at the beginning stands.

Dr McFETRIDGE: No funds were inappropriately used, but they were used without the permission of those from whom it should have been sought. What were the policies in place that caused the Lyell McEwin Hospital to draw down on the private practice funds and the non-operating funds?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This kind of pretend mock rage does not really suit you, member for Morphett. We know that privately, in practice, you are a nice guy. I know you are under pressure from your own side, so you have to appear to be a bit macho, but it really does not suit you, member for—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —and it certainly does not suit you, member for Kavel. What I was trying to say in a polite, calm and consistent way is that the individual officers who were involved in this were trying to do what they thought was the right thing, which was to minimise the amount of cash that was not being used for a productive purpose. They did it contrary to policy guidelines. They should not have done it, they have been disciplined, and we will do everything we can to make sure it does not happen again, including changing the structures and centralising the financial arrangements in the department.

Dr McFETRIDGE: You are centralising the arrangements, but are you going to separate the reporting of the non-operating funds and the operating funds so that it is clear what the bottom line is in each of those areas?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The advice I have is yes, we will. I should not have said 'disciplined'; they have been counselled, which is the appropriate language, I gather.

Dr McFETRIDGE: For four years in a row they have been counselled. That would be more than counselling them. I have a lot more questions on those non-operating funds; however, there is a bigger issue out there that we need to deal with, but we will not get anywhere near that at the moment. I refer to page 589, the whole of health finance supply and asset management system Oracle, the Oracle corporate system. Does the department know what its true financial position is at the moment?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised yes.

Dr McFETRIDGE: That will be news to a lot of people I have been speaking to. My understanding is that the hospitals have limited access to information, including debt management, internal reporting and FTE figures. If that is correct, why is it so?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: There do not appear to be any particular issues. We are transitioning, as I have said, to a new integrated, centralised system, which will provide in the longer term much better financial information to everyone. The September reporting is being issued and the full-time equivalent figures are being finalised at the moment.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Referring to the same reference, using the Oracle system, do you have a system for patient billing currently and what information do hospitals have currently to follow up their debts?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised that the patient billing system is done through the patient administration system, I think it is called, and that is a different system, which has been in place for many years, and that is continuing.

Dr McFETRIDGE: So, that is not going to be integrated into the Oracle—into the whole of the health, finance and asset management system?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The advice I have is that the patient billing will not be part of the Oracle management system.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to the same reference again. Did the department seriously believe that it could implement a general ledger system across all sites and with all of the interfaces required within the 10 to 12 months program that was set up?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The advice I have is that phase 1 of that project was delivered on time, on 1 July. There are always issues to work through, but the general ledger arrangements were put in place in time.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Referring to the same reference again, my understanding is that hospitals cannot get information on their bottom line. If they cannot get information on their bottom line, how can the department have information on its bottom line?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I guess that, if they have those concerns, they have an obligation and responsibility to pass them on to the finance manager, the CEO or the minister, rather than the opposition, but I am not advised that that is the case. We have issued, I am told, something like 8,000 management reports in the last week. But, of course, as I said at the beginning, the arrangement we have in place is that the Department of Health provides funds to the various regions, which then have their own systems, and all financial systems will now go through Oracle.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Same reference. In the Auditor-General's Report, it is stated that it is anticipated that the fully integrated system will be completed December 2010. Are you still confident that the system will be fully integrated and completed by that time?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The advice I have is the department is on track to deliver phase 2 of the project on time, which is the date you have mentioned, end of December this year.

Dr McFETRIDGE: In the last few minutes left, I will switch to another issue. There are a lot more questions to come on Oracle, I can guarantee that, minister. Part A, the Audit Overview of the Auditor-General's Report, page 13, the South Australian Ambulance Service back pay calculations. On page 13 it says that when the payroll was transitioned 'as is' from the South Australian Ambulance Service to Shared Services, there were numerous errors and an unacceptably high error rate, in the order of 50 per cent. An expense of \$18.3 million was reported for back pay.

Minister, can you tell the committee what is happening with recovering that back pay? Is it like the Queensland nurses, where they are going to be hunted down (so to speak) to recover that back pay?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The advice I have is the overpayments and the underpayments are probably in the order of several hundred thousand dollars in both directions and the agency is working with the responsible agency (Shared Services) to work through how to both recover and obviously make sure that people get their correct pay. Finally, I take this opportunity to thank my officers who have supported me today, particularly John O'Connor, who has been the Finance Director in SA Health now since 2007 and who has announced his retirement from the health department. I would like to wish him well and thank him very much for his outstanding service.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I thank Mr O'Connor for his efforts over the years, too. He is joining a number of other senior executives who have left recently and I wish him well in his consultancy business, or whatever you are doing, John.

Mrs REDMOND: I refer to the Auditor-General's agency report, Part B, Volume 3. At page 967 there is a long list of employees who received remuneration of \$100,000 or more, and up above that it says, 'In 2009-10, 57 employees met the \$100,000 threshold for the first time.' Why were there so many employees that went up over the \$100,000 threshold, given the dire straits of the economy?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What often happens is that, with bracket creep in terms of wages, people who were on \$97,000, suddenly—with CPI and various adjustments—end up being on over \$100,000. People see this as there being a whole lot of new people in the department. I understand that a total of 170 DPC employees were remunerated in excess of \$100,000 in 2009-10 and 57 employees met the \$100,000 threshold for the first time—so the leader is right—and a total of 13 DPC administered employees were remunerated in excess of \$100,000 in 2009-10. I am advised that what happened is that most people who were on ASO8—so, they are not part of the senior executive service—because of that bracket creep I mentioned before, went over the \$100,000 mark, and hence it appears to be a whole lot of extra people. As far as I understand it, that was the main cause.

