

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 7 June 2011

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

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

### ADELAIDE OVAL REDEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 May 2011.)

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:02):** I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this matter. We are here to debate the legislation in the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill 2011. To assist the house, and for those who have an interest in this matter, I might outline the opposition's position early in the debate so those who are interested in that can then go about their business. I will then go through a process, over an hour or two, explaining some background to that position. I know the government ministers here are more interested in our position than the detail necessarily behind it.

The opposition will facilitate the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval. The reality is that the government does not need this legislation to build the project. If it really wanted to build the project, there is a whole range of processes it could go through to actually build this project. We all know that the government was in negotiations with football about a compulsory acquisition option. The government has never denied that and that is just an illustration that there are other options available to the government to deliver this project.

So, the question for the opposition was not about whether this legislation was going to guarantee the project proceeding or not. For the opposition, it was about how the project would proceed and, therefore, the accountability measures around this particular process. The opposition will facilitate the development of Adelaide Oval, based on some accountability measures being placed around the process. The reason we need the accountability measures around this particular process is because you simply cannot trust this government.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** How did I know you were going to say that?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member for Croydon asks: how did he know we were going to say that? It is because the member for Croydon was part of the cabinet, of course, that sat there and misled the public for the whole of the last campaign about this particular matter. So, it would be no surprise to the member for Croydon that we might bring up the misleading of the public for the whole of the last campaign, which, of course, saw the demise of the then treasurer now Minister for Defence over that very issue.

Even the member for Croydon so distrusted his new cabinet that he could not get to the party room quick enough to put a cap, by motion, of \$535 million on his own cabinet, because not even the member for Croydon trusts his own cabinet. As soon as he went to the backbench the member for Croydon said, 'Crikey, we can't trust this mob, we better put a cap in'—\$535 million. The member for Croydon will be pleased to know that the opposition agrees with him, and we are going to move a cap of \$535 million.

The member for Croydon will be interested to know this, and I am really glad that he interjected, in Melbourne's *The Age* today—this is why we need a legislated cap—there is a report which states:

The AFL will be expected to contribute financially to the project—

that is, the Adelaide Oval project—

but certainly not to the extent of the shortfall required, widely estimated at more than \$200 million.

This is in *The Age* today.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** That's your number.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** We didn't speak to *The Age*; it's not our number. It continues:

The state government's \$535 million pledge includes wiping off the SA Cricket Association's \$85 million debt.

So, we agree with the member for Croydon: you cannot trust the cabinet, and the member for Croydon nods. He has been asked to be quiet by the minister. The minister has gone over to the member for Croydon and said, 'Michael, it's budget week'—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I rise on a point of order. What I said to the member for Croydon was, 'This is a brave face on a white flag.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Davenport will sit down. Order! This is ridiculous. The Minister for Transport will behave and the members on my left, all of you will behave.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** So, Madam Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Madam Speaker, the member for Croydon is waving the white flag. The Liberal Party will facilitate this project by putting some accountability measures around it. The reality is that—and the government knows this, football knows this, cricket knows this, the Stadium Management Authority knows this, and indeed the Adelaide City Council knows this—the government could proceed with this project if it wanted to.

The measures that the opposition will be seeking are as follows: that the legislation cap the state contribution to \$535 million; that the Auditor-General be given powers to audit the project on a regular basis; that the normal planning process applies and that the project also be considered by the parliament's Public Works Committee. In fairness to the government, I received a phone call on Friday or the weekend, I cannot remember, it was leading up to yesterday's meeting, saying that the government intended to take it to the Public Works Committee.

After consulting the Adelaide City Council, we will introduce conditions to leave Light's Vision, Pennington Gardens and Creswell Gardens under the care and control of the council, with the licence areas covering the proposed car parking to the north of the oval and over Adelaide Oval No. 2 subject to a community land management plan to be agreed with the council.

There are some other matters that we are also seeking that did not go out in last night's media statement. These include that the legislation require the Stadium Management Authority to pay rent, and that the rent be small amounts for the first three years: \$250,000, \$500,000 and \$1 million, and then reviewed every three years by the Treasurer. I understand that SACA already pays rent to the city council of about \$25,000 a year, and we see no reason why a small rental or licence fee cannot go back to the taxpayer on the basis of this particular development.

The other issue is that the legislation also requires that a sinking fund be established; that the Auditor-General oversee the sinking fund and recommend the amounts required to be placed in the fund; and that the Treasurer has the final say on how much the SMA must put into the sinking fund. This will ensure that there is some oversight that the required amount of money is put aside for the maintenance and protection of the building.

I have already mentioned Colonel Light's Vision and Pennington Gardens. Another issue that the council quite rightly raises is that this legislation vests the land in the minister forever. The council argues that there should be a cut-off point so that parliament has to reconsider the question at some time down the track. The council is suggesting an unconditional lease to the minister for an 80-year period, and that is the position the opposition is adopting. It is an unconditional lease, the only condition being 80 years, so that in 80 years' time the parliament needs to reconsider the question.

What we are trying to do with these particular measures is to bring in a proper planning process to protect the Parklands. Under this bill the minister becomes the development authority.

The minister can put there whatever the minister wants. The reality is that this state government said it would never use major project status for developments in the Parklands. This particular process is worse than the major project status that the government said it would never use. So all we are doing is asking the government to keep its word.

Mike Rann and others went out with hand on heart saying that when there is development in the Parklands they would not override proper planning processes. It will be no surprise to the government that we intend to hold it to that promise. We are going to demand the normal planning process. This was announced in December 2009, so the government has already had nearly 18 months to do that planning process if it wanted to, so there is no reason that this should unduly delay the project or unduly add costs to the project. If the government was serious about it, it has had 18 months to start and go through that planning process.

The reality is that Mike Rann as Premier and this government went out and said that it would never use major project status to override the proper planning processes for the Parklands. This process is actually worse than the major project status. This gives minister Conlon, the minister of the day, total power to do whatever development the government wants up until 2015. Why would anyone sign off on that process? There need to be, in our view, proper planning processes.

The former treasurer is here and he might recall that in the 2002 election the then opposition and now government made great play about the Auditor-General's role and power in the Hindmarsh Stadium inquiry. The government adopted a policy that it would change the legislation so that the Auditor-General had the power of audit over publicly-funded projects, specifically quoting the need in the Hindmarsh Stadium inquiry.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** And you botched that!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No; you withdrew the legislation. The reality is that if it is good enough for your policy for the Hindmarsh Stadium inquiry it is good enough for Adelaide Oval.

The reality is that the state is about to contribute \$535 million to this project and it is only proper that the Auditor-General has the power of oversight and reporting back to the parliament on a regular basis. Why would a government be scared of having the Auditor-General oversee this process? We do not see that as an issue. The opposition thinks that the Auditor-General should have oversight not only of this project but, indeed, of other projects that should generally be within the Public Finance and Audit Act.

They are the key issues as far as the opposition is concerned: the normal planning process; the Auditor-General given powers to audit; legislation requiring rent; Public Works Committee scrutiny; a sinking fund to be established, with the Treasurer having a final say on how much is put into the sinking fund; Colonel Light's Vision, Pennington Gardens and Creswell Gardens remain under the care and control of the council; the licensed areas be subject to a community land management plan; the legislation have an unconditional lease to the council for up to 80 years; and, of course, the protection of the fig trees.

If the government agrees to these particular provisions, what that will do is bring the proper accountability processes to the project. There will be a proper planning process, there will be proper financial oversight and there will be a financial cap for protection of the taxpayers on how much they can spend. There will be a proper plan put in place for the management of protection of the Parklands and then, down the track, the parliament will have the opportunity to revisit the question in 80 years' time as to how this particular project is working and how they reinvest down the track.

They are the conditions in principle that the opposition will be seeking to amend. If the government intends to put this legislation through today, then the amendments will not be here. We finished our party position only last night at about a quarter to 10. I have not had the opportunity—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Quarter to 10?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Well, we did not start until seven on this particular topic, so—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Three hours?

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Two hours. It was a great debate.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The reality is, you see, we like to talk to each other.

**Mr Williams:** We don't ring up Don Farrell and say, 'What do we do?'

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That is right; we do not announce and defend: we actually sit down and talk it through. We do not ring up Don Farrell and say, 'Don, what should we do here?' We actually sat down and talked it through. They are the key principles that the Liberal Party will be seeking to amend and, on that basis, we would then facilitate the project of the Adelaide Oval.

I just want to go back now and track, if you like, this project and the development over some time, because it has been an interesting debate over a number of years, and there is a series of things that the parliament needs to think about and I think the state needs to think about, generally. The reality is that the Liberal Party still thinks that a two-stadium policy was and is the right policy for the state, but we accept the fact that we cannot deliver that from opposition, and we accept the fact the government can proceed with this particular development without the legislation. So, we are left with the choice: do we let it go through without any accountability measures, or do we put accountability measures in? We have decided to put accountability measures in.

I just want to talk through why I think this is not necessarily the best result for the state. We accept the fact that is going to be delivered on the state, but the reality is, if you speak to the industry, what are we getting at Adelaide Oval? We are getting a 50,000-seat stadium in the open parkland, with the only car parking infrastructure underground being 400 car parks. So, you are essentially getting an un-roofed stadium—

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Yes, like the MCG.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** —\$535 million with 400 car parks underneath. For that project, we are spending around \$535 million—\$85 million of which, of course, goes to SACA's debt. All the industry advice is: if you wanted to build a stand-alone stadium with only 400 car parks and without a roof, then it would be around that mark. What we are doing in South Australia is we are going long term to a one-stadium strategy.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Yes.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** 'Yes,' said the former treasurer. The one-stadium strategy. Every other state in Australia has a two-stadium strategy—every other state in Australia. Western Australia has two, Victoria has many, Sydney has two, Queensland has two—

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Bigger populations.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** —and even Tasmania has two.

**Mrs Redmond:** Not a bigger population!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No interjection about a bigger population there from the former treasurer. The reality is even Tasmania has two.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Two separate cities.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Two separate cities? Fine, but they are still using two facilities. The reality is that, long term, we will be the only mainland state in Australia with one main stadium, if you like. The reality is that we accept the fact that the government is going to deliver that. As I say, all we can really do is put the accountability measures around it.

There is a whole range of issues that goes to the background of this particular stadium. I just want to touch on some of those issues. What we are really getting for our money is that a lot of the industry tells us that the government would have been better to go to the Liberal Party plan of a two-stadium policy, because it thinks, long term, that is going to be where the needs of the state will be.

It was interesting when the Liberal Party met with the SANFL 2006 and in 2008. I met with them as leader in May 2006 and received a submission from the then SANFL CEO, Leigh Whicker. The advice to me as the then leader was that—I remember the figure well—he said, 'Iain, we have a net asset position of \$128 million. Why would we want to give that up and move anywhere else?' The conflict between cricket and football programming ultimately meant that the state was best served by two stadiums.

Then, when the member for Waite took over as leader he also had a meeting with the SANFL in December 2008. In December 2008, the SANFL gave the opposition this presentation, where they say that the SANFL's position was that the state needed two stadiums. It went through a whole range of things to consider. It talked about the locality and the potential for development at

West Lakes, but on the issue of two stadiums SANFL's position was very clear, and that was that the state needed two stadiums because of the conflict between cricket and football.

So, as late as December 2008, the SANFL's position was that the state needed two stadiums. In fact, they even went as far as putting out a press release saying: 'Whatever you do don't spend \$1 million on a stadium. Spend \$250 million down at Football Park and that will be the state's saviour.' I will read from a press release from 14 March 2008, where the Adelaide Crows, AAMI Stadium, the SANFL and Port Power put out a press release entitled 'A world-class stadium for Adelaide: the logical solution.' It states:

Debate over the need for a world-class stadium near the Adelaide CBD is heightened by Adelaide's bid to host the 2018 World Cup.

It is believed that such a development will cost in excess of \$1 billion...

The South Australian National Football League, Adelaide and Port Adelaide Football Clubs recognise the priorities facing Governments with regard to important public infrastructure in the areas such as health, transport and education, quite apart from spending in the vicinity of \$1 billion on the sports stadium.

The SANFL, [Adelaide Football Club and Port Adelaide Football Club] believe that an upgrade of AAMI Stadium together with first-class transport infrastructure at a collective investment in the vicinity of \$250 million is the most logical solution...

So, in 2008, the SANFL's position was that they wanted to have a two-stadium strategy. In this particular document, which is the document presented to the opposition in 2008, the SANFL's position was that football and cricket required two major stadiums due to coincident international and domestic programming. Therefore, a two-stadium policy is essential. They go on and name all the two stadiums in every state, whether that be Subiaco and the WACCA, the MCG and Telstra Dome (as it was then known), the SCG, the Sydney Football Stadium and the ANZ Stadium and, in Queensland of course, there is Suncorp Stadium, the GABBA and now the Gold Coast. They also pointed out the requirements of the rectangular sports—soccer and rugby.

The background to this is that a two-stadium policy was the advice from the codes. The Liberal Party adopted that policy of a two-stadium strategy and argued for football in the city, and the government has come to the conclusion that it needs football in the city. I know that other members will speak about the background to the argument about football in the city, so I will not go into great detail about that, other than to say that the opposition argued for football in the city.

The government was spooked by that argument; it had already committed to developing AAMI Stadium. When the government committed money to AAMI Stadium, it had the big footage of them all walking arm-in-arm down Football Park saying, 'This is the future of football. This is going to be a world-class stadium; this is where it can all happen.' Of course, that has all changed now, because the reality was that the opposition's policy about bringing football to the city changed the public debate. The government panicked and had to find somewhere else, ultimately.

We know that football went to the government and to the Premier and said, 'Look, for around \$650 million, we can build a stadium down behind Adelaide High School. We could build a stadium there.' The Premier essentially said that he was not interested, because it was too much like the Liberals' plan. You cannot possibly adopt a good idea, so we have gone to this process then of going to Adelaide Oval and that is where we are. Right up until December 2009, football in South Australia had argued for a two-stadium policy, and that is why the opposition went out and argued for a two-stadium policy, because we believed the advice of the codes at the time.

The tragedy with this particular project is that, if you look at the announcements of new stadiums around the world, they are multisport stadiums. The Western Australian Carpenter government even announced a redevelopment of a new oval in Western Australia, with 60,000 seats with the capacity to go to 70,000 and, in its announcement (which was ultimately put on hold but has not been totally cancelled, so it is still under consideration), it talked about the need to have slide seating for the rectangular sports so that you could play soccer, rugby, etc., at the one stadium.

You only had to be at Adelaide Oval on the weekend to see there were only 1,000 fewer people watching the soccer at Adelaide Oval than there were down at Football Park watching Port Power. There were only 1,000 fewer, which says something about the popularity of soccer.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** You can't count.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The minister says that I can't count, but in the media reports, one was 22,000, and one was 21,000: 22 take 21—that is 1,000. Let me put it that way: according to media reports, there were just over 22,000 down at Footy Park and 21,000 at the soccer.

**Mrs Redmond:** Even that was before everyone went home because they got wet.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** That's right. On the weekend you have this game of soccer. The spectators are a long way from the ground. The ground gets soaked. The Socceroos are reported as saying they were upset with the quality of the playing surface—so it is good for cricket, not necessarily for ball sports in the wet—and then of course all the crowd got wet. What we are saying in regard to this project is that, in 20 years' time that will be exactly the same, because there will be no roof on this.

As we say, we think there are issues with this particular project, but we accept the fact that we cannot deliver a roofed stand-alone stadium from opposition. Football and cricket say that, to wait for the outcome of the 2014 election and, if this side is successful, then to build, their financial issues are such that that is a time too far. They have agreed to the government's process. Football signed off, Port Power signed off, the Crows have signed off, cricket has signed off and the council has signed off with some conditions

The opposition accepts the fact that we cannot deliver our project from opposition, so we are going to facilitate this project by putting some accountability measures around it. We have had a number of discussions with the Adelaide City Council. I thank the council officers, staff and elected members for their communications and meetings over time. It is fair to say that the council is concerned about exactly the same issues as the opposition, and that is how you actually make sure the planning process delivers a project that is in keeping with the park-like setting, that makes it a functional facility without ruining the Parklands and keeps the ambience that we all love around Adelaide Oval in place without unduly restricting the operations of the day-to-day events that are going to be held at Adelaide Oval.

That is why we are proposing various amendments because we accept the fact that Adelaide citizens love their Parklands dearly. They certainly want them used in a modern facility, but they also want them used in a sustainable way that protects them long term. That is why Rachel Sanderson, as the member for Adelaide, has done a great job advocating on behalf of her electorate for the protection of the Parklands and her local citizens because we know how important they are to the citizens of Adelaide and the citizens of South Australia more generally.

There are some issues that go more broadly to the question about where you see the future of sport in 50, 60, 70 or 80 years' time in relation to this project. The reason I have concerns about a single-stadium strategy is that I come from this personal position: I can remember when cricket was played over five days in long white pants. During my lifetime we have seen cricket go to coloured uniforms, we have seen night cricket, we have had cricket go to 50-over games, we have gone to Twenty20 games, and now we have gone to private teams owning cricket in India—the IPL—and millionaires playing the game with privately owned teams.

So the issue I have with a single stadium is that I think there are two levels of football, and I made this point very strongly to football because I am not convinced this is necessarily in football's long-term interest. I think there is the AFL and there is the SANFL. Where will football be in 50 years' time? No-one knows, but by having a single stadium for the elite level you effectively hamstring its development. We do not know whether there is going to be a night-time summer competition, which I think would be extraordinarily popular. You could have a Twenty20 version of football played twilights, Friday nights, etc. You could well have privately owned teams. The West Coast Eagles was a privately owned team, I understand, when they first started. Dr Edelsten was involved in Sydney.

As more money comes into the sport, who knows where football will end up? We do know one thing: under this proposal we are hamstringing the sport to one venue, but their sport has made that decision. Football has made that decision, that whatever happens over the next 20, 30 or 40 years in the development of their sport, they can manage it on one oval. I am not convinced I would have made that decision had I been running football, but just as the opposition listened to the sports when we argued for a two-stadium strategy, we accept the fact that they are running football and not the opposition. They will obviously make the decisions they see in relation to the best interests of their particular sport.

There has been some comment about the Stadium Management Authority being a company and who may end up running the Stadium Management Authority. The house needs to

understand this very point. The Stadium Management Authority is a not-for-profit company limited by guarantee—it is a Pty limited company—four directors by cricket, four directors by football. If football wanted to appoint the AFL to run as their four directors, they could do that today. If cricket wanted to nominate the Australian Cricket Board as their four directors, they could do that today. In fact, if cricket wanted to nominate the AFL, they could do that today. They do not have to be members of SACA or members of the SANFL—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** I can see that happening.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No. The minister says, 'I can see that happening.' I do not think cricket are about to appoint football; I accept that, minister. What I am saying, though, is that because the directors can change, and there is no government control over who the directors can be, who will actually end up managing the SMA in 10, 15, or 20 years is anyone's guess. The minister may want to consider whether he wants any oversight as to who might be appointed as a director because the SMA is, in effect, managing this process on behalf of the taxpayer. It is managing it on behalf of the sport, but it is also managing it on behalf of the taxpayer.

