

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 5 April 2011

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

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

### SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March 2011.)

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:03):** As the lead speaker on this bill for the opposition, it gives me some pleasure to speak to the Supply Bill. The Supply Bill is the mechanism that provides the government with its money between, essentially, 1 July and when the Appropriation Bill is passed some time later in August or September, and it gives the house an opportunity to comment on matters financial and economic generally. It is in that regard that I want to address the house in relation to the state of the budget, the state of the state's finances and some of the carry-on from the government opposite.

The only real thing that has changed between the debate about the budget and the debate about the Supply Bill is the fact that the treasurer has gone, both as treasurer and as deputy premier. The treasurer has gone because of a number of factors: part of it is the community backlash against a very unpopular budget delivered by a very unpopular government. I have never seen the number of protests following a state budget that we have seen in the last 12 months—protests virtually weekly, if not fortnightly—across a whole range of issues, whether it is cuts to the public service, whether it is selling the forests, whether it is the Adelaide Oval exercise, whether it is the cuts to community hospitals or whether it is Ward 4G at Flinders Medical Centre.

So many protests have happened on a continual basis since the delivery of the budget, but nothing has changed, except that the treasurer position has changed. There has been not one policy by the government—not any major policy; a couple of minor backflips—but not one major policy change in relation to the budget delivered last year.

The other reason why the former treasurer is gone, apart from the unpopularity of the budget and the budget measures—and, by the way, the former treasurer kindly reminded us that all the cabinet, including the member for Cheltenham (Jay Weatherill), the member for Playford (Jack Snelling) and the now Deputy Premier John Rau, all those people (and all of them leadership hopefuls, of course, on the other side of the house) all backed the decision unanimously.

That was kindly given to us by the former treasurer in a contribution to this house, just to put on the record that the budget that is so unpopular is not just the budget of Kevin Foley (the former treasurer, now Minister for Police), but it is a budget of the Labor caucus. It is a budget of the Labor cabinet. And there were media reports, of course, that, when then treasurer Foley presented the budget to the Labor caucus, there was applause and, indeed, some even suggested a standing ovation for this particular budget.

Now, Madam Speaker, I do not hear too many Labor MPs clapping, I do not hear too many Labor voters clapping, I do not hear too many unionists clapping and I do not hear too many South Australians clapping for what has been a terrible budget for the state—and, indeed, it is an unpopular budget by an unpopular government.

The other reason, of course, why the former treasurer is now no longer treasurer (the one change since last year) is that this government is bitterly divided; and this government is bitterly divided along personality lines and it is bitterly divided along policy lines. What the unpopular budget did was to open up these divisions within the government.

You had the issue of recent weeks of the Minister for Industry and Trade (Tom Koutsantonis) talking about the need for a nuclear debate. You had the Minister for Police backing him in that particular line of argument in a direct contradiction to what the Premier had been saying for eight or nine years. This is the Premier, of course, who, in his former days, worked for then premier Dunstan as an adviser and who wrote that famous leaflet about why uranium mining

should not happen in South Australia—in fact, why Roxby Downs should not go ahead—and that no credible economic commentator would back Roxby Downs.

Now, of course, the Premier runs around sprouting it as the saviour of the state. However, the division between him and the want-to-be leader, Tom Koutsantonis (who sees himself as further progressing up the chain and undermining the current Premier), was stark. There was the clash in cabinet between the then leadership rivals, the member for Cheltenham (Jay Weatherill) and the then treasurer (Kevin Foley), over whether cabinet was properly informed about the impact of the long service leave and annual leave changes that the government announced.

Through freedom of information, we revealed the rather terse memos sent from the then treasurer to the then minister for public sector reform about the impact of that particular reform. It was about a \$300 million extra debt figure, if I recall properly, and it was just another example of the bitter divisions playing out in that case at a cabinet level.

Then we had, of course, the rather unsavoury exchange right before the cameras during question time between minister O'Brien and then treasurer Foley when we asked treasurer Foley whether he agreed with the Minister for Forests' explanation to the South-East community that the state was borrowing to pay its wages and that it was selling the forest to keep its AAA credit rating; and, when given the opportunity, rather than be conciliatory, the then treasurer essentially poked the Minister for Forests in the eye with his answer.

So, when we asked the Minister for Forests whether he would like to respond to the then treasurer, the Minister for Forests said that of course what the treasurer said was 'bloody nonsense', to quote the minister. What we have had since the delivery of this very unpopular budget is the Labor divisions slowly but surely opening up. Even on the public sector cuts to entitlements we had members from the left faction from the government out the front of the chamber, out in front of the parliament during the protests, walking around to the unionists saying that they individually did not support the cuts to public sector entitlements. The member for Ashford was even quoted in the media as saying that she did not support the cuts to entitlements.

So, what has changed since the last budget is this: the budget has been so unpopular and the government has been so divided that the treasurer has gone from the portfolio—nine years as treasurer have now gone—and what you have is a government that is divided, a government that is looking over its shoulder to see who is leaking on who next. Only last week, there was a leak from cabinet regarding your electorate, Madam Speaker, and the explosives factory at Whyalla.

This government is internally divided. It has lost its direction and it is on the nose with the South Australian public. The other issue that has come out over the last 12 months since the budget—

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** I rise on a point of order. My understanding of this particular debate is that we have to directly address the issue of supply. I do think the member for Davenport—entertaining as it may be—has taken some licence with that, so I would ask you to rule on that matter, please.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Ashford, normally these supply debates are fairly wide ranging. I will listen carefully to the member for Davenport. I will not uphold your point of order at this stage but I will listen carefully and remind him.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Let me explain it to the member for Ashford in these terms. The reason this is relative to the supply debate is very simple. The money we are about to agree to supply to the government is going to fund the very issues to which it is divided about. It is going to fund the Treasury department, which is setting about cutting the long service leave and annual leave of public servants. It is going to fund the forestry department, which is helping to sell the SA forests on behalf of the government. It is going to fund the cabinet office; the cabinet office (or whoever) that happened to leak the cabinet document to do with the Whyalla explosives plant. It is ultimately going to supply state government funds towards that explosives factory for the planning process, or whatever. So, the supply debate is about any government action that is funded by government money. That is why, by definition, it is a wideranging debate.

Apart from the division, the other things it is going to fund are all the issues that the government was not honest about with the public before the election—the deception. So, we have had the division, let us now talk about the deception. This government is deceptive of the public. It simply has not told the truth. One of the biggest issues that will be funded by the Supply Bill is the Adelaide Oval project. We remember, of course, the former treasurer calling a press conference on

the very day we were being briefed by the Stadium Management Authority, and suddenly admitting that he knew before the election that there was going to be a blowout in the Adelaide Oval project.

We have now discovered that cabinet misled the people when it went to the election saying that the cost of the hospital would be \$1.7 billion, when it had already agreed in November, prior to the election, that the public sector comparator should be adjusted to \$1.8 billion. Another deception of the South Australian people.

There was the issue of pensions. Low income earners were given increases by the Gillard government, and they were not to be touched, but straight after the election this government dipped its hand into the pockets of the pensioners. Another deception on behalf of this government. There is the most recent issue of drinking water. It has now come out that the government had information that it is safe to drink properly treated stormwater, but for political gain it deceived the public on that particular issue. So, this is a government that is divided. It is deceptive of the public and, as a result, it is a deeply unpopular government.

I will touch on some of the key issues relating to the budget and the spending that this Supply Bill will fund going forward, and make some comments on the Adelaide Oval project, just so that the house is clear as to what is being contemplated by the government in relation to the Adelaide Oval project.

The opposition was given a briefing in the last two weeks by the Stadium Management Authority about the Adelaide Oval project, and it was an interesting brief. South Australians need to understand a few things about the Adelaide Oval project. The first thing they need to understand is that we were advised by the Stadium Management Authority that it will be built to last 50 years—so Adelaide Oval will be a 50-year stadium.

I also understand that, under the divorce clause, as I call it (that is, the clause in the agreement between football and cricket that tells them what happens if football and cricket cannot get on in 10 or 15 years' time), all the assets go to cricket if football leaves Adelaide Oval. If AFL football leaves Adelaide Oval, my understanding is all the assets go to cricket.

What that means for South Australia, one would think—that is, if football leaves Adelaide Oval and all the assets go to cricket—is that would lock in football to the Adelaide Oval for the 50-year period of the agreement, so that Adelaide will never have, or is unlikely to have, a covered inner city stadium—unless, of course, SACA is contemplating at some date in the future covering Adelaide Oval. If football loses its assets by leaving Adelaide Oval, how will it ultimately fund a brand new, inner city covered stadium? I think it is important to realise that there are some big questions to be answered in the next few weeks when the South Australian Cricket Association members take their vote.

The Stadium Management Authority this week sent the opposition a copy of the economic development model that was given to the *Sunday Mail* about a week earlier and which received wide coverage in the *Sunday Mail*. It is interesting to go through that document and see the economic modelling for the Adelaide Oval project. The Adelaide Oval project looks like it will deliver around 125 new jobs in the city, made up of the 405 jobs that they claim will be created in the city and taking off the 290 jobs that already exist at West Lakes, giving a net of around 125 extra jobs. At a \$535 million cost, those 125 jobs come out at about \$4 million a job, off the top of my head, so that is quite an expensive exercise in job creation and not something that is highlighted in bold in the economic report.

The report also makes it clear that future Adelaide Oval attendances are modelled on a certain level of attendance. I note that on the weekend Port Power and Port Adelaide Magpies had their reunification game at AAMI Stadium, heavily promoted by the media in an effort to gain higher attendances, and there were a touch over 23,000 spectators at the game. The Stadium Management Authority's modelling shows that Port Power games will have to average 30,000 at Adelaide Oval (about a 26 per cent increase on what they are currently getting) to make it pay. It also shows that they are relying on maintaining the Rugby Sevens every year going forward with attendance at about 25,000, and there will be a rugby international game, apparently, every year, attracting 30,000 people as well.

**Ms Bedford:** The parliamentary cricket match?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Not the parliamentary cricket match. Unfortunately, member for Florey, the parliamentary cricket match is not a big crowd puller.

**Mr Pederick:** Shame!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It is a shame. So, there are some rather ambitious targets in the economic modelling that goes with the Adelaide Oval project. However, the point I really wanted to make in relation to the oval project is that the state needs to understand what the deal is. As far as I can gather, the deal is that the agreement has been locked in: if football leaves, cricket will get the assets, and that, essentially, means football is there for 50 years. It is hard to imagine, without football, how one could possibly have another inner-city stadium.

The other issue is the question: where is plan B? The media have been somewhat interested in that question. Let me put this on the record: the South Australian National Football League has advised the opposition that it is not in a position to talk to the opposition about other options because it signed a legal agreement with the government some time ago to negotiate in good faith to deliver the Adelaide Oval project, and that therefore excludes it from negotiating on any other project.

It is difficult for anyone to suggest a plan B if you cannot negotiate with the income generator (which is football) to talk about that particular project. On this plan B that the media keep talking about, I think the media and the public need to be aware that the opposition is essentially locked out of negotiating with football until this matter is resolved by the government, SACA and the SANFL one way or another through the SACA vote and whatever flows from that.

However, there are many other options for venues for stand-alone city stadiums. Just because the Royal Adelaide Hospital site (assuming that project goes ahead) is gone, there are lots of other sites available in the city for an inner-city stadium if that was the state's wish. Of course, we should remember that it was only about two years ago that football itself went to the government and suggested a stand-alone inner-city stadium for football as its preference, but the government, for its own political reasons, knocked it back.

Another issue is compulsory acquisition. The government has never ruled out whether it will move down the path of compulsorily acquiring Adelaide Oval should the SACA vote go against it. If the government is not contemplating that, then any of the government ministers can come in and put that on the record or put out a press release at any time, but until a government minister rules it out (and it has been in the media for two or three weeks now), it is a fair assumption on behalf of the public that the government is seriously contemplating the compulsory acquisition of Adelaide Oval assets (SACA assets, if you like) to deliver this particular project. If the government wants to rule that out, it can do it at any stage.

Madam Speaker, just relax, because this is all going to be paid for, of course, by selling the state's forests—the harvesting rights for the state's forests. We know that for a number of reasons. First, the Minister for Forests went to the South-East and had that famous meeting that was taped (with his knowledge), where he said, 'We need to sell the forests to maintain our AAA credit rating.' If you go to the budget papers, it is crystal clear that the level of debt stays at around \$7.3 billion, \$7.4 billion, \$7.5 billion in the 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 years. That is despite the fact that we are spending \$535 million on the oval, plus the bridge, plus all the add-ons that the house is well aware of. So, even though we are spending that \$535 million, the debt does not go above the \$7.3 billion, \$7.4 billion mark.

Why is that, Madam Speaker? The reason is that the government has already factored it into its budget estimates. Kevin Foley (then treasurer) told the house he factored in the budget estimates in year 2011-12 whatever the revenue stream is—and we do not know what the revenue stream is—from the forest sale. If you look at the debt figure in the budget it is crystal clear that the forest sale comes in, the Adelaide Oval expenditure goes out, and the debt level hardly changes over that three-year period. So, it is a fair summary that we are, essentially, selling the South-East forests to help deliver the Adelaide Oval project.

Many South Australians are concerned about whether the state actually has the capacity to afford the Royal Adelaide Hospital project, the Adelaide Oval project and the high cost of government under this government's reign at the moment. However, you need to relax, Madam Speaker, because the current Treasurer says that he was only joking when he said across the table at a lunch on the weekend that it would not be of too much concern to him if the SACA vote failed because it would make his budget a lot easier; he was concerned that he could not afford necessarily to do everything the government has promised.

Well, we all know on this side of the house that the Treasurer was not joking. There are leaks coming out of the government and leaks coming out of the Public Service, all to the effect that the government is in trouble on its budget. On the first day of the Treasurer's reign, when he

took over from the former treasurer, we did the Treasurer the courtesy of asking him some very simple questions about whether he would change any policies that were announced in the very unpopular budget announced by the previous treasurer, and the current Treasurer did us the courtesy of saying that he would not be changing any of the key policy settings.

So, nothing has changed, other than the Treasurer. The Treasurer has changed, but the cuts to the Public Service, the cuts to community services and the government waste continues, and what we have now is a Treasurer who is starting to see the writing on the wall—that what the government has promised is going to be very, very difficult indeed to deliver. It is interesting that there have been two announcements in relation to two key major infrastructure projects that are to be delivered by the money in this Supply Bill: one is The Royal Adelaide Hospital project; the other is the selling of the forests.

The announcement of whether the forests will be sold has been delayed past the SACA vote, and SACA votes on 2 May. The Treasurer announced recently that he was going to consult more. Having announced it in 2008—it is now 2011—the Treasurer has suddenly discovered that he should consult the Chamber of Commerce in the South-East. With due respect, I suspect that it has already been consulted; this is just a delay tactic to put the decision on the sale of the forests back past the SACA vote.

In relation to the other issue, the Royal Adelaide Hospital project, we have been asking the government to come clean with South Australia about what is the total cost to build—the construction and finance cost to build—and then the ongoing costs to the South Australian public over the 29-year contract period after it is built in a five or six-year period. The government has promised that it will put all of those financial details on the record but—surprise, surprise!—the Minister for Health, John Hill, said that that will be announced a lot closer to the June budget than the original time frame, which was about now.

It has put those two issues—two big, key infrastructure issues—back behind the SACA vote issue, and you can interpret that only as that the government is somewhat nervous about its budget position and that it is somewhat nervous about what the SACA vote may ultimately do to the Adelaide Oval project. Essentially, none of the key economic data has changed since the budget debate back in September, so I am not going to sit here and regurgitate all of the same debate we had in the budget debate back in September, but the level of debt is going up about 75 per cent over the next three years.

The government intends to collect about \$1 billion extra in taxes and revenue—and that is, of course, before federally we get a carbon tax and before we get a national disability scheme levy. So, the cost of living is starting to hurt ordinary South Australians out there, and you really have to wonder whether this government is listening at all to that message. All of the key economic data that was presented as part of the budget in the opposition responses still holds true today: our debt level is growing and our tax level is growing.

There have been three independent reports in the last 12 months, all confirming that South Australia is the highest-taxed state in the nation. We are also the highest spending government per head of population in Australia. So, we have a typical Labor government here: we have deception to the public before the election, we have the highest-taxed state in South Australia and the highest spending. High tax, high-spending government—welcome to the Labor government.

I want to conclude with a simple story that summarises the state budget pretty well and the supply that will be feeding it at the next state budget. I go back to the discussion I had with my son when the budget was originally brought down in September. I was home reading the six or seven volumes of the budget papers and my 26-year-old son came in and said, 'What are you doing?' I said, 'I am reading the budget.' He said, 'That would be exciting. It won't affect me much.'

I said, 'Well, actually it will because the government is putting up water prices by 100 per cent again. They have just put them up by 100 per cent; water prices are going to go up 100 per cent again. They are going to collect about \$1 billion extra in revenue which means all of our costs of living are going to go up, so we are going to have to start charging you rent.'

He said, 'Well, that won't happen. I will move out and buy my own home.' I said, 'The problem with that is, mate, this government has actually cut the First Home Owners Grant scheme, so that makes it hard, and they are going to collect \$20 million extra through stamp duty.' So buying a home for a university student or someone just out of uni is actually going to be very difficult.

On that, he scratched his head and said, 'I'll tell you what: I will go and live at grandma's.' I said, 'You can live at grandma's if you want, but understand this: you will have to use public transport more there than you will where we live.' Public transport costs are going up above CPI, car registrations are going up, speeding fines are going up—he does get one or two occasionally—and, of course, compulsory third party insurance is going up. So, moving to grandma's is actually not going to solve his problem.

Then he came up with this brainwave. He said, 'I will tell you what I will do. I will move to the country, to the South-East, and move in with a mate of mine who is a teacher, whose wife works for the Public Service.' I said, 'That will be interesting for you, but bear in mind that the South-East could be struggling a bit in the future because this government is going to sell the forests and the local mayors think that could cost up to 3,000 jobs. There may actually be fewer teachers needed in the South-East, so how secure your friend's job is in the South-East, I am not sure. They are also going to cut the housing subsidies for country teachers; that is under threat, so your friend might not be too happy with that. They are also, of course, cutting the 3¢ a litre subsidy for country petrol, so it is going to be more expensive to live, and whatever you do, don't have an accident.'

**The Hon. S.W. KEY:** Point of order: I am not sure where this particular contribution is going, but the member for Davenport having his son—whatever his age is, 25 or 26—listening to all this advice is miraculous. I would just ask him to perhaps come back to reality because it seems like a bit of a fantasy to me that a twenty-something person would actually take all of this advice.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Ashford, I am not sure what your point of order was. I think I will allow the member to continue and go back to the substance of the debate.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, it is leading to a conclusion. The 3¢ a litre fuel subsidy was cut, so petrol will be more expensive. I said to him, 'Whatever you do, don't have an accident in the country because they are cutting funding to the Keith, Moonta and Ardrossan hospitals, and be careful what you eat because the border watch for fruit fly is being cut after midnight.'

With that, he scratched his head and said, 'Look, I think I am going to go to the pub for a drink. This is all too hard.' I said, 'Go to the pub, but just be aware, mate, you will need to take a bit more money because the government is actually doing cost recovery on the hotel industry. They are going to have \$4,000 a year in extra costs at least, so all the prices of beer are going to go up.' He said, 'I am a bit cleverer than that. I will go to the cellar door and grab a wine.' I said, 'Sorry, they are cutting the cellar door subsidy by \$50,000 as well.'

With that, he said he thought he might go fishing. I said, 'You can't go fishing because of these marine parks and the no-take areas.' With that, he said, 'Well, under this government, you might as well go and hide under a rock.' I said, 'You can do that if you want to, but bear in mind, mining royalties are going up 5 per cent.' So, that was the impact of the budget.

This Supply Bill gives the government an opportunity to change its policy and change direction. The great tragedy for this government is that it said after the election—now, let's remember this—it was going to go out and reconnect with the community. It was going to reconnect with the community. Having reconnected with the community, what major policy has it changed? The Adelaide Oval policy remains. The Royal Adelaide Hospital project remains. The 'selling the forest' project remains. The desal plant is a debacle financially. It is a basket case of a government. It is a divided government, and we are poorly served by this particular government.

As is the tradition in the house, the opposition will support the Supply Bill, but we just bring to the house's attention that we have before us a divided government that deceives the South Australian public, and we are the poorer for it.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:35):** How disappointing that it appears that nobody from the government is going to stand up and defend the position that the state finds itself in.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** How do you know?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Well, you just had an opportunity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The convention of the house is that we take turns.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I give the call to who speaks.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I was just pointing out, Madam Speaker, that nobody from the government seems to want to speak.

**Ms Bedford:** We were shocked that the member for Davenport finished so early.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I think he covered a fair bit of territory and, unfortunately, I have a fair bit of territory to cover too, and I only hope that I have the ability to get across most of it. One of the hallmarks of the most recent budget and the matters that the government is going through with regard to the finances of this state is that obviously the budget is out of control.

The former treasurer had lost control of the expenses in the budget, and he admitted that himself—not that we needed an admission from the treasurer, but he did admit that the expenses were out of control—but we find ourselves still desperate for cash. When I say 'we find ourselves', the state and this government finds itself desperate for cash and is doing whatever it can to increase revenues or to bring forward cash revenues.

The proposal to forward sell the forests in the South-East is the biggest example. It is an outrageous plan of the government to even contemplate bringing forward rotations to the forest, and I do not think that the government has really thought the policy through at all. The current Treasurer has announced that he is sticking with all the former treasurer's policies and the policies that the government has had and announced to date—and I will not labour the point anymore; the member for Davenport has already canvassed that issue that there has been no change—but in relation to the proposal to forward sell the forests, the government announced that it was not selling ForestrySA. It will retain ForestrySA.

I do not think the Treasurer understands what ForestrySA does. It actually manages the forests on a day-to-day basis. If we have sold all the revenue stream from the forests but we are going to continue to have ForestrySA as the government agency, what revenue stream will we have over the next 60, 80 or 100 years to pay for the management of the forests, to pay for those people who work at ForestrySA, to pay for the materials etc. that they utilise to manage those forests? ForestrySA will become a burden on the public purse. Instead of creating a revenue stream for the government, the forests in the South-East will become an annual economic burden to the budget. It is just nonsensical.

ForestrySA returned to Treasury revenue of \$43 million last year. If we capitalise that at 6 per cent, we get \$716 million. To have a positive effect on the budget, we would need to get at least \$716 million for the forward sale of the forests. If you capitalised it at 5 per cent—and I think that is probably closer to the rate at which the government could borrow money—that figure rises to \$860 million, so you would need somewhere between \$700 million and \$850 million for the sale to have a positive impact on the budget, and that is without taking into account the ongoing cost of paying to maintain the ForestrySA agency.

I would argue that we would probably need, depending on how many rotations we forward sell and how many years we are going to maintain ForestrySA in this budget negative fashion, at least \$1.5 to \$2 billion. That is probably what the forest is actually worth, but I doubt very much whether we will get anywhere near that. That ignores the other potential economic impact of selling the forest, and that is the economic impact of losing thousands of jobs in the South-East. The tax revenues from those thousands of jobs are probably much, much greater than the \$43 million that the Treasury receives directly from ForestrySA.

So, the government needs to put the business case on the table. It needs to come clean. Treasury has obviously done the work, but what the government wants to do is grab the cash now, because it is spending it and its expenses are out of control. It wants to grab the cash now, and to hell with the future. That is the problem with the proposal to forward sell the forests, and the people of the South-East have seen straight through this proposal and have demonstrated on the steps of parliament in the city of Adelaide and will continue to fight to have that decision overturned.

I do wish to talk briefly about the Adelaide Oval proposal—again, a pretty dumb proposal, in my opinion. I will say, I am actually a member of SACA, so I will get to vote on 2 May.

**The Hon. R.B. Such:** How are you going to vote?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** How am I going to vote? I think I'll be voting no, Bob. I think I will be voting no, but at least I am declaring that I am a member. There are a whole heap of commentators out there having lots to say about this particular policy decision who do not have the guts to declare that they are SACA members, and for one reason or another they are putting one side of the story. We read in the morning paper that we might consign ourselves to mediocrity if we do not support the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** I think that was Alexander Downer.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I do not care who it is, Tom. I do not care who it is. The member for Davenport pointed out that this deal locks us in to this position for 50 years. That is what we were told by the Stadium Management Authority last week, I think it was. It locks us into a deal for 50 years. So, football, which is the big money generator for any stadium that is going to be built in this city into the foreseeable future, will be locked in to Adelaide Oval. So, we will be locked in for 50 years to be a one oval city, a one stadium city.

For somebody to come out and say that we consign ourselves to mediocrity by not supporting this development, I do not think they have looked beyond the next couple of years. I do not think they have realised that in 2025, 2035 and 2045 we will still be watching football in Adelaide sitting in an uncovered stadium, because there will be no choice. We are locked in for the long term to Adelaide Oval. I am not too sure that spending \$535 million of taxpayers' money to achieve a net gain of 12,000 seats is actually good value for money. That is what we would be getting: 12,000 seats more than we have today.

The finances are predicated on Port Power getting 30,000 spectators to every game they play at the Adelaide Oval. I think that is a stretch; I think that really is a stretch. The reality is that the disastrous situation we find ourselves in on this whole debate has been brought about because of the conflict between the SANFL and the AFL over who controls the two football licences in this city. It is quite clear to anybody who has studied this that the AFL wants to regain control of those football licences. The SANFL obviously does not want to relinquish them. In the meantime, the AFL is quite happy to see the SANFL bleed, and bleed profusely.

Just think for a moment of how much money the AFL is pouring into the Gold Coast and into Western Sydney—both cities that do not have football as part of their long-term culture—to develop new clubs in those cities, yet it turns its back on Australian Rules Football in Adelaide. The AFL has been very coy in coming forward and putting its money on the table in Adelaide.

The suckers in this whole debate are the taxpayers. I suspect the taxpayers will be screwed, will be the losers, and we will end up in the long term being a one-stadium city with a substandard stadium that we are obliged to use for the next 50 years. I will not repeat all the things that my colleague the member for Davenport said, but that is what we would be locking ourselves into.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** Do you have a son?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Do I have a son? I have a grandson.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** What are his thoughts on the budget?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** One of my sons is a member, too, and I think I know how he will be voting. I will talk for a moment about the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We know that the former treasurer inadvertently let slip the \$1.8 billion number when the government keeps claiming that it is a \$1.7 billion project, and it was not until after the election last year that it was revealed that in fact cabinet did sign off on the extra \$100 million in November 2009. So, the government has been very tricky with the numbers. We know that that same former treasurer inadvertently let slip more recently 'the \$2 billion hospital'. We know from experience that the former treasurer does have a problem with Freudian slips and he has obviously done it again.

We do not know exactly what the taxpayer is going to be up for with the move of the Royal Adelaide Hospital from the east end of North Terrace to the west end of North Terrace. What we do know is that it is going to cost a hell of a lot of money. We do know that it is \$2 billion and going northwards. We do know that accessibility is going to be an issue. We do know that fewer services will be delivered from the new site than are currently delivered from the existing site. We do know that this will be a great waste of taxpayers' money.



Similarly, we have seen a great waste of taxpayers' money in things like Shared Services. Already the budget to develop Shared Services has blown out from \$60 million to \$100 million, and last year the Auditor-General pointed out that the projected saving is falling short by \$100 million, as well. What we can take from this sort of data is that this government just is not capable of managing the state.

The member for Davenport also briefly mentioned the desalination plant. What a crazy decision it was to double the size of the desalination plant from 50 gigalitre capacity per year to 100 gigalitre capacity per year. In the five years before level 3 water restrictions were instituted in Adelaide, the average water use in the city was 168 gigalitres. A 100 gigalitre capacity desalination plant will provide between 60 and 70 per cent of our total water needs, without water restrictions. I think that is absolute overkill, and it comes at a cost of \$1.1 billion. The original desal plant was going to be \$1.1 billion; now we are facing a cost of \$2.2 billion. The government claims that it is a \$1.8 billion project, but it overlooks the fact that it is also necessary to build a \$400 million series of pipelines to connect the northern and southern systems of the distribution network simply so that we can use the water. It is an absolute disaster and, again, a billion dollars ill spent.

The opposition took a proposal on stormwater to the last election. That billion dollars would be about double what we believe it would cost to have a comprehensive and integrated stormwater harvesting and recycling system across metropolitan Adelaide. The government likes to cover its backside with all sorts of policy issues, and the government is claiming that it is doing great things with stormwater and will be harvesting 20 gigalitres of stormwater by 2013. It is very easy to collect stormwater, and it is relatively easy to store it; it is almost impossible to use it if you do not bring it up to drinking standard. If you do not bring it up to drinking standard you have to build a second pipe network to distribute the water to use it. The government keeps ignoring this fact, but the former minister, the member for Cheltenham, divulged that it would cost \$6 billion to duplicate the pipe network across metropolitan Adelaide.

