

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 6 April 2011

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ARID LANDS NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARD REGION FACT FINDING VISIT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:02): I move:

That the 48th report of the committee, on the South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board Region Fact Finding Visit, be noted.

Every year the Natural Resources Committee aims to visit at least two of the Natural Resources Management Board regions to meet with board members and staff, as well as members of the local NRM groups and, obviously, the community in those particular areas.

In November last year the committee spent three days in the Far North of the state as guests of the South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board. Our hosts, who included former presiding member Chris Reed, former general manager John Gavin, NRM officer Janet Walton, fauna recovery officer Reece Pedler and GAB chief investigator and mound springs expert Travis Gotch, provided us with detailed, and, I have to say, highly stimulating information of the various stops on our tour.

Since our visit in November 2010, I am sorry to say that presiding member Chris Reed's tenure has expired and that general manager John Gavin has also left as a consequence of administrative changes associated with the board's integration into the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Both Chris Reed's and John Gavin's expertise and enthusiasm will no doubt be greatly missed by the Arid Lands NRM Board and, I am sure, the local community.

Members may recall that I first spoke about this visit to the Arid Lands NRM region late last year when tabling the annual NRM levy reports for the boards. I referred particularly to the dedication of the NRM board's staff and their work and the sometimes harsh conditions they regularly endure in order to do their jobs.

Retaining valuable staff in remote regions of the state is always a great challenge. While staff employed in remote localities do not expect the same facilities that are available in the city, it is still important that they are provided with basic employment conditions and support to enable them to undertake their roles effectively with a minimum of personal hardship. Committee members agreed unanimously to take an ongoing and active interest in the employment conditions for the remote region NRM staff, especially in light of the integration process with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

The committee recently obtained a briefing on the integration process from DENR Chief Executive, Allan Holmes. Committee members broadly support the changes as outlined by Mr Holmes on the proviso that they will maintain the strong NRM focus, efficiencies and critical onground works of the NRM boards and facilitate improved employment conditions and opportunities for staff. I should say, as an ex-trade union official and a very proud trade union member, that I consider this to be extremely important, but this is the philosophy of the whole of our committee.

Some concerns remain that the new NRM board regional manager roles that have replaced the general manager roles in the regions may at times prove difficult to reconcile given the added complication of having two masters—a presiding member and a chief executive of DENR—whereas the previous role was more independent. Members of the Natural Resources Committee look forward to seeing how these challenges will be managed.

On our first day in the region, the committee visited Prominent Hill mine, south-east of Coober Pedy, where our hosts OZ Minerals provided us with a tour of the mine and a detailed briefing. Prominent Hill is a new copper, gold and silver mine. Unsurprisingly, water is a major issue. As a condition of its water licence, OZ Minerals monitors its impact on the Great Artesian Basin and, while Prominent Hill complies with its licence conditions, concerns were raised about the long-term upwards trend for Great Artesian Basin water use and the potential for negative effects on the mound springs in light of the additional mines proposed for that region.

On day two of our visit, the committee was very fortunate to be given a slightly bumpy but nonetheless spectacular aerial view of the recently filled Lake Eyre and surrounds, with radio commentary from the arid lands board staff. This was a very important moment for us. Members were able to see firsthand the dramatic transformation of this normally dry region resulting from recent rains and surface flows. In addition to the filling of Lake Eyre and the stunning greening up of the region, an increase in feral animals such as camels, donkeys, horses and pigs was also apparent. This demonstrated well the double-edged sword and the challenges that favourable conditions bring to the region.

Members heard that feral cats also remain a major threat to wildlife, and that rabbits are making a comeback as the calicivirus is losing its effectiveness. Highly mobile feral animals such as camels, horses and donkeys present an enormous challenge to the NRM board and to pastoralists. Members will be aware of the recent federal government move to price carbon as a prelude to a carbon trading scheme. The committee heard that it may be desirable to provide offsets or carbon credits to landholders for the removal of camels, horses and donkeys in the same way that offsets are being considered for agricultural practices.

This kind of innovation could be useful because, to date, the national feral camel removal project is barely keeping pace with the breeding rate and, when the drought conditions return, the animals will once again become a major threat to the outback ecology and pastoral infrastructure.

Committee members were impressed by the Arid Lands NRM Board's dingo research and management projects. These projects have attracted funding support from the sheep industry as well as mining companies. Dingoes are unique in that they are both a pest (mainly south of the dog fence) and a benefit (mainly north of the fence). Dingo management is a prime example of how NRM boards, land managers and residents can work together to their mutual benefit. The arid lands board is training local people to work as doggers to help maintain the dog fence and manage dingo numbers where they are a threat to livestock.

Research is also being undertaken at the Arid Recovery Project near Roxby Downs into the potential benefit of dingoes in keeping down fox and feral cat numbers, thereby reducing the extinction rate of native animals.

Finally, I would like to mention the issue of outback roads. Madam Chair, I know this is an issue that you are also very interested in. The committee heard from local residents about the challenges of outback roads and the need for improved road maintenance techniques. The Arid Lands Board has been working closely with local landholders to build up expertise in road grading and to improve the long-term condition of outback roads.

The committee recently met with both the Minister for Environment and Conservation and the Minister for Transport to discuss these issues. I should say that our committee has decided that, in addition to the recommendations we make, we try, wherever possible, to follow up portfolio issues with the relevant minister. So, this is a bit of a difference I think our committee has maintained but one I am very pleased about, and I know the committee members are pleased that we have an action element to our investigations.

With the exception of designated highways, outback roads passing through pastoral lease land fall under the responsibility of the Pastoral Board. High visitation rates, compounded with prolonged and repeated wet weather in the region, have caused more damage than usual to these routes, and there are insufficient resources to maintain them properly. The committee has recommended a new strategy to ensure that public access routes are better funded, either through responsibility being handed back to the department of transport, or through funding for pastoralists to undertake maintenance and repair. There is also potential for mining companies to become more involved.

I would like to commend the members of our committee, the Hon. Geoff Brock MP, Mrs Robyn Geraghty MP, Mr Lee Odenwalder MP, Mr Don Pegler MP, Mr Dan van Holst Pellekaan MP, the Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC, the Hon. John Dawkins MLC and the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC. Finally, I thank the fantastic staff that we have supporting our committee. I commend this report to the house.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:12): It is a pleasure to speak after the member for Ashford on this report. We did have a very enjoyable and, more importantly, very productive trip to outback South Australia. Madam Speaker, I know it is an area that you support to the best of your ability as well. It is an area I am particularly proud of. An enormous part of the area we visited

is within the electorate of Stuart, and the other parts are also areas I am very familiar with and very proud of, from my own previous business life.

The Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board, which conducted the tour, really does need to be thanked. The presiding member at the time, Chris Reed, and the CEO at the time, John Gavin, put a lot of work and effort into really showing us as much as they possibly could of their area in the time that was available, as did their staff. Three of their key staff, Mr Reece Pedler, Ms Janet Walton and Mr Travis Gotch, also put a lot of time and effort into showing us what they could of their area. All of those people are experts, so we were very, very fortunate to get information directly from them, on the ground so to speak, and once even in the air.

The members of the Natural Resources Committee take the work quite seriously, and they all work in very genuine bipartisan fashion. As far as I can tell, this committee works probably better than most with regard to really doing the very, very best they can in relation to the topic they are considering at the time.

I would like to pull just a few things out of the key findings and recommendations and just make a couple of comments. Obviously, I will not go through the lot, but I will refer to some areas that are of particular importance to my mind and to the electorate of Stuart. Recommendation No. 1 is with regard to staff funding, and it recommends, as follows:

...staff funding and contractual arrangements need to be revisited by DENR to provide greater security of tenure, together with improved working and accommodation conditions, to ensure that outback and remote boards can attract and maintain the best staff and make the best use of those people employed.

Unlike the member for Ashford, I have never been a union organiser, and I know I never will be. However, I do consider the issue with regard to this part of South Australia as just as important as she does. It is not feasible for this board to try to attract the very best people to do the best work they can when they do not have secure employment. Every year that goes by, there are more and more other employment opportunities for these people, typically in the mining industry. I think we need to enable natural resources management boards to compete with other potential employers so that they are able to keep the best employees possible.

The second recommendation that I would like to highlight is actually the second recommendation of the report regarding outback roads. People in this place know how strongly I feel about the value of outback roads, and I spoke about them again yesterday. It was clear to all members of the committee who took the trip that work needs to be done in a completely non-political way. I think every member of parliament who visited, regardless of their own personal affiliation or background, came away knowing that not enough resources go into this very important issue in South Australia, particularly outback South Australia.

Another fact that came to light—and I certainly was not aware of this at the time—is that uranium is actually mined at Prominent Hill. I think it is important to highlight that. Most South Australians would not know that Prominent Hill is technically a uranium mine, certainly by the standards of other mines, a very small one. Uranium is taken out of the ground at Prominent Hill and then sent to Olympic Dam for processing. I have no problem with that whatsoever, but I think it is important to put on the record that that is an important fact for the people of South Australia to know. I think uranium mining should be supported. It is an incredibly important part of our economy and, hopefully, it will be a more important part of the economy in years to come.

Water, as we all know—whether it comes from the River Murray or out of the ground—is a critical issue, probably the most important issue that we face in South Australia. Interestingly enough, in the comments and recommendations section of the report, No. 5 highlights:

Demand for water from the Great Artesian Basin...is rapidly increasing due to expansion in the mining and exploration industries. Development projections indicate the GAB will account for 10 per cent of all water use in South Australia by 2016—

which, as we know, is not very far away—

Current board projects indicate the resource is in decline over the long term; with recharge lower than discharge. The resource needs protection for users including the environment.

So, all users being pastoralists, the mining industry and certainly the environment. That is a vitally important issue for South Australia, and it is highlighted in this report. This report also seeks the South Australian government to commit further funding to this issue so that our state is able to access commonwealth funding to work on the project.

With regard to feral animals, certainly people in this house have heard me talk about dingoes a lot, and I appreciate the fact that the member for Ashford (the chair of the committee) commented on this just a little while ago. The report talks about the great difficulties associated with finding a commercial way of harvesting feral camels. There is a project planned, or proposed, for near Port Pirie, and I certainly hope that gets off the ground. It will be a difficult issue because, as everybody would understand, it is very hard to transport camels probably in excess of 1,000 kilometres to market when all you really want is the meat or the other products that you can use for other reasons. I certainly hope that project near Port Pirie is able to go ahead, because feral animals in our area are an incredibly important thing.

The importance of dealing with feral animals is heightened at the moment because of the tremendous season we have had probably for the last 18 months and the fact that high rainfalls have been positive for anything that is trying to grow; it does not matter whether it is a crop in the South-East of South Australia or whether it is a cane toad trying to work its way down into our state from Queensland. All living organisms really have benefited from the rain, including feral animals, so we need to be particularly vigilant, because ferals will explode.

Coupled with that is the fact that a lot of the programs trying to address the problems of feral animals have been really hamstrung, and people may be aware that there is a program worth \$19 million to deal with feral camels at the moment. They have actually had to stop their work recently because they cannot physically get to the areas that they need to, and that is true of all areas in the north of the state. This report highlights the importance of getting into the areas that are currently inaccessible because of water as soon as they are accessible to deal with the explosion in ferals—ferals being animals and weeds—because they are both causing great difficulty for our state at the moment.

These are the items out of this report that I chose to highlight. There are some other very important findings and recommendations as well. Again, I thank the people from the South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board who conducted the tour and led us through their part of the state, and I compliment all members of the committee, who work very well together to deal with the issues that our committee chooses to look into; and particularly our chair, who leads us very well. The people on this committee do a good job working together on these issues.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (11:21): It is a great privilege to be able to follow the member for Ashford, who is a great chair of our committee, and also the member for Stuart, who is right—member for Ashford, you do lead it very well. The 48th report indicated that this committee had a tour of the north of South Australia. We visited Prominent Hill, which gave us a better overview of what is happening up there. As the member for Stuart has indicated, it is a little known fact that uranium is mined at that mine and I have no issues with that either.

We also had the opportunity to visit Coober Pedy, and it gave us an opportunity not only to talk to some of the locals but also to talk to the council and to understand the pressure they are under, especially with the power supply up there, which is run by the local council. That is something that we all take for granted down here, but it is definitely a big issue up there, as with the water.

We also had the opportunity to visit William Creek and talk to some of the landowners there, the pastoralists, and to understand more about the issues that are confronting those people. At the same time, we did have the great opportunity of going in three small aircraft to have a look at the lake system up there, Lake Eyre, etc., and to get a better understanding of where the rivers are coming in and the feeding into that from Queensland in particular.

As the member for Stuart indicated, I am also going to touch on a few of the findings and recommendations from this report. One of the things that concerns me is the NRM boards. The staff members up there are very, very good. That does not concern me. They have a lot of knowledge and the experience to be able to guide the parliament going through, but those staff need to have improved conditions. They need to have better security for their tenure; there were a couple of occasions when they were not too sure whether they were going to have a job within two months. So, the staff themselves need to have better security, greater direction going forward for their own commitment.

The member for Stuart also touched on the water issue. We talk about water in South Australia and we worry about it in Adelaide in particular. You have some reservoirs here, but the outback of South Australia is 100 per cent reliant on the River Murray, and from the Great

Artesian Basin in the north there they do not have opportunities for the River Murray water. They have to take it out of the Great Artesian Basin. As the member for Stuart has indicated, the draining of that extraction is greater than that going into the basin, so we as a state need to look at alternative or extra water coming in so we do not do any more damage to the Great Artesian Basin. The resource opportunity for South Australia is all in that area, and without security of water and power those conditions will not improve or go forward.

As to the outback roads, whilst there are thousands of kilometres of road system up there, I would suggest (and it is one of the reports) DTEI needs to meet with the South Australian Arid Lands NRM boards up there and also the pastoralists. These are the people who have firsthand knowledge of the condition of the roads and who understand far better how we can maintain those roads to a higher standard.

We also understand that, no matter who is in government, we need to control our expenditure. However, at the same time, those roads up there are the lifeline of not only tourists but also pastoralists. There are times that these people cannot get their product or their stock down to market. When they cannot get their stock down to market, they do not have any finances to continue operating their facilities.

The member for Stuart has also referred to the feral animals in that region. The feral animals up there include camels. Camels are great and are a beautiful animal, but they do a lot of damage up there. As the member for Stuart has indicated, I also hope that the export camel abattoir, which will also process animals other than camels, is established at Port Pirie. It will not only assist with the economic development of that region but it will also rid us of some of the feral camels that are in the outback.

Foxes are another issue that was highlighted up there. Again, we need to control those, because they are also doing damage to the natural resource. The dingo fence, which is a very large fence up there, should keep all of the dingoes away from the stock down in the south. There was talk about there being evidence of dingoes south of the dingo fence. That is another issue because, whilst the dingoes are okay and are a great animal, they do lots of damage to sheep and the environment.

The member for Stuart has indicated that this is one of the best committees in the parliament. I will go one further: I say it is the best working committee in the parliament. The membership of this committee is widespread, and it has bipartisan support. There is great support, great indications and great discussions within this committee. I am very proud to be part of the Natural Resources Committee of the parliament and am looking forward to more trips away. Whilst people might say we should not go away because it costs money, the only way we can find out what the issues are—whether in the outback, the Riverland or wherever—is to touch that firsthand in order to get a better understanding. I certainly have great pleasure in commending this report to the house.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:27): On behalf of the committee, I thank the members for Frome and Stuart for their contributions. I know that the comments they have made are felt very strongly by the other members of the committee. I commend the committee's report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GREATER EDINBURGH PARKS TRANSPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STAGE 1)

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:29): I move:

That the 398th report of the committee, on the upgrade of Commercial Road as part of the Greater Edinburgh Parks Transport Improvement Program (Stage 1), be noted.

This program, stage 1, is of particular relevance to my electorate so I will speak on it. The development of an improved road network to cater for the current and future transport demands of this development is intended to contribute to the achievement of three of the six South Australian Strategic Plan criteria, namely, growing prosperity, improving wellbeing, and attaining sustainability.

The GEP program proposal, as it is known, will generate a significant amount of employment during the construction phase through on-site labour and construction materials supply. More broadly, the move of 1,200 army personnel plus their dependants to Adelaide will generate significant long-term economic benefits to the community by increasing local spending on

goods and services. The roadworks upgrade will improve transport movements and support the associated economic growth in this precinct. The scope of this project is outlined below:

- duplication of the existing Commercial Road between Purling Avenue and Salisbury Highway, noting that this will require an upgraded existing rail crossing where Commercial Road intersects with the Gawler to Adelaide Metro line;
- installation of a pedestrian-actuated crossing at Commercial Road in front of the Phoenix Society; and
- improvements and widenings at the intersection of Commercial Road, Salisbury Highway and John Rice Avenue.

A \$24 million budget was approved by cabinet earlier this year for a package of transport improvements, which we have mentioned. Funding of \$16.5 million for the upgrade of Commercial Road between Purling Avenue and Salisbury Highway is anticipated. Based on the evidence presented to it, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (11:31): I rise to signal the opposition's full support for this report. This is a very vital investment for growth in the defence precinct surrounding Edinburgh. I was out there just last week for the 90th birthday of the Royal Australian Air Force, and I can say that the road complex around the Edinburgh RAAF base and this precinct at present is poor, confused and urgently in need of work. This is an important step in the right direction, and I look forward to its swift passage.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: HAPPY VALLEY WATER TREATMENT PLANT CHLORINATION FACILITY UPGRADE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:32): I move:

That the 399th report of the committee, on the Happy Valley Water Treatment Plant (WTP) chlorination facility upgrade, be noted.

The upgrade of the existing chlorination facility at Happy Valley Water Treatment Plant will be included in the construction of this project, and it will provide an alternate emergency road. It will ensure compliance with the legislative requirements—mainly SafeWork SA requirements and national OH&S regulations—and hence issuing of the MHF licence. It will ensure compliance with Australian standards, mostly dealing with the storage and handling of liquefied chlorine gas and avoid chlorine leaks. Chlorine is an extremely toxic substance to both humans and the environment. It will also provide operational flexibility when obtaining conventionally treated water and desalinated water over a wide range of blended ratios. A brief description of the proposed scope of the proposal is as follows:

- a 21 by 27 metre precast concrete building containing various chlorination, chlorine safety and electrical equipment;
- an alternate emergency access/egress road;
- replacement of all buried chlorine solution pipework;
- commissioning of the new chlorination facility; and
- modification of the existing chlorine building for future bulk storage and workshop, including decommissioning, demolition and removal of the existing chlorination components.

The Public Works Committee has examined this proposal and has been informed that the capital cost of the project will be \$17.848 million, including \$14.243 million in construction costs, estimated to include a 15 per cent contingency. The project is proposed to commence in May 2011, with completion expected in December 2012. Based upon the evidence presented to it, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliament Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to the parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (11:35): This 399th report of the Public Works Committee enjoys the opposition's full support. This is a very good use of taxpayers' money—\$17.8 million—to ensure we have high quality water available to taxpayers. It is a very good project and we look forward to its early construction.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WALLARA EARLY YEARS TO YEAR 7 (NEW MORPHETT VALE PRIMARY SCHOOL) REDEVELOPMENT

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:35): I move:

That the 400th report of the committee, on Wallara Early Years to Year 7 (New Morphett Vale Primary School) Redevelopment, be noted.

I believe the member for Reynell will speak on it more in depth than I will, but I raise the fact that this is an important committee and it is an important report to be reaching a 400th milestone. I would also like to congratulate and recognise the backup of the executive team that we have in creating these reports for parliament each week: our new executive officer David Morfesi and the soon-to-wed Amanda Pacella (behind the scenes) who do a great job. We are very grateful for their contributions.

Based on the evidence before us and section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, we, the Public Works Committee, report to the parliament that we recommend the proposed work.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (11:36): I am very happy to speak to the 400th report of the Public Works Committee. I make that point to the house and commend all members of public works committees, both present and past, for their efforts. I know there are quite a few present members who were members in the past. It has had a chequered history, the Public Works Committee.

It is quite an achievement to be tabling the 400th report of the committee that, after all, was formed in the aftermath of the State Bank disaster when taxpayers' money was thrown away and wasted on an array of useless projects of no benefit to the taxpayer, with the only outcome being billions and billions of dollars worth of debt.

We should never forget that the Public Works Committee was formed to make sure that history never repeats itself. That is why the 400th report should be noted today. This is a milestone in the parliament's efforts to ensure that it keeps the executive, regardless of who is in office, to account; that no executive again ever throws taxpayers' money away, as we saw during the State Bank debacle.

It is even more appropriate that that 400th report be an education investment down at Morphett Vale, as part of a primary school redevelopment. Can there be any greater or more worthwhile expenditure of taxpayers' money than to teach the children? This project is a good use of taxpayers' money. It has our full support, and we look forward to construction commencing.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (11:38): I can assure members that the members of the school community of the new Morphett Vale Primary School are extremely eager to see this construction concluded, and will be extraordinarily disappointed if it is not concluded to enable them to take possession of the school in December this year, ready to open the brand-new school in 2012. They had anticipated being able to do this in 2010, but various interventions have prevented that.

The school has become somewhat disheartened about the prospect of entering their new school. They are also concerned that there has been criticism from some people about super schools. What has brought about this amalgamation is the fact that there were two schools—the child-parent centre and a preschool—both of which were experiencing declining numbers.

Morphett Vale is an area that was full of young families 30, 40, 50 years ago, but no longer is. We have an abundant number of schools in Morphett Vale. The numbers were declining with the changing demographics so that schools were catering for only just over 100 children. This limited their ability to provide a specialist curriculum and specialist support services or even for the children to be able to participate in sport. There certainly were not enough kids to put on an AFL team—they were struggling to get a soccer team.

So the parents wisely, in my view, came together and decided that they had to build a new and bigger school to give their children opportunities. It is my experience that this is what is behind the decision of all parents who say, 'We need to close our schools and look for better opportunities for our children.' While there is a great notion about the sacredness of small schools, they are not always able to operate and offer opportunities that are experienced in slightly larger schools. We are hoping that this school will grow from the initial expectation of around 300 enrolments to something like 450 enrolments so that a wide range of opportunities and specialist support are available for the children who will attend this important school in Morphett Vale.

It is very significant that this school is to occupy the site of the previous Morphett Vale High School, which itself had to close because of changing demographics and declining numbers. This means that the school will be able to offer facilities and space that are not generally available in primary schools. There will be plenty of space for the school to grow but, more importantly, there will be plenty of space for the children's activities now and, given that this school will have a high proportion of children with significant disabilities, it is also important that a dedicated area will be provided to meet their needs and also some of the needs of their parents, who often need extra support to manage their children.

There is also the important inclusion of the Smith Family and the family centre. It is recognised by these schools that supporting parents to support their children's learning is a very important part of a modern school, particularly in an area where the parents might not have had the opportunity to have a great deal of education themselves. They can struggle in supporting their children, and so the schools involved here have wisely engaged the Smith Family to assist them in the process of providing the best environment for children to learn, both at school and at home, through the support of their children.

I want to congratulate and commend all the members of the current governing council, of the Morphett Vale Primary School, as it is called at the moment; the past members of the Morphett Vale West Primary School governing council; the John Morphett Primary School governing council; and the John Morphett Kindergarten committee of management. They have had to make some big decisions on behalf of their community. We know that no community likes to see its local school close because it is part of a community's being, but these people have put the future opportunities of their children in front of nostalgia and they must be commended.

One of the important features of the new school is that it will provide better opportunities for staff than the previous schools. Indeed, as is often the case for staff in all schools, it is part of the design consultation phase. We have stressed that staff need to have their professionalism and their needs recognised and to have a suitable space where they can not only prepare lessons but, if necessary, withdraw and debrief themselves from some of the stressful situations that they encounter in their valuable jobs in the classroom. I really hope that the things we have discussed in the consultation process manifest in the final design.

I have challenged the architects to provide the most beautiful and most stylish school in my area because, unfortunately, often the state school design—particularly in areas where the demographics are expected to change—can only be described as third rate, if not, indeed, grotty. The recent BER projects have been a huge boon to schools in my area. They finally have a really beautiful building.

Unfortunately, governments of all persuasions over the years have not found it necessary to invest in high quality design and appearance of the learning environment in some of these older schools. The School Pride initiatives, from both the state and federal governments, under the Labor regime recently, have made great improvements but the inherent design is not good. The architects have assured me that this will indeed be the most significant school in the area, both from its appearance and the actuality of the learning and teaching environment.

I can assure you that the community of this school is looking forward with eager anticipation to the decision of this parliament. Thanks to the Public Works Committee for the expeditious way in which it dealt with this matter. We look forward to celebrating the opening of the Morphett Vale Primary School next year, with plenty of time for the preparation of the site by the staff and community, starting in December this year.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: EAST GRAND TRUNKWAY GILLMAN—INDUSTRIAL ESTATE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:46): I move:

That the 401st report of the committee, entitled the East Grand Trunkway Gillman—Industrial Estate, be noted.

Under section 12 of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee has examined this proposal and recommends the proposed public works.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (11:46): The opposition supports the 401st report of the committee and looks forward to seeing this development proceed. We note that the future development of this general location by the government has been a little confused. There have

been other proposals for development at the precinct that have been abandoned as a result of budget cuts. I note that this has been covered in the media outlet *InDaily* in some detail. We were, therefore, surprised but pleased to see this proposal come forward because it will see commercial development down at the port, where it is needed.

I just make the point, in addressing this report, that another important development, besides this report, awaits government decision and that is the construction of a motorplex down at Gillman on land to the east of this particular site. I understand and welcome signals from the government that they are prepared to sit down with the motorplex proponents now and work together at delivering an outcome there.

I certainly hope that the Minister for Motor Sport becomes the sole point of contact for government with the proponents and that the various parts of government come together and look at whether or not the motorplex proposition can be supported. It would be another fantastic commercial development down at the port which would create jobs, economic activity and excitement for the port, which is much needed.

I think this 401st report signals that the government and opposition all agree that the area in the vicinity of Grand Trunkway—this site that was once the site of a multifunctionpolis and land adjacent to it—is ripe for development. It is ripe for development; that is why we agree with this report and look forward to the construction commencing, but why we also appeal to the government to look at doing all that it can to see a motorplex constructed down at the site as well. We are happy to work with the government and the proponents in a bipartisan way to see that come to fruition.

I just signal that I know there has been a political campaign run by the motorplex proponents up to this point. I think there is an opportunity for us all to put the past behind us, if you like, now that it appears the door is open.

I can signal to the house that the message I have sent to the proponents is that they should do all that they can to work constructively with the government on their proposition and that we would be happy, if the government is happy to work constructively with them, to do what we can to assist as well, to put the politics aside and get on with looking at whether or not we can develop the site. That is a genuine offer and I would certainly be prepared to recommend that on our side of the house if we can go forward, because this is an area that needs development. It is wasteland at the moment. We agree with this report and look forward to seeing the construction commence.

Motion carried.

SPEED CAMERAS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Venning:

That this house establishes a select committee to examine the use and effectiveness of speed cameras and other speed measuring devices used by South Australia Police.

(Continued from 9 March 2011.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:50): I will be brief because I know that other members have other matters that they wish to address. The first point I make is that you must have a system of monitoring road behaviour, otherwise people will do whatever they like, when they like and with serious consequences. I understand the government will oppose this. I think select committees have an important role because they give the wider community a chance to have an input. It is also an educative process for members of parliament.

My view is that speed cameras and other speed measuring devices, including lasers, are accurate if they are used according to manufacturers' specifications and in accordance with proper standards. I will seek to address some of those issues through separate measures in this parliament shortly, so I do not need to canvass them now.

I point out to members that the Queensland parliament has recently concluded a very thorough study of fixed cameras. That report is available online. It is incredibly comprehensive and covers every aspect of fixed cameras/speed cameras that has been examined, I think, anywhere in the world. I would urge members interested in this topic to have a look at that report because it covers a lot of the points that the select committee would look at.

It is a pity that the government is not going to support this, as I understand it, because I think there is merit in looking at issues from time to time. Certainly, these devices bring in revenue

but they also help curtail speeding on the road and, therefore, save lives. The critical issue is that they are used properly, transparently and according to proper standards of the manufacturer and in accordance with other standards, such as the Australian Standards.

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:52): We all know that speed is a major contributing factor to the state's road toll and dramatically increases the likelihood of being involved in an accident. The state government consistently urges drivers to slow down through ongoing road safety campaigns. Yet it seems to me that the opposition is seeking to undermine SAPOL's speed enforcement strategies by attacking them as revenue raising. It is a political campaign which undermines the simple message that drivers need to slow down and drive safely.

I understand that this motion came about from a research assignment done by an intern in the member's office. I make no reflection on their research work except to say that if the opposition wanted a report into the effectiveness of speed cameras they need only have visited the Adelaide University's Centre for Automotive Safety Research, which confirms that speeding is dangerous and that speed cameras are effective in reducing casualty crashes.

The report of the Centre for Automotive Safety Research shows, among other things, that: for every five kilometres over the 60 kilometre speed limit the risk of causing an accident doubles; the reduction of the speed limit from 60 to 50 km/h has saved lives and reduced casualty crashes on our roads; and a thorough speed detection regime, using both fixed and covert speed cameras, provides a general deterrence for motorists to speed and reduces casualty crashes.

It is a fact that speed cameras save lives. This government has no intention to revisit the substantial body of science that supports this view. The government has based its road safety policy on the advice of road safety experts, yet some in the opposition continue to cast doubt on SAPOL's speed detection regime and frequently complain that the placement of speed cameras is solely about revenue raising.

It is my understanding that members of the opposition have been briefed many times on the placement of speed cameras. Speed cameras are deployed in accordance with established SAPOL policy as part of the strategy to reduce speed-related fatal and serious injury crashes and to establish a firm base for long-term change in driver attitude to speeding. SAPOL's traffic intelligence branch identifies the locations to deploy speed cameras. The following factors are considered when installing speed cameras in specific locations:

- whether the location has a crash history;
- whether the location contributes to crashes in other nearby locations;
- where intelligence reports provide information of dangerous driving practices associated with speeding; and
- whether the physical condition of a location creates a road safety risk.

Speed contributes significantly to the extent of trauma suffered by victims of road crashes and even small reductions in average speeds can result in substantial reductions in deaths and injuries

Road safety is everyone's responsibility and SAPOL will, with the support of this government, continue to work in a coordinated effort with the community and its partners to ensure that this message gets through. This government is committed to reducing the road toll and crash injuries by maintaining speed cameras and, through road safety campaigns, urging motorists to slow down.

There is a culture among some drivers that it is acceptable to drive a few kilometres over the speed limit but, as the research has shown, this greatly increases the likelihood of causing an accident. In order to change driving behaviour, the government runs the Stop Creeping campaign to remind motorists that creeping over the speed limit is dangerous and dramatically increases the likelihood of causing a serious accident.

SAPOL has also reduced the tolerance levels at which it issues an expiation notice for speeding, so that motorists are more likely to be fined for low-level speeding offences. This is entirely appropriate, because creeping just five kilometres over the speed limit dramatically affects the force at which a car hits another vehicle or a pedestrian when they are involved in an accident.

With regard to the claim that speed cameras are about revenue raising, SAPOL's 2009-10 annual report shows that expiation revenue, which includes fines from red-light cameras and other offences, was \$76.4 million. To put that figure into context with the state budget,

expiation revenue collected by SAPOL represents just under half a per cent of South Australia's total revenue of \$15.5 billion. By comparison, SAPOL's annual budget is \$693 million.

The opposition also fails to acknowledge that all speeding fine revenue goes towards road safety programs through the community road safety fund. As has been said before, if speeding fines are a tax they are a voluntary tax, and the government would be happy not to collect if it meant that motorists stopped speeding. Not only would lives be saved but motorists would save a fortune on their compulsory third-party insurance premiums.

Any campaign to discredit SAPOL's speed detection regime is, I believe, irresponsible and undermines attempts to encourage a safer driving culture in our community.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Can I move that the time allotted for orders of the day under private members' business be extended by five minutes to allow consideration of the Berri hospital development?

The SPEAKER: Member for Fisher, no, it is not possible for you do that. You would have to do it by suspension of standing orders and I am not sure that you have the support of the parliament for that.

RAIL COMMISSIONER (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (11:59): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Rail Commissioner Act 2009; and to repeal the TransAdelaide (Corporate Structure) Act 1998. Read a first time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (12:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Rail Commissioner (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2011* is one component to further effect a long-term restructure and integration of the State's public transport functions.

Integration of the State's public transport functions has seen the consolidation of TransAdelaide and the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) Public Transport Division functions under one management and business administration structure and the removal of duplicated functions.

The integration has resulted in improved planning for bus, train and tram services, while enhancing the delivery of customer service and information. It has also allowed for the streamlining of contracts for bus, train and tram services.

This integration also supports the \$2.6 billion investment currently underway to transform Adelaide's public transport network into a vibrant state-of-the-art system. This investment also delivers a program of works to meet our ambitious State Strategic Plan target to increase the use of public transport and make Adelaide a more sustainable city.

The *Rail Commissioner (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2011* is an essential component of the ongoing integration of the State's public transport functions, with three key objectives:

- To repeal the *TransAdelaide (Corporate Structure) Act 1998*. This will also end the formal responsibilities of the TransAdelaide Board. The Board is no longer required as the responsibilities of the Board transferred to the Rail Commissioner from 1 September 2010.
- To amend the *Rail Commissioner Act 2009* for the Rail Commissioner to be accredited under Schedule 4 of the *Passenger Transport Act 1994* to enter into future service contracts with the Minister for Transport for train and tram services. This is the same arrangement afforded to TransAdelaide for accreditation under section 39 of *Passenger Transport Act 1994*.

To amend the *Rail Commissioner Act 2009* to allow the Annual Report of the Rail Commissioner including financial statements to be incorporated within the Annual Report of another public sector agency responsible to the Minister (currently DTEI), effective 1 July 2011. This will provide greater administrative efficiency and mirrors the arrangement that exists for the Commissioner of Highways under section 28 of the *Highways Act 1926*.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Rail Commissioner Act 2009*

4—Amendment of section 7—Functions

This clause amends section 7 to provide that the Rail Commissioner will be taken to hold an accreditation under the *Passenger Transport Act 1994* to operate passenger transport services by train or tram as operated by the Rail Commissioner from time to time.

5—Insertion of section 15A

This clause provides that the annual report of the Rail Commissioner to the Minister (required under the *Public Sector Act 2009*) may be incorporated with the report of another public sector agency responsible to the Minister.

Schedule 1—Repeal of *TransAdelaide (Corporate Structure) Act 1998*

1—Repeal of *TransAdelaide (Corporate Structure) Act 1998*

This clause repeals the *TransAdelaide (Corporate Structure) Act 1998*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

ELECTRICITY (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (12:01): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electricity Act 1996. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill I am introducing today improves South Australia's feed-in scheme by providing greater rewards to the owners of solar generators, and makes changes to ensure that the benefit can be adopted by as many South Australians as possible, while balancing the cost of the scheme.

This government has ensured that South Australia is at the forefront of renewable energy and climate change policy action. In 2008, this government was the first in Australia to implement a premium feed-in scheme for small-scale grid-connected solar photovoltaic systems owned by small customers. Nearly every other state and territory has announced or introduced a feed-in scheme after South Australia.

Honourable members would be aware that South Australia's feed-in scheme works by rewarding eligible small customers with a bonus of 44¢ for every kilowatt hour of excess electricity fed back into the grid from eligible solar photovoltaic systems. This amount is funded through distribution charges levied by ETSA Utilities on all its grid-connected customers. The scheme extends to 2028. The South Australian feed-in scheme has been overwhelmingly successful. I advise honourable members that there are now 32,000 grid-connected solar photovoltaic customers, representing nearly 50 megawatts of installed generating capacity.

The South Australian government announced that once installed capacity had reached 10 megawatts, the scheme would be reviewed. This threshold was reached in May 2009. The review was tasked with looking at several specific elements of the scheme including other possible technologies, retailer payments and the issue of larger systems. I am pleased to say that the review's final report found that the South Australian feed-in scheme has been successful and well implemented as measured against a number of criteria, including installed capacity, exported energy, ease of implementation and operation, and customer complaints.

The review's final report identified opportunities for further improvement while cognisant of not changing the fundamental parameters of the scheme or adding additional layers of complexity which raise administrative costs. The recommendations also recognise the importance of educating and informing customers. Specifically, the review's final report recommended the government explicitly refer to the scheme as a net scheme in legislation, make a provision to include other technologies in the scheme, consider implementing a scheme cap, and reduce eligible capacity size for each unit from 30 kVA to 10 kVA.

It recommended that the Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) conduct analysis into the value of small-scale renewable exports and provide a determination to the minister of a minimum benchmark rate for small electricity customers, and that the government and retailers publish the minimum benchmark rate for small customers while also obliging retailers to publish their rates for comparison purposes.

The review's final report also recommended that the government provide a website for customers to acquire accurate information on connecting small-scale renewables, place scheme parameters in regulation, have a second review in 2012 and make a series of transactional arrangements for existing participants in the feed-in scheme. The South Australian government considered the final report and its recommendations. The Premier announced the government's response on 31 August 2010 in his keynote address on South Australia's leadership within a carbon-constrained economy at the Committee for Economic Development of Australia's Leaders Series. The Premier announced that the government had resolved to accept the review final report recommendations in relation to referring to the feed-in scheme as a net scheme in order to make it clearer and to implement a scheme capacity cap.

To strike the right balance between the availability of the scheme and the overall cost to all electricity customers, the government proposed to close the scheme to new entrants when an installed capacity of 60 MW is reached. I advise honourable members that customer uptake of the feed-in scheme has been strong since the Premier's announcement. In order to provide an adequate implementation period, the government proposes to close the scheme to new entrants from 1 October 2011.

In order to ensure that as many customers as possible can access the scheme prior to its closure, the government accepts the recommendations to reduce eligible capacity size. The proposed mechanism differs from the final recommendation because it would be very difficult to enforce an individual unit capacity of 10 kVA. Instead, the government proposes more practical means by limiting the eligibility for the feed-in tariff to the first kilowatt hour/day exported for the first 45 kilowatt per day exported to the grid for customers who have received permission to connect from ETSA Utilities after 31 August 2010. I am advised that a 10 kilowatt solar unit exporting 75 per cent of its power to the grid at maximum generation in summer would remain unaffected by this change: 10 kilowatt is much larger than that in place in the vast majority of residential installations.

The government also proposes limiting eligibility to one generator per customer, and specifically excluding generators operated primarily for the purpose of generating a profit from the scheme. I advise honourable members that the government proposes to go further than the review's final recommendations in relation to retailer payments. The government's proposal will oblige retailers, who choose to contract with solar customers, to pay at least a minimum retail rate, which would be determined by ESCOSA, for the power received from solar panels. The retailer payment will apply to power exported by all small-scale solar photovoltaic generators, regardless of whether or not the power exported is also eligible for the premium feed-in tariff.

The mandated minimum retailer payment will continue to apply beyond the feed-in scheme's expiry in 2028 to ensure that retailers pay customers for the value they receive from power exported to the grid. This minimum rate will not be subject to the new eligibility criteria of the daily cap, and the exclusion of multiple and dedicated generators.

The government has decided not to include wind generation or any other technology in the feed-in scheme. This is consistent with the intent of the scheme, that was specifically designed to support consumers that had installed small-scale solar photovoltaic systems. Wind generation is a mature, renewable technology, which can already be deployed efficiently on a large scale, with the support of the Commonwealth government's renewable energy target. South Australia has more than 1000 megawatts of installed wind generation capacity.

A fair system of transitional arrangements is also proposed by the government. The proposed arrangements will not result in any diminished benefit for existing solar customers. However, all customers that received permission to connect for their solar systems from ETSA Utilities after 31 August 2010 (the date of the announcement) will be subject to the new eligibility criteria.

The bill also clarifies the issue of payment of a customer's entitlement by a retailer. This typically applies where a customer is permanently in a credit balance with their retailer. At a minimum, it is proposed that retailers must make a payment of any outstanding credit balance to

their qualifying customers at least once every 12 months. This clarifies and preserves the initial intent of the feed-in scheme. Retailers are able to make payments on a more frequent basis if they wish.

I am pleased to advise members that the government has also resolved to enhance the reward for owners of small-scale solar photovoltaic panels by proposing to increase the feed-in tariff from 44¢ to 54¢ per kilowatt hour. This will apply to all eligible solar customers, both existing and new, and will further reduce the payback period of solar photovoltaic systems. This change, combined with the mandated minimum retail payment, is expected to make South Australia's scheme more generous than those operating in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia, when considering the various lengths of each scheme.

I also make a comment, in passing, about the New South Wales scheme. The New South Wales feed-in scheme is a gross scheme, which contrasts with the net scheme created originally in South Australia and all other states. From inception, we have resisted the call to apply the scheme on a gross basis, as we considered the reward excessive. The New South Wales government has now pared its benefit back so that its value is now less than our scheme.

The feed-in scheme remains an important mechanism to encourage the contribution of small-scale photovoltaic generation to South Australia's Strategic Plan target of 20 per cent of renewable energy produced and consumed by 2014. This government has also set a longer-term renewable energy target of 33 per cent of the state's energy production by 2020.

The bill also contains additional amendments to the Electricity Act 1996 to provide for the technical regulator's information gathering powers to apply to his electricity emergency management functions under the National Electricity Act 1996. These amendments ensure that the technical regulator can adequately prepare for an electricity emergency event, and has sufficient information gathering powers during such an event to minimise potential impacts on South Australian customers. I commend the bill to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 April 2011.)

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (12:15): As I was saying yesterday, the September 2010 budget was an extraordinarily unpopular budget, and there was actually no necessity for it to be an extraordinarily unpopular budget. The point is that this horror budget was necessary due only to fiscal mismanagement over the life of this government, and I will explain briefly why.

The Premier and the former treasurer have been the very fortunate recipients of massive unbudgeted revenues over an extended period of time. In fact, since coming to power, they have received more than \$5.1 billion in excess of what they themselves even budgeted for—money coming into this state which was never accounted for, budgeted for, but which we received.

In fact, just in the last three years there has been in excess of \$2 billion of unbudgeted money coming into South Australia. This is at the same time that the previous treasurer would have us believe we are suffering from a global financial crisis. Well, why is it that, in that same period of time (the last three financial years), over \$2 billion worth of unbudgeted money came into this state?

Of course, that money, which has come into the state over the period of time that this government has been in power, is mainly, of course, due to the GST rivers of gold which have flowed into South Australia—legislation, of course, which was put in place by the Howard Liberal federal government and which was opposed, of course, by the Labor Party at the time and opposed by and spoken about vehemently by the current South Australian government at the time. But they have been the happy and fortunate recipients of this money, and, of course, also massive property tax increases in revenue.

Where has this money gone? Where has this additional \$5.1 billion actually gone? Has it gone towards infrastructure? Has it gone towards supporting our country hospitals? Perhaps it has gone towards our state's roads in my electorate of Norwood, or maybe closing the gap of Indigenous disadvantage in this state. Has it gone to supporting small business or family business, the engine room of the South Australian economy?

Perhaps it has gone to adult education and supporting this important sector of our economy, or maybe public housing. The answer to all these questions is an emphatic no. It has not gone there whatsoever. It has gone to budget overruns in each and every single year of this government. This government has been on a spending spree.

I would like to read into *Hansard* the money that has been spent by this government over and above its budget each year. It is like it sort of sets the budget as a bit of a goal which it has exceeded every year. Usually in business we try to come in under budget for expenses, but, no, this government basically saw it as a target which it has actually overachieved. In the first year, \$184 million overspent. In its second year,—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, member for Norwood, far be it from me to stop you in full flight, but do you have a table there? Are you reading from a table?

Mr MARSHALL: I am just reading numbers.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is okay. No need to get defensive, because I am just saying that if you do, you could also seek leave to insert it into the *Hansard*.

Mr MARSHALL: Would I want to do that?

An honourable member: Yes.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, it is not really a table. What it shows, of course, is \$3.6 billion worth of money spent by this government over and above the budget. It has had no ability to control its expenditure during the nine long years that it has been in power, and we are the worse off for it. We have had \$3.6 billion worth of unbudgeted spending.

Of course, Madam Deputy Speaker, as I am sure you and members of this parliament are all too aware, we are the highest taxed state in Australia. Under this government there has been a 75 per cent increase in state taxes and charges over the past eight years. Not only are we the highest taxed state in Australia, but we also have the highest spending government pro rata in Australia. I am not against spending—although it seems to be a little bit of a theme with the Labor Party: higher taxes and higher spending. I am not opposed to higher spending but I am opposed to waste.