Another issue that has arisen is this whole debate about what will happen with the football licences. Nearly 12 months ago, I raised with football that it was obvious to me that one option was to try to sell the licences. What the SANFL could do would be to get the SMA in place as management of the facility, then sell its licences—whether that be back to the clubs themselves or offload them to the AFL—and then, ultimately, just be a stadium manager and let the AFL or the clubs take the risk on the performance of the teams, rather than the SANFL clubs take that risk.

The government is proposing to let them rezone all the land around the current AAMI Stadium and run trams down there in 2018, at a cost of around \$220 million; after football leaves, it is going to run trams to Football Park and let them redevelop it, and that money will go into a future fund for the SANFL. There were cheaper ways for a future fund to be established if the government had wanted to be involved in that but, ultimately, that is the model being adopted. Where do you see football in 20 years' time? I suspect that you will see the AFL teams as free agents and the SANFL as, essentially, a stadium manager of the oval in conjunction with cricket, and that a trust fund will be set up to support the eight or nine South Australian National Football League clubs.

I should declare (as I have already done in my register of interests) that I am a member of the Sturt Football Club, not in a decision-making capacity or on any of the committees but as a member and as one of the vice presidents, where you pay a sum to be invited to even more expensive lunches and dinners. I also have a lad who plays for Sturt, so I do declare that interest. Sturt is a member of the SANFL, and I know that other members are members of various clubs. I raise the issue of my personal concern that down the track there will be a restriction on football and on how it can possibly develop the game. You never know what the next opportunity is, coming around the corner.

I remember 1974, when the first grand final was played at Football Park and Sturt beat Glenelg; Robbie Barton came on in the last quarter and provided an extra run, and we got across the line against the Bays. Jack Oatey was coach and, after the premiership win, he spoke about the need for a national competition. Oatey outlined his view that football would end up having a national competition involving teams from other states. He said he was not smart enough to work it out, but even in the 1970s, as Football Park was being developed, the thinking in some of the more forward thinking of the football community was to develop a national competition. My point is that we are locking this in for 80 years, and who knows where football will be in 80 years? One thing is for sure: ultimately, they will be constrained to one venue.

Another issue that cricket needs to think about is that football will, I think, end up having a series of licences of 20, 20, 20 and 20 to make up the 80-year licence configuration. If football leaves after 20 years, and cricket is left with a 50,000-seat stadium for cricket crowds, has the business case been done regarding whether cricket can sustain that? I am not sure whether cricket has looked at whether it can sustain that particular expenditure if football walks away at the 20-year mark.

The reason the 20-year mark is important is that the SANFL intends to redevelop Football Park at about that 20-year mark; that will be the crucial decision time in that particular process. Once that decision is taken, it is all over; we are locked in, if you like, for the 80 years. So, this is not a small decision the codes have taken. We are locking ourselves in here for 80 years. The

stadium is being built to a 50-year life cycle, as I understand it. So, we are locked in as a state for that 50 to 80-year period.

The SMA put out an economic report by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. I in no way criticise the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies, which was asked to produce a report, based on certain assumptions and, based on the assumptions it was given, it did produce a report. The reality is that the report itself states that there is no cost-benefit analysis—and no cost benefit analysis has been done for this project; it is essentially driven by the needs of politics and the needs of the sports. There has been no cost-benefit analysis for this project.

There has also been no business case that the opposition has seen presented publicly. Football and cricket may well have gone and done their assumptions, which we understand they have. They have developed their business case, and they have come out and made certain announcements, but certainly the opposition has not been able to go behind those announcements to look at all the assumptions to see whether they are valid.

I know there has been some public concern about, for instance, the level of attendances for both Port Power and Crows that are assumed in the economic study. The economic study assumed that we were going to have the Rugby Sevens here forever; the Rugby Sevens did not last four weeks, after the announcement of this, they have gone. So, there are some issues with the economic model, as we speak. There is not even a guarantee that the soccer games in the business case are guaranteed to be played, given the reported comments by the Socceroos after the last game there this week. So, the economic case has not been revealed.

The other point I want to make—and this comes back to the rental issue—is this: if you believe SACA, the business case for SACA says that it is going to get a \$9 million a year uplift and, if you believe football, it is going to get, from memory, an \$8 million uplift. I have no reason to doubt those figures: why would the sports propose false figures and the boards would have to sign off on them? So, I am confident those figures are around the mark, in the parameters of the advice those boards have been given.

But the question comes: what has never been revealed is how much money the SMA is going to make out of catering. The \$8 million uplift comes from the football activity and the \$9 million uplift for cricket comes from the cricket activity, but there is, from memory, an 800 or 1,000-person dining facility being placed there, in one of Adelaide's premier viewing spots. So, you are going to have a huge catering division, which will compete, of course, with the publicly-funded Convention Centre and the Festival Theatre, and other convention and dining premises in the state—and that is a 24/7 operation, in effect, in that it operates outside of cricket and football events. So, there is a huge catering profit to be made, and that figure has never been made public.

We are saying that football gets its \$8 million and cricket gets its \$9 million a year, how much does the SMA get out of its catering? That is why we say that a small rental back to the taxpayer is not unwarranted. We are, after all, paying the whole of the \$535 million, and we are, after all, paying the \$26 million a year in interest. If you work it out roughly, it is sort of 5 per cent; it is about \$20 million to \$25 million a year interest. So, if they are making \$9 million and \$8 million a year plus (it is a \$17 million a year uplift plus), why should the taxpayer not be asking for a small licence fee back? I accept that it may not be a commercial rent, but I see no reason why there should not be some ask back from the SMA to the taxpayer based on those figures.

The other issue is that the government has not put any criteria around what the codes may do with their money. So, if cricket makes \$9 million a year, then cricket says it is going to spend it on community cricket, there is no process around how we are going to actually check or guarantee that. Does there need to be? I am not sure. The same with football: they say they are going to spend their money on community football and supporting the SANFL clubs. I think the clubs will certainly claim a lot of the money.

There are a lot of issues in the background of this particular issue, and the opposition has not landed in this position without giving it a lot of thought. The problems we have with the government's bill as it stands is that it simply gives the government carte blanche to do what it wants on the site between 2011 and the end of 2015. It is essentially a bill that says, 'Trust the government to develop this nicely. We won't trash the Parklands and we will end up with a nice development.'

When the government was in opposition and introduced its own amendments to the parklands act, it made it crystal clear that its position was that a government should never have those powers. We agree with the government on that aspect and that is why we argue for the



proper planning process, because you will get a balanced outcome out of the proper planning process.

To be clear, this is the same process that delivered the Development Assessment Commission approval for the Victoria Park corporate facility for racing and the Clipsal 500. That went through the Development Assessment Commission and was approved, and then the government did not proceed with it. The planning process worked; it was politics that got in the way.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** We couldn't get a lease.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Ultimately, the development approval was done. You backed out of it because Jane Lomax-Smith—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** We backed out of it because the council wouldn't give us a lease!

**Ms Chapman:** Come on!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Ultimately, you backed out of it because Jane Lomax-Smith told you she would lose her seat. The other example is the western grandstand at Adelaide Oval itself. The western grandstand at Adelaide Oval essentially went through that process, so SACA and the government have been running around saying, 'Isn't the western grandstand great?' Certainly, the South Australian public have warmly embraced it. The planning process delivered that, and that is why we see no issue with that process.

There are some issues we will be asking in committee, just to get clarification on a few issues around how this will exactly work. If the government intends to put this to the full vote tonight, then obviously we are not going to have any amendments here today and we will do them in the other place. If they adjourn it, then we will obviously try to get our amendments done as quickly as we can, but given that it is budget week, I am not sure how we will go. We will give priority to getting the amendments done so this house can consider them. That is ultimately a matter for the government.

Even as late as yesterday we were still receiving messages from the city council (and that is not a criticism of the council) about their particular position. We could only take it to the party room last night, so I do not think anyone really expected us to walk in here today with our amendments already drafted, given the lateness of the hour that we finished last night.

Under this bill, the existing lease to SACA is extinguished without compensation. Under the bill, a new lease will (I am speaking now about what the government is proposing) be given to the SMA for up to 80 years, subject to the rights of SACA and the SANFL, which have been set out in licences granted by the minister. Essentially, they will have unrestricted exclusive use of the oval for certain periods of the year: SACA from 8 October to 14 March inclusive; the SANFL from 15 March to 7 October. I understand the advice from the offices was that, if there is a dispute between the codes as to the overlap, ultimately it is the minister who becomes the umpire, if you like.

In regard to the licence area, I have mentioned previously the requirement for licensing of certain areas for car parking and I do not intend to go through that again. I reinforce that this bill gives the minister the power to do any development the minister wants without any scrutiny at all. The exception is public scrutiny, but there would be no scrutiny against development plans or whatever. That is why we are opposed to it. It simply puts too much power in one person's hands, in my view.

In relation to Adelaide Oval No. 2, my understanding from the officers' briefing is that there is a proposal to bring half of the Clem Hill Stand down to Adelaide Oval No. 2 and it will be erected there, and then, I suspect, some change rooms and toilet facilities will be put under the stand. That is the reason the Adelaide City Council wants that area licensed differently. It wants the licensed area split into at least two—the northern car park area and the Adelaide Oval No. 2 area, the Adelaide Oval No. 2 area being licensed differently because it needs to allow for sporting infrastructure, whereas the northern car park, in the council's view (and we accept this), should not allow sporting infrastructure, as such. That is why the council wants the area split into two licensed areas.

Under the government's proposal, of course, all the construction buildings are authorised to go on site, which would be nothing unusual. Under the government's bill there is no interaction with the Adelaide Park Lands Management Strategy under the Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005. That

simply does not apply. The management plans under part 2 of the Local Government Act simply do not apply, and I understand that council rates will not be charged on this particular facility, either.

In regard to the reason the opposition has reached its position on the accountability measures, I want to talk for a little bit about, for instance, the Auditor-General's powers. The Auditor-General is reported in the media in May this year as saying to the Public Works Committee, 'Not being a public authority and a public finance, it is not auditable by the Auditor-General.' During the 2002 election campaign the government made a lot about its plan for an honest and open government which, on reflection, is a bit laughable.

Labor's plan for lifting standards of honesty and accountability in government said that 'a good government does not fear scrutiny or openness' and that Labor made commitments to 'amend the Public Finance and Audit Act to ensure proper, effective auditing of government finances, including all types of government contracts and dealings with the private sector'. It went on to say it will enhance the powers of the Auditor-General to ensure that the Auditor-General has sufficient legislative authority to investigate all of the contracts and dealings with the private sector, including the words 'it is vital for the Auditor-General to have the ability to scrutinise, properly and rigorously, public funded projects'.

The reason we will move those amendments is that the government went to the public saying that is what it was going to do and it believed the Auditor-General should have these powers over publicly funded projects. So that is exactly what the opposition is going to demand of the government. We are going to hold it to its promise.

On the issue of the Parklands, I want to reinforce what the government's position has been in the past. In 2001 the then Labor opposition released a plan called Labor's Plan to Save the Parklands. In releasing that plan, the opposition leader Mr Rann said, 'The proposals include blocking state government from imposing developments on the Parklands.' They were going to block proposals for the state government to impose developments on the Parklands. He said, 'Adelaide's parklands help make our city special but, too often, they have been seen just as land to be built on, as open space.' They go on to say in the policy:

Blocking state governments from overriding proper planning processes by using major project status and imposing developments in the Parklands.

Again, in Labor's plan to save open spaces in our Parklands, the policy said:

Labor recognises that Parklands don't belong to the state or the city council, they belong to the people and to the future generations and they intend to change the law to block state governments overriding proper planning processes by use of major project status to impose developments on the Parklands.

We are saying, 'Okay, if that's your policy, that's what you told the South Australian public, then we agree with you; we're going to hold you to it.' The process under this bill is worse, in our view, than major project status.

I do not need to hold the house much longer. I know that a lot of my colleagues wish to speak on the views from their various electorates on this matter. The reality is that the opposition believed in a two-stadium policy. I want to talk about one little issue: the issue the media have run for some time about plan B; where is plan B. Football told us that they could not talk to us about plan Bs because they had signed legal agreements with the government to negotiate in good faith to deliver the government's project. That was the advice from football. There were lots of options for plan Bs for football, in particular (because cricket will always stay at Adelaide Oval), to be talked about now that the rail yards hospital is going on what was our original site.

At the end of the day, football's advice to us was that they were not prepared to negotiate with us because they were negotiating in good faith with the government and therefore a development of different options then became more difficult. I would have loved the opportunity personally—and this is not the Liberal Party position; it would be wrong to suggest it is—to talk to football, and indeed the council, about whether the right place for an inner city stadium, if there were to be a two-stadium site, would not have been at the end of West Terrace, essentially adjacent to Adelaide High School just near Sir Donald Bradman Drive.

You could then run the tram down West Terrace, pick up netball and athletics, Keswick Railway Station and Adelaide Airport. So you would go down West Terrace, Sir Donald Bradman Drive, pick up athletics, netball, Keswick Railway Station and the airport. The government already has \$220 million in the budget to take trams to football. You could flick that budget over to there and stage it over some years, and out of that stadium they could have then flooded into the Gouger

Street end with all the restaurants, cafes, etc., and you would have a sporting precinct down the western side of the city and the cultural precinct around the northern side of the city.

I think it would have been a good discussion to have with the sports, but football locked into negotiating in good faith. If they fell over for some reason they would have been happy to come back. It is clear it is not going to fall over. All those opportunities are now gone and we are now locked into this single stadium strategy. I thank football and cricket and their officers for their negotiations, comments and discussions over many months on this issue, and the minister's officers for their briefing the other day—we appreciate that. With those few words, the opposition will facilitate this project, subject to various conditions.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:00):** When I came in here, when the member for Davenport started his comments, the former treasurer asked me across the chamber whether I got rolled in the party room last night. For the information of the house, I do not mind divulging what I said to the party room last night, and it was not that different from what the member for Davenport just told the house, that is, that this piece of legislation is not essential to deliver the project.

My comments to my colleagues in the party room were that, if I could stop this project, I would do whatever I could, but this is not a way of stopping the project, and so—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Oh, yes it is.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** 'Oh, yes it is,' says the minister, but I do not believe that is the case. I will put to the house some of the things that I said in the party room last night and the reasons why I think this is a very poor project for South Australia that will hamstring the development of sport in South Australia for many years to come, if not a couple of generations, and that is a great disappointment.

The member for Davenport, I think, has put a very cogent argument against the project; he has put why the project has ended where it is rather than where it should be. He has actually put on the record the politics that have gone on. The Liberal Party has been responsible at the end of the day for getting football into the city. The last three leaders of the Liberal Party, at least, have been arguing with football that they should be back in the city. The member for Davenport, when he was leader of the Liberal Party, approached the SANFL and argued that football should be back in the city.

The member for Waite, when he was the leader, approached football and argued that football should be back in the city; and the current leader has been arguing consistently that football should be back in the city. We are committed to having football back in the city as a party. We thought that made sense. It would not surprise me—and I do not know because I have not asked him the question—if a previous leader, Rob Kerin (the former member for Frome), might have approached football. However, we consistently were told by football that their home was at AAMI Stadium.

As recently as only a few months ago, when I spoke to them, senior people in football were lamenting that they were going to end up at Adelaide Oval. There is a whole host of people in football who still are not sold on the merits of this project. The reality is that this project is not the best thing for football in this state, and I think that anyone who understands football and understands where the Australian Rules code is heading accepts that.

If anyone thinks that playing football over the next 40 to 50, maybe 80 years (because we are talking about 80-year leases), in an uncovered stadium at Adelaide Oval, where a significant number of the seats are far removed from the action (because of the way in which the stadium is constructed), is the way that the modern football spectator is going to be watching football in Australia in the next 20 years they are kidding themselves. That is just not the way the reality is going to be.

I happened to be at the soccer on Sunday, and, notwithstanding what the minister tried to claim by way of interjection, there were about 22,000 people at Adelaide Oval on Saturday night.

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

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Well, the official figure was well over 21,000. I can attest to that because I was a guest of the Australian Soccer Federation, the Australian football association. I was actually in the committee room, and I was allocated a seat. I can tell members that it was five rows in front of the committee room, so it is well up into the stand, and in that row you got wet under what they

call the 'drip line'. I know who the drips are in this debate and they are not sitting on this side of the house.

If you go to football at Adelaide Oval, I think that you stand more than a 30 per cent chance of getting wet if the weather is inclement, and I think that was proved last Sunday. For people to claim that the vast majority of the seats will be out of the rain is a nonsense. It was sad. I was saddened to read confirmation of what I observed. The soccer players were slipping badly on the ground and they were literally tearing up the oval as they ran around the oval. I see reports that players are saying they would refuse to play at Adelaide Oval again. I am somewhat disturbed by that. I do not suspect that that is an insurmountable problem, but it is certainly a problem at Adelaide Oval at the moment.

I want to talk about a couple of things in my electorate, which I think are possibly a direct result of this decision by this government at this time. The Keith hospital: it is very difficult for me to go into the township of Keith and say to the people of Keith, 'We need a new football oval, we need a new redevelopment at Adelaide Oval,' when the government cannot even fund a couple of hundred thousand dollars to keep the doors of that hospital open. That is what is happening at Keith. The hospital is under severe threat of closure, yet this government is saying that we can spend hundreds of millions of dollars redeveloping the Adelaide Oval, and I will come to the cost in a minute.

People in the southern part of my electorate are being told that the state has to sell our forests. You can go into Mount Gambier and talk to a man, a woman and a child. They fully believe that they are paying for the Adelaide Oval, that the forests are being sold, that jobs have been threatened, and that the South-East has been sacrificed to provide a redeveloped Adelaide Oval. It does not matter what this government says: the people of the South-East are being dealt with very poorly at the moment. I totally support them in this and totally agree with them: they cannot see why this government is hell-bent on threatening their livelihoods and their communities while spending upwards of \$600 million on this project.

That is one of the reasons why I argued last night—and I agree with the point that we should put a financial cap on this development to cap the taxpayers' contribution—in the party room that that cap should have been the \$450 million because that is the amount that the government can claim it has a mandate for. It cannot claim that it has a mandate for any more than that because the Premier himself said \$450 million of taxpayers' money, 'not one cent more'. That is what the Premier told the people of South Australia before the last election, but we all know that the Premier struggles from time to time with the truth.

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Well, that is what he told the people of South Australia. I cannot answer why the Premier says one thing one day solemnly and makes a promise and then does something else the next day. I cannot answer for that. But that is what he told the people of South Australia. The then treasurer told the people of South Australia—I am not sure whether it was on 18 or 19 March but it was either the day or two days before the March 20 election last year—'We've got experts who have been working on this for a long time and we've got the numbers locked down and we know what it is, and it is \$450 million.'