Mrs REDMOND: Further down, at the bottom of the column, I note that there was no-one in the \$360,000 and above bracket last year but, this year, there are two people in that bracket and, indeed, one in the \$400,000 and above bracket. Can you tell us who they are and why they are earning over \$360,000 a year?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am always interested in who is earning more than both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, given our awesome responsibilities. I imagine one of them would be Chris Eccles, who is the CEO, and Warren McCann in his role in public sector reform. We will get you a report on the others.

Mrs REDMOND: I refer to page 987 of the same volume. This is a different group of people. We have the remuneration of employees on that page as well. Can the Premier advise whether any other staffers from his office receive greater than the 9 per cent standard superannuation, such as the 26 per cent superannuation received by Nick Alexandrides? If so, how much do they receive?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The ones you are referring to are mainly judges in the Industrial Relations Court. A whole range of functions were put over into the Premier's department, under the DPC, that had not been there before. So, we basically had the industrial relations and a range of other areas—I think we had recreation and sport at one stage as well. So, whilst they do not report

to me as Premier for administrative reasons, they were just bundled up under the department, which is about making savings and efficiencies.

Mrs REDMOND: That is all very well, but I am really more interested in why anyone gets 26 per cent superannuation and whether other ministers allow their staff to get 26 per cent superannuation.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Of course, some people come into positions with substantive positions that were held in the department for many years, but I am happy to get a report for the leader.

Mrs REDMOND: I will look forward to reading it. I refer to page 1528, which is in the Department of Trade and Economic Development. Of course, one of the portfolios that you are being scrutinised on is that of economic development. I note that there is a significant drop in the overseas trade representation figure on that page. Towards the top of page 1528, under 'supplies and services', the figure goes from \$586,000 to \$2,000 in the current year. What is the explanation for that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Are you referring to the department of industry and trade?

Mrs REDMOND: Trade and economic development. I assume that since you are appearing here as, amongst other things, the Minister for Economic Development, I could ask you about economic development.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Minister for Economic Development, but the department of trade and industry does not report to me. However, I can ask the head of that department to come and sit beside me. When we were elected we discovered that the Liberal government had set up an office in Washington and, I think, New York; it was an extraordinary amount of money for virtually zero return, so we closed them. We also found that an office had been set up by the Liberals in, I think, two places in Indonesia—certainly in Jakarta, and maybe in Bandung, from memory, where the guy who was the South Australian rep used to wear a gun in a holster around his leg or something. We closed those down. What we do is put—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes; SA Water as well, which seemed odd.

Mrs REDMOND: Have these all closed in the last 12 months?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I was explaining that what we do is go through and make substantial cuts; we make cuts where we believe we are not getting value for money. We do a review, and the department has taken some big hits.

Mrs REDMOND: Those cuts where you were not getting value for money, do they include the cuts to CITCSA, the Council for International Trade and Commerce South Australia, which represents 40 chambers of commerce?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: CITCSA was cut in the last budget round on the basis of an evaluation of priorities. It would be good to be able to fund everything, but I guess in government you have to make hard decisions. Sometimes it is really important for organisations to, basically, show where they have made successes.

Mrs REDMOND: I am a little confused, Premier; are you saying that CITCSA did not give value for money?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What I am saying is that we have made decisions which are hard ones, and they include the cuts to CITCSA.

Mrs REDMOND: If it did give you value for money—and I submit that it did, given that your \$200,000 per annum investment returned \$80 million in exports to this state—why would you say that was a priority of your government, to remove that \$200,000 of funding?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: My challenge to the Leader of the Opposition is to demonstrate what that \$80 million was made up of.

Mrs REDMOND: I will happily have Nick Begakis and Leon Coppins tell you about it, if you would like to meet with them and explain why it was either not value for money or it was not one of your priorities in trying to increase the exports of this state.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You have made a big call in terms of \$80 million; it would be interesting to see you substantiate it.

Mrs REDMOND: I am taking that figure, Premier, from figures given by those two gentlemen in speeches at the Czech Republic Independence Day celebrations last Friday night. You may not think that is an appropriate source, but that is what they said was the value of the CITCSA organisation for the \$200,000 investment that the government was making until defunding it.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: If the private sector was making \$80 million out of the work of CITCSA then presumably the private sector would fund CITCSA the \$200,000 needed, as opposed to it being a function of government. That is why I have a question mark over the authenticity of those figures; I would like to see them substantiated. If they were substantiated, if a chamber of commerce was making that sort of money, \$80 million of exports, out of its work, then I would imagine it would easily be able to fund it itself, given that the message from the Liberals over the years has been that government should get out of the way of business.

Mrs REDMOND: Premier, the message from you, or at least from your minister, the Hon. Mr Koutsantonis, at the CITCSA annual dinner this year was very supportive of the existence of and the work done by CITCSA.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sure that CITCSA has done a tremendous job over the years. That is not the question. The question is whether the taxpayer should pay for it. Given its spectacular success of the claim of \$80 million, I would imagine that just a trifling proportion of those export profits could be directed to CITCSA.