There are many examples I can give today but, with the 11 minutes remaining, I will give one example of this government's ineptitude, and that is the highways department building that was on Walkerville Terrace, which is just adjacent to my electorate. The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure sold this building for \$11 million because they said it was completely unsuitable. What did they do then? They spent an additional \$13 million fitting out the old SA Water building at 77 Grenfell Street in the city. So they sold their building in Walkerville for \$11 million and spent \$13 million fitting out somebody else's building that is not owned by the state government.

Since then, they have signed up to a 12-year agreement to rent that building at \$7.16 million per year plus GST plus 3.5 per cent indexation. The cost per square metre is \$447 per year in rent. This is extraordinarily expensive by any measure. The net cost of this over the 12-year life of this agreement is \$115 million of taxpayers' money on this folly. Quite frankly, I think we could have bought this building several times over rather than have this incredible government waste. Of course, this is just one example of where this government has taxed us extremely highly and wasted the money it has collected rather than spend it on priorities that have been very well communicated to them by the general public and, of course, by the Public Service union here in South Australia.

Recognising the anger in the community over this government wastage and the budget, the Premier was looking for a scapegoat and, of course, the previous treasurer had to go. Incredibly, when the new Treasurer was put in place, he looked like not overturning any of the previously toxic unpopular policies of the previous treasurer. In fact, almost on day one—certainly, the first day that he was asked questions in question time—he said, 'I share the previous treasurer's commitment to financial sustainability. That means we need to meet all the savings measures that have been set out in the previous budget.'

So, far from being the saviour of the Public Service in South Australia and ordinary South Australians who were shocked and dismayed at the 2010 budget, the new Treasurer comes in and confirms that he will implement all those policies. It makes you wonder why they had to go through the coup to get rid of the former treasurer if the new Treasurer was going to come in and support all of the previous toxic policies of this government.

The new Treasurer also said on his first day in question time, 'I will not allow this state to run up a credit card debt which gets left to our children to have to pay.' I do not know what set of books this guy is looking at but, quite frankly, we are massively running up our debt here in South Australia for our future generations to pay. Instead of driving down our state debt, we have been increasing debt. I find it extraordinarily worrying that the new Treasurer does not understand this very basic concept.

When I look at the projections for our debt in the forward estimates it shows that under this government we will peak at \$7.5 billion. We have not had that level of debt in South Australia since the financial year of 1998-99. That was 13 years ago. We have all this extra money, all these rivers of gold, coming in from federal government money, but our debt is growing, back to levels we have not seen since 1998-99, when we were trying to recover from the State Bank crisis left to us by the previous Labor government.

When the Liberals took over in 1993, state debt stood at \$11 billion; by the time we left office, it was closer to \$3 billion. Now, under this new government, this new Treasurer is quite happy to clock up on the credit card, as he puts it, \$7.5 billion. Of course, it would be much higher if the government was not considering selling our very valuable state forestry assets because the proceeds of the sale of the forward rotations is factored into that net debt figure.

On the debt issue, I think it is also important to recognise that debt is only one part of the liability picture that we should be looking at. There are other liabilities, which we would consider if we were in a commercial environment, which this state has which makes the \$7.5 billion look pretty insignificant.

I do not have a huge amount of time remaining, but certainly I would like to put on the record that, if we include our other unfunded liabilities with regard to workers compensation, public sector workers compensation, public sector superannuation and the Motor Accident Commission, the liability factor we have in South Australia is much higher. I should also make the point right here that, when we look at that net debt figure, we really do need to take into account some of these contracts which the government is negotiating on our behalf, which are going to encumber our state for extensive periods into the future.

Of course, I am speaking about the desal contract, which we have no visibility of here in this parliament, and I am also talking about the PPP proposal for the Royal Adelaide Hospital. These numbers will not appear in our net debt figure, but they are unequivocally liabilities this state will have for the next 20, 30 or 35 years, and we have no visibility or scrutiny of those here in this parliament, yet we have a Treasurer who says, 'Well, this isn't really that hard'—and, again, I am quoting from *Hansard*. When asked the question, 'What is the Treasurer's position on state debt?', he said:

It is a simple financial concept. Anyone who runs a normal household budget would understand that if you live off your credit card on your day-to-day expenses and run up your credit card debt you are going to be in trouble.

Well, guess what, Mr Treasurer? We are in trouble—we are in monumental trouble—and it is not being helped by pithy quotes such as that in *Hansard*.

In the remaining minutes I have, I would like to discuss the important issue of GST revenue to this state because I do not know whether this has really been highlighted so far in the debate. The federal government has suggested that there will be a review of the method of allocating GST revenues to the individual states. For those of you who do not know, GST revenues are not applied back to a state based upon population; they are not based upon the fact of how much revenue is collected in your state. There is a complex equation, which is called the horizontal fiscal equalisation policy, which basically tries to spread the GST revenue or funds across Australia. South Australia receives \$1.28 for every dollar collected in this state. Other states are receiving down to 60¢ in the dollar, and they have claimed that this is extraordinarily unfair. I see this as a massive danger for us here in South Australia.

In South Australia, we have 11 of the federal seats; Queensland has 37. They are screaming that this is unfair. I know what this minority Labor government is going to do: it is going to play to the tune of the larger states, and we are going to be left out, and this learner-plate Treasurer we have at the moment does not even have it on his radar. Well, he needs to get it on his radar. We are going to be looking very carefully at what he brings down in the budget that is coming up because the forward revenues received from GST make up a whopping proportion of our revenue in South Australia and, if they are affected in any negative way whatsoever, we will be left out of pocket, even more so than we have in the past.

I will be very reluctantly supporting the Supply Bill to allow the Treasurer \$3.32 billion. My Liberal colleagues and I will be listening very intently at the next budget to see how this government plans to balance the books. The previous treasurer thought that we should actually build a monument in his honour. I think he was joking, although you can never be sure with the member for Port Adelaide. The simple fact of the matter is that he has left this state and the new Treasurer with a complete and utter mess and, for that reason, I shall be looking at the upcoming 2011 state budget very, very carefully.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:30): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. This important bill ensures that our public servants and our departments continue to be funded, pending the announcement and subsequent approval by this parliament of the 2011-12 budget. We do this annually. Last year, of course, we had to do it with a much more expanded amount because the then treasurer could not get his act together sufficiently to bring down the budget at the usual time, that is, before the end of the financial year, after the election. This year, hopefully, the new Treasurer will be able to attend to that—

An honourable member: In a more timely manner.

Ms CHAPMAN: —in a more timely manner, indeed—and we will have it before the end of the financial year. The provision of funds in this Supply Bill suggests that he intends to do just that. One department came under the significant scrutiny of the Sustainable Budget Commission, which was operating during 2009-10. The government appointed eminent members of the community to the Sustainable Budget Commission to find all of the areas in which cuts could be made. Given that the last of the Foley budgets was going to be announced and was going to be an absolute ripper, and that we needed to rein in the extraordinary debt and cost that got out of control under his regime, the Sustainable Budget Commission dealt with a number of areas, including the Department of Environment and Conservation.

I am going to address some of those areas today and, in particular, the provision for conservation and coastal and marine, which are important aspects of our environment budget. They are very pertinent because, in November last year, the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. Paul Caica) announced that he was going to present for public consultation a number of what he described as sanctuary zones within an established 19 marine park structure. They have been known as no-go zones or exclusion zones by a number of people in the last six months that that this has been debated out in the community.

The minister said, 'I'm going to put this out for public consultation and I'm going to appoint local action groups for them to call public meetings in regional areas,' and then he stacked the LAGs. I think it is pretty clear if you read the publications in *The Australian* that people like Andy Gilfillan—who is in charge of the LAG, as it is known, on Kangaroo Island—have been caught up in what was a clear mandate by the government (in particular, the department of environment) and they are expected to tow the line. They are starting to break out on that.

However, the important thing I bring to your attention is that there was funding for the establishment of public meetings in regional areas. Over the summer break, there was no question that people in coastal towns—from the Western Australian border to Victoria—expressed concern at a number of public meetings mostly convened by local members from this side of the house and Independent members because the government did not do that. Apart from the LAG-appointed public meetings, that was it. So, local members got very active on this, and what became abundantly clear here in the city (where two-thirds of the state's population live) is that they were also concerned. Anyone who owned bathers, boats or beach houses understood that there was going to be a significant social and economic impact on their investment in lifestyle and livelihood, in addition to those who are living out in regional areas.

So, I asked the minister earlier this year to convene a meeting in the city so that people in the city who fish or who have leisure activity on the coast—and there are tens and tens of thousands of them—have a chance to find out a bit more about this. He wrote back to me saying, 'Look, it's on the website. These are the fact sheets that you can read and distribute, but if you have your meeting on the basis that I don't have one, then I will send members of the department along to provide that information.'

Yesterday, the day before the proposed Burnside public meeting, I received a letter from the minister saying, 'I am not attending.' He had never committed himself to attend—and that was fine, he does not have to—but his in writing confirmation that he would be pleased to send members of his department was withdrawn. In fact, he said that he had instructed his department

not to attend. That is the level of transparency and the level of public consultation that we are getting from this government, which is indicative over a number of fields. If I stick to this one, he has now announced, after saying that that was not necessary, you just go to the website, that he is going to have his own public meetings—not here in the city, but at Hove, I think, and at Semaphore; not where other people might live in the metropolitan area. He is going to have some, nonetheless.

Let me tell you the ambit since I have been to so many of these public meetings. You have a public meeting, you have a controller—someone who is brought in to protect the department and the minister from any outcry—you have a very limited and very strict agenda, you have it over a sustained period so that people can drop in and drop out of it, so that you never get a crowd big enough to be angry; and if people do turn up who look like they are getting a bit angry or frustrated, they are broken up into groups. We all get butcher's paper, we all get a pencil and we all have to write down our concerns.

This is just utter nonsense. The consultation is a joke, so I have no confidence in that. Nevertheless, let me say, last night at the Burnside meeting, there were somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 people, I am told. I have counted a lot of sheep in my time and I could only count the thousand-odd that were inside the hall, but there were varying different hundreds outside the hall, and it was ably attended by a very good number of members over here, including our Independent members, both in here and in another place.

So, it was a very important meeting, and I say to the house—this is important—this is what consultation is all about. First of all, you invite everybody. Last night, young and old, people aged from 6 to 90, were there. We had male and female—I have to say, more male than female, but nevertheless male and female. We had people from the country and the city—my guess is about 30 to 40 per cent from the country, the rest from the city.

We had property owners, caravan park owners, people who had kids, grandchildren who fish, boaties, people who have beach houses or tents. You name it, everyone who owns an esky across the state was there in different groups: rich, poor, good cars, tinnies, owners. You name it, they were there. There were commercial fishermen, charter boat operators, fishermen and the recreational fishing area, people who have their leisure in the coastal towns.

Notwithstanding bleatings about it being a political meeting—as if there is anything wrong with that; it is a political matter; it is a government proposal, so of course it is going to be political—the people who were asked to speak were the minister and his department. They were given a commitment to speak and an opposition position as to what our position would be. In addition, the people from the Real Estate Institute were there to tell us about whether there would be an effect on property and investment for those who have beach houses, residences, businesses, employment, jobs, etc. in country regions.

We had Jim Raptis representing the food and tourism industry. Jim comes from a family who started out on the West Coast and is now a major exporter and food producer of magnificent, beautiful fish in this state. We also had Trevor Watts, who is the current president of the recreational fishers. Other commercial fishers came and also made statements on the night, as indeed did charter boat operators and other people who live in many of the regional towns.

There is a long list of questions that were presented, which I will be forwarding on to the minister. What they were really angry about was not just that he did not turn up or that he did not send anybody—that sort of, 'I'll take my bat and ball away because I haven't got control of this nonsense. It's not on my terms, so I am not going to do it'—but that he complained about a brochure that went out. On radio I heard he even insulted the chair of the recreational fishers, who said 'Well, you know you would be a brave bloke to go to a meeting'—and that was enough to make him too scared to go. I have never actually known the minister to be a scaredy-cat. I was handed a document last night that said, 'Caica is a coward.' This is how angry people are about the issue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Ashford.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: My point of order is that it was my understanding, and certainly my instructions, that when we contribute to this supply debate it needs to be in relation to the actual Supply Bill. I am just wondering why a public meeting, however important it is, and how making negative comments about the minister for environment is relevant to this particular debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If people want to insult each other, that is fine. Member for Ashford, the reality is that supply bills are extremely wide ranging in debate, and I am afraid there is no point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: Of the very long list of concerns raised and questions to be answered by the minister about his project and how it is to operate, one of the most critical was why there has not been an economic and social impact statement on the programs that have been proposed. We have heard the minister's explanation for that in other places: he says he is going to do it down the track. However, the point is that there is a major social and economic impact on these people; they know it and they know it is coming. They feel blamed and cheated by the process to date.

The financial aspect also raises another important question on the hypocrisy of the government's saying, 'This is not about fishing; this is about marine parks and the whole of the marine environment and protecting the biodiversity.' That sounds fine. It sounds to me like a power transfer from the fisheries department to the environment department actually, but let us assume that they are genuinely concerned about that, and this is why the budget allocation to this is important.

We have already seen the hypocrisy of this government: it has approved projects that pump pollution into the water; it has approved projects that have major environmental aspects associated with them; it has approved oil rigs in areas that are to be marine park zones; and it has approved the dynamiting of ships to make them into artificial reefs. It has been very controversial over the years as to whether you should create artificial reefs with old tyres, vessels past their use-by date, etc. I can remember the former minister for tourism standing here saying she was going to set alight or put air into something that was going to explode and put these things to the bottom of the ocean to create artificial reefs for people to dive on for tourism.

So, let's be honest here. If the government gives a tink about the marine environment, the first thing they would have done was made sure that we had a marine park right outside Adelaide, where hundreds of hectares of seagrass have been destroyed because they continue to fail to deal with all the stormwater rushing off metropolitan Adelaide and killing the seagrass. So, let's be honest about the hypocrisy of these things and let's understand why the anger and frustration is there.

The three resolutions last night were: first, that these no-go zones or sanctuary zones all be removed, that they never be approved by the minister, and they are currently in the draft process; secondly, that there be no identification (and approval particularly) of any other zone—smaller, bigger or anywhere—without a social and economic impact statement being undertaken on it; and, thirdly (this was a little more controversial, but I think it passed with the biggest shout last night), that, 'We'll fish where we bloody well want to.' That is how angry the meeting got.

Quite properly, our leader, Mrs Isobel Redmond, confirmed her commitment to the first two as the opposition's policy; that is, we will not tolerate what has been presented to us to date—that must go—and she will properly review that. For any application, particularly where it is supported by a local community who have been consulted, she insists that, where there is need to protect because of rarity, risk or threat, there be proper identification of that and proper consultation and social and economic impact statements undertaken. Of course, I would never ask her to ever endorse anything that was illegal—and I am sure she would not—but I was prompted, during our own consultations, when I had a call from a retired fisherman on the West Coast. He said, 'You know, Vickie, I think your father, Ted, would have really liked these marine parks, these new zones.' I said, 'Oh I don't think so,' and he said, 'He would have; they'd be the first place he'd go fishing!'

So, let me say that there was a level of anger and frustration last night. When you make bad laws, when governments impose unreasonable and inappropriate restrictions on people, you end up with a situation where good people break the law, where good people become criminals. We have amendments in the upper house which would ensure that a person who might breach a zone and fish in the wrong area, or their boat might drift into the zone, are given a warning in the first instance and can only be prosecuted on a second offence. These are modifications we have tried to make. Of course, we have also tried to move an amendment in the upper house—which the government has completely rejected—that the parliament should review these sanctuary zones.

All this is very important, because the government is hell-bent on going down a process of having what I call a preservationist proposal. That is, draw a line in the ocean, try to fence it off (although the fish will not notice that) and say, 'This is the area'—but then, do what? If we look at

the budget there is no provision for policing, there is no provision for anything other than the development of these plans, which apparently has a \$2 million a year budget.

Let me explain. When we look at the leaked Sustainable Budget Commission report, on coast and marine it recommends that there be reduced support for marine parks and that over the next four years up to \$1.6 million a year be saved by reducing support to the marine parks program. Now, we are not even going to get the final program until 2012. This is out in forward estimates at roughly that. If that represents 40 per cent (which is what the report says) from 2012-13, that means there would be a saving of about \$3.4 million over the budget estimates. That means that for this period of development alone there is an \$8 million budget.

We are yet to see what happens in this year's budget, whether they actually follow this recommendation and cut it down, but what is very interesting is the question of what the government has to come clean on, not just in this budget but in this alleged consultation period. This government has to tell us how this will be paid for and who will pay for it. That is the reality of what has to happen here.

The report says, 'through adopting a minimalist approach to marine parks implementation, and the generation of a small revenue stream from the external sale of mapping and survey information'. Apparently we will now have to pay to get a map to find out where we cannot go; we have to pay that to the department, and it will be a revenue stream for them under the Sustainable Budget Commission. At least we get some inkling of what is coming. The other thing we find is that there is a proposal for a recreational fishing licence. This is interesting, because the government has previously claimed that it is not going to introduce that. We are yet to see what will happen in this year's budget (they did not in last year's budget) but I can tell you that the revenue stream expected from that, according to this commission report, is about \$5.5 million a year. That is on the current recreational fishing licence proposal they are recommending.

The other thing they have recommended (this is all in the department of environment) is 'Nature Conservation—cease marine ecology function'. They currently provide advice when there is any coastal development application or fisheries or aquaculture operations; someone actually goes along and gets advice from the department of environment. That is a good thing, but the recommendation here is that that be cancelled. So, we could have a situation like that plus a recreational fishing licence, and/or their other recommendation (another pearler, and to be expected), which is that the aquaculture fees and charges go up—they want to get about another \$1 million a year out of that—and that the commercial fishing fees and charges will go up.

We need to know the truth about how the government is going to pay for this, or is it simply going to do nothing except draw the lines on the map, put something on the website, publish a pamphlet, put out some survey maps that we have to pay for and, frankly, do bugger all else? That is not acceptable. That is not a commitment to the marine environment of South Australia; that is simply leaving it to be vandalised and not dealt with and protected as it should be. We need to know the truth.

What is this going to cost, who is going to be employed, are we going to have the environment police instead of the fisheries police, who is going to take control of this, and how we going to be charged for it? There is nothing surer than the fact that at the end of the day taxpayers are going to pay the price of this. If they muck it up or if they do it inappropriately, and if we are going to spend up good environment dollars on paying some peanut in a department to draw up yet another plan, prepare yet another website and create yet another pamphlet, then that is not acceptable to me and it should not be acceptable to this house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:51): I, too, rise to support the Supply Bill. I guess I do have a reluctance, standing here today, to watch South Australia slipping into a bottomless pit of debt. As a small business operator, I do wonder how we as a government are allowing this to happen. I look at some of the priorities that this government seem to be hell-bent on achieving through their term of government, and all I see is increased debt expected to go to \$7.5 billion. I see increased taxes; they are the highest in the land and yet we are continually sliding into, as I say, a sea of debt.

We have the 2010 budget that has been read out this year, and it is having a detrimental impact on the regions of South Australia. Those regions are really what is driving most of South Australia's economy. We look at the mining sector, we look at the agriculture sector, and those two areas are the major drivers of South Australia's economy. Is this government looking a gift horse in the mouth? I look at the balance; there really is no balance. We see our spending is

out of control. We are over budget by \$3.5 billion since the '02-03 year. All of these numbers have been expressed by other members on the side, and I really do not need to go over them.

What I would like to see is some initiative, some incentives, for business to come to South Australia and stimulate our economy, to stimulate growth. I look at incentives, particularly in my region up in Chaffey, where we are looking at processing industries, we are looking at primary production that are looking for a hand to get up and get on with business.

Some of those short-term gains that those businesses need are for the long term. We look at power upgrades, and in particular we have the thriving almond industry at the moment. We see one particular business that is run as a cooperative, known as Almondco. They needed power upgrades to expand their business, and the government put them through years of red tape and barriers. It really just stifled the growth of that business.

Red tape seems to be the issue with any business that wants to come to South Australia. Any new business or any existing business that wants to expand continually has a barrier of red tape put up in front of them. That red tape is not about spending a lot of money; it is about costing money. It is about this government having bureaucrats, having people standing up and saying, 'You can't do that because an internal audit is telling us that we would like you to fill out another 600 forms and jump another mile of red tape.' It is about being proactive and showing investors that South Australia is a great place in which to invest and the state in which to build a new industry or expand on an existing industry.

Again, if we are looking at businesses coming into South Australia, we need to look at payroll tax. Payroll tax is one of the biggest driver-away incentives that I know of—and that includes land tax. We are one of the highest land tax states in the nation. We are a relatively small economy in the big picture of the national economy, and yet this state government stands up and proudly says that we are going to be the highest taxing state in the nation.

Why would businesses consider coming here? That is the question I am regularly asked by businesses coming to the region—in particular, the Riverland—that are looking to take up an opportunity. We have a fantastic asset with food production and also a fantastic opportunity for processing. We have a fantastic opportunity for grassroots marketing to come out of the region. Yet, people keep saying to me, 'Why do we come to South Australia? We are going to get continually belted with high taxes; decisions that the government is taking much too long to make. We are going elsewhere. We're going to other states because that government over there is prepared to stand up and help us, where your government is not.'

I see that from a hands-on approach. Being a small business operator, the barriers that I and my fellow business people have to face are displayed to me every day. It is such a frustrating exercise to try to generate interest from investors. It is a frustrating exercise to have fellow growers or fellow farmers saying, 'We're feeling confident that the government will support our wish or our want, and we want to get on with the job and invest in South Australia.'

However, I hear too often these businesses say, 'No, it's too hard. This government just gets in our way, we're going elsewhere.' It really shows what the Rann Labor government is doing: it is taking advantage of what it is like to live in Adelaide and the support that people are getting in Adelaide, but that is not the same strategy as we see in the regions within South Australia.

I would like to touch on what is in store for South Australia's water security future. Goodness gracious—we look at the desal plant and the potential \$2.4 billion that is associated with its construction and the construction of the north-south interconnector pipe. We look at the \$2.6 billion to run that monster for 20 years—a \$2.6 billion bill to run that power-hungry, 100-gigalitre plant over that 20-year period. We look at the federal funding of \$228 million for that extra 50 gigalitres that was agreed to by the government. At what cost is that to South Australia? First of all, we look at the \$228 million that is going to be put up by the federal government for the extra 50 gigalitres at that plant. The federal government wants water. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (11 October 2010).

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):

6. Please refer to the following table in response to this question:

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Aboriginal Drug and Alcohol Council (SA) Inc.	Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative—2009-10	\$101,900	Y
Aboriginal Health Council of SA Inc.	Peak Body for Aboriginal Community Controlled Health Service Organisations—2009-10		Y
	2009-11 South Australian Aboriginal Sexual Health Coordination		Y
	Sexual Health Services for Aboriginal Islander Young Women and their Partners 2010-11	\$2,257,400	Y
Aboriginal Sobriety Group Inc.	Drug Court Indigenous Service—2009-12	\$100,000	Y
ACEDA Inc.	Eating Disorders Support Services 2008-10		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building 2009-10—Support Services for Panic Anxiety, Obsessive Compulsive and Eating Disorders	\$319,920	Y
			Y
Adelaide Day Centre	The Adelaide Day Centre for Homeless Persons—2009-12	\$78,500	Y
Adelaide Hills Council	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
Adelaide Hills Division of General Practice Inc.	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$26,392	Y
Adelaide Northern Division of General Practice Ltd	Cervix Screening Promotion in General Practice 2008-10 CSG0801		Y
	Expansion of Sexual Health Services of Northern Metropolitan Adelaide 2010-11		Y
	Stage 2 The PAP Smear CAT (Clinical Audit Tool)	\$49,375	Y
Adelaide Produce Markets Ltd	Promoting Consumption of Fruit and Vegetables 2007-09 (114/2499)	\$67,377	Y
Adelaide Research and Innovation Investment Trust	Online Social Health Atlas	\$534,940	Y
Adelaide Showground Farmers Market	Kids Club Project 2009-10	\$36,000	Y
AIDS Council of SA Inc.	HIV Serostatus and Condom Reinforcement Campaign 2009		Y
AIDS Council of SA Inc.	South Australian Targeted HIV/AIDS and STI Prevention Program 2009-12	\$1,341,000	Y
Alexandrina Council	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment	\$14,755	Y
Anglicare SA Inc.	Staying Attached—Early Intervention 2008-10		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Drug Court Accommodation Service		Y
	2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative		Y
	Archway Recovery Unit and Rehabilitation—2009-10	\$1,103,000	Y
Anti-Cancer Foundation of South Australia	Project Officer for the Cervical Screen Participation Project 2009-11		Y
	Distribution of Community Small Grants for PSAW 2010	\$338,000	Y
Arts South Australia	The Jam The Mix The Gig	\$10,000	Y
Attorney Generals Department	Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative (IDDI)	\$132,500	Y
Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society	2009-10—Intensive Care Monitoring	\$56,754	Y
Australian Breastfeeding	ABA SA/NT Branch under the breastfeeding core business support service agreement	\$35,000	Y
Australian Council for Health, Physical Education and Recreation SA Branch Inc.	Be active Physical Education Week/State Health and Physical Education Conference/Regional Seminars 2009	\$353,500	Y
Australian Drug Treatment and Rehabilitation Programme Inc.	The Drug Beat of SA Program	\$323,700	Y
Australian Medical Association SA Branch	Youth Friendly Doctor Program	\$58,520	Y
Australian Red Cross Society	2008-09 Good Start Breakfast Club—Research and Advisory Project		Y
	2008-10 Out of Hospital Funding—Community Food Security Project		Y
	Tissue Typing Program 2009-10		Y
	BloodSafe Program—2009-11		Y
	Bone Marrow Program—2009-10	\$2,036,488	Y
Baptist Care (SA) Inc.	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Baptist Care Adventure Services—2009-12		Y
	2009-10 Peer Support Worker Program	\$184,500	Y
Barossa General Practice Network Inc.	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$26,130	Y
Berri Barmera Council	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 influenza vaccination program	\$12,208	Y
Beyond Blue Limited	2006-10 National Depression Initiative: Beyond Blue	\$278,000	Y
Bluearth Foundation	Eat Well Be Active—Primary School Project 2009-11		Y
	Eat Well be Active—Primary Schools Project	\$133,500	Y
Bulner, Aaron	2007 Scholarship Payments	\$10,000	Y
Carer Support and Respite Centre Inc.	2009-11 Carer Support and Respite Pilot Program		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building	\$153,400	Y
Carers Association of SA Inc.	Support Service for Relatives and Friends of the Mentally Ill 2008-10	\$21,700	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Carers Link Barossa and Districts Inc.	2009-11 Carer Support and Respite Pilot Program		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building	\$153,400	Y
Catherine House Inc.	Integrated Accommodation 2010	\$100,000	Y
Catholic Church Endowment Society Inc. through Centacare Catholic Family Services	Youth Suicide Intervention Services ASCEND 2008-10		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS)—Southern Adelaide—Clients 18-64		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	2009-12 SA Community Respite Care Services for People with HIV/AIDS		Y
	Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative—2009-10	\$1,168,340	Y
Ceduna District Health Service	Dialysis machines 2009-10 project	\$18,347	Y
Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service Inc.	Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Health Service Sobering Up Unit and Mobile Assistance Patrol Service 2009-12		Y
	Ceduna Koonibba Well Women's Screening Project	\$190,200	Y
Central Northern Area Health Service	SA Dental Service		
	Trainee Incentives		
	NARI immunisation program	\$101,710	Y
Centre for Environmental Training NSW	Wastewater Management Training Course for Council Officers contribution	\$15,000	N
Children Youth and Womens Hospital	Funds for adverse events reporting		
	Immunisation—SA Government matching ACIR funding	\$34,513	N
Children's Hospital at Westmead NSW	NSW Poisons information centre contribution	\$77,550	N
City of Adelaide	School Immunisation Program 2009-11	\$33,933	Y
City of Charles Sturt	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	New Arrival Refugee Immunisation Program 2008-09		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$74,745	Y
City of Holdfast Bay	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$17,503	Y
City of Marion	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle Program (OPAL) 2009-14		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program		Y
	Provision of Childhood Immunisation Services	\$82,826	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
City of Mitcham	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$59,328	Y
City of Mount Gambier	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	Obesity prevention and lifestyle program (OPAL) 2009-14		Y
	H1N1 influenza vaccination program		Y
	New arrival refugee immunisation (NARI) Program 2009-10		Y
	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment	\$76,403	Y
City of Onkaparinga	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	New Arrival Refugee Immunisation Program 2008-09		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	Obesity Prevention And Lifestyle Program (OPAL) 2009-14		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$158,233	Y
City of Playford	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	New Arrival Refugee Immunisation Program 2008-09		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle Program (OPAL) 2009-14		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$144,975	Y
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	New Arrival Refugee Immunisation Program 2008-09		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$87,003	Y
City of Pt Lincoln	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 influenza vaccination program	\$10,422	Y
City of Salisbury	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle Program (OPAL) 2009-14		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$119,806	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
City of Tea Tree Gully	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$71,073	Y
City of Unley	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$16,455	Y
City of West Torrens	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	New Arrival Refugee Immunisation Program 2008-09		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$27,631	Y
Courts Administration	2009-10 Court Assessment referral drug scheme	\$414,577	Y
Clubhouse SA Inc.	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Diamond House—Day and Group Programs 2009-10	\$212,000	Y
Community and Neighbourhood Houses and Centres Association Inc.	14 th Annual Conference May 2009 and Anti Poverty Week October 2009		Y
	Fruit and Vegetable Small Grants		Y
	15 th Annual Conference, Anti-Poverty Week 2010-11	\$207,917	Y
Coorong District Council	School Immunisation Program 2009-11	\$11,019	Y
Council on the Ageing SA Inc.	Strength For Life 2008-09		Y
	Strength For Life 2010-12	\$62,500	Y
Country North Community Services Inc.	2009-11 Carer Support and Respite Pilot Program		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building	\$143,200	Y
Department for Environment	MOAA community gardens project	\$40,850	Y
Department of Education and Children's Services	Healthy eating and physical activity project		
	Eat well be active	\$259,000	Y
Department for Families and Communities	2008-11 Community Lifestyle program		Y
	Exceptional Needs Unit		Y
	Contribution for ventilators at Highgate Park		Y
	Tregenza Ave Aged Care		Y
	2009-11 supported residential facilities 'residents board and care subsidy funds'		Y
	2009-10 accommodation support program	\$5,095,741	Y
Department Further Education employment and Training	Career Start SA Program	\$224,000	
Department of Health and Aged Care	Review of food labelling law and policy	\$34,091	N

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of Health and Ageing—Canberra	ACIR State Contribution	\$789,061	Y
Department of Health and Families NT	Tristate centre for sexual health 2009-11	\$41,000	Y
Department of Recreation and Sport	Be Active	\$625,000	Y
Department Transport Energy and Infrastructure	RAH and South Australian Medical Research Institute tram extension	\$6,248,444	Y
District Council of Mount Barker	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$19,414	Y
Drug Arm Australasia	Drug Arm Australasia (SA)—2009-12	\$100,500	Y
Eastern Health Authority Inc.	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$106,978	Y
Eyre Peninsula Division of General Practice Inc.	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$26,130	Y
Family Drug Support	Family Drug Support—2009-12	\$106,300	Y
Flinders and Far North Division of General Practice Inc.	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10		Y
	4 day music workshop in Port Augusta	\$30,730	Y
Flinders Medical Centre Foundation	Funding for Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer	\$2,500,000	Y
General Practice SA Inc.	2007-2010 Implementation of the Shared Care with General Practitioners Program		Y
	Immunisation Support 2010		Y
	Rural Education of General Practitioners	\$3,099,000	Y
GP Partners Adelaide (Adelaide and Central East Division of GP)	Statewide General Practitioner Obstetric Shared Care 2009-10	\$334,300	Y
Grow (SA) Inc.	Infrastructure capacity building		Y
	Mutual Help Groups and Support Services—2009-10	\$450,100	Y
Hannah Louise Fyfe	Aboriginal Scholarship—Bachelor of Medicine	\$10,000	Y
Health Ageing Community and Disability Services Ministerial Council	NFC cost share contribution		
	NFC secretariat contribution		
	COAG Health workforce taskforce contribution		
	AHMAC Funding contribution		
	COAG Health initiatives contribution	\$1,564,796	
Health Consumers Alliance of SA Inc.	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	2007-10 Supporting and Training (Old ID 114/2152)		Y
	Attendance at Network Conference		Y
	Raising the Bar: Consumer Leadership and Community Engagement Conference 2009	\$343,400	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Health Corporate Network	WA poisons information centre contribution	\$236,415	Y
Health Services Research Association Au.NZ	Health Services and Policy Research Conference contribution	\$24,545	Y
Helping Hand Aged Care Inc.	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS)		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Day and Group Program 2009-10	\$536,650	Y
Hepatitis C Council of SA Inc.	South Australian Hepatitis C Prevention and Health Promotion Program—2009-12		Y
	Hepatitis C Education and Prevention Expansion Program 2010	\$776,507	Y
Justin John Gladman	Aboriginal Scholarship—Master of Clinical Education	\$10,000	Y
Kumangka Youth Services Aboriginal Corporation	2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative	\$66,200	Y
Kudnarto Watson	Aboriginal Scholarship—Bachelor of Medicine	\$10,000	Y
La Trobe University	Seroconversion Study and Pleasure and Sexual Health Study 2009-10		Y
	Developing new methods for building health policy capacity in Australia		Y
	HIV Seroconversion Study 2010-12	\$30,500	Y
Land Management Corporation	Contribution to Health, Design and Social Planning Project	\$65,000	Y
Life Education SA Inc.	Life Education SA Inc.	\$461,000	Y
Life Without Barriers	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS)—CNAHS Adult Clients aged 18-24		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS)—Country—All Clients		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS)—SAHS Adult Clients aged 18-64		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Returning Home Program—Psychosocial Transition, Rehabilitation and Support Services	\$3,906,178	Y
Light Regional Council	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$12,265	Y
Limestone Coast Division of General Practice Inc.	Capacity Building for Cervical Screening in Limestone Coast 2008-10 CSG0803		Y
	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$29,130	Y
Local Government Association	Funding for development of a National Local Government Environmental Organisational Risk Resource project	\$41,000	Y
Loxton Waikerie Council	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment	\$16,209	Y
McGregor Tan Research	Physical Activity—be active communications strategy	\$45,000	Y
Mental Health Coalition of SA Inc.	2008-09 Mental Health Week		Y
	Training Services for Non-Government Organisations (NGO's) 2009-10		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	2007-2010 NGO Industry Development Integration and Support		Y
	Enhance capacity to liaise and communicate with non-government mental health organisations		Y
	Mental Health Week	\$449,800	Y
Mental Health Council of Australia Inc.	National Mental Health Conference and Career Forum	\$15,038	Y
Mental Illness Fellowship of SA Inc.	Mutual Support, Self Help and Information		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Day and Group Programs—Wayville Activities—2009-10		Y
	Peer Support Worker Program—2009-10		Y
	Therapeutic Groups Program—2009-10		Y
	2009-11—Mental Health Resource Centre (MHRC) administration	\$1,021,600	Y
Menzies School of Health Research NT	Culture context and risk project	\$14,000	Y
Mid North Division of Rural Medicine Inc.	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$26,130	Y
MIND Australia	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS)—Country—All Clients		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS) CNAHS 18-64 Clients		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 (IPRSS) Southern Adelaide— All Clients		Y
	2009-11 Carer Support and Respite Pilot Program		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Returning Home Program— Psychosocial Transition, Rehabilitation and Support Services—Mind Australia	\$3,513,860	Y
Mission Australia	2009-10—Hindmarsh Centre		Y
	2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative	\$439,400	Y
Multicultural Communities Council of SA Inc.	CALD—Measure—Up Social Marketing Campaign—Out of Hospital Services 2009	\$14,750	Y
Murray Mallee Division of General Practice Inc.	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$30,454	Y
National Blood Authority	2007-11 Funding for Blood and Blood Products	\$25,744,550	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
National E-Health Transition Authority	Jurisdictional funding instalments	\$3,582,000	Y
National Health Call Centre Network Ltd	National Call Centre Network Project	\$1,798,460	Y
National Heart Foundation of Australia (SA Division)	Active Living Coalition Project Officer 2009		Y
	2009-11—SA Walking Summit/Expansion of Heart Foundation Walking Program		Y
	My Heart My Life		Y
	The SA Active Living Coalition 2010-11	\$247,614	Y
Neami Ltd	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 CNAHS Adult Clients aged 18-64		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11 South Country—All Clients		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Day and Group Program 2009-10		Y
	Returning Home Program—Psychosocial Transition, Rehabilitation and Support Services	\$4,450,185	Y
Neil Sasche Foundation Inc.	Resource Kits	\$25,000	Y
Nganampa Health Council Inc.	Nganampa Health Council Well Women's Screening Project		Y
	Nganampa Substance Abuse—2009-10		Y
	2009-10—SA Cervix Screening Program	\$83,600	Y
Northern Area Community and Youth Services Inc.	2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative	\$70,400	Y
Oak Valley (Maralinga) Inc.	Clinical Services and Health Promotion, Education—Oak Valley Women's Shed Health and Wellbeing Program 2008-09	\$23,300	Y
Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services of SA Inc.	2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative	\$95,600	Y
Palliative Care Council of SA Inc.	Palliative Care Council of South Australia Support Service 2009-12	\$78,600	Y
Planning SA	Health in All Planning Funding	\$123,000	Y
Port Adelaide Football Club Ltd	2008 Power Community Youth Program		Y
Port Adelaide Football Club Ltd	Power Community Youth Program	\$38,750	Y
Port Augusta City Council	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	Pt Augusta Substance Misuse Services—2009-12		Y
	Obesity Prevention And Lifestyle Program (OPAL) 2009-14		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$580,966	Y
Port Lincoln Aboriginal Health Service Inc.	2009-10—Aboriginal Well Women's Screening Project		Y
	Port Lincoln Aboriginal Well Women's Screening Program	\$20,500	Y
Port Lincoln Health Services	Satellite Dialysis Machine 2009-10 Project	\$23,948	Y
Positive Life South Australia Inc.	2009-12—South Australian Health Promotion Program for People with HIV/AIDS	\$430,000	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are \geq \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Public Health Association of Australia	Level 1 sponsorship PHAA conference		
	Funding for workforce development activities	\$29,091	Y
Rebecca Boltje	Aboriginal Scholarship—Nursing	\$10,000	Y
Relationships Australia (SA) Health Promotion Services	Mental Health First Aid Training Program 2008-11		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	SA Community Support and Counselling Service For People With HIV/AIDS and Hepatitis C 2009-12		Y
	SA HIV and Hepatitis C Workforce Development Program 2009-12		Y
	South Australian Blood Borne Virus and STI Program for People from Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Backgrounds 2009-12		Y
	2009-10—The SQUARE Program (Suicide, Questions, Answers and Resources)		Y
	HIV Travel Safe Campaign 2010	\$1,621,650	Y
Relationships Australia (SA) Inc.	Relationships Australia	\$148,675	Y
Riverland Division of General Practice Inc.	Women's Health Clinics in General Practice CSG0802 2008-10		Y
	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$31,130	Y
Riverland Regional Health Services	Renal Dialysis Project contribution	\$22,298	Y
Roofs SA Housing Association Inc.	Accommodation for people with mental illness 2009-10		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Incorporated leasing of property—1 and 1A Winchester Street Dover Gardens SA 5048	\$26,100	Y
Royal Adelaide Hospital	Practitioner Fellowship	\$136,364	Y
Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Radiologists	SA CT Dose Optimisation Quality Improvement Activity	\$30,000	Y
Royal Australasian College of Surgeons	Australian Safety and Efficiency Register of New Interventional Procedures—Surgical (ASERNIP-S)	\$177,000	Y
Royal District Nursing Service SA Inc.	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	Core Service—Royal District Nursing Service 2008-09		Y
	Chairing of Clinical Network 2009		Y
	Delivery of antiviral drugs 'Human Swine Influenza' 2009		Y
	HIV/AIDS Primary Care Coordination Program		Y
	RDNS core services contract—2009-10		Y
	WorkCover Grant 2009-12	\$11,304,965	Y
Rural City of Murray Bridge	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	H1N1 influenza vaccination program		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11	\$17,794	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
SA Police Department	Drug and Alcohol policy section	\$330,600	Y
Salvation Army Ingle Farm Corp	Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative (IDDI)	\$55,125	Y
Sexual Health Information Networking and Education SA Inc.	Multicultural Women's Peer Education Program 2008-10 CSG0805		Y
	2008-2009 Provision of Sexual Health Information Networking and Education Services—Out of Hospital Funds (114/2982)		Y
	2009-10—SHINE—Core Services		Y
	2009-10—Focus Schools Expansion Program		Y
	Sexual Health Education Programs Targeting Aboriginal Young People 2010-11	\$5,249,000	Y
South Australian Council of Churches	2009-10 Chaplaincy Program	\$281,700	Y
South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute Limited	Establishment Grant	\$817,678	Y
South Australian Network of Drug and Alcohol Services Inc.	Drugs and Alcohol Services Program 2008-11	\$112,500	Y
South East Drug and Alcohol Counselling Service Inc.	SE Drug and Alcohol Counselling Service Inc.—2009-12	\$209,600	Y
South East Regional Community Health Service	Dialysis machines 2009-10 project	\$23,948	Y
Southern Adelaide Health Service	Renal Dialysis Unit Project contribution		
	Aboriginal Cadetship Program	\$195,495	Y
Southern Junction Community	Housing and supported accommodation support partnership program	\$2,365,100	Y
St John Ambulance SA Inc.	First Aid Services—2009-10	\$180,300	Y
Survivors of Torture and Trauma Assistance and Rehabilitation Service	Program for survivors of torture and trauma 2008-10		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Grant Funding Letter for contribution to internal upgrades	\$325,300	Y
Sydney South West Area Health Service	2009-10 National Poison Register contribution	\$16,039	N
The Diabetic Association of SA Inc.	2006-11 Diabetes Needle and Syringe Subsidy Program (was 114/1404)	\$524,626	Y
The Barossa Council	School Immunisation Program 2009-11	\$14,201	Y
The Flinders University of South Australia	Food and beverage marketing to children using non-broadcast media		Y
	Equity of bowel cancer screening: an epidemiological and qualitative study		Y
	Managing System and Patient Sequelae to the National Bowel Screening Program		Y
	Health, economic, psychological and social benefits of educating carers		Y
	Psychosocial, demographic and program variables associated with bowel cancer re-screening		Y
	Interim Funding Agreement to Support the Establishment of the Centre for Intergenerational Health		Y
	2008-11 Parenting Eating and Activity for Child Health (PEACH)—		Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
	Out of Hospital Service		
	Stepping Up: Mainstream Care for Aboriginal People		Y
	Out of Hospital Services—Early feeding project (NOURISH)		Y
	Developing and implementing effective Mental Health Promotion and Well Being Interventions for SA		Y
	Hon. Monique Begin Airfare and Consultancy fee (One Off Funding)		Y
	Advanced Workforce Development Program 2009-10		Y
	2009-10—Scholarships for the Health Promoting Health Services Short Course		Y
	2009-12—NCETA		Y
	Social Capital and Public Policy: How social capital can inform public policy interventions to improve health and reduce inequities		Y
	Department of Health Management Service Agreement		Y
	Department of Health Research Awards Program		Y
	Health Economics Collaborative		Y
	Socio-economic status and overweight/obesity: supply of and access to unhealthy food		Y
	Resilience and the mental health and wellbeing of farm families experiencing climate variation in South Australia.		Y
	Exploring resilience and coping in relation to smoking 'at risk' populations		Y
	Sponsorship for the Australian Health Inequities Program International Symposium 2010		Y
Grant for The Finalisation of a Mental health Promotion and Prevention Plan	\$2,181,581	Y	
The Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	2009-10—Salvation Army Sobering Up Unit		Y
	Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative	\$766,375	Y
The University of Adelaide	SA Health PhD Scholarships to Examine and Redesign the Model of Care For People With/At Risk Of Developing Chronic Conditions		Y
	SA Health Master Scholarship to examine and redesign the model of care for people with or at risk of Developing Chronic Conditions		Y
	SA Health Honours Scholarship to examine and redesign the model of care for people with or at risk of Developing Chronic		Y
	SA Health PhD Scholarship to examine and redesign the model of care for people with or at risk of Developing Chronic		Y
	Mental Health Library 2008-11		Y
	Get Involved, Reach Top Health (GIRTH) Program (Development Phase) 2010		Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
	Evaluation of the effectiveness of the South Australian Family Home Visiting Program		Y
	Assessing equitable and efficient solutions to reduce hospital demand		Y
	Interim Funding Agreement to Support the Establishment of the Centre for Intergenerational Health		Y
	Evaluating the long-term costs and benefits of community-based initiatives		Y
	Heatwaves, population health and emergency management in Australia—a qualitative study		Y
	Australia's Baby Boomer Generation, Obesity and Work—Patterns, Causes and Implications		Y
	Discipline of Public Health 2007-11—J Moss FHECH 80001800		Y
	Health Economics Collaborative		Y
	Department of Health Research Awards Program		Y
	Effective strategies to reduce the costs of overweight and obesity to South Australia		Y
	Assessment of the Determinants and Epidemiology of Psychological Distress (ADEPD) Study		Y
	Can and should we link data at a national level? Vaccine safety surveillance (VALID)		Y
	Changing disease patterns among migrants: a focus on the National Health Priorities	\$1,088,127	Y
	The University of South Australia	Unpacking the mechanisms of Aboriginal well-being interventions for children and youth	
Developing an evidence-based health workforce planning model for primary care			Y
Interim Funding Agreement to Support the Establishment of the Centre for Intergenerational Health			Y
Priority Setting in Child Protection: developing an evidence-based strategy to reduce child abuse and neglect and associated harm			Y
Common Ground Evaluation			Y
Smoking: Aboriginal Health Workers			Y
PhD Scholarships to examine and redesign the model of care for people with or at risk of developing Chronic Conditions			Y
SA NT Data Linkage Consortium Agreement			Y
Radiation Therapy Clinical Preceptor Support 2009-12			Y
Deed of Agreement Chair in Mental Health (Practice and Research)			Y
Department of Health Research Awards Program			Y
Health Economics Collaborative			Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
	Consultancy Services for Evaluation of the Returning Home Program		Y
	Trial of a functional decline screening tool for hospitalised older people 2010		Y
	The Provision of Allied Health Evidence Services		Y
	Professional Certificate in Immunisation 2009-10	\$1,333,942	Y
Town of Gawler	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$15,153	Y
Tullawon Health Services	Clinical Services and Health Promotion, Education—Tullawon Well Womens Screening Project	\$19,500	Y
Umoona Tjutagku Health Service Inc.	2009-10—Well Women's Screening Project		Y
	Umoona Aboriginal Well Women's Screening Program		Y
	SA Health Aboriginal Bowel Cancer Screening Trial 2010	\$28,750	Y
UnitingCare Wesley	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11—Central Northern Adelaide—Older Persons (IPRSS)		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11—Southern Adelaide—Older Persons (IPRSS)		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building 2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative (IDDI)		Y
	Byron Place Community Centre—2009-12		Y
	2009-10—Streetlink Youth Health Service		Y
	Counselling Support Program 2008-09		Y
	Counselling Support—2009-12		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11—Central Northern Adelaide—Clients 18-64 (IPRSS)		Y
	Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services 2009-11—North Country—All Clients (IPRSS)		Y
	Infrastructure Capacity Building		Y
	Avalon Support Project 2009-10		Y
	Supported Housing in the North 2009-10		Y
	Employment Access Program 2009-10		Y
	2009-10 GP Access Program Southern and Western Metro		Y
	Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative—2009-10	\$3,593,540	Y

Information contained in this report has been sourced from the Procurement and Contract Management System (PCMS) as at 6 January 2011 for Grants paid in 2009-10 that are ≥ \$10,000. Each organisation may have had a number of grants with different purposes, each			
Grant Recipient	Purpose of Grant	Total Grants Paid	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Unity Housing Company	Housing and supported accommodation support partnership program	\$3,800,083	Y
University of NSW	ARC linkage Project—Sexual health in young Indigenous people	\$35,815	Y
University of Wollongong	2009-11 AROC Project	\$17,080	Y
Vietnamese Community in Australia	2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative	\$63,000	Y
Whyalla City Council	2008-10 Australian Childhood Immunisation Register (ACIR) \$6 Childhood Immunisation Payment		Y
	School Immunisation Program 2009-11		Y
	H1N1 2009 Influenza Vaccination Program	\$16,118	Y
Yalata Community Inc.	2009-10—Illicit Drug Diversion Initiative	\$157,500	Y
Yorke Peninsula Division of General Practice Inc.	Local Immunisation Coordinator Program 2009-10	\$26,130	Y
TOTAL		\$122,762,079	

BURSILL, PROF. D.