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

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I just said, if you were listening, the former treasurer. I said the former treasurer. Go and read *Hansard*. Go and clean your ears out. You are wandering around here taking no notice, not listening, and then making inane comments. Go and read the *Hansard*; I said the former treasurer.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That includes you, minister.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. As I said, the former treasurer solemnly said, and I reckon it was on Radio FIVEaa a day or two before the election—

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

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I never said he was, you fool. I never said he was.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** A point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, I was there before you.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** 'Fool' is just unparliamentary.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** He needs to contain himself.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for MacKillop will sit down. Your point of order was, minister?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** 'Fool' is unparliamentary. I would ask the honourable member to withdraw it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Would that be similar to 'buffoon'?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I see. Member for MacKillop, it would appear that the minister is offended by 'fool'. It is indeed unparliamentary. I am sure that, because you are gracious, you will withdraw it immediately.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I will withdraw immediately, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I will not reflect on the minister in such terms if he stops behaving—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, there are no conditions.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** —the way he has been behaving.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for MacKillop, there are no conditions applied to that point of order.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I unconditionally withdraw from calling the minister a fool. The reality is this government has no mandate to spend one cent more than \$450 million. Notwithstanding that—

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Then why are you putting \$535 million in the bill?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** There is another one in the room, madam. There is another one who does not listen and makes inane comments when members are trying to explain the reasons for what they are doing and voting for certain things. For the sake of the former treasurer, I point out that I argued in the party room that we should be capping this at \$450 million, because you promised the people of South Australia that that's what it was going to cost. You are the one who has the problem with the truth, not me. I do not have a problem with the truth, but a lot of people on that side struggle with it. They struggle with it every day.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Nasty.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Oh, very nasty—at least I'm honest, and that is something that this state could do with a fair bit of. I am delighted that the Liberal Party is going to move—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Were you honest at the cellar door that day?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Madam, the minister is making a comment, which he has made at some stage before. I personally have no idea what he is talking about. I have no idea what he is talking about, but I ask the minister that, if he has got something to say, go out on the front steps of parliament and say it. No? You don't have the guts to.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** What is it you want me to say out there?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I don't know. I have no idea what you are talking about.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Well, what are you talking about then?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** You keep saying this. You keep saying something about 'on the steps of the cellar door somewhere'. I have no idea what you are talking about, minister. Go out there and say it. You are the one who keeps raising this issue.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** I'll talk about the steps of the cellar door outside?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes, go on, go and do it. You are not going to intimidate me with more untruths, minister. Madam Deputy Speaker—

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. The honourable member—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Could you sit down please, member for MacKillop.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** —has suggested that I have told untruths. He is not allowed to do that except by substantive motion.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** How was he insinuating that you have told untruths?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** He just said that I was telling untruths; that's what he said.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I never said that.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** What did you say then?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I said I am not going to be intimidated by you insinuating, using untruths.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** 'By your untruths.'

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for MacKillop, sit down. Member for MacKillop, I realise that this is a debate of some passion and some enthusiasm, but let us stay within the bounds of what is parliamentary.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I simply make the point, if the minister has something to say about me—and he is trying to intimidate me—go outside and say it.

**Mrs Geraghty:** He's not trying to intimidate you.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** He is, Robyn, and you know he is. He is a typical coward, Madam Deputy Speaker, and I will get on with my comments. I would be a lot happier if this parliament restricted this government to \$450 million of taxpayer spend on this particular project. I would be a lot happier. That is what it promised to the people of South Australia. If it ever got a mandate, that is what it got the mandate for, yet today it wants to spend \$535 million, and that does not include parts of the project which were in the original \$450 million price tag, things like a footbridge over the river and car parking.

So, the government has been telling porkies from day one on this and will continue to, and if there is not a cap in legislation I will guarantee that the government will spend more and more money on this project, because it knows, and we know, that this government is incapable of delivering a project within budget. The reality is this government just has not been able to deliver a project within budget.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for MacKillop, I would like to make one particular point. You are inferring, and have been inferring for some minutes, that individuals and indeed governments are lying. You know that that is unparliamentary, and I would ask you to refrain from doing so. I am sure that your use of language is so extraordinary that you do not have to go down that path.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you for your direction, Madam Deputy Speaker. I do not remember using the word 'lie' at all.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Inference. I think the word 'porky' is generally understood to refer to a lie or a small pig.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I apologise to the house, but I do not know how else to explain that a minister or a premier says, '\$450 million and not one penny more' and then, after the election, it is revealed that it is \$535 million. I—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for MacKillop, order! First of all, you are not here to argue with me. I am in the chair and what I say goes. Secondly, if you do not understand the difference between inference and plain speaking, I cannot help you. Carry on.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I will make it quite plain: I am not inferring that members of the government said one thing one day and did something else the next day. I am not inferring that at all; that is fact. That is what they did. They said not one penny more. They probably said not one cent more than \$450 million one day and the next day they revealed that it was \$535 million. I am not inferring anything; it is fact. I do not have to live with it. It is not on

my conscience, and that is a blessing I have that is not shared by too many people on the opposite side. It is not on my conscience.

The problem that we have in South Australia is that we will be locked—and this is not plan B, this is plan C—into plan C, a third rate option for the city and the people of this state, for a long, long time. It is not as though we are going to spend \$535 million on the redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval over the next few years and then, in five or six years, turn around and build a decent stadium. That is not going to happen. This is going to lock the public of South Australia into that stadium for a long time—I would say 30 or 40 years. That is the lifespan these developments usually have. That is about the life that AAMI Stadium will have had by the time football moves out of there and into the city. That is about the time that we will be locked into this stupid decision.

When I was at the soccer on the weekend, I was talking to some officials from New Zealand. They are cricket followers, too, and they said what a wonderful place the Adelaide Oval is, a beautiful, picturesque stadium, with ambience, etc. I said, 'But it's going to be redeveloped and they're going to do this and this, and it's going to cost \$535 million.' This chap, who is pretty high up in soccer in New Zealand, looked at me with this incredulous look on his face and said, 'But you could get a real stadium for that.' And he is right.

This is the pity. We are selling out football. We are selling out one of the iconic cricket stadiums in the world—which will never be the same again—and we are going to get a half-baked car park in the Parklands for the princely sum of \$535 million. It disappoints me greatly and it infuriates my constituents. They believe they have been sacrificed for this, and I happen to agree with them.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:19):** This is a matter of passion and enthusiasm for me as well—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** And stupidity for him.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —and I would love to see a brand new sports stadium—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. If saying somebody is a fool is unparliamentary, I think accusing somebody of stupidity must be unparliamentary also. The minister just referred to my speech as being one of stupidity.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do apologise. Unfortunately, member for MacKillop, I didn't hear it because I was listening to your colleague.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I am sure the minister won't claim that he didn't say it.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** My reply is no because, despite the egregious insults from the other side, I am entirely honest and I did say it. I apologise. I was inflamed by the moment but I withdraw. He is entitled to make whatever speeches he wishes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister. Sorry, member for Stuart.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** That is okay. Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. As I say, I feel passionate and enthusiastic about this issue as well on behalf of the people of Stuart. I think it would be absolutely fantastic; it would be absolutely tremendous to have a brand-new sports stadium.

I think it would be even better to have two sports stadiums in the City of Adelaide. It would be tremendous. I have a stronger sporting background than anybody else currently in parliament. I value these potential facilities. I understand how useful they would be for the development of sport: for cricket, for football, for grassroots sport.

The reality is, though, we just cannot afford it. It is no different to any other things that we would like to have in our lives personally—our family budgets, our business budgets, our social lives. It does not matter how good it is. If you cannot afford it, you cannot afford it and that is the bottom line with this project. The reason we cannot afford it is that we are spending too much money on a brand-new Royal Adelaide Hospital off site. That is the reason we cannot afford it.

The government has no mandate to upgrade Adelaide Oval—no mandate whatsoever. It is not in the last budget—presumably we will learn a bit about it this week—and it certainly was not an election promise—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Yes, it was.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —to spend \$535 million. It was an election promise to spend \$450 million. So, there is no mandate to do what the government says it wants to do either.

The people of Stuart, overwhelmingly, do not support this development—not because they do not want it, but because they cannot afford it and they would like to see the money spent in other ways throughout rural, remote and outback South Australia. However, the reality is that the government will proceed with this project. Whether the people of Stuart or any other people want this to happen, the government will proceed with this project.

The fact is, as the shadow treasurer has very, very well outlined, the Liberal Party's position is to provide some accountability, to provide some control measures and, most importantly, to put amendments forward that put sensible, rational control of the project in line with what the government has already said that it would do.

Capping the taxpayers' contribution to this project at \$535 million is extremely important. It is very important because the government said, leading up to the election, that it would only spend \$450 million on this project and not a cent more. Now, it says, '\$535 million and not a cent more.' We cannot just trust that promise, so we want to put that promise into the legislation. I think it is very fair to hold the government to its latest and current promise and say that we want that in the legislation. I think that, if the government is not prepared to accept that being in the legislation, it opens up a whole can of worms about exactly why not.

Giving the Auditor-General regular oversight of the project is extremely important. Giving the normal planning authorities oversight of the project is very, very important. Allowing council to retain control over some of its assets, which it has managed for the last 100 years or more, is a very, very important control.

Putting some rent into the project, rather than just handing over all this money and upgrading the Adelaide Oval, is very, very important, and particularly important to me as our proposal is that the rent would go towards grassroots sport throughout the state. I think that is very, very important as well. Protecting some trees and quite a few other measures of accountability that the shadow treasurer, the member for Adelaide and the rest of the Liberal Party have developed together to control this project, to control the government and to hold it accountable are very, very important.

The economic case that I have seen put together for this project, I think, is fairly thin. I think it is fairly thin because the people who put the economic case together based that case on assumptions given to them which I do not think are very robust. I understand it was done by them in a hurry and I understand that it does not make the whole case wrong, but I think the reality is not nearly as favourable as that case would have it.

I think the attendance assumptions can be called into question. I think that, considering the economic benefit to the City of Adelaide by comparing the current extremely low attendances at football at AAMI Stadium and working from the lowest case that we now have and assuming that the very best case that we can imagine will eventuate, is not appropriate. I also think that, as the economic case itself points out, it is very important to restate that the overall economic case applied to this project does not consider the fact that the economic benefit currently enjoyed by the western suburbs and greater metropolitan Adelaide by what happens at the moment at AAMI Stadium is not taken away from the build-up that is claimed to come from the Adelaide Oval.

One of the very easy and simple snapshots that can be taken out of this economic case that supports the upgrade of the Adelaide Oval, and which I think most people can understand, one of the wash-ups is that this upgrade will create 405 new jobs. Now, 405 new jobs would be good. I would prefer that they were in regional South Australia, but 405 new jobs in metropolitan Adelaide is very good for our state as well. But if you want to spend \$535 million to create 405 jobs, they are pretty expensive jobs, well in excess of \$1 million per job. I call into question how usefully that money is being spent and whether claiming that 405 new jobs at a price of \$535 million of taxpayers' money is really money well spent.

The issues with regard to football and cricket are fairly well known. Cricket is asset rich, cash poor, and certainly debt burdened. Football is in all sorts of strife, financially and performance-wise, at the moment, and we all hope that both of those will improve. Whether you are a Crows supporter or a Port Power supporter, or just a football supporter in general, you would certainly like the teams' performance to improve, but the reality is that as well as playing badly they are in a dreadful financial situation, and football (the SANFL) has made it very clear that it will not survive, in its opinion, without this stadium upgrade. It sees this as the way forward and its salvation.



I think that, in reality, if you looked into their hearts, they would not honestly say that the Adelaide Oval upgrade will save them. I think they probably would say that the Adelaide Oval upgrade might save them, and it will certainly buy them some more time. I do not think that anybody who knows anything about business or sport, or football specifically, could really put their hand on their heart and say that this upgrade will save football.

We do not reach the current capacity levels at AAMI Stadium (38,000 people) and I doubt very much that we will reach the new capacity level of about 50,000 people at the soon to be upgraded (it seems) Adelaide Oval, except for the very high profile games, which at the moment, unfortunately, neither Port nor the Crows are playing in anything like high profile games.

I heard the president of the Geelong Football Club speaking on the ABC morning sports program last Saturday morning, and he had a very interesting insight, certainly something that I had not heard. He was being asked about the Geelong stadium. He was being asked, 'But surely you would like to have a bigger stadium at Geelong? Surely you would consider a much bigger stadium at Geelong, or surely you would like to shift to Melbourne CBD for all of your matches?'

He said, 'Look, there are two, maybe three, AFL teams that we always do want to play against at the MCG because we want that capacity, and of course that is good, but really for the rest of our games we are happy to play at Geelong. We love playing at Geelong. We like our home ground advantage.' He was pressed to say, 'But surely you want more seats?' His answer was, 'We would actually really like to increase our capacity at Geelong'—for quite a few years now one of the most successful and powerful football teams in the AFL—'football stadium to about 40,000 people. That would be great.'

The commentator said, 'Forty thousand, surely that's not enough?' He said, 'Let me tell you something: when seats at our home stadium are a bit hard to get, people want to be members of our club. If we had surplus capacity, it would hurt our membership, because they just know that if they want to come to one, two or three games a year, they can roll along whenever they like, buy a ticket on that Saturday, Sunday or Friday (whatever it is) and get in. When seats are a bit hard to get, they pay up; they become members; they give us their money so that they can secure a seat at our smaller stadium whenever they like.' It certainly was not lost on me that perhaps that sort of business acumen might be helpful for Port and the Crows just at the moment when they are in a diabolical situation.

Another thing that occurs to me is that, with regard to the football situation—because, as we all know from seeing the media in the past week or so, Port is in a dreadful situation, the Crows are not in a tremendous situation, and the AFL has come in to give Port a bit of a lifeline—one of the big issues that the SANFL wants to avoid is having to surrender either one of its licences to the AFL. Understandably, the SANFL's responsibility—and a big part of its work—is to try to retain those licences. It is the South Australian National Football League. It wants to retain those licences—and I respect that—and it is very fearful that, if it cannot do it, then the AFL will just take those licences away and it will have no choice but to surrender them.

I think the AFL is getting an absolutely outstanding deal from this stadium upgrade. The AFL is going to get a tremendous deal, because if it took those licences now, either one or both—who knows—it would get the football teams in all sorts of difficulty. If it can just dribble some funds into Port Power to help them through until it can then get the Port Power licence, plus a brand-new stadium, plus access to its brand-new stadium, then I think the AFL is being very smart about this and has really hoodwinked quite a few people in this situation. I see the AFL as throwing a lifeline to the SANFL so that the SANFL will not sink and drown straightaway, but I would not mind betting that it will, shortly after this stadium is completed, acquire those licences.

I can understand why the SANFL wants to fight and I can understand why it wants to do whatever it can do to keep its head above water, but I am not optimistic that it will see them through in the long run. In the long run it will come from success on the field. You do not need a big stadium to get success on the field: what you need are good players, good coaches and some money. I understand that you need to have a successful club, whether it comes through the example of the Geelong Football Club that I mentioned before, which deliberately keeps its stadium just a little bit smaller and making tickets a little bit harder to find.

One of the big issues facing football (and many other sports at the moment) is the cost of tickets. Every day and every week we hear about the price of electricity, water, groceries—the price of all sorts of things going up—and taxes going crazy. Everything is going up for the average householder. Whether it is a family with kids, one or two people, two flatmates wanting to go to the

footy or grandparents wanting to take grand kids, it does not matter, the cost of living is going up every single day, and going to the football is not cheap. That is hurting attendances enormously, maybe just as much as performance.

I am sure if the teams were performing very well perhaps the public might find some more money to get there. However, the cost of tickets is a big issue, and I guarantee you that they will not be any cheaper at the new Adelaide Oval. They will not be any cheaper at all at the new Adelaide Oval. I think it will be harder for a family to attend the football—whether they are for Port or the Crows—at the new Adelaide Oval cost-wise than it currently is at AAMI Stadium.

Another interesting thing that the SANFL has said quite publicly is that it costs it about \$2 million per year to run AAMI Stadium. That is just the cost of operation of AAMI Stadium. So guess what? It would be possible for the government to give the SANFL \$100 million over the next 50 years and take care of that issue—take care of that very genuine, very big cost issue that the SANFL faces—and save \$435 million of taxpayers' money. That would help out football—help it in the way that it asks and in the way that it identifies it as a very important issue—and yet save \$435 million of taxpayers' money for all sorts of other issues.

Another issue I would like to just point out: I cannot, for the life of me, understand why the government has not asked for some share of the proceeds of the divestment, the sale or the redevelopment of the current AAMI Stadium after the teams move down here. I understand there will be SANFL use, and I understand there are ideas, at this stage—nothing concrete—for all sorts of ways that the SANFL might make some money out of AAMI Stadium after the two AFL teams have transitioned into the heart of Adelaide. Well, we are going to give \$535 million of taxpayers' money to this cash-strapped organisation to help it survive. Why are we not asking it to contribute back some of the money that it will make, back towards the taxpayer?

Madam Deputy Speaker, as you know, I fight every day that I come down here to Adelaide, to parliament, for regional South Australia—\$535 million would go an enormously long way. As I said, the people of Stuart overwhelmingly do not support this proposal, not because they do not want Adelaide or South Australia to have an upgraded stadium, and not because they have any sort of sour grapes or do not see how nice it might be, but because they see the shortfall in spending throughout regional South Australia.

Imagine \$535 million, or a significant share of it, being spent on regional sport, regional health, regional disability services (which are extremely underfunded), regional police, education, roads—the list goes on, growing rather than shrinking. The PIRSA offices—how about just not having to sell the South-East forests? How about just not having to sell the forward rotations of wood in the South-East forests? What would that mean to the people of the South-East if this did not go ahead?

For the towns in the electorate that I represent in Stuart—whether they be the large regional city of Port Augusta, or the larger towns of Kapunda, Jamestown, Peterborough, Burra and Eudunda, all the way through to the very small communities like Farrell Flat, Mount Mary, Lyndhurst or Blinman—a small, small share of this money would go a long, long way in any of those services in regional South Australia.

I do acknowledge that the government is going to put \$5 million towards a sports upgrade in Port Augusta, but I would like to highlight that that was not going to be forthcoming if it had not been to match a Liberal Party election promise heading to the last election, because we do take regional development, whatever the program happens to be—whether it is health, whether it is sport, whether it is disabilities—very seriously.

I would like to just conclude by once again saying I do believe that an upgraded Adelaide Oval or, more ideally, two sport stadiums in the heart of Adelaide, would be lovely—they really would be good, and I do not pretend that they would not—but the reality is that we just cannot afford them. We know that the government is going to progress down this path whether or not we can afford it. It is heading down this path and it has made this decision, so the Liberal Party's position is that we want to put accountability constraints into the legislation.

We want to ensure that we do not have the '\$450 million and not a cent more' which then goes to '\$535 million, not a cent more,' and next year we find out it is '\$600 million, not a cent more.' We want to hold the government accountable to its current existing promises, the commitments that it has made today. We want the Auditor-General to have oversight, we want the normal planning approvals to be in place, and we want the government to do what it has said it will do. We want the government to be held accountable. We cannot stop it from progressing with this

plan, but we want to put some genuine scrutiny, some genuine oversight and some genuine accountability on behalf of the people of South Australia into this legislation.

**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) (12:39):** I just want to make a few comments. I do not intend—nor is it appropriate for me—to comment on the individual amendments; my colleague will do that as the responsible minister, but this is a debate where I would like to put a few things on the record. I will attempt not to be provocative in my comments about contributions that we have had from other members opposite, over the course of today, and previously.

I think, in a few short years, this city will be transformed forever. For the very first time in our city's history we will become an attraction for people living in other parts of Australia to come and see—and, more importantly, to experience—the activity, the amenity and the enjoyment that is the City of Adelaide. If we think forward, just in five years' time, at the opening of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, of the expansion of the Convention Centre, hopefully with the upgrade of the Adelaide Casino, the bridge across the river and, of course, the Adelaide Oval upgrade, we will have for the very first time in this state's history a centrepiece in our capital city that is of world-class standing.