The reality is that the flawed Water for Good document shows that only 15 gigalitres of water would water all the public parklands, gardens and playing fields across metropolitan Adelaide; so where are we going to use the 20 gigalitres of stormwater that we harvest each year past 2013? The reality is that it will not be used. We are spending good money to harvest some stormwater, but we are doing only half the job. We will not be able to use it. It will not replace the potable water supply.

We are building a desalination plant and wasting \$1 billion which could have provided a comprehensive, integrated stormwater harvesting and recycling scheme that would have provided water that could be used, as well as solving the environmental problem in the coastal waters off our metropolitan beaches, as identified in the Adelaide Coastal Waters Study. Again, stupid decisions; decisions made because of the promise of \$228 million from the federal government to support the additional cost of the desalination plant.

However, the opposition revealed later on that that was coming at a huge cost to our GST revenues. The former treasurer kept getting up complaining and making announcements that our GST revenues were falling. The reality is that the only reason the GST revenues keep falling is because we get these special grants, like the promise of \$228 million for the desal plant. When you take into account the reduction in GST, the net benefit from the federal government supporting the desal plant is only \$16 million—a mere \$16 million. So, it was a very stupid decision to double that.

We have seen water prices doubling, and they will double again—and this is even before this government's federal colleagues introduce a carbon tax. It was revealed earlier this week that would add \$863 to the average household's energy costs. I wonder how many dollars it will add to the average water bill. This government has been a supporter of some sort of carbon tax—whether it be a carbon trading system or a straight-out carbon tax—but it has not been overly honest with the people of South Australia on what the impacts of that will be on the costs of running their homes and businesses.

I started off talking about the government using a user-fees system to recover costs or the government being hungry for revenue. I want to finish off by talking about the government's penchant for applying a user-pays principle right across the board. This impacts greatly in rural South Australia, because it is supposedly quite easy to separate a public benefit from a private benefit. This has been applied in areas of biosecurity, in particular, with property identification, where suddenly we are seeing new charges being imposed on our farmers and agriculturists across the state and charges being applied to fruit growers in the Riverland to maintain border security; as I said, charges for all sorts of biosecurity.

I fail to understand the argument that this is all of a private benefit to the particular growers. I think there is a huge public benefit to provide for biosecurity in Australia, I think there is a huge public benefit to ensure that we have food security, to ensure that we are self-sufficient. It horrifies me as a practising farmer to see this nation import so much of our foodstuff. We import a huge amount of foodstuff into this country, particularly horticultural product, mainly because of stupid political decisions—and this decision about biosecurity is another one.

There will be another impost on the farming community. I was at a public meeting last week where another impost is going to be imposed on our horticulturalists and agriculturalists in the Adelaide Hills through water levies. There is a plethora of taxes and charges placed on our agricultural industries which is driving people out of business and driving our food supplies offshore. It is an absolute disgrace that this country imports any foodstuff at all. We have a huge range of climates which allow us to produce a huge range of food right throughout the seasons.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:55):** The Supply Bill is always an interesting piece of legislation that comes through this place. You would have thought that the budget process would enable supply to continue on, and that parliament's time would not be taken up with discussing the Supply Bill. Given that, though, we have this bill before us, it is for many billions of dollars, and it is up to the opposition to ensure that those billions of dollars are being put to the very best benefit of all South Australians. In my portfolios of health, mental health and substance abuse, and veterans' affairs, I have many issues that I am aware of that need more and more money.

Unfortunately, what do we see from this government, and what do we see from the health minister? We see classical crisis management. It is deflect, deflect, deflect and, when you cannot deflect it away, you deny, deny, deny, and then you deflect, deflect, deflect with some spurious claim to have achieved so much, or to be promising so much. Unfortunately, we know what Mike Rann said in 2002 on his pledge card—better hospitals, more beds—and after nine years of this Labor government we are seeing hospitals in crisis, and a health system in crisis in South Australia.

Go out and ask any nurse, doctor or person who has had experience in our health system in South Australia what they think of it. There are some good parts, sure, but it is in crisis, and we need to make sure that it is going to be managed in a way that is going to have long-term benefits—not, as we have seen from this government in so many areas, short-term solutions to long-term problems. I was interested to hear what the minister had to say in his introductory statement in the estimates committee. He introduced his advisers at the time. They were the then chief executive, Dr Tony Sherbon, and the director of finances, Mr John O'Connor. Interestingly, both of those men have gone. Tony Sherbon has gone to Canberra, and I do not think that there were too many mourning his loss. It is interesting that the director of finances, Mr John O'Connor, left and went into consulting elsewhere.

They are not the only two senior bureaucrats who have left the health department. There are a number of them: Dr Karleen Edwards, the head of Central Northern Adelaide Health Service, as it was then, left to take up a job in Victoria; and Mrs Cathy Miller, who was the head of the Southern Adelaide Health Service, left and is now doing an excellent job at Minda Home as the chief executive. They all left while Mr George Beltchev was the head of Country Health SA. There are three regions—Central Northern Adelaide, Southern Adelaide, and Country Health—other than the Women's and Children's. We have had senior bureaucrats leaving left, right and centre. Mr David Miller, the general manager of the Lyell McEwin Hospital, left and went back to Queensland, I understand. These people are not rats deserting a sinking ship—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** No-one said they were.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** These are well-known and well-credentialed bureaucrats and they are leaving this system because they do not see a big future for themselves other than lots of headaches in South Australia. The health budget is huge. We were told during the estimates committees that it is \$4.46 billion—about one third of the total state budget. We are told how much that has increased since the government came to office in 2002, and so it should, just to keep up with health inflation, which is a far, far bigger index than the normal CPI. In terms of health inflation, it depends who you ask. It is anything between 8 per cent in some areas; 9.3 per cent is a broadly accepted average. Certainly, former treasurer Kevin Foley told FIVEaa radio last February that, in some areas, it was up to 12 per cent. So, with those sorts of health inflation indices, you would be very surprised if there was not significant spending just to keep up.

In relation to country health, the minister was saying that we have put in \$430 million (I think) extra in the time they have been in government. If you index that up, using the health inflator of 9.5 per cent, I think they should have been putting in \$650 million. I think those figures are right, I am going from memory, but I know they should have been spending more than they have.

The thing that we need to make sure is happening is that not only is the money going in but it is going into the right areas. We heard the minister talking about expansions at various hospitals—Modbury, Lyell McEwin, QEH, Flinders Medical Centre, the Women's and Children's and, of course, there is the monolith down the road that is still on the books. We do not know how much and when it is going to happen, but we will talk about that in a moment. It is good to see that money is being put into recurrent expenditure for doctors and nurses, and there are still many, many issues where doctors and nurses are overworked and under-resourced.

It is good to see that we are having some capital expenditure, but let's not forget that this government has been here for nine years. What we are getting now are promises of redevelopments in the next two to three years' time—2012, 2013, 2014 and sometimes even further out than that. Of course, the new hospital is due in 2016 by some estimates, but it could be as far out as 2018 or 2019 if you go back to the estimates and the Budget and Finance Committee record and look at the discussions there, and I will talk about those a bit later.

The need to make sure we are building modern hospitals and refurbishing hospitals is something that we have to be aware of. It is happening, but it should have happened a long time ago. The demand has increased. This government has been here nine years, we are seeing our hospitals in crises. The need to make sure that all our hospitals are getting something in a timely fashion is something we would support on this side, but it is difficult to sit back and not say anything when all the government is doing is saying, 'We're going to do this, we're going to do this, we're going to do this.'

It really is quite a difficult position to be in opposition and not be able to say, 'Well, this is what needs to be done now,' when you have a government that does not listen—it just does not listen. It does not consult—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** And there's a long time to go.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I will talk to you about that later, Mick; that's not quite right. The government needs to start consulting. Let me just read an email from a doctor who spoke to me. He is involved in one of the doctor associations, and he said:

Generally our [doctors] will support changes that will realistically produce sustainable efficiency gains and better ways of doing things if this improves access to services and the care able to be delivered and they are properly consulted—even when they personally have to make small sacrifices to facilitate this. To become a doctor they are used to doing this and providing good care is very rewarding in itself.

Ownership of any change process is critical to doctors as it is to most people so when something is imposed without consultation by a centralist, disconnected bureaucracy/government with a forward understanding of how the system operates our members will not support it and they call us. These types of [Department of Health] management failures are generating a substantial workload for [this association] at present and have been for some time.

Knowing people need a health service and can't get it is distressing for most people...with doctors in a position to know the scale of this happening far more than other people in the community.

This is doctors speaking. This is not just the opposition going on about issues that they see, this is doctors at the front line speaking about this. They are very concerned about the lack of consultation, and we see it time and time again. We saw it with country hospitals.

It is good to see spending in city hospitals. It is too little too late; it should have been planned many years ago. You do not build a hospital in a day. You cannot go down to Bunnings and buy all the bits down there. Mind you, having said that, you should go down to Barwell Avenue in Kurralta Park where there is a mock-up of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital rooms. I think it is called the state health demonstration facility, or some similar name. It is in a block of units there, and I understand that, in the three or four years that it has been there, only two groups of people have ever visited it, and I can understand why.

I visited it after about eight phone calls, emails and pressuring the minister to let me have a look. It looks like somebody has gone down to Bunnings and bought some pine framing, a bit of cladding and whacked up these rooms. There is nothing in these rooms but an old barouche and a hospital light—I had a better version in my veterinary clinic—and there is an old bed in another one.

It is to give doctors the perspective of how big the rooms are going to be. I do not think you need to do that.

I will backtrack a little bit. I asked to look at this facility after having seen the government spend over \$200,000 on the Royal Show stand. I wanted to know what was happening to that demonstration facility. I was told at the time that it was going to be taken down to another area. There were going to be technical suites built down there so that doctors could come and see what they were working with, where they were working and what a wonderful facility the new Royal Adelaide was going to be. They could imagine themselves having these beautiful views over the river.

But what do we see? It is like something from Bunnings. It is a bit of pinus framing banged together—they got the nail gun out, whacked it in there and put a bit of cladding on it. It is nothing like the stand we saw at the Royal Show. I do not know where that Royal Show stand has gone. I do not know where the beds, the toilets and the pretty pictures have gone. They certainly were not down there, so I imagine that is \$200,000 down the drain.

That said, how much would that \$200,000 do for hospitals like Moonta, Ardrossan, Keith and even Glenelg hospital, where they are providing an excellent service supplementing the public hospitals with good community hospitals? To keep denying them their worth—and giving them not subsidies but enabling them to continue what they are doing to assist the public health system to deliver a better service—is a crazy thing to do. I will never understand the logic of it: there is no financial logic, there is no social logic and, certainly, there is no triple bottom line logic with any of it.

The crisis in the South Australian health system is not just rhetoric coming from the opposition. You do not have to go very far at all to be able to see what is going on in our hospitals. I have been getting access to the inpatient dashboards—and I should say it is getting harder. These show the number of occupants in the various beds, in various departments, in various hospitals. These numbers are put out regularly and they are in living colour. They have a traffic light system with an extra light: green for okay, yellow for maximum capacity, red for overcrowded, and then white, as in white-hot. It is just jam-packed; it is crush capacity in there.

All our metropolitan hospitals are over capacity much of the time on any day of the week. You will find, if you look at these dashboards, that just about all our hospitals are over capacity. The accepted percentage of occupancy for a full hospital worldwide, but particularly in Australia, is 85 per cent capacity. That allows for surges in admissions and variations in discharges, but this minister said, 'No, 90 per cent is fine, 90 per cent is okay.' He is denying the truth, so we have emergency departments and hospitals that are overcrowded much of the time. For nine years we have had promises, promises, promises, but all we get is overcrowded hospitals.

I will go through some of the hospitals and look at one dashboard for one particular day. Glenside has a capacity of 184, there are 167 in there, and it was over capacity; general beds were 95 capacity, and there were 96 patients. No patients were waiting for beds at that particular time, so it was well above the 85 per cent. If you go down the list, you don't need to go very far at all to see the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which was well over capacity: for general beds, 151 patients is the capacity; 159 were occupied, so they were in barouches and on chairs around the place, and three patients were still waiting for beds. In the Royal Adelaide Hospital, there is a 622-bed capacity. There were 686 of those beds occupied. How you can do that is wizardry to me, but there were still 10 patients waiting for beds. They must be pulling out barouches, couches, hammocks—I do not know what they are doing, but they are doing a very good job under very trying circumstances.

This is there for the minister to see every day. It should be there for the public to see every day. In Western Australia, the Western Australian Public Hospital Activity statements are put up every day for everybody to see. The IP dashboards were out there for everybody to see in the department. Now what do we see hidden up in the left-hand corner under the IP dashboard? It states, 'Unclassified but not for distribution outside SA Health'. We are trying to bury our mistakes, and we are trying to hide our faults. This is a recent addition. What is the government trying to do?

These are there, in living colour, for the minister to see every day. He can see what is going on in our hospitals. He should have been able to see, for the last nine years, what is going on in our hospitals. It is a crying shame that is going to continue for many years to come because we see a government that is saying, 'Well, in 2012, 2013, 2014, 2016 we might have something done.' Even then, it is not enough. We know that, when stage C of the Lyell McEwin Hospital redevelopment is finished in 2013-14, it will be full. It will be full; they should be planning for a stage D already.

What is the government doing to try to overcome some of these issues? It is trying to outsource some of the services, so it wants to outsource outpatients. We have 1.2 million outpatient appointments a year in South Australia. Phase 1 is to outsource 10 per cent of those, so we are going to outsource 120,000 outpatients into private specialist rooms. How is that going to happen, minister? The minister could not answer that question in estimates, and I bet he cannot answer that question now, because he has no idea.

Just this morning, I spoke to a friend of mine who is waiting to see her orthopaedic surgeon to revisit an operation. She cannot get in until the end of May this year. That is early; that is good. Most orthopaedic surgeons have a three to six-month waiting list. Most specialists, in their private rooms, have months and months to wait. How many people are on the waiting list? The minister said, 'There are no hidden waiting lists. There are GPs who are referring to the outpatients department.' These referrals mysteriously disappear; we do not know how many are out there. The minister does not know how many are out there. The hospitals know that there are thousands of patients waiting on these hidden lists to see specialists in the outpatient department.

In phase 1, the government is going to try to outsource 120,000 of those patients to specialists who cannot see them on time because they are so busy already. Then, because their private rooms are really a lost part of their enterprise—they make their money when they are doing surgery—they are going to have to charge a gap. The gap can be up to \$280, so those patients who would have gone to an outpatient department in a public hospital and not paid anything (other than the Medicare levy out of their wages) will have to pay that gap. How are they going to afford that, minister? How are they going to do that? Tell me, please, minister. If you have a magic wand, tell me how.

That is phase 1. Phase 2 of outpatient outsourcing is going to be another 40 per cent. There are 1.2 million total outpatients, we have 10 per cent going out already and a review is going on now, but we have another 40 per cent. So, what's that? 600,000. There are 600,000 outpatients who are supposed to go into the private sector every year. I wish the private practitioners could look after them because they can often do it cheaper than in our public hospitals. That is a continuing puzzle to me because we have very hardworking doctors and nurses in our public hospitals. It is a real issue, and the waiting lists and cost to patients are a real burden for everybody; not only ministers.

In the last part of my speech, let's just whizz down the road for a few moments to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital which, according to the government, is all well and truly costed out: it has the business case. I put in FOIs to get the business case, and this government wanted to charge me \$150,000 for the FOIs, for freedom of information on the business case. If it is such a good business case, minister, show me why it is such a good thing to do; do not hide behind 150,000 reasons. What did we hear from Dr Tony Sherbon, the departed CE of health, at the Budget and Finance Committee of the other place on 9 August 2010? He said:

Once we have reached financial close in February 2011, we will then have an intense process of hospital design, and so hospital construction will not commence until early 2013.

It is not going to be February 2011. It was going to be March and, now, it is going to be June. So, how much will it cost and when will it start being built? We do not know.

The minister said in estimates that it would be a five to six year build time; Tony Sherbon said that construction will not commence until 2013, so that makes it 2018, 2019. When are we getting the hospital? How much is it going to cost? What services are going to be there? There are more questions than answers, and this minister will not front the public, he will not consult. This bloke is in complete crisis. He will deny, deny, deny; he will deflect, deflect, deflect all the time—'We're going to do this. We're going to do it in 2013, 2014, 2016, but we're going to do it.' I do not believe this minister. You cannot trust this government.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (12:16):** It is my great pleasure to be able to speak on the Supply Bill. Before getting under way on my comments on this bill, I thought I would take just one minute to reflect on a comment made by the member for Ashford, who interrupted the shadow treasurer during his comments because he was talking about his discussion with his son about the budget. The member for Ashford seemed to think it was unlikely that this young man, at 25 or 26 (I think Staten is 25 at the moment) would have been so interested and would actually have been taking notice.

In defence of Staten Evans, can I say that this is quite an unusual man who at the age of 19 became president of his local Apex club and, at that same age, when his parents came back

home from holidays—I live in the hope that my children might ever do this—not only had he not destroyed the house with wild parties, but he had the house cleaned. He had cleaned out his younger brother's bedroom, painted it for them and put food in the fridge ready for their homecoming. Where you could find criticism of Staten Evans—

**Dr McFetridge:** He takes after his mother.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Someone suggests perhaps unkindly of the shadow treasurer that he takes after his mother. In defence of Staten, I say to the member for Ashford—although she is probably just listening in the distance at the moment—that he is one young man whom I would have every confidence was indeed listening to what his father was saying about the budget, and well might he listen because, of course, this government is in disarray as the taxpayers of this state pay the price of its economic incompetence for yet another year. The sad thing is that I am told time and again when I am out in the communities all day every day, every weekend, that people are so unhappy that they have to now wait another almost three years until we can get rid of the government.

For nine years this government has been telling us that it is a good economic manager. It keeps boasting about a mining boom but, in fact, we have fewer jobs in mining now than we had in 1985. We have fewer jobs now than we had then. The government keeps boasting about how many new jobs will be created—it has this attitude of, 'We're going to have 100,000 jobs way off in the future'—but the reality is that both in agriculture and mining we have had a downturn in the number of people.

Indeed, on the very day the government released its Mid-Year Budget Review, the Australian Bureau of Statistics put out information to say that mining and agriculture jobs were at 26-year lows. That is the lowest since they had begun keeping records—that is where our jobs were in those two sectors. So, far from having the right to boast about how many jobs the government has got, what it never addresses is the fact that, were it to actually just keep up with the national average, we would already have 40,000 more jobs in this state than we do.

Once upon a time, of course, South Australia was the third largest state in terms of the size of its economy and the size of its population. Our share of the national economy has declined under this government. We now have a smaller proportion of the population and, although at last our population has started to grow, it is growing more slowly than the rest of mainland Australia. The only place where it is growing less is in Tasmania.

In addition, we have housing approvals, which have been going backwards for 11 consecutive months. In February this year housing approvals dropped 2.1 per cent lower than they were. The government in the last week or so, I seem to recall, had to adjust its own budget because it has realised it has counted on getting in money that is now not going to come in from stamp duty. So, that is \$60 million they have had to wipe off. Talking to people in the real estate sector, they are actually saying that that is a big underestimate and that in fact we actually expect to have a lot less money coming in. The downturn in the real estate sector is a lot worse than what this government has acknowledged by making a \$60 million adjustment just in the stamp duty area.

It has been long known by those who study these things that this government's problem is not that it has not had the income because it has; the problem is that it overspends. What is more, it does not overspend on things that are worthwhile. It overspends on ridiculous things like lots of ministerial office rearrangements, it overspends on sending and having envoys from Puglia, it overspends on all sorts of things, but not on actual major infrastructure and the things we need to see this economy start to go. The former treasurer himself, in Estimates Committee A on 7 October last year, said:

There is no question that the blowout in expenses is our problem...There is no question expenditure overruns are the biggest threat to public finances...

Is it any wonder then that we are in strife in the economy of this state. The fact is that we actually have more money coming in. Despite the treasurer's claims, the budget revenues for this state for the 2010-11 year have increased by \$52 million. That should see us in a pretty good space; the only problem is that his spending has gone up by \$156 million. That is where the problem lies with this government: it keeps spending more than it can possibly expect to have.

Business knows—as the shadow minister mentioned in his address—that this is the highest taxing state. We have high taxes across a range of things, not just stamp duty. We tried to alert the government before the last election to the problem with land tax in this state. The

treasurer's instant response at the time was 'land tax is not a problem because it only affects rich people'. He failed to realise two particular things: firstly, nearly every business in this state—the backbone of the economy of this state—is a small business, and by and large those small to medium enterprises run out of rental accommodation, and that means that land tax is being paid by a landlord and, ultimately, even if not directly, that land tax expense is passed on to the tenant and thereby affects not just every person running a business but every person who deals with that business, and it ends up coming back to the taxpayer.

Secondly, a whole sector of the community has not had the benefit of public sector jobs or secure employment. They have made their own way in life, unlike the treasurer who said, in his own admission in an article, that he did not have the intestinal fortitude to go into business for himself—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** Yes, 'courage' might have been the word he used. They have gone out and had the courage to make their own way, take their chances and put their house on the line, but in order to secure their futures they often invest in properties they can rent out to provide for their superannuation, because they are used to providing for themselves and they have done that, but are finding now that they cannot even afford to keep their properties in this state because the land tax burden has become so bad.

We had the WorkCover debt down to an unfunded liability of, I think, \$59 million prior to the 2002 election. This government came in and has blown it out to \$982 million and, when you add on what they have done in the public sector, because the Public Service has a separate public sector WorkCover system, that is about another half a billion dollars. So, it is roughly \$1.5 billion. From where we had it at \$56 million, it is up to \$1.5 billion in unfunded liability.

What is more, for all that and for all its taking rights away from the workers—and I know that there were members over there who were very keen for us to do something about it, and they voted in favour of reducing the workers' rights and entitlements and voted in favour of those reductions in order, they said, to get WorkCover back in line—what has happened? It has just gone from bad to worse because of the failure of management. I know it is the failure of management because in this state on average our WorkCover levies are 3 per cent; in every other state and on a national average it is 2 per cent. So it is 50 per cent higher in this state, and we also have the lowest return-to-work rate.

Now, why am I able to say that it is not just about the WorkCover system and that it is the management and the way in which it is being managed by the people who have been put in charge? I can tell you why. I can tell you that it is because there are people called 'exempt employers', which are these big organisations that actually run their own workcover system, but they run it under exactly the same piece of legislation.

So, it is not the legislation that is the problem. They have an average, I think, of about a 1.3 per cent levy that they pay. They are paying much less than the national average, running a more efficient system and having higher return-to-work rates using exactly the same piece of legislation. How is that possible? Because this government does not manage things properly. That is how come.

Then, of course, we have payroll tax. Now, we did suggest to the government and it did take up one of our policies from the election—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** Well, they took up a lot of our policies, but payroll tax in particular has always seemed to me to be rather a disincentive for growing anyone's business. But one of the things that we suggested—just a little tweak that would make a big difference to a lot of people—was to remove the payroll tax impediment on trainees and apprentices. What they did was to say, 'You have to pay it but then you get an 80 per cent rebate,' and we said, 'Well, why not make it a 100 per cent rebate and then you don't actually have to do all the red tape stuff,' and they did adopt that policy.

So, congratulations to the government for having the sense to realise that it was at least a policy, because most of the good policies that we had the government, of course, did follow. But the big problem, it seems to me at the moment, is that I think there is a real risk that, given that we have this dreadfully high-taxing state where every impediment possible is put in the way of doing business (where we have got other states that have had significant problems; they have had

floods, cyclones, bushfires and all sorts of things), what is the imperative for a business to stay here?

Why would a person who is in a construction industry, for instance, not say, 'Well, you know what, this is the highest taxing state. I have problems put in my path, I have red tape put in my path. Things are going from bad to worse. The debt of this state is getting worse, jobs are downturning, the population is downturning. Why wouldn't I go to Queensland where the government, obviously, in its particular circumstances is going to move every impediment out of the way, where they have a much higher threshold for payroll tax so I can grow my business?' Why would there not be a temptation to move elsewhere?

I do not want to see that happen, but the way in which this government has been running things that is what it is doing. Let us look at how it wastes money. Let us look, first, at the desalination plant. We, of course, first proposed the desalination plant way back in, I think, 2006 or 2007, and we had done a fair bit of research on it. Quite a number of us had been over to Perth. We looked at the desal plant and, indeed, asked the question: if we signed the contract today, what would it cost to have a desalination plant just like that one you are putting there now? The answer from the people building it was \$400 million.

So, for the next 18 months or two years the government said, 'No, no, we can't have a desalination plant,' then, suddenly, as is its wont, it did a famous double backflip pike reverse somersault and decided that it needed a desal plant—not just any old desal plant but double the size. We had always said that the idea of a desal plant was just to protect us against a failure of rainfall so that we could secure Adelaide's water supplies for the population of Adelaide should there be a complete failure of rainfall.

We said 50 gegalitres was the amount, but, no, the government decides that it is going for 100 gegalitres. And, of course, with all the delays (and it is still not operating), what we have now is a \$1.8 billion desalination plant, with \$400 million (and, remember, that is the figure that we were going to be able to build one for, according to the contractors) just to connect it, let alone the disruption; and, on top of that, I understand in excess of \$30 million a year just to run it.

Whether or not we need the water, we are now going to be paying \$30 million a year to run our desalination plant. That is just one example of where this government is just unreliable in terms of anything that it touches, especially concerning money and the taxpayers of this state.

How about the oval? Originally, of course, the government's position was, 'No, the home of football is at Footy Park. No, the home of football is out there. We are never going to have it,' and then suddenly—

**Mr Williams:** We're not going to have two ovals.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Yes. It had another idea. It saw that our idea was pretty popular, so it had another idea and it decided that it would build the Adelaide Oval into its new stadium—\$450 million, not a penny more. Only one slight problem there, there was a new western grandstand and a whole lot of other stuff happening, so, okay, well, not a penny more. It was not a penny more, it was \$85 million more. I have not calculated how many pennies that would be, but it is quite a lot.

The \$450 million, remember, was to do the whole job, and then we get to \$450 million plus the odd \$85 million plus we then have to build a footbridge, which is the equivalent of a six-lane highway across, plus we have to do the car park. So, it is actually about \$600 million. You would have to say to yourself: why would a government give priority to spending \$600 million on the Adelaide Oval to effectively increase the seating capacity from 38,000 to 50,000? So, an increase of 12,000 seats—\$600 million for an increase of 12,000 seats. I keep asking myself: why would you do this?

There are a few things, you might suggest. I went to a fabulous Twenty20 match at the Adelaide Oval on a lovely night in summer, and even on that perfectly still, beautiful night—it was a beautiful night, it is a very popular match and people came along and had a ball; it was a great thing—we did not fill the 38,000 seats. So, why are we going to spend \$600 million to put an extra 12,000 seats in? Where are these miraculous numbers of people going to come from?

I am not a SACA member and I know they are going to have a vote on 2 May, but if I were a SACA member I would be saying to myself: if, as Ian McLachlan keeps assuring me, it is the case that the SACA can meet its debt in relation to the new western grandstand—and I have to say that it is quite a nice grandstand. There is a question mark about where the architects have put the



toilets and the bars, but it is a lovely view, and the oval is looking splendid at the moment. I was there on Sunday to watch the Rugby Sevens. Jack Snelling was across the table from me, as it happens.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** He was just having a general chat about things. So, there were all these people there, but 12,000 extra seats for the Adelaide Oval: why are we going to do this? Ian McLachlan assures us that the cost of the western grandstand can be met. If you are a SACA member and you are going to vote on 2 May, I would have thought that, if we can pay all of our debt for this oval then why are we being asked to give up absolute control of the entire precinct: naming rights, parking, all of the benefits and all of the money that flows out of the different franchise things around the place; why are we being asked to give that up to football for seven months of the year—that is more than half of the year—for this oval, which is almost sacrosanct, in terms of cricket lovers around the world and certainly others who I have spoken to in other states?

The other question is: what is football doing there anyway? Why does football want to come in? The reality of it is, in my view, and the thing that is not being talked about is Andrew Demetriou's agenda. Andrew Demetriou wants the AFL to control the two AFL licences in South Australia. He wants them to have control of it and he is prepared to let the Port Power team go completely rather than supporting it so that it can stay. The reality is—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** It is an absolute shame. This is really about a battle between the SANFL, which holds the two South Australian licences, and Andrew Demetriou, who wants them under the control of the AFL. That is what this battle is about. Fine; I do not mind; they can have that battle, but why would the taxpayers of this state be well served by spending \$600 million to sort this battle out for them? Why would we do that? It makes no sense.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mrs REDMOND:** Yes, indeed, and stuff it up. It is all political. Let us look at the hospital. The government went to the election saying, 'This hospital is going to cost \$1.7 billion,' and yet it knew all along, and it had actually approved in cabinet \$1.8 billion, but it was not honest enough with the people of South Australia to tell them that before the election.