Mrs REDMOND: Can I ask whether any of your trade missions overseas have ever involved any input from CITCSA?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am sure they have. My trade missions have generally involved going to India, China, the United States and Britain, and usually the work is done both by the department, and by our representatives in China and our representatives in India—we have Mr A.K. Tareen, who is doing a spectacular job—and I think the results can speak for themselves, given that one of the main aims of going to India was to increase the number of overseas students. Since we targeted India, and I am the first premier to have done so, there has been an exponential increase in Indian students. I guess it is the same with our drive to recruit overseas students from China. We have gone from about 6,000 overseas students at the start of last decade, to about 34,000 to 35,000, with growth projected to go to 60,000. It is already our third biggest export.

Mrs REDMOND: In response to that answer can I ask a further question; that is, if the results of trade missions speak for themselves, and, according to Nick Begakis of the CITCSA organisation, this budget and the removal of the CITCSA funding and the removal of the people from the department will mean that we have no capacity in this state for trade missions, either inwards or outwards, what is going to be the effect of that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is just not true. There will still continue to be trade missions; they will be targeted. It is interesting that you are asking these questions when you know that they come under another minister's line, but that is fine. The fact is that they will be targeted trade missions. As I say, if CITCSA is responsible for \$80 million worth of exports in a year then the loss of \$200,000 of taxpayers' subsidy would be totally incidental to its existence, because companies would be lining up to put in money.

Mrs REDMOND: Perhaps we will move onto another topic. On page 949, Interpretation and Analysis of the Financial Statements, I notice that the employee benefits have increased almost 10 per cent from \$83 million—a lot more than \$200,000—last year to \$91 million this year. Can the Premier explain why there is an almost 10 per cent increase in employee benefits in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for the current year?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will check those for you. There are TVSPs from last year in there, but we are just seeing if we can give you some more information on that. I understand that it is a combination of inflation, TVSPs and also movements in the valuation of long service leave, but we can get more details for the honourable leader.

Mrs REDMOND: I would appreciate that, Premier. Still on the same page, knowing that the government is really hot on the compliance with Treasurer's Instructions, what explanation can the Premier give about the indication on that page on the implementation of Treasurer's Instructions 2 and 28? There is a fairly long explanation that:

In 2008-09, audit reported that although the department—
so, that is the previous year—

had undertaken work to identify its existing policies and procedures, the documentation of those policies and procedures had not been completed. In addition, a framework had been established for the adoption of the financial management compliance program, but the program had not been actioned.

Then, a year later, it is still not in place and the compliance program has still not commenced. What is the explanation for the delay, given that other people lose their jobs for failing to comply with treasurer's instructions?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In terms of compliance with Treasurer's Instructions 2 and 28, Treasurer's Instruction 2 requires public authorities to develop, implement, document and maintain policies, procedures, systems and internal controls to assist chief executives with their financial management responsibilities. Treasurer's Instruction 28 requires public authorities to develop, implement, document and maintain a robust and transparent financial management compliance program. A financial management toolkit was issued with Treasurer's Instruction 28 to assist chief executives with the identification of their financial management responsibilities.

The department made significant efforts in 2009-10 to meet the requirements of Treasurer's Instruction 2 and Treasurer's Instruction 28. In particular, a financial management compliance framework was developed. Implementation is ongoing and is subject to review in 2011-12. The department has assessed compliance requirements and prioritised a list of policies and procedures according to the business risk associated with each item. Policies and procedures relating to taxation, bank reconciliations and assets are the primary focus.

A new web-based policy portal is being developed to help with compliance by ensuring policies and procedures are readily available. This portal is planned to be available by the end of 2010. A draft compliance testing program has been developed. Currently an online tool is being investigated that can be integrated with the policy portal to facilitate the implementation of this program during 2010-11.

Although a comprehensive compliance program was not implemented in 2009-10, there were a number of activities in place to achieve the department's compliance objectives. These include:

- Audit and Risk Committee. The Audit and Risk Committee reviews compliance requirements and activities on at least a quarterly basis.
- Internal audit. One of the objectives of all internal audit projects was to ensure compliance with relevant government requirements. Internal audit reports alert management to any compliance issue that may arise during the course of the audit.
- Shared Services SA. The department's corporate affairs branch is regularly liaising with Shared Services and compliance issues from both sides are identified, discussed and rectified.

So, a whole range of measures are underway to ensure compliance.

Mrs REDMOND: Premier, the concerns were raised a year ago and it is still not in place. I take it from your answer that you are saying, 'Notwithstanding that, we've put in place some other things to make sure that everything is hunky-dory.' Why did this Audit and Risk Committee not identify that there had been a failure to segregate the duties of receipting and reconciling moneys for SafeWork SA if they are so good at covering the gaps until you get your systems in place?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Internally, that was recognised and addressed, and we are in the process of making sure there is more fulsome compliance in the future.

Mrs REDMOND: How can you say it was recognised and addressed if one of the concerns that the Auditor raised was 'for SafeWork SA to review the lack of segregation of duties for receipting and reconciling moneys received'?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I mentioned to you before that, in terms of the range of initiatives that have been addressed, obviously that audit report for SafeWork will be addressed seriatim.

Mrs REDMOND: On page 968 of the same volume, a few lines from the top of 'supplies and services', which is a continuation from earlier items, there is 'general administration and consumables'. For some reason, general administration and consumables goes up considerably

from \$4,840,000 to \$8,501,000. What explanation is there for that dramatic increase in general administration and consumables?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I will get you a report on that. I understand that we had a whole range of things in the portfolio that come about because of WorkCover, industrial relations and so on, and that a number of things were listed where in fact we recover the money—like medical panels in relation to WorkCover. We can give you a full report on that.