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. South Australia has a proud history of scientific achievement. Many world-renowned scientists, including four of Australia's 11 Nobel laureates, shaped their careers here in Adelaide. The government recognises the importance of science in the development of our economy.

I am therefore pleased to announce today that South Australia's new Chief Scientist is Adjunct Professor Don Bursill AM. A leader and recognised expert in the field of water management, Professor Bursill will bring to the chief scientist role a wealth of experience in water science. Having been at the forefront of the most important developments and decisions regarding potable water in Australia over the past 40 years, Professor Bursill has outstanding credentials to lead South Australia forward.

Professor Bursill is not just recognised here in South Australia but nationally and internationally. As chief scientist, he will help to raise the state's research and development profile and ensure our research and development capabilities support important and emerging industry sectors such as health, resources, defence and agriculture.

Among a range of senior appointments, Professor Bursill has been a member of the board of the Global Water Research Coalition, the Water Advisory Committee of the National Health and Medical Research Council, and the Premier's Climate Change Council. As chief scientist, Professor Bursill will also now co-chair the Premier's Science and Research Council, providing dedicated leadership for strategic development of the state's science and research sector.

I congratulate Professor Bursill on his appointment and look forward to working with him, especially in identifying how we can boost research and development investment in this state and maximise benefits from previous investments. Professor Bursill will continue the work of his predecessor, Dr Ian Chessell, in enhancing the links established between government, academia and industry and to ensure that South Australia strongly benefits from the practical application of research.

I want to thank Dr Ian Chessell for his outstanding performance as chief scientist and wish him well in his role as the inaugural chair of the Goyder Institute for Water Research, which I

officially launched last week. The Goyder Institute will play an important role for our state and our nation by informing policy and debate on one of the planet's great challenges. Through its stated aim to support world-leading water resources policy and management, the Goyder Institute will also help establish our state as a national centre of expertise and knowledge on water.

It is fitting that this new institute is named after George Goyder who, after emigrating to South Australia from England in 1826 at age 22, rose to the position of South Australia's surveyor-general in 1861. Goyder was asked to survey regional South Australia and determine the location of arable land.

Goyder's line, as it became known, tracks from the Nullarbor Plain to the Victorian border and, effectively, marks the southern boundary of saltbush country. Goyder's line remains relevant today. It is therefore appropriate that this initiative, supporting water resources policy and management through best-practice scientific research, bears Goyder's name as well as his philosophy.

Of the \$50 million invested in the Goyder Institute, half is being provided by the state government. The balance comes in the form of in-kind support from the CSIRO and our three public universities: the University of Adelaide, Flinders University and the University of South Australia. I am pleased to report that work has already begun under the institute's research programs and a total of \$14 million in project funds has already been committed to a range of important initiatives.

I am also pleased to inform the house today that Dr Tony Minns has accepted the position of the Goyder Institute's inaugural director. Dr Minns is a South Australian who graduated from UniSA and completed his PhD in hydrology at the University of Delft in the Netherlands. He joined the Goyder Institute from a Dutch consulting firm where he had been Scientific Director of Hydrological Engineering. I congratulate Dr Minns on his appointment and I wish him, along with everyone involved with the institute, all the best as they build on the substantial legacy of George Goyder and South Australia's outstanding scientific and research pedigree.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Members, I draw attention to the presence in the gallery of a group of students from the Adelaide Secondary School of English, who are guests of the member for Croydon; year 12 students from Mary MacKillop College, who are guests of the member for Norwood; and a group from the Magill Lutheran Christian Women's Fellowship, who are guests of the member for Morialta. Welcome to you all. I am sure our members will be extremely well-behaved today.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:07): I bring up the 21st report of the committee.

Report received and read.

Mr SIBBONS: I bring up the 22nd report of the committee.

Report received.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:09): I bring up the 397th report of the committee, entitled Murray Futures Riverine Recovery Project—Critical On-Ground Works.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mrs VLAHOS: I also bring up the 403rd report of the committee, entitled Reynella East Child Parent Centre to Year 12 School Consolidation.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Can the Premier confirm that the total cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is \$2.73 billion?

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 (14:10): As the Treasurer has said, and as I have said before, all of the details of the costs of the Royal Adelaide Hospital will be made public when there is financial closure with the company that is constructing, maintaining and managing the hospital for us. As members would know, and it is a good opportunity to point it out to members and the public, we are beginning to see the beginnings of a new scare campaign to be run by the Liberal Party over this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: So, the logic of the Leader of the Opposition is: if you don't deny something, that means you confirm it. Can the Leader of the Opposition deny that she is going to promote some of her backbenchers over the next few months to replace some of the has-beens on the front bench? Will she deny that?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, she won't deny it; therefore she's confirming it. It is good to see the putative leader of the opposition, the member from the Legislative Council, popping his head in the chamber a little while ago—the Hon. Robert Brokenshire. He was obviously seeing where he would fit into this rabble.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will get back to the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We will reach financial closure, as I have said before—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We will reach financial closure and have the contract signed—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —before the state budget. The financial close—all of the details will be available to the public, as far as I am aware, and that is certainly our intention. It will show the cost of the construction. It will show the cost of finance. It will show the cost of risk. It will show the cost of maintenance and the cost of delivering a whole range of services over the whole of life of the project.

What the Liberal Party will do, of course, is bring all these things together and say that it is a blowout of this proportion because we are bringing to the book in advance all of the costs associated with running a hospital over 35 years. That is the fear campaign, that is the scare campaign that they are setting up for here, so just be prepared for it. This will be a good deal for South Australia. The evidence will demonstrate that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —and we will get a state-of-the-art hospital for our state. Yesterday in question time, the member for Morphett asked me questions about the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: My department leaking like a sieve! It was revealed on radio today that Ken Rollond, who is a visiting medical officer, was the leak behind the allegations—

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order. The minister will sit down. The member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: Standing order 98, ma'am.

The SPEAKER: Have you finished your answer, minister, because I will uphold that point of order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I normally do not respond to interjections, but that one was so egregious, I feel I must. Yesterday questions were asked about the closure of the gynaecology service. That was the claim made by the Leader of the Opposition: they will close—

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order. The member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister is responding to an interjection which is out of order. He just admitted that he was responding to it.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It is the substance of the question, however.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sit down, member for MacKillop! You don't shout into the microphone across the floor. Minister, have you finished your answer?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I'm almost there, Madam Speaker, I'm almost there.

The SPEAKER: Yes, well, get back to the point of the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The point of the question was: how much will it cost? I said that that amount will be available, and I made the point that there will be extra capacity in this hospital. The services of the current hospital will be put into the new hospital; and Ken Rollond—member of the Liberal Party, appeared in ads with the Liberal Party at the last election, an opponent of the Royal Adelaide—is leaking to the Leader of the Opposition. Unfortunately, they are misinformed leaks; they are based on flaws.

The SPEAKER: The member for Croydon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CFS FOUNDATION

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (14:15): I ask the Premier, can he update the house on the progress of the CFS Foundation?

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

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) (14:15): Oh, you don't like the CFS, is that the problem?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You were there, that's right. I remember your applause.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the honourable member for his question. I am pleased to advise the house that I relaunched the CFS Foundation on 28 March 2011. It was attended by an honourable member opposite—though it was not in his electorate, I have to say; it was the Leader of the Opposition's electorate. This fresh era sees the foundation with a new structure, a new logo, a new awareness campaign and a new website.

What remains unchanged, however, is its core commitment to provide benefits and support for outstanding volunteer firefighters and their families. It is a cause that recognises and honours the priceless and selfless contribution made by our state's more than 15,000 CFS volunteers of which a number of members of this house are members. In fact, I would like to recognise the Minister for Families and Communities. I have seen her in action fighting a fire—and I will not talk any more about it.

These upstanding citizens fight fires in all variety of rural and urban terrains, attend vehicle accidents and clean up after storms and spills, constantly putting the needs of their community ahead of their own. About 8,000 incidents are attended by the state's 423 brigades each year in South Australia, and I understand that the Salisbury brigade is one of the busiest.

In recent years, we have seen all too starkly the horrors they regularly confront and the danger those events invariably present. I remind members that 28 years ago three brave CFS volunteers lost their lives as the Ash Wednesday fires roared through our state. Recently, as the hellish Black Saturday fires engulfed Victoria, about 800 South Australian personnel joined the battle, with some suffering serious injuries.

One such volunteer was Ian Kleinig, a lieutenant with the Burra brigade, who was struck by a falling tree limb. The CFS Foundation not only enabled Ian's family to fly to Melbourne to be with him when he regained consciousness but it also helped out with emergency funds and extra support while Ian recovered in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and in the Hampstead Rehab Centre.

Following Black Saturday and the devastating Wangary fires on our West Coast in 2005, changes to the CFS Foundation were recommended. Its management committee recognised that a substantial fund was needed to support CFS volunteers should another catastrophic large-scale fire event arise. As a result, the CFS Foundation established a new board chaired by former chief executive of the CFS, Vince Monterola.

Can I just say that I could not think of many people in this state who deserve the title of 'exemplary citizen'. I know that the member for Mawson, the Minister for Infrastructure and all of us who worked closely with Vince (and I am sure on both sides of the house) know that he is a person who has put years and years of dedication not only into the CFS but also into all the things that he does for us. He played a major role in the rebuilding of the Eyre Peninsula following the dreadful fires there a few years ago.

Members of the house would recall that Vince, a serving CFS volunteer since 1964, has also served in a number of senior roles, including presiding member of our SAFECOM Board. Vince also headed the West Coast Recovery Committee, as I mentioned, following the fires in 2005.

The foundation aims to raise significant funds in order to provide even greater financial assistance to volunteer firefighters and their families. It will work to raise community awareness of the enormous contribution made by our CFS volunteers and further enhance their firefighting capacity and expertise through fellowships, education initiatives and training programs. I was pleased to announce a donation of \$50,000 from the state government to assist the foundation with its new fundraising push.

Since the Black Saturday fires, the South Australian government has committed more than \$47 million to make sure our state is even better prepared for the threat posed by fire through community awareness campaigns, a new emergency management system, technology and infrastructure upgrades, and additional resources to increase burn-offs and further reduce fuel hazards.

There is no doubt that we owe a huge debt of gratitude to our CFS volunteers and staff. They are the people who so often risk their lives to save the lives and livelihoods of others. They display qualities that transcend dedication and courage. They are the very essence of care and humanity and reflect the true spirit of citizenship. I urge all South Australians to get behind this terrific initiative and support the people who protect our towns, neighbourhoods and families.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. How does the Premier reconcile the government's election claim that the total cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital would be \$1.7 billion when the Macquarie Bank equity information presentation to potential investors has the total cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital at \$2.73 billion?

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) (14:21): As I tried to inform the Leader of the Opposition when she asked the question, I will give the same advice to the member for Davenport that I gave to the house. We have yet to reach financial close with the organisations who are building—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We have yet to reach financial close, but what members have to understand is that when the government procures—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That is complex so you might struggle a little bit, but let me try to work you through it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: When the government procures a project through the normal, traditional government procurement processes, for example, when it built the original QEH 50-odd years ago, it would have set a budget, gone out to the marketplace and found a builder to design and build it and it would have been built. The amount of money that it would have cost—let us say \$100 million, for the sake of argument—to build that building would have been the construction cost.

It is a bit like when somebody who wants to build a house and has a piece of land goes to a home builder who says it will cost \$250,000 to build a house on that property. What they do not say to you is you are going to have to borrow that money and there will be an interest cost payable over 35 years. When you get to your bank and sign the documents, you know how much you are going to pay over a 25-year period.

What government doesn't do when it procures under traditional means is bring to the book the cost of the financing of that project. It just says what the construction cost is. Anybody who has ever bought a house knows that because, when you sign your mortgage, you are not only paying for the construction but also the interest over a period of time.

In addition to that, in the procurement of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, because it is being done through a PPP process, what we get as a state is the benefit of risk transfer. So we transfer risk—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am getting to that. Just listen. It is complex. What we do is transfer to the—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am trying to let the public know but you keep interrupting me. What we do is transfer risk to the corporation that is building the project, and there is a cost associated with that risk. But the benefit, of course, is that you are guaranteed to get the project built in the time frame and for the sum of money. That is why you do that. There are other projects in the history of our state—and every state is littered with such projects—which have been committed to where there has been a cost overrun. So it is a bit like a person who is building a house getting a fixed price contract. You pay a little bit more but you get what you committed for. That is the other element of this.

In addition to that, in relation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, of course, we are getting a management contract for the length of the project. So the project will be completed by the end of 2015, then we have a 29½-year running cost. So there will be a cost associated with the running of the project, that is, the maintenance, repairs and provision of certain services and non-clinical services. All of those things have a cost. What we sign up to is a project which has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —all of those elements in it. So, the construction cost, the risk cost, the financing cost and the management cost—all of those things brought together. You cannot then compare all of that with the construction cost of an alternative hospital, because—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The point I would make is you cannot then compare that with what it would cost for government to build and construct a hospital on another site and not take into account the other costs associated with the financing of that, the risks associated with that, the maintenance and all those other things. So, you have to compare like with like. That is what we have in relation to this hospital. The costs associated with those elements will be made plain, as we have said before, prior to the budget, and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Waite!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The opposition, I know, objects to this new hospital. They would like to see South Australians continue to be served in a 50-year-old building which is no longer fit for purpose. That is their vision. A vision for South Australia for hospital patients to be seen in a set of infrastructure which is 50 years old and no longer fit for purpose. That is their vision; let's be plain about it. We are doing the right thing by South Australia building a new hospital. It will have a cost. That cost will be known to the public in due course.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:26): I have a supplementary question. Minister, if these costs and this process is such stock-standard regular government business, why wasn't the public of South Australia advised before the election?

The SPEAKER: I don't think that is a supplementary question, but I will give you the benefit of the doubt. Do you want to answer that, minister?

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) (14:27): The details of the costs cannot be finalised until we have reached financial closure, which is what we have said, and all of that was said well before the election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is absolutely the case that all of those elements were known publicly before the election.

YOUTH HOMELESSNESS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Youth. How is the government improving the delivery of service and support for young people who are homeless?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Premier in Social Inclusion) (14:27): I thank the member for Taylor and acknowledge her commitment to the young people in her electorate in particular. I thank her for this very important question today, given that today is Youth Homelessness Matters Day, a key event on the National Youth Week calendar.

We know that young people who are homeless are amongst the most disadvantaged, the most marginalised and the most vulnerable groups in our community, but we also know that, if young people are properly and adequately supported when they first experience homelessness, they have a much greater chance of breaking the cycle to avoid remaining homeless in their adult lives.

This government has a very important commitment to improving services and support for young people experiencing homelessness. That is why I was delighted today to launch new Good Practice Guidelines for Supporting Young People Who Are Homeless. These guidelines are a key action from the state government's youthconnect youth policy, which I was pleased to release in November last year.

The guidelines provide direction for youth sector organisations to drive best practice in aspects of service delivery, including things like ensuring a secure and welcoming environment; allowing young people to be involved in the case management process; making healthy and nutritious food available; providing opportunities for physical activities; where appropriate, facilitating re-engagement with families, parents, carers and significant others; and providing non-judgemental and culturally appropriate services.

Extensive consultation was undertaken to ensure that the guidelines reflect, in fact, what young people really need. They have been designed with a particular focus on young people with disabilities or a mental health issue, Aboriginal young people and young people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

At the launch today I was also pleased to present a cheque for \$30,000 through the Back on Track grant to the Ladder St Vincent project in Port Adelaide, an initiative that the Minister for Housing has spoken about in this place. This grant will be used to provide targeted support for the young residents of the Ladder St Vincent project to address barriers they face in actively taking up education, employment and skill development opportunities. Through these grants each resident can have a targeted package of support put in place to assist them in getting their lives back on track. In closing, we anticipate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —that through the adoption—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There's too much background noise. Minister.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —of good policy and targeted support for young people who experience homelessness they will do so for only a very short period of time, with a suitable solution found quickly and prevention strategies put in place by the service delivery sector.

MINISTER'S OVERSEAS TRIP

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister confirm whether arrangements have been or are being made this week for the minister to go on another overseas trip departing in the next few days?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (14:31): Yes, I leave Friday for an overseas trade mission that has been some two months in the planning.

CYBERTHUGS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:31): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General inform the house about the government's work to counter cyberthugs and the important role of consultation in shaping laws against this hateful trend?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for her question. The parliament may well be aware that a few weeks ago we indicated that we were looking into finding some remedies at a statutory level for some of the antisocial behaviour that is now associated with the internet. There are two distinct problems that we are particularly concerned about.

The first one is filming without consent of embarrassing or humiliating images. The disturbing aspect of this is that it appears to be the case that some of these images are

engineered, that is, the whole event is engineered by a team of people working cooperatively together, that is, everybody except the victim, in order to achieve one of these films, which are then later on distributed for the bizarre amusement of some other people.

The second aspect that we are concerned about is that second element, which is the distribution. We not only have, these days, distribution of these films or images which are achieved by actually victimising an individual who is completely innocent of any involvement in the matter, but we also have circumstances where individuals, who at the time they are filmed were quite happy to be filmed and might have even been happy at the time for the individual who holds the film to possess that film or that image, then discover at some later point in time that that image has been presented or published to the whole world by that person very much without their consent and very much in circumstances which they find to be completely humiliating.

As new technology is becoming more evident around the community, we are going to have to deal increasingly with problems which are related to new technology and how it is being used and abused. I would just like to make the point that, in as much as we are talking about films and images of that type, we have gone from a situation, perhaps, only five or 10 years ago where in Australia there were only five major broadcasters, all of them licensed to the commonwealth government and all of them regulated to some significant degree, albeit some of us from time to time might not have thought they did things perfectly.

However, now we are in a situation where every person with a mobile phone, pretty well, is a broadcaster if they wish to be, and those people, many of them, are being completely irresponsible about what they are doing, and innocent people, often children, are the victims of the behaviour these people get involved in. It is disgusting and it has got to be something that we as a parliament collectively try to do something about.

I realise that the commonwealth parliament has responsibility in relation to telecommunications policy, and I realise that we are not able to regulate what goes on in the telecommunications sector. However, we do have jurisdiction up to the point that a person presses the button on their computer. That is the zone that I think we need to be looking at, and looking at carefully.

As I have already said, this is a matter that is of great concern to me and other members of the government, and I hope that members of the opposition too are concerned about these matters. We are now in a consultation phase in relation to the construction of some offences relating to these matters. I would encourage anybody in the community who has an interest in these very important issues to please get on the website and have a look at it. I make no apology for the fact that the government is actually interested in consulting on this issue because we would like to get it right.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If members opposite have views about this we would obviously be happy to hear what they have to say as well. They are welcome to be part of the consultation. The interesting thing—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Again, I know I am being berated by the Hon. Mr Wade in another place. I have been accused of committing the terrible sin of consultation. It has gone on too long, he says. He is sick of consultation. He does not want consultation. He wants the government to legislate and then mop up afterwards. Well, that is not the way we want to deal with this.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Of all of the consultations that we have had underway, and I think at one point there were 13 or 14 of them—but the numbers are coming down, member for Bragg—we are introducing bills, even today there are three more coming in, but in all of those consultations we have had no contribution from members opposite. They have had an opportunity to be involved in the consultation process.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can you tell me which one?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Which one have you been involved in?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Members opposite can get involved in this if they want to. Go on the website. Get involved. Make a contribution.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FISH STOCKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries. Can he advise the house what is the current state of fish stocks in South Australia?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (14:37): I thank the member for the question. The way that we manage fisheries in South Australia is by way of four categories, and if I could just give a description because then I will move onto the various types of fish. We have the category of under-fished, and that is under-utilised and has the potential to sustain harvest levels higher than those currently being taken. So, that is under-fished.

Fully fished: harvest levels are at or close to optimum sustainable levels. Current fishing pressure is considered sustainable. So, we are talking about a sustainable fishery. The third category is over-fished or depleted, and here we have harvest levels that are not sustainable and/or yields may be higher in the long term if catch or effort levels are not reduced in the short term, or the stock may still be recovering from previous excessive fishing pressure.

Recovery strategies in the over-fished or depleted fisheries will be developed by PIRSA, if we have that issue, to reduce fishing pressure and ensure that stocks recover to accessible levels within agreed time frames. Then we have uncertain, we do not really know the lie of the land, but I do not think we have any categories.

So, just working through the fisheries: Western Zone Abalone Fishery, fully fished, sustainable; Central Zone Abalone Fishery, fully fished, sustainable; Southern Zone Abalone Fishery, fully fished; Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery, fully fished; Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery, fully fished; Sardine Fishery, fully fished; Blue Crab Fishery, fully fished; Giant Crab Fishery, fully fished; Marine Scalefish Fishery snapper, fully fished; Marine Scalefish Fishery King George whiting, fully fished; Marine Scalefish Fishery southern calamari, fully fished; Marine Scalefish Fishery southern garfish, depleted. In relation to the garfish fishery, our strategy is increased commercial net mesh size. We are trialling gear configuration and we are reviewing the recreational bag and boat limits.

The Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery, depleted; and the Southern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery, overfished. There we have a number of strategies, one of which is management of the quota. I am sure that the member for Mount Gambier is aware of my rather controversial decision at the time to close down the month of August to prevent the taking of buried females, that is, females actually carrying eggs.

It was my view that that particular fishery was under some stress; stock take numbers had been in decline. We had a remarkable turnaround in that fishery in the last season and, I think, everybody in the South-East is breathing a sigh of relief that we are actually seeing a significant rebound in that particular fishery.

The advice that I have received is that in the northern fishery we seem to have that issue under control. I think that is a fairly comprehensive snapshot, if you like, of the present state of play in South Australian fisheries.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MARINE PARKS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Given that the government has now been working on marine parks for nine years, and has had four environment ministers, will they now release the scientific data supporting the establishment of no-take fishing zones?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:41): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and, of course, I thank the deputy leader for his question. Of course, the information that relates to the science on which the marine parks is based is readily available. I offered a presentation to members of parliament last week, or the week before, which a few of them attended, to actually look at the basis on which the science is being used for the development of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —a representative marine parks system. Of course, the science we have used and are using is, in fact, world's best practice. Even yesterday, there was another presentation that was offered to members of parliament with Professor Hugh Possingham, who is a world-renowned expert on the design of marine parks and the principles—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: He is. He is an outstanding South Australian, not living in South Australia at the moment, but outstanding. I noticed that, conspicuous by their absence, were many of the—I did notice that the member—

Mr Marshall: You were conspicuous by your absence last night.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Your students have left, have they, so you can act in this inappropriate way, or are they still there? Alright, that's okay. You set the example to the students about how to act; that's fine. The science is there, it is readily available, and I did have an understanding that this question was going to be raised. I guess if there was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pederick: PIRSA manage fish, not DENR.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

The Hon. P. CAICA: I guess something that came out of last night's meeting were the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition that they support marine parks but, of course, do not in any way support sanctuary zones. So, what they will be saying is that they will continue with just what exists at the moment.

The science is readily available, and I will just reinforce this point for the opposition, even though I have said it before, I will say it now and I will say it again in the future, but they do not listen—the marine parks design principles are not a fisheries management tool. What they are—

Mr Pederick: It's all about fish according to you.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, I did see the member for Hammond's press release some time ago—and someone must have written it for him because it was reasonably articulate—quite simply looking at, 'Why are we doing marine parks?'. I will paraphrase it here: why are we doing marine parks if it is not a fisheries management tool? I have said ad nauseam that it is not a fisheries management tool. It is one of the tools in the toolbox that is very valuable, the most important tool—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —in preserving and protecting the marine habitat in which a variety of species live, not the least of which, of course, is fish. It is about creating an environment where all species continue to thrive, because we are protecting the habitat in which they live and that, in turn, then benefits—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, they have shown to date that they are not willing to listen. They want to politicise this process. I acknowledge that the member for Davenport promulgates information that says he is behind the establishment of 19 marine parks. I also acknowledge, given last night's meeting and the way it has been reported, that the Leader of the Opposition does not support sanctuary zones, and that is the difference between us and them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Bragg for the second time, I have had enough of this.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EXPORTS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:46): My question is to the Premier. Would the Premier advise the house how the state is performing in the global market with regard to exports?

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) (14:46): I would like to thank the honourable member for this very important question, because I am very pleased to inform the house that South Australia's recovery following the global financial crisis continues to go from strength to strength. South Australia has fared much better than most other states in Australia and, indeed, other countries around the world.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't like any good news. So the ABS suddenly is wrong because you are always right! The latest data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows exports from South Australia continuing to rebound strongly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't like this, do you? No, you don't. I know there was a big blue in your party room, a big, big blue, about the oval. I know that is why you haven't asked any questions this week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We have been hearing about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We love getting your phone calls, your cards and your letters. In the year to February 2011, South Australia recorded a 23 per cent increase in exports to \$9.9 billion. This was the second-highest growth rate in the nation; only Western Australia recorded a higher growth rate. In the month of February alone, South Australian exports topped more than \$1 billion, the highest monthly total recorded since August 2008.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You would be blaming me if it was the other way.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Come down the front; go down to the front. We want to see you on the front bench.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Anger management—come down to the front bench, and we will get your other mate as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As I said, the 'Pellekaan brief' and the 'Marshall plan'—who's going to get there first? Metal ores and metal scraps accounted for the greatest increase, in \$778 million worth of goods exported. Our record-breaking grain harvest also delivered an increase in wheat exports of 133 per cent, or \$664 million.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Now they are anti the bush. I don't know! Other significant increases included copper, up \$183 million; meat and meat preparations, up \$121 million; other commodities, which included, for example, barley, up \$108 million; machinery, up \$84 million; and vegetables and fruit, up \$54 million. It is important to note that these results—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is important to note that these results have come despite the high Australian dollar, which has consistently been above parity. Combine this with poor economic conditions around the world and there is no doubting that it is a tough climate for exporters to operate in.

Despite this our exporters have risen to the challenge and our industries continue to perform strongly. I think members of both sides of the house should commend the efforts of industry. Furthermore, these latest statistics show that the efforts of this government in having targeted campaigns in growth markets continue to pay huge dividends for the state.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Given that education is our second biggest export, you don't think—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You don't think the government has had any role in that? It was about 6,000 to 8,000 under you; 34,000 students under Labor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You couldn't actually get mining exploration going.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Somehow you were anti-mine. It was all some kind of mirage in the desert. Anyway, here we go.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: As much as members opposite protest about our trade offices in India and China, this government will continue to support them. Go and ask the education sector whether they appreciate our offices in India and China. We continue to support them because in the year to February, exports to China grew \$697 million or 61 per cent. In the year to February, exports to India grew 74 per cent or \$306 million. This is a \$1 billion increase in exports to India and China.

Don't expect it to be reported, but it is really important for this state. These latest results are very encouraging for South Australia as our exports are continuing to diversify, as our mining industry continues to gain momentum, and, when the US and European markets fully recover, I am confident that exports will continue to grow strongly. Let's hear it for our exporters, even if the Liberals opposite do not value their contribution to this state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MARINE PARKS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Does the minister accept both recreational and commercial fishers' anger at his government's proposal to establish no-take zones within marine parks, given that at the same time his government is licensing BP to search for oil in the marine park in the Great Australian Bight?

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: No.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will stop arguing.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition, quiet. Minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:53): I do acknowledge that there is a degree of angst out there from recreational fishers. I have always accepted that, but we talk about, amongst other things, the science. I notice now they are anti-mining as well, but when we talk about science—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: They don't like the science that is underpinning marine parks. They didn't like the science last week at Strathalbyn in relation to water allocation planning. They don't like the science as it relates to carbon trading and the like. Quite simply, if we used the science that they are using for marine parks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: If we undertook and used the science that they are using, we would still be clubbing seals, we would still be hunting whales and we would make sure we deplete all species.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order, members on my right, also!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Transport! The member for Finniss.

MARINE PARKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:54): My question is also to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Can the minister confirm that the marine parks' implementation and management will be taken from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources and given to the regional natural resources management boards? The opposition has been advised that the management of marine parks is to be placed with the state's natural resources management boards which, in the future, will use marine parks as a method of revenue raising to fund their operation.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:54): Madam Speaker, I am not being disrespectful of my friend, the member for Finniss, because I know that he got very upset yesterday and was very

sensitive about some of the things that I said. We have previously ruled that out. We won't be doing it again. It is, again, asking questions that have no substance in fact to continue to promote fear, scaremongering and anxiety out there amongst the people who we want to support marine parks. Again, it is—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —a question that is actually based on continuing to be able to scare people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

MARINE PARKS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): My question is, again, to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Is the minister aware that five surveys were commissioned by his department between May 2006 and December 2009 into the community understanding and attitudes towards the establishment of marine parks, and is he also aware that the latest of those reports states, 'There has been a constant and slow decrease in those who understand the term "marine park".'

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:56): I am aware of the surveys that were undertaken over an extended period of time, that is, to gauge the level of understanding of marine parks. I do understand also that—and I am not quite sure that it is completely accurate, but I will answer the question as best I can. When I say 'completely accurate', I mean the way in which the question was phrased by the deputy leader as not being completely accurate.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I'm alleging that you throw a lot of berley out there to see what you can catch. But, Madam Speaker—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: They have asked the question—let me answer, for God's sake. Quite simply, I am aware of that, and I question the level of understanding, certainly, that marine parks were going to exist. But, Madam Speaker, it is simply this: I would expect that that level of understanding would have deteriorated based on the misinformation that is being promulgated by the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Frome.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Frome, sit down until members are being quiet.

DISPLACED EFFORT WORKING GROUP

Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Why are four of the 11 communiqués from the Displaced Effort Working Group missing from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) website? The Displaced Effort Working Group was formed to address commercial fishing displaced by the introduction of marine parks. I understand that this group has held 11 meetings.

In response to my question on 24 February 2011, the minister indicated that it had finished its work. I asked whether all the minutes of those meetings will be made available, to which the minister replied:

What we want to do is be completely transparent about this. The marina alliance has asked for more clarification on detail with respect to those sequential principles. Certainly, if we want these parks to be co-produced—if we want the input of commercial and recreational fishers and others—we will make that information available.

However, minister, I notice that as at today there are still communiqués Nos 1, 6, 7 and the final paper not posted to the DENR website.

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) (14:58): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Look, I do not know the reason behind that. I am assuming that there were meetings of the displaced effort working group that might not have resulted in a communiqué actually being established as a result of those meetings.

I still reinforce the point that this process is one that I and the government want to be totally transparent about. We want information to be available, because that will in turn better inform people. The only people who do not want to be informed is this mob, here—and I don't put you in that category. What I will do is chase up the answer to this question, and I will get back directly to the house and to the honourable member with an answer.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Can the minister advise the house of the ongoing contribution of the Nation Building—Economic Stimulus Plan to affordable housing in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Minister for Housing.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:00): Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Torrens, sit down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the member for Torrens for her question and ongoing support for new and innovative housing here in South Australia.

The Nation Building—Economic Stimulus Plan is providing \$434 million to South Australia to build 1,360 new social housing properties and refurbish hundreds of others. Last year, I advised the house that Housing SA had completed stage 1 of this program under budget and ahead of schedule. We had a target of 273 new properties by 30 June 2010 and we achieved 304. We had a target of 391 upgrades and we achieved 503. I am proud to report that we now have achieved our next milestone of 1,011 new properties. We aimed to achieve this target by 28 February 2011, and I can advise we had achieved 99 per cent of those by this date. The remaining 1 per cent were completed during March 2011.

Despite one of the wettest summers on record, our staff and contractors persevered in their efforts to provide these much-needed houses for vulnerable South Australians, and we are still under budget. We are on track to deliver around 1,378 new houses and apartments instead of 1,360.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Sorry?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Lochiel Park? Yes, I am happy to tell you about Lochiel Park.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, they're not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Wrong again. Every time she opens her mouth she gets it wrong, Madam Speaker. Let's reflect back to, when was it, 1988? How many houses did they

build? How many houses were built by your government in 1998? 34! I wonder if you came in under budget on those.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: In eight years?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There were 34 in 1998. The total build in 12 months was 34. Did you come in on budget on those? We will be able to construct 1,378 new houses and apartments instead of 1,360, and 25 per cent of construction is targeted at regional areas.

We are not just building acres of new social housing. The program is being strategically targeted to achieve a more sustainable mix of homeowners and renters. The program is not just running under budget: it is using these funds to create a multiplier effect in our economy, and the UNO Apartments building in Waymouth Street is a shining example of this. The commonwealth agreed to South Australia's innovative suggestion to use Nation Building funds to construct this landmark building and sell some of the apartments on the open market and through our Affordable Homes program. The funds from these sales will then be reinvested to build more affordable housing. This system of building, sale and reinvestment stimulates our construction industry beyond the original vision of the stimulus package. It is estimated that the housing stimulus work in South Australia will generate 1,500 jobs.

But it does not stop there. The program is supporting the community housing sector, with 500 properties already in the hands of community housing providers. These properties will have ownership fully transferred in the coming year and will allow these community organisations to leverage these assets and grow. Despite all these other benefits, the most important part of the program is the people—the people who were homeless, the people fleeing violence or the people dealing with major health problems—who now have a home, and we are housing them quickly.

Let's not forget that the Liberals opposed the stimulus package. Let's not forget they sold 11,000 houses in eight years, and let's not forget—

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

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister is entering into debate in answering her question.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It is factual.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is not factual. It is all argument, you fool.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Transport! Minister, have you finished your answer?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, I haven't. In 1998, 34 houses were built by the then Liberal government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: While I think we have much to celebrate, there is also much more to go. The stimulus package is supporting cutting edge projects like Woodville West, like the UNO Apartments and the Lochiel Park green village. I pay tribute to the federal government for putting the funds on the table, and I commend this government and the department for the vision and hard work to make this money go further and deliver more for the people of South Australia.

POLICE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Police. Is it standard practice for an investigation into an assault to be suspended if the investigating officer goes on leave? Then police minister Wright wrote to the former member for Morialta, Lindsay Simmons, in reference to a serious school assault at Craigmore High School in February 2009 and explained away the failure of an officer to investigate the assault in a timely manner on the basis that 'the officer was commencing his annual leave'.

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) (15:06): I guess the member for Unley is somehow trying to entwine me in that question. I am not quite sure how, but operational—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order. I will wait for the ruling of the chair.

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down, minister. Point of order.

Mr PISONI: My point of order is the minister is imputing improper motives on me, and I ask it to be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: I don't think he can withdraw when he says 'I assume'. He has not actually said straight out that you have done that, but I would ask the minister to be very careful about what he is saying. Minister, do you want to answer the question?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We are allowed to use propensity reasoning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I guess as a police minister I can see form in terms of what this gentleman gets up to.

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: The same point of order, Madam Speaker. I ask you to ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, I didn't hear what he said then because of the noise from your side. What was the second comment you are asking him to withdraw?

Mr PISONI: He was suggesting I had form in bad behaviour. That's what he was saying.

The SPEAKER: You had form in what?

Mr PISONI: In bad behaviour, through his inference, and I ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I think you are being very sensitive, member for Unley. If he'd only said you had form—

Mr PISONI: I'm being sensitive?

The SPEAKER: I think you were being very sensitive. I don't think you have a point of order there. Minister, can you just answer the question as it was asked and not make any assumptions or anything else.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You big sook!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: If that is about unparliamentary—

Mr PISONI: I don't believe that 'sook' is parliamentary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: I ask the minister to withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Hey, sunshine, the day you can beat me in this place will be a very, very long day away. You are a political novice, and you are very, very poor at the art of parliamentary debate. But, Madam Speaker, I will be more than happy to get a report from the police commissioner.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

JOHN HARTLEY SCHOOL

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:09): Madam Speaker, my question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have got one minute left of question time. We will do it in silence. Member for Light.

Mr PICCOLO: Madam Speaker, my question is to the Minister for Education.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: he is not doing it in silence.

The SPEAKER: That's a frivolous point of order, and I should throw you out! Member for Light.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sit down, Minister for Police!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Light.

Mr PICCOLO: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, be quiet!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sit down, member for Light. I think we will call this question time to a halt. Are we going to have silence? Member for Light, ask your question.

Mr PICCOLO: My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister advise the house about the recent formal opening of the new John Hartley School within my electorate?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his question and note that he has had a deep involvement with John Hartley School and has attended the school on a number of occasions, including with me. He has also been invited to join as a member of the governing council, so he has had an extraordinarily close relationship with the school. I know that he is incredibly proud of what we have achieved at the John Hartley Birth to 7 School.

It opened its doors towards the end of last year. It is one of four of our six brand-new schools which have opened, part of the \$200 million project to build six brand-new schools in the northern and western suburbs of Adelaide.

Last Thursday I was fortunate enough to be able to attend the formal opening of the school. It was a wonderful event, with students, staff and parents who are all incredibly excited about what the school has to offer. Indeed, enrolments are up from around 380 when it opened to almost 500 just a term later; so, people are voting with their feet and are enrolling in this school because of its state-of-the-art facilities.

Students are able to learn in a range of quality learning spaces, including outdoor learning commons situated in each building, a resource centre, a science centre, a health and science area and, in keeping with the school's art focus, an art space adjoining the school hall, which allows easy movement between the two.

There is an incredibly impressive range of physical education facilities, including a hall, tennis courts, cricket and soccer pitches. There is a kitchen area and kitchen garden for students to learn the science of food preparation, healthy nutrition, and planting and caring for the vegetable garden. Throughout the school there is a fantastic focus on new technology. All learning areas have interactive whiteboards. Each years 6 and 7 student has a laptop, and there is easy access to computers for students right from reception to year 5.

Thursday's opening was about the school community. They designed the opening. It was run by students, and it was an incredibly impressive and, I must say, moving event. Every parent

that you spoke to was proud of the decision they had taken. They made this choice, and it is a big choice to bring together an amalgamated number of schools. For those of them who had concerns at the beginning, they all now believe that they have made the right decision.

I want to pay tribute to the leaders in the school community, in particular the principal, Aiva Ositis, and the chair of the governing council, Cathy Lee. The school community has, I think, excelled itself in what is an extraordinarily big enterprise to start a new school. The school students look wonderful in their new uniforms. They sang beautifully to the assembled guests, and it was a wonderful celebration of a fantastic new school.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:14): In the last few question times the Treasurer and the Minister for Health have been telling the opposition and the public, 'Don't worry, all the costs to do with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will be revealed.' They will all be revealed as if there is some change of policy and they are going to suddenly, in some great act of honesty, reveal the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital project to the public. Well, Madam Speaker, this ragbag, slapdash, sideshow of the government is not known for its honesty.

The opposition can reveal today that the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital project is \$2.73 billion—\$2.73 billion. When the hospital is built in 2016, when the contract to manage the hospital starts to operate, the cost to construct the hospital up to that point is \$2.73 billion.

Remember the dishonesty during the campaign? The government said it was \$1.7 billion and then it was revealed later that it was \$1.8 billion. The government misled the public during the whole campaign on that particular issue, and it misled the public for the whole campaign on the issue of the cost of the Adelaide Oval. We had a treasurer who the only thing he could remember was what he had to forget.

What we have now is a Royal Adelaide Hospital project that is not \$1 million more, it is not \$10 million more, it is not \$100 million more, it is \$1,000 million more than what the South Australian public were told during the election campaign—\$1,000 million more. That is not the opposition's figure, that is the figure from the Macquarie Private Bank document entitled, 'The New Royal Adelaide Hospital Equity Information Presentation', dated January 2011, so it is current.

This is the document that the Macquarie Bank is using to seek private investors into the hospital. If you go to page 22 of the document it talks about the total use of funds come 2016, and the total use of funds come 2016 is \$2.73 billion. So, this is not the opposition giving this figure, it comes from the Macquarie document being sent to private investors to invest in this project—\$1,000 million more than the South Australian public were told.