Furthermore, let us look at what you get for your money, because that is what it keeps doing. Rather than saying, 'It has blown out,' it keeps down-scoping what it is going to do. I will just go back to the Adelaide Oval for a moment. At the SMA briefing the other day, it admitted that it cannot give us the final figure, even though \$535 million is the final figure for what it is going to spend, so it admitted that. It cannot tell you whether what it is proposing is going to cost \$535 million, and if it cannot build that it will have to down-scope it.

Similarly with the hospital. Remember the hospital? It was going to be 800 beds. Now it is sort of 800 something. There are some chairs in there, some recliner rockers and things. It was going to be all single rooms. Now there are some single rooms. They were all going to have ensuite facilities, and now there will be some ensuite facilities. They were going to have opening windows, and now we are not having open windows. They were going to have a railway station underneath but we are not going to have a railway station underneath.

By the way, what is a hospital without an outpatients department, because now they want the doctors to do their outpatients service at their private rooms? They have not twigged to the fact that most of these guys do their public hospital work almost as a goodwill gesture and as a training and teaching mechanism. The only appropriate place to do that is at the hospital, not taking up the time in their private rooms where they earn the money that enables them to do that work.

Government members have not quite cottoned to that because they have never actually had to be out in the real world earning their own living, putting their own houses on the line and taking the chances that people in the real world have to do day in and day out. Not only is the hospital a disgrace but the government also is a disgrace.

I close by reminding the assembled multitude that, under the government's own Mid-Year Budget Review, the 2010-11 budget deficits are on all three accounting measures. In 2010-11 we will have a cash deficit of \$1,879 million (\$1.879 billion) of the net lending, a cash deficit of \$1.64 billion, and a net operating deficit of \$493 million. They are our three figures for this year.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (12:36):** I will cover a range of issues in addressing the Supply Bill. They are not necessarily in order of importance but they are all important. The first point I would make as a general comment is that the government is not selling its message. It has done, and is doing, some very good things but it is not getting that message across. Likewise, I think the opposition is not selling its message in terms of putting forward alternatives. I guess it would argue that it is too far out from the election, but I think it is dangerous to leave things to chance and hope that the government will fall out of office.

The government recently allocated money for putting lights in Happy Valley Drive in my electorate—something I have been seeking for more than 15 years, I believe, so I am delighted with that. I have written to the minister (Hon. Tom Kenyon) to thank him for that, and I am sure the previous ministers for road safety had a hand in it as well. The electorate is very pleased with that initiative.

One of the matters of great concern to me, and it is a very significant budget item, is our police force (SAPOL). I acknowledge that our police force, in terms of the vast majority of its personnel, is a very fine one, but I think it is time that there was an independent review of the police force in South Australia in terms of how it is structured, how staff are allocated and a whole range of related matters. The government says it does not interfere in operational matters, and that is true, but it does have ultimate responsibility for the way in which the police force operates and, despite the fact that we are told we have more police than ever, I see little evidence of them out in the field.

I think it is time that we had a look at all the operations of the police force, and that should be done by an independent review, probably a judicial review. We had some instances recently, and someone used the expression 'the wheels are falling off the police cart'. That might be a bit strong, but we have had concerns about response to issues and police being called out. I think it would be in the interests of the community, in particular, and even the police force itself, to have an independent review to ensure that the way it is operating is in the best interests of the community, that it is run in the most efficient way and staff are being allocated in areas of priority.

People come to me, as I am sure they do other members at times, about various issues within the police force, and when you have thousands of employees you will always have some people who experience or allege bullying and other things. However, I think the issue is bigger than that. It is more about the structure, management practices and allocation of staff within the police force.

I am pleased the government is reviewing the Anti-Corruption Branch as it sits within the total anti-corruption structure. I think it is long overdue for reform and, hopefully, will be part of the new proposal announced by the Attorney. The Police Complaints Authority is not part of the police force but, likewise, it needs an overhaul. I do not believe it is doing its job. In fact, in many ways, I think it has become a non-performing entity. They tell me they are too busy to undertake a lot of inquiries and they are very selective in what they do inquire into, so I think it needs to be part of the overall review, as well.

Last week I visited the Riverland and went into New South Wales and Victoria, but I can assure the member for Chaffey that I do not have any designs on his seat. I meet with business people, irrigators and anyone and everyone I can talk to or who is prepared to talk to me. There is an unfortunate thing happening in this area—and hopefully the Tourism Commission will pick up on this. As we know, South Australia has fantastic regional areas for people to visit as tourists, and yet what are often local excellent destinations are ignored by people in Adelaide.

Part of the problem in the Riverland is the suggestion that the area might be under water. Fortunately, the river is carrying a lot of water and the lagoons and backwaters have plenty in them, but I can assure members that towns like Renmark, Loxton, Barmera, Berri and Lyrup are not actually under water. They are fantastic places in terms of tourism and people should make the effort to get up there. I hope we see a change in what is often conveyed as a high flood level when, really, what should be conveyed is that the river level is high. There is no danger to people in terms of camping and holidaying in areas like the Riverland.

When I was in the Riverland I met the people running a federal mobile information system, a giant pantechicon with about nine public servants who travel with this unit visiting country areas. They have just been to Western Australia and they are now in South Australia and they also went to Victoria for the floods. They provide information to rural people about a whole range of issues, and I commend the federal government for that, because I think it is a good service. However, after

talking to the team leader I think that service could contain preventive health messages as well, focusing on the usual villains like ovarian cancer, prostate cancer, breast cancer, melanoma and all those sorts of issues.

As we know, country people tend to suffer more as a result of inadequate health information and inadequate health services. I would like to see our Minister for Health (the Hon. John Hill) take this issue up with his federal counterpart and also the federal Minister for Human Services, because I think it is too good a facility not to fully utilise in terms of getting a message out to country people about health information. There is a bigger but related issue which we need to address, and that is that people in country areas often have to wait to get medical treatment.

Even in places like Murray Bridge it is not always possible for someone to see a GP in a short space of time. That suggests that the state, in conjunction with the federal government, needs to be supporting more scholarships and getting more young people trained to be doctors in rural areas. Of course, they need to get their clinical practice before they embark on any solo activity in a country area, but I think it is incredible that in this day and age people in country areas—not just the Riverland—do not have ready access to medical facilities in the way they should. That needs to be addressed, and I make that plea again to the Minister for Health.

As we know, the management of water has received a lot of attention lately regarding the eastern and western side of the Mount Lofty Ranges, and a lot of people have been making noise—some of it not all that rational. In that area, as with other areas of the state, water availability has to be managed, and one has to know how much is being extracted and used, otherwise the poor farmer or whoever is downstream is going to find that their water supply is cut off. I make a plea to the minister in charge that there not be a knee-jerk reaction because some noisy people make a carry-on about water management.

Water management is critical; water is money in our community. Other parts of the state seem to have been able to cope with a water management regime. I think it is critical, in the Mount Lofty Ranges especially, which supplies water not only for farms but also for domestic use as well, that it be properly and appropriately managed, and that means that the NRM boards have to come up with sensible and reasonable management strategies. However, it should not be decided simply by a few people making a lot of noise; it should be done on a more rational, long-term planning basis.

Another issue I have paid some attention to is that the government needs to allow more shopping in the metropolitan area on a Sunday morning. Someone responded to me on talkback and said, 'There are plenty of small supermarkets around.' There are not in my area. In Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley, there are no small supermarkets; they have only the big operators—Foodland, Coles and Woolworths. At O'Halloran Hill, on the edge of my electorate, there is a small one run by a Chinese family, but it does not really offer the range most people would want.

A lot of people focus on food and say, 'Well, why don't they get their food the day before?' It is not just about food; supermarkets carry a whole lot of items. In my electorate, I have people queuing up at 11 o'clock on a Sunday morning to get into the supermarket. There is no reason, as in Victor Harbor and other country areas, why the supermarkets should not be able to open up, on a voluntary basis, on a Sunday morning at 9am.

In due course, I will be introducing a bill that will protect the public holiday rights of shop assistants. I hope that the government would not go down the path of trying to deny people the basic opportunity to buy food and other things for birthday parties, etc., on a Sunday morning. Many people want to go to church or have a family picnic, and they should be able to buy things on a Sunday morning. As I have said, it is up to the supermarkets whether it is viable to open, and they can employ additional shop assistants. We do not want shop assistants being required to work extended hours, but there are plenty of young people who would happily work an extra couple of hours on a Sunday morning.

The GST issue has reared its ugly head. There is a review underway (members would be aware of that), but I think that could be costly for South Australia not only because we have, in essence, a bigger share than states such as New South Wales and Victoria get per capita. I think we are going to be clipped around the ears because the government here will be accused of not undertaking reform in a lot of areas, and I have just mentioned one—shopping hours. That will be one that I think will come back to bite this government because there will be an argument that the government has not reformed enough in that area; it has made some progress but not enough.

The other one that will sting this government is lack of reform in local government in the metropolitan area. You can talk to whomever you like in the other states—and I have just been interstate on this very issue—when they look at Adelaide and say, 'You have 19 councils in Adelaide?', they basically throw up their hands. So, I am telling the government: do not be surprised if, as a result of this review, South Australia does not get a whack around the ears financially in relation to GST funding because it has not reformed local government—and the government has not shown any interest whatsoever in reforming it. People within local government in the metropolitan area tell me that there is no interest in reforming it because they do not want to upset their own little patch. So, you will not get any reform in that area. However, when the GST allocation is cut, the government here might take this issue very seriously.

The other thing with the GST review is that I believe local government should get a share of a growth tax. Local government in this state, as in other states, is starved of money to do what it needs to do—that is, building bridges and repairing roads. Whenever I have raised this at the state or federal level, I have always had a knock-back, saying, 'We don't want to give councils any access to a growth tax.' Well, I think it shows hypocrisy and a double standard when governments say, 'We regard local government as an important tier of government,' when they are not prepared to adequately fund it or allow it to be funded adequately. Councils cannot run themselves and carry out their functions based on a property tax and parking fees. It is ridiculous, it is a nonsense and it is time that that issue was addressed, as well as simply how much money a state gets back from the GST formula.

In terms of public transport, I think this government has done a lot of good things. I do not think it has sold its message very well, though. I would like to—and I have been saying this for years, it is not new—extend the tram line even further out to Prospect, via North Adelaide, out to the eastern suburbs. The electrification of the railway is fantastic. Once again, the government is not selling that message. It is temporarily inconvenient to people who are in the south and north, but, in the long run, it is a fantastic initiative and one that I have been talking about in here, I think, for nearly 20 years.

A big area of government expenditure is the courts system, which, I think, needs a major overhaul. Basically, what we have got is a system run by lawyers for lawyers. It has been captured by lawyers in the same way as the medical system has been captured by medicos. Our hospitals are essentially run for the benefit of the specialists and other medicos who work in them, and the courts system is run for the benefit of lawyers and by lawyers, not for the public.

I think it is time that the public had more say, not in determining the outcome of a case but in the way in which the courts system is structured. There are many deficiencies, inadequacies and inefficiencies in the way the courts system operates, and I think it is time that there was a complete review of that, with input from people outside the lawyers' circle. That is no disrespect to lawyers, but, I think, the courts system belongs to the people, it does not belong to the professionals who work in it.

With regard to law and order, I do not know about other members, but I am sick of hearing about night-time robberies, break-ins and so on, often, but not exclusively, in the northern suburbs. Now, you cannot blame the police for that, but obviously there is a significant social problem underlying that. You have to ask the question: why it is that, nearly every night, we are getting people robbing service stations and breaking into houses? It is just an endless cycle of that type of crime.

I assume much of it is drug related. We need to front up and deal with these issues sensibly and appropriately. People who cannot behave themselves, I think, should be locked up. I do not support the conventional prison for most of those sorts of people. I would put them in a work camp which would be run at a much lower cost than the conventional iron bars approach. As a community, we should have virtually no crime in South Australia and in Adelaide, but after every night, on the following day, you hear of service station robberies and related crime occurring too frequently in our society.

I am not naive enough to believe that just improving literacy and numeracy will solve it, but I think we need to have a more concerted approach in terms of tackling some of the causal factors that lead to people becoming criminals. I do not believe it is inevitable. I do not think people are born with a criminal genetic make up. We create a society, or allow it to exist, in a way which creates people who end up being criminal in their behaviour. So, we need to address that. We do not seem to have made enough progress in terms of tackling the core issues of ensuring that people can have a meaningful and constructive life without having to resort to crime.

There is a huge problem in the Indigenous community and I have been saying it for many years. You have urban Aboriginal people who know nothing about their culture, which is a fantastic one based upon their traditional values. I do not know the figures, but I suspect that many of those people offending at night are probably some of those young Aboriginal lads. Talking to some of the senior people in the community, they despair at what is happening because these young Aboriginal people are on the road to nowhere.

Yet, when I look around in places like Murray Bridge and elsewhere, many of the young Aboriginal children—it is not only Aboriginal children, but it is particularly apparent there—do not even attend school. How do I know? Some of my family are closely involved with Aboriginal children. They foster them, they wanted to adopt them, but you are not allowed to in South Australia. So I know firsthand what goes on, and we have many of these young Aboriginal people in particular on the road to nowhere. We need some innovative approaches to ensuring that we do not just keep having more and more people in prison because that, in the end, is not the real answer.

In the short time left, I will say that I was in Queensland recently. There is a big debate going on up there about who should run parliament in terms of the resources and the funding. There is a big argument about whether the government or the parliament should run it. I believe we should have independent financing and management in the parliament, and I think the parliament should actually run the electorate office allocations as well, as it does in Victoria.

We need an annexe here. Despite what some people say, we need a proper annexe where staff can work in decent conditions to serve the people of this state. I know that money is tight at the moment, but we need to address that issue and not continue being apologetic for having second-rate facilities here for our staff in particular and for a parliament that should serve the people of South Australia.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:56):** As I understand it, the Supply Bill provides for some \$3.32 billion to be expended prior to the required appropriations being in place. I wish to start with some preliminary comments that are quite general in nature and, I suppose, give my perspective on what I understand the role of government is.

We come to this place, and those who sit to the right-hand side of you, Madam Deputy Speaker, have a responsibility for the receipt and expenditure of some \$15.5 billion. That in itself involves some enormous challenges to get the priorities right, but there is an expectation across the wider South Australian public of 1.6 million people that that money will be spent in the areas where the greatest need exists and, indeed, for an investment in the future capacity of our state to grow, too.

I have great concerns about the fact that we do not appear to have in place a climate that provides an opportunity for effort to be rewarded, and that is my great frustration. South Australia has a predominantly small business based economy. With over 130,000 small-business operators, we have thousands and thousands of people out there who work long hours each day devoted to what they do, trying to provide the absolute best quality of service they can to their customer or to the person they are working for, and they expect governments to put in place an environment that allows reward for that effort to flow through financially to them.

That is my great concern because, when you look at the issues surrounding the cost of operating business and the regulation that surrounds business, it creates an enormous level of impost and, in many cases, a complete disincentive for some people to actually get out there and extend themselves, to grow the business, to give job opportunities to younger persons (and, indeed, older persons) who have the skills, and to grow our economy as it flows through.

It worries me. It worries the people I talk to. It worries the people who sit on this side of the chamber. It must worry the members of the government whose constituents come to them and talk to them about issues that they have problems with. They must shake their head in disbelief sometimes, because I know I do when I am told of instances where I think, 'This is wrong, this is the wrong principle, it's the wrong policy, it's the wrong mindset,' and, indeed, what is our challenge to get it right?

There would be those who argue that the Supply Bill is a rather useless debate. It is an opportunity for politics to come into the argument, for it to be recorded in history, for the facts to be altered, but it really is a great opportunity for members from both sides of the chamber to talk about things that are important to them, things they believe should be a principal policy for the

government in future years going forward, areas that they are concerned about and areas where they acknowledge that a right decision has been made. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### **TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **TERRORISM (SURFACE TRANSPORT SECURITY) BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **FORESTRYSA**

**Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier):** Presented a petition signed by 171 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action and stop the forward sale of harvesting rights of ForestrySA plantations.

#### **WESTERN MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WATER ALLOCATION PLAN**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** Presented a petition signed by 95 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the Minister for Environment and Conservation not to approve or attempt to implement a new water allocation plan for the Western Mount Lofty Ranges until detailed social and economic analysis is undertaken and the recommendations of PIRSA and industry bodies are properly considered.

#### **ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

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

#### **SAND CARTING**

**4 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). For each year since 2002—

1. What is the total tonnage of sand carted to and from South Australian metropolitan beaches by the Department of Transport and local councils, and in each instance, how much sand was carted, where was the sand transferred to and from, who was the carter and what were the associated costs?

2. How much dredged sand was used by the Department and local councils to replenish these beaches and what were the associated costs?

3. How much land based sand was transported by the Department and local councils to replenish these beaches and what were the associated costs?

4. What was the Department's annual recurrent budget and expenditure to undertake sand-bypassing at the Glenelg and West Beach harbours?

5. What were the details and associated costs of each sand management project undertaken by the Department?

6. What was the actual or estimated cost of periodic sand carting from the harbour to the dunes at West Beach and the removal of sand from the northern end of Glenelg beach to south of the channel breakwater, respectively?

7. What was Transport SA's annual recurrent budget to maintain the harbours at Glenelg and West Beach in a safe navigable condition; and undertake sandbypassing works (to maintain longshore drift) at these sites?

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

1. A total of 1,725,179 cubic metres of sand has been moved since the 2001-02 financial year at a total cost of \$10,301,907.

The specific volumes, locations of sand sourced and deposited from the financial year 2001-02 to the most recent financial year are detailed in Table 1.

Table 1:

m3 Compacted	Sand Source	Sand Destination	Financial Year	Cost
40,000	Glenelg	Seacliff	2001-02	\$300,000
22,500	Torrens outlet	Henley Beach Sth	2001-02	\$38,128
21,734	West Lake Shore (E. House)	Tennyson	2001-02	\$20,000
20,364	Glenelg	Brighton	2003-04	\$158,839
23,220	Glenelg	Seacliff	2003-04	\$202,640
30,000	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Pk	2003-04	\$90,000
15,000	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Pk	2003-04	\$90,000
120,000	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Sth	2003-04	\$330,000
15,387	Glenelg	Brighton	2004-05	\$153,130
11,548	Glenelg	Seacliff	2004-05	\$121,055
1,455	Glenelg	Nth Glenelg	2004-05	\$13,593
7,500	Glenelg	Brighton	2004-05	No Cost To Board
18,750	Glenelg	Nth Glenelg	2004-05	No Cost To Board
21,930	Torrens outlet	West Beach Trust	2004-05	\$116,960
14,273	Torrens outlet	Brighton	2004-05	\$170,815
12,277	Torrens outlet	Seacliff	2004-05	\$154,304
12,075	Torrens outlet	Nth Glenelg	2004-05	\$108,335
12,588	Torrens outlet	West Beach Trust	2004-05	\$70,726
7,497	Torrens outlet	Henley Beach Sth	2004-05	\$29,988
38,460	Glenelg	Brighton	2005-06	\$377,000
30,000	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	Nth Glenelg	2005-06	\$180,000
6,150	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2005-06	\$23,500
15,380	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2005-06	\$54,100
25,000	Torrens outlet	Henley Beach Sth	2005-06	\$137,800
23,000	Torrens outlet	Brighton	2005-06	\$341,000
20,130	Torrens outlet	West Beach Trust	2005-06	\$90,500
40,000	Semaphore Sth	Semaphore Pk	2005-06	\$218,000
12,220	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Sth	2005-06	\$53,700
40,000	Glenelg	Brighton	2006-07	\$418,951
5,826	Glenelg	Brighton	2006-07	\$84,148
28,935	Glenelg	Brighton	2006-07	\$465,950
30,000	West Beach	Nth Glenelg	2006-07	\$90,585
13,480	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2006-07	\$43,092
34,620	West Beach	West Bch Trust	2006-07	\$110,260
25,000	Torrens outlet	Henley Beach Sth	2006-07	\$141,555
30,000	Torrens outlet	West Beach Trust	2006-07	\$120,000
10,000	West Lake Shore (E. House)	Tennyson	2006-07	\$36,802
3,850	West Lake Shore (E. House)	Tennyson	2006-07	\$12,320
30,770	Pt Malcolm	Semaphore Pk	2006-07	\$93,233
10,000	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Sth	2006-07	\$37,000
7,805	Brighton	Brighton SLSC	2007-08	\$35,220
14,506	Glenelg	Seacliff	2007-08	\$137,808
10,181	Glenelg	Brighton	2007-08	\$93,669
7,805	Glenelg	Brighton	2007-08	\$89,757
3,046	Glenelg	Brighton	2007-08	\$35,029
46,645	Glenelg	Brighton	2007-08	\$500,766
17,080	Glenelg	Seacliff	2007-08	\$212,646
6,457	Glenelg	Seacliff	2007-08	\$84,587
3,100	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2007-08	\$12,990
91,806	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2007-08	\$367,224
40,036	Torrens outlet	Henley Beach Sth	2007-08	\$152,137
16,000	Glenelg	Brighton	2008-09	\$172,886
27,400	Glenelg	Seacliff	2008-09	\$341,130
24,600	Glenelg	Kingston Park	2008-09	\$322,102
3,619	Glenelg	Brighton Jetty	2008-09	\$39,085

m3 Compacted	Sand Source	Sand Destination	Financial Year	Cost
15,183	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2008-09	\$60,732
47,915	West Beach	Nth Glenelg	2008-09	\$206,034
11,053	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2008-09	\$44,212
127,094	Torrens outlet	West Beach Trust	2008-09	\$610,051
41,175	Torrens outlet	Henley Beach Sth	2008-09	\$156,465
4,956	West Lake Shore (E. House)	Tennyson	2008-09	\$16,850
16,129	West Lake Shore (E. House)	Tennyson	2008-09	\$54,838
39,958	Pt Malcolm	Semaphore Pk	2008-09	\$135,857
5,000	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Sth	2008-09	\$20,000
47,133	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Pk	2008-09	\$160,252
8,635	Glenelg	Brighton Jetty	2009-10	\$93,258
10,230	Glenelg	Brighton	2009-10	\$110,484
9,527	Glenelg	Seacliff	2009-10	\$118,611
12,162	Glenelg	Kingston Park	2009-10	\$159,322
29,935	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	Nth Glenelg	2009-10	\$128,720
16,954	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	Nth Glenelg	2009-10	\$72,902
36,012	Torrens outlet	West Beach Trust	2009-10	\$172,857
5,054	West Lake Shore (E. House)	Tennyson	2009-10	\$17,183
20,069	Semaphore Jetty	Semaphore Pk	2009-10	\$68,234
1,725,179	Total cubic metres			\$10,301,907

Since 1973, trucking contractors have carted sand on behalf of the Coast Protection Board (administered through the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)) and not the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) or local councils. Sand carting is generally undertaken by either PD Excavations Pty Ltd or AR Contracting Services Pty Ltd.

2. Sand dredged for harbour maintenance does not directly contribute to beach replenishment as it has been deposited offshore, but the sand does move onshore. The rate at which sand moves onshore is being evaluated by a DENR survey group.

In 2007, a small amount of dredged sand was placed onshore to monitor seagrass particulate plumes (not for beach replenishment). Sand, regardless of if it is on or offshore, contributes to protection by attenuating wave energy.

3. Sand introduced to the metropolitan beach system from land based (external) sources has come from Mount Compass (28,292 cubic metres), the former Magic Mountain site, Glenelg (26,250 cubic metres) and Price, Yorke Peninsula (6,367 cubic metres) at a cost of \$1,271,865.

4. Annual recurrent budget and expenditure for sand-bypassing at Glenelg and West Beach harbours is contained in Table 2.

Table 2:

Actual	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Glenelg	\$1,300,000	\$800,000	\$409,000	\$835,000	\$392,000
West Beach	\$1,700,000	\$500,000	\$603,000	\$680,000	\$394,000
Budget	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10
Glenelg	\$1,500,000	\$800,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$700,000
West Beach	\$900,000	\$500,000	\$600,000	\$600,000	\$700,000

5. Sand management projects since 2002 include:

- Sand carting—this has been the predominant method of beach replenishment for the last 30 years—refer figures provided in Table 1.
- Introducing coarser sand to the beach system at a cost of \$1,271,865. Coarser sand is more stable and less susceptible to littoral drift and storms.



- Sand bypassing (dredging) and harbour management—DENR has taken over this responsibility, which was previously carried out by DTEI. In addition, harbour management is now integrated into the beach management strategy. The cost is listed in Table 2.
- Sand pumping trial—trials were conducted in 2006—2007 to test the success of various sand collection and pumping devices—the budget and actual spending for this was \$1.6 million.

6. Figures for sand carting from south of the West Beach harbour to north of the harbour and from south of the Glenelg breakwater to Glenelg North are shown in Table 3 below. Sand is not carted from Glenelg North to south of the breakwater.

Table 3:

m3 Compacted	Sand Source	Sand Destination	Financial Year	Cost
1,455	Glenelg	Nth Glenelg	2004-05	\$13,593
6,150	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2005-06	\$23,500
15,380	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2005-06	\$54,100
13,480	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2006-07	\$43,092
34,620	West Beach	West Bch Trust	2006-07	\$110,260
3,100	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2007-08	\$12,990
91,806	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2007-08	\$367,224
15,183	West Beach (Adel. Sh)	West Bch Trust	2008-09	\$60,732

7. As per the response to question 4, DTEI no longer maintains the harbours at Glenelg and West Beach but the budget was approximately \$1.9 million per annum. DENR's annual recurrent budget to maintain these harbours is \$1.3 million as a result of integrating harbour maintenance with beach management, including realignment of the navigation channel, thus reducing the volume of sand entering the harbours.

#### SA WATER OPERATIONAL AND SERVICE CONTRACTS

**202 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (15 March 2011). With respect to the Report of the Auditor-General 2009-10, page 1449—Operational and Service Contracts—What payments were made by SA Water to entities external to the SA Government and in each case, what was the name of the entity and what services were provided?

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

As outlined in the report of the Auditor-General 2009-10, page 1449, the Operational and Service Contracts spend in 2009-10 totalled \$131.3 million. This included costs incurred by SA Water from a number of contracts as follows:

- The agreement between United Water International and SA Water is for the management, operation and maintenance of Adelaide's metropolitan water and wastewater systems.
- Hewlett Packard contracts related to Server Management, Database Management, Storage Area Network Management, Hardware Maintenance and maintenance of the customer billing system.
- Operators of water/wastewater treatment plants in regional areas including the Victor Harbor Wastewater Treatment Plant, the ten Water Treatment plants under the Water Treatment and Economic Development Agreement and the water treatment plants near nominated townships along the River Murray under the Country Water Quality Improvement Project.
- Delivery of external projects on behalf of other State Government Agencies such as the Lake Albert pumping program, Barrage Environmental Impact Statement, South Coorong Lagoon Pumping program as well as the provision of water and wastewater services to remote communities. All of these costs are fully recoverable.
- Other major contract services relate to over 900 individual contracts which include:
  - Land management and preventative maintenance primarily for fire prevention and the maintenance of critical flood warning stations.

- Regional and metropolitan facilities management contract and regional security contract. The security contracts are for the provision of security services, primarily guards and patrols, for key SA Water sites.
  - Regional Operations utilised 701 suppliers which required specialist skills or expertise on activities such as wastewater treatment sludge removal and chemical sewer cleaning. Suppliers were also used across Regional Operations to provide services such as earth moving and excavation services for use in restoring infrastructure failures, large scale weed spraying services and fencing services for land management works.
  - Contract services to support SA Water applications and systems including customer systems, financial systems, works management systems, payroll systems, mail management systems, as well as undertaking an information services strategic review.
  - Customer Services related activities including billing and collection of monies from SA Water customers, reading meters, bill printing expenses, credit management, Dial before You Dig, payments to individual plumbers for their claims and call centre overflow and customer surveys.
- Further information on contracts exceeding \$0.5 million may be found at the following government web site:

<https://www.tenders.sa.gov.au/tenders/contract/list.do?action=contract-view>

#### DEFENCE SA

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (7 October 2010).

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Motor Sport, Minister Assisting the Premier with the Olympic Dam Expansion Project):** I understand that the proposed budget savings will be achieved through greater cost recovery from industry participants at major defence trade events coupled with a reduction in sponsorship, Defence State marketing and promotion activities. Individual measures will be determined as part of Defence SA's ongoing business planning processes.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND COMMUNITY EDUCATION

In reply to **Mr PENGILLY (Finniss)** (6 May 2010).

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** Above entitlement leadership funding has been provided in the past to multi or dual campus schools. This extra funding was provided as an additional supplementation payment to their normal school entitlement. Following the introduction of the new Student Centred Funding Model, this extra funding will not be provided to these schools from the commencement of the 2011 school year.

The new Student Centred Funding Model (SCFM) will provide Kangaroo Island Community Education with more income in 2011 compared with what it would have received had the previous funding model been retained in 2011.

#### EDUCATION WORKS

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (10 November 2010).