Mrs REDMOND: I appreciate that there is a number of things involved, but why such a dramatic increase?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: There is a range of other things including an across-the-board settlement involving state records on copyright and a range of other issues, but we will get you a full report. It is quite a simple explanation. It is about money that is actually recovered in other areas.

Mrs REDMOND: Thank you, I will look forward to the report. Just a few lines further down there is quite a significant increase also in contractors and consultants from \$4,608,000 up to \$6,783,000. Is there an explanation for that dramatic increase?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We will give you a report on, say, all consultants above \$10,000.

Mrs REDMOND: Further down on the same page under grants and subsidies in item 8 there are several I wanted to ask about. In particular, I notice that the Aboriginal community assistance grant, I assume it is, has gone down significantly to more than half of its value—\$4,231,000 down to \$1,000,873. Is there an explanation for that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is basically that it will appear in another line. It is to do with some things that were transferred over to Families and Communities. It appears as things like Better Pathways; they just have different names.

Mrs REDMOND: Is the Premier indicating that, although it is in different places and under different names, the Aboriginal Community Assistance Program in the generic sense of those words is still receiving the same funding as it was?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They are certainly receiving funding. We can give the actual figures. But what has happened is that there are just different names for something that was under a different umbrella description. We can get you a report on that.

Mrs REDMOND: I understand that you are saying it has been transferred to other projects, what I am trying to get at is: is the same amount of money being basically applied to the same activities, albeit in specific names?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Given that we have been over time putting in a lot greater effort into Aboriginal engagement, I am sure that would be the case, but we will check and give you a report on it.

Mrs REDMOND: On the very next line, I am sure the same does not apply to the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra operating grant. What is the explanation for the significant drop in the grant funding for that?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We will take that on notice.

Mrs REDMOND: Well, we will keep going. A couple of lines further down is the Department of Health, which did not have any figure for it last year but suddenly there is \$1,374,000 under Premier and Cabinet, and I am curious as to what it is in Premier and Cabinet that requires a payment regarding the Department of Health?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Are you referring to the \$1,374,000?

Mrs REDMOND: Yes.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is the relocation cost to move out of the Glenside property as part of the Adelaide Film and Screen Centre in 2009-10. As you would be aware, the construction of the Film and Screen Centre is now very much under way, and I am looking forward to opening it next year. It is to do with the relocation costs.

Mrs REDMOND: I will assume that you may wish to give these on notice, but could I also get explanations for why there is a significant drop in the funding for the International University Precinct project and, concerningly, of the Aboriginal community essential services assistance on

the next page? It is a continuation of item 8, about halfway through the section on item 8 on the next page. It goes from \$2,976,000 million down to \$344,000, and also Breaking the Cycle goes from \$564,000 down to \$43,000. I am happy if you take them on notice, but I would like to have an explanation as to those.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In terms of the university city, when you look at what we have been doing, which has been all about the badging of Adelaide as a destination for overseas students, it is extraordinarily helpful, when we are marketing ourselves as a university city, as an education city, in terms of attracting overseas students. We have been spectacularly successful to be able to say that, in addition to the three existing universities, we have had things like the Royal Institution of Science (which is the first time the RI has gone outside of Britain and 220 years), or the University College London. Of course, in places like India it is well known because not only is it number four in the world, but one of its alumni was Mahatma Gandhi. We also have Carnegie Mellon—top universities—and, hopefully, in the next few months there will be another university announcement as well. Because it has gained its own momentum, it is not necessary to maintain the unit at the existing strength.

On the other issue of Aboriginal Affairs, that money now appears in a different line under fuel purchases, under community infrastructure on page 968, and that has gone up. Rather than being a cut, it is actually an increase in funding; it just has a different title.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, I saw that community infrastructure has gone up to just over \$5 million. So you are saying that community infrastructure is going to take care of the whole of the Aboriginal community essential services assistance?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It has been transferred from one line to another, because we have taken on responsibility for running the power lines and infrastructure in the APY lands. You would be aware that for years there was a run on oil, and with a combination of working with Amanda Vanstone in her role as the federal minister for Aboriginal Affairs, they provided a power station, we provided the reticulation, which was about well over \$20 million, and the power station was probably about \$10 million, and we have taken on responsibilities for running that.

Mrs REDMOND: I assume that this might be the last question. I refer to page 955 of the same volume. I notice that in the budget the net result for the cabinet office was \$7.1 million for this year, but in this document the disaggregated disclosures show a net result of \$7.6 million for this year. Why the difference between \$7.1 million and \$7.6 million? It is only half a million dollars. I know the Treasurer thinks \$100 million does not matter between friends, but half a million matters to me and to people like CITCSA.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The \$100 million certainly did not mean much to the former Liberal government, which handed over \$100 million to a group of consultants to sell ETSA straight after it promised the people of the state it would never do so—\$100 million for a group of consultants, which is the biggest consultant pay out in history by the Liberal government. I will get a report on it. I would imagine it is a commissioning of a report, or something like that. We will check it out.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Volume 5 of the Auditor-General's Report, page 1685, deals with ForestrySA dividend; Volume 4, pages 1172 and 1173, deals with ForestrySA generally. I am just trying to get some more detail on exactly what is in the budget in regard to the sale of forests. In the Mid-Year Budget Review, you say that the amount for the sale of the forest is on a 'business as usual' basis. A 'business as usual basis', I would assume, means that ForestrySA is getting money from the sale of all of the rotations. So, is the amount of money in the budget for the sale of the forest based on one rotation, two rotations or three rotations?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: An amount for the sale of the rotations is in the forward estimates. It is in 2011-12. I will not disclose to the house the figure, for obvious reasons. As I said in the house today during question time, we have not finalised, we are still waiting on advice as to whether we sell forward two rotations or three rotations. Again, for commercial reasons, I do not want to go into public discussion on that. As I also said today in the house, we have undertaken scoping work on it; in fact, I will be having discussions with Treasury in the next week or so about where we are at. We are doing some impact statements.