Let us make this clear. This is not the management contract, the day-in, day-out management contract over 29 years. It is not that cost. This is the cost to have the facility ready at the end of 2016, and then from that point on the South Australian public will pay a service payment for the next 29 years. This \$2.73 billion figure, including the extra \$1,000 million, is built into that contract over the 29 years.

That is going to be a huge cost to the South Australian public. What do we have? We have a Premier who is on his last leg and about to go, the former treasurer has already stepped down from the treasurer's position, and the rumour is that the Minister for Health will not be there at the next election. They are going to sign it up and go. Those three key people are going to sign it up and go and leave the South Australian public to pay the debt for the next 29 years.

The government says this is all about transferring the risk. The public should ask this one simple question: we are transferring the risk at what cost? We now know the cost is an extra \$1,000 million, a total cost of \$2.73 billion. The opposition brings that to the public's attention. It is the Macquarie's document and the government should hang its head in shame.

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS MEMORIAL DAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:18): There is an important date at the end of this month. April has a number of important dates. Last Friday, 1 April, was Rainbow Autism Day, a celebration of the lives of autistic people living within our community who have been known to overcome unbelievable odds with the love and dedication of their support network and a lot of hard work and determination.

Dedicated parents, Shane and Allison Dix, arranged an activity in association with principal Mrs Wink Dowdy at Redwood Park school, which saw the students raise money and awareness of how normal the needs of autistic people and their families are, with early intervention being the most important action that can be taken.

This year, our Easter celebrations will spill over into ANZAC Day commemorations, creating a particularly long weekend. Families will have the opportunity to be involved in religious traditions and many will take the opportunity to go away on a short break. Attending the ANZAC Day dawn service has become a rite of passage for many Australians. I feel deeply honoured to be involved in services held annually.

However, the date I want to talk about today is 28 April, International Workers Memorial Day. An ecumenical service to commemorate this special day in Adelaide will be held at Pilgrim Church and family, friends and colleagues who have lost someone through a workplace death are invited to attend, regardless of their religious beliefs. I am sorry I cannot be there to join Andrea Madeley and the members and supporters of her group, VOID (Voices of Industrial Death), and commend her work, particularly in strengthening penalties around workplace accidents—the stick part that must accompany the educative carrot in our fight to keep workers safe.

Each year, up to two million men and women die as a result of work-related accidents and diseases. It is a fact that more people die at work than those fighting in war. In a world where death, injury and illness at work can be taken for granted, this day is a very important date in our calendar highlighting, as it does, the preventable nature of many workplace accidents and ill health and the importance of our unions in the fight for improvements in workplace safety. It is recognised as a national day in many countries, including Argentina, Belgium, Bermuda, Brazil, Canada, Dominican Republic, Luxembourg, Panama, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Taiwan, the United States and the United Kingdom.

In Australia, there are more than 600,000 work-related incidents, including diseases, injuries and fatalities, every year. Every two to three minutes, someone in this country lodges a workers compensation claim. The Australian Safety and Compensation Council stated in its March 2009 report, entitled 'Cost of Work Related Death, Disease and Injury', that as many as 7,000 fatalities occur each year as a result of work-related disease, which is four times the annual road toll. Apart from the staggering human cost, the economic cost is estimated to be more than \$50 billion a year.

I am pleased to note that the federal Labor government plans to introduce new health and safety laws to ensure national consistency in each state and territory by the end of the year. I hope the new laws will ensure the world's best safety standards for workers will be implemented and that they will respect and uphold the role of unions.

Many of the protections and rights we enjoy at work were fought for and won by unions, including workers compensation, rest breaks, protective clothing, restrictions on heavy lifting, licences and training when working with heavy equipment, and bans on dangerous chemicals and asbestos. We all remember the dogged struggle waged by SA's own Jack Watkins, and many others, to combat the insidious consequences of asbestos.

More recently, around 12,000 people have died in Japan's catastrophic earthquake and tsunami and there are still more than 15,000 people missing. On International Workers Memorial Day this year, I hope we will also pause to think about the workers at Japan's crippled Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power station. So far, there are seven dead and 21 injured. This number will rise as the effect of exposure to high levels of radiation takes its toll.

History has shown that those workers who suffer from acute radiation sickness will not find their way into the most commonly quoted statistics, unless they die promptly. In the days immediately after the catastrophic earthquake and tsunami, when explosions rocked the plant, 750 workers were evacuated but 50 stayed behind to try to contain the crisis. Reinforcements have since boosted their numbers up to 400, with workers being rotated in and out on one-hour shifts to limit their exposure to radiation.

Twice a day, a bus packed with new shift workers and supplies drives into the heart of the plant. Workers are divided into working groups of specialists, including electricians and control room operators. They toil away in unbearable heat and darkness, breathing through respirators, dressed in white suits with hoods to cover them from head to toe. Even the short periods they spend near the reactors can expose them to dangerously high levels of radiation.

Because deliveries of supplies are limited, they get by on very little food. There is no lunch break, they have bottled water but they do not have running water to wash their hands or bodies because the plumbing is broken. Instead, they are forced to use alcohol spray. The workers are isolated, with no way to talk to their families because the earthquake toppled nearby communication towers. Before they drop off to sleep, they put down radiation protection lead mats on the floor of a huge room on the second floor of the building, just a short distance from the reactor.

These are the living conditions of workers at the Fukushima nuclear plant, who are racing to connect cables, repair machinery and check equipment in order to avert a worse catastrophe at the facility. I acknowledge their bravery, stoicism and selflessness. I also join the Ukrainian community of South Australia in commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Chernobyl disaster.

STORMWATER HARVESTING

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:24): I rise today on the subject of stormwater. Prior to the state election in 2010, the Labor government opposed the Liberal's sensible stormwater harvesting policy. Just in recent times, it has been back on the agenda through the media and through policy decisions, so stormwater harvesting needs to be looked at again.

According to an article in *The Advertiser* on 4 April referring to a letter to the previous minister from the CSIRO and Dr Peter Dillon, stormwater requires only simple treatments to achieve drinking water standard. The question I ask is: did the taxpayer of South Australia know this? Today, we are looking at a 100-gigalitre desal plant at a cost of around \$2.4 billion, which will include the north-south interconnector.

That north-south interconnector, at a cost of around \$403 million—\$403 million for an interconnector—has been put in place for the extra 50 gigalitres in the desal plant. I wonder what sort of storage we could put, with that desal water, into an aquifer at a much-reduced cost. We have the expertise here in South Australia, we have the aquifers under Adelaide, but do we have the government's will? I suspect not. We hear that the plant will be used with renewable energy certificates or offsets. Where do those renewable certificates come from? I believe that is just smoke and mirrors.

We look at Adelaide as a catchment; we look at the Murray-Darling Basin as a catchment. Dr Peter Dillon has explained that Adelaide, or cities, are highly effective catchments and Adelaide could yield 4,000 times more run-off per hectare than the Murray-Darling Basin. On an average year up to 180 gigalitres of stormwater flows out to sea, and there is potential for 250 gigalitres of this urban stormwater to be harvested, stored and recovered in one year in the three cities studied. So far that includes Adelaide, Perth and Melbourne, and the cost is less than the current mains water supplies.

I wonder if the people of South Australia understand what the desal plant is going to cost them as opposed to what it would cost them to harvest stormwater? We called for a desal plant of 50 gigalitres; an affordable desal plant. What we needed to do was diversify away from the River Murray. What we are seeing is an ad hoc, kneejerk reaction, of putting in a 100-gigalitre desal plant at huge cost to the South Australian taxpayer. What we are also seeing is that the flow-on cost of that 100-gigalitre desal plant is the north-south interconnector pipe. That north-south interconnector pipe is going to use a huge amount of human resources at huge cost, at huge inconvenience, and I believe that it is an unnecessary exercise when we look at water coming out of the desal plant being pumped through a north-south interconnector to fill up reservoirs. At what evaporation rate? At what loss going into these reservoirs?

Would the government consider pumping some of that desal water into underground aquifers, underground storage, where we don't see the evaporation or the losses and what we can see is that the water is stored, it is clean, it is kept green and it is safe under the ground. Again, I would like to bring this to the water minister's attention: does he want to continue taking water away from the food producers of this state and to save the Murray instead of looking for sensible solutions in his own backyard?

The water minister, I believe, is a stormwater denier. The government has misled and condemned South Australians to paying billions of dollars for a desal plant that does not reduce the city's reliance on the River Murray. That is the crux of the reason that we put the desal plant in: to take the draw out of the River Murray, to give South Australia better water security, and yet this government continues to overlook an opportunity staring it in the face. We watch the water go out to sea. We watch that water destroying sea grasses. We watch that water having an impact on the

fishing industry, having an impact on the environment, and yet we see marine parks trying to be introduced while we have up to 180 gigalitres of water running out into the gulf every year.

Murray water, for Adelaide, is stormwater. It flows straight from the Riverland streets into the river when it rains. In actual fact, if we look at our rainwater tanks, those rainwater tanks are stormwater.

AUSTRALIAN CONSUMER LAW

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:29): On 1 January this year an historic and significant step was taken to improve the rights of Australian consumers and to reduce red tape for small business, with the commencement of the new Australian Consumer Law, or ACL. In 2008, COAG reached agreement around an agenda of more than 36 reforms to deliver a seamless national economy. The point of these reforms is to improve competition and reduce barriers to investment by harmonising regulation that is currently duplicated and/or is inconsistent across states, territories and federal jurisdictions.

Consumer law was identified as a priority area for reform, with the Productivity Commission estimating that the introduction of a single national consumer law would produce economic benefits of between \$1.5 billion and \$4.5 billion a year. As well as reducing compliance costs for business, the Australian Consumer Law also significantly improved protection for consumers. It drew on recommendations of the Productivity Commission in combining the best practice in state and territory consumer law.

The new ACL also delivered a new national unfair contract terms law, covering standard form contracts; a new national law guaranteeing consumer rights when buying goods and services, which replaces the existing laws on conditions and warranties; a new national product safety law and enforcement system; a new national law for unsolicited consumer agreements, which replaces existing state and territory laws on door-to-door sales and other direct marketing; simple national rules for lay-by agreements; and new penalty enforcement powers and consumer redress options.

This is great news for consumers and businesses alike and should be recognised as a fantastic step forward for our economy and our consumer affairs system. I would like to provide a real example of how the ACL is working. My office was recently contacted by a constituent seeking assistance with a consumer affairs concern. She had been telephoned at home by a company selling discount booklets that promoted local businesses. She was told that the booklet contained \$4,000 of value for the price of \$99. That sounded very good and she agreed to purchase it.

The same day, a representative from the company knocked on her door to take receipt of her money and provide her with the booklet. Unfortunately, upon examination, the product did not meet her expectations or needs. The savings included products and services that she was unlikely to utilise, such as a bicycle puncture repair kit, a fringe trim and a monthly piece of bung fritz from the local butcher. Furthermore, these products and services were located at some shopping complexes that were not conveniently located to her for her normal weekly shopping. She was elderly and it made it difficult to get there.

The booklet did not meet her expectation and did not deliver the products and services she had anticipated. Despite a number of attempts to contact the company, the constituent was unable to resolve this matter and get her money refunded. Under the new ACL in relation to unsolicited consumer agreements, such as door-to-door selling or telemarketing, there is now extra protection for consumers. These include a cooling-off period whereby the consumer is provided with 10 business days in which to change their mind and cancel the contract without penalty. Furthermore, agreements reached over the telephone must be received by the consumer in writing within five business days, improving transparency around the terms and conditions of the sale.

I am pleased to note that the company in question has now agreed to refund my constituent's money in full and that the matter has been successfully resolved, largely thanks to the new, clear provisions of the ACL. I believe that the ACL provides a clearer, more transparent and simpler framework for consumers and businesses to trade fairly. It also assists with equitable outcomes in the event of a dispute, and I commend the state and federal Labor governments for their work in this area.

MOUNT BARKER DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENT

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:34): I would like to raise some issues in the house this afternoon concerning the Mount Barker Development Plan Amendment and the comments that have been coming from some members of the community in relation to the role that the Liberal

Party has played as a consequence of the DPA. Several letters have been written to the local paper and some public comments made criticising the Liberal Party in its opposition to the DPA—comments along the lines that the Liberal Party has not been able to convince the majority of the community in its opposition to the DPA, that our attack has been mild and other criticisms levelled at the Liberal Party.

I want to put on the record this afternoon that those claims are wrong. The Liberal Party has led the campaign from well before any other political party entered the debate in opposition to the DPA. I undertook community consultation in April 2009, sending out 9,000 communication forms seeking feedback from the community in relation to the government's proposal to rezone good, prime agricultural land for residential development. I received over 1,300 responses, in excess of 13 per cent—

Ms THOMPSON: I rise on a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A point of order. The member for Reynell.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will stop the clock.

Ms THOMPSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to page 13 of the *Notice Paper* and Order of the Day No. 1, Mount Barker Development Plan Amendment. I was listening carefully to the member for Kavel, and initially I thought that his remarks did not trespass upon the matters covered by that order, but I would like you to consider whether in fact he is now trespassing onto the subject of that item.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is actually a very good point.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Have you stopped the clock?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have stopped the clock, member for Kavel. You have already asked us that and we heard you the first time. Yes, I think that is a relevant point of order.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Just as a point of explanation, I presume that you are talking about the motion that I moved condemning the government concerning the Mount Barker DPA. Is that right?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that what you are referring to, member for Reynell?

Ms THOMPSON: The member should note that asking questions across the floor of the chamber is not appropriate.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Is that—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No; ask me—through the chair.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I am asking a point of clarification. The motion that I moved last sitting week was specifically condemning the government in relation to the Mount Barker DPA. This is a separate issue, a separate matter, concerning the DPA. It has nothing to do with the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bear with me for one moment.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, it is not a frivolous point of the order. It is an extremely serious point of order, and I uphold that point of order. Member for Kavel, clearly you still have three minutes in which to discuss whatever you so choose.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But I am going to be quite creative here. Bear with me. If you would like to talk about something completely different, and I realise that you have been stopped mid-flow, we could perhaps go to the member for Mawson and come back to you for a whole five minutes.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: No, Madam Deputy Speaker, I am quite satisfied to continue my remarks.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Clearly not in the same vein, however?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It is in relation to the criticism levelled at the Liberal Party in terms of its opposition to rezoning agricultural land for residential development in Mount Barker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kavel, I think that the member—sit down please, thank you. I think that you will find that the member for Reynell actually makes a very good point. She does, and I do uphold it. I do not want you to argue with me about it. I would like you to speak about something else.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I want to speak about the Greens party and its supporters levelling criticism unnecessarily at the Liberal Party and its position in relation to rezoning land in Mount Barker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You wish to speak about the Greens? Excellent.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I wish to speak about political involvement in relation to that issue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excellent. We have still stopped the clock, so that is fine, and we will begin the clock again.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Thank you. It is my understanding that it is the intention of the Greens party and its supporters to perpetuate a myth that they are the party that has been leading the campaign in relation to that matter. As I said, I implemented a survey of the constituency in those three towns—Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne—and the strong feedback in relation to that survey was that the vast majority of the community was supportive of retaining prime agricultural land for the purpose of agriculture.

A number of letters have been written to the local paper criticising the Liberal Party. I want to point out that I think it is a bit steep for the Greens' supporters to try to claim the high moral ground in relation to this issue when it was their preferences that supported the Labor Party's re-election at the election last year.

A particular person wrote to the local paper stating that the Greens ran an open ticket in Heysen and Kavel and in most other electorates. That is my understanding of the wording, or words to that effect, as I do not have the particular text here with me. I have done a check of the website of the electoral commission and in every key marginal seat the Greens published a specific how-to-vote card preferencing the ALP candidate above the Liberal candidate.

The claim made by that person is incorrect, and that is a clear example of the supporters, I believe, of the Greens party trying to perpetuate a myth that they are taking the high moral ground in relation to their opposition and that the Liberal Party has done very little in relation to opposing the rezoning.

PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY, HEALTH

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:42): I rise today to update the house on my role as the parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Health and the Minister for the Southern Suburbs. In the health sector I have been giving the minister a hand with country health and have been travelling around the state meeting people and looking at some of the health facilities.

I started at the Keith Hospital and had a very good meeting with the board, and I want to congratulate them on the work they have done for their community. I also went doorknocking in Keith, and it has been a long time since anyone has doorknocked in Keith, let me tell the house. I had a very good reception there and it was wonderful that people gave up their time to talk to me about their links to the hospital, and people obviously are very attached to that hospital.

I picked up some really good stories and met some very nice people, including the ladies at Mrs Davidson's house who were playing bridge. I had a lovely 20 minutes with the four ladies there. The son-in-law of one of those ladies is on the Keith Hospital board, so I could tell him later in the day when we had our meeting with the board that I met his mother-in-law. That was very good.

Last Monday I went up to the Barossa Valley and, with the member for Schubert, looked at the Tanunda and Angaston hospitals. The member for Schubert has been very vocal in calling for a new hospital to be built in Tanunda on a greenfields site, and there are very good reasons for that. I want to thank the staff of those two hospitals for taking me around and showing me their facilities. It is a \$70 million proposition and, obviously, the federal government would have to help out with that, so I wish the member for Schubert well in that cause.

Last week I went to Ceduna to visit the half-finished Ceduna District Health Services. The new hospital is open and the staff had all moved in. They have been in about a week. In fact, they had their first birth the night before I arrived, so everyone was pleased to know that things worked well and that everything was in its place. It is always difficult moving house, let alone moving hospitals with brand new facilities. To hear that it all went well is very good.

It has fantastic views, as well. It is right on the seafront, and everyone has their own single room with an ensuite, which will be just like the new Royal Adelaide Hospital when it is built. The Ceduna hospital and associated health facilities are part of a \$36 million project at Ceduna. It is great that the government is investing in our regions.

Later on in the day I joined with the members for Light, Frome, Chaffey and Hammond as we had our first site tour as the Select Committee on the Grain Handling Industry, which is a great committee. It is the first time I have been on a select committee, and it is fantastic to get out in the regions and talk to farmers and people down on the wharves to find out how it all works and how it could perhaps work better.

I thank everyone who has already come along to give evidence to our committee. People have been very respectful of fellow farmers and the people who are involved in the industry. We are getting to hear some stories—some good, some bad—about what went right and what went wrong in this harvest and perhaps how things can be done better in the future.

As I said, that was our first week on the road. We started in Ceduna and then flew to Cowell. We had a great meeting there in the afternoon and then flew down to Port Lincoln that evening. We had a meeting in Port Lincoln the next morning, followed by a site visit to the wharves at Port Lincoln. We then flew on to Minlaton, where the member for Goyder was in the audience.

Mr Brock interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: We also did a tour of the port of Thevenard while we were in Ceduna. It was very informative to see how they load the gypsum, the salt and the grain all at one facility. I also want to mention that the member for Flinders was in attendance at the Port Lincoln meeting. These members have offered to act as conduits for us to make sure that more and more people around the state come along and give evidence.

Next week we are off to Taillem Bend, Pinnaroo and Loxton, and we will be having meetings there. I invite any members of the public who want to give evidence or make contact with us to please do so. The following week we are off to Wallaroo, Crystal Brook, Clare and Freeling, so we are getting about the state. We want to hear all the stories about what is good and what is bad about the grain industry here so we can help make any improvements that might be needed before the next harvest is in.

EVIDENCE (DISCREDITABLE CONDUCT) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:48): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Evidence Act 1929 and to make a related amendment to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:48): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As part of its serious crime policy at the last election, the government undertook to amend the Evidence Act 1929 to codify and improve the criminal law as it deals with the admission and use in criminal proceedings of evidence of past discreditable or criminal conduct of an accused. The Evidence (Discreditable Conduct) Amendment Bill 2011 deals with a complex area and applies to the three types of evidence of past discreditable conduct that can be presented in a criminal trial. They may often overlap in practice because the evidence may be capable of supporting different chains of reasoning. This type of evidence is known as propensity evidence, similar fact evidence and evidence of uncharged acts.

The present law is overly restrictive, complex and unsatisfactory in having the practical effect that cogent and reliable evidence of past misconduct is often excluded from a criminal trial.

The jury may well be kept in the dark as to such highly probative evidence. The present law in this area is in need of major reform.

Given the fundamental importance of this area of the law in daily practice in the criminal courts at all levels, it is crucial that the law be clear and comprehensible and capable of straightforward application. At present, the law conspicuously does not meet these simple goals. The law in this important area needs reform.

The bill will allow prosecutors, in an appropriate case, to present to a criminal court similar fact evidence (that is, evidence of multiple examples of similar conduct led to establish that the accused did a particular act), propensity evidence (that is, evidence that demonstrates that an accused has a particular tendency to act in a certain criminal manner), and evidence of previous criminal or discreditable conduct for which the accused had not been charged (that is, uncharged acts).

The bill provides that a court may allow evidence of the previous acts and/or convictions of an accused to be admitted at a criminal trial when it is in the interest of justice to do so. The bill will simplify and improve this often confused and controversial area of the criminal law. The bill aims to improve outcomes for victims in general and, in particular, victims of sexual offences, while still maintaining an appropriate balance and ensuring that the defendant's right to a fair trial is not undermined.

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

Leave granted.

Ever since the original leading decision of the Privy Council in 1894 in *Makin v Attorney-General (NSW)* [1894] AC 57, an immense amount of judicial, legal and academic ink has been spilt in trying to satisfactorily explain and rationalise this area of the law and attempting to reconcile the countless, and often inconsistent, decisions of the courts in applying the underlying principles to the many and varied circumstances before the criminal courts whilst maintaining appropriate safeguards. Such efforts have proved somewhat fruitless and the present law with respect to the admission and use of past misconduct in criminal proceedings is, frankly, in a mess. The present law in this area is not just complex but it is incomprehensible to many involved in the criminal justice system; be they police officers, jurors, lawyers and even magistrates and judges. It can be regarded as the legal equivalent of the famed Schleswig-Holstein question that bedevilled nineteenth century European diplomacy, of which Lord Palmerston, the British Prime Minister, said:

The Schleswig-Holstein question is so complicated, only three men in Europe have ever understood it. One was Prince Albert, who is dead. The second was a German professor who became mad thinking about it. I am the third and I have forgotten all about it.

Recent decisions of the High Court, notably its decision in *R v HML* (2008) 235 CLR 334, far from solving the problems in this crucial area of criminal practice, have the potential to compound them. There continues to be much uncertainty about the admissibility and use of this type of evidence, the directions that a trial judge is required to give and the applicable standard of proof. Over recent years, the courts have considered this topic on numerous occasions. Much time has been spent by courts and law reform agencies on the subject. The number of cases of alleged sexual abuse, some dating back as far as 50 years ago, coming before the courts has increased over recent years. All indications are that this trend will continue. The present law is a confusing morass that is in need of comprehensive reform.

The Bill is the product of an extended consultation process. The Solicitor-General, officers of the Attorney-General's Department, the Bar Association and the judiciary have been closely involved in this process. I am particularly grateful for the invaluable assistance kindly and generously provided by Mr Malcolm Blue QC and Mr Jonathan Wells QC from the Bar Association, and Justice Duggan and the Joint Courts Criminal Legislation Committee, as part of that process. The final Bill meets with the approval of these parties and is an example of the benefits of a consultation process that has ultimately produced what has arguably eluded other efforts at law reform elsewhere, namely, agreement as to an effective, simplified and balanced legislative model. The Bill meets the objectives identified in the Serious Crime Policy without sacrificing appropriate safeguards. The Joint Courts Criminal Legislation Committee concludes of the Bill:

The simplicity of the Bill stands in stark contrast to the present mess. We think it has merit. There is nothing in the wording which requires further comment.

There is a general exclusionary rule at common law that evidence of bad character or criminal conduct not related to the charge is inadmissible and cannot be used in criminal trials. This rule is not absolute but the current common law test in South Australia imposes a very high threshold for the admissibility of such evidence, at least if it is to be used for propensity or similar fact purposes. The evidence must be of such a high standard that in itself it affords no reasonable inference other than the guilt of the accused before it is admitted. This test derives from the much criticised decisions of the High Court in *R v Hoch* (1988) 165 CLR 292 and *R v Pfennig* (1995) 182 CLR 461. The result of that test is that cogent, reliable and highly relevant evidence is sometimes kept from a jury. The Bill will improve the criminal justice process by allowing prosecutors in appropriate cases to introduce evidence of prior offending when it is both relevant and appropriate and in the interests of justice to do so (for example, in cases of

alleged sexual abuse where the accused has committed other sexual offences in similar circumstances and that is relevant to the current proceedings).

However, the Bill also recognises the need for an appropriate balance to be struck. It is not intended to allow the routine introduction of evidence of discreditable conduct. The 'time honoured law' of England and Australia 'that you cannot convict a man of one crime by proving that he had committed some other crime' (*R v Ball* [1911] AC 47 at 71 per Lord Loreburn LC) is a strong principle of the criminal law. The election commitment does not overturn or displace this principle as much as modify it in order to arrive at a fair and workable modern model. The admission of such evidence is confined to where it is relevant, appropriate and in the interests of justice to do so.

Overview

The Bill has 6 major features.

First, it is intended to clearly and unequivocally overrule the high 'no rational inference test' test of admissibility prescribed by the High Court in *Pfennig*.

Secondly, it confirms that the rule of the High Court in *R v Hoch* is clearly and unequivocally overruled not just in relation to sexual offences but generally. The mere fact that there is a reasonable possibility of collusion between the alleged victims is an issue of credibility for the jury and not an issue or ground for determining the admissibility of the evidence.

Thirdly, it is not intended to 'open the floodgates' to the unrestricted or wholesale admission of evidence of discreditable conduct, especially if it is introduced for propensity or similar fact purposes. The Bill provides criteria for the admission and use of evidence of discreditable conduct. In any case, the probative value of the evidence of discreditable conduct must substantially outweigh its prejudicial effect. If the evidence of discreditable conduct which the prosecution seeks to use relies on a particular propensity or disposition of the defendant as circumstantial evidence of a fact in issue, then the evidence must also have 'strong probative value', having regard to the particular issue arising at trial and the circumstances of the individual case, for it to be admissible. Judges are all too alert to the risk of impermissible reasoning and are well placed to assess that risk in any given case.

Fourthly, for completeness, the Bill extends to the admissibility and use of evidence of discreditable conduct for non-propensity, or non-similar fact, purposes, such as to show the background or context to the alleged offence, the relationship between the parties, to provide evidence of motive or intention in an appropriate case, or to disprove a possible defence, such as accident, self-defence or provocation. The Bill is intended to maintain the grounds for the admissibility and use of this type of evidence to the sensible, balanced and workable model outlined by Chief Justice Doyle in *R v Nieterink* (2000) 76 SASR 56.

Fifthly, the Bill endorses the position, outlined in *Nieterink* and other cases, that, if the evidence of discreditable conduct is admitted for a specific and limited purpose, such as to establish the background or context to the alleged offences or to shed light on the relationship between the parties and not for a wider propensity or similar fact line of reasoning, then it is incumbent upon the trial judge to give the jury an explicit warning as to both the correct and incorrect uses that they can put the evidence to. The jury, in particular, must be told that they cannot use the evidence of discreditable conduct to reason that the accused was the sort of person who might commit the offences charged.

Finally, the Bill is intended to dispel the uncertainty created by some recent cases, such as *HML* as to the standard of proof, and to further remove any suggestion of a universal requirement that any uncharged act must be separately proved beyond reasonable doubt. Any such general requirement is both unnecessary and confusing. The Bill incorporates the view expressed by the High Court in *R v Shepherd* (1990) 170 CLR 573 that the uncharged act, like any species of circumstantial evidence, need only be proved beyond reasonable doubt if it might form an indispensable link in the chain of reasoning towards guilt.

Detailed Operation

Section 34O makes it clear that the Bill applies to any type of criminal trial at any level of court. The Bill will not apply to disputed facts hearings which are not governed by the rules of evidence. The Bill does not apply to civil proceedings and is not intended to alter any of the rules relating to civil trials.

Section 34O further makes it clear that the Bill prevails in the event of any inconsistency with any existing common law rule of admissibility.

The Bill uses the expression 'discreditable conduct' as opposed to 'criminal conduct'. This is deliberate. It extends to conduct that is properly regarded as morally repugnant although not necessarily criminal. Such evidence might be properly admitted and used either for a propensity or similar fact purpose or for more limited purposes as evidence of uncharged acts. The type of egregious conduct described in *R v Alexander & McKenzie* (2002) 6 VR 53 is an example of the type of improper but non-criminal conduct that could be caught by the expression. However, by way of comparison, in *R v von Einem* (1985) 38 SASR 207, the fact that the accused was a homosexual was not, in itself, conduct which would fall within the term 'discreditable conduct'.

The Bill discards the existing rigid test governing propensity and similar fact evidence derived from the decision of the High Court in *R v Pfennig* (1985) 182 CLR 461 in favour of the simpler and clearer position stated in the Bill. The *Pfennig* test requires that the evidence of discreditable conduct, at least for propensity or similar fact purposes, will only be admissible at trial where it is more probative than prejudicial to such a degree that there is no rational explanation of that evidence consistent with the innocence of the accused. This test has been heavily criticised, even before *HML*, as technical, complex and too restrictive. It raises the bar too high. This test has the practical effect of excluding highly reliable and probative evidence. It further effectively requires the trial judge to

usurp the traditional fact finding role of the jury. In effect, the *Pfennig* test takes the traditional 'gatekeeper' function of the trial judge into the proper domain of the jury or other trier of fact.

Pfennig has been subjected to much academic criticism, notably, by Jonathon Clough in 1998 in an article in the *Adelaide Law Review*. The *Pfennig* test has been rejected in England and New Zealand by their respective Law Reform Commissions and in Canada in the leading decision on point of the Supreme Court in *R v Handy* [2002] 2 SCR 908. *Pfennig* has been further rejected in successive Law Reform Commission studies in Australia, at both a State and Commonwealth level, and has been rejected in every other Australian jurisdiction apart from the Northern Territory and Queensland. The Queensland Law Reform Commission has recently suggested its repeal. The Australian Law Reform Commission has recently repeated its earlier criticism of the *Pfennig* test.

The High Court, in *Hoch*, ruled that a possibility of concoction by complainants colluding in their allegations created a rational explanation consistent with innocence, therefore excluding such evidence of discreditable conduct even if similar, under the high 'no rational inference' test later confirmed in *Pfennig*. The Bill provides that this approach is not to be applied in South Australia generally. Matters of credibility, such as the question of any possibility of collusion between the alleged victims, are matters within the province of the jury and are not an issue for the trial judge relating to admissibility of evidence. *Hoch* has been widely criticised. In particular, as three leading and erudite academics on the Law of Evidence, Jill Hunter, Camille Cameron and Terese Henning, noted in 2005:

Has the High Court in Hoch failed to acknowledge the multitude of cases in which complainants are siblings, neighbours and friends? The basis for insinuating collusion in these contexts is strong. Meeting the challenge of a cross-examiner who claims collusion is no easy exercise. Hoch, if it represents a standard of safety for the fairness of children, also represents a severe disadvantage to prosecuting a serial sexual predator of children.

The approach in *Hoch* has previously been discarded in South Australia in relation to sexual offences and it is now thought that there is no reason why this should not be done generally.

Ever since *Makin v Attorney-General* in 1894 (if not earlier), the courts have resisted any diminution of 'the general principle that it is not competent for the prosecution to adduce evidence tending to show that the accused has been guilty of criminal acts other than those covered by the indictment for the purpose of leading to the conclusion that the accused is likely from his criminal conduct or character to have committed the offence for which he is being tried', as observed by the High Court in *Pfennig*. This basic proposition has been confirmed on many occasions by the High Court (see, for example, *R v Harriman* (1989) 167 CLR 590). The Bill does not displace or discard this basic principle. It operates on the principle that the courts will remain faithful to this principle. The Bill is not intended to open the door to the routine admission of evidence of discreditable conduct. The Bill acknowledges that it is wrong in principle to allow the unchecked use of evidence of discreditable conduct by the prosecution, especially for propensity or similar fact purposes. The Bill recognises the difficulty of containing the effects of such information which, once dropped like poison in the juror's ear, 'swift as quicksilver it courses through the natural gates and alleys of the body' (*Hamlet*, Act I, Scene v, ll. 66-67). The general principle is specifically preserved in section 34P(1) which confirms that it is impermissible to use evidence of discreditable conduct to suggest that the defendant is more likely to have committed the offence charged simply because he or she engaged in other discreditable conduct. Such evidence is inadmissible if only led for that purpose (the *impermissible use*). *Discreditable conduct evidence* is evidence tending to suggest that a defendant has engaged in discreditable conduct, whether or not constituting an offence, other than conduct constituting the offence charged.

The basic exclusionary principle in section 34P(1) is subject, however, to the important qualification in section 34P(2) which provides that evidence of discreditable conduct may be admitted for a use (the *permissible use*) if, and only if, the court is satisfied that the probative value of the evidence to be admitted for a permissible use substantially outweighs any prejudicial effect that it may have on the defendant. There will be a wide range of circumstances in which the prosecution's purpose for adducing evidence of discreditable conduct may be permissible. The evidence to be admitted must be sufficiently probative and possess a degree of relevance so that the probative value of the evidence substantially outweighs any prejudicial effect that it may have. The probative value of the evidence must be assessed against its likely prejudicial effect. The trial judge must determine if there is an unacceptable risk of prejudice to the accused, so that his or her trial would be unfair if the evidence of discreditable conduct were to be admitted. In this context, prejudice does not refer to simple prejudice to the accused but, rather, the risk of an unfair trial and a wrongful conviction. Here the risk is that, despite its permitted logical use, the jury may, nevertheless, engage in impermissible reasoning despite the efforts of the trial judge. The question of admissibility may, or may not, depend on the manner in which the defence case is to be conducted.

However, the Bill does not preclude the use of evidence of discreditable conduct to suggest that a defendant is more likely to have committed an offence if the evidence relies on, or discloses, a particular propensity or disposition of the defendant as circumstantial evidence of a fact in issue. Such evidence may be admissible if led for that purpose. There will be circumstances in which the probative value of evidence of discreditable conduct is derived only from the propensity of the accused or disposition to act in a particular manner. The case of *R v Straffen* [1952] 2 QB 911, the famous 'brides in the bath' case (*R v Smith* (1915) 11 Cr App R 229), and the facts in the *Makin* and *Pfennig* cases, are examples of the type of case where this type of evidence would be properly admitted under the Bill for such reasoning. It would be artificial to attempt, as has been sought on occasion in the past, to argue that the evidence of discreditable conduct in such cases can always be properly admitted on a basis other than relying on the propensity or disposition of the accused to act in a particular way.

The Bill distinguishes between evidence of discreditable conduct that is introduced for propensity or similar fact purposes as circumstantial evidence of a fact in issue and that which is not. If the permissible use of the evidence of discreditable conduct which the prosecution seeks to use relies on a particular propensity or disposition of the defendant as circumstantial evidence of a fact in issue, then the permissible use must, additionally, have

'strong probative value' having regard to the particular issue or issues arising at trial for the evidence to be admissible. This means that the evidence must be more than simply 'relevant' or 'material'. It must have a sufficiently strong probative value to clearly outweigh the prejudicial effect of such evidence. What will amount to strong probative value will depend on the particular circumstances of each case. The test of establishing strong probative value is not intended to be the same as under *Pfennig* as requiring the exclusion of any rational inference inconsistent with innocence.

A problem lies in the term 'evidence of uncharged acts'. A number of other expressions are also used to describe this type of evidence, such as 'background', 'relationship', 'context', 'narrative', 'sexual interest' or 'sexual attraction'. On occasion, this type of evidence has even been confused with, and included in, the definitions of similar fact or propensity evidence. The Bill recognises that no label is ideal.

The Bill clarifies and simplifies the current law in respect of the admissibility and use of evidence of uncharged acts for non-propensity or non-similar fact purposes by adopting the law as expressed in the South Australian decision of *R v Nieterink* (1996) 76 SASR 56. *Nieterink* was a workable and effective model that reflected many decades of established practice. This was widely taken to be the law prevailing in South Australia before the High Court's decision in *HML* in 2008 'muddied the water' and cast some doubt on its application.

Evidence of uncharged acts had long been used without major difficulty or objection in criminal cases at common law until relatively recent times. It was not generally viewed as a form of evidence introduced for similar fact or propensity purposes but, rather, was admissible for some other purpose. This emerges from the Chief Justice's analysis in *Nieterink*.

However, the introduction and use of evidence of uncharged acts has caused considerable difficulty in criminal trials over recent years. These difficulties have been exacerbated by the recent confusing judgment in 2008 of the High Court in *HML*. In this case, the 7 judges delivered 7 different and inconsistent judgments. It is very difficult to identify any clear and consistent statement of the law from *HML*. The Bill addresses this problem.

The Bill provides that, where the evidence of the uncharged acts of past discreditable conduct is adduced for a non-propensity or non-similar fact purpose, then the evidence need only be of sufficient probative value as to substantially outweigh its prejudicial effect. It need not additionally be of strong probative value. In practice, this type of evidence will most usually fall within the category of 'uncharged acts'. Evidence of 'uncharged acts' may be led in any type of criminal case and its use is not confined (as is sometimes supposed) to sexual cases. Such evidence may apply in a wide variety of different circumstances and for various purposes. Criminal charges cannot be fairly or accurately judged in a factual vacuum and, in order for the jury to make a rational assessment of the evidence directly relating to a criminal charge, it may be necessary for the jury to receive evidence, in some detail, of the context and circumstances in which the alleged offences are said to have been committed. In simple terms, evidence of uncharged acts of discreditable conduct is led where, without the evidence, it would simply be impossible to appreciate and weigh the story surrounding the alleged offence. The evidence of the uncharged acts of discreditable conduct, as the Law Commission of England in both its Consultation Paper and Report on the Use of Evidence of Bad Character helpfully noted, is so closely entwined and involved with the evidence directly relating to the facts in issue surrounding the alleged offence that it would amount to distortion to attempt to edit it out.

The potential use of evidence of uncharged acts of discreditable conduct cannot be exhaustively defined. The English Law Commission helpfully noted that there were 4 'indicators' of the type of evidence that fell within what might be termed as evidence of uncharged acts (or 'background evidence' as they described it) and was not subject to the criteria governing the admissibility of similar fact or propensity evidence.

Firstly, the evidence of discreditable conduct may be so close to time, place or circumstances to the fact or circumstances of the offence charged that it would make no sense to try and edit it. This category, the Law Commission Consultation Paper noted, was the *res gestae* type of evidence. The decision of the High Court in *R v O'Leary* (1946) 73 CLR 566 is a leading example of the use of this particular type of evidence.

Secondly, the Law Commission noted that evidence of discreditable conduct may be necessary to complete the account of the circumstances charged and to make it comprehensible to the jury. Such evidence may show the 'background' or 'context' to the charged offence, whether immediately prior to the alleged offence or going back some period in time. It might show that the alleged offence 'did not come out of the blue' and, without such evidence, the facts of the alleged offence would be incomplete or incoherent. The evidence is relevant, as was noted in *Nieterink*, as, without it, the jury could hardly understand the context in which the alleged offences occurred. It may explain other aspects of the case, such as why the victim might have submitted to the acts that are the subject of charge, why the victim did not complain about the alleged abuse, or why the victim acted or behaved in a certain manner.

Thirdly, the accused may have a relationship with the victim and the evidence of previous discreditable conduct may relate to the victim of the alleged offence rather than the victim of other offences. The evidence is not admissible to establish a general criminal disposition or propensity but to show the true nature of the relationship between the parties in a manner that bears directly on the guilt of the accused and/or a fact in issue. Examples of the legitimate use of evidence of uncharged acts of discreditable conduct in this context is provided in cases such as *R v Garner* (1963) 81 NSWLN 120, *R v Hissey* (1973) 6 SASR 280, *R v Wilson* (1970) 123 CLR 334 and *R v Peake* (1996) 67 SASR 297. In particular, in *Wilson* (1970) 123 CLR 334 at 344, Menzies J persuasively reasoned:

It seems to me that here, as so often happens, an attempt has been made to reduce the law of evidence—which rests fundamentally upon the requirement of relevancy, i.e. having a bearing upon the matter in issue—to a set of artificial rules remote from reality and unsupported by reason. Any jury called upon to decide whether they were convinced beyond reasonable doubt that the applicant killed his wife would require to know what was the relationship between the deceased and the accused. Were they an ordinary

married couple with a good relationship despite differences and disagreements, or was their relationship one of enmity and distrust? It seems to me that nothing spoke more eloquently of the bitter relationship between them than that the wife, in the course of a quarrel, should charge her husband with the desire to kill her. The evidence is admissible not because the wife's statements were causally connected with her death but to assist the jury in deciding whether the wife was murdered in cold blood or was the victim of mischance. To shut the jury off from any event throwing light upon the relationship between this husband and wife would be to require them to decide the issue as if it happened in a vacuum rather than in the setting of a tense and bitter relationship between a man and a woman who were husband and wife.

The fourth category of uncharged acts identified by the Law Commission refers to evidence that may assist in establishing motive in an appropriate case. The oft quoted comments of general application of Lord Atkinson in *R v Ball* [1911] AC 47 at 68 illustrates this:

Surely in an ordinary prosecution for murder you can prove previous acts or words of the accused to show that he entertained feelings of enmity towards the deceased, and that is evidence not merely of the malicious mind with which he killed the deceased, but of the fact that he killed him. You can give in evidence the enmity of the accused towards the deceased to prove that the accused took the deceased's life. Evidence of motive necessarily goes to prove the fact of the homicide by the accused, as well as his 'malice aforethought', inasmuch as it is more probable that men are killed by those who have some motive for killing them than by those who have not.

The potential significance of evidence of motivation is not confined to cases of murder.

Though not listed by the Law Commission, it is also clear that evidence of uncharged acts may also be relevant and admissible to assist in showing the requisite intention to make out an alleged offence. The English case of *R v Williams* (1987) 84 Cr App R 299 illustrates where the evidence of the violent history of the accused in relation to the victim was admitted to establish the intention. The accused was charged with threats to kill. The prior evidence was relevant and admissible to show that the threat had been uttered with the requisite intention, had been intended to be taken seriously by the victim and had not been said in jest or temper. The prior history showed that the accused had not been merely 'sounding off'.

The evidence of uncharged acts of discreditable conduct may be relevant in other contexts. Such evidence may rebut a potential defence, such as accident, self defence or provocation, or assist in showing the identity of the offender. It may show the accused's sexual attraction to the victim as in *R v Ball*. [1911] AC 47. Moreover, circumstantial evidence may be admissible although it reveals other criminal conduct. Evidence of previous crimes of the accused may be admissible because it identifies or connects the accused with the commission of the alleged offence. It extends to evidence disclosing criminal or discreditable conduct, such as evidence showing an association with the crime scene or the criminal venture or the possession of equipment which might have been used to commit the crime.

Though, in practice, evidence of uncharged acts of discreditable conduct most often arises in relation to cases of sexual abuse or homicide, the Bill is not confined to such cases. Evidence of uncharged acts under the Bill, as at common law, may apply in other types of cases, such as domestic violence, where the final violent act of the accused may result in a charge of assault or threats but at trial it is impossible to properly understand the nature and context of that final act without reference to evidence showing earlier discreditable conduct. The decision in *R v Garner* (1963) 81 (NSW) WN 120 illustrates this point.

The Bill makes it clear that careful consideration must be given to the purpose for which any discreditable conduct evidence is admitted. The use of evidence of uncharged acts is potentially dangerous because the notion of the relevance of uncharged acts can be rather vague and easily used to admit what otherwise would be inadmissible similar fact or propensity evidence by an extended view of what is to count as relevant as part of the 'background' or 'context' or 'relationship'. The prosecution must give reasonable notice of the purpose for which such evidence is adduced. Rules of Court will be formulated for this purpose. It will be incumbent on the prosecution to give sufficient particularity of the purpose it contends for the admission of evidence of discreditable conduct. If the evidence is adduced to show a particular propensity or disposition of the defendant as circumstantial evidence of a fact in issue, the prosecution must clearly signal that it is advanced for that purpose and describe in sufficient particularity why the evidence is properly relevant and admissible in the particular case for such a purpose. If the evidence is adduced for a non propensity or non-similar fact purpose, the prosecution must still clearly identify the specific and limited purpose for which the evidence is adduced. It is unlikely to be enough for the prosecution to simply assert, without anything further, that the evidence is relevant as part of the background, or to show the relationship between the parties. The prosecution should specify why the background or relationship is relevant and properly admissible in the particular facts and issues of the case. If the evidence of discreditable conduct is admitted for a specific and limited purpose, such as background or for placing events in their context or as part of the relationship, its use is confined under section 34Q to that purpose and it cannot be employed for wider similar fact or propensity purposes, even if it is capable of such a wider application.