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** As reported in the Auditor-General's report, \$3.3 million relates to project management expenditure by the Department of Education and Children's Services for the year on the Education Works project which includes the New Schools PPP project. As outlined in the Auditor-General's report, this comprised \$794,000 for consultants and other government agency assistance, and \$2.5 million relating to departmental project management and administration

The \$3.3 million relates to three components of the Education Works project. That is, the Stage 1 costs directly attributable to the construction of the New Schools under the Private Public Partnership arrangement, Stage 1 costs attributable to the transition from the closing schools into

the new schools, and Stage 2 costs relating to the second tranche of Education Works school projects.

The New Schools PPP project directly accounted for \$1.226 million of the costs. Transition costs accounted for \$0.481 million of the costs. Stage 2 costs accounted for the remaining \$1.57 million.

For the New Schools PPP project, \$780,000 related to consultancies, legal and probity costs including non-government providers, \$253,000 related to salaries, with the remaining \$193,000 as other project costs.

Transition costs to the new schools included \$301,000 for salaries and other costs of \$180,000. Included in other project costs was \$110,000 relating to training and development for staff.

The remaining \$1.57 million relating to Stage 2 was made up of \$14,000 in consultancies, \$1.041 million in salaries, and \$515,000 in other project costs.

Summary of costs:

	PPP costs (000's)	New Schools costs (000's)	Stage 2 costs (000's)	(000's)
Consultancies and legal and probity costs	\$0.780 m		\$0.014 m	\$0.794 m
Salaries	\$0.253 m	\$0.301 m	\$1.041 m	\$1.595 m
Other	\$0.193 m	\$0.180 m	\$0.515 m	\$0.888 m
Total	\$1.226 m	\$0.481 m	\$1.570 m	\$3.277 m

### EDUCATION WORKS

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (10 November 2010).

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** As reported in the Auditor-General's report, the \$794,000.00 relates to consultancies and other non-government providers for Education Works projects, not merely the New Schools PPP project.

Of the \$794,000 cost in 2009-10:

Amount	Details
\$13,856.00	Education Works stage 2, school amalgamations
\$308,738.53	Aurecon (previously called Connell Wagner Pty Ltd) (see note below)
\$376,012.53	Corrs Chambers Westgarth
\$34,339.68	Reimbursement to the Department of Treasury and Finance for probity costs from Pitcher Partners in Victoria
\$61,068.88	Crown Solicitor's Office, legal costs

Aurecon, as the lead consultant, included project management costs and fees from Walter Brooke as the architectural consultant, Rider Levett Bucknall as the cost consultant, and KPMG as the financial consultant.

### EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (10 November 2010).

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy):** I would like to clarify for the Member for Unley that the number of (non-executive) employees remunerated between \$150,000 and \$400,000, as reported in the Auditor-General's report, increased from 57 in 2008-09 to 99 in 2009-10. The number of executives within these remuneration bands increased from 23 executives in 2008-09 to 26 executives in 2009-10. These employees comprise school based, regional and central office personnel.

The remuneration includes salary, employer's superannuation costs, use of motor vehicle in accordance with prescribed conditions and associated fringe benefits tax.

The major cause of the increase in numbers was a rise in salary rates during 2009-10 by 4.0 per cent for Education Act employees, 2.5 per cent plus a \$600 flat one-off payment for Public Sector Act employees, and 2.5 per cent for executives due to enterprise bargaining agreements.

In addition, employees who received an amount under the TVSP scheme and/or retired and received in excess of \$150,000 due to the payment of leave entitlements also contributed to the increase.

### OLYMPIC DAM

**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) (14:05):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Last Wednesday 30 March I met with BHP Billiton CEO Marius Kloppers and Uranium President Dean Dalla Valle, with the Minister Assisting the Premier with the Olympic Dam Expansion Project. Mr Kloppers advised us that BHP Billiton was announcing on that day that the Olympic Dam project would be progressed from pre-feasibility phase to feasibility phase. This is a step that will increase the company's already significant activity on the project. It highlights the importance of the project to BHP Billiton and their confidence in its future.

The decision by the company comes ahead of the release of the supplementary environmental impact statement for the Olympic Dam project, which will occur in the near future. Once the supplementary environmental impact statement is released, the formal assessment of the project by the commonwealth, South Australian and Northern Territory governments can begin. The government is also negotiating on the indenture agreement for the project with the company. Subject to these negotiations and the project meeting all regulatory requirements, I expect that the board of BHP Billiton will be in a position to give the go-ahead for this project by the end of the first quarter of next year.

This is a very exciting step in the development of the most important economic development project South Australia has ever seen in its entire history. It is already a giant, producing 180,000 tonnes of copper each year, but the expansion will see that increase to 750,000 tonnes per year when the expanded mine is fully operational—from 180,000 tonnes to 750,000 tonnes.

Independent economic analysis of the project's impact on South Australia's economy estimates it will add more than \$45 billion to the gross state product of South Australia over the life of the mine. The company has stated that the project, if approved, will generate significant new employment opportunities for South Australia in terms of direct employment, construction jobs and additional flow-on employment across the state, and will see BHP Billiton invest heavily in South Australian businesses and services, especially in the Upper Spencer Gulf region of Whyalla and Port Augusta. This is a project which stands to benefit South Australia and South Australians for decades and generations to come.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Rules made under the following Acts—

District Court—Civil Rules—Amendment 16

Supreme Court—Civil Rules—Amendment 15

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

Regulations made under the following Act—

Railways (Operations and Access)—Evidentiary Provisions

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

Chiropractic and Osteopathy Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Regulations made under the following Act—

## Tobacco Products Regulation—Further Variation

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

Department for Families and Communities—Addendum—Annual Report 2009-10  
Regulations made under the following Acts—

Liquor Licensing—

Dry Areas Long Term—Normanville

Dry Areas Short Term—Tumby Bay

By the Minister for Mineral Resources Development (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Rules made under the following Acts—

Gaming Machines—

Advertising Code of Practice—Notice No. 1

Responsible Gambling Code of Practice—Notice No. 2

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

By-laws made under the following Act—

Flinders University of South Australia—

No. 1—Definitions

No. 10 and 11—Vehicles, Traffic and Parking

No. 25—Defences and Exemptions

### FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES REPORT

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:09):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Last sitting week I was accused by the member for Bragg of somehow seeking to hide the details in an addendum to the 2009-10 annual report for the Department for Families and Communities. I wish to advise the house that the report and the addendum were lodged with the cabinet office for tabling in parliament on 11 November 2010. At that time I understood that the addendum was tabled with the annual report on 11 November; however, that was not the case.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Further investigations with the cabinet office and the procedures office in Parliament House have confirmed that the addendum was not specifically tabled in both houses of parliament, although my office approved the tabling of both documents. It appears that an administrative error occurred—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —after the report and addendum had left my office. There was no intention to hide information contained in the addendum. Quite the contrary. It was published on the department's website on 11 November, the day the report was tabled in parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** That's right; I hid it on the World Wide Web—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —and how many months did it take you to find it?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Well it worked then, didn't it? It took you a long time to find it. The Public Sector Act 2009 requires that annual reports be submitted to the relevant minister within three months after the end of a financial year; that is, by 30 September. The minister then has 12 sitting days to table the report. An addendum was drafted and received by my office on 9 November 2010—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —to replace page 34 of the annual report, which contained Families SA notification data for 2009-10 that was unavailable as at 30 September 2010. The addendum was necessary only because data was not available at the time the annual report was assembled.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### **DEEPAK FERTILISERS AND PETROCHEMICALS CORPORATION LIMITED**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:12):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Since coming to office this government has had a strong focus on growing the state's economic prosperity by increasing employment and investment in South Australia. As a government, we are prepared to give consideration to reasonable proposals from potential investors based on their merit and assessed in the public interest.

Last Monday, cabinet approved the conditional leasing of a parcel of land at Port Bonython to a company, Deepak Fertilisers and Petrochemicals Corporation Limited—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —to undertake a three-year feasibility study into the construction of a technical ammonium nitrate manufacturing plant. I am advised that several locations were considered as part of this initial process, and Port Bonython was the only location to meet all the necessary requirements.

This proposal would inject \$350 million worth of capital investment and create between 350 and 400 jobs during the construction stage, with a further 80 to 100 full-time jobs in the running of the plant.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** However—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left will be quiet; I am trying to listen to this.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** However, I must emphasise that Deepak has been granted approval to undertake a feasibility study. This is not a final approval but the first step of the process. The company must, over the next three years, prove that it can meet the strictest conditions. These conditions include:

- a safety buffer zone as required by SafeWork SA;
- a plant design which minimises land requirements and environmental impact;
- acquiring all necessary statutory and regulatory approvals;

- completing the appropriate financial appraisals and arrangements; and
- last, and arguably the most important, there must be full community consultation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Community consultation and cooperation will be a vital part of this process. Deepak officials must engage meaningfully with the local community throughout the detailed investigation phase. Additionally, the state government will engage in community consultation, and I have already offered a full briefing to the Whyalla council at its convenience.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** This is the beginning of a conversation. I want to have a sensible discussion about the future of Whyalla and the diversification of industries.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As a community we need to seriously consider the extent to which mining industries establish themselves in Whyalla to take advantage of the increased mining activity. I think that diversified long-term jobs in Whyalla will be the lifeblood of the town. I want to make sure that there is adequate protection to the environment, to the cuttlefish and to the surrounding areas, and I want to hear all concerns.

Madam Speaker, I am well aware of your concerns as the local member. Rest assured, you and the good people of Whyalla will be provided with regular updates throughout the feasibility study phase. This opportunity, as I am sure you understand Madam Speaker, is an emotive one but one that I think needs a full and frank discussion.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** There is now a significant opportunity for the town of Whyalla to become the hub and the focal point for our rapidly expanding mining industry. I look forward to discussing the proposal with the Whyalla community to ensure the best outcome is delivered for the town.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:18):** I bring up the 398<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Upgrade of the Commercial Road as Part of the Greater Edinburgh Parks Transport Improvement Program (Stage 1).

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mrs VLAHOS:** I bring up the 399<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Happy Valley Water Treatment Plant Chlorination Facility Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mrs VLAHOS:** I bring up the 400<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Wallara Early Years to Year 7 (New Morphett Vale Primary School Redevelopment).

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Mrs VLAHOS:** I bring up the 401<sup>st</sup> report of the committee, entitled East Grand Trunkway Gillman—Industrial Estate.

Report received and ordered to be published.

## QUESTION TIME

### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL GYNAECOLOGY DEPARTMENT

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** My question is to the Minister for Health.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs REDMOND:** Why is the government closing the gynaecology department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and why have staff been threatened with the sack if they disclose the government's plans?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:20):** I thank the member for her question. I am not aware of any such matter. I will happily get some information for her and give a report to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Little Para.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### PLAN FOR ACCELERATED EXPLORATION

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:21):** My question is for the Minister for Mineral Resources Development. Can the minister advise how the state government is working with the mining industry in stimulating new mineral discoveries and in attracting and securing major levels of mineral exploration investment?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:21):** I thank the honourable member for his important question. South Australia's Plan for Accelerated Exploration (PACE) was launched by the Premier in 2004. The PACE initiative is now recognised around the world—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The PACE initiative is now recognised around the world and throughout Australia as one of the most successful government initiatives in stimulating new mineral discoveries and in attracting and securing major levels of mineral exploration investment. A PIRSA customer survey showed that 96 per cent of respondents found PACE to be an incredibly successful program, delivering extraordinary growth in the minerals and energy sectors for South Australia.

The PACE initiative has been assessed as providing a net benefit of more than \$300 million. When we talk about PACE, the numbers are often large and they really do speak for themselves. I will try not to confuse members opposite. The state now has 16 major mines operating or nearing completion compared to just four in 2002—a fourfold increase—from the time the government introduced the PACE initiative. In 2009-10 South Australia achieved a record mineral production of \$3.3 billion—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for MacKillop will be quiet!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —trebling in size since 2003-04 and surpassing the Strategic Plan target of \$3 billion a year, four years earlier than anticipated. In the year prior to the introduction of the PACE initiative in 2003, mineral exploration expenditure in South Australia stood at \$35.9 million, just 4.9 per cent of the national mineral exploration spend. Compare that to now, when South Australia's mineral exploration expenditure for the December quarter totalled \$59.5 million.



Mineral exploration for the entire 2010 year totalled \$189 million, well exceeding the Rann government Strategic Plan target of \$100 million. Also, last year the PACE scheme underpinned the industry's confidence in exploration investment, particularly in forward drilling programs which smashed through the million meter mark for drilling work approvals. I will repeat that: last year the PACE scheme underpinned the industry's confidence in exploration investment, particularly in forward drilling programs which smashed through the million meter mark for drilling work approvals, an increase of 35 per cent from 2009.

Due to this outstanding success, Premier Rann released the Labor Party Mining in South Australia Policy 2010, a successful policy, I might add, endorsed by the people of South Australia, which included a \$10.2 million expansion of the original initiative called PACE 2020. PACE 2020 is building on the outstanding success of the original PACE initiative, sharing and expanding its core principles of economic stimulation, accessibility to land, development of sustainable exploration and mining, increasing cultural awareness and balancing development with the environment.

Victoria, Queensland, NT and Australia's mining giant Western Australia have now also established PACE-like mineral exploration initiatives, which include a collaborative drilling program with industry designed to encourage small companies to explore in underexplored greenfield regions of Australia. As the Premier has said previously: imitation is the highest form of flattery.

This government—the Rann government—has worked very hard to create a climate of certainty for investors and mining companies, and it is this work which is paying dividends. However, there is always more that can be done, and we look forward to working with the industry and stakeholders to ensure SA's mining industry continues to move in the right direction. PACE 2020 components help unlock new frontier areas of exploration and further streamline the process from exploration to mine development.

Once again I put on the record my congratulations to the owner of RMG Services, Rudy Gomez, on selling his Carrapateena copper project—a direct PACE discovery—in the state's Far North for \$250 million to Oz Minerals. RMG Services is just one company which took advantage of the state government's PACE initiative and is a true example of how successful the scheme really is.

Let me conclude by saying that the Rann government's PACE program and the new PACE 2020 initiative is driving mining development in this state, and it will continue to act as the primary mechanism in building South Australia's international profile and strengthening investor confidence in the state's resource sector.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL GYNAECOLOGY DEPARTMENT

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** My question, again, is to the Minister for Health. Will there be a women's health centre and gynaecology department at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:25):** I thank the member for her question. As the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Yes or no.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** As the member would know, the main source of services for women in the centre of Adelaide is, of course, the Women's and Children's Hospital, which is a very fine institution and which was created, in fact, I think, by bringing together two other hospitals during the term of the former government.

It is a very important service which provides the major services to women in our city. What other services are then provided in other hospitals, of course, is a matter that clinicians and hospital administrators determine. I am happy to get advice for the member, as I said, about this issue, but I can assure her, and I can assure all women, that women will continue to be given outstanding service at our leading women's hospital, which is the Women's and Children's Hospital.

**MARINE PARKS**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:26):** My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Minister, could you advise of the upcoming opportunities for South Australians to participate in the development of our state's 19 marine parks?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Environment and Conservation.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:27):** Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge her as a committed environmentalist. South Australia is fortunate to have marine ecosystems that are renowned for their unspoilt nature, and that is why the government is committed to taking action now to ensure that our precious marine environment is protected for the future; and the government is equally committed to developing marine parks with the full involvement of the South Australian community.

We want to develop a system of marine parks that are valued by the whole community, requiring the right balance to be struck between protecting areas of high conservation value and maintaining existing uses. To this end, the government is currently undertaking an extensive community engagement program to assist in the development of marine parks. In fact—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Finniss!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** He can't help himself, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** He knows he is misbehaving.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** In fact, I think that members would be hard-pressed to find comparative examples where a government has undertaken such a comprehensive community consultation. Indeed, the government has received—

**Mr Pengilly:** You made a total mess of it, Paul!

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. Indeed, the government has received input from more than 18,000 people in the last three years and established 13 marine park local advisory groups across the state to ensure that local knowledge is at the forefront of marine parks development. These groups have held four meetings with a further meeting yet to come ahead of the finalisation of their advice with regard to their—and I repeat 'their'—preferred zoning scenarios.

Members may now be aware of the government's series of community information days where recreational fishers and, indeed, all interested members of the community can come along and have their say on marine parks. These will be held around the state, including at Hove and Semaphore, on 9 and 10 April respectively. The government's position has remained consistent. We support marine parks and the need for properly informed public discussion of the proposals.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** But I have to say, Madam Speaker, and you can hear it now, that it really is unclear where the opposition sits on this matter. On the one hand, we have the member for Davenport, the former—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order. Member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister is now entering debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I will give him the benefit of the doubt at this stage. He has only just started. He will continue with his answer. Sit down.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will go back to his answer.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I will, Madam Speaker. On the one hand, we have the member for Davenport, the former leader of the opposition, who letterboxed his constituents looking to take credit for establishing what will become our fantastic network of marine parks.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. I think it is now patently clear that the minister is debating his answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for MacKillop will sit down.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I think it is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will sit down also. At this stage the minister is just seemingly quoting something and I do not see where it comes into a point of order, but I will listen very carefully from now on. Minister, get back to your answer.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, I am attempting to, Madam Speaker. Of course, if the truth be known, nothing much on the marine parks front did happen on the member for Davenport's watch.

**Mr PENGILLY:** I have a point of order, Madam Speaker. With respect to your previous statement, the minister is not quoting anything. He is reading and just debating. He is not answering or even attempting to read a quote from the member for Davenport, myself or anyone else. He is clearly debating.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, I think you need to be very careful. I think you are starting to stray.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I will be extremely careful, Madam Speaker, and I will read from a flyer that Iain Evans delivered. The fourth dot point announced the establishment of 19 marine parks—

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

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I am wondering what responsibility the minister has to the house for a flyer that Iain Evans put out.

**The SPEAKER:** I am wondering also, member for MacKillop, and we will see what point he is going to make out of this.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the other hand, we have the member for Bragg, the indefatigable aspirant leader, who has set about a campaign of deliberately misleading the public, including—

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

**Mr MARSHALL:** I raise the point of relevance. The question was about the government's consultation. It had nothing to do with the opposition's excellent consultation on this topic.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down, member for Norwood. I do not uphold that point of order.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Of course, Madam Speaker, the point is that the process of consultation which the government is undertaking is being, if not compromised, diverted by the mistruths and misinformation that is being handed out by the Liberals. We talk about—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Finniss.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It's an audition for the front bench. I mean, deliberately misleading, the member for Bragg, by including through—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order. Member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister is definitely debating now. By saying 'deliberately misleading', I don't think it is factual. I think it is opinion.

**The SPEAKER:** As I have said before, the minister can choose to answer a question as he chooses. Relevance, debate, whatever—I give a lot of leeway to people in asking questions and I can also do the same in answering questions. Minister.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Madam Speaker, it is not factual. It is fact, in fact. What is fact is that you are promoting misleading information. Of course, we have here a flyer distributed by the member for Bragg that is—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Bragg!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —completely and utterly scaremongering in the face of what is being—

**Mr PENGILLY:** I have a point of order, madam.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. Member for Finniss.

**Mr PENGILLY:** It is point of order 127.

**The SPEAKER:** No, I do not think he has made any personal reflection yet on the member for Bragg, and I am sure he is not. If he does, he will be made to sit down.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Of course, Madam Speaker, and I accept that, but the flyer makes the false and outrageous claim that you will not be able to fish in marine parks. This, of course, is absolute nonsense. 'Marine parks. Do not fish', quoting from her flyer, Madam Speaker. This, of course, is absolute nonsense but it demonstrates the sort of depths the former deputy leader will plummet to for her own political gain.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Then, Madam Speaker, we have the member for—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** What has that got to do with her portfolio?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Well, that is a good question, as to what it has got to do with her portfolio, but I am not going there. She can do what she wants, as long as it is factual. But then there is the member for Finniss who, on several occasions, has offered colourful insights into his views on marine parks. Talk about a wolf in sheep's clothing, or whatever the maritime equivalent is of that. In between running about scaremongering and perpetuating misinformation, he claims to be an ardent supporter of marine parks. However, when provided with the opportunity to become better informed on the issues, he can embark only on what are cynical and, at times, offensive attacks on the officers who are trying to cure his ignorance.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** To use some of his own words—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —the only voodoo politics is coming out of the opposition. Of course, the member for Finniss is also contributing—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I'm using his words.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** On a point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** This is a disgrace on the parliament. The minister is just hurling abuse at the opposition when he is supposed to be answering questions on the matters which he is responsible to the parliament for. It is an absolute disgrace.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, go back to your answer. You have been going now for something like eight or nine minutes. I am sure you are about to wind up quickly.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I'm not far from winding up, Madam Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! And I am sure the minister's answer will be relevant to the question.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It is. Of course, the member for Finniss is also contributing to our prisons' policy, suggesting that government may need to make more room in our prisons for recreational fishers. What an absolute disgrace for a so-called community leader to behave in this way.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Finniss, you are warned for the second time.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** We have the shadow minister, the Hon. Michelle Lensink—and who knows what position she has; they can't even work out who has carriage of this particular portfolio. In spite of some of the outrageous claims made by members opposite, all our marine parks will be accessible for both recreational and commercial fishing, and the government has committed to ensuring that. Wherever possible, sanctuary zones will be located in areas of low—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** They don't want to know.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Madam Speaker, it's a bit like—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** At least, I hang around, mate. If my town is blown over, I'd be there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will wind up his answer.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I will indeed, Madam Speaker. I will finish off with this point, if you will allow me. I have provided several briefings, and there is another one this afternoon on the scientific aspects of marine parks. Just to give you an example, Madam Speaker, again, the person who called for a meeting, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, did not come until half an hour into that meeting. The member for Finniss did a runner, went off to speak to the radio—and what a snow job it was.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** They don't want to be informed, Madam Speaker, because it's not in their best interests to be informed on this particular process. There is still further consultation to go—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —in relation to how we best manage our marine parks for the future. I invite the opposition again, as I have before, here and now, to take a constructive approach to this process, instead of trying to obstruct a community-driven process they publicly claimed to support.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I draw members' attention to the presence in the gallery of some people from Genesee & Wyoming, who are guests of the Premier. Also in the gallery, sitting next to a

former member for Cheltenham, Murray DeLaine, is Miss Molly Byrne, who was a member of this house for many years, from 1965 to 1979, and one of the pioneers for women in this house.

## QUESTION TIME

### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:39):** My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Will the minister explain why patients at the Royal Adelaide Hospital who have been designated for out-of-hospital community care remain in hospital for an extended time? The opposition has received health department documents indicating that a number of patients should be transferred to out-of-hospital community care, including four inpatients who have been in hospital for 585 days, 312 days, 259 days and 193 days respectively.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister for Health.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:39):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is well known, I think, and members on both sides of the house would understand, there are certain patients for whom it is often very difficult to find appropriate community-based solutions. When their health needs have been addressed in a hospital, not frequently but in some cases, it is often not very easy to find a community-based solution.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Unley!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** It is not always easy to find a solution. In fact, I recall a patient in one of the hospitals—and I will not refer to the hospital because it might identify the patient—who had, in fact, been in hospital since the time that Dean Brown was the minister for health. That patient's placement there was by an arrangement that he, as the then minister, made. It is not always possible to find easily in the community a solution to—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I know it sounds like a long time, but it is not always possible, and it could be that, for a range of—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** The member for Bragg—the beachport suburb of Burnside which she represents—says, 'Why not build them a house?' It is not a matter of building houses: it is a matter of having appropriate support. Sometimes patients have complex physical needs which require a whole range of treatments. Sometimes they have very complex mental health needs. Sometimes they have complex disabilities. Sometimes they are very young. Sometimes, all of those factors apply at once. It is not always possible to easily find solutions for those people.

We work as hard as we can through health and through the agencies that my colleague is responsible for to try to package together solutions to those circumstances. Sometimes, offers are made to patients and their families about a particular way that the matter can be dealt with, and those suggestions are rejected. Sometimes, patients have unrealistic expectations about where they can live and in what circumstances, and, sometimes, their carers have very unrealistic expectations about what can happen in the community. All of those are factors which we work on. If the member has a particular patient he would like—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** —me to investigate and get some information on, I am more than happy to provide it but, obviously, I cannot in this place and in public talk about particular patients.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Get a question up.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### MYLICENCE

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:42):** Can the Minister for Road Safety advise the house about the initiative to add a MyLicence group to Facebook?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Premier with South Australia's Strategic Plan) (14:42):** MyLicence is an initiative of the government that was launched in June 2010 by the now Treasurer and former minister for road safety—a brilliant initiative, clearly—as an interactive website for new and young drivers, their parents and driving supervisors about road safety and licensing stages.

I am pleased to announce that MyLicence has joined Facebook to reach out to even more young South Australian drivers. The social networking site is being used to encourage young drivers to stay in touch with the latest road safety news. Despite steady falls in South Australia's road toll during the past decade, young drivers continue to be over-represented in road crashes. People aged 16 to 24 years make up 13 per cent of the population but account for 27 per cent of fatalities and 29 per cent of serious injuries. Also, young drivers have a significantly higher risk of death relative to the number of kilometres they drive compared to other driver age groups.

To combat this deadly toll, it is essential that our road safety messages reach young people in a way in which they can relate and in mediums that they use and access regularly. Through Facebook, the new MyLicence page can achieve that goal. The MyLicence page on Facebook will be an interactive page that provides important driving and road safety advice and regular updates on rules affecting learner and provisional drivers.

The page contains links to the MyLicence website for more information about licence stages and rules, links to the online learner theory practice test, the hazard perception test for provisional drivers, as well as broadcasting regular road safety video clips sent to MyLicence e-newsletter subscribers. This includes advice and tips about a wide range of road safety issues affecting young drivers today, including driving at dusk, leaving a safe braking distance and how to buy a safer car.

I encourage both young drivers and their parents to get online to take advantage of the new MyLicence Facebook page or subscribe to the website to receive the MyLicence e-newsletter.

#### HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:44):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister agree that emergency department delays causing ambulances to go on bypass or diversions are decreasing the availability of ambulances and putting lives at risk?

The Australian College of Emergency Medicine reports that access block and hospital overcrowding results in extended delays at the incident scene or increased transport times. Last week, on Monday 28 March, at Flinders Medical Centre, three ambulances were ramped at the same time. One ambulance had been waiting three hours, one had been waiting two hours and the third was only able to leave because the small child transported was left waiting in the emergency department with the child's mother.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:45):** Of course, one can always highlight a particular example and say that means the whole system is not working, but the reality is quite different to that. I am very pleased to report there has been an overall improvement in the average wait time in the emergency departments of South Australia's public hospitals. Figures from SA Health show the average wait time between being triaged and clinical treatment starting across all hospitals has improved from 50 minutes in 2007-08 to 45 minutes in 2009-10, and the year-to-date figures to the end of January show a further improvement so far to 41 minutes.

At the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department, which was the subject of attention recently, average wait times have improved from 39 minutes in 2007-08 down to 31 minutes for the year to date. The average wait time for treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is, for the year to date, currently 43 minutes, and the average time patients spend at the emergency department receiving treatment at the Royal Adelaide, year to date, is 328 minutes, that is 5½ hours. There are

times when some patients wait longer, and that is obviously not what we would want, but, of course, they are the odd exceptions.

The overall stats show that the number of patients going into our emergency departments is increasing, the average time they are waiting to be seen is reducing, and the average time they spend in the emergency department being seen before they are admitted or discharged is reducing. So, all the stats are heading in the right direction.

On Monday of last week at the hospital the member referred to, Flinders, it was especially busy, and there were a couple of occasions when there was a temporary diversion in that hospital. That happens in all hospitals from time to time; that is the nature of hospitals; that is the nature of an emergency department.

The overall trend lines—and that is what one should look at—show improvement. Despite the fact that there are more patients going to our emergency departments every year, we are doing better every year in delivering services to them. I pay enormous credit to the doctors and nurses and the others who work in our emergency departments day after day, year after year. It is a difficult job and they work under a great deal of pressure from time to time, but they are delivering an excellent service to the people of our state.

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of Tom and Wendy Chapman. Wendy Chapman is, of course, a former lord mayor of Adelaide. Welcome.

### QUESTION TIME

#### BROADBAND INTERNET

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:48):** My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. How is the government helping to support the provision of high speed internet in broadband blackspot areas?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:48):** As the internet has become a more pervasive part of our everyday lives, accessibility to online services has become crucial. Indeed, online service systems have fundamentally transformed not only the way that we provide public services but also business services, and the provision of new services through high speed broadband has opened up even more opportunities for innovation. However, due to limitations in existing broadband technology, there have been parts of the metropolitan area that have not been able to access high speed internet through the conventional ADSL technology.

These blackspot areas that have previously missed out on broadband have been provided with access to high speed internet through the rollout of the Adam Max, a wireless high speed broadband project developed in partnership between the state government and Adam Internet, using international standard WiMAX technology. This project has resulted in high speed broadband being extended to 59 locations throughout the Adelaide area, benefiting some 3,000 households and businesses.