The important point here—and particularly with the member for Mount Gambier being with us—is the government is not selling the business. ForestrySA will remain the entity which the purchaser of those timber assets will be contracted to, supplied to ForestrySA. What we are doing is selling forward the timber rotations to maximise a lump sum payment by which we can reduce debt. As I said in the house today, it is in the budget (a figure) and we will make public exactly the

final process. We have undertaken scoping work. We are now doing other local impact work to ensure we comply with all cabinet requirements and then we will make the decision.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will go through it one by one. My understanding is that no land will be sold. I think the government has made that clear previously. If ForestrySA is going to continue (in your words) to own the business, does that mean that ForestrySA is going to continue to own the land and the trees, and the only thing that is going to be sold is the harvesting right at a period in time when the trees have reached their economic growth limit for sale?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Those details have not been finalised as yet. Again, it is premature for us to say exactly how we will proceed with the sale of the rotations until such time as we have finalised a position.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I do not understand why you as Treasurer who is selling the forest and the adviser cannot give us more detail, because two years ago in the Mid-Year Budget Review you advised the house that the Mid-Year Budget Review estimates are compatible with ForestrySA continuing on a business as usual basis. A business as usual basis means that ForestrySA has available to it the proceeds from all forward rotation sales.

Did we put in the budget a figure based on the sale of one rotation, two rotations, three rotations or four rotations? You must have picked a range because someone somewhere has made a judgment about a range of figures and they have put them in the budget. I do not want to know the figure, I understand the commercial confidentiality of the figure, but if it is business as usual, then one assumes that it is all rotations, not just one or two.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: These are rotations in their individual cycles of 30 years. We have a figure in the budget for a number of rotations which I am not going to share with the committee. We are getting advice. Initially we were selling two rotations. There may be more value in a third rotation, but it is business as usual for ForestrySA. Nothing will change with ForestrySA. It is about who owns the trees and about the timber which will be contracted to ForestrySA, and they will operate as they have in the past.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Let me clarify that. ForestrySA will not own the trees. As part of the sale process, ForestrySA will not own the trees for 30 years. You just said that it is about who owns the trees and who gets the harvesting rights. Now they are two distinct and different issues. Can you clarify to the committee: is it the intention that the trees are going to be sold, owned by a private operator for 30 years and then harvested, or is it to be that ForestrySA is to own the trees for 30 years and then you sell the harvesting right at 30 years? Which option is it?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You have to sell something. I mean, honestly, you are missing the point: we are selling the trees. You have to sell something, you cannot just sell a picture of them, but the part of the deal will be that ForestrySA will manage the plantation and it will choose its harvesting arrangements. I am not sure what its current harvesting arrangements are, but that is a separate deal altogether. It will be business as usual. Again, I do not know who will come forward to buy the trees, but my guess is a super fund or someone looking for a government-guaranteed business. It will be an attractive product for various fund managers, I guess.

ForestrySA will continue to manage the plantation on behalf of the owner and continue to harvest and contract, whoever it does in its normal course of business, the harvesting rights. So, the only difference in the whole operation will be that, instead of timber plantations appearing on our balance sheet, or on our books, we are transferring the ownership to the private sector for an up-front payment, but ForestrySA will remain the manager of that plantation under the agreement, and it will be business as usual. So, in a sense, it is a balance sheet transaction and should not affect the operation of ForestrySA at all.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: As to when the trees are harvested, will that be a decision of the owner or ForestrySA as the manager?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That would be a matter of an agreement between the owner of the asset—the timber—and ForestrySA. If it is a commercial purchaser, he, it, or whatever you want to call it, will operate in a commercial manner. I assume that ForestrySA now has various arrangements and tenures for its harvesting rights, for whatever is in its best commercial interests. It would be a matter between the owner of the timber and the business itself.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Moving onto a slightly different topic, Volume 2, page 589 of the Auditor-General's Report talks about the new RAH PPP. Previously, you have mentioned that there was an option for the state government actually to make a capital contribution towards the RAH as

a way of lowering the PPP payment. Has that decision been taken and will the state government be making a capital contribution as part of the process, or will it be totally funded by the tenderers?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As we have always said with the PPP, it has to provide value for money for the taxpayer. The whole process of a public-private partnership is that it has to be value for taxpayers. If the bids cannot beat what would be the public sector comparator or building it ourselves with a build-and-construct contract, you would have to consider whether or not it is worthwhile going forward with the PPP.

What we have also said on the public record to date is that global financial markets have been in turmoil and are still in a degree of turmoil. I think the Premier might have said today in a meeting that, when you dodge a bullet—as Australia would appear to have done—people do not think there was a bullet shot. There was and we dodged it, but most of the world has been hit with it. Equity and debt in the international financial markets reflect the cost of borrowing. It is no secret that the cost of borrowing internationally is higher than it would normally be in a normal balanced considered financial environment.

I have said repeatedly, and I am happy to say it again today, that one of the options always open to government will be and could be—and it may not be—for the government to provide a capital grant to the project or, indeed, we could choose to become (and I will save Hansard the trouble of my using the technically correct Latin term) one of the financiers of the project in the financial consortia.