The Bill, consistent with *Nieterink* and established judicial practice, makes it clear that, if evidence of discreditable conduct is adduced as 'uncharged acts' and not as a form of propensity or similar fact evidence, then the jury must be explicitly warned that the evidence can only be used for the limited purpose (such as showing background or context or relationship) and cannot be used for a wider propensity or similar fact mode of reasoning (even though it may be capable of such a use). The directions required by the Bill should be simpler and more straightforward than required under the present unclear and complex law. Though it is sometimes asserted that the jury's ability to understand and act on such directions is debatable, such directions are commonplace in criminal trials. The criminal justice system must operate on the basis that the jury will faithfully act on, and follow, such directions. As was noted by the New South Wales Court of Appeal in the case of *R v Milat*:

Ultimately, however, it is the capacity of jurors, properly instructed by trial judges to decide cases by reference to legally admissible evidence and legally relevant arguments, and not otherwise, that is the foundation of the [criminal justice] system.

This theme was developed by McHugh J in *R v Gilbert* (1993) 69 A Crim R 450 at 453-454:

The criminal trial on indictment proceeds on the assumption that jurors are true to their oath, that, in the quaint words of the ancient oath, they hearken to the evidence and that they obey the trial judge's directions. On that assumption, which I regard as fundamental to the criminal jury trial, the common law countries have staked a great deal. If it was rejected or disregarded, no one — accused, trial judge or member of the public — could have any confidence in any verdict of a criminal jury or in the criminal justice system whenever it involves a jury trial. If it was rejected or disregarded, the pursuit of justice through the jury system would be as much a charade as the show trial of any totalitarian state. Put bluntly, unless we act on the assumption that criminal juries act on the evidence and in accordance with the directions of the trial judge, there is no point in having criminal jury trials.

One of the issues that often arises in practice is the standard of proof required in respect of uncharged acts, especially if of a sexual nature. There are also suggestions in some recent cases, notably *HML*, that any uncharged act, especially in a sexual case, must be established beyond reasonable doubt before it can be led or used. The Bill rejects this approach as dogmatic and unhelpful. Evidence of discreditable conduct is a species of circumstantial evidence and, like all circumstantial evidence, need not be established beyond reasonable doubt save, and unless, it forms an indispensable link in the chain of reasoning to guilt. Any universal requirement for an uncharged act to be independently proved beyond reasonable doubt is confusing and would have the effect of even further complicating jury directions in an already complex area of the law. It would have the practical effect of excluding cogent and reliable evidence that is routinely admitted and used, especially in non-sexual cases. Such a universal requirement is, further, a major departure from the established rule identified by the High Court in *R v Shepherd* (1990) 170 CLR 519.

The Bill incorporates the view of the High Court in *Shepherd*. Section 34R(2) provides that, if evidence of discreditable conduct is admitted under section 34P and that evidence is essential to the process of reasoning leading to a finding of guilt, the evidence cannot be used unless on the whole of the evidence, the facts in proof of which the evidence was admitted, are established beyond reasonable doubt, and the trial judge must give a direction to that effect. This accords with past judicial practice.

The Bill confirms the established judicial practice set out in *Nieterink* and many other cases that, if the evidence of past discreditable conduct is admitted for a specific and limited purpose, such as background or relationship that does not involve a propensity or similar fact line of reasoning, then it is incumbent on the trial judge to warn the jury to this effect.

The effect of *Nieterink* is that the jury should be told how they should use the evidence and how they should not use the evidence. The jury has to be told the particular manner in which the evidence could be used. It is contemplated that this can be done relatively briefly. Usually, it will not be enough for the trial judge to speak generally to the jury of the evidence establishing 'background', 'context' or 'relationship' matters. It will be preferable for the trial judge to be quite specific about the proper use of the evidence, both to help the jury to approach the evidence in the correct manner and to reduce the risk of an incorrect approach. The jury should be told that the evidence, if accepted, is evidence of the limited and specific purpose for which the evidence was specifically admitted. Even if the evidence is capable of being used for propensity or similar fact purposes, as will often be the case in practice, the jury must be warned they cannot use the evidence for such wider purposes.

The jury has to be warned quite specifically not to reason, if they accepted the evidence of the uncharged acts of discreditable conduct, that the accused has committed similar offences and that the accused was the type of person who might commit the offence charged and find him or her guilty on that basis. The trial judge should emphasise that generalised reasoning of that sort is not permissible. The jury should be particularly directed to convict only if satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the particular conduct that is the subject of the specific charges the defendant faces has occurred. The jury should be specifically warned not to reason that, as conduct similar to that charged has occurred, they can convict on a particular count.

The Bill recognises, as was observed by the Chief Justice in *Nieterink*, that it is very important that these warnings and directions are given in an appropriate case because of the potential for prejudicial misuse of evidence of uncharged acts of discreditable conduct. The Bill further recognises that it is important for the trial judge to emphasise both the correct and incorrect use of the evidence. If both aspects are not present in any summing up, there is a real risk that the jury will misunderstand their task.

The Bill finally deals with 2 incidental issues.

First, the Bill applies to both the prosecution and the defence. The accused may seek to show that a police officer or the alleged victim has a tendency to act in a certain malevolent manner. The cases of *Knight v Jones; ex parte Jones* [1981] Qd R 98 and *R v Harmer* (1985) 28 A Crim R 35 are examples of such situations. However, it is clear that in deciding whether to exercise its discretion to admit the evidence of discreditable conduct under the Bill, the court, as at common law, will be swayed by the very different nature and purpose of the defence as opposed to the prosecution leading such evidence. The fundamental right to a fair trial will obviously apply. Therefore, in practice, a different test of admissibility will apply as regards the defence. Whilst it is clear that an accused is not entitled to adduce evidence going merely to the credit of a prosecution witness, it is equally clear that an accused is entitled to call, in support of his or her defence in disproof of the prosecution case, any evidence which is properly relevant to an issue and this might include evidence touching on the disposition, character or violent propensity of some other person. Though evidence of a propensity to commit the alleged crime, bad character or prior convictions

cannot be simply led by the prosecution, that is because the policy of the law as to the fairness of a criminal trial and not because such evidence is irrelevant. This policy of exclusion does not apply to the defence. The test of admissibility in such cases for the defence will be more akin to the test of relevance applicable in civil cases. The Bill is not intended to alter this position. The ability of the defence to adduce such evidence will still be considerably wider than the prosecution.

The accused may seek to introduce evidence of discreditable conduct against a third party in criminal proceedings. The case of *R v Button* (2002) 25 WAR 382 provides an illustration of when such evidence could have been properly adduced by A at his or her trial to suggest that B had in fact committed the crimes with which A had been charged. That is appropriate, as it must be possible for an accused A to defend a criminal charge by seeking to prove that the offence was committed, in fact, by another person B. It is logical that A should be able in an appropriate case to lead any evidence tending to prove that the offence was actually committed by B. That would include any discreditable conduct adduced for propensity or similar fact or other purposes which would be admissible in a trial of B. The test for the admissibility of such evidence will not be as high as if the prosecution were seeking to use such evidence. The test will essentially remain as one of relevance having regard to the nature of the facts and issues in the case. To require more of an accused is to interfere with the time honoured principle that it is not for an accused to prove his or her innocence. That is consistent with the usual position that the accused bears no persuasive onus of proof, merely an evidential one.

Secondly, the Bill recognises, in section 34T, the major practical problems that can arise from the defence seeking to use evidence of discreditable conduct against a co-defendant at a joint trial. Such a joint trial may become too entangled and a jury, even if given detailed directions, may be unable to prevent undue prejudice to the co-defendant. In such circumstances, the Bill, confirming and reinforcing existing practice in this area, provides this to be a strong factor to taken into account in the trial judge's existing common law discretion in deciding whether to order separate trials.

Conclusion

Though a variety of other models are used in Australia and elsewhere, it was considered that none of those models was ideal for South Australia. The *Uniform Evidence Act* model arising from the work of the Australian Law Reform Commission that is used in Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory is not without its benefits but that model is also not without its problems and has not met with universal acclaim. There have been very recent suggestions about reforming this model.

The Bill is particular to South Australia and has been the subject of an extensive consultation process with expert input from various interested parties. There was unanimity that the existing law was in need of major reform. It was widely felt that the present law was too complex and difficult to apply in practice and that the test from *Pfennig* and *Hoch* set the bar of admissibility too high and should be modified. It was further widely felt that the position in *Nieterink* usefully reflected what should be the position with regards to evidence of uncharged acts. These features are all incorporated in the final Bill.

In summary, the Bill will enhance the successful prosecution of offenders and improve outcomes for victims of crime in general and, in particular, victims of sexual offences, whilst still maintaining an appropriate balance and ensuring that the defendant's right to a fair trial is not undermined. The Bill is not a dramatic 'shifting of the goalposts' in favour of the routine and unrestricted introduction of evidence of discreditable character. Rather, it is an overdue effort at clarification of a notoriously difficult area of the criminal law in favour of a workable and considered model. The Bill is the product of the extensive consultation process and implements an important election policy in a fair, workable and effective manner that achieves the stated goals of codifying and simplifying this difficult and complex area of the criminal law and allowing, in an appropriate case and with proper safeguards, the greater use of this type of evidence by the prosecution. The conclusion of the Joint Courts Criminal Legislation Committee of the final Bill is telling:

The simplicity of the Bill stands in stark contrast to the present mess. We think it has merit. There is nothing in the wording which requires further comment.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Evidence Act 1929*

4—Insertion of Part 3 Division 3

The new Division (comprising sections 34O to 34T) is to be inserted after section 34N of the *Evidence Act 1929* (the *principal Act*).

Division 3—Admissibility of evidence showing discreditable conduct or disposition

1—Application of Division

The Division applies to criminal proceedings and prevails over any relevant common law rule of admissibility of evidence to the extent of any inconsistency. The Division does not apply to—

- evidence given by an accused person pursuant to section 18 of the principal Act; or
- evidence of the character, reputation, conduct or disposition of a person as a fact in issue.

2—Evidence of discreditable conduct

Discreditable conduct evidence, in the trial of a charge of an offence, is evidence that tends to suggest that the defendant has engaged in discreditable conduct (whether or not constituting an offence) other than the discreditable conduct constituting the offence in respect of which the defendant is on trial. Discreditable conduct evidence—

- cannot be used to suggest that the defendant is more likely to have committed the offence because he or she has engaged in discreditable conduct; and
- is inadmissible for that purpose (*impermissible use*); and
- (subject to this section) is inadmissible for any other purpose.

Discreditable conduct evidence may be admitted for a use (the *permissible use*) other than an impermissible use if, and only if—

- the judge is satisfied that the probative value of the evidence admitted for a permissible use substantially outweighs any prejudicial effect it may have on the defendant; and
- in the case of evidence admitted for a permissible use that relies on a particular propensity or disposition of the defendant as circumstantial evidence of a fact in issue—the evidence has strong probative value having regard to the particular issue or issues arising at trial.

3—Use of evidence for other purposes

This section provides that evidence that under this Division is not admissible for one use must not be used in that way even if it is relevant and admissible for another use.

4—Trial directions

Provision is made in this section for the directions that the judge must give in a trial in which discreditable conduct evidence is admitted.

5—Certain matters excluded from consideration of admissibility

Evidence may not be excluded under this Division if the only grounds for excluding the evidence would be either (or both) of the following:

- there is a reasonable explanation in relation to the evidence consistent with the innocence of the defendant;
- the evidence may be the result of collusion or concoction.

6—Severance

This section makes provision for a defendant to apply for a separate trial where two or more defendants have been charged in the same information, or the severing of charges from an information, where a party proposes to adduce discreditable conduct evidence and the matters that a court must take into account when considering any such application.

Part 3—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

5—Amendment of section 278—Joinder of charges

This amendment is related to the proposed amendments to the *Evidence Act 1929* relating to the admissibility of discreditable evidence and also makes a technical change relating to the definition of *sexual offence* in subsection (4).

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

The transitional clause provides that the amendments to the *Evidence Act 1929* are intended to apply in respect of—

- proceedings for an offence commenced but not determined before the commencement of this clause; and
- proceedings for an offence commenced after the commencement of this clause.

An order made by a court under the *Evidence Act 1929* as in force immediately before the commencement of this clause will remain in force according to its terms.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (TATTOOING, BODY PIERCING AND BODY MODIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:52): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:52): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This particular bill has been a long time coming. This bill will amend the Summary Offences Act 1953 to set out what is and what is not lawful when it comes to tattooing, body piercing and other body modification procedures.

Over the years, alternative forms of body piercing, other than the traditional ear piercing, have become more popular and widely accepted by mainstream society. The practice of permanently altering your body through body modification procedures, such as branding, scarification or implantation, have also become popular.

The bill does not seek to limit the choices of informed adults. However, given the increasing popularity of these procedures and the inherent health risks associated with them, the government believes that the present state of the law is unsatisfactory. It does not go far enough to ensure that minors do not receive seriously invasive piercings or other body modification procedures.

The current law is difficult to apply, so that service providers, parents and police may find it hard to know when the law is broken. It does nothing to protect intoxicated or impulsive adults from undergoing procedures that they may later regret. Accordingly, the bill proposes to set out clearly what procedures can be performed on minors, stipulate what records must be kept, impose a ban on the sale of body modification equipment to minors, and prevent the tattooing or piercing of intoxicated persons. The government believes that these measures strike an appropriate balance between protecting young people from harm and recognising the autonomy and individuality of a young person.

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

Leave granted.

Consultation

This Bill is the culmination of work undertaken by the 2005 Select Committee on the Tattooing and Piercing Industries, subsequent consultation by the Government on the recommendations of the Select Committee, and recent public consultation on a draft Bill.

During consultation on the draft Bill comment was received from over 40 interested parties, including industry workers, government agencies, the Law Society, the Australian Medical Association, the Professional Tattooing Association of Australia, YACSA, the Hepatitis C Council, Environmental Health Australia and the Member for Adelaide.

Although there was broad support for better regulation of the industry, there were objections to some areas of the draft Bill, particularly the proposed age restrictions. All of the submissions received were considered by the Government and a number of the concerns raised have been taken into account in the drafting of the final Bill.

Details of the Bill

The Bill contains a number of measures to better regulate the tattooing and piercing industries, and to better protect the health and well-being of our children.

A major feature of the Bill is the new restrictions on the types of procedures that can lawfully be performed on minors.

The draft Bill that was released for public consultation restricted the piercings that could be lawfully given to minors to earlobe piercing and, with the consent of the minor's parent or guardian, piercing of the eyebrow, nose, navel or other part of the ear. All other body piercings and body modification procedures were prohibited to minors.

What emerged from the public consultation was that, while respondents generally supported a ban on intimate body piercings and body modification procedures for minors, there was broad opposition to the proposed age restrictions for non-intimate piercings.

Piercing of the genitalia, anal region, perineum, nipples or uvula are examples of intimate body piercing. Non-intimate piercings are any other body piercing (other than earlobe piercing), such as piercings of the tongue, cheek, nose, navel, eyebrow and neck.

The majority of respondents felt that 16 and 17 year olds were mature and responsible enough to make their own decisions about obtaining non-intimate body piercings without having to first obtain parental consent. Particularly when a 16 or 17 year old can lawfully drive a car or consent to medical treatment, and could, possibly, be living independently and may, therefore, be unable to obtain the necessary parental consent.

A number of respondents also suggested that minors under the age of 16 should be allowed to get non-intimate piercings if they have the consent of their parent or guardian.

As a result of these concerns, and the clear opposition to the proposed ban on many non-intimate body piercings, the draft Bill was revised. The Bill now before the House imposes clear rules about the performance of body modification procedures or body piercing on minors.

Firstly, the Bill prohibits the performance of body modification procedures, such as branding, scarification, implantation and ear stretching, on minors. This is by analogy with the current law which prohibits the tattooing of any minor under the age of 18 years unless the tattoo is performed for medical reasons by a legally qualified medical practitioner. In both cases, the body is permanently altered.

Secondly, the Bill prohibits the performance of intimate body piercings on minors.

An intimate body piercing is defined in the Bill as the piercing of a person's genitalia, anal region, perineum, uvula or nipples.

The piercing of an intimate area of the body is a seriously invasive procedure that places a minor in a very vulnerable position. Minors should not be subject to inappropriate or indecent contact and the law protects them by prohibiting these procedures, regardless of whether the minor or a guardian purports to consent. This is consistent with the approach taken in Western Australia, Victoria and Queensland.

Thirdly, the Bill introduces a requirement of parental consent for all other body piercings (other than earlobe piercing) if the minor is under 16 years of age. These non-intimate piercings are still an invasive procedure and the Government believes that the minor's parent or guardian should be involved in the decision making process if the minor is under the age of 16 years.

However, 16 and 17 year olds will be able to make their own decisions about getting a non-intimate piercing, such as a tongue, lip, nose, navel or eyebrow piercing. This is consistent with the current age of consent for medical treatment.

The Bill does not propose to restrict earlobe piercing which appears to be widely socially acceptable for children. Although it would be usual for parents to attend with, and consent to the earlobe piercing of a young child, formal evidence of consent and records will not be required.

The Bill provides two ways in which a parent or guardian can give consent for their child to have other non-intimate piercings. They can give consent in person or they can give written consent.

To prevent minors from faking the consent of their parent or guardian there is a requirement that the written consent be in the prescribed form and be verified by statutory declaration, i.e. witnessed by a Justice of the Peace. It will also be an offence to make a false statement or produce false evidence to a person who offers body piercing or body modification procedures.

If, for some reason, a parent or guardian is not comfortable filling in a consent form and getting it witnessed, they still have the option of attending the studio with their child and giving their consent in person.

The Bill also provides that a parent or guardian cannot give consent to a minor undergoing a procedure if they are intoxicated (whether by alcohol or by any other substance or combination of substances). Non-intimate piercings are still an invasive procedure and require fully informed consent. If the parent or guardian is intoxicated, their ability to make an informed and rational decision on behalf of their child may be impaired. The Government does not believe that parental consent given in these circumstances is a valid consent.

Another feature of the Bill, which was supported by a number of respondents, is that it will be an offence for a person to perform a body piercing (other than an earlobe piercing) or a body modification procedure on any person unless the service provider has:

1. entered into a written agreement with the customer setting out the nature of the procedure and the manner in which it is to be carried out;
 2. given to the customer free of charge a copy of the written agreement and prescribed information;
- and
3. if the customer is less than 16 years of age and the procedure is a non-intimate body piercing, received the consent of the minors' parent or guardian either in person or in the prescribed form and verified by statutory declaration.

The prescribed information that will be required to be provided to a customer with the written agreement will be information about the possible health risks associated with body piercing and body modifications procedures.

Just as informed consent to a medical procedure requires information of potential risks etc., the Government believes that it is important that a person's decision to get a body modification procedure or body piercing performed is based on fully informed consent.

Requiring a service provider to enter into a written agreement with a customer ensures both parties are clear about what procedure is to be performed and how that procedure will be carried out. Requiring a service provider to also provide the customer with information about the possible health risks arising from a procedure, ensures the customer can make a fully informed decision.

To further support fully informed decision-making, the Bill makes it an offence for a person to perform a body piercing or body modification procedures on a person who appears to be intoxicated. A defence exists where the service provider can establish that he or she believed on reasonable grounds that the person on whom the procedure was performed was not intoxicated.

When a person is intoxicated (either by alcohol or some other substance) it can impair their ability to clearly look at the consequences of a proposed act and make an informed decision. In many instances, once the person has sobered up, they regret getting the procedure done.

The Government has also taken heed of the concerns raised during the consultation process about the proposed ban on taking deposits and the impact that this would have on businesses. This provision has been removed from the Bill.

In addition, the Bill makes it an offence to sell body modification equipment to a minor or supply body modification equipment to a minor in connection with the sale, or possible sale, of goods.

This offence has been included in the Bill because there will be some minors who will purchase body modification equipment and attempt to perform one of these procedures on themselves or on their peers. Ear stretching is a perfect example of this.

Ear stretching is the process of gradually stretching an ear piercing to accommodate larger size jewellery and can permanently modify the body. There are a number of methods for achieving this such as using a scalpel or dermal punching to create a larger hole at the outset or using a taper to gradually stretch the original piercing.

Tapers are a commonly used method for stretching ear piercings and are widely available for purchase. A ban on the sale of this equipment, or any other equipment designed to be used for the purposes of body modification, to minors prevents unscrupulous operators from selling this equipment to minors so that they can perform the procedure at home.

To support these provisions, the Bill entitles service providers, and the police to require proof of age so as to verify whether a person seeking a service is a minor. It also requires service providers to keep the records prescribed by regulation. It is intended to prescribe a requirement that the service provider keep details of evidence of proof of age produced on request and of evidence of a parent or guardian's consent where that is required. Police will be entitled to enter the premises and inspect these records, as well as make copies of these records.

It is necessary to give police broad powers to ensure that the legislation is properly enforced. The power for police to enter premises and inspect and take copies of records is separate from the powers exercised by environmental health officers to enable the investigation of public health concerns.

As it will be an offence for any person to perform intimate body piercings or body modification procedures on a minor, or to perform these procedures on any person without first entering into a written agreement with the customer, police need to be able to inspect records retained by businesses for the purposes of the Act to ensure that businesses are acting lawfully.

The ability to enter premises at any time and ask a person to produce proof of age also assists police in determining whether a service provider is complying with the legislation.

Because of the risk that some minors will produce false evidence of age, a service provider will have a defence if he or she reasonably relied on proof of age produced by a person who turns out to be a minor.

The Bill does not alter or add to the law about health inspections, which are provided for under the *Public and Environmental Health Act* and are the responsibility of local councils. If a business poses a health hazard, then the council can take action under that Act to require rectification of the hazard and can, if necessary, close the business down until this occurs.

Concerned members of the public should report any suspected hazards to the relevant council for investigation. The Bill does not provide for mandatory codes of practice for these businesses. Instead, guidelines can be published by public-health authorities. For example, the Department of Health publishes hygiene guidelines for skin-puncturing businesses. If these guidelines are ignored and hazards arise, the law already provides a remedy.

Concerns were expressed during the public consultation that over-regulation of the industry, particularly in relation to the performance of non-intimate piercings on minors, would result in an increase in minors performing these procedures on themselves or their peers, or going to backyarders.

The Government believes that the measures contained in the Bill, and existing public health legislation, addresses the majority of the concerns raised in the public consultation process.

Explanation of Clauses

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

4—Substitution of Part 4

This clause proposes to delete the current Part 4 that deals with offences related to tattooing and substitute a new Part 4 that deals with offences in relation to body piercing, tattooing, body modification and related activities.

Part 4—Tattooing, body piercing and body modification

21A—Interpretation and application

This section defines a number of terms for the purposes of the measure and provides that the Part does not apply to body piercing or a body modification procedure performed on a person if the procedure is performed by a medical practitioner for a genuine medical or therapeutic purpose.

21B—Performance of body modification procedures on intoxicated persons prohibited

This section prohibits the performance of a body piercing or body modification procedure on an intoxicated person. The section provides a defence of a belief on reasonable grounds that the person on whom the procedure was performed was not intoxicated. The penalty for an offence against this section is a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for 12 months.

21C—Performance of certain procedures on minors prohibited

This section prohibits the performance of any body modification procedure, and any intimate body piercing procedure, on a minor. The section also prohibits the performance of any other body piercing (other than an earlobe piercing) on a minor who is aged under 16 years without the consent of the minor's parent or guardian.

The section provides for a defence against a charge where evidence of age or parental consent was required to be produced which, despite being false, produced a belief of the defendant that the performance of the procedure was not prohibited. In order to rely on the defence, a person must retain copies of the evidence offered at the time of the alleged offence as proof of age or consent.

The penalty for an offence against this section is a fine of \$5,000 or imprisonment for 12 months.

21D—Pre-conditions to performing certain procedures

This section provides for certain matters to be completed before any body modification or body piercing procedure may be carried out. In relation to all such procedures, the service provider and the customer must enter into a written agreement that contains the prescribed information as to the nature of the procedure and the manner in which it is to be carried out, and the service provider must give to the customer a copy of the agreement and the prescribed information.

In addition, in relation to minors under the age of 16 years proposing to have a piercing other than an intimate body piercing or earlobe piercing, the consent of the parent or guardian must be obtained prior to the procedure being performed by their attendance in person or by provision of the prescribed form verified by statutory declaration.

21E—Sale of body modification equipment to minors prohibited

This section prohibits the sale (including supply linked to a sale) of body modification equipment to minors. Body modification equipment is defined in the section to be equipment designed to be used for the purposes of body modification. The section provides for a defence against a charge where evidence of age was required to be produced which, despite being false, produced a belief of the defendant that person was not a minor. In order to rely on the defence a person must retain copies of the evidence offered at the time of the sale as proof of age. The penalty for an offence against this section is a fine of \$2,500.

21F—Display of information

This section provides that a person who offers, for fee or reward, to perform body piercing or body modification procedures must display prescribed information at the premises where the procedures are offered. The penalty for an offence against this section is a fine of \$1,250.

21G—Record keeping

This section requires a person to retain copies of records of relevant documents under the Part for a period of two years. The penalty for an offence against this section is a fine of \$1,250.

21H—Offence to make false statement or produce false evidence

This section creates an offence to make a false statement or produce false evidence to a person who offers body piercing or body modification procedures in respect of the age of a minor or the consent of

a minor's guardian to the performance of a body piercing or body modification procedure. The penalty for an offence against this section is a fine of \$2,500.

21I—Police powers

This section provides for police powers to enter premises at which tattooing, body piercing or body modification procedures are advertised, offered or performed, and require the production and inspection of records that are required to be kept. A police officer may also require any person present at such premises to provide his or her name, age and address and the details of the procedure the person is seeking at the premises. It will be an offence (attracting a penalty of \$1,250) to hinder a police officer in the exercise of these powers or to fail, without reasonable excuse, to comply with a requirement of a police officer under this section.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

DEVELOPMENT (BUILDING RULES CONSENT—DISABILITY ACCESS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:55): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Development Act 1993. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Since the commonwealth Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (hereinafter referred to as the DD Act) came into force in March 1993, complaints to the Australian Human Rights Commission have shown inconsistencies between the requirements of anti-discrimination law and building law in Australia. This has continued to cause difficulty for the building industry.

In 2000, the commonwealth government amended the DD Act to allow for the development of disability standards for access to premises. In 2001, the Australian Building Codes Board was asked to develop a proposal for technical requirements which could form the basis of these premises standards. Standards were developed and endorsed by the commonwealth House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs. The committee reported to the commonwealth parliament on 15 June 2009.

It is intended that the 2011 version of the Building Code of Australia will incorporate the requirements under the premises standards through identical technical provisions and these will apply to most Building Code of Australia building classes. This includes office blocks, education facilities, retail outlets, entertainment venues and buildings used for commercial activities. The premises standards do not cover detached private residences, apartment blocks and flats which are not used for short-term rent, or a private residence attached to a building of a different classification, such as a caretaker's cottage.

The premises standards set performance requirements and provide references to technical specifications to ensure dignified access to, and use of, buildings for people with a disability. They clarify the general non-discrimination provisions of the DD Act in relation to the design, construction and management of buildings.

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

Leave granted.

Complying with the Premises Standards satisfies the DD Act non-discrimination requirement for the matters covered by the Standards. If a person acts in accordance with the requirements of the Premises Standards, a successful complaint cannot be made in relation to that action under the DD Act. Accordingly, compliance with the Building Code of Australia will ensure the same level of protection. The purpose of the Premises Standards is to ensure greater and dignified access to, and use of, buildings for people with a disability and also provide greater certainty to the building industry, particularly where an applicant is seeking to upgrade or extend an existing building. The Standards set performance requirements and technical specifications for non-discriminatory access and provide a practical and on-going means to improve building access. The Standards achieve this by requiring that all new buildings, as well as upgrades or extensions to existing buildings requiring building approval, meet these Standards.

As a consequence of the national approach to this issue technical amendments to the *Development Act 1993* are required to ensure the legislative framework supports the introduction of the *Disability (Access to Premises—Buildings) Standards 2010* (Premises Standards), prepared under the Commonwealth *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*.

The specific amendments to the Act are:

- Clause 4—includes a new definition of affected part to define the areas of a building that are necessary to provide a person with a disability with a continuous path of travel from the principal pedestrian entrance of the building to the location of the proposed new building work.
- Clause 5—a number of technical amendments to ensure the performance requirements of the Building Code in relation to people with disabilities apply when existing buildings are upgraded.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Development Act 1993*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts a new definition of *affected part* for the purposes of inserted section 36A and the proposed amendments to section 53A. It is proposed that an affected part of a building (in relation to which building work is to be carried out) will be the principal pedestrian entrance of the building and any part of the building that is necessary to provide a continuous accessible path of travel from the entrance to the location of the building work.

5—Amendment of section 53A—Requirement to up-grade building in certain cases

This clause amends section 53A, in relation to the application of subsection (1), by deleting the provision of a prescribed date in the section and replacing it with reference in subsection (1) to a prescribed date that is to be prescribed by regulation.

This clause also amends section 53A(2) of the Act in light of changes to the Building Code relating to access and facilities for people with disabilities. Currently, a relevant authority may require additional building work where prescribed building alterations are undertaken and building access and facilities for people with disabilities within any other part of the building are inadequate. This clause proposes to amend the section so that the relevant authority may, when prescribed building alterations are undertaken, require additional building work in the affected area of the building if the affected area does not comply with the performance requirements of the Building Code. The restriction on the section only applying to buildings constructed before 1 January 1980 is to be deleted.

The clause also inserts a new subsection (3) providing for the regulations to specify circumstances in which a relevant authority may not require building work or other measures, or a specified kind of building work or measure, to be carried out under subsection (2).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the member for Chaffey is keen.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:59): I am chafing at the bit, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have to take that back; that is a dreadful pun!

Mr WHETSTONE: I am a little unsure where I finished up, but perhaps I will start off at the top of my page. What I was looking at is just what is in store for South Australia's water security future. At the moment, we are looking at the water security of Adelaide, in particular, backed up by a \$2.4 billion desal plant. That involves 100 gigalitres of water that is going to underpin Adelaide's water security. To have that \$2.4 billion plant operational and functional here in Adelaide and for the betterment of South Australia, we have the north-south interconnector, which has been a bit of a debacle. There has been a lack of transparency right across the city of Adelaide, given that it is part of the 100-gigalitre plant.

With that plant, we look at the \$2.6 billion running costs over the 20-year period. I think that it is outrageous that we can have that desal plant sitting there, whether it is idle or working, at a cost of \$2.6 billion to the South Australian taxpayer. With that 100-gigalitre desal plant comes some federal funding of \$228 million, but at what cost is that plant coming to the South Australian taxpayer, and at what cost is it coming to the water users of South Australia? Whose water will the government give to offset the \$228 million? That is the question that this government has not yet

answered. That is the question that every water user in South Australia, particularly on the River Murray, is waiting to hear.

The \$228 million will incur a water give-up and that water give-up will obviously come out of South Australia's Murray River allocation. What irrigators are very concerned about is whether it will come off their allocation or off SA Water's allocation. That is the million dollar question. Again, the South Australian government will lose \$212 million in GST revenue to offset that \$228 million.

Where it leads to is increased water bills. We are looking at a 32 per cent increase in water charges. Every South Australian's water bill will continue to increase, and this is what I would like to know: will the plant run to spec for that warranty period to be upheld? Will that plant run at 75 per cent capacity for two years so that that plant will receive warranty? That is the big question. It will cost taxpayers a significant amount of money, in the order of \$130 million per year, while we pump water from the desal plant into reservoirs and into the connector pipe.

What sort of losses are we going to see? As I said previously in my grievance about stormwater, why won't the government look at storing some of that desal water—that very, very expensive desal water—in some aquifer? We have aquifer under Adelaide. We have the expertise, and yet we do not have the will. Again, there are maintenance costs on running the pipeline and the pumps that will pump the water from the desal plant into the reservoirs, circulating it around the interconnecting line. It is coming at a huge cost to South Australian taxpayers; that interconnector pipe is going to cost \$403 million.

While we have got reserves in our reservoirs and we have got reserves in our Murray, we have got a 100-gigalitre desal plant sitting there, creating debt and interest payments with an increased burden on the South Australian taxpayer. Why aren't we looking at cheaper alternative water solutions? Again, this government just continues to ignore good Liberal Party policy with aquifer storage, and in particular, storing that very, very expensive desal water.

What I would like to know, with this government, is who was in charge of negotiations? When they agreed on the 100-gigalitre plant, who was negotiating with the warranty and saying, 'Will it ever rain again?' I am sure that the government thought, 'It is never going to rain again so we are going to put in that extra 50 gigalitres. The taxpayers will pick up the bill.' But there was not any sort of a contingency on how they could actually supply water any more cheaply. As I said earlier, 180 gigalitres of water reportedly runs out to sea every year: outrageous!

Reportedly, SA Water pays huge consultant fees. They pay more and more to their bureaucrats and, at the same time, we do not see any delivery improvements, we do not see storage improvements and where are the dam capacity improvements? That is one of the big issues that South Australia—in particular, Adelaide—are ignoring.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: 'Is'; it is the singular.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, member for Croydon. There are always alternatives to be put on the table. Again, that money could have been better spent on the smaller 50-gigalitre desal plant and, with the offset of the extra 50 gigalitres, that money could have been spent on aquifer storage as a much cheaper form of storing water, obtaining water, recycling stormwater and recycling greywater. It is done all around the world and, as I say, we have the expertise here in this state to do that and yet we continue to run with on-the-run decisions to increase the desal plant to 100 gigalitres, to be a huge burden on South Australian taxpayers. We need to see more initiatives with this precious resource, more efficiencies and wiser use of water, and also wiser use of taxpayers' money when it comes to our water security.

I move on to some of the services in regional South Australia and, in particular, we are looking at the condition of our rural roads. After having our record over 10 million tonne grain harvest, look at what damage has been done to country and rural roads. In particular, a lot of the extra use of those roads was because carriers were given uncertainty through a monopoly in the market. A lot of these trucks are using the roads two and threefold to get the grain to a silo. They do not just go to the silo closest to their farm, they are shopping that grain around, and that has taken a toll on our roads.

What we are seeing is increasing pressure on unsealed roads and increasing pressure on the shoulders of roads. In particular, with the grain harvest, we see a very trying vintage this year, and all that increased pressure on our roads has taken its toll. To date, we are seeing less and less funding put toward those roads by our state government. We continually see increased support from federal government, but the state government is relying on that federal government money.

I would like to talk a little bit about country health and, as it was advised at question time today, we are watching the South Australia government build the new RAH at the rail yard site at a revised cost, reportedly, of \$2.73 billion. We need good hospitals and we need good people to man those hospitals, but at the same time we are watching country hospitals and services continue to decline, with our staff, our specialised services and the infrastructure deteriorating.

Members interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: I hear members interjecting on the other side. I just wonder how long since they have paid a visit to a country hospital and had to use country hospitals in time of need, not just visiting to see what is going on, just to go there—

Members interjecting:

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes; but did you visit that hospital for need or did you visit it as a passing tourist? That is the question. We need doctors and nurses to man these health stations. At the moment, we see doctors and nurses in the regions working long hours. They are given no incentive to stay there. They are addressing increased pressures and they are on call almost 24 hours a day, seven days a week. That is the way doctors work in the regions because the doctors have to because they need to be there to uphold the health system. What we are looking at on the other side is: why would a doctor want to work in a country hospital when they are looking at an antiquated hospital and facility when they could live in Adelaide and practise in a new hospital? There is no balance.

What we are seeing is a \$2.73 billion hospital in Adelaide, and every hospital in Adelaide is overcrowded. We are not looking at any more beds; we are just looking at shiny rooms, shiny floors and recliner chairs. On the other side, we go to country hospitals and we have empty rooms and empty beds. The government needs to be looking at how it can actually move city patients to country hospitals to utilise those services. That would offset the pressure on the budget.

Also, to revamp the existing RAH could have been a much cheaper and simpler exercise. Those savings on upgrading the existing RAH could have been put to great use in all other hospitals, not just in the regions, not just in the country but every other hospital in South Australia could have benefited. But, no, this government had to have a shiny trademark hospital down at the rail yards there, with no extra beds, with more recliner chairs but of no benefit to every South Australian. Again I say that we are looking for a structured balance.

Looking at police, at the moment, we see metropolitan police from Adelaide coming up into the regions on a revenue-raising exercise. They do not come up there for any other reason. The police come up to the regions and they have a blitz on the roads and, next minute, they are pulling over constituents with paint coming off the bonnets and pulling over constituents with dirty numberplates. Why are those resources not put to better use fighting crime, instead of revenue raising? It is absolutely outrageous.

Again, we look at the government focusing on revenue raising and not crime. We are looking at centralising services and, to me, it is just an outrageous, shortsighted exercise. Again we look at revenue raising by means of fines, but we do not look at giving good service.

Time expired.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:12): As we do every year, it is necessary for a Supply Bill to be passed to ensure that the government departments and agencies will receive funding to cover their budgets for the start of the 2011-12 financial year until the budget is passed through the parliament, but I just want to digress a little.

The revelation today during question time is shocking news indeed. The single biggest budget project right now is the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and to hear that the cost has now blown out from \$1.7 billion to \$2.73 billion is a state disgrace. I do not think it has sunk in yet what a grave day this is and what the repercussion of that is for the state and for us here in this place as politicians. The government has lost total control of this major project.

Add to this the \$535 million cost of the Adelaide Oval upgrade and who knows what that final cost will be, realising that the sporting codes are supposed to find that gap, but I bet they do not. That adds up to a total of almost \$4 billion. Add this to all the other rising state debts that we have and the huge interest bill we are paying—almost \$2 million a day—what will our state debt be in March 2014?

We know what happened in 1993 with the State Bank, and I think the situation is going to be worse. What chances do we have that the state government will provide a new Barossa hospital at \$50 million to \$70 million? I did appreciate the member for Mawson who, in his role as parliamentary secretary of health, visited last week. I heard what he had to say a few moments ago, and I commend him for his words and also for coming up and being very open and transparent about what was happening and what he was looking at. I do appreciate it. I also throw out an invitation to all ministers. I note, too, that the Deputy Premier was up there last week. I really did appreciate his visit to address a large gathering on planning, and he made some fairly controversial comments. I say good on him because I would agree, I think, with almost all of them.

He chucked out the challenge to me sitting in the gallery. We had a private discussion in front of 80 people, and I just said, 'Well, okay, you put out the challenge and I will make sure that, when the time comes, we will address this, because what you are saying might be controversial and radical but, in the end, we probably do not have any choice. We have got to make a stance. We have got to do that.'

As a person who has been here for 20 years, I am prepared to bite the bullet and do it for my constituency, even if it means having to agree with a Labor minister, but I will do that if it brings the right result. I commend both members for going up there, and I think that both days were very, very fruitful; and I note today that they got very good coverage in the local media. I kept out of it, you will notice, and that was a deliberate tack.

Anyway, I look forward to the results that will bring. I am just concerned about what will happen by March 2014. What will the people of South Australia do at the next state election? The debt will be bigger than the State Bank debt which led to the routing of Labor in 1993. I was here in 1993. It was my first general election, having come into this place as a result of a by-election in 1990.

In 1993 it was my first election, and I observed the total routing of a government. It left them with 10 seats. If you look over there, members of the government, if there are 10 seats, will yours be one of them?

Ms Bedford: Will yours be one of them?

Mr VENNING: No, I will be there. Mine is not at any risk at all. I just say to you: there is time for members to do certain things. There is no-one to blame but yourself because you are the government. We are the management of South Australia. If you allow this sort of thing to continue on, individually you will pay the price at the election, and there is nothing surer than that.

When you get a swing like that, very few people survive. I just have regrets, because in 1993 the then Liberal government could have formed its own opposition. I actually sat on this side of the house in government. I had a team of 11 people here with me and we could have been the opposition—could have. I put the idea up.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Piccolo): I heard that you were, Ivan.

Mr VENNING: Well, I was sitting on the crossbench on this side of the house, and I had some very notable figures with me, including an ex lord mayor. We were going to do wondrous things. Seriously, it is not great and it is not smart to win elections by that majority, as the new Premier of New South Wales will find out. It is not good for the state for any party to dominate like that, but that is what I fear will happen. I think that is very much a possibility.

I say to people that I am just sad because there are some good members opposite, but I just cannot understand the slogan or the notion that is continually pushed around that Labor cannot manage finances, even with us being the highest-taxed state in Australia. A lot of you would not like that tag (I wouldn't), but what are you doing about it? Let's prove that you are a modern government. I know that the Premier has changed his tack completely on mining, particularly on Roxby Downs. What we are seeing there now is magnificent, and you would never believe that he was actually opposed to that venture in this place. He called it a mirage in the desert. Now it is a positive reflection. He has certainly come a long way.

Ever since the Labor government returned to power in March 2010 there has been increasing evidence that South Australians are far from happy with their performance, and this includes their usual supporter base, the trade union movement. We have all seen numerous demonstrations and rallies here at Parliament House—people fiercely protesting against the decisions imposed by the Rann government, including last night, of course, at the Burnside town hall.

In the past 30 years I do not recall any government arousing such negative sentiments amongst the people. I do not believe that Labor really should have won the state election in 2010. We are now assured, as I said, of a real routing, à la New South Wales, at the election in 2014.

People are sick and tired of the waste of Rann Labor and their blatant disregard for South Australians—the taxpayers who are funding this financial mismanagement machine. I am sure that many who have joined in the rallies in support of various causes have probably never done so before in their lives—and many who were there last night said that on the radio this morning. Their anger at this government is palpable. People have had enough.

Earlier this year, for the second year in a row, South Australians have been ranked as having the highest taxes in the nation. Tax revenue has increased 75 per cent since the government came to office in 2002. The Institute of Public Affairs State Business Tax Calculator calculates the level of state and territory governments' taxes on business. Its most recent report released on 10 January shows that South Australian taxpayers pay more than double the state and territory average on land tax.

I think that land tax is an insidious thing. I know it affects many of us—it does me, personally, and I have already spoken to various people about that. I am lucky that I live where I live, but I could be staying across the road much more cheaply than living in my own house if I did not have to pay land tax, and it is choking the rental market severely. Land tax revenue has quadrupled under the Rann Labor government, and we are all feeling the pain.

What is it doing to the rental market? I wonder if that has been calculated. I note the ex-treasurer is sitting with us today. People will not invest in rental houses with this impost, and only he would know that. He has done well to maintain the state's credit rating and I wonder how long it can be held, particularly under a new treasurer.

South Australia's poor ranking shows how out of touch and arrogant the Rann Labor government has become. They released a slash and burn budget in September last year, cutting small funding commitments such as \$300,000 to the Keith Hospital (which will ensure its closure) in an effort to find savings, and now it has become evident that we are still the highest taxed state or territory in the nation. The new treasurer has warned this year's budget will be just as bad. How on earth could it possibly get any worse?

South Australians are seeing funding cuts to the hospitals, and a proposal to sell off our timber industry which has generated \$46 million this year for state revenue. There have been cuts to our tourism budget. Pension increases have been absorbed by cancelling public housing rent assistance for pensioners. There have been extensive public sector redundancies. The list goes on and on. But, at the same time, we see taxes and charges increase. No doubt they will increase again in this year's budget. We are told to expect a shock budget from both the federal and state governments, so heaven help us.

One area of cuts that I feel very strongly about is the cuts being made to agriculture, and it has been very well portrayed to the house by my colleague the member for Hammond (the shadow minister). It was bad enough for 179 PIRSA jobs to be axed and funding slashed for research and development activities in last year's budget, but now we learn that funding will be cut to the Advisory Board of Agriculture, a body that has had a record of providing governments of all persuasions with good, unbiased advice on agriculture matters for the past 123 years. I served on that board for 10 years and I served several Labor ministers, including Frank Blevins and Lynn Arnold, and I thought it was very worthwhile.

Also, today we hear the Premier in this house standing up and proudly telling us how well we have done in the export market and how we rank as the best in Australia on our exports. What is that in relation to? It is mainly the grain market—we have had a great year on the farm for our grain growers, and that is great because it is good for the region, but what about returning some of the finances back to the state so we can have better roads, better hospitals and better schools? We want something back. The notion of country people is that if you live north of Gepps Cross, south of Darlington or beyond the tollgate you get ignored, and that is pretty true.