What that will do for commerce, be it in O'Connell Street, be it in Rundle Street, be it in the mall, be it wherever in the precincts of the CBD: we will have night football, we will have weekend football, we will have people staying in the city, and will have a vibrancy that we have never experienced before. That is why I am very proud of this project and, of the many things that I have been involved with and responsible for in this parliament and my time in government, nothing will give me greater satisfaction than being a champion for this project from day one.

The debate has been at times nonsensical and hysterical but, if we break away the politics, the reality is that a city the size of Adelaide, a state the size of South Australia, has to utilise its assets and its capital outlays in the most productive way possible. That is why a two-stadium solution has not worked; that is, you had Adelaide Oval that has not been developed over time to its full potential, and none of us could say that Adelaide Oval is an asset that is utilised. I mean, five days a year, or seven days a year with a couple of one-dayers, is hardly an engine room of activity at Adelaide Oval.

Football Park was built for very good reasons by the SANFL, the great Max Basheer and Don Brebner and others at the time for, I guess, the disappointing reason that they could not come to an agreement to live at the Adelaide Oval cooperatively with cricket. I am a West Lakes person. I have lived by, near or around that stadium all my life. I was there at the very first dig that occurred for that stadium.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** For the '77 grand final.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** For the '77 grand final there, when you used to sit on concrete, before they even put the aluminium seats in. I live opposite it now. My life has been around that particular stadium. It is a great area, but the reality is that it is for many South Australians and many visitors logistically difficult to get to.

The idea of a stadium in the CBD would always be a far greater attraction to people. It would be easier for people to get to. With the amount of expenditure by my colleague who is supervising this project and doing a great job with it, with the electrification of our rail, with the urban development plans that we have and with light rail in the city, it will be an easier, safer and better way to access a football match. So, there is no argument about, in my view, the need for a city stadium.

The debate developed into a brawl between whether we should have a stand-alone stadium or an upgraded Adelaide Oval. I have always strongly felt that an upgraded Adelaide Oval is a far superior option than a stand-alone stadium. The truth is—and my colleagues across the chamber will disagree with this vehemently—a stand-alone stadium would cost well in excess of \$1 billion, particularly a covered stadium. On one hand, members opposite are saying \$535 million is too much to be spending on a stadium, but on the other hand they were prepared to commit their government, should they have won, to a \$1 billion-plus covered stadium.

**Mr van Holst Pellekaan:** RAH on site.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Look, I'm trying to be constructive. If you want to interject I'll come back and fire up. That was a position that my opponents—our opponents—put, and they are entitled to do that. However, the problem is that cricket would not play there. There is also the fact that the AFL said they would not play there, but let us assume they did: you would have 22 games a year. The operating costs of a brand-new stadium are exorbitant. You only have to look at Etihad. I have seen some of the operating costs of these stadiums, and I think it cost Etihad \$2 million a year just to deal with the issues of the cost of the retractable roof and maintenance of the oval itself. With 22 games a year, these stadiums are inefficient. They are cost burdens, quite apart from whether or not we had a physical location.

I want to pay tribute to a number of key people in this process. One who I think has been unfairly maligned by many opposite (and one or two on my side) is Andrew Demetriou whose vision for this has been outstanding. For much criticism that he may receive, which I think is unwarranted, his philosophy and that of the AFL is that we need to have football stadia in the centre of a population, in the centre of a city, for all the reasons that I outlined before. He understands the product that he has to sell through TV rights and through sponsorships and the quality of the stadium—how it presents on television, the facilities that it offers to the media and, importantly, bums on seats—and we can get a crowd that will, to a large extent, populate these grandstands.

Adelaide Oval delivers all those objectives of the AFL and they have been absolutely resolute in championing the argument for Adelaide Oval, and it is not about an AFL takeover, not about Andrew Demetriou trying to get his way, but it is common sense. I think if we were to rub out everything we have here in the city now and we were building the city again and we said, 'Where would we want to build a multipurpose stadium?', I could not think of a site better than the Adelaide Oval, with such a short walk to the CBD, a short walk up to North Adelaide, in the middle of the Parklands and so close to public transport. I do not think you could find a better site, certainly not where the hospital is being built, in my opinion.

Importantly, we are dealing with this issue of asset utilisation. Ian McLachlan—and again I want to pay tribute to Ian—is a conservative, but he was really the one who started all this in discussions that he had with Andrew Demetriou before I was brought into the loop, and Ian's point was this issue of asset utilisation. Members opposite and, I am sure, some on my side say 'Let's have two stadiums,' and as the member for Stuart said, it would be great to have a lot of things in this world, but we in this state, whether we like it or not, do not have a population or an economy strong enough and large enough to sustain two very expensive pieces of infrastructure.

In years gone by (and both sides of politics have made this mistake, and again the member for Stuart could understand this), we have tended to give—call them 'Taj Mahals'—pristine assets for individual sports when perhaps we should have been a lot smarter. I could not think of any better sport than basketball. We built the Entertainment Centre, but basketball wanted unfettered access to its own stadium—that is my memory—and I am sure the concert organisers did not want bloody basketballers running around, so what we did as a government, and it was a Labor government, was build whatever we ended up calling it—the Clipsal and the Dome.

Then netball, of course, wanted its own facility. It did not want to share with basketballers, so a Liberal government built a stand-alone facility for netball. The reality is that all those three assets are expensive to maintain and the reality is that there was not enough money in our economy and in our sports to sustain those three entities. We have had to spend a lot of public money on each of those assets over the years when sensible policy about asset utilisation would have said, 'Build one Entertainment Centre and make the sports coexist.' With Football Park, we are going to get great asset utilisation, and what I have liked about this debate—and this is not a cheap shot at the opposition; it is just a fact—is that a lot of people were opposed to this.

The SANFL was bitterly opposed to the Adelaide Oval project. Leigh Whicker was opposed to the Adelaide Oval project. Rod Payze was opposed to the Adelaide Oval project. I could not find too many people at the time who were all that keen on it but, in the end open minds, objective analysis, and people prepared to consider the merits of the argument, one by one started to realise that this was the best option.

I want to pay great tribute to Leigh Whicker again. Leigh has lived and breathed this project for 2½ years. He has worked enormously long hours, juggling his role as the head of the SANFL—

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

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** —yes—and the head of the SMA, but, when presented with the great opportunities of a developed Adelaide Oval, Leigh quickly became an incredibly crucial and

enthusiastic supporter. He came from a position of outright opposition initially, but he had and does have the great ability to actually stand back, look, consider and be persuaded of the merits.

Over time, the SANFL Commission, which was opposed to it, came around because it is a good, sensible thing to do. You have had Alexander Downer say it, you have had Christopher Pyne say it, and you have now had John Olsen, as the chairman and having played a very crucial role, say it—and I think his role should be acknowledged and appreciated as well. This has been a very tortuous process, but I think when that stadium is opened even some of the harshest critics from those opposite, perhaps the deputy leader (who knows, he could be deputy premier), will look back over time and realise that this actually is a great outcome for the state.

It will be a beautiful design, it will be a unique design, it will not be the traditional oval where it is just built in by massive concrete grandstands. It will maintain a character, an open-ended northern end, the Moreton Bay fig trees, the uniqueness of the grandstand design—those features will be there. It will be a unique oval. It will not be a second-rate oval. It will not be a second-best option. It will be an outstanding addition not just to Adelaide but to the ability of our nation to host world-class sporting events, whatever the sport may be.

As to Port Power and the Crows, there is no question that Port Power is in serious strife but, equally, the Crows are not travelling as well financially as they would like. Why is that? Well, it is about the quality of their football—that is undeniable—and it could also be about the fact that we do have as big a population as Perth or WA and that it is harder for us to provide the necessary financial support across business and the population to support the two clubs at this point.

What we do know—and there has been extensive work undertaken—is that we will get more people to both Port Power and Crows games because it is closer. If you live at Happy Valley, Aberfoyle Park, Gawler, or Norwood, it will be more attractive for you to travel into the city to watch that sport. People who have become used to Football Park, some of my friends, have said 'Oh, crikey, we are going to have to hike up to the city.' Well, it is only a 20-minute drive, and that is not going to be an impediment—although I must say to my colleague the transport minister that one of my constituents said, 'Listen, we used to give free bus trips to people from Adelaide down to West Lakes. Can you give us free bus trips from West Lakes into the city?' I said, 'I doubt that.'

We will see better crowds. I accept the argument of the member for Stuart that this is not a panacea, that this is not a silver bullet and that this will not be the saviour of our clubs in total, but it will make a significant improvement to the operations of those clubs. My colleague the Minister for Transport, who has stepped in (as he should) as infrastructure minister to manage this project, has done an outstanding job in negotiating with desperate—oops, I meant disparate—groups, including Adelaide City Council, for example, which I think has shown a degree of maturity and an ability to see the benefits of this for the wider city and state, and which has acted very well, very nobly.

I have to say that I have never risen to my feet in this place and been remotely complimentary about the Adelaide City Council; however, having gone through the fiasco that was the Victoria Park stadium, I think Peter Smith, the mayor Stephen Yarwood, and the councillors in general have, from what I can observe—and I think my colleague has demonstrated it in the outcomes we have achieved—shown a preparedness to engage and work constructively while still representing the core interests of their constituents. I thank them for doing what I thought was an almost impossible task; that is, to bring the Adelaide City Council with us on this journey. The Minister for Infrastructure should be applauded and commended for his ability to do that.

I want to come back to the theme I have been talking about, and have to say that I have been incredibly tempted to go on the political attack when listening to the deputy leader and the member for Stuart, and, indeed, my long-time friend the shadow treasurer. Everyone is entitled to an opinion and a view, and the truth of the matter is that there are probably 69 different views about what is right or wrong on this issue—whether or not we should spend the money, whether it should be new, closed, roofed, or whatever. The reality is that it is happening, and I think all of us will reflect whatever role we may have played.

The truth is that members opposite did play a role in this whole debate about whether or not we should rebuild, re-energise, the City of Adelaide, and it would be churlish of me not to mention the former leader the member for Waite, and the front bench of the time, who did champion a riverbank development. It was different to what we wanted to do but, in fact, we are in government. That is what happens, you win and lose elections. We won the election and have seized the moment to make sure that we leave a long-term legacy of benefit to this city and this state.

The Royal Adelaide Hospital will be one of the most magnificent investments of public money that this nation has ever invested in and the precinct, with the vibrancy that will come with football in the city, will make us a destination. No longer will people come to Adelaide and the best they can do is feed a few ducks and go for a jaunt on *Popeye*; there will actually be serious activity. We will have a Federation Square, we will have a Darling Harbour, we will have a Riverbank as they do in Brisbane. We will have our precinct, and we will be a better city for it and a better state. All South Australians will benefit from this. We only have to look at the people who come to the cricket from various parts of country South Australia, to the test matches and the one-day matches. This is an asset for all the state.

I want to conclude by saying that Ian McLachlan in particular, a visionary, can rest easy tonight and be proud of his work. Andrew Demetriou, who some see as a hard man of business and sport, is, again, a great visionary, a great leader and a great advocate for the advancement of Australian Rules football. I want to mention my colleague Pat Conlon, John Olsen, and importantly Leigh Whicker, who probably thought, for many a day, that this moment would never arrive. From once being a critic, he went on to be one of the most forceful advocates for this. Let us also remember that for Leigh Whicker it came at personal anguish and personal cost; the great friendship between Leigh Whicker and Max Basheer was long and well regarded. I can understand Mr Basheer's concerns and disappointments, but it just shows how committed Leigh Whicker was, and is.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

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

#### **HEALTH SERVICES CHARITABLE GIFTS BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **SAFE DRINKING WATER BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **CORPORATIONS (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) (TERMINATION DAY) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **CORONERS (REPORTABLE DEATH) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **APPROPRIATION BILL**

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

#### **SEX INDUSTRY REFORM**

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford):** Presented a petition signed by 848 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to repeal the laws, under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and the Summary Offences Act 1953, which criminalise sex workers in the pursuit of their profession.

### **ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS**

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

#### **SURGICAL PATIENTS**

**20 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). During 2008-09, how many surgical patients were re-admitted within seven days after being operated on and discharged from each of the following hospitals—Flinders Medical Centre, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Lyell McEwen Hospital, Modbury Hospital Whyalla Hospital, Port Augusta Hospital, Mt Gambier Hospital and Port Lincoln Hospital?

**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):** I am advised:

The number of surgical patients readmitted within seven days during 2008-09 to the nominated hospitals, is presented in the below table. The table also includes the readmission rate: the number of readmissions divided by the total number of discharges for surgical patients.

Hospital	Readmissions within 7 days	Readmission rate
Flinders Medical Centre	109	0.8 per cent
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	72	0.8 per cent
Lyell McEwin Hospital	65	1.0 per cent
Modbury Hospital	26	0.8 per cent
Whyalla Hospital	6	0.3 per cent
Port Augusta Hospital	10	0.7 per cent
Mount Gambier Hospital	18	0.8 per cent
Port Lincoln Hospital	9	0.7 per cent

The Australian Government and the States/Territories have agreed on a national approach for identifying readmissions for elective surgery. This approach has been adopted in preparing the table.

### HEALTH BUDGET

**23 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Have the \$7.3 million in savings to head office administrative efficiencies which were targeted in the 2006-07 Budget been achieved and if so, how have these savings been achieved?

**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):** I am advised:

The Department of Health was required to meet savings as part of the 2006-07 Budget of \$7.271 million over the four years 2006-07 to 2009-10 relating to head office administrative efficiencies. The Department of Health has achieved this savings target on a recurrent basis.

This savings target was achieved by the Department of Health as a result of strategies identified during a 2006-07 and 2007-08 Departmental review, which included management of vacant positions, internal organisational restructuring and general efficiencies.

These management strategies have not impacted on frontline health care services.

### METROPOLITAN HEALTH SERVICES

**25 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Have the \$15.2 million in administrative efficiency savings to Metropolitan Regional Health Services targeted in the 2006-07 Budget been achieved and if so, how was this achieved?

**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):** I am advised:

The Metropolitan Regional Health Services were required to meet savings as part of the 2006-07 Budget of \$15.201 million over the four years 2006-07 to 2009-10 relating to administrative efficiencies.

Of the total 2009-10 savings of \$7.824 million, around \$4.647 million (2008-09 component) in savings have been achieved through the review and restructure of existing organisational structures.

In 2010-11, SA Health is continuing to work towards identifying strategies in consultation with health regions to meet existing and growth in savings required across the forward estimates. The management strategies targeted in 2010-11 include:

- improved leave management through the standardisation of leave management and review of annual leave policies across the Portfolio
- better management of overtime costs through a comprehensive review of overtime and the implementation of standard overtime policies across all major metropolitan hospitals
- more efficient utilisation of agency staffing

- reduction in administrative support costs through the review of all non-clinical services and the reduction of duplication of support services
- vacancy management through review of historical practices surrounding filling vacancies and the focus of priority filling of essential positions.

These management strategies will not affect frontline health care services.

### METROPOLITAN HEALTH SERVICES

**26 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Have the \$26 million in cuts to Metropolitan Regional Health Services and service delivery changes targeted in the 2006-07 Budget been achieved and if so, how was this achieved?

**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):** I am advised:

The Metropolitan Regional Health Services related savings initiatives approved as part of the 2006-07 Budget are represented by two separate savings initiatives.

The Metropolitan Regional Health Services are required to meet savings of \$21.593 million over the four years 2006-07 to 2009-10 relating to \$6.392 million over four years for service delivery changes and \$15.201 million over four years for administrative efficiencies.

Metropolitan Regional Health Services—service delivery changes

This savings initiative of \$6.392 million over the four years 2006-07 to 2009-10 relates to the sale of Commonwealth bed licences associated with the transfer of patients from the Tregenza Aged Care Service to a private provider. This savings initiative has been fully achieved recurrently.

Metropolitan Regional Health Services—administrative efficiencies

The Metropolitan Regional Health Services were required to meet savings as part of the 2006-07 Budget of \$15.201 million over the four years 2006-07 to 2009-10 relating to administrative efficiencies.

Of the total 2009-10 savings of \$7.824 million, around \$4.647 million (2008-09 component) in savings have been achieved through the review and restructure of existing organisational structures. In 2010-11, SA Health is continuing to work towards identifying strategies in consultation with health regions to meet existing and growth in savings required across the forward estimates. The management strategies targeted in 2010-11 include:

- improved leave management through the standardisation of leave management and review of annual leave policies across the Portfolio
- better management of overtime costs through a comprehensive review of overtime and the implementation of standard overtime policies across all major metropolitan hospitals
- more efficient utilisation of agency staffing
- reduction in administrative support costs through the review of all non-clinical services and the reduction of duplication of support services
- vacancy management, through review of historical practices surrounding filling vacancies and the focus of priority filling of essential positions.

These management strategies will not affect frontline health care services.

### HEALTH BUDGET

**28 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Have the \$48 million efficiency dividends outlined to be undertaken across Health Expenditure in the 2006-07 Budget been achieved and if so, how was this achieved?

**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):** I am advised:

The Health Portfolio was required to meet savings as part of the 2006-07 Budget of \$47.05 million over the four years 2006-07 to 2009-10 relating to efficiency dividends, with



\$45.612 million over four years allocated across all health regions and \$1.438 million over four years allocated to the Department of Health.

#### Department of Health—efficiency dividend

The Department of Health has recurrently achieved this savings target. This savings target was achieved by the Department of Health as a result of strategies identified during 2006-07 and 2007-08 Departmental Reviews, which identified opportunities for internal organisational restructuring and general efficiencies.

#### Health Services—efficiency dividend

The Health Services allocation of the efficiency dividend in 2009-10 is \$18.434 million and approximately \$13.504 million (2008-09 component) in savings have been achieved recurrently through the implementation of Regional strategies.

In 2010-11, SA Health is continuing to work towards identifying strategies in consultation with health regions to meet existing and growth in savings required across the forward estimates. The management strategies targeted in 2010-11 include:

- improved leave management through the standardisation of leave management and review of annual leave policies across the Portfolio
- better management of overtime costs through a comprehensive review of overtime and the implementation of standard overtime policies across all major metropolitan hospitals
- more efficient utilisation of agency staffing
- reduction in administrative support costs through the review of all non-clinical services and the reduction of duplication of support services
- vacancy management through review of historical practices surrounding filling vacancies and the focus of priority filling of essential positions.

These management strategies will not affect frontline health care services.

### SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

**29 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Have the \$1.2 million in administrative savings to the South Australian Ambulance Service targeted in the 2006-07 Budget been achieved and if so, how was this achieved?

**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):** I am advised:

The \$1.2 million in administrative savings relates to the administration costs for the SA Ambulance Service Superannuation Fund. The savings have been achieved by moving administration of the SA Ambulance Superannuation Fund from a commercial super fund to Super SA. Super SA has reimbursed SA Ambulance Service for the lower administration fees.

### MODEL OF CARE

**33 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010).

1. What is the 'endorsed model of care' within all service and facility planning?
2. What are acute medical and surgical assessment units, how do they operate, what staff are allocated to these units and how do they benefit patients?

**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):** I am advised:

1. The endorsed Model of Care was developed as a result of South Australia's Health Care Plan 2007-2016.

The principles of the Model of Care and design of services are in line with:

- the state-wide principles developed by the Clinical Senate
- the patient safety design concepts

- safety and quality principles incorporating concepts of right care, right time, right place, right person/team
- South Australia's Health Care Plan 2007-2016.