Those decisions have not been taken. We are still analysing the value-for-money case put forward in these respective bids. This is an incredibly tortuous and lengthy process, but we believe that whatever we finally land will be a superior outcome to what would be the case had we gone about it as a normal government-build project. However, we will have to wait and see, and I have to be very careful what I say on those issues, given that we are still in the middle of evaluating these tenders.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Have there been any discussions with the commonwealth about contributing to the new RAH? If so, what was the nature of those discussions and what decisions have been taken there?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We have certainly not approached the commonwealth for a capital contribution towards the project. Under the new health agreement—assuming it all gets sorted out, because there are still some anomalies, and it depends on whether or not your federal colleagues in Canberra support the legislation—assuming that it goes forward in the way former prime minister Kevin Rudd and Nicola Roxon put forward, the commonwealth, going forward, would pick up 60 per cent of the cost of the capital servicing component of the PPP.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So that this poor layman can understand it, that 60 per cent of the cost of capital, is it 60 per cent of the borrowing cost of the tenderer, loan and interest repayments, or is it 60 per cent of the government's costs if it borrows?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: These things have not been finalised because we are still in discussions with the commonwealth about how this will land. Some states are doing PPP and some are not, so we have to sort that out. However, we would expect that the commonwealth would pick up 60 per cent of the financing costs of the project and 60 per cent of the depreciation value of the project.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Does that include this project, the RAH? The legislation has not yet been signed off federally and you have not signed off yet on the tender, so is it your understanding that, once we sign the tender—if the legislation goes through as Kevin Rudd intended—then, even though our tender might be signed before the new health agreement takes effect, the costs as you just described them will be covered by the commonwealth?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That switchover point will occur at the point we lose 30 per cent of our GST. I think that is initially put down as the 2014-15 financial year. Of course, the project will be under construction by then, and if it is a pure PPP there will be no government contribution prior to that—depending, as I said earlier, on whether or not we choose to be a part-financier of the project, given the issues I raised about the global financial markets. We would have to pick up those costs until such time as we reach the switch point, which is when they take the GST from us—or when we give it to them, that may be a better way to describe it. I am also advised that there are some transitional provisions envisaged prior to the 2014-15 handover, so it may be that there are some transitional obligations taken up by the commonwealth, but as yet that has not been finalised.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Could those transitional obligations be payments to the state?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am told that there is likely to be a transition period on the GST, but the agreement with the commonwealth is that it is on a no worse off basis. Hopefully—you never know, you might be sending me a thank you card in three years' time, and you will be sending me a thank you card for a lot of things we have done, just quietly, if there was to be a change of government—the commonwealth—I lost my train of thought then when I was giving that gratuitous—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, all right. What we are hoping is that over time, from 2014-15 onwards, the health systems embedded in each state will have a growing contribution from the commonwealth, because the reality has been, all the way through, as long as the Liberal Party were in office and I am sure back in the Bannon days, but certainly in the past 10 years, that the state's capacity to meet the rising health cost means that we have to undertake massive surgery in other parts of the budget, and that is what we are seeing in this budget.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I move on to Auditor-General's Report, Volume 2, page 590, which is the commonwealth health and medical research centre. Is the commonwealth payment for the health and medical research centre still \$200 million, or has it increased; who is responsible for any blowout in the construction cost; and is there any GST clawback on this particular project? Is it one of those projects where we get the money up-front and then there is a GST adjustment in following years?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will take the last question first. You are right, this is something that we are battling consistently with the federal government when out of the kindness of their heart they choose to give us a lump sum payment, but under horizontal fiscal equalisation we can lose up to 90 per cent (sometimes) of the grant that we get from the commonwealth. I have trouble explaining that one to my colleagues at times when they think the commonwealth is being generous, and I guess that from a commonwealth point of view they are, but under HFE it gets washed around the system.

We have been able to have this project quarantined from that arrangement because it will be a payment from the commonwealth directly to the South Australian Medical Research Institute (SAMRI) which will not be on the state government's balance sheet. The issue of cost overruns—we would be hoping that there will be no cost overruns. If there were to be cost overruns that would be a matter for the commonwealth and, I guess, the state to address. We are advised that the costs that they have included have been very well tested.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have a similar question but on the Adelaide Oval. Given that the Adelaide Oval grant will be coming straight to the state government and not to SACA, will that mean that there will be GST clawback on any money given by the federal government for Adelaide Oval? With the desalination plant the grant comes to the state government, and there is clawback because it is a contributed asset. You have just advised us that on the other project where the grant goes direct to the research centre that it is not a contributed asset in that sense and therefore GST clawback does not apply. So, will there be GST clawback on the Adelaide Oval grant?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Of course, one is assuming we get money from the commonwealth. However, hypothetically, if we do (which means we have to win the World Cup) there might be a little bit of clawback, but you need to put that in the context that the large generosity of the national government is that all states will be given a similar amount of money. My understanding is that all participating states will be offered up to a certain amount of money, consistent around the states. I am not sure if the ACT is in the mix. We might lose a little bit through washing it out through HFE but, given that most states will be getting it, it would be a small impact.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Volume 5, page 34, which talks about the Convention Centre. This is the issue that has been raised in other committees, but no answer as yet has been given. The election commitment listed this particular grant as a recurrent funding payment in the general government sector. Is this still a recurrent funding payment in the non-financial public sector and what is the impact on the forward estimate years?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We have provided and will be providing this money as an equity injection. You have two ways of making these contributions: you can either make a capital grant or