We have had all these cuts, yet the total estimated revenue of 2010-11 increased by \$52 million in the three months since the delayed budget was handed down in September. However, spending also increased to \$156 million during this time so we ended up down by \$104 million. In October the then treasurer said during estimates committee hearings:

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

He is dead right, and 10 points go to him for having the courage to say so, but it is a pity he is not there to address that. No doubt he will watch with a fair bit of interest in the months ahead.

Labor continues to underestimate revenue collection each year, and from 2002-03 to 2009-10 they collected a massive \$5 billion more than they expected. The question is: where has all this revenue gone? Let us look at some of the recent examples of the expenses of the Rann Labor government that everyday South Australians are paying for. There is a \$792 million commitment to 12 ministerial offices for its fit-outs and lease agreements for the future. Every time this figure is written I ask my researcher, 'Is that figure correct? Is \$792 million correct?' She assures me that it is and, on checking, it is—\$792 million.

There is a new \$1.7 billion hospital that has now increased to \$2.73 billion. The cost to the government is at least \$1,000 million more than projected. We know that the original figure is already out of date. The Labor government knew at the last election that it was already \$100 million behind, but they failed to admit that to the people prior to the 2010 election. Given the record of the government, I would expect that figure to blow out even further. Well, it has. What hope does the Barossa Valley have of ever getting a badly needed new hospital under this government when so much money is being wasted on a new facility in the rail yards? The RAH could have been upgraded for a lot less where it is. It is economic mismanagement at its worst and it will drain the resources out of the health budget for years to come.

As I said, there are blowouts in the Adelaide Oval project, before it is even voted on by the members—\$450 million was initially promised, not a penny more. Now we are seeing that increased to \$535 million, and what guarantee do we have that it will not continue further? The desal plant is \$1.83 billion and counting. One can only guess how much this will blowout. At the same time, we will all be slugged an extra 32 per cent per kilolitre for our water. The desal plant is twice as big as it needed to be. Labor went from a no desal policy to a double-size policy—poor management, bad decision.

There are 1,500 brand-new plasma TVs for our prisoners, at a cost of nearly \$1 million. There is \$490,000 for remodelling the Minister for Transport's office. There is nearly \$250,000 remodelling the Premier's CEO's office in the last two years. There are ministerial office costs of \$35 million per year. There are 212 spin doctors and other staff. Under the Rann Labor government the number of spin doctors and other ministerial staff has increased by about 100 staff in just eight years. The Premier's department has also grown by almost 500 since 2005, increasing from 630 full-time positions to 1,158. I cannot believe the state of South Australia could even consider having that many people in the department, and a lot of them spin doctors.

The Rann Labor government recently gave up the rent-free property the government utilised in Walkerville, which was used by the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure, in favour of renting a property in the CBD at a cost of \$137,000 per week, signing a 12-year lease. What is the logic in that and who made that decision? I would really like to know who made that decision. It would not be any member in here. Somebody out there made that decision and I would like to know whether they were given a direction to do that. It is crazy business. That amounts to \$86 million extra that the government will pay in rent over the life of the lease. On top of that, the minister is now seeking cabinet approval for a \$13 million refit of those premises—another lazy \$13 million. That would go a long way to getting the Barossa hospital started.

The much-hailed Shared Services initiative, heralded to save the government millions by centralising payroll, has failed miserably. It has now cost over \$100 million, compared to an initial budget of \$60 million—a totally inept decision. That is not to mention the cost of South Australia's activities in Puglia.

A recent report by the Centre for Independent Studies found that South Australia has the worst financial ranking of any state in Australia because of high taxes and poor controls on government spending. No wonder, when you look at some of the examples that I have just discussed, the report shows the government is spending \$9,329 per head of population to provide services. That is \$668 per annum more than any other state. Expenditure on government expenses is even worse. South Australia is well above the average of all the other states, averaging \$8,861.

The government continues to cut support from PIRSA and the department of agriculture. Particularly after what the Premier said today—I was very proud to hear of the export performance of the state. It was very good.

Ms Chapman: Except fish.

Mr VENNING: Except fish. It was a very good performance. Consider how well the grain farmers did last year with the problems that we had. A lot of the problems started in this place by upsetting grain marketing and the problem we had with our now Canadian-owned operator, which is presently the subject of three inquiries—in spite of all that, the farmers did well. They had a good crop, managed the weather very well, and we returned that in spades to the state's economy. What recognition do we get for that from the government? How about some money for some of these roads? Some of the major roads in the Mid North are still dirt roads; it is shocking. The Gomersal Road has just been resealed, which it needed. For two years it was just a mass of potholes.

Many cuts are badly hurting the agriculture sector, particularly, as I said, the Advisory Board of Agriculture. I think it was pretty mean spirited of this government to attack it. Never in my time have I heard the Advisory Board of Agriculture attack the government—never. It was one of those no-noes. I said in a press release this week that I think it is time it did. It should be fighting for its survival. As Frank Blevins would tell you, he got very good advice from his board, as did Lynn Arnold, and the man who is sitting here would remember that because he was an adviser at the time.

I look back at those times with a fair bit of favourable memory. Many board members get a very minute sitting fee and a travelling fee. Most of them would be well out of pocket by sitting on the board. They are taken not from political bodies but from agricultural bureaus across the state, and they are not political. I reckon that decision is a shocker, and I wonder whether it is too late to reverse it. I did raise this matter with the minister, and I am sure he has been given pretty poor advice.

Finally, with all this negative discussion in my speech today—I do not like being negative; I am a naturally positive bloke, which most people would know—I put it to the government that it is not too late to reverse some of these things—it isn't. If some of you people who are in marginal seats want to survive, I think it is time you started throwing your weight around in caucus and reversed some of these decisions.

The opposition is not always wrong. On the decisions of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, we are not always wrong. On the decisions of the Adelaide Oval, we are not always wrong. With the oval, I would leave it exactly like it is, maybe build the bridge, but I certainly would not spend that sort of money.

Time expired.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:33): It is a privilege to rise and speak on behalf of the people of Adelaide about the Supply Bill, which I support, but I ask that the government give due consideration to some of the most important and pressing issues facing the Adelaide electorate. First, I turn my attention to the educational needs of the Adelaide electorate.

Adelaide High School is the only public secondary school in the Adelaide electorate and has had significant pressure for many years from parents wanting to enrol their children; so much so that at some stages up to 500 students have been on a waiting list and now even sibling rights for special entry students have been removed to curb demand. To my knowledge it is also the only public school gazetted not to have to accept students who live in its zone.

Under the government's 30-year development plan, the city's population would increase by 11,000 people. This will only exacerbate the problem, not to mention the TOD at the old Clipsal site that will also put pressure on numbers at Adelaide High School. Currently, there are six public primary schools and only one public secondary school in the Adelaide electorate. That is not satisfactory.

On Tuesday 16 March 2010, only days before the election, in a last-minute effort to save the seat of Adelaide the government announced an expansion of Adelaide High School student numbers by 2013. It stated:

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

I call on the government to look to the future, not the short term. The 250 extra places for Adelaide High School will not even bring it into line with the state asset management plan benchmarks that were given to DECS in June 2001 which indicated at the time that the building area, identified as 10,471 square metres, equated to a shortfall of space for approximately 226 students. Based on

current figures, this would now be a shortfall of 329 students. How will the government's proposed extra 250 places solve this problem? This is a piecemeal, half-hearted attempt to address the issue.

It was also in the same press release that it was stated that the expansion would not encroach on the Parklands. However, as a member of the Adelaide High School governing council, of the five proposals that have been put forward to us for the expansion, four of these encroach onto the Parklands and the fifth option requires the knocking down of a heritage building. Thus, it is extremely unlikely that there will be any approval to expand the existing site.

Noting that Adelaide High School is already over capacity by 329 students and numbers are increasing yearly, by adding Prospect and Walkerville the demand could increase by up to a further 650 students. Thus, by 2013, Adelaide High School will require another 800 places. There is an urgent need for another public high school in our inner north. Every child is entitled to have a local education. The proposed super school at Gepps Cross is not what the people of Adelaide want, and the people of the Adelaide electorate let the previous member for Adelaide know their displeasure with this idea at the last state election.

After calling every primary school in my electorate, only 12 of the 212 grade seven students who graduated last year chose to go to the Roma Mitchell super school, their designated 'in zone' school. Instead, last year's grade 7s across my electorate are so starved for a suitable public high school with room that they are scattered across 16 public high schools. This is quite amazing as there are only 40 high schools in the entire Adelaide metropolitan area. This separates them from their friends and community and means that parents are less likely to be involved with the school due to distance and time available.

Anecdotal evidence from talking to schools and constituents shows that families will do whatever it takes to get their child into a decent school, even driving from Prospect to Glenunga every day or temporarily moving into an area to gain enrolment. This is an unsatisfactory solution, or non-solution, and needs urgent attention and correction. This is not about Liberal or Labor or which party holds the seat of Adelaide, this is about the needs of our children, our future and the clear and defined unquestionable need for a second high school in the inner north city area.

Another concern I have is the lack of commitment to stormwater harvesting. I call on the government to act and commit to the innovation of stormwater harvesting by supporting the Eastern Region Alliance, being a cooperative of seven suburban councils: the city councils of Burnside, Campbelltown, Norwood, Payneham and St Peters and the city councils of Prospect, Tea Tree Gully, Unley and Walkerville.

The Eastern Region Alliance seeks to create a scheme for the capture, storage and distribution of urban stormwater within the eastern metropolitan region of Adelaide to enable a secondary source of water and to reduce the councils' reliance on mains water. They have already spent \$65,000 of their own money for a study, and they have now received a federal grant to undertake a feasibility study which will be ready by December of this year. The Eastern Region Alliance is seeking funding of \$6 million (just 18 per cent of the total projected cost of \$33 million) to make stormwater capture a reality.

Another area of concern is Rundle Mall, the premier retail centre in the heart of Adelaide, home to over 700 retail speciality stores, 200 service providers and 15 unique arcades and shopping centres. This precinct employs around 5,000 people and is visited daily by thousands of the 110,000 city workers and 50,000 students who earn or learn in the city, as well as thousands of tourists each year. I believe it needs the assistance of the state government to return this important tourist attraction to its former glory.

I ask this government: why would a new business choose to start operation in South Australia? What incentive does this government offer for businesses to grow and prosper? How many businesses are we losing to other states due to our unfair, uncompetitive and punitive state tax regime?

Adelaide Oval: I cannot comprehend why the Adelaide Oval development is at the entire risk and cost to the South Australian taxpayer and how we are now expected to have only one oval in the state, after 40 years of having two ovals, when we are expecting an increase in population. It appears that this oval may satisfy the needs of cricket and football, but what about the hundreds of other sports that desperately need funding and clubs that encourage grassroots sports throughout the state?

I give the example of the North Adelaide Basketball Club, which has 53 teams operating out of Hillcrest and which, for around six months, due to water damage was operating using one court. I am happy to note that they got their second court back only two weeks ago. I contacted Basketball SA and asked whether they had requested a four-court stadium at the Gepps Cross Super School, thinking this would be a perfect location for a sporting hub with The Pines hockey stadium and the velodrome nearby. They had made this request and, even though the school is built on the State Sports Park land, only two courts were built and they are not accessible to the public.

Indoor basketball courts can be used by a multitude of sports, including netball, volleyball, badminton, table tennis, indoor soccer, gymnastics and karate. I also note that the majority of the school halls built with the BER money were built at 75 per cent size and therefore are not suitable for competition, which is a crazy waste of money. I believe we need a balanced approach to all sports in this state, not just to the two most profitable sports with the highest-paid players.

Members opposite may be interested to know that 301,600 South Australians, or 30 per cent of the adult population, are involved in organised sports. Approximately 90 per cent are never paid a cent for playing, coaching or administering their chosen sport, and 80,000 South Australians actually participate in sport or active recreational pursuits at least once per week. Football is at the very bottom of the top 10 activities for South Australians and cricket does not even make it on the list. More South Australians swim than play cricket and football combined. For South Australian children, more girls play netball than boys play AFL, and more boys play soccer than AFL.

The State Strategic Plan mentions increasing participation in sports, yet it allocates around \$1.7 million per annum for all sporting facilities, with a fifty-fifty matching of funds, but will give away \$535 million to spectator sports with no matching of funding required—\$535 million for a place that might hold one game per week and would seat 50,000 South Australians, if we are lucky, which is an increase of only 12,000. For that money, we could house the 1,200 people with severe disabilities who are desperate for supported accommodation, or build a new high school that is desperately needed.

Where are this government's priorities? Front-line social welfare services are under siege, with some no longer operational. For example, financial counselling services for Families SA clients have been axed, putting pressure on NGOs. Byron Place, which provides essential services for the homeless, has lost its funding to provide case management, and the Women's Library in North Adelaide has been closed to the public. I believe these mean-spirited cuts to services or, in some instances, the death of services, is all in an effort to pool together money for the Adelaide Oval taxpayer bequest to two wealthy organisations. It is a shameful sorry state of affairs.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (16:43): I am very concerned about the state finances as we consider this Supply Bill. I am particularly concerned about the short term but also about the long term. I want to focus initially on the issue of the hospital.

We have had the startling revelation today, as a result of questions from the leader and the shadow treasurer, that the hospital project could cost us up to \$2.7 billion or more simply for the capital build, let alone the operating contract. If that is correct, then the cost to the state taxpayers over the 29-year life of the project is likely to be many, many billions of dollars more.

This is like a car hire purchase agreement. You buy it at a set cost, and by the time you have paid, on an annualised basis, the financing of that build, over the life of the project you have paid many, many billions more than the original build cost. You buy a car for \$50,000, you might finish up paying \$150,000 over the life; it is a similar sum.

I believe that the parliament and the public need to see the details of this financial arrangement before the contract is signed. What we have heard is that the government intends to sign up to this complicated financial arrangement on our behalf and only then, after the deal is done, reveal the details to which we are committed. The point was made in parliament earlier today that we, and our grandchildren, will be paying for this up to 35 years from now. This thing is due to open some time around 2016; 29 years after that we will still be paying for it. How will we fund that annualised payment out of the health budget, with pressures continuing to grow, and ensure that we can adequately remunerate doctors and nurses where the cost-drivers for health are now, and will continue to be, in the years going forward?

Unlike a toll road—or even a desalination plant, dare I say—there is not a product that comes from this hospital for which there is an income. You are not able to charge and therefore

recuperate the costs of the annualised financing payments. You are running a hospital, and I fear that this hospital is going to be a rod for this state's back for many years to come.

As we have heard, the current Premier, the former treasurer and the current health minister will not be here over this period to pay the bills. If I was them I would be quite concerned, because in 2002 this government set out to reform itself and to defeat the legacy it had carried for the preceding eight years; a legacy in which it bankrupted this state as a result of dodgy financial transactions orchestrated by the State Bank, that left this state with a debt in excess of \$11 billion, a significant proportion of which was due to the State Bank collapse.

They claimed that they were setting out to rebadge themselves as responsible financial managers. The reason I would be concerned, if I was any one of the aforementioned members, is that there is a risk that, as this thing turns into the biggest lemon we have ever seen in financial terms—I have no doubt that it will be a nice hospital but the financial cost of it may be something we regret for years to come—that they will be saddled with the legacy of having left us a financial time bomb.

It may not seem on the scale of the State Bank, but I can assure you it is a very significant amount of money that we will have to pay. I draw members' attention to the arrangements entered into on a much smaller scale in Mount Gambier, to build the hospital down there. Just add up what you will be paying each year to pay for the capital build, and then for the operating costs of this hospital, and you start—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You have to service capital to cover it anyway, it is no different.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am advised by bankers that they are laughing themselves all the way to the bank over some of these public-private partnerships that have been entered into by state governments around the country. Some of them, in New South Wales and Queensland—New South Wales, in particular—have been an absolute farrago. It is a very simple equation, because what these consortia do is go and borrow money on international debt markets at set rates which are, at present, very, very low, and then lock in, through the contracts process, an independent rate of return on that borrowing which is well in excess of their borrowing costs.

It is very simple. You go out there and borrow \$2.7 billion at 1 per cent or 2 per cent, and they are the sorts of rates that money is available at, at the moment, and you lock in an average rate of return on that borrowing of something like 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12 per cent from the taxpayers for each of the next 29 years. It is a great way to make money. These consortia deal with the risks that might be associated with the capital build at the outset.

We are going to be denied access to all of this information as this secret contract is entered into and then given to us as a *fait accompli*. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I have called for the government to provide these details to the Public Works Committee, and I would like to see that done before financial close.

I find the government's argument, firstly, that there is a commercial-in-confidence or financial imperative in not disclosing, very questionable indeed. You have a preferred contractor, you have entered into a deal. The deal is supposedly agreed to. You just need to sign on the dotted line. I see no reason why that cannot be subjected to some public scrutiny before you sign.

As importantly, I find the current Treasurer's position that he has secret crown law advice that says he does not have to send it to public works highly doubtful. As the Premier himself once claimed, when he was leader of the opposition, all crown law are the government's lawyers. It is only a legal opinion. I know why he does not want to table it. He does not want to table it because I am sure it is based on a loophole that defies the letter of the act rather than the intent of the act.

The right and proper thing to do would be to send this to the Public Works Committee for scrutiny before the deal is signed because it is not too late. It is not too late for the government to turn away from this high-risk project and go back to a far more affordable model which is to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital where it is now.

You went to the election saying this would only cost \$1.7 billion; it is clearly going to cost more in terms of the capital cost than that, up to \$1 billion more, and if you really spelled out the facts to the people of South Australia, they would know that it might be anything up to \$11 billion or \$12 billion if you added up the cash payments that will be made over the 29-year life of the project, and that is just for the capital build, let alone the operating cost.

For a much more affordable price for the taxpayer, you could give us a world-class hospital where it is. It is not too late. Scrap the project; stop it. Admit you were wrong. Do not put a rod in our back; rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Yes, we will have fun with it for six months. Of course it will have been a backflip, but you will not give us a 29-year legacy of unaffordable lease payments on a hospital that arguably goes beyond what is needed.

We could have had a very good world-class hospital based around what we have. It is a potential State Bank-type farrago that sadly, as far as the Premier, the former treasurer and the current health minister are concerned, for them may ultimately become their legacy, because it will be stripped bare if there is a change of government on March 2014, let me tell you, and the full facts and details of the contract will be exposed. It will be hung around their necks for the rest of their professional careers as their legacy to this state.

I would be very concerned about that hospital, and I would go as far personally as to say, in my opinion, it is such an important matter that this house should consider putting this Supply Bill on hold until the facts are resolved. If ever there is an issue that should result in a major fight between the opposition and the government, this is it. Questions were asked about the State Bank farrago when the information first started to come in, and they were dismissed by the Labor government of the day. It turned out that all of the concerns were right. There are serious concerns about this project.

I want to move on to some other issues, and this in particular is to do with the absolute cynicism of decisions made by this government in the two years leading up to the last budget, particularly the 18 months leading up to the budget. I refer to what I badged as the 'dirty dozen' projects. They are a dirty dozen of projects and I just want to remind the house what this government did.

In the 18 months leading up to this state election and in the two years leading up to the state budget, during most of that period, they knew a horror budget was coming. In fact, they had formed a Sustainable Budget Commission back in June 2009 to address the very issue of slashing the budget to the bone, saying that we needed three quarters of a billion dollars' worth of cuts and then ultimately looking for 1½ billion dollars' worth.

They knew we were in tough times. They knew there would be cuts coming, but what did they do? They approved 12 very expensive projects to relocate departments into plush and grand new offices, all of which could have either been cut back in scope, put on hold altogether or certainly had economies extracted from them. Let me run through those projects for you, because I want it on the record. First, the Environment Protection Authority/environment and heritage relocation, a refit-out cost of \$5.4 million, signed up to an annual rent of about \$1.7 million, \$419 per metre square over 15 years, which is \$36 million worth of rent.

The University City Program: refit University College London, \$4.1 million fit-out cost. The trade and economic development department moved at a fit-out cost of over \$5 million into plush new digs in the Conservatory Centre, \$1.6 million other 10 years, plus GST of 4 per cent, \$35 million worth of rentals out of Terrace Towers—plush offices already.

When we were in government every minister wanted to be there they were so good. Two other ministers have stayed there but they were not good enough for the Department of Trade and Economic Development. They moved. Then fit-out works involving the Department for Families and Communities, the LMC and the SA Industrial Relations Commission, again, to the Riverside building, \$12.2 million worth of fit-out costs, and we have signed a lease of \$6.5 million over 12.5 years, with GST of 3.5 per cent—\$105 million worth of lease payments. Some of the rates per square metre we are paying here, particularly for the DTED and DTEI moves, are amongst the highest in the city and well above the mean average.

Under the Premier's department, the SA Film Corporation's relocation to Glenside campus, \$42.9 million worth of capital works. The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure has relocated to 77 Grenfell Street, \$13 million worth of capital works, and it has signed at a rate of \$447 per square metre and a lease over 12 years at \$7.16 million, with GST of 3.5 per cent compounding—\$115 million worth of rent.

The Old Parliament House refurbishment, which has not come to the Public Works Committee, involves a large amount of money. Correctional Services, \$5.3 million worth of fit-out costs, exorbitant rent of \$15.8 million over 10 years. The Public Trustee relocated from Franklin Street to Victoria Square, \$6.3 million worth of fit-out costs, \$20 million worth of rent over 10 years.

The Attorney-General's Department, a refit of \$5 million. Again, \$61 million worth of rent to be paid over 10 years.

The police department relocation, \$38 million worth of fit-out costs, \$9.5 million over 15 years. That is \$203 million, including \$3,840 per car park at an annual rental for 84 car parks, plus an annual increase of 3.5 per cent. There are some very happy developers in town. SafeWork SA, \$7.7 million for the World Park relocation at Richmond Road, signing up for \$1.8 million of rent over 10 years (\$23.8 million). All this adds up to just short of \$800 million, signed up and agreed to by this cabinet (and mostly put through Public Works) in the 18 months to two years leading up to the election and this horror budget. It was a spending spree, an absolute spending spree.

I can imagine the conversations in cabinet. They would have gone along the lines of, 'Gentlemen, ladies, if you want your expensive departmental office moved, get it in before the election, because we are planning to cut \$750 million to \$1.5 billion out of about the budget. We're going to cut public servants, cut their conditions, close country hospitals and small schools. We're going to cut services to the disabled and to other areas of need. But it's alright, you can spend \$800 million on flash office rebuilds,' some of which are an absolute disgrace.

Any one of those projects could have been trimmed back, deferred or put off knowing that tough times and tough decisions were coming, but where did this government put its priorities? In flash ministerial offices and in building new Taj Mahals for its ever-growing government. I find the story of the 'dirty dozen' to just sum up this government to a T.

What a cynical exercise, to be out there during an election saying you were looking for three quarters of a billion dollars worth of cuts from the hides of South Australians who most need it while, at the very same time, you are signing up for plush refits and leases that could have been deferred or cancelled for roughly the same amount of money—in fact, even more. It is an absolute disgrace.

I will not stop reminding South Australians of where this government put its priorities. Forget country hospitals, small schools, the disabled, public servants and their conditions and jobs—just build yourself new Taj Mahals. It is a government in decline, spending money on itself instead of on the people who need it most.

I want to point to a couple of issues linked to my portfolios where cuts have been lamentable. One is the axing of Playford Capital where other options such as a trade sale could have kept it alive. The report into that has been kept secret: the minister will not release it. I draw the house's attention to warning bells rung by Access Economics in their late 2010 report where they point to some of the economic difficulties this state is facing, in particular, the fact that we have put all our eggs in the baskets of defence and mining while other parts of the economy have been in decline.

There have been the savage sacking of people within the Department of Trade and Economic Development, the farragoes of Puglia, and the expensive extravagance of our overseas offices while the successful attraction of businesses to this state is the very thing that we need. So, at the very time we need to be attracting businesses here, we have taken the axe to the very department that was delivering such good results and delivering those jobs.

There have been cuts to Bio Innovation SA. The very way forward is through innovation, science, creativity and academic excellence and linking that to industry. Instead, what do we do? These are the very areas that we cut.

The current government enjoyed, for the first seven years of its life, the most buoyant economic times this country and state have probably ever seen. I completely refute the notion that this government has been good economic managers and that the former treasurer was a good Treasurer. What a load of bunkum! It is very easy to look good when every year your revenues are exploding. The cash was falling across the counter at him.

At the first sign of adversity (the global financial crisis and tightening of revenues) when there was a need to trim back, they had to cut back the largesse they had engaged in during the seven buoyant years. They had let out their belt and fattened themselves up as the cash came at them. They had to tighten their belt with the first tough budget we have seen. What has happened? They have fallen to pieces. They have completely fallen to pieces.

The union movement and the left of the Labor Party are arguing among themselves. And why? For the very first time they have faced a tough budget. Compare that to the sort of budgets

the state liberals had to face after the State Bank mess they left us. It is a very serious Supply Bill. It comes to the parliament in very difficult times. This government has served us poorly and I express my concern to the house.

Time expired.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (17:03): It is my pleasure to speak today on the Supply Bill and it is very important, I believe, for members to speak to the Supply Bill and take the opportunity to address the current state of play with regard to the state's finances.

Last year's debate on the Supply Bill was one of the first opportunities I had had to make a contribution in this place. In that debate, during the discussion, I highlighted some of my funding priorities for the people of Flinders (my electorate) and regional South Australia generally. Unfortunately, sadly, almost 12 months on, it appears that nothing has been achieved on that front.

The frustrating lack of progress seems to have been caused by a paralysis in the Labor Party. They have stopped governing, they are racked with division, and they have forgotten that it is their job to fight for the future of South Australia. It appears to me that they have instead been fighting amongst themselves over the spoils of office, and South Australians have had enough. At the second reading stage of the Supply Bill last year I spoke of the dismay—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: —more coughing; it seems it is that hour of the day—that people in regional communities were feeling in regard to the state's finances and the subsequent mismanagement by Labor over a long period of time. If there is one thing I would like to achieve in this place, it is to get due recognition for the country areas of this state of the contribution they make to the state's economy. We will keep talking about that.

People from all walks of life have been despairing that a state budget in the tens of billions of dollars was burdened by a state debt forecast to blow out to a staggering \$7.5 billion. You do not need to be an economist or a business owner—although it does help—to work out that when your debt burden is approaching almost 50 per cent of your operating budget, that is a cause for great concern. Certainly, it is not a position that is economically viable in the long term.

Unfortunately, this sort of financial recklessness is what people have come to expect from Labor governments throughout Australia—it is so predictable. A failure to exercise budgetary restraint throughout their time in office has caused their current financial predicament. A failure to responsibly administer the state's expenditure over nine years ultimately has led to last year's horror budget, and the impending budget will further hurt regional South Australia.

In my Supply Bill contribution in 2010 I spoke of the abject failure to adequately invest in infrastructure, particularly in rural and regional South Australia. I spoke of the port at Thevenard, which is the second busiest port in the state. It exports grain, salt, gypsum, mineral sands—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I have caught a few fish from there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRELOAR: I am pleased you have, and I hope that you are able to continue to do that, honourable member. The Thevenard port is crying out for investment to raise it to a standard where it can adequately carry out what it is required to. I spoke of road infrastructure and the backlog that has occurred under Labor governments: the Wirrulla to Kingoonya road and the Tod Highway, particularly that stretch from Karkoo to Kyancutta, which carries an extraordinary amount of grain. It is actually frightening to look at the state of disrepair that that road is in.

In 2002, the current Labor government—or the then Labor government that is still in power—promised that a desal plant would be built on Eyre Peninsula to satisfy our water security issues. Here we are, nine years on, and there is no sign at this stage of any desal plant being put in place. We have bought ourselves a couple of years with two wet winters and we have had some significant recharge, but the long-term water security issues remain.

Almost 12 months on, nothing has been done to address this lack of investment in infrastructure across country South Australia. I have spoken in some detail in the past and will speak again about country health services and the critical importance of country hospitals, which have borne the brunt of last year's slash-and-burn budget, and the warped spending priorities of the Rann Labor government.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: What about the Ceduna Hospital?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRELOAR: The state faces more uncertainty within the next budget. The communities of Keith, Moonta and Ardrossan have been vocal in their opposition to cuts to community hospitals. Indeed, communities across my electorate are resolute in their desire and need for better hospital facilities and health services. I will make special mention now of the hospitals at Ceduna and Port Lincoln and congratulate the government on their expenditure and efforts to those two hospitals. However, I remind the minister present of the hospitals that lie in between those two regional hospitals and provide invaluable and very important services to the smaller communities that lie across Eyre Peninsula.

In regard to Adelaide, the rail yards hospital faces the real risk of budget blowouts, and that will place strain on the health budget and, therefore, the ability of the government to improve our still ailing country health system. There are staffing issues; staffing issues remain. It is always a challenge to attract doctors to the country, to attract allied health professionals and, just as importantly, all those nursing staff, who, in my opinion, are overworked, underpaid and perform such a vital role. We need to be able to attract and hold these skilled people into country areas.

There is much conjecture over services that will not be available at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, at the rail yard site, especially in light of recent news reports regarding the lack of gynaecological services and outpatient services. The reason for that is the government attempting to mitigate the budget blowout. How much will the RAH cost? It was \$1.8 billion. It has been revealed today that it has blown out by \$1,000 million to a total cost of \$2.73 billion. The government needs to come clean on this.

One very valuable government scheme that is available to country patients is the patient assisted transport scheme—and it is invaluable—to allow country patients to travel to Adelaide, to the city, to receive specialist care here in the city where it is available. It is much appreciated, it is very valuable, and, unfortunately, once again it is underfunded.

Last year, in reference to the Supply Bill and the subsequent budget, I referred to the importance of education in regional areas. A fundamental role of state governments is to fund health and education. They are the two most important things. Unfortunately—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Don't tax you, don't tax me—

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Croydon, behave yourself!

Mr TRELOAR: Unfortunately, one of the funding cuts we have seen is that to small schools. Small schools are the fabric of a small country community, and the definition of a small school is those with under 100 students. I have a number of small schools in my electorate—all are facing funding cuts.

All these funding priorities that I have mentioned remain in the minds of the people of Flinders, but we are witnessing a Labor Party in paralysis. The deep divisions are plain to see, and South Australians are sick of it. The government is wracked with division and those divisions are compounded—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes, but we all love one another.

Mr TRELOAR: I can feel the love here; I can feel the love in the house, member for Croydon; you're expressing your love.

Ms Chapman: Just between themselves, though.

Mr TRELOAR: Just between themselves, yes. Unfortunately, and quite seriously, this government is wracked with division, and those divisions are compounded by the dire state of the state's finances. It is a budget out of control. State debt is costing us \$2 million a day in interest—\$2 million a day. Total state debt and liabilities will approach \$20 billion. This is not economically viable for a government to operate its budget.

It would seem that the union movement is at war with the government as well. Savage cuts to the Public Service and the government's attack on workers' entitlements have seen the unions turn on Labor in an unprecedented and quite extraordinary state of affairs.

The government has been backed into a corner as a consequence of their financial mismanagement over nine long years. They are now making these cuts and attacks on public sector workers because of their failure to properly manage the budget. Can I remind this house that it is a budget that has seen record GST windfalls and increased taxes. We are the highest taxed

state in the nation. We keep hearing that, we understand that, and yet they cannot control their expenditure; they cannot balance the budget.

It will again be left to the Liberal Party to come in and fix this mess. I noted today that the state governments in Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales have all been running budget surpluses in 2011. What's the theme here? They are all now Liberal state governments. It is no coincidence that those states are running surpluses and cleaning up the messes left by previous Labor administrations. As I pointed out, there is a theme here, and it would appear in this state that that theme is set to continue.

I have touched on regulation and red tape in this place before, and I think it is important to raise these issues in the context of supply. Small to medium businesses have suffered the consequences of red tape and regulatory confusion and the impact on small business directly affects the state's finances. A more efficient business sector is clearly better for the budget bottom line, as they become more profitable and the state's export income increases. The Rann Labor government has presided over a declining trend in our exports and in our share of the national economy.

I have also spoken of government services being provided in situations where they have not been requested and where they have not been required. It would seem that this government has it the wrong way around. Essential services such as health, education and policing have been left to diminish, whilst a monolith bureaucracy seeks to establish a model of cost recovery for services that ordinary people do not want or require, particularly those residents of the country. So, what happens? It allows a government and its associated bureaucracy to become self-fulfilling.

I will turn briefly to the issue of marine parks, because it is a hugely important issue on the Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast. Three million dollars over two years has been slashed from the operating budget of the marine parks program. What impact will that have on the management of marine parks? The government is all over the place when it comes to its marine parks proposal.

Among the thousand or so people at the Burnside Town Hall last night for the public meeting were countless people making the point that the marine parks proposal is actually about money. The government will not admit that, but it is laden with debt and is, once again, looking at this cost recovery model. Whether it be permits to fish or expiation notices for its absurd no-take zones, the government will look to increase its coffers to paper over the huge cracks emerging not only in its budget but also its financial credibility and legitimacy as a government.

Mr Whetstone: And the caucus room.

Mr TRELOAR: And the caucus room. Finally, to agriculture. That is the industry that I come from. I was quite dismayed to see that the Advisory Board of Agriculture is due to be disbanded after 30 June, which will be a sad day. This is the one direct link that the states' producers have to the minister for agriculture, and it looks as though it is going the way of all of those other services that have been disbanded.

I have come to the conclusion that the people of South Australia can no longer rely on this state government for anything much at all. This government has not prioritised its spending, in fact it has had some really warped priorities. Thinkers in Residence come to mind. We have a thinker in residence in our local district. He comes out with things that are quite profound, very insightful and we do not pay him anything at all. He makes a wonderful contribution.

The Puglia affair comes to mind; spending gratuitous amounts of money on government advertising. They are making it up as they go along, lurching from one crisis to the next. There might be a new Treasurer but the ingrained Labor way of financial mismanagement and economic vandalism continues.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (17:19): I would like to add to the record the great achievements of the Rann Labor government regarding the Supply Bill. As we have sat patiently here today we have heard the opposition decry this government. I would like to place on the record a different perspective.

The difficult decisions made by the government in the 2010-11 budget allow it to meet growing demands in important areas, with extra expenditure provided in areas of need, including the Department of Health, the Department for Families and Communities, the Department of Education and Children's Services, the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure and the justice portfolio. Our spending on health is likely to reach \$4.5 billion in the 2010-11 year. In the 2010-11 budget, the government announced the following initiatives:

- \$111 million for strategies to achieve a four-hour turnaround for emergency departments for 95 per cent of our patients;
- \$88.6 million to provide an extra 260,000 elective surgical procedures across metropolitan and country hospitals;
- \$64.4 million to upgrade the Women and Children's Hospital for more specialist cots, extra theatres, new single-patient rooms, and a further \$7.3 million for staff and operating costs;
- \$46 million for the Modbury Hospital to remodel the emergency department and provide a 36-bed rehabilitation inpatient unit, which is badly needed. This is on top of the \$12 million already committed to redevelop that hospital; and
- \$38.6 million over two years as part of the \$125 million redevelopment of The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to provide a new three-storey building for a new emergency department, a new outpatients area and nine new operating theatres, all badly needed and all warranted decisions this government had to make.

The government also provided the Department for Families and Communities with an extra \$307 million over four years, including:

- \$137.7 million for increased resources for children under the guardianship of the minister. As we know, the demand in this area is growing;
- \$70.9 million for Disability SA to help South Australians needing accommodation support, community support, community access and respite through the state;
- \$13.8 million for disability equipment;
- \$4.2 million for children with autism;
- \$3.1 million for home visiting for seniors; and
- \$2.9 million in rebates for personal alert systems for seniors, to keep them safe.

The government has also provided \$156 million for new initiatives over the next four years to the Department of Education and Children's Services. Beyond this, there is an extra \$265 million over four years, which has been provided from the South Australian Education (Government Preschools and Schools) Arbitrated Enterprise Bargaining Award 2010. This will provide more than 700 extra staff and support staff and also reduce the administrative burden on our school leaders in managing information technologies in our schools. Many of the teachers in my area have actually praised this initiative and are very grateful to the government for providing these resources to allow them to do this and behave in an innovative way with their resources in their schools.

Further, the government's historically high levels of investment in infrastructure continued in the 2010-11 budget. We are investing \$10.7 billion in infrastructure over the next four years. The major projects include:

- \$1.4 billion invested over four years to upgrade the major metropolitan rail lines, including the electrification of the Gawler, Noarlunga and Outer Harbor lines and the extension of the Noarlunga rail line to Seaford;
- \$842.8 million for the South Road superway—the state's biggest individual road project. The drilling and initial roadworks for that are already underway and it looks like being an important initiative and addition to the roads in the northern area that I regularly access;
- \$445.5 million to the duplication of the Southern Expressway from Darlington to Old Noarlunga and an interchange at Darlington, which the people of the south have been calling for for many years. This government has listened and will deliver the project to them;
- \$29.9 million to refurbish the Port Bonython jetty, which is important for our state's economic future;
- \$21.2 million for road and rail improvements to service the Greater Edinburgh Parks, for the increased battalion usage and the increasing enterprises like the Coles warehouse and many businesses that inhabit that precinct;

- \$12.4 million to expand the rural road safety and blackspot programs, which is again, a warranted and worthy decision;
- \$12 million to the Greenways and Cycle Paths project, as we have an increasing percentage of people who are recreating and riding to work; and
- \$5.2 million to the upgrade and replacement of bus shelters in this state.

Again, if you are a local member of parliament, as I am, people ring you about these things and this government is delivering.

The government has also invested in the justice system with \$186.1 million in new initiatives over the next four years to make our communities safer, with extra police and programs to tackle street crime and domestic violence. When you live and work in the northern suburbs, domestic violence is something that you hear about every day. I am proud that our government is making initiatives in this area to improve the services for men and women who are suffering from such a plight. Initiatives include:

- \$106.3 million over four years to recruit an extra 300 police and equip SAPOL with the latest crime-fighting equipment. In 2010-11, the operating budget for SAPOL alone is \$693 million;
- \$15.5 million over four years to target street crime, including the establishment of the Southern Community Justice Court system—the state's first community court. Again, this is very badly needed. I have heard people in the southern electorates talk about how this is going to improve their lives and their communities;
- \$7.8 million for measures to change domestic violence legislation, to support the management of intervention orders and to establish assessment and intervention programs; and
- \$5.4 million over four years to continue the upgrade of new technology, infrastructure and equipment for the state's volunteer-based emergency services system.

All our volunteers deserve support. This is a particularly worthy initiative. This government has not forgotten small business or low income households. The government has provided payroll tax relief and a major boost to concessions that took effect on 1 July last year. It will deliver payroll tax relief of around \$80 million over four years for employers of apprentices or trainees.

There is also an increase to and extension of concessions for up to 235,000 South Australians—that is right, 235,000 South Australians—including seniors and low income earners, for their water, sewerage, emergency services levies and energy bills. Further, this government has provided \$20.6 million over four years for sports grants and \$1.2 million over four years to increase multicultural grants so that cultural richness in our state is recognised, supported and further advanced. All these things are worthy achievements and all of them are under the Rann Labor government and we are proud, on this side, to be part of that government, unlike the people on the other side.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:26): After the riveting final part of that speech, I feel a need to respond to the Supply Bill 2011. I note that, with the Supply Bill, we are seeking the carriage of funding of \$3.332 billion. Perhaps it could be \$2.332 billion, or something in that vicinity, if we did not have this exorbitant blowout in the new Adelaide Oval costs that were revealed today.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: The Adelaide hospital, I should say. Thank you, member for Chaffey—the Adelaide hospital blowout.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Not the oval—

Mr PEDERICK: I would not be surprised, now that the member for Croydon has reminded me of the Adelaide Oval blowouts, where this government indicated that the Adelaide Oval would receive funding from the state government of \$450 million and not a cent more. Now it has gone to \$535 million and we still do not know what it is going to cost for the Labor government's flawed plan to desecrate Adelaide Oval.

If it happens, it will be one of the worst building and planning decisions seen in this state. I firmly believe that if the Adelaide Oval is butchered, when the first brick is laid it will be a stadium that will be 30 years out of date as you start the project. The roof will not be able to close, so that

cuts out events that could be held at a stadium with a covered roof from about 300 days. It is quite obvious that our proposal of a covered stadium in the Parklands is the far better policy. The Labor Party had to rush out with a policy. They had to run people over here from the AFL, get everyone out on the Adelaide Oval and make a great show of strength for their proposal.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: They're history.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will be heard in silence. Behave yourselves.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Speaker, for your protection. They are a rude bunch on that side.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely. This is just one of the many flawed decisions of this government. I want to go over some of the issues to do with my portfolios of agriculture, food, fisheries and forests. We have seen 179 jobs being cut from PIRSA. They talk about targeted voluntary separation packages, but I think what you need to do is take out the word 'voluntary'. They are targeted separation packages, that is for sure.

Certainly, there is a friend of mine who has worked for PIRSA for many years who got the chop several weeks ago. He would have been quite happy to stay in the service for many years. His service to the rural industries, to Rural Solutions, has been exemplary over many years and all of a sudden he is put in a position where his great wealth of knowledge is not wanted. I find that disgraceful, apart from the other 178 jobs that have been cut in this tranche and over a hundred previous to that.

In these cuts to primary industries, we see \$80 million cut out over four years—\$20 million a year cut out of primary industries. Yet, we have the Premier come into this place today espousing how well the state's economy is going, talking about the impact that agriculture has had on the economy. Next thing, we will have the Premier saying that he made it rain, because that is exactly what happened this year. It rained on the parched grain fields of this state.

The farmers, who have been suffering for so many years with years of drought and low commodity prices, all of a sudden got a break. It was not exactly a clean break. As the member who proposed the grain-handling industry committee, I am well aware of the issues to do with grain-handling during harvest. I do not believe farmers were able to capitalise on the amount of money that they should have made for that money to be injected into regional economies and also to have the money that they could use to spend in the city whether visiting for work or as a tourist.

We cannot have the Premier just making out that he is something close to God and has created this great wealth in the rural sector. It came because it rained. We see this government just stepping away from primary industries. We see Rural Solutions SA, which is the extension part of primary industries, going to full cost recovery—\$12 million cut over four years. The state government has indicated that it will withdraw support for so-called lower value activities and Rural Solutions will begin to charge full-cost recovery prices for the services it provides.

As activities of Rural Solutions SA are downsized, there will be a consequential loss of external revenue to the Department of Primary Industries and Resources for services provided. The new operating model will result in workforce adjustments—sackings—and require the significant decrease in support costs.

Then we look at the South Australian Research and Development Institute and the cutbacks there of \$8 million over four years, where SARDI will have to increase cost recovery and reduce costs, resulting in a reduction in research and development activity and service delivery across the broader spectrum of primary industries research.

This is the sad bit: the savings will be achieved through the cessation of some research and development activities and workforce changes. The issue here is that we know that the Adelaide university is looking at merging with SARDI or picking it up and, let us hope, if this does go ahead, that they do not just pick up the bones of what once was SARDI.

SARDI has several properties that it owns around the place. One, for instance, is the property at West Beach. Will that property still be held as part of the research program in this state? It is interesting to note that, on my understanding, other universities or private investors were

not given the opportunity to have a look at SARDI and look at whether they could incorporate it into their programs.

The whole sad thing is, as I indicated earlier, that the Premier comes in here today espousing how good the economy is in the state, and a lot of that is on the farmers' good work, yet research and jobs are just being cut to the bone. Where will South Australian research and development expertise and innovation and benefit go? Will it end up being contracted to interstate and overseas companies? Will the profit focus compromise the integrity of the research and reputation of SARDI? All these costs are coming on top of the taxes farmers already pay to support the Labor government's policies on super schools, super hospitals, super highways and super entertainment facilities.

We look at the impact that this government has placed on commercial fishing and aquaculture with more cost recovery (\$1.3 million over three years) by raising the current fees charged to the commercial fishing industry to fully recover the costs of providing commercial fishing regulatory and support programs; and \$1.9 million over three years by raising the fees and charges to the aquaculture industry to cover the full cost of regulatory and support programs.

It looks like the government believes that fishermen make too much money. I note that, at one stage, the minister for fisheries put out a press release in which he indicated that they did make too much money and that their profitability was too high. Well, you would have thought that someone who has had a bit of work in business, as minister O'Brien has (which is highly unusual for someone on that side of the house), should know better. These rises to the cost of fishing will necessarily be passed onto the markets, and this will cost export and local markets, and it could also threaten existing export markets and inhibit export growth.