The Model of Care aims to support the health system reform so that:

- it encompasses a whole system approach
- care is integrated across disciplines, sectors and organisations
- patients are at the centre of the system
- evidence informs decisions and practices
- the workforce is supported to become more flexible and involved in shaping the future
- the hospital will be a learning organisation
- partnerships with other providers, industry, universities and other key stakeholders will be actively promoted.

In summary, the goal of the new Model of Care is to strive for clinical excellence and quality of care through a patient centred approach.

### **OBESITY PREVENTION AND LIFESTYLE**

**35 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Which councils received Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle (OPAL) funding, how much did or will they receive, how will this program be implemented and what results are expected?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts):** I am advised:

In 2009-10, six Councils commenced the five year OPAL program and another four commenced in September 2010. The Councils participating are: Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Whyalla, Copper Coast, Onkaparinga, Marion, Playford, Salisbury, Port Adelaide Enfield and Charles Sturt. Another 10 Councils will become OPAL sites, five in mid 2011 and five in mid 2012 bringing the total to 20 Councils over four years, with each funded for five years. Councils are chosen following a formal submission process.

Each Council to date has received \$50,000 to use directly in their community. The Councils have matched this amount. The State Government has also provided two staff members. In total, Councils are receiving approximately \$200,000 per year or \$1 million over the course of the OPAL program.

OPAL is based on an internationally recognised program called EPODE (Together we can prevent childhood obesity). Like their French counterparts, OPAL staff work from Local Councils—the hub of communities. Already they have consulted with their communities to determine what is most needed to support healthy eating and physical activity.

OPAL promotes a new healthy eating or physical activity 'theme' every six months. The first was, Water. The original cool drink.—a replacement message for sugar-sweetened drinks. The next theme will focus on play, and decreasing electronic screen time.

This methodology is working in France. Results from EPODE are very promising, with significant decreases in childhood obesity in intervention towns. A drop of nearly 2 per cent has just been reported from 2005-09 in EPODE communities, compared with the overall level of overweight and obesity across France.

Over the coming years, OPAL will expect to see positive changes in weight status, behaviours (more children active more often and healthier eating) and greater understanding of what constitutes a healthy lifestyle. OPAL will pursue changes to the physical environment to make healthy choices easy choices.

Evaluation of the OPAL program is being guided by a high level Scientific Advisory Committee chaired by Professor Boyd Swinburn from Deakin University, a world authority on community obesity-prevention programs.

### BREASTSCREEN SA

**36 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). How does the government aim to achieve 2004 National Accreditation Standards to have 70 per cent of women aged 50 to 69 years of age being screened for breast cancer over a 24 month period without increasing funding to BreastScreen SA?

**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):** I am advised:

Participation in screening rates for women aged 50-69 in South Australia is the highest in the nation.

The introduction of digital mammography at BreastScreen SA is aimed at bringing about some productivity gains, which are anticipated to have a positive impact upon participation rates.

### SOUTHERN ADELAIDE HEALTH SERVICE

**39 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What savings initiatives are expected to be met by the Southern Adelaide Health Service and which programs and services will be reduced to meet the required savings targets for 2009-10 and 2010-11?

**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):** I am advised:

The savings requirements that were allocated to the then Southern Adelaide Health Service (now part of the Adelaide Health Service) in 2009-10 and will be in 2010-11, are based on savings initiatives approved as part of the 2006-07, 2007-08, and 2008-09 Budgets.

The funding allocations for 2009-10 and 2010-11 include the following savings initiatives:

- Savings Efficiency measures—reflects savings requirements from prior year State Budgets and includes growth in these savings targets.
- FTE Reduction (TVSP savings)—reflects a share of the 428 FTE reduction for the Health Portfolio, announced in the mid year budget review.
- Health Reform Strategy Savings—this is a continuation of savings in 2009-10 and 2010-11 that were approved as part of the 2007-08 Budget.
- Procurement and Supply Chain Savings—this savings initiative represents efficiencies expected from the Procurement and Supply Chain Centralisation project to offset savings requirements approved as part of the 2008-09 and 2009-10 Budgets.

### SOUTHERN ADELAIDE HEALTH SERVICE

**40 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What savings initiatives are expected to be met by the Southern Adelaide Health Service to meet the requirements of the National Partnership Agreement on Hospital and Health Workforce Reform?

**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):** I am advised:

The National Partnership Agreement on Hospital and Health Workforce Reform was agreed following the November 2008 COAG meeting.

The National Partnership Agreement does not require savings measures, but does contain measures aimed at improving efficiency and capacity in public hospitals that will help to meet demand for health care and hospital services.

### PUBLIC HOSPITAL STATISTICS

**42 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What strategies are in place to reduce the preventable admission rate in South Australia's public hospitals?

**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):** I am advised:

South Australia's Health Care Plan 2007-2016, which was released in 2007, is driving current reform in health care in South Australia. The Plan outlines the key health system reforms, which include improvements to South Australia's health system, to help prevent unnecessary hospital admissions.

In 2008-09, SA Health invested \$35 million in the implementation of initiatives that form part of GP Plus Health Care Strategy. The GP Plus Health Care Strategy addresses key recommendations arising from the Generational Health Review to provide a fully integrated and accessible health care system and to increase prevention and early discharge services to promote good health. This investment has been increased to over \$68 million for the current financial year.

Examples of this investment include:

- packages of care provided to people that enables them to have care at home and avoid a hospital admission
- pre-hospital intervention by the ambulance service so as to avoid unnecessary transfer to hospital.

SA Health is investing in prevention programs, which promote good health, especially in the areas of weight, smoking and alcohol. This year South Australia launched the Obesity Prevention and Lifestyle Program, a five year program for families and children aimed at tackling obesity and chronic disease.

### HEALTH BUDGET

**44 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). How does the State Government expect to achieve \$90 million in savings (as outlined in the 2007-08 Budget) from service delivery changes as a result of health reform and which programs and services will be reduced to meet the required savings targets?

**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):** I am advised:

The Health Portfolio was required to meet savings, as part of the 2007-08 Budget of \$89.9 million over the three years 2008-09 to 2010-11, relating to service delivery changes to be derived through reforms of the health system.

South Australia's Health Care Plan 2007-2016 promotes increased investment in primary health care and the development of primary health care networks resulting in a greater connection between general practitioners and other parts of the health system. Cost efficiencies have been projected by SA Health in this area, as the cost of delivering out-of-hospital services in the form of hospital avoidance packages and via other primary health care services, such as the investment in GP Plus Health Care Centres are lower than the cost of providing services in an acute hospital setting.

The introduction of new initiatives to assist in the long term management of people with chronic disease and the implementation of a number of healthy lifestyle programs will over time assist in keeping people healthy and reducing the burden on the hospital system. Consistent with above, cost efficiencies are anticipated from investing in these early intervention and prevention programs.

In 2010-11, the Department of Health will continue to work with health regions to identify and implement strategies to transition the provision of services towards prevention and out-of-hospital strategies. These efforts will be further enhanced with the anticipated completion of the Elizabeth and Marion GP Plus Health Care Centres in late 2010, and the Noarlunga and Modbury GP Plus Super Clinics in stages starting in late 2010.

### BUDGET SAVINGS INITIATIVES

**47 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). How does the State Government expect to achieve the \$81 million in savings initiatives (as outlined in the 2008-09 Budget) and which programs and services will be reduced to meet the required savings targets?

**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):** I am advised:

The Health Portfolio was required to meet savings as part of the 2008-09 Budget of \$81 million over the three years 2009-10 to 2011-12.

The Procurement and Supply Consolidation Project, identified in the 2009-10 Budget is expected to achieve savings of at least \$44.1 million over the next four years 2009-10 to 2011-12, with \$8.1 million expected in 2009-10.

Through the Procurement and Supply Consolidation Project, SA Health is consolidating warehousing and procurement/purchasing activities and introducing best practice supply chain initiatives. In addition, this project will streamline suppliers, product range and implement a common procurement and supply chain system to increase efficiency and improve the quality and safety of services and supplies.

A range of initiatives are also in the early stages of being developed to ensure improved efficiencies in service delivery across the Health Portfolio to meet required savings targets from the 2006-07, 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10 Budgets.

The savings strategies to achieve SA Health's remaining savings targets include the review of portfolio wide support functions. These strategies will not affect frontline health care services.

#### **BUDGET SAVINGS INITIATIVES**

**48 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What revised arrangements to procurement activities will be undertaken to achieve the \$44.1 million of savings identified in the 2009-10 Budget?

**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):** I am advised:

The Procurement and Supply Consolidation Project, identified in the 2009-10 Budget, is expected to achieve savings of at least \$44.1 million over the period 2009-10 to 2012-13.

The primary objective of the consolidation project is for SA Health to establish a single service that delivers best practice procurement, contracting and supply chain management to the public health system. As site by site transition to the new consolidated operating model occurs, financial savings will be derived from:

- improved sourcing by leveraging entire SA Health spend
- improved process efficiency through standardisation, automation and innovative supply chain techniques
- elimination of off-contract buying through better defined, tightly controlled processes
- improved standardisation and rationalisation of products
- improved productivity associated with efficient, effective product search processes (catalogues) and improved demand forecasting
- reduced product inventories and obsolescence throughout the supply chain.

The full implementation across SA Health will occur over the 2009-10 and 2010-11 financial years. The implementation will occur in line with, and be supported by, the rollout of the new Oracle Corporate System across SA Health. The benefit of these savings will contribute to the South Australian Governments Strategic Plan to realise increased administrative efficiencies to allow funds to be reinvested into frontline services across SA Health.

#### **BETTER ORAL HEALTH IN RESIDENTIAL CARE PROGRAM**

**49 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). How much State Government expenditure is allocated to the 'Better Oral Health in Residential Care' program?

**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):** I am advised:

SA Dental Service was the recipient of a \$1.3 million project grant funded by the Australian Government to develop an evidence-based model called Better Oral Health in Residential Care. The Department of Health and Ageing is responsible for implementing the Model as part of Australia's first national Nursing Home Oral and Dental Health Plan.

### NATIONAL ALCOHOL EARLY INTERVENTION PILOT PROGRAM

**50 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). How much State Government expenditure is provided for the National Early Intervention Pilot Program to address adolescent binge drinking?

**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):** I am advised:

No State Government funding is provided, however, the State Government's Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia spent \$7.2 million in 2009-10 on alcohol primary prevention and early intervention.

### REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

**51 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Will funding allocated to the food and catering services at the Repatriation General Hospital also incorporate the development and implementation of nutritional standards and menu guidelines for public hospitals in South Australia?

**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):** I am advised:

The Repatriation General Hospital (RGH) patient menus are based on Industry standards 'Towards the Development of Best Practice Patient Food Services', 1996, Nutrition Unit, Department of Public Health, Flinders University of South Australia.

The RGH menu aligns to 2009 draft standards: 'Menu and nutritional standards for adult inpatients in South Australian acute care hospitals'.

The RGH currently provides from within its operational budget a nutritional menu for inpatients that is consistent with industry standards.

### SURGICAL TASK FORCE

**53 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010).

1. Who are the current members of the Surgical Task Force, how often does it meet and what advice has been given to the Minister by the task force?

2. What is the task force's current operational and strategic plan for elective surgery and what advice has been given to improve surgery timeliness?

**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):** I am advised:

1. The Surgical Services Taskforce meets once a month and reports to the Chief Executive of SA Health through the Chairman of the Taskforce and the Executive Director, Operations, Department of Health. The Chief Executive provides regular updates on the activities of the Taskforce to the Minister as required.

The membership of the Surgical Services Taskforce includes senior clinical membership from across all our major hospital sites and Chief Executive Officers of each of the regional health services. The membership is:

Name	Position
Mr Rob Padbury, Chairman	Director, Division of Surgery and Specialty Services, Flinders Medical Centre
Mr David Swan	Executive Director Operations, Department of Health
Ms Kae Martin	A/Director, Operational Strategy, Department of Health
Ms Deidre Kinchington	A/Manager Systems Coordination, Operational Strategy, Department of Health
Mr Tony Williams	Clinical Director, Operating Room Services, Royal Adelaide Hospital
Dr Cindy Molloy	Medical Director, Division of Surgery, Women's and Children's Hospital
Dr Peter Chapman	Chief Medical Officer, Country Health SA

Name	Position
Dr Andrew Luck	Director of Surgery, Lyell McEwin Hospital
Mr Jim Young	Surgeon, Lyell McEwin Hospital
Mr James Edwards	SA Regional Committee, Royal Australian College of Surgeons
Prof Guy Maddern	Head, Division of Surgery, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital
Prof Villis Marshall	Clinical Director, Surgical & Specialties Service, Royal Adelaide Hospital
Mr Paul Clark	ENT Surgeon, Flinders Medical Centre & Noarlunga Health Service
Mr Graham Mercer	Head, Arthroplasty Services, Repatriation General Hospital
Mr Nick Marshall	Plastic and Reconstructive Surgeon Visiting Specialist, Flinders Medical Centre
Assoc Prof Brian Brophy	Director, Neurosurgery, Royal Adelaide Hospital
Vacant	SA Vascular Group—(Mr David King resigned 9 August 2010 replacement is currently being sought)
Dr Richard Kelly	Director of Operating Theatres, Repatriation General Hospital
Assoc Prof Jamie Craig	Ophthalmology, Flinders Medical Centre
Mr Martin Turner	Chief Executive Officer, Adelaide Health Service
Ms Lesley Dwyer	Chief Operating Officer, Adelaide Health Service
Ms Gail Mondy	Chief Executive Officer, Child, Youth & Women's Health Service
Dr Di King	ED Workforce Liaison Group, Flinders Medical Centre
Ms Margaret Martin	Practice Improvement Consultant, Flinders Medical Centre
Ms Beth Hooper	ACORN, Operating Room Nurses
Mr Gregg Otto	General Surgeon, Modbury Hospital
Dr Simon Jenkins	Royal Australian & New Zealand College of Anaesthetists
Dr Peter Joseph	The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, College House
Mrs Jenny Wildy	Principal Project Officer, Systems Coordination, Dept of Health

2. The Surgical Services Taskforce was established to provide leadership in supporting the ongoing model for the management of surgical services (elective and emergency) across South Australia.

The Surgical Services Taskforce contributes to the enhancement of governance and leadership, workforce planning and, demand and capacity management for surgical services. During the next financial year the following strategies will be included in the planning for the Taskforce:

- Standardisation of Practices in Patient Management, which includes:
  - pre-admission and post-discharge planning
  - waiting list management practices
  - improved assessment of 'Ready for Care' patients in outpatients
  - clinical urgency categorisation in line with best practice.
- Capacity Management, which includes:
  - Maximising existing acute capacity through addressing the management of planned activity and unplanned activity as a single system of care by defining low complex surgery to be undertaken in dedicated elective surgery sites.
  - Increased development of elective surgery sites.
- Development of Clinical Guidelines for Bariatric Surgery.

#### **COMMON GROUND FRAMEWORK**

**54 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What is the 'Common Ground' framework, is it operational and how much State Government funding has been allocated to implement this framework?

**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):** I am advised:

In 2004, a formal partnership called the Common Ground Agreement was established between the Health and Community Services Sector, the Department of Health and the Department for Families and Communities.

The aims of Common Ground were to:

- collaborate on matters of mutual interest
- lead improvements in policy development, governance, consumer participation in service planning, delivery and management
- engage in public debate about policy, service delivery and governance.

In 2008, a review of the Common Ground Agreement was undertaken resulting in the development of the Stronger Together Agreement, which built on and strengthened the partnerships.

There is no dedicated budget identified, as the Agreement describes a working relationship encompassing different forums, working groups and collaborative projects between the parties.

#### **NEW TRANSITION CARE PROGRAM**

**55 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Where will the 38 New Transition Care Program places occur and what is the expenditure allocated for these places?

**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):** I am advised:

South Australia has been allocated 58 New Transition Care Program places by the Commonwealth Government, which will be made operational during 2010-11.

The Adelaide Health Service will receive 58 places. Of these, the southern area will receive five places and the central and northern area will receive 36 places.

Country Health SA will receive 17 places.

It is expected that these 58 new places will all be fully operational from 1 November 2010.

The Transition Care Program is a joint State and Commonwealth funded initiative. The Commonwealth expenditure budgeted for these places is \$2,568,472 and the State Government expenditure budgeted for these places is \$1,181,036.

#### **NATIONAL HEALTHCARE AGREEMENT**

**57 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What are the details of the new arrangements between the Health Care Agreement and the National Partnership Agreements through the Council of Australian Governments?

**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):** I am advised:

The National Healthcare Agreement (NHCA) commenced on 1 July 2009 and replaced the previous Australian Health Care Agreements, in addition to the Public Health Outcomes Funding Agreement and other public health funding, as well as funding for service delivery for essential vaccines and youth health services. The NHCA relates to the various health-related National Partnership Agreements in that it contains specific long term objectives and overarching principles agreed by the Commonwealth and the States and Territories relating to issues such as Indigenous health, prevention and aged care.

The National Partnership Agreements are generally time-limited reform agreements, whilst the NHCA is an ongoing agreement subject to periodic review. Every National Partnership Agreement will be subject to review at the relevant cessation date and, if agreed they should be continued as ongoing arrangements following these reviews, may be rolled into the NHCA.



**EMERGENCY MEDICAL RETRIEVAL SERVICE**

**58 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010).

1. How much expenditure is provided to operate the statewide Emergency Medical Retrieval Service?
2. How many patients utilise this service on an average daily, weekly, monthly and annual basis, respectively?
3. What is the cost per patient of utilising this service?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts):** I am advised:

1. The consolidated draft budget for 2010-11 provided by the Department of Health for the operation of MedSTAR is \$9,328,910 of which \$1,520,000 relates to the helicopter service.
2. 1,647 cases were referred to MedSTAR in the first 6 months of 2010, which is an average of 9 per day, 63 per week, 274.5 per month and 3 294 per year.

Not all of these cases result in patients being retrieved (537 requests). However, every case requires the input of MedSTAR retrieval coordination staff, for periods of up to an hour or more. 1,110 retrieval missions were undertaken in the first 6 months of 2010.

3. The average cost per patient is \$3,506.37 based on 2009-10 actuals and activity quoted above.

**RENAL TRANSPLANT SERVICE**

**60 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010).

1. What savings will be achieved by transferring the renal transplant service from the Queen Elizabeth Hospital to the Royal Adelaide Hospital?
2. What provisions will be made for the renal transplant service at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital during and after construction of the building?

**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):** I am advised:

1. The transfer is not designed to achieve savings.
2. In 2016-17, renal and transplantation services will transfer to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital (RAH). Accommodation requirements for renal and transplantation services are being considered, along with those for other RAH services, and will be consistent with the Model of Care for the new RAH.

**ELECTIVE SURGERY**

**62 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What is the operational plan for the Elective Surgery Strategy and what initiatives of this plan will be implemented in 2009 and 2010, respectively?

**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):** I am advised:

The initial Elective Surgery Strategy for South Australia for 2009-10 was to achieve 38,500 elective surgery procedures in Metropolitan hospitals. This target was later revised to include the Commonwealth Elective Surgery Waiting List Reduction plan of achieving at least 43,586 elective surgery procedures in Metropolitan hospitals. Metropolitan hospitals undertook 44,557 elective surgery procedures during 2009-10. The operational plan developed and implemented in 2009-10 has focused on the provision of sustainable improvements in patient outcomes through:

- establishing sound leadership and governance through the Surgical Services Taskforce
- maintaining and improving performance expectations from 2008-09

- monitoring timeliness targets in accordance with the national agenda, with the aim of working towards no patients waiting longer than:
  - 30 days for urgent patients
  - 90 days for semi-urgent patients
  - 365 days for non-urgent patients.