Last night, the project was announced as the winner of the Growing Prosperity category of the 2011 Premier's Awards—Showcasing excellence in the public sector. This award recognises the fantastic benefits that have arisen from this project in terms of not only increased efficiencies for local businesses but also better opportunities for the wider community.

I had the opportunity today to meet the Managing Director of Adam Internet, Scott Hicks, and I congratulated him and his team on employing something like 200 South Australians in this very innovative industry. Indeed, according to one independent analysis, it has been estimated that over the past five years from the beginning of the project the economic benefit of removing Adelaide's blackspots would be \$63.6 million.

The project was made possible through a \$3 million contribution from the South Australian government, as well as an investment from Adam Internet and the connection subsidies from the Australian government. I congratulate Adam Internet and staff from the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology on their success in delivering this highly successful and innovative project.



**ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL**

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Do you agree that the National Healthcare Agreement's recognised hospital safe working capacity is 85 per cent occupancy, and can you confirm that on Sunday 3 April 2011 the Royal Adelaide Hospital was at 106 per cent capacity, with the cardiovascular service at 111 per cent capacity, internal medicine at 108 per cent capacity, and the orthopaedic and trauma service at 106 per cent capacity?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:51):** I am very pleased that the member asked this question, because it highlights why we need a new Royal Adelaide Hospital—because the current hospital is just not big enough and there is nothing you can do to make it big enough in the time frame by which we need it to be increased in size. We need more beds, we need more operating theatres and we need more emergency department capacity.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** We are going to do all of that and every single step we take you knock. All you can do is knock progress in this state. Greg Kelton had it right, Alexander Downer has it right: you are absolutely the most miserable bunch of pessimists and opportunists that this state has ever seen.

**An honourable member:** Mediocre I think was the word used.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Mediocre, B grade people.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**CEDUNA DISTRICT HEALTH SERVICE**

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:52):** My question is also to the Minister for Health. Can the minister update the house about the redevelopment of the Ceduna District Health Service?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:52):** It is good to get a positive question in this place, and I thank the member for Mawson—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** How cynical. I thank the member for Mawson, who is also my parliamentary secretary assisting me in regional health issues, for this question. I am pleased to advise members that the member for Mawson visited the Ceduna District Health Service just last week, and that followed a visit by the Premier the week before. So, the government has done a very good job of—

*The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** And the minister for environment has been there as well. I don't know if he visited the hospital; I hope you didn't. I hope you didn't need to anyway. The Premier was there during a stopover in Ceduna.

Work is due to start this month on the second stage of the \$36 million Ceduna District Health Service redevelopment. Stage 2 includes a new GP Plus healthcare centre, and that incorporates space for doctors, dentistry, community health, allied health, physiotherapy, mental health, and a day activity centre as well. This will be the first of the GP Plus healthcare centres to be established in regional South Australia. The other centre we are planning is at Port Pirie, and \$12.5 million has been provided for that project as well.

The start of the second and final stage of the Ceduna redevelopment follows the completion of stage 1 last month. All patients, staff and services at Ceduna District Health Service have moved to the newly completed building. I am told by the member for Mawson that they have

had their first birth and their first operation in the new facilities last Tuesday night. So, congratulations to the parents involved in that birth, and I congratulate—

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** No, I don't think the member for Mawson assisted. He probably assisted by keeping his distance. That would have been the best assistance he could have given. So, I do congratulate the hospital on that first achievement. The member said he was particularly impressed with the ocean and courtyard views from the new single ensuite patient rooms. I am looking forward to seeing them myself; I understand they have the most stunning views of any hospital in the state. People also commented to him that they could see the value of rebuilding the new Royal Adelaide Hospital on a greenfield site to establish single patient rooms and avoid disruption within the existing operational hospital because they have had that experience themselves.

I would like to thank the staff, members of the health advisory council and everyone involved in bringing this new project to fruition and ensuring the smooth transition of patients to the newly built hospital. Hospital chief executive Andrew Lane and regional director Michelle Smith have provided exemplary leadership, and I congratulate them. The staff and community of Ceduna can justifiably feel proud of their role in the creation of these new facilities, which include a brand-new emergency department, a new theatre suite, day procedure unit and residential aged care.

There are new indoor and outdoor areas, which reflect the cultural needs of local Aboriginal communities, and they include sandstone and bush themes, traditional cooking areas, and a grieving courtyard. The latest technology is also incorporated to allow for advanced telemedicine and communication with other sites. This is, of course, particularly important to our remote hospitals and assists with our goal of providing more health services in regional communities which are close to where people live. Using state-of-the-art technology, staff at Ceduna can perform tests, compare records with those held at other hospitals and provide specialists in Adelaide with up-to-date results. So, it is bringing the bush closer to the city.

We have been very keen to expand the capacity of the health system in regional South Australia, minimising the amount of travel country residents need to undertake to receive the medical care they need, and we are beginning to see the effects of that happening. There has been a steady increase in the number of patients being treated in our country hospitals over the past four years. Country hospitals recorded 90,940 inpatients in 2009-10, a growth of 4.4 per cent over the previous year. So, we are seeing stronger growth in patient services in the country compared to the city, which is part of our strategy. We want more country people to be seen in regional hospitals rather than have to come to the city. It helps people in the city and it also helps people in the country.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** It is all right for the member to yell out and make abusive comments while I am speaking, but the facts are that more country people are being seen in country hospitals as a result of the policies of this government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** —and we are meeting that growth with increased investment. This year \$714.5 million is being provided to public health services in the country; that is a 13 per cent increase over last year and a massive 88 per cent increase in expenditure on country health since this government has been in office.

This investment is supporting more elective surgery in the country, more dialysis, more chemotherapy and more mental health care in regional South Australia. I am particularly pleased, as is the government, that dedicated mental health beds are now being placed into regional areas for the very first time. The first intermediate care places were recently established in Mount Gambier, with more to follow in other parts of the state. I can also report that work has started on an upgrade of Port Lincoln Hospital to establish a new reception area, waiting room and five purpose-built specialist consulting rooms.

#### **PUBLIC BUILDING WORKS**

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Does the government have a policy of only paying for public building work upon completion of the work?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (14:58):** Public building works are very different in their size and scale, so I do not believe that there would be a single, one-size-fits-all policy. For example, if you were building a very expensive building I am sure you would probably like some payments along the way. I will get an answer for the member on the methods of payment from the relevant agencies and bring back a detailed answer. However, I do not think we would apply a one-policy-fits-all approach.

#### **ECHUNGA SCHOOL PROJECT**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:59):** My question is also to the Minister for Infrastructure. Why did the government pay the builder of the Echunga BER project, who went into administration, up-front, prior to completing the project? Will funds lost be recovered? When will the building be completed?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (14:59):** I congratulate the member for Unley for—after a year and some 600 successful builds—finding something to complain about in the BER program.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Can I say that the Building the Education Revolution was a challenge from the commonwealth for us to build, from memory, some 670 builds. It was somewhere north of \$900 million of work in an absolutely historic, an absolutely heroic, time frame.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I rise on a point of order. As interesting as this might be, the question was specific to the builder who went into administration before completing the work at Echunga and had already been paid for the work.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There was no indication—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! No quarrels across the floor. There was no indication of the project that the member's question involved anyway. So, I am listening carefully.

**Mr Williams:** Yes there was. The member said—

**The SPEAKER:** I did not hear that bit.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I do not see how you can say that building infrastructure in schools is not relevant to the question. Minister.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** For the benefit of the man with three votes—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Standing order 98 says that one must answer the substance of the question and not engage in argument. I am not engaging in argument, and if you believe that talking about the Building the Education Revolution project, of which this is a project, is not answering the substance of the question, then I am afraid that you did not deserve all three of those votes you got.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I would point out that interjections are also out of order, Madam Speaker.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for MacKillop, I warn you.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** As I pointed out, it was a series of builds in an absolutely historic and heroic time frame in which South Australia did better than anywhere else. Why did we do better?

**Mr Pisoni:** Well, release the information.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Release the information? Don't worry you don't need the information. You can just make your own—you ask Martin Hamilton-Smith—you can just make your own. Make your own, sunshine!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Williams:** What are you hiding?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** What are we hiding? Can I point out to the man with three votes that this program was audited at a national level.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order, ma'am: standing order 127.

**The SPEAKER:** I don't think that was personally reflecting on one member. But I am sure that the minister knows the standing orders enough not to reflect on anyone. Minister.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I am certainly not reflecting on the member for MacKillop. I think his colleagues with his three votes did that enough. I do not need to make any reflections upon him.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will return to the question.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** It was a program that was audited at a national level, as a result, as I understand it, of requests from the opposition at a national level, and the findings of that audit reflected extremely well on South Australia. Can I go on to point out why we did so well—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I have all day. The reason that we did very well in that program was because of the very strong working relationship between this government and the building industry, and I think if you go and ask the Master Builders, for example, they have described this program as a saviour for their industry. You, having ignored all the great successes of businesses in this state to find one that you do not like—and can I say that, at the Unley Primary School, where we built a building, despite you scratching around trying to find something wrong, everyone and the neighbours have been very pleased with what was done there. But can I say that if the biggest difficulty that we have is this matter in Echunga then I, at least, have some pride in the South Australian building industry and the management of—

**Mr Williams:** Why don't you answer the question?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**An honourable member:** He's getting to it.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I'm not getting to it, I'm telling you.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I have answered it. And here's the thing for the member for MacKillop: one day, God forbid, they might get into government and then they will get to answer the questions the way they like, but while they are in opposition, so richly deserved—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** The only Liberal Party in the country that can't win an election it seems—but while they are in opposition they get to ask the questions and I get to answer them, within the standing orders in the way I like, and the way I like to answer it is to point with pride to the success of the BER program in South Australia, and point with pride to South Australian builders and South Australian departments—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** —and I don't care how much noise you make because, by golly, we're good and we're going to keep being good.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Florey.

#### **ELDERLY CITIZENS, HOME VISITS**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:05):** My question is to the Minister for Ageing. Can the minister advise the house of the government's actions to support the independence of older people and increase their links with the community?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:05):** We are moving into a future with a vastly different population and society to the one we knew only 20 or 30 years ago. We have smaller families, including an increasing number of single person and childless households, families that do have children are smaller, children often live and work vast distances from their parents, and we are living much longer.

I am pleased to announce that we have signed up with Meals on Wheels SA, a highly respected volunteer organisation, to partner with the Seniors Information Service in providing a home visiting service to older members of our community who may for a range of reasons be isolated. With an investment of \$3.1 million over four years, we are aiming to conduct 25,000 visits that will help many thousands of our citizens who need it most. Volunteers are receiving specialist training, and in the first phase of the program, which began on 2 February this year, already 220 people have been visited and benefited from this program.

These visits are more than just a cup of tea and a chat. They provide a chance for the trained volunteers to spend time talking with the older person, gain an understanding of their particular circumstance and put them in contact with social groups, sporting clubs, opportunities to be involved in their local community as well as government supports and services that they might need. The aim of this program is to help break down social isolation and keep all older citizens safe, happy and healthy. Where a volunteer becomes aware of a specific need, they can make a direct referral to the relevant agency or ask for a professional assessment.

After the Stockport floods, I directed my department to doorknock every home in the affected areas, and I also joined in this work. I witnessed first-hand the need for and benefit of a personal visit to assess needs and provide support, even if it was just to let people know help was at hand if they needed it.

Older South Australians may not have been through a natural disaster, but age, frailty and disability can be incredibly isolating. Since coming to government we have increased Home and Community Care funding by 99 per cent to a record \$174 million this financial year. The services provided by this funding assist older people and those with a disability remain in their homes. Some examples include \$16.9 million to the Royal District Nursing Service, who provide a teleservice where older people receive twice daily medication monitoring services through a video phone link; \$7.4 million is also provided this financial year across the state to 95 agencies to provide transport for older people.

Labor has also committed \$2.8 million over the next four years to expand and better coordinate the community passenger networks to help older South Australians to get to appointments and stay active in their regional areas. We are dedicated to ensuring that older people are supported in their choices to remain active and connected to their communities, their families and their activities.

Together with Meals on Wheels, the Seniors Information Service and the many agencies that deliver in-home support, the state government will continue to help those South Australians who helped shape our state to remain active, connected and valued in our community.

#### **SCHOOL UNIFORM SUBSIDY**

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:09):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Will the minister explain why families at the new super schools were given a \$200 government subsidy per student for uniform costs, yet families of the new Adelaide West Special Education Centre did not receive a subsidy?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:09):** I thank the honourable member for the question. I do not know the answer to it. I will take it on notice and find out, but it is not a new proposition for uniform subsidies to be provided. I had someone in my office say that new schools over the decades have always had that facility, so it is not an unusual proposition.

I must say that my recollection from attending some of these schools (all of them) is that they have all struck new arrangements for their school uniforms, and, when they have done that, when they have actually settled on the design—which has sometimes been a matter of some controversy between parents, especially with two schools coming together—they have obtained the new uniforms and then the subsidy has followed. I will find out what is happening with Adelaide West.

#### MARINE PARKS

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. What advice has the government—

*The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** —had from tourism operators and Tourism SA about the impacts of the proposed sanctuary zones within marine parks? The South Australian Tourism Industry Council (SATIC) has raised concerns about the proposed sanctuary zones within marine parks and has released figures that fishing for pleasure attributes to over 20 per cent of many regions' tourism. Ward Tilbrook, Chief Executive of SATIC, stated:

It is important that government has a focus on the health of our marine environment, but it does need to provide definite science on how recreational and charter fishing is threatening marine plant and animal life in South Australian waters to justify any further restrictions or prohibitions on recreational and charter fishing in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Environment and Conservation.

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:11):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. He has given me a great deal of scope in which to answer the question, and I know, Madam Speaker, that you will take that into account when I am answering. I have not met with the organisation to which the member refers; however, I did, of course, meet with the—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for MacKillop!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —head of tourism, Mr Darbyshire, a very, very decent person who understands the advantages to tourism in getting the balance right between use in marine parks and the preservation of the environment in which the species that are being sought will be sustained. There is no doubt in my mind that the figures—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —that were quoted by the deputy leader are close enough to being correct. Quite simply, and I have said this ad nauseam as well, the role of recreational fishing and, indeed, tourism that is linked to recreational fishing is a very, very important component of our regional economies. I guess that I will restate what I said—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Haven't you got some medals for fishing?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, I do, Patrick, but I don't want to go there. The first I had seen of that organisation's foray into this debate was a press release of last week, and I would have thought, quite frankly, that it would have been better for them to have had a chat with me before they issued that press release. Amongst—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bragg will be quiet.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —other things, Madam Speaker, is their assertion that marine parks are going to reduce the value of houses within the areas in which marine parks will be located when, quite frankly, I am not aware of that anywhere in Australia or the world.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The whole idea is, of course, for marine parks to actually continue to attract tourists beyond even those that are focusing on recreational fishing. As I have said, why would we go about destroying regional economies?

As I have mentioned previously, and I will say it again—although they are not listening because they do not want to listen. I think, Madam Speaker, that the idea of opposition is not actually to become better informed, because what is the use of throwing grenades if you actually become better informed? They are not coming to any briefings. They are not listening to those briefings, because quite frankly they do not want to know. Tourism—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** —is a very important component of what will underpin marine parks. As I said earlier—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Norwood!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** That is the third time he has been warned, Madam Speaker, but far be it for me to be a dobber.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** That's right, she's the dobber. So, Madam Speaker, we will continue to have a flourishing tourism industry when marine parks and sanctuary zones within marine parks are established.

## MARINE PARKS

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:15):** My question is also to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Can the minister confirm when the government will undertake and make available for public review a comprehensive economic and social impact study on regional communities as a result of the implementation of marine parks and sanctuary zones?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:15):** Quite simply, the process we are undertaking is one of engagement with the community. The local advisory groups will—

*Mr Griffiths interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Hang on, let me finish, Steven. I have said one sentence, mate; I respected you—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Unley.

**Mr PISONI:** Members must be addressed by the constituency which they represent.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold that point of order. Minister, you refer to members by their electorate, not by their name.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, I apologise to the member for Goyder. Let me get started, at least, please.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** The best thing about the Leader of the Opposition is that I much prefer to read her comments in the paper because I don't have to listen to her shrill voice.

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

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

**Mr PENGILLY:** 128.

**The SPEAKER:** No, not at this stage. Minister, get back to answering the question and do not reflect on people.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, I am attempting to, Madam Speaker. Quite simply, I am awaiting advice from the local advisory groups. When that advice is received, of course, we need to go through a consultative process once I determine whether or not those zones and no-go zones will be in place; and we will do, simultaneously, an economic assessment. What is the point of doing an economic assessment at this point in time, because it is an information-gathering exercise? No decision has been made.

### WINE INDUSTRY

**Ms FOX (Bright) (15:16):** My question is to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries. As a keen drinker, I ask the minister whether he could please update the house on Wine Australia's Vintage 2011 program, which aims to promote South Australian wine?

**The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:16):** I thank the 'keen drinker', the member for Bright, for her question. Through Wine Australia's A+ Regional Heroes program, Wine Australia has brought 100 Chinese traders, educators and some media to Australia for a hands-on experience of this year's vintage. Forty of these visitors are currently visiting South Australia's various wine regions. I formally welcomed them at a reception event held at the National Wine Centre on Sunday evening. I thank Lucy Anderson (who is now based in Hong Kong with Wine Australia and she is also a member of the South Australian Wine Industry Council) for the work she has done in bringing those 40 visitors to Adelaide.

The visitors were divided into smaller groups, with each group spending several days within one of South Australia's famous wine regions, including the Adelaide Hills, Barossa Valley, Clare Valley, Eden Valley, Coonawarra, Langhorne Creek and McLaren Vale. They are currently being hosted by leading winemakers and wineries, experiencing picking, pressing and plunging, at a time when South Australian wineries are delivering the 2011 vintage.

The 2011 vintage program has been designed to develop a new and informed generation of Chinese wine influencers, who will be able to promote premium South Australian wines to their markets in China. It will give our visitors a live experience of South Australia's regional wine, food and culture. I am pleased to say that the state government, recognising the importance of this initiative and its potential flow-on benefits to the South Australian wine industry, has contributed \$70,000 towards the Vintage 2011 program.

This visit by Chinese stakeholders demonstrates that this government is working together with grape growers, wineries and the regional, state and national wine bodies to increase the awareness and increased uptake of South Australia's world-class wines. China is Australia's fastest-growing wine market. It is expected to overtake Canada as Australia's third-largest export market in the near future, and this state government-assisted initiative is not only contributing to further developing this market but also ensuring that South Australia secures the majority share of this growth.

### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL GYNAECOLOGY DEPARTMENT

**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) (15:20):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Early in question time, the Leader of the Opposition asked me a couple of questions about gynaecological services at the RAH, and I said that I would get further information, which I now have, and I will provide that to the house.



I am advised that consideration is being given to moving some gynaecological services from the current RAH to the QEH and the Women's and Children's Hospital. The RAH, I am also advised, will always remain the state's level 1 trauma hospital. Any changes that are being suggested will see the WCH and QEH offer more lower acuity care to women in their communities. In line with the SA Health Care Plan, this is partially to create additional emergency capacity at our major trauma hospital, the RAH, where, as the member for Morphett pointed out, there has been an increase in emergency surgery; in fact, up 10 per cent to January this year. Any moves would provide lower acuity services closer to where patients live, and that would be a good thing. This is about providing the right services in the right places.

There has been one meeting with lead clinicians, I am advised, from all three sites to look at what is provided, where and how services can be improved, and this is consistent with other arrangements we have done with other services—ophthalmology, orthopaedics and so on. These discussions are at a very early stage, I am advised, and no commitments have been made.

I am also advised that allegations of clinical staff being fired if they speak out are completely incorrect, despite what the Leader of the Opposition says. All clinical services that are at the current RAH will move to the new RAH, and this includes gynaecological services. At the current RAH there is also a drop-in type centre, where women can arrive without an appointment. As per the SA Health Care Plan, the new RAH will be the state's major trauma facility, and there may be some movement of primary healthcare-type services. I hope that explains it all for the member.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### MARINE PARKS

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:22):** I speak today about the government's proposed exclusion zones within marine parks. May I say at the outset that the debate that has ensued since the announcement last year of the proposed exclusion zones has exposed a deep-seated divide in the environmental community, and it has clearly identified the conservationists and the preservationists.

Sitting on the conservationists side, I am proud to say, is the Liberal Party, which understands the importance of protection and ensuring, as best as possible, that our natural resources are protected, that there is active attention to that and that wherever any species is threatened we act on it, that we do not just draw up another plan or proposal.

Sitting on the other side are the preservationists, who the Labor Party and the Greens have clearly lined up—those who think you can put a net or a fence around something and it stays the same forever without any contribution. It is the lazy way, it is the cheap way, and it is the way in which the Labor Party has decided to go as environmentalists.

So far in this debate we have had failed consultation, and we have had conflicting data from the scientists as to the value of the marine environment. We have had no disclosed or published basis as to where the boundaries are drawn and why, only a percentage amount. We have had complete ignorance by the government of its own primary industry department, which has advised the government that it has obtained a balanced and sustainable fishery management program.

They have broken promises as to the areas to be included—the total area in the exclusion zones—compared with their earlier promise. They have made no account of or produced data as to the displacement problem that will occur in those areas remaining that are able to be fished, and to date there has been inadequate compensation for the commercial fishers. In addition, they have made no compensation available for local businesses, such as food, tourism, caravan parks and the like, in those towns. They have ignored the impact on the coastal communities and the lifestyle which many living in those regions have chosen, and, of course, they have failed to undertake any social impact statements to date. In addition to that, they have totally disregarded the plummeting value of properties, and their owners. They have had scant regard to the food and tourism industry, and we heard today from the minister that he has not even consulted with the Premier, stakeholders or council in relation to that.

We have had no explanation or response to the complaints of those industries and the hike in food prices that will result. We have had no economic impact statement, and we hear today from the government that it has not decided on the final boundary, so why do one? Well, why not do that with a social impact statement? We have had a refusal by the minister himself, or members of his

department—notwithstanding a previous promise to do so—to even attend the first public meeting, which is being convened by the Liberal Party and other stakeholders at the Burnside Town Hall tonight. That is not because we wanted to do it; it is because when we wrote to the minister earlier in the year asking him to do it, he declined, but offered at that point to send along his officers to explain the government's position.

His silencing of the critics by keeping people ignorant, by giving them the mushroom treatment, has really been the imprimatur today. So, my message to the minister is: he needs to listen, he needs to come along to public meetings (whether we convene them because he will not, or if he belatedly convenes his own), he needs to go there and listen and understand that he was born with two ears and one mouth for good reason, and he should use them in that proportion.

I also make a comment today on Monsignor Cappelletti, which is a name members would remember from a great SA fishing family. I have written to Monsignor Cappelletti and asked for an indication of the social impact. Today, I received a letter saying that he will not be putting in a submission on this. Well, let me say that there is not an 11<sup>th</sup> commandment which says, 'Thou shalt not fish.' Monsignor Cappelletti needs to deal with this matter and understand what vulnerable communities, young people and families are exposed to every minute they are excluded from those zones.

Finally, what about the price? This is what the government has to come clean on; not just what is in the Sustainable Budget Commission's leaked report, which tells us that the government is going to increase commercial fees, it is going to consider increasing a recreational fishing licence and that it is also going to cut—under its recommendation—a 40 per cent cost of the support to marine parks. So, we are going to get the super cheap, superficial, totally inadequate response from the government on this important environmental issue.

#### REACHOUT

**Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (15:27):** My subject today is ReachOut.com. On 21 January, I had the pleasure of meeting with a young woman named Sarah Nelson, a year 12 student from Mount Gambier, who is with us here today. Sarah is a youth ambassador for ReachOut.com, an e-mental health service delivered by the Inspire foundation for young people aged 14 to 25.

Housing more than 500 fact sheets, videos and stories developed by young people in consultation with mental health professionals, ReachOut.com enables young people to access easy-to-understand resources to enable them to help themselves and their friends. Reach Out also features an online community forum where young people can learn strategies from each other to get through tough times, as well as gain support and a sense of connectedness from people going through similar experiences. The site seeks to reduce stigma and increase mental health literacy, social connectedness and help seeking.

Sarah was particularly passionate about the importance of Reach Out due to her own experiences with the website. When we met, Sarah told me how from a young age she struggled with an anxiety disorder without ever even realising what it was. When she began having daily panic attacks—attacks that would leave her heart racing and make her feel numb, dizzy and shaky—Sarah became desperate to know what was going on. Like many young people, she went looking for answers on the internet, and it was there that she found ReachOut.com and learnt for the first time that what she was experiencing was not her fault, but was likely to be an illness, a panic disorder. Reach Out helped Sarah discover that other people had similar experiences, that she was not, to use her words, 'so abnormal' after all, and that it was a normal and good thing to seek help.

Sarah's experience with Reach Out is indicative of the kind of assistance that the service provides to just under 400,000 young people around Australia every year. Findings from Inspire's 2010 national user survey showed that over 71 per cent of Reach Out's users were experiencing high to very high psychological distress, and yet only 53 per cent of these young people identified that dealing with their own distress was their primary purpose of visiting. Such lack of awareness and help seeking shows us that there is a huge need to increase mental health awareness in young people, reduce the stigma they feel, and construct services that can provide help to young people, even if they are unaware of how or unable to yet seek it.

Ninety-two per cent of 15 to 17 year olds use the internet, and after family and friends, it is where they turn to for advice and support in difficult times. It is accessible, anonymous, engaging and informative, providing a space where young people can feel empowered and confident to talk

about sensitive issues. Thus, with suicide continuing to be a leading cause of death for young people under the age of 25, and with rising rates of anxiety, depression and other mental illness among our young people, Reach Out has a critical role to play in providing a safe space for young people to access information and find their own help.

I would just like to now read a bit that Sarah said in her speech to the National Youth Parliament:

Anxiety makes life such a struggle. It affects not only the individual, but the people around them. So, what help is available? In cities you have access to counsellors, psychiatrists, psychologists, specialists, GPs, doctors, youth facilities, and on and on the list goes. Rural towns do not have this advantage. In Mount Gambier we have school counsellors, backlogged GPs and a community health service known as CAMHS. CAMHS currently has a six-month waiting list due to such high demand and a backlog due to emergencies. Because of this, suicide is one of the biggest killers of youth in Mount Gambier. We need help. Our town is in a situation few could honestly comprehend. Kids are dying.

Every year at youth parliament, mental health is brought up, proving to me that it isn't just us facing this never-ending battle. We need the government's help. We need the government's support. We need whatever we can get. We are trapped in a struggle that has seemingly no end. I plead, I beg, I implore, please help us. We need the support and action of the government or there will never be an end. More kids will die.

That is coming from a lot of our young people.

I would like to thank minister Portolesi and minister Hill for meeting with Sarah today, and also Aram Hosie, who is the managing director of Reach Out and research and policy in that part. I would also like to thank the Hon. John Dawkins from the Legislative Council, who has met with Sarah at various times, too. To this end, I would encourage members to familiarise themselves with this fantastic service and look forward to continuing to support Sarah and the Inspire foundation, and help young people lead happier lives through the delivery of ReachOut.com.

### **MAGILL ROAD, PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:33):** I rise today to speak on the dangers facing residents of Trinity Gardens and Beulah Park in my electorate due to the lack of pedestrian crossings on Magill Road adjacent to Salop Street. On Thursday I will table a petition to this house signed by a minimum of 390 concerned local residents, who are calling on the government to install a pedestrian crossing on this busy arterial road. This is a particularly dangerous stretch of road, a major arterial with two lanes of traffic coming in both directions and bike lanes on either side. It is nearly impossible to cross this road at any time, let alone during peak hour.

Residents, led by local Beulah Park resident, Angelina Dente and her daughter Christina, have been trying to get a safety crossing installed in that vicinity for more than three years now. This is not the first time that residents have called for a pedestrian crossing for this stretch of road. I know that this was raised several times with the previous member for Norwood, and since I was elected in March 2010 I have had a number of people make this point to me. It is an issue not only for local residents but also for a lot of the small businesses that reside and are domiciled on Magill Road.

What have we got in response from the government? So far, very little that is satisfactory to the people. In October of last year I received a letter back from the then minister for road safety, the member for Playford, in response to my letter, telling me:

To increase driver awareness of pedestrians crossing near the McDonald's Restaurant, the pedestrian warning signs were upgraded to the latest standard fluorescent signs on 16 March 2009.

That was hardly the response that local residents and businesses were looking for. Instead of putting in the requisite pedestrian crossings to guard safety for these local pedestrians, basically we upgraded the colouring on the signs adjacent to the McDonald's. It is not enough. It is certainly not accepted by the local residents or by me as the local member.

This government waxes lyrical about the importance of healthy lifestyles and pedestrian and cycling activity. In fact, this government established an Office for Walking and Cycling, and I commend it for that. It is important to get as many people out of their vehicles and walking and cycling, for commuter traffic as well as for recreation. However, when it comes to real action and responding to real need as identified by people in the community, this government is again found wanting.