you can make an equity injection. The rationale for this is that the debt still accrues on the state's balance sheet, so the debt is still there.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Is that the non-government sector or the general government sector?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It appears in the general government sector because we are providing the debt, so we incur the debt. Because of the nature of the operations of the Convention Centre, they will not be in a position to fully service this amount, and an equity injection seemed a sensible thing to do.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Volume 2, page 636, which talks about HomeStart finance borrowing. The Auditor-General notes that HomeStart finance has increased its borrowing limit from \$1.35 billion to \$1.75 billion. Is the HomeStart debt included in the general government sector debt or the other sector debt, and how much HomeStart debt was written off in 2008-09 and 2009-10?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: On the earlier question, I should also say that the other reason we put an equity injection into the Convention Centre was for their own accounts as well, because if we provided a grant that would come on their books as revenue and they would be seen to make a \$300 million profit, depending on what years they came in. It just seemed to us to be a cleaner way to do it, but money is money; it is the same effect.

In terms of HomeStart, I will come back to the house with moneys that have been written off, but my advice is that it has been minimal in terms of their balance sheet. The HomeStart debt appears in neither the general government sector nor the non-financial sector as a financial business such as the Motor Accident Commission or WorkCover. It appears when we consolidate the total government debt, which appears no doubt in our annual financial statements.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Audit Overview on page 13 raises the issue of Shared Services SA. It raises the issue that there was a 50 per cent error in the back pay of ambulance officers, and this incurs a tax and superannuation problem for the ambulance employees. Firstly, how can Shared Services be so incompetent to have a 50 per cent error? That is a huge error rate in back payments. Secondly, what is being proposed to solve the tax and superannuation problems of the individual employees as a result of this 50 per cent error of Shared Services SA?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not agree that it demonstrates incompetence. What it demonstrates is that—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You know, as a former cabinet minister—and I am sure you could both privately and publicly recall many incidents where in large organisations shit happens, and—

Mr Marshall: So that's the technical term for this?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The technical term for this. What we are doing in the exercise of Shared Services is we are undertaking a massive reform of the state public sector. We are taking 52—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes—52 agencies where we are taking all of their payrolls and a large number of their back office operations. What has occurred, unfortunately, in a few cases—and the ambulance would appear to be the most acute—is that not only has the error been made from officers within Shared Services as that has been amalgamated, but there have also been problems with data transfer and records kept by existing agencies.

One of the great benefits of Shared Services is that you will get a common platform, a common methodology and a common system of payments. The reality is that, among the vast array of government agencies, as you would recall as a former minister, there are all different ways of managing payroll, and it would be fair to say that some of the agencies were pretty ordinary in the way they had managed payroll. It is very unfair to single out Shared Services for error without acknowledging—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Super and tax? What's happening with super and tax?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, I will come back to the house with a considered answer, because I think we are still negotiating our way through those. I am advised that the taxation issues

are relatively simple and are being sorted out. The super issues are being sorted through with SuperSA on a one-on-one basis to get them reconciled. But it is not unexpected that there would be glitches. If you have a look at what occurred in Queensland, I think you could call that incompetence where nurses were not paid for weeks if not months. It is not surprising, whilst unfortunate, that these things do not go as smoothly as one would like. This is a significant reform, and I reckon if I was to go back through my 17 years in this parliament, you and I having joined the same day, I bet you they have buggered up our payroll in this joint a few times. We probably do not even know about it. They probably owe us money.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: If they owe us money, Treasurer, I am happy for you to look at that and forward through the appropriate correction. Auditor-General's Report, Volume 5, page 1690, talks about the \$33 million error. Can you explain how Treasury simply forgot or did not account for the cash transfer to Consolidated Account?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That was an easy hit on a Sunday.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, I was just wondering why he didn't pick it up earlier.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Have you really? I look forward to it. In late June 2009, there was a transfer of \$80.102 million from the surplus cash working account to the Consolidated Account in accordance with the cash alignment policy. That is something I brought in, incidentally, a reform that did not exist under the former government. Included in this—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I think your agency couldn't get it right.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, if you want to be critical of Treasury, go right ahead, but, as I said, mistakes occur in government.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I wasn't being critical, I was just repeating what he said.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, well; if I look back on some of your bureaucracies, Mr Evans, there were plenty of stuff-ups by your departments under your administration. Included in this transfer was \$33 million from the industry finance assistance account, which was an administered fund. The transaction was approved by myself and the cash was returned to the Consolidated Account prior to 30 June 2009 in accordance with the Treasurer's approval. The \$33 million in cash was correctly transferred between the bank accounts, accurately recorded in the Treasurer's account. The receipt of the \$80.102 million is recorded in the Consolidated Account receipts, Statement A, page 6, 2008-09 Auditor-General's Report, Volume 6. The general ledger journal reflecting the \$33 million cash alignment transfer between these administered funds was not processed in 2008-09 and was subsequently processed in 2009-10 as a prior period adjustment, as it is related to the previous financial year.

The error in the general ledger was identified by the Department of Treasury and Finance in September 2009 through departmental internal controls, and the correcting general ledger journal was processed in 2009-10. We identified the error ourselves because we have good internal controls. The \$33 million in cash was never lost or missing. It was always in the correct bank account, and it was simply the general ledger that required updating, so that the \$33 million cash was recorded against the correct account.