The Elective Surgery Strategy Plan continues to develop strategies that promote:

- equity of access
- system re-design with continued development of elective surgery sites
- increased theatre efficiency and utilisation
- improved peri-operative management of waiting list patients
- out of hospital management of patients until they are deemed 'ready for care', which includes functionality management by general practitioner.

### HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**63 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What additional anaesthetist and emergency department resources have been provided to assist with demand pressures?

**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):** I am advised:

SA Health remains committed to supporting South Australian public hospitals with demand pressures. Commencing in 2008-09 was the staging of the appointments of 20 additional emergency department physicians and 25 additional anaesthetists, which will be completed by 2010-11. These additional clinical positions will strengthen workforce capacity and ensure a workforce that supports timely and appropriate patient care to support emergency services.

In addition to this, further emergency department resources have been provided through the Taking the Pressure off Public Hospitals, through the Council of Australia Governments' (COAG) Emergency Department initiatives.

These new initiatives include the development of:

- Acute Medical Units at Flinders Medical Centre and the Royal Adelaide Hospital (RAH).
- Nurse Practitioner roles to support the treatment of non-urgent Australasian Triage Scale 4 and 5 patients in 'See and Treat' Clinics, which have been implemented at the RAH, Lyell McEwin Hospital, Noarlunga Health Service and the Women's and Children's Hospital.

The Government has also committed to the Every Hospital—Every Service, Hospital Services Policy 2010, which includes a number of strategies to complement the COAG National Partnership initiatives.

A key strategy of Every Hospital—Every Service is to further enhance the patient pathway through the whole health system, through enhanced provision of services.

### HOME VISITING PROGRAM

**65 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010).

1. How many staff are currently employed on the Home Visiting Program and how many were employed to work on this program in 2007, 2008 and 2009, respectively?
2. How many patients are currently on the waiting list for the program?
3. How many patients at each of South Australia's major public hospital currently utilise this program?

**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):** I am advised:

1. In 2009-10, the Family Home Visiting Program supported a total FTE of 132. In 2007 there were 71.97 FTE employed in the program; in 2008 there were 89.89 FTE employed in the program and in 2009 there were 97.10 FTE employed in the program
2. The program does not have a waiting list.
3. There are currently 1456 families involved in the program.

**HEALTH PROGRAMS**

**66 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). How much funding was allocated in 2008-09 and 2009-10 for each of the following programs—TeamSTEPPS, bringing nurses back into the workforce projects, blood safe projects, and any other safety and quality projects?

**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):** I am advised:

TeamSTEPPS™ is an acronym for Team Strategies and Tools to Enhance Performance and Patient Safety. In 2008-09 a total of \$135,800 was allocated to the program and a further \$185,000 was allocated in 2009-10.

Bringing Nurses Back into the Workforce (BNBW) was an Australian Government initiative aimed to encourage nurses and midwives to return to the workforce by providing bonus payments to eligible nurses/midwives at 6 and 18 months following demonstration of continuous regular employment across these periods. In 2008-09 \$78,808 was allocated to eligible participants and employers (this includes amounts paid in 2009-10 for claims relating to 2008-09). In 2009-10 \$122,764 was allocated to eligible participants and employers.

BloodSafe is an ongoing collaboration between the South Australian Department of Health, the Australian Red Cross Blood Service, South Australian public and private hospitals and their transfusion service providers. In 2008-09 a total of \$0.91 million was allocated to the program, while funding in 2009-10 of \$1,370,572 was allocated. The increased funding in 2009-10 was inclusive of new Commonwealth funding to support a national rollout of the BloodSafe developed transfusion e-Learning Program.

Other safety and quality projects include consumer engagement, open disclosure, healthcare associated infections, patient identification, clinical handover (additional to the TeamSTEPPS project above), medication safety, falls prevention, pressure ulcer program, workforce and staff patient safety survey. The funding allocated to these programs was \$1.59 million in 2008-09 and \$0.83 million in 2009-10.

**OUT OF HOSPITAL PROGRAMS**

**68 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What programs are run as 'out of hospital' programs?

**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):** I am advised:

Please find attached a list of out-of-hospital programs.

List of 2010-11 funded GPS (Out-of-Hospital) Programs

List of GP Plus Services (GPS) (Out-of-Hospital) funded programs	Brief Description
Primary Prevention	
Eat Well Be Active Healthy Weight Strategy Priorities Implementation	To improve the health and wellbeing of South Australians by working towards achieving the target of reducing the percentage of South Australians who are overweight or obese by 10 per cent within 10 years.
Start Right Eat Right	An award based training and assessment scheme to increase the capacity of South Australian Long Day Child Care Centres to provide safe, healthy food choices to children.
Health Promotion	

List of GP Plus Services (GPS) (Out-of-Hospital) funded programs	Brief Description
Do it for Life	State-wide lifestyle modification program aimed at high risk adults with SNAPS risk factors (Smoking, Nutrition, Alcohol, Physical Inactivity and Stress).
OPAL	A community-based childhood obesity prevention program involving comprehensive social marketing, along with a variety of programs and activities to support healthy eating and physical activity through a range of settings, including schools, Local Government, health services and community organisations.
Tobacco and Alcohol	
Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia (DASSA)—Primary Prevention Strategy to Address Binge Drinking	To address binge drinking in young people through a media campaign (Drink too much it gets ugly), alcohol action plan development, screening tools, training, data analysis.
DASSA—Smoking and Disadvantaged Groups including Youth	Training around tobacco control for those working with Aboriginal People, young people, and other disadvantaged groups, plus development of innovative strategies to support youth to quit.
COAG Subacute (Rehabilitation, GEM & Palliative Care) Strategies	
Rehab @ Home	Funding supporting community based teams delivering safe care in community based settings (for example home, residential aged care and other primary care locations). This is reducing the need for hospitalisation and reducing the amount of time spent in hospital waiting for community based supports to be in place. A good example is the Health Care @ Home service, which coordinates packages of care delivered in community settings
Palliative Care @ Home	
GEM In the Community	
Metro Home Link/Health Care @ Home	
Hospital Avoidance Program	Packages of care for clients, aimed at avoiding unnecessary hospital admissions or facilitating early discharge from hospital. GPS funds have substantially funded/fund the major initiatives in this area—Metro Home Link operated from December 2010 and from January 2011 the Health Care @ Home service has operated, which is provided under contract by RDNS for SA Health.
Chronic Disease Community Program	To improve the quality of life for people living with chronic diseases. Targeted and tailored care packages with self management provided to assist people to better manage their health and well being, and integrated management plans are developed for all participants.
Metro Health Referral Unit (MRU)	The MRU is a centralised service for the metropolitan area to streamline the process of referral to hospital avoidance and discharge support services.

### HOSPITAL SUPPORT DISCHARGE CARE PACKAGES

71 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). How many hospital support discharge care packages were provided for each of South Australia's major metropolitan public hospitals in 2007, 2008 and 2009, respectively?

**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):** I am advised:

Transition Care Packages provide short-term care that seek to optimise the functioning and independence of older people after a hospital stay.

The total number of Transition Care Packages delivered across metropolitan hospitals for the following periods are:

- 2006-07 693
- 2007-08 901
- 2008-09 891

Country Home Link (CHL) aims to avoid preventable visits or admission to metropolitan hospitals of people from country South Australia, or to assist people from country South Australia to leave metropolitan hospitals earlier, in a safe and supportive environment, than would otherwise have been possible.

CHL Home Supported Discharge packages

- 2007-08 76 (commenced May 2008)
- 2008-09 1,108

The Metro Home Link (MHL) service provides short term support and assistance for people in their own home or residential care facility, to assist patients to leave hospital earlier in a safe and supportive environment than would otherwise have been possible or to avoid preventable visits or admission to hospital.

#### **SA AMBULANCE SERVICE**

**79 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What government measures are in place to assist the SA Ambulance Service to meet response time targets?

**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):** I am advised:

The Government provides support for a number of key initiatives, which assist the achievement of SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) response time targets.

These include the introduction of single paramedic response and intervention vehicles (SPRINT), the Extended Care Paramedic (ECP) program and the implementation of a new call triage system in 2008-09.

In 2009-10, SAAS expanded its ECP program and commenced introduction of Automatic Vehicle Location (AVL) technology.

SAAS has also started the first phase of a mobile data terminal program that will enable information to be passed to ambulance vehicles without requiring voice transmission. This measure will further reduce time from the call to dispatch cycle and is due for progressive roll out to 327 ambulance vehicles commencing in 2011.

#### **CHILDREN, YOUTH AND WOMEN'S HEALTH SERVICE**

**82 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). During the past 12 months, how many patients have been attended to and how much State Government financial assistance or grant funding is provided for each of the following services—North and West Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Child and Youth Health, Women's Health Statewide, Second Story, Yarrow Place Services, Hospital Links, Child and Family Integration Services and Child Protection Services?

**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):** I am advised:

The services listed are State Government entities, administered by the Children, Youth and Women's Health Service:

Service	No of patients attended to in 2009-10	Budget 2009-10 \$
North and West CAMHS	Northern 854 Western 493	2,352,794
Child and Family Health Service	49,541 clients have received 1 or more visits	31,394,544
Child and Family Integration Services	203 clients	2,094,185
Women's Health Statewide	3,952 services provided to patients (medical, counselling and intake/referral)	1,562,646
The Second Story including Hospital Links—	10,025 services provided to patients (medical, counselling, groups and intake/referral) Included above	3,633,544 266,931
Yarrow Place	5,179 services provided to patients (medical, counselling and intake/referral)	2,420,968
Child Protection Services	2,313 services provided to patients (assessment, medical, therapy, intake and strategy discussions)	3,028,022

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH COMMISSION

**85 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). How many employees that previously worked for the South Australian Health Commission were retrenched, redeployed or offered targeted voluntary separation packages?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts):** I am advised:

All staff employed under the South Australian Health Commission Act 1976 were transferred to the Health Care Act 2008 on 1 July 2008.

On that date, there were no staff retrenched, redeployed or offered targeted voluntary separation packages.

#### VANCOMYCIN RESISTANT ENTEROCOCCUS INFECTION

**89 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What is the current rate per 1,000 for admitted patients of Vancomycin Resistant Enterococcus infection in—

- (a) all South Australian public hospitals;
- (b) public hospitals in rural and remote Areas;
- (c) the Royal Adelaide Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, and Lyell McEwen Hospital, respectively; and
- (d) the Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Berri and Mount Gambier Hospitals, respectively?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts):** I am advised:

The Department of Health monitors the rate of health care associated Vancomycin-Resistant Enterococci infection in public acute care hospitals. This does not include all of the smaller rural and remote facilities, where health care associated infection with this organism is extremely rare.

Rates are expressed per 1,000 patient-day, rather than admissions, which is in line with national definitions.

The current rates for the hospitals named are as follows:

	Aggregate Rate for July 2009—April 2010 Infection
SA Public Hospitals (8 Metro and 6 Country)	0.05
Country Hospitals (6)	0.01
Royal Adelaide Hospital	0.10
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	0.02
Flinders Medical Centre	0.07
Lyell McEwin Hospital	0.03
Whyalla Hospital	0.00
Port Augusta Hospital	0.00

### CLOSTRIDIUM DIFFICILE INFECTION

**90 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). What is the current rate per 1,000 for admitted patients of Clostridium Difficile infection in—

1. (a) all South Australian public hospitals;
- (b) public hospitals in rural and remote Areas;
- (c) the Royal Adelaide Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, and Lyell McEwen Hospital, respectively; and
- (d) the Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, Berri and Mount Gambier Hospitals, respectively?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts):** I am advised:

1. The Department of Health monitors the rate of detection of Clostridium difficile disease in all public acute care hospitals and the larger country hospitals. Rates are expressed as cases detected per 1,000 patient-days, in line with national surveillance definitions.

The current rates for the hospitals named are:

	Aggregate Rate for July 2009—April 2010
SA Public Hospitals (8 Metro and 6 Country)	0.23
Country (6)	0.05
Royal Adelaide Hospital	0.40
The Queen Elizabeth Hospital	0.46
Flinders Medical Centre	0.10
Lyell McEwin Hospital	0.27
Whyalla Hospital	0.00
Port Augusta Hospital	0.00
Port Lincoln Hospital	0.00
Berri Hospital	0.00
Mount Gambier Hospital	0.12

### SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

**96 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Has the internal correspondence made by the South Australian Ambulance Service in relation to the testing of uniforms been publicly released and if not, why not?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Karna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts):** I am advised:

Staff notices have been issued regarding the testing of uniforms and these are available on the SA Ambulance Service intranet site. These notices were also provided to all staff via email and fax.

**SA AMBULANCE SERVICE**

**98 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). When will the South Australian Ambulance Service publicly release the first report from Health Safety Environment Australia Pty Ltd?

**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):** I am advised:

The first report from Health Safety Environment Australia Pty Ltd is available for all staff to access on the SA Ambulance Service intranet site.

**SA AMBULANCE SERVICE**

**100 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010).

1. What cleaning process and cleaning agents were used by the South Australian Ambulance Service in ambulances and ambulance staff homes following identification of toxic agents in those affected uniforms?

2. Was a remediation report provided following this incident and if so, when and to whom was it provided to?

**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):** I am advised:

1. SA Ambulance Service facilitated the cleaning of all stations and ambulance vehicles, as well as the homes of some affected staff.

There have been two state-wide cleans undertaken. The first of these included a number of strategies and used vinegar and hot water, and commercially available cleaning products.

A second state-wide clean is being undertaken in accordance with independent, expert advice obtained from Health Safety Environment (HSE).

The process for the clean includes:

- (a) Clean air conditioners—filters, vents and ducting.
- (b) Clean all surfaces, including furniture, with a HEPA filtered vacuum cleaner.
- (c) Clean carpets and soft furnishings with hot water and detergent. Water to be changed between rooms and disposed off-site or to sewer.
- (d) Wash all hard surfaces with water and a pH=7 detergent that has no sensitiser effects. Change water and cleaning rags between surfaces/rooms and dispose of water off-site or to sewer.
- (e) Rinse all surfaces with plain water twice. Dispose of used rags and water off-site.

2. HSE was engaged to conduct a review of the cleaning process. The HSE report was posted on the SA Ambulance Service intranet on 10 February 2009, and is available to all staff.

**SA AMBULANCE SERVICE**

**101 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Has the Chief Executive Officer of the South Australian Ambulance Service met with staff regarding the identification of toxic agents in affected uniforms?

**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):** I am advised:

The former and current Chief Executive Officers of the SA Ambulance Service have met with staff who experienced allergic reactions.



The Chief Executive Officer and Executive Directors provide regular communication to all staff about the progress of issues relating to the uniform through internal communication mechanisms (for example all staff emails and faxes).

#### SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

**102 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). Has the South Australian Ambulance Service facilitated the bulk billing of pharmaceutical requirements of staff affected by uniforms and how long does it take for staff to be reimbursed for medication?

**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):** I am advised:

The SA Ambulance Service does not have bulk billing arrangements.

Payment reimbursements are completed by SA Ambulance Service within three weeks of receipt of claims.

#### NORTHERN REGION AMBULANCE STATIONS

**104 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (29 June 2010). What was the cost of cleaning the Northern Region ambulance stations and vehicles as part of the statewide cleaning process?

**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):** I am advised:

The cost of cleaning all Northern Regional Area (country) stations and vehicles was \$1,001.943.

#### SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

**105 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (29 June 2010). What measures have or will be introduced within the South Australian Ambulance Service as part of the implementation of the Efficiency Review conducted by Ernst Young?

**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):** I am advised:

The Efficiency Review conducted by Ernst and Young recommended that an integrated model for service delivery of Finance and Workforce service across SA Health be developed.

Finance and Workforce structures have now been aligned across the health system and this includes SA Ambulance Service. Finance and Workforce Divisions provide services which reduce duplication, and introduce greater standardisation and support.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**112 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). What is the expected demolition cost for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and which buildings will be retained when the main hospital is demolished?

**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):** I am advised:

The heritage buildings will be retained. The cost of demolition of the buildings not to be retained after 2016 is yet to be determined.

#### PAXTON REVIEW

**113 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). With respect to the Paxton Review—

1. why was the increase in the cost of mental health demand upon the efficiency and cost profile of emergency departments in hospitals not included as part of the Review;
2. why were the Flinders Medical Centre and the Noarlunga Hospital (Southern Hospital Service) not included as part of the Review; and

3. will there be an efficiency and cost review of those Adelaide Health Service hospitals not included as part of the Review?

**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):** I am advised:

1. Paxton Partners was commissioned in 2007 to evaluate the overall of the delivery of acute services in the hospital sector, which is the major cost component of the hospitals. The 'increase in cost on mental health demand' was not part of this review because the mental health system was, at the time, the subject of a comprehensive study by Monsignor David Cappo and the Social Inclusion Board.

2. At the time of the appointment of Paxton Partners in 2007, the hospitals selected to be included in the review were those considered to be the highest priority given the relative financial performance of the hospitals at that time. The hospitals selected after consultation across the health system were the Royal Adelaide Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Repatriation General Hospital.

3. There are ongoing efficiency and cost reviews that occur for all public hospitals as part of SA Health's governance processes, including reviews for those hospitals not previously included in the Paxton review.

#### HEALTH PERFORMANCE COUNCIL

**114 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). With respect to the Health Performance Council—

- (a) how much does it cost to operate and manage the Council;
- (b) how many times has the Council met;
- (c) how many times has the Minister met with the Council;
- (d) what is the remuneration of each Council member; and
- (e) what recommendations have been made by the Council to the Minister since its establishment?

**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):** I am advised:

1. In 2009-10 \$700,700 was allocated for the ongoing operations of the Health Performance Council.

2. The Health Performance Council has met 13 times since its foundation in 2008.

3. The Minister for Health has met with the Health Performance Council a total of five times since 2008.

4. The Chairperson (who is also a member) receives remuneration of \$26,534 per annum, plus a yearly retainer of \$10,000. All other members are remunerated at a rate of \$17,690 per annum. Deputy members are entitled to a sitting fee of \$737 per meeting attended. However, Deputy Members only attend meetings when requested to do so by the Chairperson or members.

5. The Health Performance Council provided their first report, for 2008-10, by 31 December 2010. This report contains recommendations for improving health system performance, and was tabled in Parliament on 8 February 2011.

#### HEALTH WORKERS

**118 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). How many additional doctors, nurses and allied health workers have been employed since 2002?

**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):** I am advised:

At June 2009, there were 3,255 doctors (2,528 FTEs) engaged in the South Australian public health sector, an increase of 1,074 doctors (766 FTEs) since 2002.

At June 2009, there were 14,668 nurses/midwives (11,337 FTEs) employed in the South Australian public health system, an increase of 3,692 nurses/midwives (2,738 FTEs) since June 2002.

At June 2009, there were 2,855 allied health workers (or 2,288 FTEs) employed in the South Australian public health system, an increase of 931 persons (740 FTEs) since June 2002.

### HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**119 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). What is the average waiting time that patients spend in South Australian hospital emergency departments before being admitted?