The problem is not only about Magill Road in my electorate, nor is it with the adequacy of glowing yellow signs as recommended by our former minister for road safety, it is instead with the methodology used to decide whether a pedestrian crossing is needed on a particular road.

According to the Code of Technical Requirements for the Legal Use of Traffic Control Devices, a pedestrian crossing should only be installed if:

...there are no fewer than 60 pedestrians crossing the roadway within close proximity to the site...in two separate one hour periods.

I ask you, Madam Deputy Speaker, who would actually risk life and limb to cross Magill Road so that they could prove that there is actually a requirement? It is completely dangerous and I would not recommend to anybody that they do this. There is no centre refuge in the middle of that road and there are no pedestrian lights for some distance.

Angelina Dente, the Beulah Park resident who has led this push—a pensioner in my local area, who has lived in the area for many years—has to walk 600 metres down the road to the intersection at Portrush Road and then another 600 metres back up, a total of 1.2 kilometres for a simple trip to cross the road to catch the bus, visit the doctor or the local businesses in that area. It is completely unsatisfactory. She is not alone. She is typical of people in the area who would never attempt to cross in peak hour for fear of their lives, yet peak hour is when the traffic surveys to establish the need for crossings are conducted.

Sixty people need to throw caution to the wind in order to convince the government that a road is in need of a safety crossing. The methodology is flawed, the system is flawed and it is causing considerable stress to residents who want only to be able to walk the streets of their area in safety. I call upon this government and the new minister to look again at the rules that dictate whether a crossing is necessary and to instead listen to residents who know an area best. Sticking to their flawed processes and installing token signs will not protect the residents of Trinity Gardens and Beulah Park when crossing this dangerous road. It is time the Minister for Road Safety re-examines the conditions by which a road is judged unsafe.

#### **CLEAN START**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:39):** I have referred a number of times to the fantastic campaign that is being run by United Voice, previously known as the Miscellaneous Workers Union, with regard to Clean Start. This campaign is looking at making sure that cleaners have their proper industrial rights.

I was interested to read, after the most recent cleaner leaders' meeting that was held in March in Sydney, that someone who I would not normally associate progressive views with, in the form of radio announcer Alan Jones, was taking up the Clean Start campaign. He was really concerned—after having the opportunity to talk to cleaners at the conference, I believe—that they were being paid less than \$21 an hour. The information I have is that Alan Jones, not known for being backwards at coming forward, said that any employers that paid workers less than \$21 an hour were 'disgusting' and 'obscene', and 'To every employer out there...to ask someone to work for \$16...I think it is immoral.'

Jones went on to say that Spotless, a firm that contracts many cleaners around Australia, was a joke, and, when told that it was refusing to meet with its cleaners, he said, 'That's the kind of people they are.' He said he would continue to support the Clean Start campaign and would name and shame contractors and owners who did not do the right thing. I guess my assessment of Alan Jones has been somewhat altered by his support for this campaign.

Sadly, there are some real concerns in the cleaning industry, and in most recent times campaigns have hit South Australia. However, just before I talk about South Australia I would like to compliment Darren Cheeseman, the federal member for Corangamite. He has written to the Spotless general manager in Melbourne to show his support for cleaning workers trying to negotiate in good faith. I understand that there has been real difficulty in actually getting to the negotiating table, let alone getting into the details of what the new agreements would be like.

It was Darren Cheeseman's view that Spotless had no interest in resolving the issues that cleaners faced every day, such as bullying and harassment, overwork, unsafe working conditions, and poverty-level wages, amongst other things. He has also said that he hopes, particularly in the case of the shopping centre cleaners' campaign, that Spotless, the major contractor in that area, does not trade off conditions such as penalty rates, overtime and rostered days off. I commend Darren Cheeseman MP for that.

I understand that in South Australia we have, perhaps, a happier situation. My advice is that the South Australian government supports the Clean Start campaign principles—having had the opportunity to go to the Labour History seminar that was recently held in Adelaide, I also

understand that Prime Minister Julia Gillard—then deputy prime minister—also came out publicly to support the Clean Start campaign to make sure that cleaners get a fair go. I am sure that people in this chamber would be aware that in South Australia Spotless is a major employer, and there are a number of state government workers, particularly in the CBD, who work as contractors or subcontractors for Spotless. There are also a number of facilities, management of government-owned buildings, where I understand that the workers are employed under the Clean Start collective agreement.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate United Voice for continuing this campaign. Having been a cleaner myself, particularly in my student days, I feel very strongly about cleaners having a fair go—and there are a number of members here who are identifying that they have also been cleaners; and this is paid cleaning, not the unpaid cleaning that we all do. We hope that in South Australia they have the same success.

### MARINE PARKS

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:44):** I wish to speak about marine parks, as did the member for Bragg. This has always been an issue for me and an issue for South Australians. As a member of parliament, I, like every member in the House of Assembly, am here to listen to my constituents and bring feedback to the parliament, and I have consistently done so on this. It has never been a personal issue; however, today, unfortunately, we saw the minister attacking individual members.

I can only presume that the question the minister was asked, from his own side, was written by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and that the answer was also written by that department. I have always defended minister Caica, and I thought we had a good working relationship, but it seems that as of question time today the CEO for department for environment is the de facto minister, and we have a minister who does not sit in the chamber, and I think it is outrageous.

I refer to some comments that the minister made during his answer where he referred to me as: 'when provided with the opportunity to become better informed on the issues, he can embark only on what are cynical and, at times, offensive attacks on the officers who are trying to cure his ignorance'.

A fortnight ago when we had a briefing on marine parks with the department for environment, the minister and the marine parks people, I raised a couple of issues which had taken place in my electorate, one at Seal Bay, where some journalists who went to Seal Bay were put on the carpet by the department for environment there. The chief executive said, 'No, that didn't happen, that wouldn't happen,' and basically tried to put me down and ridicule me. That is fine, I can wear that, I do not worry about that. However, this is the response I received yesterday from the CEO of the department for environment, written on 28 March:

Dear Michael

Re: Seal Bay Incident

I write to you following our briefing last week regarding the Marines Park program in South Australia.

At that briefing, you advised of an incident that occurred at Seal Bay, Kangaroo Island, regarding the treatment of a journalist from *The Australian*. You indicated that after several telephone conversations, the journalist was advised that a commercial fee would be charged to photograph on the beach at Seal Bay.

In response, I said that this would not have happened because I believed that staff at Seal Bay understood the need to promote nature-based tourism on Kangaroo Island and would have facilitated the journalist's success.

I owe you an apology because the events that you described did take place and I was wrong to suggest that your account was inaccurate.

Please accept my apologies. I have followed up the matter to which you referred and I have taken action to ensure that a more cooperative approach will be taken in the future.

The Commercial Sites Manager has also spoken to the journalist involved and apologised for any inconvenience.

Yours sincerely

Alan Holmes

Chief Executive

I use that as an example of the nonsense that has gone on over the last few years, and indeed, the last few months, in relation to this marine parks fiasco, and the total lack of control by the minister over his own department.

The fact is that this department has run around perpetrating nonsense for months and months and months, and when a member of parliament gets up to raise those issues in the parliament they get abused, or if they ring them up on the radio they get abused. It is simply not good enough. It is the ultimate Sir Humphrey, and it is a very clear sign to me and many others that the minister is being totally outwitted by his department. I find it most unfortunate. There is no question that you have unelected, patronising, department for environment personnel running around putting down members of parliament, and preaching to the people of South Australia, telling them untruths.

**Mr Pisoni:** A weak minister.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Yes, an extremely weak minister who is not on top of it. We had an excellent briefing from the department of fisheries a few weeks ago where it was made blatantly clear that fish stocks are very well managed, and they are good through individual species. But, what do we have? This morning on the radio we had the Wilderness Society, who are probably fed by the department I would think, saying that fish stocks are in danger, blah, blah, blah. What a load of hogwash. Then, to cap it off, we have this cowardly minister refusing to attend a meeting at Burnside tonight. If it was the 1914-18 war he would be sent a white feather and his department people would be as well.

That is where we are at in this debate. They need to come in and start being honest and transparent, and the minister needs to pull this department into gear. The cabinet needs to pull the minister into gear, and the Premier needs to pull the minister into gear. He is not up to the job. I am very sorry about this, but I have tried to do the right thing, along with other members in this place, and he has totally, absolutely, and completely failed and he is a disgrace to the position of minister in South Australia. I urge the government to do something about it rapidly in the best interests of the marine parks debate, which I do support.

#### **NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR FAMILIES OF IMMIGRANTS**

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:49):** I rise today to talk about some events I attended over the weekend on behalf of the Premier, Mike Rann. On both Friday night and Saturday I had the pleasure of representing the minister at events celebrating the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of ANFE, which is the national association for families of migrants. ANFE was established in South Australia in 1961 by the late Cavalier Antonio Giordano AM.

As I said, this year marks the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the organisation, which has provided to the Italo-Australian community a range of services and support. Among those things the organisation seeks to promote the rights of people of Italian background to participate in the South Australian community; provide culturally appropriate welfare services and activities; promote the Italian language and heritage within a multicultural context; provide respite for carers of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds; and assist in matters of integration, settlement and post settlement.

ANFE is a national organisation which over its half a century of operation has supported everything from multicultural programs and youth development initiatives to aged care, support and welfare. At the moment, the head of ANFE is the Acting President, Mr Remo Pocarro, who I met for the first time on Friday night, and who also attended the museum events on Saturday.

The organisation had its beginnings in South Australia back in the late 1950s, when informal gatherings of Italian migrants took place at the then Mocca Bar on Hindley Street, then known as 'little Italy'. With the need for migrant welfare services apparent, ANFE became the first community organisation, independent of the Italian Consulate or the Australian government, to provide assistance to newly arrived Italian migrants. The early development of the organisation and the foundation on which it now rests can be attributed to the high level of volunteers who, over 50 years, have dedicated their time and effort to providing for their fellow community members.

Recently, in accordance with the many anniversary celebrations of the organisation, numerous events have been held in honour of one of its key founders, Mr Antonio Giordano AM. Mr Giordano was born in May 1907 in Naples, Italy—one of the greatest cities in Italy, of course—and migrated to Australia in 1924 after obtaining the equivalent of a working visa.

Despite his reasonable education, Antonio assumed many manual labouring jobs throughout Victoria and New South Wales in his first years of settlement. As the Depression hit Australia in the late 1920s, Antonio was forced to live out of a swag, a victim of the exponential increase in unemployment. Years later, in 1937, Antonio was engaged as a writer and journalist for

the publication *Il Giornale* and then the *Italo-Australiano*. It was here that his participation in the wider Italian community truly commenced, becoming secretary of the Italian Club in Sydney.

In June 1940 Antonio was interned as an enemy alien due to Italy's involvement in the Second World War. Despite spending the next four years behind barbed wire, Antonio did not give up his service to the Italo-Australian community, producing a newsletter for other Italians, directing theatrical performances and other activities. After his release he became a part-time interpreter for the commonwealth Crown Solicitor's Office in Adelaide, participating in numerous prosecution trials and becoming well respected in legal circles for his ability to communicate to the court the various cultural differences of Italian migrants.

In 1945 Antonio married Lucy, a South Australian resident of English migrants. In 1954 Antonio returned to his passion of journalism and joined the staff of *Corriere d'Australia*. He contributed to other Italian and Australian newspapers with letters and articles focusing on immigration, exploration and history.

His contribution to the Italian community in Australia continued. He became secretary of the Italian Chamber of Commerce in South Australia and other parts of Australia. He also served as president of the Juventus Soccer Club in Adelaide after assisting with its incorporation. Antonio also worked for the Bank of Adelaide, where he acted as the Italian officer for public relations. He was also very active in trying to ensure that Italian naturalised migrants retained some rights when visiting their homeland under the title of double citizenship, what we call dual citizenship today.

The current exhibition at the Migration Museum pays testament to the work of this man in Australia, and I would recommend that people attend that exhibition, because it is quite incredible how one person can fit so much into one life. As the Acting President of ANFE, Mr Remo Pocarro, remarked recently, Antonio Giordano lived a colourful but meaningful life.

#### SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:54):** I believe that, prior to the luncheon adjournment, I was talking about the environment that needs to exist within South Australia to support business growth, and I just want to continue a little on that, especially as it relates to some of the portfolio areas that I have responsibility for. I will talk about small business first, if I may.

I am really fearful of what Labor's position is on small business. As I have quoted many times in this chamber, 130,000 small businesses in South Australia need that support. At a difficult time when the nation is struggling with the challenges of the global financial crisis and the impact that is having on businesses, as well as the export opportunities in our state and the reduced amount of available expenditure that families and individuals have, instead of supporting small business opportunities, we found in the last budget (and, sadly, it flows through to the next budget, so that is the link that comes with respect to the supply debate) a withdrawal of government services to support small business.

Even more amazingly, the Minister for Small Business (Hon. Mr Koutsantonis) in the *Hansard* of 23 February this year confirmed that the Liberal Party is the party of small business. It truly is. If the Minister for Small Business is recognising that his own party is not supporting small business and talking about the opposition being the party for small business, that is a message we will continue, because we are here, we are open and we want to make sure that small business has opportunities to grow; but to do so it needs to ensure that government principles, policy and financial resources are there to support it.

It is interesting that a recent report of the Sensis Business Index identified that only 6 per cent of small businesses are actually supportive of government policy. That is a damning statistic that shows that only one in 16 (or thereabouts) businesses actually believe that government policy is supporting them in running their business and having the opportunity to grow.

Above anything else, that means that government has to rework what it does about small business. But, instead, what have we found? The minister has taken away support for small business. We have lost the Small Business Month. We have lost the funding that was there to reduce—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I will get to that. We are abolishing the funding support for business enterprise centres that comes from the state government. The amazing part for me in this is that

the Business Enterprise Centre (BEC) network has existed for a good number of years. There is a belief within the community that the business enterprise centres are there to support business. I know that, in a meeting that the Leader of the Opposition and I had with one of the BEC members last week, it was enforced upon us that, across its network, the BECs actually take in 70,000 telephone calls per year from small business looking for assistance. That is 70,000 calls.

If those resources are no longer there because the state government is withdrawing from 30 June this year its funding support for the Business Enterprise Centre network, who is going to pick up the slack? The Office of Small Business within the minister's area has seemingly been reduced. There is no Small Business Month. There is seemingly a 21 per cent decrease in staffing levels within the small business Big Impact program. Who is going to be there?

Small business is desperate. It wants to succeed. In many cases it is mum and dad businesses; it is single-person operators with maybe one partner. It is those people who are so busy doing the work that they need to know there is someone at the end of a telephone to give them some guidance. The BEC network performs a wonderful role in doing this and it does it free of charge.

There will have to be a complete rethink about the BEC network. I know that four of their number are actually looking to combine to continue to service all of the BEC network areas. They are going to struggle financially. There is commitment from federal government dollars there that will take it through to mid-2012; and certainly a hope that the federal government continues to recognise and give respect to the Business Enterprise Centre network because those people are out there. They have got contacts with the community. They have been giving assistance for many years. Their name is well known. The fact that they can get confidential advice is well respected, and the fact that they can help support small business and help it grow is one that needs to happen.

So I want to reinforce the message that, from what the opposition is hearing, it is obvious that the minister does not support small business. He has acknowledged publicly in *Hansard* that the Liberal Party is the party of small business, but it is still an opportunity for change. I hope that, with a new Treasurer in place, there is indeed going to be a change in the principles behind some of the policy decisions that the Treasurer will make and that an increasing social awareness will give respect to small business and we will have a turnaround and an improvement.

**Mr Pisoni:** No.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The member for Unley suggests to me that we are doubtful about that. We live in hope, though.

I will briefly comment on regional development—another example of where funding support from the state, flagged in last year's September budget, is again continuing through the forward estimates period and it will have a detrimental effect. History reflects on the fact that regional development has been a difficult portfolio area for the Labor government. There have been, in fact, seven different ministers over the last eight years. Continuity is needed. Change creates opportunity, I understand that, and different perspective comes into it, but you need to ensure that, within that ministerial role, you have people who see opportunity and fight for programs and financial support, and who can see the great opportunities in regional South Australia and take the struggle into cabinet meetings to ensure the resources that are needed flow through to it.

It concerns me that, when I look at the State Strategic Plan, I can see very few references to regional South Australia. One is the fact that 18 per cent of the population of our state will remain within regional areas. That, in itself, sounds okay but, in effect, it makes very little difference to the number of people who live in the regions now. In effect, it is a downwards percentage movement, and that frustrates the life out of me.

The opposition really has a strong focus on the fact that we want our regional communities to grow. The government, it appears, is prepared to let them become dormitory communities with no growth and no future, and that cannot be allowed to continue. We have to ensure that our population goes up. The state is working towards that, but let us also make sure that regional South Australia gets a share of that.

The Regional Development Australia network is a recent amalgam of the regional development boards and the area consultative committees, so it is federal, state and local governments working together. But, again, the budget decision of last year, impacting through the



forward estimates and coming into effect from June 2013, is a withdrawal of funds from Regional Development Australia.

I know the minister (Hon. Michael O'Brien) did some good work in the time that he was there. He no longer holds the portfolio, regrettably. It concerns me that I need to ensure that the ministers in the cabinet room are fighting for more money that is needed, and it flows through every possible area. The Regional Development Infrastructure Fund (only about \$3.5 million per year) has been underspent in recent years. It amazes me that you can have dollars available for a state government project to support infrastructure. We should have made sure that it got out there.

The Liberal opposition, as part of its 2010 election campaign, committed 25 per cent of royalties money from mining operations to go into a regional development infrastructure fund—\$43 million in the first year and then growing as forward estimates grew for mining royalties. That would have created tremendous opportunities for the really important infrastructure that will be needed to translate opportunity into reality.

I use as an example a discussion I had with an iron ore exploration company that is looking to operate just north of Kimba. It has told me that, in the first of three stages of development, on the basis of two million tonnes per year going out of South Australia and working on a \$160 per tonne sale price for the iron ore, to get it from the site and road freight it to just north of Whyalla, put it on the rail, take it by Genesee & Wyoming down to Port Adelaide and ship it out will probably cost in the vicinity of \$110 per tonne.

All members in this chamber should shake their head in frustration at that because, indeed, how do you encourage business to look at setting up mining opportunities when that outward cost is going to chew into their revenue so much? That is where infrastructure is really the key. Infrastructure is not cheap when you look across the regions and the metropolitan area at building what is needed for a vibrant future, but you have to look at opportunities where state government and private enterprise can work together to ensure this money flows through.

The company I spoke to talked about the possibility of another deepwater export port being based on the eastern coast of Eyre Peninsula. They tell me that Chinese people will put up the investment money that is required, but let us also look at opportunities where there is a level of appropriate investment to ensure that projects happen through state government funds to make sure that these mining opportunities do have a future and, indeed, that the communities that will be close by, or the communities in which the people who work within these enterprises will live, also have a future.

I also want to reflect upon a couple of things from last year's budget that really frustrate the life out of me, which have commenced and will flow through to forward years, as it affects the region, and I refer to the removal of the regional metropolitan subsidy scheme. An amount of 3¢ or thereabouts per litre might sound a small amount in the budget papers. After coming into effect on 1 January this year, the net effect, though, is that, over the 3½ years of the forward estimates, for people who live and travel through regional South Australia the additional cost of petroleum will be \$49.8 million (50 million bucks in round figures) over 3½ years. That is what it is going to cost you to live and travel through regional South Australia. Those of us who live in the regions suffer terribly from an often poor transport network. It is important for us—

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** And an expensive one—the member for Finniss is talking about getting back to Kangaroo Island, and there is no doubt about that. It is important that we recognise some of those challenges and that we keep some support in place. The removal of that petroleum subsidy scheme, which has been there, I think, for some 13 or 14 years, has not received a very high profile. It has frustrated the life out of me that some of the media people have not picked up on this because it has a direct effect on the pockets of everyone who lives in regional South Australia and, indeed, the vast number of metropolitan-based people who travel through our great regions. So, let's make sure we improve some things.

I also want to talk briefly about the funding cuts as they relate to the community private hospitals—two are in my electorate and one is in the electorate of the member for MacKillop, at Keith. In my case, for Goyder it is the Ardrossan and Moonta hospitals. It may be that (and the minister has certainly talked about this in the chamber), as a result of assistance provided now by Country Health, there is a greater level of return from the federal government for aged-care facilities provided by those hospitals.

However, I am looking at the fact that, for that first three or four months in particular after the announcement made in the September budget, those communities at Moonta and Ardrossan thought their future was seriously at risk. They still have grave fears about whether, structurally, they will still have sufficient revenue to provide aged care and emergency services and the bed facilities they have. It is that uncertain.

So, instead of just announcing things and then, after the community starts to rally against it, come out and say, 'Yes, we'll give you support to work on business plans to give you a financial future,' why can you not do that beforehand? Why can't you be proactive and, instead of just identifying a target opportunity and saying, 'I'll take \$1.174 million out of four different hospitals,' why don't you actually work through it proactively before these budget announcements and tell the boards of these hospitals, 'Okay, we're considering this. We feel, though, there is an opportunity, if we work with you, to get around any short-term financial problems you have in place.'

You would then not have 1,000 people at Moonta, as there was, or 250 people at Ardrossan or, indeed, probably 1,000 people on the steps of Parliament House, as a first step showing the parliament how much it does not like this decision. For the Keith community, in a different electorate to mine, they are going to keep up the fight, because for them it is a critical one. I just want to enforce the fact that there is a way for governments to do things. Instead of just deciding and then defending its decision, how about real consultation and real support for communities, be they metropolitan-based or regional, to ensure that we get some positive outcomes.

Finally, in the last few minutes available to me, I want to talk about some transport and infrastructure issues. Significant dollars are being invested, but history will reflect upon the fact that there have been many times in the past where announcements have been made by the Rann Labor government about transport infrastructure being put in place and that not translating into work on the ground.

For me, one of the greatest points by which I can enforce this is an announcement, which I believe was made in August 2005 or thereabouts (I might be a few months out), where both the Premier and the Minister for Transport talked about the fact that, as part of their vision for transport, they would put \$40 million into widening South Road between Port Road and Torrens Road.

I am not a permanent resident of Adelaide. I do travel through the city many, many times now, being a member of parliament. I have a sister and brother-in-law who live just about immediately adjacent to this section of road, so I have been on it at peak times, slower times, night and day. I have seen the difficulties it presents through creating a bit of a bottleneck and through the power lines there, and the polls that support those lines, because of the lie of the land actually angling in fractionally and the camber of the road.

Motorists are told now that the only way they can travel safely, if it is a large vehicle, is to be in the middle of the road and, in this case, they cannot be on the western side of the road. That is how there was a very serious accident not that many months ago, and that is how, sadly, a person was killed. None of us in this chamber want to see that happen, so when dollars are being committed to projects, especially in blackspot areas like that, but do not translate to work on the ground after a five or six-year period, we really have to start raising questions. This is not political point-scoring: this is a fact of life. The Labor government committed to those dollars being spent as part of its vision. We are now some six years down the track and it is still not happening.

There is work occurring on South Road—I recognise that. An enormous amount of dollars is being spent on the superway at the northern end of South Road, but this is an area that has killed someone now. This is an area where traffic is very congested and we have boom gates from the train line just a bit south of that, before you hit Port Road. This is a very busy area at most times of the day and there is a high number of very large trucks travelling along this road. This is an important project that needs to happen.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Hear, hear!

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The member for Croydon supports that, so I commend him on that.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Yes. If you make the promise, actually make sure that you do the work.

**Mr Marshall:** Has he been arguing for it in cabinet?

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Good question: was he arguing for it in cabinet? Another obvious issue for us to talk about is the backlog on maintenance for the Transport SA network. In about 2005, the Royal Automobile Association put out a report entitled, I believe, 'Backwater Benchmark' which highlighted, at that stage, some \$200 million in backlog on road maintenance work for our transport network. I cannot see the improvements from any money that has been spent since then. There is a desperate need for those dollars to be allocated.

Again, the Liberal Party—and I am pleased that this is part of the transport policy that we took to the election—committed \$10 million, \$12 million, \$14 million and \$16 million across the forward estimates and, on top of that, in the six years out beyond that period, identified another \$152 million that was going to be invested in that \$200 million backlog to actually ensure that we put in as many resources as we could to maintain that basic infrastructure.

Roads are what we travel on all the time. Roads are the lifeline between our communities. Roads are what carry all of our freight. Roads are what the nation makes an enormous amount of money on. As we are using roads by an ever-increasing amount, the freight load is going to double over the next decade. There will be a continuing pressure on our road network. Unless investment continues to occur, I have serious concerns about the capacity of the road network. The ongoing backlog will be enormous. There will be pavement failure. It is an investment that needs to happen.

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:12):** The budget was delivered six months after the election, and what did the government do when it delivered that budget? It took South Australians to the cleaners. However, this morning we heard how badly cleaners in our schools in South Australia have been treated. Let me just tell a story. You are not looking very animated, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am always animated, because the excitement in here is phenomenal, but I was actually trying to work out who was interjecting more: the members on my right or the members on my left.

**Mr Pengilly:** It's over there.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You dibber-dobber, member for Finniss. Carry on, member for Unley.

**Mr PISONI:** I always enjoy the banter, Madam Deputy Speaker. We heard that the cleaning contractors were forced to pay their staff higher salaries due the federal Labor government. They were told by the department, 'That's bad luck. You've got an existing contract and you've got to honour it.' When they contacted me 12 months ago, that is what they told me the department was telling them to do.

Cleaning is a very competitive business. There are a number of competitors and, because of that, margins are very tight. We would see losses of some \$20,000 to \$30,000 by some of these small family businesses in order to honour these contracts. Eventually, the department realised that it was those companies that were in an unsustainable position but, instead of tearing the contracts up and starting again—which is what the cleaning contractors wanted—it reduced the hours that cleaners worked so they did not have to pay penalty rates.

The intention of the federal Labor Party was to pay the lowest paid workers more, and then the state Labor Party, under a minister who claims to believe in social justice (minister Weatherill), says, 'Look, I'm having trouble managing my budget and meeting these cuts that we all agreed to as a state cabinet.' According to Mr Foley, everybody agreed, including Mr Weatherill, and I remember he specifically pointed Mr Weatherill out as agreeing to these budget cuts, and so instead of actually renegotiating these contracts for the same amount of work to be done for more money, they then instructed schools to not have those contractors in after hours. So, here we have kids doing maths and science experiments competing with a vacuum cleaner, competing with the broom, competing with the banister brush!

It is a ludicrous situation, and the minister said on radio this morning that it is a transition period. There does not need to be a transition period. Tear those contracts up! Allocate more money. Pay the cleaners more, pay them what Julia Gillard promised them, and renegotiate those contracts. That is the intent of the federal laws that the federal Labor Party introduced, and yet this government is so devoid of funds to be able to manage its budget that it is now asking the lowest paid workers in our society to forego their penalty rates because they cannot afford them, rather than renegotiate their contracts and find cuts in the bureaucracy where people are earning six-

figure incomes. They will not find cuts there, but they will very quickly and easily find cuts for those people who are earning very modest incomes of \$25,000 or \$30,000 a year.

I think that is indicative of a government that is out of touch, and that is why we have had a budget released that will see the introduction of increased licence fees, registration, stamp duties, water, electricity, public transport, TAFE fees; all going through the roof, through the Rann government maladministration. Millions of dollars in unbudgeted revenue still comes in, and yet the former treasurer and the new Treasurer cannot balance the books.

Isn't it ironic, the debate we are having at the moment over the carbon tax in Canberra, where the Labor Party in government is criticising the Liberal Party for playing hard on the carbon tax? Remember the GST debate? Let's compare the GST debate and the carbon tax debate. In the first GST election in 1993, John Hewson was crucified because he could not clarify the price of a birthday cake after the GST, and yet Julia Gillard cannot even tell us how much electricity will cost! It is a major contributor to this economy and she cannot even tell us how much electricity will cost. Yet Labor in opposition demanded to know how much the candles on a birthday cake would cost and said if John Hewson did not know that he did not deserve to be the prime minister of Australia—and of course, he paid the price.

Let's have the comparison that we hear between the GST debate and the carbon tax debate. We have Labor in opposition opposing a tax that was replacing the existing tax, but a modern tax that every other OECD country in the world had adopted years earlier. They opposed it, for all sorts of reasons, not once, but twice; two elections, two GST elections. John Howard as prime minister, of course, said, 'I will take a GST to the election. If I am returned in 1998, you will have a GST.' Of course, he won that election, but Labor still opposed it. They opposed it in the 2001 election as well, and they lost that.

What did Julia Gillard say? She said, 'There will be no carbon tax' before the election. Then there is a carbon tax after the election, and yet you hear the Labor party supporters saying, 'Well, John Howard said there would be no GST' as some sort of comparison. That is the hypocrisy of the Labor Party, comparing how they operate in government and how they operate in opposition. When they are in government, anybody who argues with them is extreme; when they are in opposition, they oppose everything for political purposes. There is a big difference between the way we operate and the way they operate.