We look at the biosecurity issue with the PIC fees, the property identification fees and biosecurity fees indicated in the recent budget. These two measures increased revenue by \$9 million over four years. The budget also indicates that the government will save \$1.5 million through operational efficiencies. Well, this was not even a smart policy.

First, we have property identification codes, which is a fee of \$76 every two years. For a lot of industries this has been covered by industry levies, but suddenly we have this other levy. Then, on top of that, the government is going to tack on a biosecurity fee, which could be in the range of \$165 to \$250 per annum.

I would have thought that, if you are going to put an impost on people, it would have been far easier to do it in one hit, but this government just loves putting itself into pain. It has gone through the pain of introducing the PIC fees, then it wants to hit the landholders again—and it is not just commercial landholders, it is people who may have only one or two animals. There is also the fact that the government is looking at more savings of \$1.3 million through biosecurity aquatic pest management efficiencies in aquatic pest outbreak response and surveillance activities.

I think that one of the most interesting cutbacks—and I think it is a terrible cut back in terms of the effect on state agriculture—is seed support to the Advisory Board of Agriculture. This is the government supplying less than \$200,000 a year for the Advisory Board of Agriculture, which has operated for decades in this state. We have a minister, sadly, who indicated early last year when he became the minister for primary industries, that he was the best option for primary industries in the country. The sad thing is that he believes that he does not need grassroots advice from the Advisory Board of Agriculture, which had representatives from right across this state involved on the ground floor of agriculture.

I would have thought that was a vital body to keep in touch with, but, no, the minister is cutting its funding and setting up what I call a second tier body, which will involve people like Elders, Viterra, and, if you are lucky, at the end of the committee of however many it is (whether it is seven or nine or eight), a couple of farmers. We are going to lose a lot of that grassroots knowledge.

We have seen the government also cut \$7 million from wine industry support through the cellar door subsidy, so the annual cap on cellar door subsidies will be reduced to \$50,000 per producer from 1 July this year. A further \$2.3 million saving over four years will be made through a reduction in grants and programs relating to the agriculture, food and wine sectors. Assistance to food industry organisations and associations will be reduced.

We also see that in the last budget the government introduced a payroll tax rebate for exporters but that will be gone by 2013, a saving of \$10 million for the government. What effect will

that have on exporters of this state? Then we have another one that hits regional South Australians right in the hip pocket: \$50 million over four years will be cut from the regional petroleum subsidy. That is 3¢ a litre, but it all adds up. There are many people in the country who travel up to 100,000 kilometres a year, and they have to because of their jobs, health care and business needs. This will increase production and freight costs, which will all be passed on to consumers.

The big one, I think, in this state that is already having an effect on the morale of the good citizens of the South-East, especially around Mount Gambier and in the member for MacKillop's seat, is the proposed forward sale of forests. It is such a short-sighted policy. It is just ridiculous. I was talking about the Adelaide Oval upgrade earlier in my contribution and I firmly believe that the forward sale of forests is what this government is relying on to come up with that \$535 million, and it is outrageous. This sector returned \$43 million to Treasury in the last financial year and the government wants to get rid of it—up to three rotations, up to 111 years of forestry. It will just be gone. We are told that they will put in safeguards and protect jobs. What a load of hogwash!

It is not every day of the week that I stand next to a unionist and we actually agree on something; and we agree fervently that this is a terrible decision not only for the South-East but also for this state, because this will directly export hundreds, if not thousands, of jobs out of the South-East. It will have a direct impact on 3,000 jobs. Morale is already very low in the real estate sector and right across all sectors down there—whether you are running a corner store or a small business, or whether you are selling used cars or new cars.

The problem we have is that the government does not understand that, if a Chinese investor or an American superannuation firm comes in and buys these forward rotations of forest, they have no connection to the South-East and all they will be worried about is the bottom line. I know for a fact that you can get containers into Malaysia (and it probably would not be a much different cost into China) for \$450. Members can imagine how many containers are coming over here from China but they probably get sent back empty because there is so much more gear that we are importing. They could be loaded with logs and shipped off.

Mr Pisoni: Ballast.

Mr PEDERICK: Ballast.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Exactly. So what will happen to the mills in the South-East? What will happen to our timber industry, which supplies around 75 per cent of the building timber in this state and much of the timber around the south-eastern part of Australia? What surety is there for the construction industry in this state? There is none. It is a mad decision. When you do the sums over the 111 years, it will rob potentially a billion dollars from the state's coffers and from the income especially of the South-East. It is just ridiculous.

I also want to talk quickly about issues such as marine parks. A lot of us went to a meeting last night at Burnside, which was well attended. There are estimates that up to 1,500 attended. There were a lot of people outside the hall and people hanging in through the windows trying to hear what was happening. These are other people who have been overlooked by a government that wants to fence off up to 10 per cent of the state's waters from fishing. That equates to up to 25 per cent of these so-called marine parks.

What the minister for environment fails to understand—and I know the minister for fisheries is trying to educate him, as he was today, on the status of the fisheries—is that fisheries are actually managed under the Fisheries Management Act 2007. The Fisheries Management Act 2007 also manages aquatic organisms—that is your kelps, etc., that grow on the sea floor. So, what the heck is happening with the environment department? They are trying to take over the management of fisheries. What next? Are they going to start charging management fees to fisheries, as well as the fees that Primary Industries charge? It is an outrageous proposition.

The government needs to listen to this, because the recreational fishers and the commercial fishers are as one against this proposal. It is a crazy proposal and I believe it is one of the things that will bring this government down in less than three years' time. There are many other things I want to say, but I will have to make that contribution later on. There is so much more I need to say about funding for agricultural programs like the broomrape funding, country health, the money that has been spent on the desalination plant—so many wasted dollars—but I will make that contribution later.

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) (17:47): This bill, to reiterate the earlier comments of the Treasurer, is to enable the provision of government service delivery until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2011 receives assent. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the supply acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main appropriation bill.

In closing debate on this bill, I would like to place on record the great achievements of this government in fiscal management. Careful management of this state's operating position has put the state in a position to embark upon a record investment in critical infrastructure that will provide benefits to South Australians for many years to come. The last state budget provided more than \$10 billion of infrastructure spending over the next four years. This government has also delivered tax cuts in recent years to help both businesses and individuals and to secure future growth.

In total, it is estimated that, once all measures have been brought in, the government will have reduced taxes on a cumulative basis by around \$4.6 billion by 2013-14. This is not a trivial sum and will help boost private enterprise, which is still feeling the effects of global recession. This government also understands the real need to invest in services for South Australians today on top of the provision of infrastructure for tomorrow.

The last state budget provided extra investment over the next four years in areas that affect the lives of South Australians every day. There is \$883.5 million more investment in health, \$156 million more investment in education and \$525.4 million more investment in transport—big numbers. Also, over the next four years this government has provided an extra \$137.7 million in alternative care funding for vulnerable children. That is on top of an extra \$25.2 million in 2009-10. There is an extra \$70.9 million for Disability SA, on top of an extra \$13.8 million specifically for disability equipment, and an extra \$4.2 million for children with autism.

This government also increased energy, water, sewerage and fixed property emergency services levy concessions for pensioners. We also extended the energy and emergency services levy concession to low income earners. Prudent management of operating spending has enabled these investments to be delivered while keeping borrowings at a manageable level.

Prudent financial management is not something that just happens; it requires hard work and tough decisions. This government has shown that it has the appetite for the hard work needed and is more than capable of taking tough decisions. As a result, South Australia has retained its AAA credit rating against the backdrop of global recession, a global recession which saw other advanced economies suffer.

The government took the difficult decision to cut back on jobs in the Public Service—more than 3,700 full-time equivalent employees over four years. This government does not hide from cutting back on administration and the Public Service and cutting back on executives. What the opposition will not tell you, though, is that the government has also invested in new public sector jobs, partially offsetting these cuts with nearly 2,000 new full-time equivalent employees who will fully carry out the promises that government took to the last election.

The government's fiscal record speaks for itself: a AAA credit rating. The government's record in delivering services speaks for itself: more and better hospitals, more doctors, more nurses, more police and more teachers. The government's infrastructure record speaks for itself as well: more than \$10 billion in spending over the next four years.

Before finishing, as Minister for Road Safety I feel it is my duty to provide counsel to the honourable member for Davenport. I am prepared for my department to provide some reference material for him to bring to the attention of his son in what I am sure are regular and wide-ranging lectures about the dangers of speeding that can impact on far more than just the hip pocket. I would like to thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate.

Bill read a second time.

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) (17:52): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:52): As the member for Hammond just mentioned a few moments ago, there is so much to say and so little time. Let me start off by going back over the desal plant. We have in South Australia a government that was dragged kicking and screaming to eventually come to the understanding that we needed a desal plant to have a climate independent water supply to guarantee critical water for metropolitan Adelaide.

Everybody is aware that the delay in coming to that decision cost the South Australian taxpayer dearly when we entered a contract to build what turned out to be a very expensive desal plant. That was bad enough, but then the government foolishly took the decision to double the size of that desal plant and to build a desal plant with a capacity of 100 gegalitres a year, when it was patently obvious to anybody who looked at Adelaide's water demand that, even over the next 20 or 30 years, a 50-gegalitre desal plant (or thereabouts) would adequately protect us for critical water needs.

The government was sucked in because the federal government offered \$228 million, which is only a fraction of the additional cost. The opposition then exposed the fact that that \$228 million grant was actually offset by a reduction in our GST revenues of something like \$212 million, and I think \$214 million was the actual figure. There was a net benefit of about \$12 million. The government contracted to build a 100-gegalitre desal plant at a cost of a bit over \$1.8 billion.

The government did not tell the people of South Australia that the original proposal at \$1.4 billion also included the interconnect, the pipe to connect the northern and southern parts of the Adelaide distribution network. That interconnection only becomes necessary when the capacity of the desal plant is greater than 50 gegalitre is a year. At a capacity of 50 gegalitres a year, all the water produced at the desal plant could be used in the southern part of the distribution system, and the balancing could be done by pumping from the River Murray to only the northern reservoirs rather than to Mount Bold, which currently, on average, has about 24 gegalitres year pumped to it. So, with a 50-gegalitre desalination plant, we would not need to build the interconnecting system between the northern and southern parts of the system.

We have had this decision to double the size, but on the back of that it is also then necessary to build the interconnector of the two parts of the water distribution network. Unfortunately, that comes at a cost to the South Australian taxpayers of another \$400-plus million. I am putting the proposition to the house that maybe the government should seek to cut its losses. It has already made a giant mistake in contracting to double the size of the desal plant. Maybe we should cut our losses and decide not to build that \$400 million north-south pipeline. It is not needed, unless we were in critical need of the 100 gegalitres a year from the desal plant.

The reality is that we will build, at a cost of \$400 million, that pipeline. We will then run the desal plant at at least 75 per cent of its capacity to prove up the desal plant over a two-year period, at great running cost, but the water will actually be wasted. The reality is that, we will use the water produced from the desal plant but our reservoirs, particularly in the northern part of the system: Millbrook, Kangaroo Creek and the Para reservoirs, will be just sitting there unused. We will have waters overflowing those, running down the rivers into the ocean. Maybe we would be better off to forget about building the north-south interconnector, continue to use the water from those reservoirs and save ourselves \$400 million.

I think that is something that the government should seriously look at. I say that because we are in a financial mess. We have, as has been revealed today, a billion dollar blowout in the Royal Adelaide Hospital and we have not even, at this stage, seen the figure for the year to year operating expenses of that hospital, but we do know that it is going to be significantly higher than the operating expenses of the existing hospital. We also know that we are committed to at least \$535 million for an upgrade of the Adelaide Oval.

The budget is already in great difficulty, and yet we have these costs coming on board over the next few years. The one that really worries me is the new build for the Royal Adelaide Hospital because it will not come on as a cost to the budget until 2016.

I am starting to wonder whether this government is setting itself up for opposition; whether it has taken a fair bet that it will lose the next election, and that insuring against the future it wants to cripple the state and ensure that there is no money available for an incoming government post the next election. The government has seen this happen before.

It happened in 1993 when the State Bank disaster, the SGIC disaster and the mismanagement of the finances of the state crippled the state. There was a change of government and the incoming Liberal government had to rebuild the state, and that government did a magnificent job in the eight years that it was in government. But note that the ministers of this government, on a daily basis, go out there and say, 'This is what we are doing' and compare it with what the previous Liberal government did, knowing full well that the previous Liberal government was hamstrung by a state which had been bankrupted.

The question I pose to the house is: is this government seeking to repeat history? Is it setting the state up for a period of Labor in opposition, crippling the state's finances and leaving a state burdened from financial mismanagement such that an incoming Liberal government will not be able to perform? That is the question I put today. That is what I suspect is happening to the finances of this state, and it is an absolute outrage.

[Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30]

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (19:30): The Supply Bill is one of those interesting pieces of legislation that comes into this place and gives the government sufficient funds to continue on until the end of the financial year, and what an end of the financial year it is going to be this year. Today, we heard about the \$1 billion blowout in the cost of the hospital. I look forward to seeing how the government is going to explain that away, because I know that they did not tell the truth during the election campaign. Even on the day before the election was called, John Hill was talking to Leon Byner on FIVEaa and said it was \$1.7 billion, when he knew, in November last year, that it was \$1.8 billion.

They could not tell the truth then, they are not telling the truth now and what is going to happen? South Australians are going to pay. They are going to pay and pay and pay. Our children are going to pay, our grandchildren are going to pay and I am really worried that our great-grandchildren are going to continue to pay for the follies of this government.

Having said that, I now have great trepidation and fear for my electorate of Morphett, which I love dearly. I am very privileged to be the member for Morphett. I have been for over nine years now and I look forward to serving my constituents for many more years to come. My electorate down there is a safe Liberal seat, held for 32 years now by the Liberal Party. It is a pleasure to be the member down there and continue on the great work of the former member, the Hon. John Oswald. I am afraid that there will not be any money left in the till to spend in my electorate of Morphett on really essential programs.

We saw how the last budget attacked the Glenelg Community Hospital—a fantastic community hospital. My son was born there; it is no longer doing obstetrics and gynaecology. We have seen that hospital provide one of the best programs, one of the most economical and beneficial programs provided by a community hospital to assist the public hospital system; that is, Recovery at the Bay. It was saving the health system hundreds, if not thousands and thousands, of dollars a day, by having patients from the Repatriation General Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre come down to the Bay.

If they were not quite ready to go home, they were coming down there at a cost of about \$120 a day. So, there were about \$1,000 per patient per day savings on an acute bed in one of our major hospitals. That was saving the government a lot of money. There were up to 10 patients in there at any one time in the Glenelg Community Hospital. What do we see? The government cut that program from down there.

Fortunately, the Glenelg Community Hospital is not like Moonta, Ardrossan, Keith and Blackwood, where they are relying on the funding from the public sector to enable them to keep their cash flow going and do the great job they are doing for their communities. The Glenelg Community Hospital is bursting at the seams with day surgery down there. Specialists are coming in and working for their private patients down there and they are doing a fantastic job.

They did not need that program. It was a little bit of cream on the cake. It was not something they were concerned about, but it just shows the ideological stupidity of decisions being made where you are cutting off your nose to spite your face. They were paying \$120 a day for those patients, now they are going to put intermediate care beds in some of our larger public hospitals at a cost of hundreds and hundreds of dollars a day. It is a crazy situation.

We are seeing nonsensical, illogical, completely non-economical solutions—well, they are apparently called solutions—to imaginary problems in other community hospitals where the government keeps insisting they are funding these private hospitals. They are only private inasmuch as they are not owned by the government, but they are community hospitals and they have been doing a great job.

But go past Glenelg Community Hospital, in my electorate of Morphett—let's drive from Parliament House down there and go through the 17 sets of traffic lights on North Terrace through the trams. I love my trams, but those 17 sets of traffic lights down on North Terrace cause some issues. They are reasonably well coordinated, most of the time. Sometimes you can get stuck and it will take you 20 minutes to get from West Terrace down to Parliament House, but they can coordinate those traffic lights. Yet, at the Africaine Road and Tapleys Hill Road intersection at Glenelg North, according to this government, they cannot put in traffic lights and have them coordinated.

The first letters to me said that it would cost \$300,000; now they are saying it is going to cost \$500,000-plus to put in one set of traffic lights at the intersection of Africaine Road and Tapleys Hill Road. I just remind the house that 7,500 cars a day, 400 buses a week and hundreds and hundreds of cyclists were crossing the King Street Bridge until recently when it was closed for repairs. Much of that traffic was going down Africaine Road to try to get onto Tapleys Hill Road, and about 45,000 cars a day use Tapleys Hill Road.

The S-bend of Africaine Road and the S-bend of Tapleys Hill Road, by the end of the airport runway, is a very dangerous intersection. It needs a long-term solution for a long-term problem. We are not looking just at a short-term solution for a long-term problem with the banning of right-hand turns by the government.

The King Street Bridge closure has exacerbated an already dangerous intersection. We have seen one young man seriously injured there. He is still in hospital. The total cost of the ambos, the fireys and all the others turning up is about \$900,000. That is twice what it would cost to put traffic lights in, but what do we see from this government? Lazy solutions, short-term solutions for long-term problems, banning right-hand turns at that intersection.

The City of Holdfast Bay first wrote to the minister in 2005 about traffic lights, so the minister cannot say he did not know or was not warned about it. I wrote to him about it in December last year. We have had nothing but a recalcitrant approach from this government. It is ignoring my constituents in Morphett, and I know they will continue to elect Liberal representatives for many years to come because they know what a Liberal government could do for them, and they are being ignored by the Labor government.

To get to Glenelg you have to go down Anzac Highway. It is a goat track to Glenelg; Anzac Highway is an atrocious road now. It is one of the major thoroughfares in this city, yet it is rutted and potholed. They have done patches and pavement repairs which cause traffic to weave all over the place on those three lanes going down to Glenelg. Damage is being done to cars, not immediate damage from going down massive potholes but continual damage because of the state of that road. For a major thoroughfare, the condition of that road is atrocious.

What will we see? We will see continued patching up. It should be a thoroughfare of pride for South Australia. The nice bits are the overpass and a couple of other bits that have been patched up. That is fine, but the majority of it is an absolute goat track. In fact, if you want to see the parochialism of this government, just go to what used to be my boundary at Somerton Park. It changed after the redistribution. You can see where the electorate of Bright finishes and the electorate of Morphett starts because that is where the new road pavement finishes. South of that boundary it is new and paved; north of it is the old potholed Brighton Road. That is how parochial this government is.

Oaklands Road is just as bad; it is an atrocious road. They should rename it Rodeo Drive. It is like riding a bucking bronco going down that road. There are potholes, ruts and corrugations. It is an atrocious road to go down. Between Africaine Road, Oaklands Road, Morphett Road and Anzac Highway there are some serious issues that my constituents want fixed and want fixed now.

The other big issue down there is Oaklands crossing. What did the government do at Oaklands crossing? It completely stuffed it. We have the new aquatic centre, which is almost ready to be opened, one of the biggest shopping centres in the southern hemisphere, the Noarlunga train line and the intersection of Morphett Road and Diagonal Road. The railway station was moved closer to the crossing so that stuffs up any chance of grade separation later on, which would have

been the ideal solution for that problem. Once again, short-term solutions for long-term problems: move the railway station, make it look a bit nicer—it looks quite nice—but wrong spot, wrong solution.

They put in a temporary bus bay and then a pedestrian crossing. It stuffed up the whole intersection. Do you want to see any of this? Go onto my website, go to my YouTube clips and you will see Africaine Road and Oaklands crossing. You will see what a dog's breakfast and how dangerous they are. It is something this government should be ashamed of. I am ashamed that this government is ignoring the taxpayers of Morphett and allowing this to continue. I have had no indication whatsoever from this government that there are going to be any changes or improvements.

Back in central Glenelg, there is the lack of funding for a state event which is New Year's Eve. We get a miserable \$25,000 and 70,000 South Australians turn up on New Year's Eve, but the ratepayers of Glenelg are supposed to handle that. Apart from that funding, we do not get any funding for widening the walkway of the lock gates, so a mum with a pram has to wait for somebody with a bike to come the other way and, if the lock gates do not work, it is a whole shemozzle, and at the moment that creates extra problems with the King Street bridge out.

We have not seen the H-class trams for a long time. Where are the H-class trams, Minister for Transport? What have you done with those iconic trams? Are they still rotting in some old car park down at Lonsdale? I haven't seen them out there. They are iconic trains; they can run these historic trams all over the world, but not in South Australia, apparently.

This government has no foresight; they have no vision for their future. They certainly are not looking after the electors of my electorate of Morphett. It is a safe Liberal seat. I will be making sure I keep it that way, and this government is doing a lot to help me because they are doing nothing to help themselves.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (19:40): I focused on two areas in my speech on supply yesterday, saying that really the dreadful financial management that we are all aware of has sent this government down two paths: one is the path of creating red tape and one is the path of being forced into choosing priorities that really damage the country areas. I have 10 minutes tonight, and I would like to just mention in a bit more detail my thoughts on that first vein.

Essentially, the poor management has led to the government having insufficient funds to do the jobs that it wants to do. It is a great shame if that is the case. When you get in that situation, you really have no choice but to decrease services if you do not want to increase taxes, and we all know that we are the most highly taxed state in the nation already.

Cutting services but trying to seem to be still responsible is the problem that the government has faced. What happens is that it goes down the road of 'user pays'. It still wants to regulate, it still wants to set the rules, it still wants to tell people and councils and everybody who will listen exactly what they need to do, how they need to operate and what their rules and regulations will be, but it pushes all the costs associated with that onto the users.

I mentioned yesterday two areas that really cut across each other and highlight a good example of the difficulties that we have. One is the River Murray levy that everybody in the state pays, even those people who do not actually get any water at all from the Murray, and one is the biosecurity levy that is proposed which, while everybody in the state will benefit from healthy biosecurity, only the primary producers in the state would pay, which is really at odds with itself.

What happens now is that this moves down the path of creating enormous red tape because when the body creating the rules and the regulations is not actually incurring the costs directly, there is less interest in the efficiency, and it is creating red tape everywhere. The government still wants to set the rules but make the users pay, so they do not really care how much the users pay.

We are already incredibly highly taxed. If you look at the things that continue to grow, that continue to bite into everyday South Australians, there is the River Murray levy, the biosecurity levy that is proposed, land tax continually going up, stamp duty, vehicle registration, boat registration, truck registration.

I think it would be remiss of me not to mention what is going on with truck registration for the heavy transport industry at the moment. What the government has done to transport operators who want to register a B-double in this state means that we have state-based operators who

seriously consider registering their trucks interstate because it is so expensive for them, and some actually do, if they have the legal opportunity.

They can have interstate runs and, if they can possibly avoid paying the truck registration fees that they are hit with here in South Australia, they will, but then, of course, that means they get interstate-based drivers, they get interstate-based customers and their business shifts interstate. While they might still essentially be South Australian companies, when they choose to pay the lower interstate costs, a lot of the benefits that those companies create end up interstate as well, so we miss out.

It goes on: driver's licence, boat licence, firearms licence, hunting permits, payroll tax, emergency services levy, WorkCover. Look at WorkCover. The WorkCover levy has got so far out of control, both in regard to financial control and administrative control for this government, that it decided to take one of the all-time cop-outs and actually remove the bonus penalty scheme, which has previously been one of the foundations of the WorkCover scheme in the way in which it is set up and the way in which it operates so that businesses with a good track record, businesses which do their very best to support their workers, to provide a healthy, safe, productive and useful workplace for their people could have a lower WorkCover rate—and if people had accidents (whether they were because the employers were not doing the right thing, or perhaps through bad luck, but, one way or the other), if you had a workplace that had accidents you paid more and if you had a safe workplace you paid less.

I am astounded that members from the other side of the chamber who support workers and who are union members and union organisers (very often) allowed that to happen. The bonus penalty scheme was one of the best things to protect workers, to encourage people to have safe workplaces, and this government removed it because it was just all too hard to administer. I find that surprising and unacceptable.

Looking back at that list of things, we remember back to 2000 when the GST came in. The GST was brought in by the Howard Liberal government. The understanding was very clear across all the states that the GST would come in and that GST collected from states would be returned to states by the federal government; and, in fact, South Australia so far has actually benefited and got more than its share back from the federal government.

It looks like this government may be able to stuff that up as well, and it looks like we are going to lose the small additional benefit that we have recently had, but we will wait and see how good new Treasurer Snelling is on that issue. But in return for that extra GST money, the states were going to reduce or remove an enormous number of the state-based taxes. It was not going to happen overnight, it was not going to happen instantly: it was going to happen slowly and steadily over time as the states and as the agencies could actually manage it.

But then, of course, two years later, in 2002 we went from a Liberal to a Labor state government and, lo and behold, stuck in the mud, it became suddenly impossible. So, what should have happened—which was a strong reduction in state-based taxes—did not ever, ever eventuate. It could have but it didn't.

It would be remiss of me not to mention once again the Remote Areas Electricity Scheme. This is, as people have heard me say quite a few times in this place, just a shambles and a disgrace. The fact that the government is trying to spruik itself that it still gives a small subsidy, a \$5.5 million subsidy, to outback areas, to 13 good communities throughout the outback, is shameful, when in reality what it is doing is that it is slugging homes, slugging families, slugging businesses and slugging visitors with increased electricity costs, in some situations significantly more than double their current situation.

That will hurt businesses more than anyone else, businesses in remote areas, which, if they cannot operate, if they cannot employ people, then the homes, the families and the people who live in these small remote towns will not have jobs. Not only will they get hit with their own electricity bill but they will get hit with lack of employment, reduced hours and, potentially, unemployment in remote areas.

I look at the impact that this has had on councils—this red tape, this cost shifting and this wanting to be the one who sets the rules but not the one who actually pays the price. Look at the impact that that has had on regional councils throughout the state. Look at what happens with rubbish dumps all over the state. Quite understandably, the standard of rubbish dumps needs to go up. We need to get better, all of us, as people in our homes and in our businesses, with regard to councils. We need to get better with the way in which we manage our rubbish.

But what the state government says is, 'Well, look, this is what you need to do now. This is what you need to do next year. This is what you need to do the year after that.' The rules are getting tighter and tighter; and, 'Yes, we know that that will be much more expensive for you, but, oh, that'll be your problem. You sort that out. We just give you the rules, and we know that the rules mean that you will incur far more costs, but you worry about how you're going to pay for it. Oh, and if you can't figure it out yourself, what we suggest you do is just pass that on to your local people in your councils. You'll sort it out somehow.'

Essentially, the further away you can get from the state government bearing the costs, the better as far as the state government is concerned, but it still wants to set the rules. What this is going to do, and I do not make any joke of this, is to completely undervalue state government. If over time this state government wants to have the responsibility for setting the rules but pass the costs on to other people, whether they say, 'Oh, that's a federal government issue', or, 'That's a local government issue,' or, 'That's an industry issue,' or, 'That's a small outback community areas issue. You guys all have to pay for it,' eventually we will not need a state government. Eventually we will not need a state government if we keep heading down that path. State governments are in place to provide services to people, homes, business, industries, communities and organisations that cannot do it directly for themselves. One of the main reasons to have a government is to provide these services.

If this government wants to set the rules but send all the costs and hard parts elsewhere, why do we have a state government? It will not be hard to set the rules and figure out what really needs to be done. If we continue down this path, the state government will do itself out of a job because of its own financial mismanagement.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (19:51): I rise to add a further contribution to the Supply Bill 2011. I want to talk about some particular cuts and arrangements in my electorate for branch broom rape funding, which is currently under review under the national review scheme. I am very concerned about where we are heading in the future with this funding. It is a very tough parasite to control—it is basically a parasitic plant that attaches to plants.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, my predecessor supposedly fixed it. Some properties in the Murraylands next year are coming out of quarantine after their so-called 12 years of being controlled under the broom rape program, but I am very concerned because there will still have to be a program involving the paddocks that come out of the 12-year cycle because they will still need monitoring. There needs to be careful thought, both at a state and federal level, about what funding is allocated to this program in whatever form it takes leading into the future. Our horticulture crops could be at risk and there could be a risk to affected farmers not being able to deliver produce, either to markets or the local silo. I certainly do not want that to happen. But I reiterate that we must keep up the fight and be vigilant.

I want to make some comments about the money that this government is spending on the desalination plant. Our plant is costing very close to \$2 billion, and it is a lot of money. A group of Liberals, including me, went to Perth and saw their first plant of either 45 or 50 gigalitres, and that plant cost \$300 million to build. On top of that, there was \$87 million worth of pipes to connect it to the system around Perth, so I believe that was pretty cheap water in the desalination field. I think we went over there in late 2006 or early 2007.

We have a plant in Adelaide that is double the size of what it should be at 100 gigalitres. It will cover around 60 to 70 per cent of Adelaide's water supply in a complete drought, in a complete disaster when we have no ability to pump water from the River Murray. It is interesting to note that, in the last four years, we still had the ability to pump from the Murray after the engineers suddenly realised they could lower the pumps, but I kept getting told early in the drought that they couldn't. So we have \$1.8 billion worth of desalination plant and over \$400 million worth of pipeline. It is absolutely ridiculous when you think of what happened in Perth.

Mr Whetstone: It is outrageous.

Mr PEDERICK: It is outrageous, thank you to the member for Chaffey. It is totally outrageous. The cost of the pipe network to connect the desalination plant with the northern suburbs is more than the cost of the original plant in Perth with the associated pipe infrastructure.

Another issue in country areas close to Adelaide is the cuts in housing subsidies for public servants within 100 kilometres, which certainly affects my electorate. It has already had an effect

on the school my children go to, Coomandook Area School. A teacher was trying to find a house in Tailem Bend, but one was not available. I do not know who was looking at the map, but I would think Tailem Bend is a few kilometres outside the 100 kilometre ring from Adelaide. I guess for whoever was swinging the compass around and decided they wanted to grab a bit more it was a pretty easy decision. It has already caused issues locally with people.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr FEDERICK: Thank you, Michael. There was one teacher who wanted to reside at Coonalpyn. Sadly, the local store is shut at Coonalpyn, so this person said there was no incentive for them to stay there, and then they could not get the Public Service subsidy to live in Tailem Bend. I know for a fact it is already affecting the recruitment of police in my area. We have a great area, and it is a real issue that we cannot attract people to the area to do their jobs, whether they be police or teachers, and they are vital services that we need in the bush.

I will talk about the locust funding for the plague this year. We had \$12.8 million allocated for the control of locusts by the government. It was well short of the Victorian government's program, which I think was about \$43 million, and \$10.4 million of the state funding was spent. I wanted to see farmers get a full subsidy for the chemical, and the ones who had to use their boom sprays generally were quite happy to do that. However, no, the government came out with a program where they might be able to claim a subsidy of about 20 per cent, and that program ended at the end of December.

Has the government not realised that the locusts have been on the wing? We have had the second, third and probably the fourth generation this season. I wonder whether there is anything in the budget for a control program this year because I believe they will be on the wing again when we need to hit them in the spring. At the moment, we have all the rodents and insects—spider invasions, millipedes, mice, rats, locusts and crickets—it is all happening. I wonder whether funding is being set aside for another locust control program this year because I certainly think it needs to be.

Something that has been very dear to my heart all my life is the River Murray. I am very, very disappointed by the attitude of this government in removing the bunds at Narrung, Currency Creek and Clayton. Finally, after we asked many questions in this house, the Minister for Water Security, Paul Caica, suddenly realised he needed to write to the federal government to access more funding. He had obviously spent part of the funding that had been allocated when they built the bund at the Narrung narrows, and he was \$300,000 short to remove it. It was about a \$2.6 million program to remove that bund.

I must say there was a lot of community agitation, and I note that the deputy leader, the member for MacKillop, and the Hon. David Ridgway (and I would have been involved had I not been away on leave) went down and started the job for the government during January, digging the bund out. By taking six months, minimum, longer than they should have in making the decision to remove that bund, they have removed the right of those people around Lake Albert to access water fresh enough for their irrigation properties and their stock.

We also see the issue of the bunds at Clayton and Currency Creek silting up, and they need to be removed as well. I understand that will come at a cost of about \$5 million; but they need to get on with it. These bunds went in in a hurry to assist with issues looming with acidification in the Lakes, and on this side of the house we reluctantly agreed that they should go in. But why is there this delay that takes so long to get these mounds of dirt out? It is because the other side of this house, the government side, the Labor side, do not care because it is not affecting their electorates.

It is an absolute disgrace that this has gone on, when we have gone past peak flow in the River Murray, so that the people of Lakes communities and at the mouth out past Goolwa could have had the right that they should have and seen the full flow of the river. It is an absolute shame.

In closing, it is good to see—and I do not know whether it is common sense or whether a sudden realisation set into the Minister for Agriculture today, who did a backflip on the night shift on the quarantine stations in this state. It is well received in the community, and it just shows the idiocy of making a decision that affects the whole state and not just the primary producers.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (20:01): I would like to start off this gripe in particular looking at this government's reliance on the two main economic drivers in this state—mining and agriculture. Within 2010 particularly, the budget absolutely cut the guts out of PIRSA and SARDI

and, almost, the long term future of agriculture research and development. Research and development in agriculture particularly is about the next generation's future, it is about the next generation after that's future, it is about what is about to happen today, what is about to happen in 50 years' time.

Again, we look at the marine parks issue. I am absolutely disgusted at this government's approach, the communication they have given the people who it affects. They have based the marine parks issue on bad advice. It is not about sustainability of our waters at all; it is about revenue raising.

The government promised \$20 million to restructure the Riverland through the Riverland Futures Task Force. It was a program that delivered \$5 million over four years. In 12 months, less than \$700,000 has been spent through this program. My question is: has the government committed that \$20 million to the region, or is it just window-dressing as pre-election promise?

Today the government delayed the Berri regional hospital upgrade, not allowing it through the Public Works Committee motion. I watched the minister walk in here today and be asked the question: could the time be extended by five minutes? He would not extend that time by five minutes, just to allow a motion to go through, on a public infrastructure project that was the government's initiative. It was very, very disappointing.

As I speak today, \$60,000 a day is being forked out by this government to watch no work being done on the Chowilla regulator. The Chowilla regulator is a government initiative to support an environmental project, supported by the federal government, to keep the long-term benefit of an environmental asset that this state owns, which is the Chowilla flood plain. We do have other environmental assets through the Banrock wetlands and also, of course, the Lower Lakes, through Lake Alexandrina, Lake Albert and, of course, the Coorong. Who in the department negotiated this situation? Who negotiated that, while there was no work being done through a high river, we would have to fork out \$60,000 a day to watch nothing happen? It beggars belief.

The desal debacle is absolutely mismanagement at its pinnacle. The overall cost is going to blow out to over \$2.4 billion—\$2.4 billion of taxpayers' money. The Liberal Party's policy was to look at a 50-gigalitre plant and look at diversifying our water supply. We looked at stormwater harvesting. We looked at greywater re-use. This government has committed \$2.4 billion of taxpayers' money to put a 100-gigalitre plant in, which is not yet operational. We continually see delay. We continually see mismanagement of this plant. For example, the north-south interconnector, a \$403 million project. It is an absolute waste of money.

In consultation with several members on this side, we look at that desal plant being up and operational and we wonder: why would they spend \$403 million today when they are not needing it? Why wouldn't they pump the desal water into an underground aquifer at much less cost to every taxpayer in South Australia? We look at the cost to every South Australian taxpayer to keep that desal plant running—\$130 million per year. It really does beggar belief.

I have done a grievance on stormwater and I have done a grievance on the desal plant today, so I will not continue with that, but I will look at country health. Today, we hear that the new RAH cost has blown out by over \$1 billion; that is, \$1,000 million, without a brick laid. Not one brick has been laid and we have already seen a \$1 billion blowout. It absolutely beggars belief.

With country health, particularly in the seat of Chaffey, we have had an attempted takeover by stealth of our community hospital land and assets by Country Health SA. We have major waiting times for local doctors. Some local constituents are waiting for up to six weeks to see a doctor. It is outrageous to think that people in the country have to wait six weeks to see a doctor.

We have increased costs for emergency patients at the regional hospital. We have doctors who are being transported up to the regional hospital over the weekends at outrageous cost for people to visit a doctor. We see way too many locals having to travel to Adelaide for medical reasons to see specialised services that have been promised to the regional hospital. It is a huge encumbrance to those rural constituents of mine who have to travel, find accommodation and deal with the stress of being sick, or deal with their loved ones who are sick. It is an extended cost to country people, again.

We have a major health crisis in the Riverland with poor seasonal conditions for grape growers. We have major mental health concerns, with the agriculture sector dealing with drought, floods and a lack of support in what they do with their business. We have funding for rural

counsellors and volunteers drying up. While we see an increasing need for counsellors to give support to the regional farmers and businesses, the government is pulling that funding. It is absolutely outrageous.

As of only last week, we have seen that public libraries funding has been reduced by over \$1 million from 2013. That creates a big black hole for local council budgets to pick up, and that is forcing costs onto the Riverland ratepayers.

If we look at country roads, one particular road that is drawn to my attention is the Loxton to Karoonda road. That road is almost impassable in a heavy vehicle (a truck). To add to that, that road has been supporting a sand mine. Again, that is one of the two economic drivers in South Australia and yet the state government has refused to step up to the plate and draw on federal funding and support to upgrade that road.

If we look at small school grants, I think, as I reflect, that the member for Flinders today said that he has many small schools in his electorate, as do I. Through the 2010 budget cuts, we see almost forced amalgamations of schools. It is almost amalgamation by stealth, and I think it is absolutely outrageous.

In closing, I have a question to every member and every person in this chamber: would a business of today prosper or even survive with Rann Labor government thinking? I think not.

Mr Griffiths: Only 6 per cent of businesses in South Australia support Rann policies.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, who is actually speaking here? I thought it was the member for Chaffey, then the member for Finniss, then it was the member for Goyder. I don't know.

Mr WHETSTONE: It is a duet.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: This is more than a duet. This is some sort of threesome. It is not natural.

Mr WHETSTONE: Well, I think you were having a twosome up there, engrossed in a conversation with the member for Norwood.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am too. We were just talking about you.

Mr WHETSTONE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (20:11): I am afraid that today we witnessed yet another financial debacle orchestrated by the Labor Party in South Australia. There were shades of the early nineties again. I shook my head in disbelief when I heard that here we have another state Labor government \$1 billion out of control on this project alone. I was, like everybody else in this place, I would suggest, absolutely stunned by the announcement.

You just wonder where it will end up. You would have to say that this Rann Labor government in South Australia could not even organise a chook raffle. They would stuff that up. Quite frankly, you have had a change of treasurer; who wears the blame on this I do not know, but who picks up the bill? That will be the poor old South Australian taxpayer. It is an absolute disgrace, and I was very pleased that it received widespread coverage in the media tonight.

It is yet another nail in the coffin of this Labor government in South Australia. We will belt a few more nails into it over the next three years too, trust me. Just \$1 billion alone, and that was not our cooking up figures, that came from a document that was produced in this house. You well know that and you ought to sit there in shame, quite frankly.

We have also had \$8 million spent over four years on the marine parks program that is still not happening. Money means absolutely nothing to this government. It means absolutely nothing. They do not care where it comes from, as long as the poor old taxpayer still puts their hand in their pocket. Be in absolutely no doubt, I have no hesitation in suggesting that, despite the minister's denial today, marine parks and sanctuary zones will become a focus of revenue for this government if they ever come into place. Hopefully, just hopefully, there is enough common sense on the other side to squash it once and for all. As our leader said last night, on coming into government, it will be canned.

There are a host of things that are wrong, and another one is the removal of these regulators at Narrung and Clayton, and some people spoke to me yesterday about the Clayton regulator. My very clear understanding is that the feds have come up with the money for that—and

they should both have been removed, but they have not been removed—and it has been squirreled away or spent on some other useless project, I would suggest, yet these things need to take place.

It worries the daylighters out of me, and it worries the daylighters out of those on this side of the house, that this state is going to be back where it was when the Liberals came into government in 1993. We are going to have to clean up an almighty mess yet again. The Labor Party in this state cannot manage money. The Labor Party in New South Wales made an appalling mess of everything; they are gone. In Victoria they are gone, and in Western Australia they are gone.

Australians generally and South Australians I know are absolutely fed up with spin. They are totally fed up with spin. They want good stable steady government, instead of the nonsense they are getting thrust upon them at the moment. I can remember asking John Schumann once, 'Why did you leave what you were doing in Canberra with Senator Meg Lees?' He said, 'I got out when the children took over.' I reckon that is what is happening here.

Quite clearly, I do not think those who are coming in are up to it. I think they are failing in their task. Heaven knows what sort of a budget we are going to get out of our new Treasurer. I think what has occurred today is an outrage. I commend our side of the house for getting this issue up, putting it on the table and exposing it for what it is worth. I do not think there is any doubt that tomorrow the print media are going to have a field day on it. We had Greg Kelton calling for the head of the police minister in the paper this morning. I suggest he will be calling for the heads of a few more by the end of next week. This cannot go on. It is a nonsense, and any of you who are in marginal seats must be shaking with—

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: —rage and fear, I would suggest. It is three years, and a lot can happen in three years. But I'll tell you what, a billion dollars' worth of debt is going to be an appalling thing for people to have lodged in the backs of their minds. I do not intend to go on tonight, I know we have other speakers. I have made my point and I rest my case.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (20:16): I want to continue my remarks from this afternoon when I spoke in the grievance debates about issues concerning the rezoning of land in and around Mount Barker; in particular, the role that the Greens and their supporters are attempting to play in the district.

It is my belief that the Greens' supporters are attempting to promote themselves as the campaigners in relation to opposing the rezoning, and they are endeavouring to diminish the Liberal Party's attempts, and its opposition to, the rezoning. I know I got pulled up on a point of order this afternoon, and we worked through that so that is fair enough; however, the point I want to make is that this particular issue of rezoning land was the number one issue in that part of the electorate leading up to and including the election last year.

The results of the ballots at the Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne polling booths are a clear indication that the Liberal Party had convinced the majority of the community that it was strongly opposed to the rezoning of that land, against the claims by the Greens and their supporters were that the Liberals had not convinced the majority of the community.

The votes were at such a level that the state Liberals won the combined vote of the two Mount Barker booths on the primary vote. They won the Littlehampton booth on the primary vote and the Liberal Party was shy, by about 20 or so votes, of winning the Nairne polling booth on the primary vote. If that is not an indication that the majority of the community understood the Liberals' position in relation to the matter of rezoning land, I don't know what is. The claims by the Greens and their supporters, I believe, are incorrect.

As I said this afternoon, the Greens preferenced ALP candidates ahead of Liberal candidates in every key marginal seat, and as a consequence of that they assisted the re-election of the Labor government, which then rammed through the DPA. The Greens have to understand their role in this matter.

You may ask the question: 'How do you know it is the Greens and their supporters who are perpetuating this myth?' As it happens, at least two people have written letters to the local paper; one was the wife or partner of the Greens candidate who ran against me at the election last year. The other person was the Greens' candidate for the Mayo electorate at the federal election last year. If that is not a clear indication of the Greens supporters and their involvement in this issue, trying to perpetuate a myth, then I would like to know what is.

Having said that, I want to bring my remarks around to some of the issues that I think are important concerning the portfolio areas that I have a responsibility for on behalf of the Liberal opposition, particularly in relation to road safety. We all understand that road safety is a very important issue that the state faces on a daily basis and I will say that, looking at the statistics as at 4 April, there are some encouraging trends.

Thankfully, the number of fatalities for the year to date compared to this time last year are down. As at 4 April, fatalities were at 42 in 2010 and this year, in 2011, they are at 28. I think that is a very pleasing improvement in the reduction of fatalities on our roads. However, another measure that I know the government looks to in relation to crash statistics is serious injuries. We do not hear a lot about serious injuries in the press. We certainly obviously hear about fatalities and the tragedy that results when somebody is killed on our roads.

My family has experienced that with two of my cousins being killed in road crashes over the years, so I have an understanding of the grief and anxiety and all the emotions that come with those situations. However, when we look at the serious injury statistics, we are at a higher level this year in 2011 compared to the year-to-date figures for last year. It is only marginal, but we are still fractionally higher. It has not gone down.