**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):** I am advised:

According to the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare Australian Hospital Statistics 2008-09 Report, the average time spent in Emergency Departments for patients with an end status of 'Admitted to this hospital' for 2008-09 in South Australia was six hours and four minutes. This was the second lowest in the country and below the national average of six hours and 10 minutes.

### HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES

**120 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010).

1. What are publically funded core health and medical services and what are non-core publically funded health and medical services?

2. List all publically funded core health and medical services provided by the State Government?

**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):** I am advised:

The provision of health services is not divided into core and non-core services.

### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**121 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). Has Mr David Panter ever been directly involved in hospital design and development prior to his involvement with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

**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):** I am advised:

Dr David Panter was educated in England and holds a PhD in Developmental Psychology. He has held senior executive and chief executive roles in a number of National Health Service bodies over 15 years.

In these various roles Dr Panter has been involved and led a number of hospital developments. In the mid-late 1980s he led the development of the HIV/AIDS wing at St Mary's Hospital, London and was involved in the overall hospital development. He also worked on the Chelsea and Westminster Hospital Project, a 650 bed teaching hospital.

In the 1990's, Dr Panter led the development of Newham Hospital in East London and early planning and development work on the refurbishment of St Bartholomew's Hospital in the City of London and the new Royal London Hospital in Whitechapel, which is due to open shortly. In the late 1990's-early 2000's, Dr Panter led the redevelopment of Mount Vernon Hospital, Harefield Hospital and Hillingdon Hospital in outer West London.

In addition to these acute hospitals, Dr Panter was also responsible for the development of a number of Mental Health and Primary Care facilities across London during this time.

Before arriving in Australia in 2004, Dr Panter was the Chief Executive of Brighton and Hove City Council in the UK and successfully oversaw the final negotiations on three significant Private Finance Initiative schemes for:

- the development of 5 schools
- a new multi-million dollar city library complex
- \$2 billion waste disposal/recycling facilities and services contract over 25 years.

#### **INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE**

**122 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). What was the total cost of the KPMG Due Diligence Report on the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science, which was commissioned by the South Australian Government and which the Minister stated on 8 May 2008 that he would disclose?

**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):** I am advised:

The cost of the due diligence report conducted by KPMG relating to the establishment of SA Pathology was \$150,000.

#### **COUNTRY HEALTH CARE PLAN**

**124 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). Was a Regional Impact Assessment Statement completed to assess the impact of the Country Healthcare Plan released on 5 June 2008?

**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):** I am advised:

A consequence of the decision not to implement the Country Health Care Plan was that a Regional Impact Assessment Statement was not required.

#### **HOSPITAL DATA**

**125 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010).

1. How many staff are responsible for data reporting and analysis in each of the following entities—

- (a) Department of Health;
- (b) Central Northern Adelaide Health Service;
- (c) Southern Adelaide Health Service;
- (d) Country Health SA;
- (e) Children's, Youth and Women's Health Service; and
- (f) Office of the Chief Executive?

2. What was the budget allocation to the Department of Health for hospital data collection and analysis during 2008/09?

3. Was this amount exceeded and if so, what was the total amount spent?

**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):** I have been advised:

1. Data reporting and analysis is carried out by staff in a wide variety of clinical and business units (for example finance, policy and planning, and administration), all at differing degrees and levels and therefore, it is not possible to calculate the number of staff responsible for data reporting.

2. & 3. It is not possible to calculate the amount spent on hospital data collection and analysis. Hospital data collection and analysis is carried out by staff in a wide variety of clinical and business units, all at differing degrees.

### HEALTH, FREEDOM OF INFORMATION REQUESTS

**126 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). What guarantees are there that Freedom of Information requests will not be assessed by Department of Health employees where there is a conflict of interest?

**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):** I am advised:

Department of Health employees are bound by the South Australian public service Code of Ethics, which is issued under Part 4, Section 15 of the Public Sector Act 2009, and applies to all public sector employees.

The Code of Conduct includes the requirement that all public sector employees declare and appropriately manage interests that may conflict with the way their duties are carried out.

### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**127 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). Will the minister be supporting the removal of trees and structures along the River Torrens to provide the views of the river for patients at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

**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):** I am advised:

Trees and structures along the River Torrens are beyond the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site. SA Health has no plans for their removal.

### HEALTH, MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION ROLES

**128 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010).

1. How many people are employed in media and communication roles in each of the following entities—

- (a) Department of Health;
- (b) Central Northern Adelaide Health Service;
- (c) Southern Adelaide Health Service;
- (d) Children's, Youth and Women's Health Service;
- (e) Country Health SA;
- (f) Royal Adelaide Hospital;
- (g) Queen Elizabeth Hospital;
- (h) Lyell McEwin Hospital;
- (i) Flinders Medical Centre; and
- (j) Office of the Chief Executive?

2. What was the budget allocation for the SA Health Media and Communications Unit in 2008-09?

3. Was this amount exceeded and, if so, what was the total amount spent?

**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):** I am advised:

1., 2. & 3. In 2008-09 there were 43.8 FTE positions across SA Health in media and communications roles. This is inclusive of SA Ambulance Service, the Department of Health, Country Health SA, Southern Adelaide Health Service, Central Northern Adelaide Health Service, and the Children, Youth and Women's Health Service.

SA Health does not have a single Media and Communications Unit.

### SHARED SERVICES

**130 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010).

1. Which functions were transferred from the Department of Health to Shared Services SA?
2. How many full-time equivalent employees were redeployed or offered a targeted voluntary separation package as a result of the changes?
3. What savings were generated by this move?

**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):** I am advised:

1. The transition of Tranche 1 services from SA Health to Shared Services SA consisted of Accounts Payable, Payroll/HR Data Entry and some Purchase Card Services.
2. Five employees, who previously occupied in-scope positions within Country Health SA prior to being proclaimed to the Department of Treasury and Finance, were offered a Targeted Voluntary Separation Package (TVSP). Two of the five employees accepted the TVSP offer.

The three employees who did not accept a TVSP have been placed in alternative roles, of which two have since been permanently placed and one is on a temporary placement.

3. Since SA Health transitioned Tranche 1 services to Shared Services SA, any savings which may have been achieved to date have been retained by Shared Services SA.

### ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS

**134 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). How many Root Cause Analysis (RCA) teams were formed in the last two years?

**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):** I am advised:

There have been 87 Root Cause Analysis teams formed in the two year period from 18 August 2008 to 18 August 2010.

### PATIENT SAFETY REPORTS

**136 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). How many avoidable deaths and adverse events were there in each South Australian public hospital for each year since 2002?

**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):** I am advised:

The South Australian Patient Safety Reports for 2003-04, 2004-05, 2005-08, 2008-09 are available on the internet at:

<http://www.safetyandquality.sa.gov.au/Default.aspx?tabid=63>.

The 2003-04 Report is the earliest published report cataloguing adverse and sentinel events in the South Australian public health system.

### HOSPITAL EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**139 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). What measures have been undertaken to ensure there is 24 hour emergency treatment available in all public hospitals in regional areas across South Australia?

**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):** I am advised:

Every hospital in country South Australia has access to on-call medical support on a 24-7, 365 days basis. In the instance where a doctor may not be available locally, alternate arrangements are made to ensure that appropriate remote medical support is provided to nursing staff at the local health service.

The availability of emergency medical cover is monitored on a daily basis by local health services.

Across country South Australia there are approximately 100 doctors paid for being on-call in any given 24-hour period so as to provide an appropriate emergency response relevant to the local context.

Doctors credentialed to provide emergency support receive continuing medical education and assessment to maintain their skills in the clinical domain relevant to the cover they provide.

When there are difficulties experienced in providing appropriate medical cover by the local doctors, Country Health SA usually engages locum support based on the needs of the local community.

A new agreement was negotiated with the Rural Doctors Association of South Australia in February 2010 with a strong emphasis on recognising the critical role that doctors have in supporting Country Health SA to meet its service obligations and the impost that being on-call presents to individual doctors. On-call payments were increased by 93 per cent for the majority of doctors providing on-call services for hospitals in country South Australia.'

#### HEALTH DEPARTMENT CHIEF EXECUTIVE

**140 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). Has the Chief Executive ever directly or indirectly given a direction concerning the clinical treatment of a patient during his term as Chief Executive and if so, on how many occasions?

**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):** I am advised:

No.

#### HEALTH SERVICES

**142 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). What advice have the former Central Northern Adelaide Health Service, the former Southern Adelaide Health Service and the Regional Boards given to the minister since their formation?

**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):** I am advised:

The Central Northern Adelaide Health Service and the Southern Adelaide Health Service were previously responsible for the provision of health services across Adelaide and as such provided information to the Minister for Health on a range of issues as was required.

As there are no Regional Boards, it is not clear what the second part of the question is referring to.

#### VACCINATION PROGRAMS

**145 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). How many South Australian children had adverse reactions following flu vaccinations from January to June 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):** I am advised:

The Immunisation Section received a total of 194 reports of reactions following receipt of influenza vaccination in children less than seven years of age.

183 of the reports related to the CSL product Fluvax or Fluvax Junior.

All reactions were transient and resolved within a short period.

The Commonwealth suspended the use of the flu vaccine in children less than five years of age while they conducted an extensive investigation into the higher than expected number of reports relating to the CSL products Fluvax or Fluvax Junior in children less than five years.

The outcome of the investigation reported there was an increased risk of fever and convulsions associated with the CSL products.

The Therapeutic Goods Administration has recommended that seasonal flu vaccine continue to be offered to children less than five years of age, but the use of the CSL product (Fluvax or Fluvax Junior) in children under five years is not recommended, and an alternative brand of flu vaccine should be used in this age group.

### VACCINATION PROGRAMS

**146 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (27 July 2010). How many children each year since 2000 have suffered from adverse or debilitating conditions such as autism, convulsions or brain haemorrhaging as a result of each of the government funded immunisation programs—diphtheria, tetanus and pertussis, poliomyelitis, measles, mumps and rubella, haemophilus influenzae type B, hepatitis B, pneumococcal disease and chicken pox?

**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):** I am advised:

The safety of all vaccines is a very important issue.

The monitoring of vaccine safety in Australia is taken very seriously and conducted through a variety of independent mechanisms, one of which is managed through the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA).

These systems rely on the general public and health providers to report any unusual or unexpected event following receipt of a vaccine. The reports are reviewed and assessed by an expert committee.

Reports received from general practices, other immunisation providers and the community, considered to be serious are forwarded to the TGA. Data on these assessments is retained by the TGA, not SA Health.

Most reports relate to mild, short lasting reactions, and serious reactions are extremely rare.

Vaccines are considered to be an extremely safe and highly effective means of controlling vaccine preventable disease. Over the years, vaccination has saved countless lives.

The controversial United Kingdom (UK) study by Dr Andrew Wakefield (erroneously published in 1998) that suggested a link between vaccines and Autism has been retracted and totally discredited by the medical and scientific community.

The controversy resulted in the decline of vaccination rates in the UK and a subsequent upsurge in measles cases, followed by the first death of a child from measles in 14 years.

There is no evidence to suggest that vaccines are related to serious debilitating conditions, and to suggest such, in the absence of evidence, is irresponsible and dangerous to the health of children.

### HEALTH BUDGET

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (22 July 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):** I am advised:

1. There has been no budget blowout for the Department of Health for the 2009-10 financial year.

### JULIA FARR ASSOCIATION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (26 October 2010).

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** As part of the 2009-10 Audit process, the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) became aware of concerns raised by the Auditor-General about grant funding arrangements between the Department for Families and Communities (DFC) and disability service providers.

The former Treasurer, the Hon. K.O. Foley MP, was briefed on the nature of the Auditor-General's concerns as part of regular verbal briefs provided by DTF.



The Auditor-General confirms in his report that funding to DFC was used for its approved and intended purpose:

'Of crucial importance, it is acknowledged that the grant funds allocated to the department were used to facilitate the purchase of disability equipment as was approved by Cabinet.'

### CHILD PROTECTION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (10 March 2011).

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability):** The Families SA Child Abuse Report Line (CARL) does not receive notifications of alleged abuse or neglect via email, as email is not a secure mechanism to convey confidential information about children and families.

Waiting times at CARL are highly variable depending on the time of day and the volume of calls.

The most recent available data for day time CARL average call waiting times is:

- January 2011—2 minutes, 54 seconds;
- December 2010—4 minutes, 32 seconds; and
- November 2010—9 minutes, 48 seconds.

CARL currently provides 249 mandated notifiers from health, education and police with E-Carl registration, to make their notifications via E-Carl. E-Carl is a secure electronic notification system developed to assist mandated notifiers who make very high volumes of notifications to CARL. These mandated notifiers, by virtue of their experience of making notifications, understand the nature and quality of the information that CARL requires to make a good assessment of a notification of alleged abuse or neglect.

It would be detrimental to the safety of children to allow all mandated notifiers to make their notification via E-Carl, as notifiers may omit to record critical information in their E-Notification. This would make it difficult for CARL staff to make a good assessment of the child's safety. Valuable time would be lost by CARL staff trying to contact notifiers to clarify and seek further information.

The 249 registered E-Carl users include:

- 74 users in the health sector across 8 different health services;
- 72 South Australian Police users; and
- 103 users in schools.

To be a registered E-Carl user, the mandated notifier must have their own individual user identification to be able to log into E-Carl. E-Carl operates within the State Government's Justice Network to ensure that the information is secure and not accessed by unauthorised persons.

Families SA is currently working in partnership with the South Australian Police to register and train more police personnel to use E-Carl. This is possible because police personnel already access the Justice Network and Families SA can target specific police personnel who are required to make high volumes of notifications to the Child Abuse Report Line.

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

AustralAsia Railway Corporation—Annual Report 2009-10

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Tandanya—National Aboriginal Cultural Institute—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Dangerous Area Declarations—Statistical Return 1 January—31 March 2011  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Classification (Publications, Films and Computer Games)—General

## Legal Practitioners—Schedule 2 Fees

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Passenger Transport—Taxi Fares

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
WorkCover Corporation—Claims Management—Contractual Arrangements

By the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission—Annual Report 2009-10

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

Charitable Funds, Commissioners of—Annual Report 2009-10

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Education and Children's Services, Department of—Annual Report 2010  
SACE Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2010

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas Long Term—Gawler Areas 1-5

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

University of Adelaide—  
Part One—Annual Report Annual Report 2010  
Part Two—Financial Statements Annual Report 2010

By the Minister for Urban Development and Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Development—Institutional Riverbank Zone

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I draw members' attention to the fact that we have visitors from TAFE who are guests of the member for Adelaide. I think also we may have a group from Carrick college. I am not sure whether or not they are here. Welcome, and we hope you enjoy your time here.

### QUESTION TIME

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Treasurer. Why did the government lie to the South Australian people before the last state election—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order. The Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Madam Speaker, you simply cannot put that in a question.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I ask the member to reword the question.

**Mrs REDMOND:** I will reword it, Madam Speaker. Why did the government deliberately mislead the South Australian people before—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** You cannot put comment and argument in a question. It is a standing order as old as the house.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Yes, I again uphold that point of order. I ask the leader to be very careful about how she asks the question. She understands the protocols in this place.

**Mrs REDMOND:** My question, Madam Speaker, is to the Treasurer. Why did the government tell the people of South Australia before the last state election that the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital would be \$1.7 billion when he knew full well, and so did the government, that it would be in excess of \$1.7 billion?

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Plainly, the question, again, contained argument. Let me phrase it for you. 'When you knew full well' is argument. Can I offer to the Leader of the Opposition 101 lessons in my office about parliamentary debates?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I think the last half of the leader's question was unfortunate and should not have been asked in that way so I do uphold that point of order. However, we will leave it at 'why did they tell...before the last election?' and leave it at that. The Treasurer.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:09):** Madam Speaker, from day one this government has been completely open, frank and honest about—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —building a new hospital and about the costs involved. The simple fact is that if we had built this hospital in the traditional way, if we had borrowed the money ourselves and built it in the traditional way, and if we had borne all the risks associated with building a hospital of this complexity, then it would have cost us about \$1.7 billion. The reason that it is costing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Leader of the Opposition and the deputy leader!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The design and construction of the hospital under the scenario of a self-build, the design and construction of the hospital as I explained to the media yesterday, would have been about \$1.7 billion. Why is the design and construction \$1.8 billion? For several reasons, but primarily because of risk. We have got a fixed-price contract, and that makes absolute sense. It makes good sense for South Australian taxpayers. It means that if anything goes wrong—we are talking about the biggest, the most complex infrastructure project in this state's history. There are many, many things that can go wrong that are out of the scope of the control of the government. The great thing about this project and the great thing about having a fixed-price contract with the consortium is that, with respect to any of those things that can possibly go wrong, they will bear the brunt of that. Of course, like in any—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition will come to order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Like with any fixed-price contract, of course, you pay a premium. The other reasons are: the hospital is going to be a bit bigger—it had to be a bit bigger for it to do what we wanted it to do; it had to have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** You always know when the opposition is upset because they interject, they will not hear what you have got to say. They try to shout you down, and it is a good sign. You know that the opposition is in trouble when they try to shout down ministers on their feet. It is a sign of an opposition in dire trouble. The simple fact is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** You laugh all you want, mate. Fake laughter! I love the strained laughter.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order. The member for Finnis.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Standing order 98.

**The SPEAKER:** I think that when you have had three points of order on the question, it is a bit unfair to be bringing points of order here, but I would ask the minister to get back to the question.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The simple fact is that we have got a fixed-priced contract, so the factors were obviously the risk premium and the size of the hospital; we needed to update some costs for the ICT to make sure that the ICT and the hospital worked exactly the way we wanted it to work; we needed to update the estimates for connecting the utilities; and, finally, because the project is starting a little bit later than we originally wanted it to that has had an effect on the cost as well.

The government has been completely open. Yesterday, we put more information out into the public sphere than would ever have been made in the entire history of this state. Yesterday, the Minister for Health, the Premier and I put out and made more information available to the public—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —than ever would have been—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order. The Minister for Transport.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I simply cannot hear the Treasurer making a very good answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! You did not name a standing order, but I agree. Members on my left will be quiet. You are asking questions. The minister has the right to be heard in silence. Treasurer.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Yesterday, ma'am, the government put more information about the financials of this particular infrastructure project, more information into the public sphere, than any government of either persuasion would ever have done before on any infrastructure project. We have been completely open—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —and completely frank with the South Australian people, and, what is more, the great thing is that South Australian people know up-front exactly what this project is going to cost. We know exactly what we are getting into.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! If you want to quarrel, can you please go outside.

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Defence Industries, order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader will be quiet. The member for Croydon.

#### REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (14:15):** Can the Premier tell the house about the recent state visit to South Australia of His Excellency Mr Demetris Christofias, President of the Republic of Cyprus?

**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):** I am pleased that the honourable member has raised this issue. I know that he has been a passionate supporter of the calls of justice for Cyprus for many years. On Thursday 26 May 2011, I was delighted to welcome to Adelaide His Excellency Mr Demetris Christofias, President of the Republic of Cyprus, with Mrs Christofia, the First Lady.

His Excellency last visited Adelaide six years ago when he came as president of the parliament of Cyprus. On this occasion I welcomed him back as the leader of the one legitimate government of Cyprus, as recognised by South Australia, the Commonwealth of Australia, the United Nations, the Commonwealth of Nations, as well as the European Union.