What did the former education minister say when we announced our school autonomy policy in the lead-up to the election? That it was a backward policy. She said that it took us back to the Olsen-Brown days. 'The Liberal Party only wants to go backwards when it comes to education.'

**Mr Marshall:** Where is she now?

**Mr PISONI:** Where is she now?—a 15 per cent swing. I know the member for Croydon is upset about that. I know he is still recovering from the removal of Jane Lomax-Smith from this place. I know he is very upset about it and I do sympathise.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** I am.

**Mr PISONI:** Yes, I acknowledge how upset you are, and I know that you are in regular contact with the former member for Adelaide. That is what she said before the election. What did the new education minister, Jay Weatherill, say? That he wanted to introduce more autonomy for principals in schools. We get a lot of press releases from this government, but we see very little action. There is a lot of talk but very little action. Finally, the people of South Australia are waking up to that and that is why they have stopped listening. This is what he said on 8 June 2010 as part of a press release:

Education Minister Jay Weatherill says he is concerned the current system of teacher recruitment does not give principals enough say and leads to good teachers leaving public schools or the profession.

He goes on to say:

Principals have been raising concerns with me that they don't get enough say in recruiting teachers to their schools—and that matching teachers to schools is critical.

He makes some good points. There are some real issues that principals have in managing their schools. There is too much department control and too much centralisation of the education system here in South Australia. That is why we support school autonomy. That is why we are the owners of school autonomy. Johnny-come-lately Julia Gillard and minister Weatherill have got on the bandwagon, but they do not understand it. Minister Weatherill does not understand it, because this

memo on the new personnel advisory committees (PAC) went out to principals just a couple of weeks ago. He goes on to inform principals:

A PAC must be established in each school. The PAC is fundamental to ensuring effective staff consultation occurs within schools and is a key forum which contributes positively to decision making processes on matters pertaining to human resource management.

Let us look at who is on the personnel advisory committee. Remember, the minister who sent this out is the same man who says he wants more autonomy for principals and who wants principals to be able to run their schools. I refer to the South Australian Education Staff (Government Preschools and Schools) Arbitrated Enterprise Bargaining Award 2010, which is the award where the government caved in to the teachers' union because it was getting close to an election. The government accepted some of the conditions, and this is one of the new conditions:

Each school will establish a Personnel Advisory Committee (PAC) comprised of the following membership:

(a) the Principal...

Thank God the principal has a say on this committee, but who else has a say? A nominee elected by the AEU. Then, of course, an equal opportunity representative elected by school staff. So, here we have the principal who has to get the okay for resource management of his school from the AEU and other staff members, and yet the minister is telling the public, because he knows parents want school autonomy, 'We believe there needs to be school autonomy.' Instead, what we get is less autonomy for principals. We have an actual committee made up for the smallest of resource changes that happen within a school.

If a non-teaching staff member's position is discussed, if she is moved from the administration area next to the canteen to the administration area next to the library, according to this provision in the enterprise agreement it may require a meeting of the personnel advisory committee to discuss whether that is in the best interest of the school and staff. For heaven's sake, that is going backwards, not going forwards. Why doesn't this government like school principals? It appoints them into these positions but then it does not trust them to run its schools; just like it does not trust governing councils to make the real decisions that schools need to make, as concerned parents who have a stake in the performance and education outcomes of the students at that school.

There was a classic example when I attended the meeting put on by DECS last night, when 80 parents, students and former students turned up to discuss the positioning of the expansion for 200 students at Marryatville High School. It was an absolutely pointless meeting, because, in the end, the governing council could only make a recommendation, and it was very clear to all those in attendance that the department was pushing option 2, which was to build a monstrosity in front of that beautiful heritage building. Do you know what the department said? Best value, it said it was best value.

So, there is the minister for education sending out his department heads to tell the people of Marryatville High School, 'You must make a compromise because we made an election pledge on the run, without doing the work, to combat what the Liberals were offering at the last election. You must make a compromise so that we can honour that election pledge within our \$60 million budget over the four schools that we promised to expand.' That is what that is all about.

Apparently, there is now a new regulated size for an oval. A reduced oval in front of the building is now a new regulated size, the Marryatville oval. You can still play footy on it, although I am not sure if the footies are the same size; they didn't talk about the regulation size of the footies being reduced. I know that people like the member for Hammond and I might be a bit big to play on that team but, according to the department, you can still play footy on that oval because, although smaller, it is still a regulation size for football and cricket—despite the fact that they already have to retrieve balls that go out onto Kensington Road.

Of course, then there is the Adelaide High School expansion. The press release at the time was big: it said that there would be an expansion of Adelaide High School of 250 students and that there would be no encroachment on the Parklands. The governing council was asked to consider five options by the department; four of them encroached on the Parklands, and the one that did not meant they had to knock down a heritage building. Every single condition that the government promised prior to the election was thrown out by this minister in a desperate attempt to honour a cobbled-together election promise to counter the very sound election promise the Liberal Party made for a second city high school in Adelaide.

If the member for Croydon put his constituents before the party he would support that, because he knows that there are many people in Croydon who would love to send their kids to Adelaide High School. They can't, because they are not in the zone and there is no room for them. As a matter of fact, there is not even enough room for those in the very small zone. This is what it has come to. At the next election Labor will have been running this state for 33 of the last 44 years, and this is what it has come to. It has come to penny pinching on school cleaners, making election promises on the run, and then expecting school communities to take discount packages in order for the government to deliver it. That is what it has come to, after 33 years of Labor government in this state.

Some interesting facts came out with the My School website. We have seen a lot of criticism from the AEU for non-government schools for having so much money. This is politics of resentment that the AEU is very pleased to push in its disdain for the non-government school sector, but let us look at the figures provided by the department to the My School website in the actual resource entitlement statements—if you like, the profit and loss statements that cover the amount of money the school actually receives.

Let us look at what the department told the My School website operators that the budget was for the Kangarilla Primary School (and I know that the member for Finniss will be interested in this). The My School website says that school receives \$817,000. Do you know what the resource entitlement statement says? It says \$553,000—a 32 per cent difference. The department hangs on to 32 per cent of the money allocated to that school. But that is not all. You move to Murray Bridge High School—and the member for Hammond would be very interested in this—the My School website says that \$11.734 million is allocated to Murray Bridge High School. Do you know how much Murray Bridge High School actually receives? It receives \$7.98 million—a 32 per cent difference. Thirty-two per cent of the money allocated to Murray Bridge High School does not reach the school.

This minister says he wants more school autonomy but we are seeing less school autonomy and more centralised control of our schools and in that time we have seen a drift of 10,000 students to the non-government sector from the government sector. When I asked the education minister what provisions he has made for schools for the 12,000 homes at Buckland Park, he said 'None'. They have wiped their hands of providing public education in the 30-year plan. Where is another city high school as part of the 30 year plan?

If the urban infill ideas that they have for Marrayville High School are an indication of what they plan for urban infill as part of the 30-year plan, God help us, because the criteria seems to be best value. We know what best value is: blue board and a five star rated air conditioner. That is what we are going to see popping up all around in front of our heritage buildings and streetscapes in our inner suburbs, in my electorate of Unley, the electorate of Hartley, and in the electorate of Norwood. This is all supported by the member for Hartley—she is very keen on the 30-year plan. I know she supported it in cabinet—because cabinet speaks as single voice, and if she didn't I would be very keen to hear her correct me.

To finish off, before the election we heard a promise by this Premier of 100,000 new jobs in South Australia. The latest job statistics are coming out on Thursday—you can bet your bottom dollar that if it is a good figure we will hear from the Premier, and if it is bad figure he will leave it to minister Snelling to deal with it. With February's figures we saw the unemployment figures rise to 5.8 per cent when we saw stagnation around the country. We saw an increase of half a per cent of unemployment here in South Australia. There are fewer people working in South Australia now than when Mike Rann made the promise of 100,000 new jobs. There are more people unemployed, and fewer people working than when he made that promise 12 months ago of 100,000 new jobs. So, when you hear these promises from Labor, take them with a pinch of salt.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:32):** I appreciate the chance to rise and speak on the Supply Bill. Of course we will support it. As you know we will support the Supply Bill because that is the convention and that is what is required to keep the state operating. It certainly would be remiss of me not to point out what a difficult, dreadful situation the state is in financially. I would go so far as to say that I do not believe that there is one member of parliament with a place in this chamber who actually does think that the state is in a good financial position.

Members and ministers can talk about the services and the different things that they are providing but, if you look at the state, if you look at the debt, if you look at where we are heading, if you look at the trends, I do not think that anybody could say that the debt that we have—heading towards \$2 million a day worth of interest—could be acceptable by anybody's standards. The state

has had rising income throughout the term of this government but spending has been going up even more, and it really is a situation of mismanagement with regards to finances.

There is difficulty everywhere. If you look at the results of the last budget—and I do not think that anybody would have ever seen the sort of backlash from unions, such a broad cross-section of unions against the government and against the budget. There is difficulty in the city. The unions and the public service cuts and the deceit with which they were handled, I think, is really shameful. The vehemence with which the public sector unions, particularly, but certainly many others, felt about the way that they had been treated was very clear on the steps of parliament house week after week.

Another city example—and as members know here I do not normally stray into city issues, I normally concentrate on the country—is what occurred with the Parks Community Centre. That was just dreadful, and I think it really highlights how difficult this is and what a bad situation the government is in with regard to managing its finances. You would never, ever have expected the government to do that to the Parks Community Centre. To its credit, it turned around only because it had such a dreadful backlash from its own voter heartland.

I know a bit about the Parks Community Centre. I lived in Croydon, in fact, for a few years when I lived in Adelaide. I used to go to the Parks Community Centre very regularly to use the gym and the exercise facilities, and I saw all the other good work that went on there, so I feel quite comfortable, while I am the member for Stuart, talking about that place. I think there are two good examples—the dealing with the Public Service and the Parks Community Centre—that highlight what a difficult situation things are in when that is required in the city.

I would like to focus on two key directions that this government is pushing towards because of the financial situation that it is in at the moment. One is with regard to red tape. When finances are in a dreadful situation, as they are, the government has no choice but to reduce services unless it wants to increase taxes, and we are already the most highly taxed state in Australia, so I do not think it saw any option there.

The government must find a way to reduce its services, and one of the things this government has done is move towards the user-pays system, and I can understand. I have got a strong business background and I have done lots of things in corporate life and in my own small business involvement. I do understand that you need to try to put the costs where the costs belong, but what this is leading to at the moment is an extraordinary impost on industries and an enormous amount of red tape.

The reason for that is the government is still setting all of the regulations but trying to put the cost of administering them and imposing them on industry. Consequently, it does not have a vested interest in keeping that cost down. The government, broadly speaking, needs to provide the regulations and provide the money to put them in place, or allow industry to set the regulations and cop the costs. Either one of those things will get a far more efficient outcome than what we have at the moment, where the government still seeks to impose the regulations and oversee and set the rules, but tries to push all the costs towards the industries. I give two specific examples of where this has really gone haywire. We have a situation at the moment where the government is proposing a biosecurity levy, but the primary production industry will have to pay. In reality, biosecurity is an issue that affects the whole state. Every single person who lives or travels through the state is affected, potentially could cause harm, hopefully benefits from far more than that.

Biosecurity affects the entire state, and yet the cost of the levy will just go to primary producers and agriculture and industry. Yet, on the other hand, you have got the River Murray levy, where people who do not draw any water from the River Murray at all are paying the levy all over the state. So, you have got one situation where industry pays and everybody benefits, and you have got one situation where everybody pays and lots of people who do not benefit at all are included in having to pay. That is causing all sorts of red tape and inefficiency, and I really do think that is an outcome of the state being in a very dire financial situation. As I said, poor finances, having to decrease services, trying to push a user pays system, and the government is trying to still impose all of the regulations.

The other direction that I really want to focus on, that comes out of being financially strapped, is priority setting. It is no different to a household or a child's pocket money, all the way up to a state or federal budget. There is never enough money, I accept that. There is never enough money to do all of the things that you would like to do, and that would be true whether it was a Liberal or a Labor government. But when you are really under pressure your choice of priorities

really comes under pressure as well. What we are seeing at the moment is that the government, which typically favours the city over the country and the outback areas anyway, is really pushing shamefully down that path.

The city is in trouble with regard to funding money to provide services that it deserves, but the country and in the outback areas are in a diabolical situation at the moment. It is not much fun just pointing out problems if you do not have a solution or you do not want to contribute. There are two very easy things, and these are not things that people here have not heard before but they are worth highlighting: \$535 million going towards the Adelaide Oval. It is not necessary.

At a time when we are looking for money to provide services for the state, and particularly in the country, spending \$535 million is absolutely not necessary. It might be necessary for the SANFL so that the AFL does not take over its football licences. It might be necessary for SACA so that it can get rid of its debt much more quickly. I can understand how nice it would be to have a city stadium and to have football in the city.

I have no trouble with that whatsoever, but it is not a priority when you do not have the money; it is not a priority when you have to try to forward sell the forests in the South-East to make it happen. Add to that the RAH. We can all consider what the costs might be, and the government has not been brave enough to bring forward its costs, even though I am sure it would have them, absolutely positive that it would have them, but it will not tell the state, the taxpayers and the parliament what they are.

What we do know is that, from the calculations that both sides did before the election, there will be about a \$1 billion gap in the cost of rebuilding the Royal Adelaide Hospital on site where it is now versus building a brand new one. We can talk about how high or how low the costs might have been, and we will find out eventually, but what we know is that it is about \$1 billion more expensive to do what the government has done.

Between the Adelaide Oval and the Royal Adelaide Hospital, we have got \$1.5 billion being spent that does not need to be spent—\$1.5 billion. Imagine what that could do for all of South Australia. Imagine what that could do in Adelaide and in the country and in the outback. If the government did not feel the need to build its icons, if the government did not feel the need to build these facilities in its own honour but provided the services or save \$1.5 billion, imagine how much better off the rest of the state would be.

Imagine how much better off the finances would be, even if you did not spend any more money on extra services and things. I think specifically about my electorate, the electorate of Stuart that I represent, and I will just list a few towns. These towns are very geographically diverse, they are socially diverse, they are population-wise diverse. I think about Peterborough, Kapunda, Eudunda, Marree, Lyndhurst, Cadell, Morgan, Blanchetown, Yunta, Wirrabara and Orroroo, just to name a few.

I think of some of the smallest places like Bower and Cockburn and, of course, the biggest in the electorate of Stuart, the regional city of Port Augusta. They would all benefit enormously. All the towns of Stuart would benefit enormously if they had a small slice of that \$1.5 billion, and the rest of it could be shared around the other 46 electorates in the state. The issues that are really burning in the country at the moment and could without any doubt receive more money and benefit very well from it include country health. The government took away the small schools grants in the last budget. Why would you do that? A relatively small amount of money it had to take away from small schools, and particularly small country schools as far as I am concerned.

We do not have enough regional police. The government took away the 3.3¢ a litre fuel subsidy from country areas. Aboriginal communities could certainly benefit from more resources. In the country we have great difficulty providing mental health services and special needs teachers. That is a really big issue in the country that a lot of people are not aware of. If you have a child who needs special support for his or her learning, it is near on impossible to get the support that you need. We do have some special needs teachers who do the very best they can, but there is just not enough of them. They are overstretched and overworked, so then, of course, it is even harder to attract others to come into these jobs because there is not funding for that sort of thing.

Think about the Remote Areas Electricity Scheme. As everyone here knows, we are in the midst of the government removing a subsidy so that it will increase the cost of electricity to 13 different communities around South Australia. The Provincial Cities Association just Friday, or perhaps yesterday (I forget which), came out really strongly opposing it. Thirteen communities from



tiny places like Cockburn, all the way through to significant towns by regional outback standards like Coober Pedy are really going to suffer. Their tourism is going to suffer.

Domestic consumption, obviously, is a great difficulty. Businesses are the lifeblood of these towns. People cannot live in such remote places if their businesses are not successful because they need the services that the businesses provide, but they also need the employment. If you live in a small country town or an outback town where there are no businesses, you have no jobs there. You do not just drive to the next suburb or the other side of town. You do not have the headache of saying, 'My job is the other side of Adelaide and I have a half hour or 45 minute commute every day.' You have nothing: you have absolutely no choice. I think the government really underestimates that. As I mentioned before, the proposal to forward sell the wood in the forests is going to have an enormously detrimental impact on the communities in the South-East.

I will refer to outback roads, which people here know I talk about all the time. The government completely underestimates the value of these roads, and I will give the example of the Birdsville Track. My opinion is that the government looks at that and says, 'Well, it runs from Marree to the South Australian-Queensland border and there are only so many cattle stations between here and there and there are only so many people up there, what is the issue? How much money do you really expect us to spend on those roads?' That is completely missing the point.

Just north of the Queensland border is the town of Birdsville, an exceptionally successful town with regard to tourism. Tens of thousands of tourists every year go to Birdsville, and guess what? Those tourists are very often from South Australia also. Some of them come from Brisbane, Sydney and Adelaide but an enormous number of the tourists that go to Birdsville go to the Flinders Ranges and other outback South Australian places, and even as far down as the wine districts of Clare and the Barossa, for example. If they cannot get to Birdsville, some of those people will not come and be tourists in South Australia.

There is another really shortsighted view with regard to outback roads, and I use the Birdsville Track again as an example but it is relevant all over the place. The government says, 'We don't need to provide that road and spend money to maintain that road so that Queensland cattle growers can use it. That is the Queensland government's problem. Let them go to Brisbane.' That completely ignores the multiplier effect associated with the sale of beef.

I am told that, for every dollar earned through the sale of beef at the market, there is a seven to one multiplier. So that means that, if a South Australian beef producer sends their beef to market in South Australia, we get \$8 of benefit in our state—the \$1 per kilo that went to the grower and then the other \$7 that comes from transport, slaughtering and the sale yard, all the way through to the steaks and sausages going to the butcher shop or supermarket. If we get the Queensland cattle coming into our state, which we should be seriously encouraging, we do not get the first dollar but we get the other \$7. If we can encourage them to come into our state and send their beef through our processors and local markets, we get the entire multiplier effect. So, anyone having a view that we do not need to provide that road for other state's cattle stations is really short-sighted.

I think there is an enormous undervaluation, underestimation and under-appreciation by this government of the value of regional and outback South Australia, and I think that mistake leads to under-investment and under-provision of services in country and outback areas. I looked at some ABS figures, for example (and I looked at this number very quickly so I hope I have got it correct), and it is staggering to think that something like 38 or 39 per cent of the state's mining revenue is generated in the inner eastern suburbs of Adelaide. That is not the government's fault, but we need to look very closely to try to understand exactly the full value.

If it is happening with mining—and it is very easy to pick out mining because we all know that there are no mines in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide but, understandably, that is where the head office and the accountant is so that is where the income is reported—how many industries does that apply to as well that are very hard to pick out because there might be some of that industry in the city area or the broader metropolitan area but the income is actually generated and the services and investment need to be provided in the country so that it continues?

That undervaluation of what the regional and outback areas of our state contribute to our state economy I think is leading to an unfortunate under-investment in and under-supporting of these areas and really focusing on the city. As I said before, when money is exceptionally tight, as it is because of the government's mismanagement over many years, the people that I represent, and others in the country, really miss out.

Another example is power outages. We have had really serious and extreme power outages in the Upper Mid North just lately. For the last two to three months, we have had a very high number of planned and unplanned power outages affecting about eight towns, all north of Laura and up between Laura and Carrieton and that area, and we are told quite clearly by ETSA that it is old power lines, old insulators. It is a situation where, basically, the porcelain insulators are getting dry and cracked and getting water into them. We need some investment.

What we need to do is to see the value of our country areas. We need to make sure that it is a priority—that it is a priority that the man at the Orroroo general store does not have to throw out hundreds or thousands of dollars of food from his freezer because he has had an unexpected power outage. We have to understand that people in the hospital should not have to run around in the middle of procedures trying to flick on their emergency generator and that sort of thing. We should be investing in infrastructure and spending money in country areas.

I raised the Kapunda Primary School quite a few months ago. The chair of the Kapunda Primary School governing council told me that the governing council budget has to contribute to the school's electricity bill because the budget the government and the education department gives the school just is not enough and has not been enough for years. It is something in the vicinity of \$10,000 that they have to pay to top it up. There is just not enough priority.

I recently had a meeting with a delegation of mayors from the central region Local Government Association. We all know that there has been really, really unseasonal and devastating floods. They have asked the government whether it would be able to help, through the state government's resources or with support from the federal government, to get funding to support the maintenance of these local council roads. Right now, the bill for this group of councils is up around \$40 million. I urge the government to support those councils. The councils absolutely cannot do it themselves. They need the government's support. I have not had an answer yet. However, if we get a negative answer, it will be another issue to add to this list of low priority in country areas.

Everywhere I go, community leaders, whether they be councillors, church leaders, sporting leaders, or whether they be the average man or woman on the street, feel completely duded by the government, and I think that is a great shame. I understand the realities of the financial situation the government has got us into, but putting all of the priorities into the city and not focusing on the country is not acceptable.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (16:53):** I am certainly pleased to make a contribution this afternoon concerning the legislation before the house, namely, the Supply Bill. Obviously, this is an annual piece of legislation that we deal with here. It is critical to the state in ensuring that the required moneys flow to the various agencies and areas of the state until the main budget is brought down later on in the year.

As other speakers, particularly on this side of the house, have highlighted, I also want to reinforce some actual facts in relation to the financial situation this state finds itself in. Looking back at the Mid-Year Budget Review, when it was brought down at the end of last year (and this has been highlighted by previous speakers, particularly the leader), on all of the three accounting measures, the 2010-11 budget is in deficit. The net lending is in deficit; there is a cash deficit and there is a net operating deficit. I do not need to traverse the actual dollar amounts because speakers highlighted them previously.

According to the mid-year budget papers, South Australia's budget deficit is \$104 million worse than it was three months ago, at budget time reaching \$493 million. That is an indication of the really quite tragic, I think, financial situation we find ourselves in. When we look at the revenue aspects of budgetary matters, from 2002-03 to 2009-10, the government has collected a massive \$5 billion more than it anticipated. These revenue windfalls are masking unbudgeted increases in expenses, as has been highlighted by the Auditor-General. We have communicated this to the house. We have spoken about this in the house previously. The Auditor-General's Report 2008-09, Part C, page 12 states:

Over the past six years the state has received large amounts of unbudgeted revenues that enabled net operating surpluses.

I think that encapsulates it. We have said in this house for many years that the government does not have a revenue problem, it has an expenses problem. Talking about state taxation, under the Rann Labor government, South Australia has become the highest taxed state in the nation. I have said this before and I will continue to say it, because it is the fact of the matter: it is a hallmark of

Labor governments right around this country, both federally and state, that they are high taxing, high spending governments.

I remember that as a young man, as a teenager, when we had to suffer those years under the Whitlam federal government. There was enormous taxation and enormous spending, a complete waste of money on a whole range of initiatives that had to be then hauled back into shape by the Howard-Costello government. Keating tried it when he was prime minister, but he did not achieve much. The financial situation had to be hauled back into shape by the Howard-Costello federal government—the prime minister and the treasurer. The Liberal federal government was responsible for hauling the financial situation of the nation back into a really outstanding position.

If we look at taxation revenue—and this is again quoting from the latest figures that the government has provided in the Mid-Year Budget Review—in 2001-02, the general government taxation was \$2.193 billion and, in 2010-11, it has increased to a staggering \$3.846 billion. That is a massive 75 per cent increase. However, what situation do we find ourselves in? We find ourselves in a deficit on the three accounting measures that are taken into consideration. All that means is financial mismanagement.

When we are looking at balance sheets and profit and loss statements, and so on, having been a bank manager in a previous career, I have an understanding of how to read these types of papers. I have highlighted some revenue figures, but we also need to look at the expenses. Expenses control has been extremely poor since this government has been in power. No sooner does the money come in than it goes out the door. Again, I will quote from the Auditor-General's Report 2008-09, Part C, page 40:

A major risk to the budget and, in particular the forward estimates, is the outcomes from enterprise agreements and control of FTE numbers.

That is obviously in relation to Public Service issues. As I said before, this government has not had a revenue problem; it has had rivers of gold flowing into its coffers, but it has always had an issue with controlling expenses. As I said before, the hallmark of all Labor governments has been high taxing and high spending.

Another point I want to make is in relation to the excuse that the previous treasurer used for the current state of the budget in terms of falling into deficit. The excuse that he used is that it is a consequence of the global financial crisis (GFC). I just want to raise a question in relation to this matter. We have the federal Treasurer, Wayne Swan, saying that the nation has been insulated, protected, against the effects of the GFC through the stimulus packages, the BER and all the massive spending initiatives rolled out by the federal government.

So we have the federal Labor government—Treasurer Swan—saying that through its initiatives, through its policy direction, there has been a cushion, an insulation, a protection from the GFC. However, we have state Labor here in South Australia using it as an excuse, that because of the GFC we have fallen into this terrible financial situation. The point I am making is that you cannot have it both ways. Either the GFC has caused the effects here in South Australia or the federal government's initiatives have protected us from the GFC. You cannot walk both sides of the street. We know what happens when you try and straddle the fence. I will leave that up to the imagination of individual members.

I want to move on to issues in relation to the areas of portfolio responsibility that I have on this side of the house. I want to talk about emergency services first up. It is public knowledge that there was a press conference here a few weeks ago. The Country Fire Service Volunteers Association has made a submission to the government, and I think it is part of the budgetary process. I have not seen it, but I understand it is part of the budget process and is calling for additional support for our volunteers.

Everybody in this place agrees that volunteers are absolutely essential for the very important role that the CFS and the SES play in our community. Without volunteers, those agencies would absolutely collapse. There is not one member in this place who would disagree with that. However, under this government, CFS volunteers have been struggling for funding. They have been struggling for funding, and I note the previous minister for emergency services, just prior to the election last year, announced a \$9.2 million funding package for the CFS, I think. The majority of those moneys were to improve IT connectivity and other communication tools within the brigades.

The feedback I received was that that was not actually the highest priority of the volunteers. They actually need increased funding to meet their training needs, and as a consequence of meetings that I and some other members of the opposition had, at the election last year the Liberal Party announced a \$13 million funding package to support CFS and SES volunteers. That is our current policy. That is over and above the \$9.2 million that the government announced.

We were happy to maintain that \$9.2 million, but we announced an increase in funding to the CFS and SES volunteers of \$13 million. I think that shows who understands the needs of the volunteers and who is actually committed to meeting the needs of the CFS and SES volunteers. I get a lot of contact from volunteers within the CFS in relation to unmet training needs, and some figures that came my way show that only a relatively small percentage of the 423 CFS brigades meet their minimum training requirements. Courses are cancelled due to resource issues, they are not reorganised, they are not rescheduled, and so the volunteers suffer as a consequence of that. I have a meeting with the executive of the CFSVA this week, so I hope we can discuss some of those issues. It will be a pleasure to raise those issues publicly on behalf of the volunteers.

I also want to speak about some of the capital works projects that we have seen fall into serious problems. We have seen the refurbishments or rebuilds of the Wilmington, Hamley Bridge and Balaklava CFS stations experience some real problems. The problems have come from the building company having financial difficulties, and other issues having an impact, so those capital works stopped. In talking to my colleagues who represent those communities, the member for Stuart and the member for Goyder, there was real frustration within those communities that the CFS station rebuilds had just stopped dead, and the government was floundering around for quite a while trying to find a way to remedy the problem.

In Balaklava, I understand, they had the equipment scattered around at about three different locations—the fire truck in one place and some other equipment somewhere else. I recognise the commitment that the volunteers made through these difficult times, but having all that equipment spread around in different places within a town is not an ideal way to run an agency and to support your volunteers. I know the government has contracted Sarah Constructions, a construction company, and the works are proceeding, and I think things are relatively back on track in terms of the schedule that was re-negotiated to see the completion of these works.

Another example I want to raise is the blowout in the budget for the construction of the new Port Lincoln station for the MFS, CFS and SES. There was a significant blowout in the construction of that station. You might say, 'There is often a hiccup with these things,' but it goes to the issue of how this government manages projects. We have seen time and time again that it is a pattern with this government of mismanagement of projects, from large infrastructure projects like big roadworks.

**Mr Marshall:** The Mount Bold reservoir.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** That is right, member for Norwood, the Mount Bold reservoir. Well, that was scrapped. That did not even get off the drawing board.

**Mr Marshall:** New prison.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** New prisons—all those issues. Relatively small projects, compared to major road infrastructure works, are mismanaged. It goes to the core of how this government operates, because my understanding is that not one member on that side of the house has had any real practical experience in the community. Not one of them has run a business, I do not think, apart from the minister for agriculture—he has run a business, I beg your pardon. However, there is a small percentage of government members who have had any real experience running a business or being part of a corporation. They have basically come up through the union movement, joined a Labor member's staff or a minister's staff, and then progressed up into the ranks of MPs.