The total serious injuries for the year to date for 2010 is 277, compared to 279 for 2011, so there is an increase of two there. However, what is more disturbing, when we look at the serious injuries sustained for P-plate drivers, is that the year-to-date figure last year in 2010 was 24, compared to 30 this year. Again, I think it is an issue that the government needs to continue to look at in terms of safety for our P-plate drivers.

I know that legislation was passed last year in relation to our inexperienced drivers, looking to improve the laws that increase safety around those drivers. However, they are the statistics and, while the fatalities are down, the serious injuries have not decreased, and for P-plate drivers the injuries have increased for the year to date.

I have some serious concerns about the way the government has dealt with the whole issue of road safety, because we have actually had five ministers for road safety in about the last five years. There has been no continuity of an incumbent in that role over the last five years, so the minister has hardly got their feet under the desk to then be able to implement any serious policy direction in relation to the pursuit of road safety.

Another aspect of road safety is running an effective advertising campaign. The government has been running the same advertisement for almost two years and members may be aware of it. That is where you see this glass of beer hovering in the air following somebody walking around, or a glass of wine hovering in the air following another person walking around. I received feedback from people about that advertisement, because I asked people, 'What do you think about that road safety advertisement?' They did not understand it, and I did not understand it for the first few times until I actually watched it and understood what the message was. The whole issue about advertising is that if it does not grab the attention of the viewer within the first five seconds, well, you have lost your message.

The government has to be serious about an effective advertising campaign in relation to road safety. One person told me that they actually thought that it was an advertisement for beer; it was actually an advertisement to go out and purchase a certain brand of beer—no connection to road safety. In reality, it is a total waste of taxpayers' money because the Motor Accident Commission sponsors, I understand, a fair proportion of the advertising in relation to road safety. They are a few issues I want to have raised, and I will continue to highlight these issues as we progress.

Time expired.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (20:26): I just want to touch on an issue about a Sustainable Budget Commission report (a report that was famously leaked prior to the last budget) and the reason that this impacts on the Supply Bill. I have just got off the phone from the Australian Hotels Association in relation to a media report tonight that the government is looking at going back and reinstating some of the Sustainable Budget Commission report recommendations that the hotels industry understood were rejected by the government, not included in the budget or the forward estimates and not included in the Mid-Year Budget Review.

As I say, I have just got off the phone from the Hotels Association so I have not had the chance to go back and check that exact position, but, clearly, the Hotels Association's

understanding is that the government did not include the measure I am about to address in either the budget, the forward estimates or the Mid-Year Budget Review.

What the Hotels Association is saying is that, the government has been in discussions with the Hotels Association regarding the introduction of yet another increase in tax, yet another increase in fees. The fee that it is looking to introduce now is an increase in an annual liquor licensing fee. It was the Sustainable Budget Commission measure E 5.2.9.2, and, according to the Sustainable Budget Commission report, it would raise additional revenue of around \$4.5 million per year out of the pubs and clubs industry.

The issue here is twofold: one is that if the government is now going to go back and revisit this particular Sustainable Budget Commission recommendation, then it is clearly obvious that all the other Sustainable Budget Commission recommendations may well be reconsidered by the government. Why would they pick just one out? That is a signal that the budget may well be in trouble.

Members might remember that the government laid out four years' worth of savings measures, four years' worth of revenue measures, in its last budget. It has been a very, very unpopular budget. It saw the demise of the then treasurer, the member for Port Adelaide, now the Minister for Police; and, of course the new Treasurer has come in saying, 'Well, we're going to adopt exactly the same policy.'

However, the new Treasurer appears to be going one step further. The new Treasurer now seems to be saying that he is going to go back and look at the Sustainable Budget Commission report and see where he can pick up more revenue or, indeed, more cuts to the Public Service or programs out of the Sustainable Budget Commission report. The concern is, of course, that the Sustainable Budget Commission report—all those things that were rejected—may well be back on the table.

The second issue is that you would have to ask the question on behalf of South Australian businesses: when is enough tax enough tax? After nine years of Labor government, after nine years of what some in the media say has been good economic management by the former treasurer, we have the highest taxed businesses in Australia, we have the worst WorkCover rate in Australia, and we have the worst return-to-work rate in Australia. All of those things—

Mr Pisoni: And the highest unemployment.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: And the highest unemployment, my colleague interjects, in Australia.

Mr Marshall: And the worst government in Australia.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: And the member for Norwood may well be right: we have the worst government in Australia. However, I have to say on behalf of my federal colleagues that I think the federal government would take some beating, but the Rann government may well just do it. On behalf of those businesses you have to start asking the question: how many more costs does the Labor Party, federal and state, expect them to bear before it breaks the camel's back?

The introduction of a carbon tax federally will impose a cost not only on households but also on all those businesses, of course: that will be an extra cost. There is a proposal for a national disability insurance scheme levy. That will be an extra administrative burden for someone within the scheme: there will be an extra cost there. The issue is not only the fact that the government has gone back to look at the Sustainable Budget Commission issues again—it is a clear sign the budget is in trouble—but it is also the cost to business.

One of the problems with this government is that on some occasions it has failed to make a decision and on other occasions when it has made a decision it has made a bad one. I will give the example of marine parks. This government has been consulting for eight years. It has had four ministers that have run a consultation program for eight years. It has had five consultants' reports—five surveys—into the issue, and the government simply cannot make a decision.

The other example is the dispute between Treasury and the department for recreation and sport over the princely sum of \$1.4 million (\$200,000 a year). Treasury and the department for sport were in dispute for six years, and no-one could make a decision. It is a classic example of a government that does not have the confidence to go on and make decisions.

When they have made a decision, they have panicked. They have been spooked by the politics of issues and they have made bad decisions. This government spent an eternity telling

South Australia it did not need a desalination plant. It absolutely did not need one. That was after the Liberal Party announced that the contractor in Western Australia said he could repeat that exercise in South Australia for around \$400 million.

John Hill, the minister for the environment at the time, and other ministers such as Michael Wright went out and said, 'We don't need a desalination plant.' When the politics of the issue turned the Liberals' way, the government came out and announced a huge desalination plant that has now blown out—it is not the \$400 million cost; and I think one of my colleagues quoted it—to \$2.2 billion or \$2.4 billion, a massive increase.

The Adelaide Oval was an announcement because the Liberal Party talked about football being in the city. It was only a year before that that the state government and football were arm in arm walking along at AAMI Stadium saying, 'This is the future of football.' The government was going to put in \$100 million, football was going to put in \$100 million and football was going to survive at AAMI Stadium. Only when the Liberal Party announced the concept of football in the city did the government panic, and it went from a taxpayer contribution of \$100 million at Football Park to \$300 million at Adelaide Oval to \$450 million at Adelaide Oval to \$535 million at Adelaide Oval, and it is climbing.

Today we have the issue of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the increase in costs there. All of these increases in costs, all of this poor management of process and all of this poor management of projects adds cost to living in South Australia, and that is why we are the highest taxed state in Australia—because we have an incompetent government. We have an incompetent government that cannot run process and it cannot run projects. I hate to think how much the—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The Hindmarsh Stadium.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The poor old member for Croydon mentions the Hindmarsh Stadium. Go and get the Auditor-General's Report and it will tell you it came in on time and on budget—\$28 million.

An honourable member: Under budget.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Under budget. The Labor Party make a great kerfuffle about that, but under budget and on time. I hate to think what the current estimate is for the duplication of the Southern Expressway. I wonder what the cost estimate currently is for the duplication of the Southern Expressway. We have a government that is tired, we have a government that is divided and we have a government that is imposing huge costs on South Australia, not only for this generation but for many generations to come.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PISONI (Unley) (20:35): We hear cheers from the member for Croydon.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You do. Bring it on.

Mr PISONI: You should actually take your suit off when you are going to have a sleep and put some pyjamas on, then you might not have as many crinkles in it. Today, I did in fact ask the Minister for Police a serious question in regard to police resources in the department. We know there was that terrible situation at Craigmore High School where we saw a child suffering from Aspergers who was king hit to the ground and knocked unconscious and videotaped. That was a terrible situation. A few weeks later we saw the education minister then go down there on the first National Anti-Bullying Day. Somebody obviously briefed the Governor to say that this was an isolated incident—'Craigmore is a great school; this is an isolated incident.'

We can look back to a very similar incident that happened on 9 February 2009 where a grandmother, living in the seat of Morialta, wrote to the then member, Lindsay Simmons. She wrote to Lindsay Simmons complaining about the lack of police action when her grandchild was assaulted at the school. I was very curious to read the letter that Ms Simmons received from the then police minister, the Hon. Michael Wright, the member for Lee. He explained in the letter:

South Australia Police (SAPOL) advises that after...made the report, it was allocated to a police officer attached to the Family Violence Investigation Section of the Elizabeth Police Station to investigate. The investigating officer assessed the report but was not able to progress this investigation prior to commencing his annual leave.

Then no further contact was made until 6 May. This poor family were distressed at the violent incident—an assault on their child. No action was taken by the police department. This action was obviously sanctioned by the police minister, because it appears to be a legitimate reason for a three-month delay in an investigation on a violent attack in a school.

It is no wonder that we are seeing these types of things not being dealt with by the department and the police, because the department's very own KPMG report that deals with the way the department handles complaints and investigations says that the department does not even have a memorandum of understanding with the police, nor does it have qualified people in its investigation branch. There is nobody with investigation experience for investigating these types of incidents, disputes between teachers and principals or disputes between teachers and the department. There is nobody that is qualified in that department to deal with it. That report was received by the minister in November last year.

I was very surprised to hear that the police minister could not answer that question. I would have thought it was pretty obvious that, if investigations are being delayed because of annual leave, you have a real staffing issue. I would imagine that you would have a very severe staffing issue if there is not somebody else to pick that up. If you are not covering for people who are on leave, that would suggest that, despite all the rhetoric we have been hearing for the last nine years from this government, we have an under-resourced police—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: A 40 per cent reduction in crime.

Mr PISONI: The member for Croydon says there has been a reduction in crime, but what did the new Attorney-General say today? He said that Adelaide is not a safe place, you cannot go out at night. That is what he said today in reference to the attack on the police minister on the weekend. What has it come to when you cannot even go out at night? That is exactly what South Australians are asking themselves: what has it come to when you cannot go out at night? I would like to know what evidence he has that there is some campaign out there where people are saying that it is a sport to attack the former treasurer. I would like to know what evidence he has to make that claim.

Mr Marshall: That's just in his own faction.

Mr PISONI: That's his own faction, is what the member for Norwood tells me. I am sure that a lot of that is happening in the Labor party room at the moment—a lot of attacks on the member for Port Adelaide.

I would also like to spend some time talking about stormwater management and how that is going in my electorate. I thought I might spend some time discussing the management of stormwater by this government, and again relate it to the promise that was made by this government, Mike Rann standing knee deep water in Mitcham in the floods of November 2005, saying, 'We will fix this; we will fix this flooding.' We all remember the sight of Mike Rann visiting the homes of the people of Mitcham affected by flooding in November 2005.

Legislation was introduced to this parliament in 2006. We were promised that it was going to bang together the councils' heads, that this was going to make them fix the stormwater issues in Adelaide and in particular in those creeks that run through Burnside, Mitcham, West Torrens and, finally, out to sea. The further downstream you are the more threat there is from flooding in South Australia; but that has obviously all gone out the window with the drought that we have had because nothing is being done.

Just to show how inept the Stormwater Management Authority is, I wrote to its manager on 15 July 2010 to inquire on behalf of a constituent about an issue he had in dealing with some debris that was threatening to cause flooding in his home. All of July went past; all of August went past. By 1 September I had not even received an acknowledgement of my letter, so I made an inquiry and then I got an acknowledgement immediately. That is obviously a culture that has developed under the management of minister Conlon about how the Stormwater Management Authority must work.

I received a letter in January this year ensuring me that I should be very excited about this, that to ensure that all five councils meet their time line in delivering the stormwater management plan for the Brownhill Creek and the Keswick Creek, the SMA resolved to issue an order to councils to have a stormwater management plan prepared by 30 April 2011. The Stormwater Management Authority was set up five years ago, and their report for a plan is not even due yet. Here we are, five years later and it is not even due. So, God knows how long it is going to be before the residents in Burnside, Mitcham, Unley and West Torrens are going to see any work done. As a matter of fact, the City of Unley has now been left out in the cold by having \$500,000 of funding, that it believes it was verbally guaranteed by department heads for the culvert under Unley Road, pulled from it. That is another expense for Unley ratepayers.

So, despite the promises on stormwater and despite the television images of the Premier knee-deep in water in Mitcham promising to fix stormwater in the inner southern and western suburbs of Adelaide, nothing is done. Five years later, board fees—and on that board, of course, we have Anne Howe, the water commissioner, she was on the Stormwater Management Authority. No wonder nothing got done. I am sure she had an excuse. It was our fault in the Liberal Party and, of course, she had an excuse to blame others.

Time expired.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (20:46): I am inspired to speak tonight about one of the most complete and comprehensive failures of a minister in Her Majesty's Government ever, and that is the Minister for Families and Communities. There are a number of reasons for that, and I am going to be brief tonight, but let me give you an illustration of what happened in last year's budget.

First of all, we had that monumental announcement about selling off the Parks. The poorest and most vulnerable people in the community have services provided there. When this embarrassment was exposed and there was public outcry, what did the government do? As usual, it sent it off for review. Who did it get in? Monsignor Cappelletti, as usual. Trot him in, he does a review and we are still waiting for his report.

In the meantime, the Port Adelaide Enfield council has done a report and it says, 'Double the money on it, do the development and keep it there.' So, we are waiting, with bated breath, for that monumental disaster from last year's budget to be remedied. I have asked the Treasurer to do so by retaining that site, redeveloping it and making provision for that service.

Secondly, her other great contribution to last year's debate was to announce that, notwithstanding that her own Premier had promised, in writing, that he would not use the \$30 one-off payment from the federal government for the purpose of calculating rental payments on Housing Trust properties, what does she do? Blow that. She says, 'It's in; it's to be assessed.' The only minister in Australia.

Minister Macklin writes to her protesting about this. Recently, under FOI, I found that she is still writing to her, this year, asking that that be remedied. That is another disgraceful abandonment of the very people she is supposed to be here in this parliament to fight for.

What do we have next? We had this other little gem. Two weeks after last year's budget we find that she is going to change the rules of assessment for rental payments to Housing Trust, and she is going to add in other payments that tenants receive at a 100 per cent rate that previously had not been taken into account. But so that she does not get caught out on that, she does not put it in the budget at all. It is announced two weeks later.

What is her excuse for that? Her great excuse for that is, 'Look, we made that decision in cabinet a few years ago so I didn't need to put it in the budget.' She just turns up with a letter to the thousands of Housing Trust tenants across South Australia, who are provided housing by this government, and she says, 'Well, bad luck, you tossers are going to have to pay under a new rate.'

Next, she decides to announce—as she did today with her great monumental effort about what she is doing on public housing for South Australians, after she is selling off with gay abandon public housing in the state—that she has, on time and on budget (apparently, ahead of budget) the money that she is spending from the federal government. This is the bailout money for her incompetence. She is using that money to be able to do property development, and she wants to tell us today that she has approval. Well, we know that. Why did she come in to tell us that today? I wonder if it is something to do with the FOI we have in at the moment to release those reports that have been sitting on her desk and that we are still waiting for.

Next, of course, is Lochiel Park. You remember that little gem, the Premier's great green village in the seat of Hartley? Taxpayers have put \$10 million in to produce this little gem of a green village. I accept, as I said to the LMC, that when you are starting up new technology and new green ecology sometimes you need a bit of seed money; that is fair enough. What has happened with all these promises for this modest little village? What happened? She only has to build four community houses. They have had the money for six years and she has not even built four houses. That is a disgrace.

So, let me say one other thing. I read in the paper this week that when we have asked that all the proceeds from Strathmont for those 66-odd residents who are still there, they used to have about 400, and of course—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What's your policy?

Ms CHAPMAN: The Liberal government had commenced the policy to put them into community housing. This government continued it, and we are pleased about that, but wait for this: she is the owner of this site and yet, when asked to ensure that the balance of the proceeds of this site—some of which have already been earmarked for our youth prison—be actually set aside for people with disabilities, what did she say? She said, 'I have to discuss that with the Treasurer.' She owns the property, for goodness sake. What a complete fool!

So, I ask the government to get smart and get rid of her. Seeing that poor old Michael O'Brien is going to have stuff-all to do once they have got rid of PIRSA, you may as well give him the job because he is the only one who knows what he is doing in the government.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (20:51): Last November, I spoke about the difficulties facing the wine industry, particularly the impact the strong Australian dollar would have on the industry. Unfortunately, sir, as you would know, being from the Southern Vales, the situation—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We all took no notice.

Mr VENNING: Well, you are probably right. The situation for grape growers has not improved. The recent wet weather could not have come at a worse time, right before harvest. Many growers will have their fruit rejected or downgraded because of the damage the rain has done. This is after many had to pay out for expensive chemicals to try to combat the diseases caused by the wet weather, such as downy mildew. Many vines, especially whites, have been affected by butt rot and botrytis, and many have just split on the vine. So, it is an absolute calamity.

This comes on the top of years of hardship for the wine industry. Oversupply, low prices, drought, water shortages and the high Australian dollar have all contributed to a difficult period. Problems began when the Aussie dollar got up to US75¢; that was about two or three years ago. Well, how do you think we are getting on today? This morning, the dollar hit \$US1.04. So, how do you think the exporters are going against that? It is extremely difficult.

Recently, the independent grower body, the Wine Grape Council of South Australia, said that only one-third of more than 1,000 growers who responded to their recent survey said that they made a profit in 2010. The council has also said that two-thirds of the grapes harvested in South Australia were sold below the cost of production. Sir, you would understand as much as I, representing a wine region, the problems that wet weather has brought about this season. Predictions are that prices will be even lower for the 2011 vintage grapes.

A local grower in the Barossa, and a dear friend of mine, Mr Leo Pech, has been saying for years that the industry is heading for massive trouble unless the oversupply issues can be overcome. He has provided me and many other members of parliament with a lot of advice over the years and he has been spot-on. Leo has been growing grapes for 61 years and I know things are the worst he has seen in all this time.

Leo recently talked about the situation on ABC radio and said that, on average, he normally sprays about four or five times a year. This year, he has had to spray up to 11 times, and he still has fungus on his vines. Having to spray this many times comes at a huge cost, and Leo's is not an isolated case—there are many, many of them.

In fact, a recent report in one of the local papers stated that there will be an increase in demand for counselling services in the Barossa because of this year's poor grape harvest. We have heard of some very unfortunate incidents where the obvious has happened, without me stating it here.

What is the answer? The growers who are losing money would be better off removing varieties that are not in demand, but how do they do that? Many growers do not have another source of income and cannot sell their vineyards because no-one wants to buy them, so they continue to borrow money and keep going into debt in the hope that the next year will be a good year and prices will increase.

I really feel for these people because I, too, am a farmer relying on primary industry. I feel so lucky that in my enterprise, when wheat prices are bad, I have alternatives. I can go to barley, I can go to legumes, I can go to hay, I can go to cattle and I can go to sheep. I have so many other options to keep the farm viable. Many of these people do not have any choice but to keep on growing grapes at a loss, as you know, sir.

I hope that the next harvest does bring a better year for the growers. It is a shame, when we are about to begin vintage festivities next week, that we will be celebrating a less than stellar harvest, but I hope growers may be able to forget their worries, even for just a short time, and enjoy themselves. I believe the quality of this year's vintage to be good, especially from the hand-picked vineyards, so our quality will be maintained because by hand-picking they can let the occasional bunch that is not up to standard drop to the ground.

Food security is another matter that is of grave concern to me. I think it is absolutely ludicrous that we import any food at all into Australia. Australia has the ability to be self-sufficient in food, yet we import everything and anything, from Chinese apples to fish from Thailand. A report released by Growcom a couple of weeks ago, entitled 'Food Security Issues for the Australian Horticulture Industry', includes some extremely worrying data with regard to our domestic food security and our food imports and exports. Members ought to read this because it gives you the creeps and causes great concern.

The report shows that Australia now imports more than a third of its fruit supply—34 per cent—and 19 per cent of our vegetables. I find this alarming. What will happen to the availability of fruit and vegetables as the world's population heads towards the predicted nine billion people by 2050? Logically, countries will hold onto their food stocks to feed their own people and export less, meaning there will be less available to others.

This highlights a problem that I believe could be easily overcome. We need to become totally self-sufficient with our food. The report lists several of the challenges that our domestic food production industry faces or will in the future: resources such as land availability, water and chemicals, fertiliser availability and prices, a reliable oil supply, farm profitability, food prices, and research and development—a very important challenge. The report recommends an increase in research and development funding from 3 per cent to 5 per cent of the gross value of agricultural production along with the formation of a central food security agency to be set up by the Australian government.

I have been speaking ad nauseam in this place about the importance of research and development to the future of our agricultural industry, but to no avail. Instead, we have seen the Rann Labor government strip 179 jobs from PIRSA as well as slash \$80 million from the budget. Funding to the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) has also been reduced to save \$8 million over four years. The Advisory Board of Agriculture will have all its funding withdrawn by 30 June this year.

This is the treatment that agriculture in our state receives—an industry that is worth, or was worth, \$12.5 billion to the South Australian economy. It is appalling, particularly to hear today of South Australia's wonderful export record, all due to the grain growers. I said in my contribution on last year's budget:

The government should be increasing the funding to ensure South Australia's food security. Ensuring our food security will be a major challenge for the future.

Now we see a report which states quite clearly that food security is an issue for us in the future, and increases in research and development activities are needed in order to try to prevent domestic food security problems in the future. I hope the minister for agriculture saw a copy of the report—and I have some time for this minister, incidentally—and took note of how important R&D is for our future food security.

This Rann Labor government has demonstrated that it does not consider research and development a priority, and I shudder to think what further cuts it has in store for the agriculture sector in its 9 June budget. Rann Labor seems more concerned about building city stadiums and new city hospitals than it is about future food supply. It will not be in my lifetime when food supply problems emerge but probably in my children's or grandchildren's time, and then the shortsightedness of some of the Rann Labor government's decisions to cut research and development will become apparent.

Today we had more bad news: a \$1 billion blowout on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, up to \$2.7 billion. Add to that the \$530 million for the Adelaide Oval. Who is doing the budget on all this? Who is making these decisions with all the other debt we have and are running up and the interest we are paying?

A lot of us on this side have run businesses and do budgets and, you know, South Australia cannot afford either this \$2.6 billion blowout of the new hospital or the Adelaide Oval. We

cannot afford it; you will break this state. Shades of the state bank! I was in this house back there by that pillar when the Hon. Jenny Cashmore did exactly as Iain Evans did today—revealed the extent of a financial mismanagement of the then Bannon Labor government. She walked out after being suspended, and it was not too long before 14 members of the government went with her. Fourteen members of the government lost their seats at the subsequent state election on that issue.

All I can say to members here is, you have time. I say this very genuinely: you have time to turn some of these things around. Admit that you have made a mistake with this hospital. Okay, we might give you a hard time for six or eight weeks, but the right decision has to be made, and the right decision is to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital right where it is.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (21:01): I wish to talk about some things that are relevant to my electorate also when it comes to the grievance opportunity as part of the supply debate. The first one relates to a decision that was made and announced on 16 September last year when the budget came down and the impact that that is going to have across forward years on my community, particularly as it relates to my community's private hospitals.

In my case it is Moonta and Ardrossan that were affected by the budget decision, and I have to tell you that the immediate effect of this was absolutely one of shock in those communities and a great fear that evolved immediately as to what the future was going to be. I understand, yes, that a lot of discussions have taken place since then. A lot of nervous energy has been expended by the hospital boards, the management of the hospitals and the wider communities of those areas in trying to determine that they have a strong future.

I do recognise that Country Health has become involved and helped develop revised business plans but, as I posed the question previously, I pose the question again this evening. When decisions like that are going to be made, in trying to control panic that is going to be evident because obviously people are going to be fearful about the future of their facilities, come in early and talk to the communities and do not rely upon it being dragged into the debate and the argument about it. Give some specifics, though, especially as it relates to Moonta because to me it is still a crazy decision even though things have moved forward a bit in the argument about it since.

Moonta is a private community hospital. It has some eight beds and a contract existed where patients could come from the public hospital system which was full—and in most cases probably that would be close by in Wallaroo which has, I believe, only about 19 or 20 beds—and they would accept those public patients into the Moonta private community hospital on the basis of a fee of only \$120.05 per night. In itself that sounds very cheap, and it is very cheap, especially when you compare it to what the cost of a bed is within the public system. I am advised that, for example, something like the RAH has a cost of approximately \$1,400 per night. I find it very hard to comprehend, from a financial viewpoint (and when you have a system that works well, it provides an overspill facility and there is only a cost being met when the service is required), that you do not retain that sort of thing.

Yes, it identified a savings across those four community hospitals of \$1.174 million. It has a detrimental effect upon those communities enormously, which I hope they do recover from. I was there not long after the announcement, and a public rally was held at the Moonta Hospital and a thousand people were there. They filled the lawn area in front of the hospital. They showed up as a sign of support for their facility, which they have supported for generations. They were fearful for it. They wanted everyone to understand the importance of it, and they were prepared to take up that fight in any way possible.

Similarly, the Ardrossan Community Hospital has been challenged financially for a vast number of years. It has had an agreement in place since 2006, I think, for originally \$120,000 per year in recognition of accident and emergency costs. That has increased a little now to its current situation of \$146,000 per year. From 30 June that hospital, like Moonta, faces the withdrawal of those dollars.

The Ardrossan Community Hospital has also looked at business plan opportunities and recovery of funds for the aged-care facilities that it provides as part of its operations from the federal government, but it is that accident and emergency issue. Ardrossan, being located on the coast road, with probably 300,000 visitors going past that area of Central Yorke Peninsula heading further south, has a very important position. Its ambulance service is extremely busy collecting, transporting and treating injured people.

Those people are delivered to the Ardrossan hospital and treatment is provided to them. It does come at a cost. The hospital board recognises that and contributes towards it, but it does require that level of support. It might have found some other revenue sources that will compensate in some way to allow it to have a future, but it is still a great frustration to me that public funds cannot be committed to provide facilities to ensure that the public can be treated.

The next issue I wish to talk about is marine parks. I commend the member for Bragg for organising the meeting last night. Some members in this chamber will say that it was blatantly political but, really, it was a forum and a voice opportunity for the thousands of people across South Australia who are really strong recreational fishers and who wanted to have the chance to express themselves in one united voice.

Being there and hearing those people and the anger in their voice, how loud they yelled things out, the fact that they wanted to get on the microphone and the fact that they were comfortable being in front of a television camera or a radio microphone indicated that they wanted a chance for people to hear the frustration they felt.

Marine parks are a very emotional issue, and for the people I represent in this place from Yorke Peninsula and the Adelaide Plains it is one they will continue to argue against for ever and a day. I have been to the public meetings held on the peninsula, and they are not ones that I have held, so they are not political. They are meetings that have been called by local action groups that have formed themselves together or, indeed, by the local advisory group (LAG) that the minister has appointed. In each of those meetings I hear a lot of frustrations and tensions flowing through, too.

The people who attend those are very supportive of the principle behind marine parks. The Liberal opposition is supportive of the principle behind marine parks, but there is a level of frustration that is flowing through these sanctuary zone declarations that came out at the end of November. There was no consultation with the local advisory groups, and, again, they are being instructed by big brother who sits to the right-hand side of the Speaker that 'This is what you are going to take.'

These people want the chance to go out fishing. It is for the commercial operators, it is for professional fishers and it is for the rec fishers, and it is the impact upon the economy of the Yorke Peninsula that we in this place all have to be concerned about. Last night, a member from the Real Estate Institute, Mr Robin Turner, as a private individual, provided some comment from a real estate operator on Yorke Peninsula who talked about the percentage of transactions that go through his business that are related to people who buy holiday homes or homes on the peninsula. Those people are not permanent residents.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: How would you do it if you were in government?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I want to make sure, Mr Foley, member for Port Adelaide—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: How would you do it?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Consult; consult early. Tell people, engage the local advisory groups. You appoint local advisory groups but do not use their expertise. You come in there and you tell them, 'This is what's going to happen.' You get people to nominate for this and they are the ones who become the public face of it and they are the ones who cop the flak for it, but those local advisory group members are good people, too. They cop an enormous amount of flak over it. Those people want to get a positive outcome, too. They want to find a middle ground opportunity that allows marine park principles to be reserved, for some small level of sanctuary zones to exist—a smaller level.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: And I can quote to the member for Port Adelaide an example of a group of people who have gone to an enormous amount of physical effort in the Port Victoria, Chinaman Wells and Balgowan communities for Marine Park 11. They have looked at the 14 key principles that the minister has asked his department to look at when determining proposed sanctuary zone locations. They have met those and they have found areas that they think meet all those criteria and occupy only 3.2 per cent, not the 25 per cent that is currently proposed, or thereabouts, for Marine Park 11. So we have to, indeed, use this forum as an opportunity to argue the case.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am not disputing the out of boundaries, member for Port Adelaide. I am talking about the sanctuary zone boundaries that are within the parks.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Already I have had people contacting my office asking, 'Can I go fishing off the beach?' That is the level of anxiety and fear that exists. All you are doing is putting fear in the community. The level of distrust that is out there is enormous at the moment.

You have to do the economic and social impact study to determine that and then use that as really important evidence to look at the target size: how big do we want this sanctuary zone to be? The minister continually talks about 10 per cent of marine waters being targeted for sanctuary zones. That is his principle. Look at what the economic and social impact will be, because the science and principles are important, but you have to look at people.

That is what we in this chamber deal with all the time, that is, people; and these people have made substantial investments. They are really concerned that, indeed, tourism and all the by-product industries that support recreational fishing and the people who come there to live permanently will be seriously and permanently harmed by such large-scale sanctuary zones. The communities that are close to a sanctuary zone feel gutted.

I will quote Port Victoria again. It is a small town with 400 people and an amazing history in the grain trade, the port, 'Cape Horners' and all that sort of thing. The marine areas have been part of their life forever and they are really concerned that their future is going to be taken away because of this. So, the process has to be right.

Talk about consultation but let's get it right and make sure that we bring the community along with us, otherwise they will keep complaining and clogging the talkback radio stations. They will use any forum they have to ensure that the members of the Labor Party in the government—backbenchers, ministers, whatever it is—are told every day about what they feel. These recreational fishers are 270,000 people who live across South Australia. It is an enormous lobby group. They want to make sure they have the chance going forward to go fishing. We all want to make sure they have got the chance to go fishing but, unless you do it properly, you are going to fail.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (21:12): It is my pleasure to rise tonight and speak on the Supply Bill which is currently before the house. The Treasurer, of course, has asked us to pass this bill, allowing him access to \$3.22 billion worth of this state's money. I am loath to provide the Treasurer and his government access to these funds—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Vote against it!

Mr MARSHALL: —I may very well do that—without the full scrutiny of this parliament. Time and again this government has proven itself completely and utterly unworthy of the trust of this parliament and completely unworthy of the trust of South Australians. Tonight I would like to give three examples of the untrustworthiness, if that is a word, of this current government—three capital projects which this government has failed the people of South Australia on.

The first of these is the north-south interconnector. There was no mention of this major \$403 million capital project prior to the election; yet, after the election it is quite clearly revealed that the planning for this had been under way for quite some time. In fact, I understand that almost \$35 million was spent—when the government was actually in caretaker mode, by the way. They spent \$35 million on preparations for this project. This project, of course, is completely and utterly—

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

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I draw the Speaker's attention to the fact that the member is making a very misleading statement. Governments in caretaker mode are not capable of executive government and making decisions. That is the convention. I would ask, for consistency and the quality of his contribution, as someone learning the ropes, as a member on trainer wheels, that he should listen to people like me who are—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Port Adelaide will sit down. You have made your point, but there is no point of order, anyway.

Mr MARSHALL: The project was, of course, not necessary whatsoever. It is there to cover up the government's ineptitude in the doubling of the desal project. There is absolutely no need for this massive expenditure.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: May well the member for Torrens laugh at this \$403 million mistake currently being made by this government.

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

Mrs GERAGHTY: The member knows full well I was not laughing at that issue. I was actually laughing at him.

The SPEAKER: Order! That was not a point of order, either. The member will sit down. The member for Norwood.

Mr MARSHALL: It is another example of this government being tricky, evasive and absolutely deceptive. Prior to the election, there was no mention of the \$403 million expenditure but they already had it underway. In fact, they announced the project just two days after the election. They did not tell people before the election and immediately started work after the election. It is completely and utterly outrageous. It is disturbing a lot of homes in the eastern suburbs, dotting the eastern suburbs with a whole pile of pumping stations and encumbering the state with \$403 million additional debt, which we can ill afford, because of the incompetence of this government. The second capital project that I raise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Norwood, sit down for a moment. I know that the member for Norwood is very loud and very vocal, and I am sure that members on my right are looking for an opportunity to pay him back, but he is entitled to be heard in silence. Member for Norwood.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The second capital project that I would like to draw the house's attention to tonight is the Adelaide Oval, and what a debacle that was. Prior to the election the government went to the people of South Australia saying, 'We are going to spend \$450 million on the upgrade of the Adelaide Oval.' Other members have covered the detail of this particularly well, but I just want to draw the attention of the house to the \$450 million which was stated to the people of South Australia before the election and immediately after the election \$535 million—what an outrage!

It all become very clear thereafter that the former treasurer, the member for Port Adelaide, was fully briefed that \$450 million would be completely and utterly inadequate. Unfortunately, he did not recall that briefing he received, even though the minutes of that meeting and that advice were actually given to him in writing. He was caught out. As I said before, this is a particularly deceptive government.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order, member for Port Adelaide.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am loath to speak in my own defence because I normally roll with the punches, although every now and again I do not roll that well and cop them. I was not provided with a written set of the minutes until well after I had made that unfortunate statement in the parliament, for which I have apologised.

Mr MARSHALL: The third—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not quite sure what your point of order was, but you have made your point. Member for Norwood.

Mr MARSHALL: The third capital project that I would like to draw this house's—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Wasn't it four? You can't even count to four.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: I don't know what you are talking about. The first one was the north-south interconnector, the second one was the Adelaide Oval and the third one was the Royal Adelaide Hospital. That just shows the incompetence of the people opposite. They cannot even

count on one hand—absolutely hopeless! Anyway, the Royal Adelaide Hospital is the third capital project I would like to talk about. They went to the election with \$1.7 billion expenditure. Immediately after the election, it was revealed that cabinet had already discussed the fact that it had blown out to at least \$1.8 billion—just a lazy \$100 million, and clearly just small change for this crowd opposite.

Then today it was revealed by the shadow treasurer that it is common knowledge in the investment community that the build on this project is \$2.73 billion. This was not in any way denied by the Minister for Health today in the house. He used his weasel words to cloud the issue and talk about a whole pile of other extraneous costs that will exist over the very long period of the PPP. There was no clarity given to the people of South Australia about the entire cost or the entire picture prior to the election, and we still have no clarity now.

Each of these projects has been handled in a tricky and deceptive way. They come in here every day avoiding scrutiny at every opportunity, and this really undermines the integrity of this place. We have very few sitting days: in fact, last year we had 32 sitting days; I think this year we are finally up to something like 52. I think this is only the second time we have sat past 6 o'clock since I have been a member of this parliament. Question time is an absolute farce, with members opposite completely evading answering any decent questions that are provided by the opposition. Estimates are a complete joke; some members treat them with respect, but the vast majority fill up the time asking themselves Dorothy Dixers, which use up the opposition's valuable time for scrutiny.

The committee structure has been allowed to rot under those opposite. The freedom of information is a complete farce, and the member for Bragg has shown that to its full extent in recent times. Questions on notice are completely avoided. Tricky, evasive deceptive—I personally have no confidence in this government whatsoever. I have no confidence in their ability to manage our budget in a prudent and optimal way. They are divided and they are not a worthy government.

They are currently asking us to trust them with the carriage of the Royal Adelaide Hospital PPP. It is completely outrageous that we should be asked to trust those people opposite. I have given three good capital project examples tonight where they are completely untrustworthy.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I thought you gave four.

Mr MARSHALL: Three, already tonight. It is completely outrageous that they should be asking us to trust them with the carriage of the PPP for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, when they have proven themselves unequivocally to be completely inept and completely untrustworthy. They are likely to encumber this state and future generations with the mismanagement they have for this PPP.

They do not care, though. They do not care, because most of those people opposite—not all of them, but most of them—will be long gone, long gone by the time they open the doors on this Royal Adelaide Hospital, long gone when we as a state have a massive noose around our neck, courtesy of the incompetence of the tricky, deceptive nature of the government opposite.

Here lies the problem. They are asking us to trust them, but they do not want this massive project to go to Public Works. There is no scrutiny for the project in this parliament; there is no independent evaluation. They just want us to trust them, just trust this lazy, self-serving, tired, incompetent government and the new L-plate Treasurer.

There has only been one member opposite who I have heard today who has got up to even slightly defend this Supply Bill before the house. It does not show a lot of confidence from those people opposite. As stated earlier, I am loath to support this Supply Bill, and I encourage this government to change their leadership and reinstitute the integrity of this parliament with full disclosure and full parliamentary scrutiny of crucial decisions which will affect future generations here in South Australia.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (21:22): Like the member for Norwood, I rise to speak about the north-south interconnector pipeline, specifically the eastern section, which is due to begin construction this week and which will disrupt the lives of many of my constituents.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Are you still here? We have heard repeatedly from the government that this is the pipeline we had to have. The only reasoning that I can see behind the need to have this pipeline is because the government have said so. On 13 May 2009 the government announced

that they were doubling the size of the desalination plant and that this would reduce South Australia's reliance on the Murray. The desalination plant was, of course, originally a Liberal Party policy, and it was suggested at a size of 45 to 50 gigalitres.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will behave and listen to the member in silence!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If you can't cope, go outside! Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: This would have been sufficient to provide security for our critical needs in drought years as well as reducing our reliance on the Murray. Together with a suite of other solutions, including increased use of technology and use of stormwater harvesting technology, this was a worthy public policy approach to dealing with our water security needs.

It took two years for the government to recognise the utility of desalination and adopt it as their own policy, but, of course, in doing so they doubled the size of the plant. The then minister for water admitted in a media release on 29 July 2009, one month after the decision to double the plant's size, that:

At 50 gigalitres, the Adelaide Desalination Plant was able to be integrated into the Happy Valley water supply system without the need to interconnect the northern and southern systems. However, the recent capacity doubling of the plant means we need to connect the two systems to ensure we can optimise use of the 100GL capacity over 12 months.

Without that doubling, there would not have been the need for this \$400 million of expenditure. Despite this admission, no details were provided on the pipeline prior to the election, what areas it would affect, or the requirement to build pumping stations. A day after the government announced that the contracts to build the pipeline had been signed on 23 March 2010, Russell Emmerson from *The Advertiser* wrote:

The problem was highlighted back in 2007 when the state government approved the 50 gigalitre desalination plant at Port Stanvac—and underlined when it decided to expand the plant's capacity to 100GL.

The claim that this is a pipeline that we have to have this one I do not buy.

In the first instance, by the government's own admission, the only reason this is happening is because of the decision to double the size of the desalination plant. All of the disruption and the higher water costs could have been avoided had the government adopted a policy solution in line with that suggested by the Liberal Party.

Even with the government's larger plant, I believe there remains the unexplored potential to make use of the aquifer to store water from the desalination plant, rather than building this extravagant, wasteful, disruptive pipeline; to make use, in fact, of the infrastructure kindly provided to us by nature. But I fear that such innovation is beyond the scope of this Minister for Water; such innovation is beyond the imagination or capacity of this government.

Typical of this government is the complete lack of consultation with the public. The Minister for Water has referred to media releases made by his predecessor, announcing the government's intention to build a pipeline. As I have said before, these announcements were accompanied with no detail.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GARDNER: Announcing projects with little or no detail and then later drip-feeding information to nearby residents does not amount to consultation in anyone's dictionary. There is a great deal that might be said about the Labor Party's approach to consultation over the past 12 months following the March 2010 election. After the election, the education minister belled the cat in his unsuccessful attempt at the deputy leadership. On 22 March 2010, he said on ABC radio that the:

...government needs to renew, and what I am offering is a changed approach, a different approach and a more consultative approach.

I cannot imagine why he would have wanted to say that. For one reason or another, the Labor Party rejected that 'more consultative approach'. The education minister was also kind enough to

further define the government's approach a bit later on last year, in labelling that approach as the 'announce and defend' model as opposed to the 'consult and decide' model that it would have done better to adopt.

In that deputy leadership tussle, the Premier gave his support to the member for Port Adelaide but promised, nonetheless, that he and his government would, indeed, reconnect with voters. Meanwhile, on 22 March 2010, AquaLink announced that it had already signed a contract with the government to build the interconnector.

This deal was done a month before the state election, \$35 million was spent without going to public works and it was only announced two days after the election. Clearly, the prospect of ripping up roads and knocking down trees was something that needed to wait until after the election before the public could be taken into the government's trust. But still, this announcement included no further detail.

The consultation process with the public, if it could be called that, began with the Minister for Water announcing how much he had consulted with the public. SA Water then informed residents who will be affected by the project that this would take place, but gave them no details. Finally, the minister admitted at a public meeting in the eastern suburbs that maybe consultation had been inadequate.

This all happened after the election and after the contracts had been signed. This is another example of the government choosing the easy option of announcing and defending, rather than consulting and deciding.

To the merits of the project and the expenditure of huge amounts of public money, this is half a billion dollars that could have been spent elsewhere. The government has argued that the desalination plant makes sense because of the \$228 million grant from the commonwealth government, despite the state giving up \$212 million in GST revenue.

This is another example of the Labor government's financial wisdom. For a net \$16 million from the commonwealth, we incur a cost of \$403 million for this pipeline, assuming that costs do not blow out. We have already seen delays at the desalination plant, so who knows how much this pipeline will end up costing or how long it will take.

As the member for Hammond pointed out earlier on in this debate, the cost of this pipeline is more than the people of Western Australia paid for their desalination plant and pipeline combined. Imagine what else could have been done with that \$403 million. Just in Morialta, we could resurface the Gorge Road, we could stop cuts to the Norwood Morialta High School and avoid the forced amalgamation of the Stradbroke Primary and Stradbroke Junior Primary schools—cruel cuts from last year's state budget.

We could build a state-of-the-art performing arts centre at the Charles Campbell Secondary School to allow them to capitalise on their excellent performing arts program in a meaningful way. We could even get some action on some of the government's own local election commitments to the residents of Morialta prior to last year's election that it has so far failed, dismally, to deliver, such as the promise to install traffic lights at the Graves Street/Newton Road intersection and the promise to deliver a fire siren for residents in Athelstone backing on to Black Hill, promised by the government but for which it is now asking the Campbelltown council to pay in an extraordinary penny-pinching exercise for the sake of about \$2,000.

It also promised a new fire station for the people of Montacute. In fact, one of Lindsay Simmons' election pamphlets talked about how the work was going to be commencing 'this year', in early 2010. Not a sod has been turned yet. The government has failed to deliver on its promise. We could even make up for the federal Labor government's failure to match state government commitments to deliver mains water supplies to Skye and the redevelopment of the Campbelltown Leisure Centre. All of these could be delivered 20 times over for the cost of this pipeline and without the inconvenience to my constituents in Morialta.

There are a number of other problems with the project, in addition to the secrecy and in addition to the mismanagement. This project is going to be hugely disruptive to residents in the eastern suburbs, who are going to have their streets ripped up to have the pipeline laid. In SA Water's report to the Public Works Committee in November last year, it was admitted that 'The project will require the removal of significant trees.' In a final admission, something the residents of Wattle Park are already concerned about, the amenity of the area around the pumping stations, and again I quote from its report, 'is likely to change'.

Worse still, is the fact that the government originally did not even want to build the Wattle Park station on the land that it currently owns in the area, preferring to build on an alternative site. Luckily, the residents of Wattle Park, with the help of the opposition—and I pay particular credit to the member for Bragg, whose constituency shares with mine the suburb of Wattle Park—sought the details, asked awkward questions and brought the truth to light.

It is clear that the government has failed to reconnect with the community. It is clear that the government has failed to deliver good policy in the best interests of South Australia's future. To my mind, it is increasingly clear that this government is looking and smelling more and more like the former failed New South Wales Labor government, which was destroyed at the election only two weeks ago.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (21:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 21:33 the house adjourned until Thursday 7 April 2011 at 10:30.