The \$33 million error correction disclosed in the 2009-10 financial statements was to ensure that the operating balance for equity correctly reflected the \$33 million cash transfer that occurred the year before. Given this involved a transfer of cash between two treasury accounts, there was no overall impact on budget outcomes. The Department of Treasury and Finance is reviewing its processes in relation to processing the return of surplus cash to the Consolidated Account to ensure that the appropriate journal entries are recorded in the accounts of the entities impacted by the transfer. The Treasurer will be advised when this process has been completed. As part of the 2009-10 year-end process, all surplus cash working account journals for DTF-related entities were checked and have been verified. Does that answer your question?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It does. I have one last question. Can you update the committee on who leaked the Sustainable Budget Commission report?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, yes. I think we are getting close. The bloodhounds are still sniffing. I am not going to give you any story out of this, Greg Kelton or Michael Owen, if you are

listening. Analysis of the computer data has assisted the government investigator with several lines of inquiry. It sounds like *The Bill*, doesn't it—'several lines of inquiry'.

Interviews have been conducted with a number of employees and follow-up interviews have been conducted with several. The investigation phase is now almost complete. The government investigator plans to conduct interviews this week, commencing 25 October 2010 (yesterday), with one or two more employees who could not be interviewed last week due to work commitments. He will then prepare a report to the Crown Solicitor on the outcome of the investigation. The Crown Solicitor will advise the government concerning the outcome and any recommended action. I have not been interviewed or considered as a suspect.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My first question is on defence, and it relates to page 267 of the Auditor-General's Report. I know I asked some questions about this during estimates, so I am just seeking further information, or an update at least if the situation has changed. What is the name of the existing Defence SA contractor which was awarded the \$18.6 million site preparation works project for stages 3 and 4 of Techport Australia which was mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have no idea. I may have been advised, but I have forgotten, which I apparently do occasionally. We will come back to you as soon as we can on just who the contractors were.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Can you also advise whether there was any other work that this contractor was performing for that or any related project? I think the point the Auditor-General makes is that you used an existing contractor for this work.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They often do that. It may well have been that they were doing work on the general Techport project and it was appropriate to assign them a further piece of work. The one thing I do know, with Andrew Fletcher and his team, is that probity is absolute, but I am happy to get an answer for the member.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Why were the requirements of DPC Circular 28—Construction Procurement Policy Implementation Process not adhered to in this case and why was DTI not engaged to carry out the work and has an exemption now been provided?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Again, I will get a more detailed answer. I do not have anyone here from Defence, I am sorry. What I will say is that I guess (it always worries my staff when I guess), and to the best of my recollection, Defence SA, particularly with both Andrew Fletcher and his team having the skill sets to do that work and administer that work from within Defence SA, chose not to use DTI, but I will get a full answer for the member.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Can the committee take it that the system will now change to that required by DPC Circular 28?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will get clarification on that, but Defence SA operates its own contracting arrangements. I will find out whether a permanent solution has been put in play to that or whether or not it is seeking exemptions as it goes along.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In regard to competitive tender process, which I think is a point the Auditor-General was hinting at, why did Defence SA, in this case, not invoke a competitive tender process and what action has been taken since to ensure that there is not a recurrence of that?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I guess it is not unusual for there to be comment by the Auditor-General on matters relating to practices that do not fully align with what would occur in the normal public sector. In relation to Defence SA, with its own board and senior private sector expertise (as we had that discussion about the Motor Sport Board, with some of its contracting arrangements and the way in which it presents its accounts) both are right. I will get a fulsome answer for the member, but I would guess that they may again sit in this situation where what Defence SA is doing is correct from its charter and it might be at variance with the public sector norm. But I will get all of that clarified and get a proper answer for the member.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I suppose I could make the point that, in terms of being a model citizen, in compliance with DPC requirements and circulars and Treasurer's guidelines, it would set the right example to all other departments if departments or agencies reporting to the Treasurer strictly adhered to the Auditor-General's requirements. I suppose I am making a point rather than asking a question. I move to the issue of contractors. I refer to page 285 of the report. Why has

expenditure on contractors in Defence SA risen from \$1.44 million in 2009 to \$3.2 million in 2010; and could you name the top 10 contractors? I think this was something I asked during estimates.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I guess again that that would be to do with the work we have been doing with concluding the project which is Techport, but Defence SA also has responsibility for Technology Park. That is a really good story; I must do a Dorothy Dix on that. What we have been able to do with Tech Park in the last 12 to 18 months and various other projects that it is supervising such as DSIC and whatever that other acronym is that we have there somewhere is a really good story.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: If you do not have your defence people here, this might need to be taken on notice. I notice that total expenditure on Techport Australia's commercial and educational precincts and the supply precinct, stages 3 and 4, is estimated at a total combined cost of \$40.9 million in the budget papers, but in the Auditor-General's Report total expenditure to date was put down as \$35 million, with a further \$2 million of expenditure forecast in 2010-11. There is a discrepancy of nearly \$4 million.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Underspend.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, that is the point. I am asking you: are you expecting an underspend of around \$3.92 million on that project?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We will check that, but I can tell you, if there is an underspend, we will scoop it back, we are never short on that. Again it just shows the expertise that Andrew Fletcher and his team have brought to managing these major projects. Andrew Fletcher, having come from the private sector and these large contracting areas, has been able to manage the project extremely well.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Moving to the issue of Victoria Park, which is mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report at page 1,293. Have you had a chance to determine the break-up of that \$3 million that was spent on the cancelled Victoria Park? I think you undertook to give us an indication of where those moneys were dispersed.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What I will do is get an answer. I do have to stick to protocol here. I am happy to take the other questions, if you want to hand them to me, and I will get you a written answer on them.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: That would be great.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 17:58 the house adjourned to Wednesday 27 October 2010 at 11:00.