What I am saying is that they do not understand how to manage things. Clearly, going back to my statements in relation to the budget, they do not know how to manage the budget. We would not be in the financial situation that we currently are in if that was not the case. I see that the clock is winding down, but there is another aspect I want to talk about in relation to emergency services, and that is bushfire mitigation work, particularly cool burning in public lands. Information has come to us—we get a lot of information coming to us at the moment; that is a symptom of a government in turmoil—that only about 50 per cent of identified public lands are cool burned compared to what the government wants to achieve.

Obviously there are a number of reasons for that. It is a resourcing issue, you need people who are experienced and trained in those processes in order to conduct the cool burns properly, but I recall that during estimates committees last year the department for environment and heritage was looking to reduce the number of national parks officers who had the responsibility of managing the cool burn program. Now if you are only achieving 50 per cent of fire mitigation work you want, why would you expose the community to further risk by reducing the number of people who have the experience to carry out that work? I do not know, but it is an interesting question that the government needs to address.

All in all, the inadequate manner in which the government is dealing with the state's finances has been highlighted, and it will continue to be highlighted by this side of the house. I believe the government is drifting. It has no direction. It is disengaged and out of touch, lazy and divided. We see the continual turmoil government members are experiencing—the left is leaking on the right and so on—

**An honourable member:** The right is leaking on the right.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY:** The right is leaking on the right, as well. As a consequence, this state is suffering.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:13):** It is with pleasure that I rise to speak on the Supply Bill today, a bit over a year since the election at which I, along with a number of other members, came here for the first time. I note that, between supply bills, addresses in reply and appropriation bills, this is about the fourth time in about 15 or 16 sitting weeks that we have had debates in this chamber on broad topics.

The Supply Bill seeks \$3.332 billion so that the government can keep functioning across all areas of the Public Service between 1 July and whenever the Appropriation Bill is passed. Of course, when that Appropriation Bill is discussed, we will have a fifth opportunity in a little over 13 months to have this same sort of debate again. However, it does give us an opportunity to consider the direction in which the government is heading and to look at ways that the state might be better served by taking some other directions.

I start by making this observation. This is a tired and enervated government with an insipid approach to public policy. In looking at this Supply Bill, of course we have the money for it to continue as it has been going for nine long years. It is a government lacking in inspiration. On a good day some of its ministers might fire up in question time and potentially give an impressive speech in the house, or they might take it up to the press gallery in an interview, but on matters of deepest importance for good public policy it is stuck in a rut.

The government seems to be focused on personalities and character. We do not see the development of policy, the exciting radical ideas, the fresh approach that might lead to improvements in South Australian public policy. What is missing from the debate are those sort of radical exciting ideas, and hearing about their aspirations for South Australia's future. How can we do better should be something that South Australian politicians in this house should constantly be looking at.

Over recent years, we have seen that approach taken by the opposition. The Liberal Party has suggested a number of ideas that after initially being decried as wasteful and pointless by the government have eventually been taken up. We saw that when the opposition pointed out that the Commonwealth Games bid and the World Cup bid could be helped through having a new city stadium the government decried it as unrealistic for a long time. It promised hundreds of millions of dollars for AAMI Stadium and other projects, before eventually coming up with the Adelaide Oval project that we have seen run into all sorts of problems and cost blowouts, and we are yet to see how much that is going to cost.

We saw a similar stance taken with desalination. When the opposition suggested a 45 or 50 gegalitre desalination plant to meet Adelaide's critical human needs as a part of Adelaide's water solution, the government decried it as unnecessary for a long time. The member for Kavel was just talking about the Mount Bold reservoir plan that went nowhere, but eventually of course the government saw that there was a potential opportunity to try and take on that Liberal policy. It could not release the same policy, so it had to introduce a new bigger and better 100-gegalitre desalination plant, that is costing South Australia a huge amount of money and will cost South Australians extraordinary increases in their water bills for years to come while, at the same time, potentially having environmental consequences that a smaller desalination plant, such as the Liberal Party initially suggested, might not have.

We have seen the government look at the Adelaide High School proposal for a second campus, as promised by the Liberal Party at the last election, and decry the need for that, only during the election campaign to decide, actually this is going to be a problem for us. The member for Adelaide's election showed the popularity of that policy, amongst her other attributes, and the government took on its own version of the policy. Again, it could not do the same thing that the opposition had promised, it had to come up with something new, so it came out with something worse, something less good than our solution would have been.

As the member for Unley, the shadow minister for education, pointed out in his contribution, the Labor government's policy during the election was for an increase in numbers at Adelaide High School but they promised that their new buildings would not encroach on the Parklands. They then put to the school council five options, four of which encroached on the Parklands, and the fifth which involved the demolition of a heritage building.

Clearly, in taking on Liberal policies, twisting them around, missing the point of what they were supposed to achieve, the government has demonstrated time and time again that it is interested in policy only in as much as it might impact on a headline, as it might somehow try and steal the Liberal Party's thunder, and it does not have any greater strategic view as to what the policies are supposed to achieve. That is why the government, when it is trying to put these policies in place, is continuously stuffing them up.

On a broader front, I want to use this opportunity to speak about some of the directions concerning me about where our state is travelling, and some areas for consideration and improvement. One objective measure by which you might judge how South Australia is travelling is to look at our net migration figures. We have seen for years that people are voting with their feet. This is something that has been of great concern to me since long before I entered this place. When I first became a candidate and decided that I wanted to run for parliament, it was for a number of public policy reasons, that I spoke about in my maiden speech. One of them was that I have a sincere concern that many of our best and brightest do not see a future for themselves in South Australia if they wish to pursue a career in their chosen field and achieve the best possible outcomes for their family. Many of them do not see the opportunity to do that in South Australia.

I was a teenager when the State Bank disaster befell our state. At the time, there was a huge rush of net interstate migration away from South Australia because people did not have optimism or confidence in our economic future. Throughout the 1990s and early into the next decade that started to turn around. We went from having a net migration loss to other states of over 3,000 a year up to, I think, about 4,000 in the early to mid-1990s, which was improved to basically a net loss of almost zero by the beginning of the last decade.

Even in that context, when the situation had improved, I know from my own personal experience of finishing university in the late 1990s, a significant proportion (probably three out of four) of the people who I went to university with had to go to Sydney, the Gold Coast, Brisbane, Melbourne or overseas in order to pursue the sorts of careers they wanted and the opportunities to better themselves. Many of them are lost to South Australia forever. Particularly once people meet somebody, get married and have children interstate or overseas and start building a life for themselves, they are often lost to our state forever. When we have the head office of only one of Australia's top 200 companies in Adelaide, it is easy to see how that might occur.

I note that Rann Labor government did notice as its figures started to get worse throughout the last decade and we started to go away from a zero net migration impact to the figures that we are approaching now. The Rann government put in its strategic plan target to 'reduce net loss to interstate to zero by 2008.' Of course, it failed dismally in reaching that target.

In the last 12 months, as of the figures from the last couple of weeks, we saw the 3,307 people left for interstate in the last 12 months—it just continues to get worse. Even once you take into account migration from overseas and the birth rate, South Australia's population only grew by 1.1 per cent over 12 months. Net interstate migration is three times higher than it was under the last Liberal government when we were recovering from that State Bank fiasco.

This has a real impact on South Australia's future, because, as I say, once you lose those people it is very hard to get them back. But why are they leaving? They are leaving because they see their opportunities to improve their careers interstate and overseas as being better. I would like to quote from Isobel Redmond's response to the Mid-Year Budget Review, because she makes a very good point in relation to this. She said:

It is a dire reflection on the Rann Labor Government, that today there were more mining jobs in South Australia in 1985 than there are today. If [South Australia] had kept pace with national jobs growth under the Rann Government, there would be 40,000 more jobs in [South Australia]. South Australian exports and our share of the national economy have declined under the Rann government.

And that is absolutely true. We have the highest unemployment rate in the nation at the moment.

During the last election, when I was elected, it seemed that the government's main strategy in getting re-elected was to continually talk about this figure of 100,000 jobs that were to be created under the Rann government. Well, it has had a pretty bad start in the first 12 months of its four years, with 4,400 more South Australians out of work today than there were 12 months ago. The South Australian unemployment rate has gone up to 5.8 per cent, the highest in the nation and our highest rate of unemployment since August 2009 during the global financial crisis. It is a dire indictment on the performance of this government in unemployment, particularly with a view to the state of youth unemployment and the fact that we want young people to see their future in South Australia.

I took the opportunity earlier today to use what is more often than not a young person's medium to discuss the issue. I asked people who are on Facebook what they thought and I got a couple of responses from young people in their teens, early 20s and one in the 30s that I want to share with the house. The first person's comments I want to share, and I would rather not share his name, said:

I'm nearly 19 and I have applied for 78 jobs and got turned down from all 78 the reason was my age! That's unfair, if I'm capable of doing the job why should my age matter. I have just received a job but no thanks to Centrelink or my job agency, it's all thanks to the person my grandparents know.

That is a very sad indictment on employment opportunities for young South Australians. I think it is particularly concerning that the government's approach to job creation seems to be focused on the idea that it is government that creates jobs and opportunity, whereas we on this side of the house believe that, in fact, it is business that creates jobs and career opportunities.

Government can employ public servants and government can employ trainees for a time, but ultimately that has got to be paid for out of the taxes of the non-government sector. Meaningful employment growth requires the conditions for business to thrive and prosper, and I do not see the focus of this government being on that.

One of the people who commented on my Facebook wall was, in fact, our 2011 Youth Parliament Governor, Samantha Mitchell. Her comment, I think, was fairly poignant. She said:

Youth retention rates in South Australia. Let's develop industries such as advertising and marketing (for example) which are dominated by the eastern states. Sooo many qualified people—

And I note that she has three 'o's in the 'so', to express emphasis, I believe—

are moving interstate where the work is. Let's keep them here.

Again, that is a function of the fact that marketing, advertising and those sorts of industries tend to be dominated by eastern states companies because, of course, it is in the eastern states where those head offices that make decisions about their advertising or marketing campaigns are being made.

The opportunities for young people in South Australia to pursue a career require in many cases for them to move interstate, and there is no prospect of it getting better. I note that the shadow employment minister, the member for Unley (David Pisoni), put out a press release pointing out that job ads are plummeting under Labor. He made the point that South Australia's job advertisements plummeted a staggering 32.3 per cent (that is over the last 12 months) compared to a national decline of just 3.7 per cent.

It is extraordinary. I suggest to every member of this house that our employment opportunities are actually getting worse, and what sort of a message does that send to young South Australians? The third comment that came up on my Facebook a couple of hours ago when I was looking at this was from someone who commented on how employment might be helped. I will quote Taara Reedman, who said:

Stop culling the public sector!!! There is point at which 'efficiency measures' create massive inefficiency; for example, highly paid senior professionals doing routine admin work because departments can't afford to employ admin staff.

That is also a function of this government's mismanagement of the public sector and its budgets over the last nine years. We saw in last year's budget the government having to take measures to remove 4,000 public servants from the payroll, but, of course, this is following nine years where the Public Service was increased by 18,105. Only 2,554 of those jobs were in fact budgeted for.

I note that the former treasurer (now the police minister) during the estimates committee on 7 October last year said:

There is no question that the blowout in expenses is our problem. There is no question that expenditure overruns are the biggest threat to public finances.

In nine years in government the Labor Party has been unable to control its spending. It has gone over budget by a total of \$3.5 billion since 2002. So, of course we end up in this situation where, having gone so extraordinarily over budget, it has a couple of options: it can increase taxes, increase charges and levies; or it can cut the Public Service.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** The member for Norwood points out that it has had to do both through its incompetence and mismanagement over nine years. The tax, of course, is a real concern, because, when the government increases the tax rates, that is actually a disincentive for businesses to invest in South Australia, and it also directly leads to less employment and fewer career opportunities for those young people in South Australia.

The Institute for Public Affairs in December 2010 released its State Business Tax Calculator, and it made the general point, first, that jurisdictions with a relatively high business tax load tend to maintain relatively weak economic performance over time compared to low-taxing states and territories. Where does South Australia fall on this ladder, I wonder? Well, we pay more than double the state and territory averages on land tax. We have payroll tax that increased from \$601 million to \$956 million last year. Particularly in relation to South Australia, the IPA has made the point:

To create an economic climate more conducive to economic development and innovation, the government should reduce its above-average tax liabilities.

I do not see the opportunities for radical reform of our tax system that might actually improve our outlook in economic terms and, most importantly, improve our employment outlook coming from this government any time in the future—this government that has wasted money and mismanaged the economy so much that taxes on property have increased from \$731 million in 2001-02 to \$1.6 billion in the Mid-Year Budget Review for this year.

This is at a time when our GST take has increased from just over \$2 billion when the Labor Party took power to \$4.7 billion in the coming year. The government has more money than it has ever had before and it has spent it so unwisely that it is having to increase the tax take that is hurting business and the opportunity for employment.

In the limited time I have left, I contrast this with one measure that the Western Australian government took a couple of years ago. It gave small businesses, in particular, a full or partial rebate on their 2009-10 payroll tax, and about 4,500 employers who had an annual payroll of less than \$1.6 million (so generally up to about 28 employees on average earnings) got a full refund of their 2009-10 payroll tax.

It cost that government about \$100 million, but what an effect it had! They had unemployment slated to reach 6.75 per cent in 2010-11, and what happened? I noticed in *The West Australian* on 10 March, a couple of weeks ago, that unemployment in Western Australia, far from reaching the heights predicted two years ago of 6.75 per cent, has dropped to 4.2 per cent, its lowest rate since the middle of last year, and it continues to go down. Unemployment is falling around Australia. It fell in New South Wales to 4.8 per cent (a state that saw a cataclysmic result for the Labor Party due to its mismanagement). In Victoria it has fallen to 5 per cent, in Tasmania to 5.6 per cent and in Northern Territory to 2.3 per cent. In Queensland it has stayed steady, but in South Australia unemployment has gone up to 5.8 per cent.

It speaks volumes about the competence of this government, and it really concerns me that I do not believe they have the capacity for a fresh approach. I do not believe they have the capacity for any sort of radical ideas or radical policy development because they are too focused on their own internal difficulties and problems. I believe that South Australians deserve better and, particularly, young South Australians deserve a future where they can build their careers in South Australia.



**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:33):** Like others, I rise to indicate my support for this bill. It is a critical bill, unlike some others. I commend the member for Morialta, whose speech I listened to, for his conscientious efforts and his commitment to the cause and the matters that he raised. So, well done to him.

Year after year we come into this place and, seemingly, speak about the same things. I wonder where this government is going with its expenditure. It seems to be meandering all over the place. It seems to need a road map to get back on track. It has changed treasurers. However, we have the ludicrous situation today, which the member for Davenport raised yet again in the house, of the current Treasurer trying to make light of some remarks he made on the weekend.

It is a serious business in this place, and it is highly important that members have the opportunity to say a few words on matters relevant to their electorate, particularly in the case of the Supply Bill. Once again, it is a time when local government is going through their budget process. It is a time when they are trying to do more with less, and it is a time when they seemingly get less and less from the state government, due to the causes the state government seems to be running down and what it wants to spend its money on. However, let me remind the house that a lot of it is actually the taxpayers of South Australia's money, and there are a few taxpayers who actually live outside the metropolitan area. Quite frankly, at the moment, I think the current government makes the Sheriff of Nottingham look like a generous man!

I am not impressed. The councils in my electorate are absolutely struggling to maintain their infrastructure, and they are struggling to provide the services they need to provide. I have letters coming in that express concern about some council's level of debt. That is a matter the councils have to work through, but they are limited by their rate and levy income and whatnot. It is a serious matter when roads are run down, and they are not receiving the attention they need, principally because local government does not have the resources to fix up those roads.

In saying that, I want to talk about the overbearing and omnipresent bureaucracy in the state government area. We make laws in this place, some of them good, some of them okay and others stupid, in my humble opinion. The local councils are being forced to carry out more and more responsibilities, with legislation from both the state and federal governments, they are ill-equipped to deal with. They do not get it right all of the time; in fact, I think we in this place possibly need to have a good, hard look at where local government in South Australia is going. It concerns me that we let it meander along.

In the last 12 months, we have seen the debacles at Burnside, and we have seen fights between Mitcham council and West Torrens council, for example. We have issues out in the country. What needs a good, hard look at is the Local Government Association. I do not think it is providing enough possible reform mechanisms, through giving advice to the state government, to achieve more. I hope the new Minister for State/Local Government Relations, the Hon. Bernie Finnigan in another place, will have a good hard look at it. We have seen some shenanigans in the Adelaide City Council, and we see ongoing fights between the executive government and the Adelaide City Council. I do think it is something that has to be thought about. Turning to hospitals, I have to say that I am fortunate that I have only two hospitals in my electorate, both of which are particularly good facilities. Kangaroo Island is an exceptionally good facility, with a multitude of services, but even that facility struggles to accommodate everything that is required. Similarly, the south coast health services at Victor Harbor provides an excellent service.

The point I would make on this matter is that what we do not need, nor do we want, in the country is the centralisation of services, such as in health, where more and more country people are being required, despite what the minister says, to come to Adelaide for all sorts of treatment or for services, which could well be provided in the country areas. Country people should not have to come to Adelaide for everything. It is not as simple as hopping on a bus down at Henley Beach, hopping on a train from Gawler or coming in from the south by train or bus. It just does not work like that in the country. There is little or no public transport to assist them. So, clearly it is a large and costly exercise, both in financial terms and in time terms for country people to come to the city for treatment. There are obviously treatments that people cannot have in the country, so they must come to the best care in the city-based facilities, and I acknowledge that.

I also think that we need to look at the entire system. It was brought to my attention only last Friday by someone who spoke to me in my KI electorate office in Kingscote that one particular person had seven or eight trips to Adelaide for a 15-minute appointment paid for by the taxpayer. To me, that is just a hideous waste of public money. There must be a better way of doing it.

Another issue that the government needs to address is the matter of police resources. I have heard the current minister and the past minister say in this place that there are plenty of police resources and that they have employed extra police officers and that they are doing a wonderful job. However, the reality is that we continue to be underfunded for police resources in the country. Police officers would tell you privately that they would dearly love to have more people working in their areas. I know that every now and then we get a hiccup on the South Coast, where something has happened and the police patrol just cannot get there. I acknowledge the fact that the police are out there but, seemingly, they are never—or rarely—in the right place when they are needed because they have to cover such a wide area. They are put under strain trying to get back to another incident, and then they bear a few grumbles and whatnot because they were not on site to deal with an incident because they were over on the other side of the Fleurieu.

Similarly, on Kangaroo Island this is also an issue. This is a double whammy as far as I am concerned. It was alarming on the weekend to hear of the number of drink drivers who were caught by RBTs. I fully support the police. I will just put on the record that I was recently stopped at an RBT, and I blew 0000, you will be pleased to know, at 11 o'clock at night. Quite frankly, if I or any other member in this place were so stupid to get caught driving under the influence of alcohol or drugs, we would deserve it. I am not assuming that it will not happen to someone in this place. I certainly hope that it will not happen to me; however, should I be so stupid, it would serve me right.

On the weekend, just out of the town of Kingscote on Kangaroo Island, some of the local yahoos went mad and put blackies everywhere. The police just cannot be there and the kids have now wised up to this. They have one car following the police car—or nearby—noting its presence and letting everyone else know where they are by text message. So, if the police are busy at Inman Valley, the kids in Victor Harbor go to town, or drive around. They do not really do blackies down there. However, I can assure you that, on Kangaroo Island, if the police have to go to Parndana or Penneshaw, or wherever, the hoons in Kingscote cut loose. It is a sad indictment of where we are that this government is simply just not putting enough resources into rural policing. I feel extremely sorry for the officers in that they cannot deal with everything.

Just on that, the incidence of drugs and their availability really frightens me. If I had my way, I would commit a bit of Sharia law on some of these drug dealers and remove a few things that they value—and you can come to your own conclusions about that. I just think that the way kids are able to get drugs before their minds are mature enough to realise the inherent dangers is alarming. It is highly concerning. It goes well beyond marijuana. I know people who have smoked marijuana for 30 or 40 years and reckon they are okay. I can tell you that they are not; they have well and truly burned out their brain cells. Then it goes on to ice, that appalling drug that is around the place. The incidence of ice and methamphetamines is becoming more prevalent, and their availability is more prevalent, and I commend the police for the drug raids that they do right across my electorate, on both sides of the water. They have had a little bit of success lately with marijuana, which I am particularly pleased about. The marijuana season, I understand, has been extended by the cool weather and the fact that it is not ripening as quickly as it could.

I have a new neighbour and just the other day there were a couple of stray sheep wandering around that we tried to get, and we actually found some marijuana-growing activity—well, it is not growing at the moment—about 100 yards from my boundary, in the scrub. No-one was more surprised than me. I wonder where all this stuff is going to stop. We have to stop the stupidity on the roads, we have to stop as much as possible acts of arrant stupidity and people driving under the influence, so I urge the government to commit more resources to that.

I also raise the issue of funding for rural councils in such areas as foreshore protection and sand management. I met recently with the mayor and CEO of the City of Victor Harbor and we discussed a number of issues. I would like to read a letter that I have received into *Hansard*. It is dated 24 March and states:

Dear Michael,

Re: foreshore protection and sand management

On behalf of Mayor Philp and myself, I thank you for the opportunity to discuss a range of issues with you on 2 March 2011. Our primary purpose for the meeting was to discuss foreshore protection and sand management. In response to your invitation to put our concerns in writing, I provide the following.

Several weeks ago, there was some television news coverage regarding the sand relocation program on the Adelaide metropolitan coastline. The news reports made two important points:

1. The cost of providing the pipework and other infrastructure to pump sand in a relocation process along the metropolitan coastline had exceeded budget expectations. The intended project would be scaled back.

2. The future maintenance costs associated with relocating the sand along the metropolitan coastline were likely to be borne by the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board.

If this information is correct, it represents a real concern to our council, as it would other councils within that natural resources management board area. The City of Victor Harbor has its own sand replenishment challenges. Our annual expenditure may not be significant as we currently only do what we can afford. However, the real issue here is equity. Our communities all contribute to the board. Why aren't all coastal councils within that particular board afforded the same opportunity to have sand replenishment/coastal protection works funded by the board? Currently we compete for Coastal Protection Board funding. The following table indicates our expenditure—

and I will not go through that. The letter continues:

However, in 2010-11 the council applied for a \$44,000 grant from the Coastal Protection Board to be offset against planned expenditure of \$56,000. Our grant application was unsuccessful and our program of work was cancelled. However, our coast protection problems still exist and expand each year. Council would be appreciative if you could research and confirm the circumstances reported with regard to the metropolitan sand relocation program.

What I am alluding to is that the problem for rural councils is that the metropolitan councils are funded under the Adelaide's Living Beaches program, so it is a different kind of funding. The City of Victor Harbor does a good job, and this council and past councils and elected members all do their best to look after what they have got. So, I believe it is wrong for the government to reduce this funding or not make funding available so they cannot get on with the good work that they do.

It is a sad indictment and I suppose why I say that is, we have this ludicrous amount, I understand, of \$8 million—and I stand corrected if that is wrong—that has been spent so far on a marine parks program that is not even in place. We cannot find money to look after our coastline and whatnot, but we can spend \$8 million over the last umpteen years on this program which is still far from complete and does not even look like completion.

**Mr Gardner:** Wrong priorities.

**Mr PENGILLY:** 'Wrong priorities,' the member for Morialta says. He is quite right, it is wrong priorities. What we need is some equity going back into regional and country South Australia. We need a stop to this mad idea that everything revolves around an area south of Gepps Cross, west of the Tollgate and north of Darlington, because I can tell you that the people in the south feel as though they are missing out badly. Just recently, for example, in the Sellicks Beach area, which I now represent, there is a plan to put in some effluent drainage. Three attempts have been made by the mayor, the CEO and the council to meet with myself and the Minister for the Southern Suburbs, minister John Hill, to discuss this matter. The first two moves were cancelled at short notice, for various reasons. I know ministers are busy people. Remember that minister Hill is the member for Kaurana, but he is also the Minister for the Southern Suburbs. Talk about window dressing.

The letter that the council got back cancelling the last meeting said that it was not under his jurisdiction, it was under the jurisdiction of another minister. Why on earth would you have a Minister for the Southern Suburbs if you do not do that? It is absolutely ludicrous. It is a failure by this government. All it is doing is putting glitzy wrapping around things and having ministers for the south and ministers for the north and actually not doing a crumpet about it—absolutely not a crumpet.

This is where things are going wrong. This government is totally and absolutely toxic out in the community; it stinks to high heaven. We all know that it is three years before anything can happen on that score, so what I say to the government is get your priorities back on track, start doing some sensible things, and if you can sort your own mess out within your own party you might have a hope of doing that. That is something that is dragging back South Australia at the moment.

This announce and defend mentality that minister Weatherill talked about approximately 12 months ago is still ongoing. We had the ridiculous situation last week with the explosives factory, with minister Koutsantonis on his bandwagon, announce and defend. We have this ridiculous situation at the moment with the marine parks. We have yet another situation with Adelaide Oval where we are having this seemingly endless debate about what is going to happen. I am not going to get myself in too much trouble on that one, but I have my own views on that. We can find hundreds of millions of dollars for sporting grounds. We cannot find any money for rural South Australia, roads, councils, hospitals, schools or additional police services, but we can find money to do things to entertain a few people. To me, that is absolutely mad. I think it is ridiculous.

**Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (17:53):** I rise to contribute to the Supply Bill debate before this house. The Supply Bill, of course, is to provide \$3.32 billion worth of money to the government

to operate between 1 July this year through to the time when the appropriation bill is passed, which is probably sometime in August. What we are essentially asked to do is to approve this expenditure of \$3.32 billion without seeing the budget. I come from the commercial sector and, let me tell you, I am neither familiar with this practice of authorising expenditure without a budget nor comfortable with it. It seems completely crazy to me. My worry about this is compounded by the fact that we have a new Treasurer—the L-plate treasurer—who has only been in the job for a few months, and we as the parliament are being asked to basically take him on his word that he knows what he is doing and give him authorisation to spend \$3.32 billion of our money without us seeing the budget.

So far, I do not think the Treasurer has performed particularly well in this house whatsoever. This was confirmed in a conversation that he had with the member for Heysen, the Leader of the Opposition, on the weekend, when he confessed to her, 'I hope this stadium deal doesn't go ahead; it will cause me a lot less problems.'

This does not sound like the words of a capable treasurer—a man who is in charge of \$16 billion or so of our money to expend in the best way possible. He is certainly struggling, and he is under a lot of pressure—a lot of pressure from the South Australian community and from the Public Service union in South Australia. Of course, he is very much under pressure from his own party, the ALP, the broader membership, and from his cabinet colleagues. We know that the budget handed down in September last year was a very divisive budget. Not only did it divide cabinet between left and right, it actually divided right and right and left and left. Basically, it sent shock waves through that cabinet and it is leaking like a sieve. Never before have we had so many calls to the Liberal Party team regarding leaks from this government.

In fact, because we have such finite resources in the Liberal Party we have basically had to install an automated telephone system: press 1 if you have a leak against the Premier; press 2 if you have a leak against a minister; press 3 if you have a leak against the left; and press 4 if you have a leak against the right. It is a laugh. We have had to automate that system because we just do not have the resources to handle the number of leaks coming through at the moment.

As I said before, this was a very unpopular budget. In fact I put it to you, Madam Speaker, that it was so unpopular it actually caused the treasurer to lose his job. It caused him to lose his job because of his complete inadequacy over nearly nine years in that job. It was in September 2010 that the former treasurer brought down one of the most unpopular budgets in the history of South Australia. Of course, it was a budget that confirmed the deception against ordinary South Australians leading up to the election.

In the budget immediately prior to the election, and confirmed in the mid-term review some weeks before the election, the then treasurer maintained that he needed to put the Sustainable Budget Commission in place and look for \$750 million worth of cuts going into the forward estimates. He confirmed that only weeks before the state election—\$750 million worth of cuts. What did we get after the election? First, we had a delay in the budget for more than six months, which seems extraordinary.

Our budget did not come down in September even though we started operating on 1 July. When it finally came down, there were \$2.2 billion worth of cuts and revenue measures over the forward estimates. At the time, the former treasurer was at pains to point out that this was not only his budget but that indeed it was unanimously supported by all of cabinet. In fact, I think he actually mentioned to the house that there may have been a standing ovation for him. I find that extraordinarily difficult to believe. There certainly wasn't a standing ovation from the people of South Australia. It has been an extraordinarily unpopular budget with all South Australians and the public sector. In fact, we have had so many rallies out the front of the parliament that (1) it has been difficult to get in, and (2) it has given South Australia a sort of 'Paris in the autumn' appeal because we have so many rallies and strikes going on. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (PERSONAL PROPERTY SECURITIES) BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Page 21, after line 24—After clause 50 insert:

Part 18A—Amendment of *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*

50A—Insertion of section 173A

After section 173 insert:

173A—Water management authorisation is not personal property for the purposes of Commonwealth Act

A water management authorisation is not personal property for the purposes of the *Personal Property Securities Act 2009* of the Commonwealth

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 6 April 2011 at 11:00.