On arrival, President Christofias and Mrs Christofia attended a lunch hosted by His Excellency the Governor, and I understand this was a very important opportunity for the President to meet local members of the Cypriot and Greek communities and members of parliament. It was an opportunity to hear about the work of the President in trying to resolve a serious international injustice and ongoing breach of United Nations resolutions. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition also attended this function, and her comments leaving the lunch were reported to me and members of the Greek and Cypriot community.

In the evening, together with the President of the Cyprus Community of South Australia, I hosted a reception in their honour for members of the Cyprus community of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Disgraceful. In the evening, together with the President of the Cyprus Community of South Australia, I hosted a reception in their honour for members of the Cyprus community of South Australia. Despite the physical distance that separates us, a special bond has united South Australia and Cyprus for many decades. It is a relationship cultivated by our former premier Don Dunstan.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The Leader of the Opposition seems very angry today. I understand that she was rolled last night in the party room over Adelaide Oval. It is quite clear—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is interesting that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —the Leader of the Opposition was rolled by the former leader of the opposition who still has the field marshal's baton in his knapsack. I congratulate the member—

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, Madam Speaker: 98, debate, digressing, not answering the question.

**The SPEAKER:** I understand that the opposition is very sensitive about this but I direct the Premier back to the substance of the debate.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Don Dunstan, as the member for Norwood, visited Cyprus in 1957 when the struggle for independence from colonial rule was finding voice. He visited Nicosia when Cyprus was in flames. He subsequently put the struggles of Cyprus on the political agenda here in South Australia and nationally. I have been proud to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —continue his commitment to the Cypriot cause, and certainly on this side of the house there are many who have joined me—a cause that sought independence, then sovereignty, and now justice and reunification.

I have witnessed the injustice and suffering imposed on families on a number of visits that I have made to Cyprus. I have seen the walls of division. It is the last remaining wall. We saw the Berlin Wall torn down, we saw the end of apartheid, but an ugly scar divides the island of Cyprus. I travelled to the UN buffer zone, as well as peered over the fence to the once glorious town of Famagusta. I have met with courageous Cypriot leaders, including on my most recent visit several years ago President Christofias, as well as his predecessor as president, the late Tassos Papadopoulos.

I know that my preparedness to speak out nationally and internationally on this issue has certainly earned the ire and sometimes the condemnation of Turkish authorities and the illegal regime in northern Cyprus. However, we, on this side of the house, will continue to provide strong support in the pursuit of a reunited, bizonal and bicomunal federation with full restitution and right of return for all refugees.

Indeed, our state government has supported 14 Greek-Cypriot South Australian families who lost their homes to the Turkish occupation to take their cases for compensation to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg, and are the only government outside the Republic of Cyprus, as far as I am aware, to have supported Greek-Cypriot refugees in this way. Since the election of President Christofias in 2008, he has worked tirelessly to eradicate the scar of the no-man's-land that divides his beautiful island. He has vindicated the faith shown by the people of Cyprus in his preparedness to bring about the reunification of his homeland. I know he has been working with Alexander Downer, who is the United Nations special representative in this cause of reunification.

The President's ability to engage the previous leader of the illegal regime in negotiations delivered significant outcomes that in turn raised genuine hopes of a bilateral agreement. Here in Australia and throughout the broader international community, we admire President Christofias's unswerving belief that there is only one Cypriot home, and that is a united Cyprus, not a divided one. Even if, as it seems, the Turkish-Cypriot leadership will not listen, the Turkish-Cypriot people apparently will. No-one in this cause has ever said anything against the Turkish-Cypriot people or, indeed, the people of Turkey; we are talking about their governments.

I have observed with interest the recent demonstrations that show that Turkish Cypriots are tired of their leadership dragging its heels and making unrealistic demands outside of the framework for dialogue and the United Nations resolution parameters. They raged against oppression, occupation and colonisation by Turkish settlers, and demonstrated for human rights, for working rights and to preserve their identity as Cypriots.

I think it is really important to send a clear message to Turkish Cypriots that we here in South Australia hear their calls. They want to join in the European community of nations, and President Christofias, along with the people he inspires, is showing them the way. He encourages all Cypriots to embrace and experience the benefits that can be derived from cooperation across the existing divide. He often speaks of his vision for the future of Cyprus as home to the 'peaceful coexistence, the common creativity and the prosperity of Greek Cypriots, Turkish Cypriots, the Maronites, the Armenians and the Latins'.

We here in South Australia applaud President Christofias's commitment and his vision and we pledge our continued support as he strives to achieve that goal. All I can say is I deplore those hypocrites who pretend they support the cause and then say something else behind their backs.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** My question is again to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer now admit that the opposition was right when we asserted back in April—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs REDMOND:** Will the Treasurer now admit that the opposition was right when we asserted back in April that the cost of delivering the new Royal Adelaide Hospital building would be in excess of \$2.7 billion?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:23):** No, I won't, Madam Speaker, because I don't admit to things that aren't true.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:23):** My question is directed to the Minister for the River Murray. What were the findings of the science review conducted by the Goyder Institute in relation to the guide to the proposed Murray-Darling Basin Plan?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:24):** I thank the honourable—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** It's not a comic, Mitch, so you probably wouldn't read it, so you'll learn something here today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I do thank the honourable member for her very important question. The Goyder Institute is an excellent initiative of this government, and I acknowledge the Premier's foresight and commitment in ensuring the institute's establishment. I can inform members that the findings of a high-level science review into the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's guide to the proposed plan undertaken by the Goyder Institute, in partnership with its partner, the CSIRO, has recently been released. The review examined the implications of three environmental water recovery scenarios of 3,000 gigalitres, 3,500 gigalitres and 4,000 gigalitres, which had been proposed by the MDBA in their guide.

The science review findings demonstrate that there are environmental, social and economic benefits for South Australia under the guide's three proposed scenarios. Key environmental assets would benefit from increased flows under all three scenarios most of the time and South Australians may avoid the costs and impacts of extreme low water levels, such as those that were experienced over the past decade. The review found that water recovery scenarios of 3,500 and 4,000 gigalitres are most likely to enable South Australia to meet objectives for its two key environmental assets in the basin: the Riverland-Chowilla flood plain and the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth.

Below 3,500 gigalitres the achievement of those objectives becomes more problematic. Each of the three scenarios could support a permanent freshwater future for the Lower Lakes, improve the health of the Coorong and keep the Murray Mouth open more frequently than is currently the case. To achieve this outcome, however, environmental water would need to be delivered to this site in low flow years.

It is important to note that the method and timing of water delivery is critical. The science review highlights that there are existing physical and operational constraints which at times prevent the delivery of environmental water at the required frequency, timing and duration for these key environmental assets, with some of these constraints able to be overcome through changes to river operations and investment in infrastructure, works and measures. The report also found that water quality would be expected to improve under each scenario and the basin salinity target of 800EC at Morgan would be met. However, the MDBA salt load export target of two million tonnes per year on a 10-year rolling average would not be met under any of the three scenarios under discussion here.

The socioeconomic impacts for major water users in South Australia would be similar under all three guide scenarios. The review found that, in the worst case, if reductions were borne solely by irrigators, the economic costs could be between 4 and 6 per cent of average annual production value, or between \$27.1 million and \$43.9 million. Very importantly, the review also found that these impacts would be reduced through ongoing water purchase and investment in more efficient water infrastructure, both of which would potentially generate new economic activity in the region.

In this context it should also be noted that the commonwealth has already purchased significant amounts of water from South Australian irrigators, which is not taken into account in either the guide or the review. The review also indicated that the costs of mitigation measures associated with prolonged low flows and drought were estimated to be \$790 million between 2002 and 2009. Under the guide scenarios, similar mitigation costs may be avoided in the future.

The review was based on information in the guide and the models that the MDBA developed to underpin it. Although the MDBA has since been reviewing its modelling and analysis, the Goyder science review has developed tools that will make it easier to assess the scenarios contained in the proposed basin plan when it is released. The Goyder review report will be provided to the MDBA to support the objective of having a clear scientific evidence base for the basin plan. It will also be used in formulating South Australia's response to the proposed basin plan following its release. I encourage all members to read the review, which I understand is available through the Goyder website.

### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** My question is again to Treasurer. When did the Treasurer first become aware that the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital was going to exceed the \$1.7 billion being promised by the government, and why didn't he immediately inform the public? We know since the election that the government had approved in cabinet in November 2009 an increase to at least \$1.8 billion.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Get over it, Isobel.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:29):** The final costings of the hospital were not made known to me before the final budget submission was prepared and it was taken to cabinet and, so, before the government made the decision, before cabinet made the decision that we would go ahead with the signing of the contract and the financial closure—it was not until that stage that all the costings were known. They couldn't be calculated until we were at that late stage in the preparation of the contract.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** This is all very interesting but the question was: when did he know that the cost was exceeding \$1.7 billion?

**An honourable member:** What standing order?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** When did he first know?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down, member for MacKillop.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister is answering the question as he chooses but I am listening very carefully to his answer and I think it is very relevant. Treasurer.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I am more than happy to talk about being honest with the South Australian people, because what the opposition took to the last electorate was absolute nonsense. It claimed that it could rebuild on the existing site—on a car park, apparently, without any provision for what you might do with the cars that actually park there—for, from memory, about \$700 million. If you want to talk about being honest and frank with the South Australian people—



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order: standing order 98. The minister is not only not answering the question, he is now debating.

**The SPEAKER:** I think we need to define what we mean by 'debating'. I am comfortable with what the Treasurer is saying. Treasurer, can you get back to the substance of the question?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Madam Speaker, I am more than happy to have the integrity and the honesty of this government held up on this project.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order. The bellowing man who insists upon the standing orders should know it is out of order to interject. I cannot hear the Treasurer.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I am having similar problems hearing also. I remind members on my left of the standing orders where you are not to interrupt people on their feet. If you continue to do so, under standing order 137 you will be named and you will leave the chamber. You have asked the Treasurer three questions now relating to the hospital. I ask that you let him answer them in silence and treat him with the respect he deserves.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I am more than happy to have a contrast drawn between the honesty and integrity of this government on this project and the dodgy proposal which the opposition took to the last election where it pretended—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. I'm sure you don't need to have an understanding of what debate is after hearing what the minister just said.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Yes, sit down. The minister will now get back to the question and be careful about his wording.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The simple fact is that, on the question of costings, I was made aware of the full costings—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** —of this project. Treasury gave me a briefing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Treasury gave me a briefing on the full costings of this project when the submission was being taken to cabinet. It was not until that fairly late stage in the negotiations between the government and the consortium that we could know exactly what the costings were going to be.

## RECONCILIATION WEEK

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:33):** My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. In light of Reconciliation Week (which has just ended), can the minister advise the house how this government is recognising and acknowledging Aboriginal South Australians?

**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) (14:33):** I would like to thank the member for Little Para for this very important question. Reconciliation Week was marked last week and provided our community—in fact, this place—with the opportunity to reaffirm our collective commitment to reconciliation. This year's theme was 'Let's Talk Recognition'—particularly fitting given the debates

we are having around constitutional recognition, and recently the debate we have had in this place around acknowledgement of traditional owners.

This government understands the importance of recognition. That is why in this place I confirmed our commitment, this side of the house's commitment, to the protocol of acknowledging traditional owners, and that is why I have spoken publicly about the need to recognise racism in our community, also. One practical step this government is taking is asking the South Australian Aboriginal Advisory Council chaired by Parry Aigus to provide us with advice about how to tackle racism in our community at a very practical level.

What is clear from talking to members of the council, and other Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people in our community, is that this recognition goes a long way in the journey of reconciliation. Indeed, the reaction to the government's commitment to acknowledging traditional owners demonstrates this. This is, of course, in stark contrast to the way in which the opposition reacted to reports of the Victorian—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** —Liberal government would be scrapping its acknowledgement in that state. Madam Speaker, I did challenge the Leader of the Opposition to declare—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Norwood, you will be quiet.

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Why are you so agitated? She's perfectly relaxed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** Madam Speaker, I challenged the Leader of the Opposition to declare her position, and she did—good on you—but with barely a moment's thought she agreed with the Victorian Liberal Party's position. That was reported that the acknowledgement is tokenistic and, in her words, as reported in *The Advertiser*, 'political correctness gone too far'.

I have since noted that the Victorian Aboriginal affairs minister, Jeanette Powell, has now publicly stated that the Victorian government will not be scrapping the acknowledgement. Ms Powell said on the ABC:

I don't know why, who put that information out there or where it came from. I just know that it didn't come from the government.

She went on to say that:

There is no confusion that it has caused anxiety and probably some confusion in Aboriginal people's minds as well, because they see that the government has made this change to deliberately do this and, again, the government did not.

I now ask the Leader of the Opposition: does she still consider the acknowledgement—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** —mere tokenism? I know—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I know that the Leader of the Opposition has declared that we are heading into a—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** —that the opposition will now no longer be a policy-free—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order. The minister will sit down.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I know ministers struggle with question time, but question time is about ministers answering questions, not asking them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! That is true, but—minister, have you finished your answer?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI:** I have, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. The member for Davenport.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:37):** My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer confirm that the payments of around \$1.1 million a day for 30 years for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital do not include paying for doctors, nurses and medical services?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:37):** The payment of \$397 million we pay every year, which is about \$1.1 million a day, covers the construction of the hospital, the design of the hospital and the ongoing running of the hospital, the maintenance of the hospital, the cleaning and the orderlies, and all the other ancillary costs that go along with running a hospital. The core health functions, we think it is important that those remain—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Grumpy grumble beans have been handed out, I think, to the members of the opposition. Someone has been handing out the grumpy grumble beans. Madam Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Yes, I think the Leader of the Opposition is the person purveying the said grumble beans and infected her colleagues. The government has always been open about this. We think that those core clinical functions—the treatment, the teaching, the research—are all things that are appropriate to stay within the province of government.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:38):** My question is directed to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house when work is expected to start on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

**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) (14:39):** Yesterday, a major milestone in the delivery of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital passed, when the Treasurer, Minister for Health and I announced financial closure on the contract with SA Health Partnership to build, operate and maintain the new hospital.

South Australian Health Partnership is made up of Leighton Contractors, Macquarie Capital Group, Hansen Yuncken and Spotless. SA Health Partnership took control of the site yesterday when financial close was reached. Next week, they will commence work on removing the foundation slab of the old rail sheds and will do further drilling of that area. Remediation and site preparation—in essence, digging a very big hole to put in the foundation and account for the site slope—will commence in July, and the foundation slab of the new hospital will be poured in early 2012.

When it is opened in 2016, it will provide a full range of complex medical, surgical, diagnostic and support services including 800 beds, 100 per cent single inpatient bedrooms with ensuites (80 per cent will have a view of the River Torrens but 100 per cent will have ensuite facilities both for privacy and infection control); 40 identical technical suites (operating theatres, intervention suites and procedure rooms that will each be 65 square metres); 181 recovery spaces; and 78 emergency treatment and eight resuscitation spaces.

Leading-edge technology will be incorporated in the design so that supplies can be efficiently moved around using automated guided vehicles and automated ordering systems. Electronic tagging of biomedical and other clinical equipment will allow staff to quickly and easily locate equipment, saving time and increasing efficiency, and there will be capacity for five MRI machines, seven CT scanners and six linear accelerators.

There will be room to expand. The new RAH site is almost 13 hectares compared to the current RAH site of 5.6 hectares. There is also capacity for a 30 per cent expansion, still leaving two hectares of open space. Green space: the new RAH will have 2.7 hectares of courtyards, gardens and outdoor areas built into the hospital compared to less than 2,000 square metres at the current RAH, and most inpatient rooms will overlook the Torrens and Parklands with opening windows.

Let's have a look at the Liberals' position on the hospital because I am a little bit confused. Over the past couple of years, the Liberals have shifted their position on the new hospital.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** You don't want to hear this, do you?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

*The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Premier!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** First of all, the Premier is not responsible to the house for the Liberal Party's views—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** —and in going to this, he is going to debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I understand your point of view, and I will listen very carefully to what the Premier says. It is a bit premature yet to bring up a point of order.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I think given that this is the subject of debate about alternative plans for hospitals, we saw in 2007—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** It just reinforces my point of order. We are in question time and the Premier has just said, 'This is a debate about the hospital.' He has admitted himself that he is about to debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down. I would ask the Premier to get back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** So the Liberals at first supported—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** He is ignoring your ruling that you gave not two seconds before.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down. I will make that judgement, not you. The Premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** First of all they supported the City West site. Then they did a backflip and said they supported the existing site. Then they went back to the City West site.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** This is clearly a debate. It is making a mockery of question time and a mockery of the parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It is making a mockery of the opposition's so many varied positions.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, sit down. Both of you, sit down. We have 24 minutes left of question time. There is still a substantial number of questions to get through.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, or I will call this question time to a halt! Premier, I would direct you back to the substance of the question, and I would ask that you finish as soon as you can.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Then they went to Keswick and then they went to Bowden-Brompton and so we have had so many positions from the Liberals that—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order, the member for Finniss.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Ma'am, the Premier is deliberately ignoring your instruction to go back to the text of the question and is debating the matter. It is just ridiculous.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I cannot say whether he deliberately ignored my instructions because I could not hear for all the noise coming from both sides of the house. Premier, have you finished your answer?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I have.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. The member for Davenport.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Defence Industries will be quiet also.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:44):** My question is to the Treasurer. Why did the Treasurer claim yesterday that the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital had increased because there had been an increase in the hospital floor space when the floor space has reduced? In November 2008, the Minister for Health stated on radio that the cost was to be \$1.7 billion and the floor space was to be 170,000 square metres.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:45):** We have been through over four years of contest over this new Royal Adelaide Hospital. An election has taken place in relation to this new Royal Adelaide Hospital. What we have determined to do as a government is to give the people of our state the very best hospital we can provide them. We need to give them a new hospital with a—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Madam Speaker—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** Madam Speaker, I—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I think we are going to be here until 5 o'clock, the way this question time is going, or I will call it to a close. We will have some order on my left and also my right. You will be quiet because I'm getting very cross about this. Someone will leave in a minute. Minister.

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rarely blush, Madam Speaker, but I came close to it on that occasion.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** I can't hear you.

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** I'm sorry, I'm so shocked by the interjection. The process of developing proposals for the hospital has gone in this way: we made an assessment early on that the option of building on the new site was not viable; we looked at a range of other sites where we could produce a hospital; and then we went through a process of deciding that, if we are going to build on the Royal Adelaide—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** Madam, they are inviting me to enter into argument across the chamber, which would be disorderly.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** I'm getting to the point if they would stop interrupting. We went through a process of designing a hospital which we could use as a benchmark for the provision of services, and that is what we did back in 2007, from memory, and we came up with a floor space of approximately 170,000 square metres, which was going to cost the sum of money that has been described. Over the process of the intervening years, the design and the processing of that has changed, and the original—

**Mr Pisoni:** It's gone up in price.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** Well, I'm not sure whether members on the other side have ever bought a house or built a shed or done any other bit of planning which involves infrastructure, but if they had, Madam Speaker—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition, you are warned.

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** —they would realise, of course, that, as you go through a design process and a costing process, things change. The planning process we went—

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** You still can't say that 170 is smaller than 167.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Davenport, you asked the question; you will listen to it.

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** If you stop talking, I will answer the question. The process we went through involved a series of design and costings processes and thoughts, and the stage that we finalised our own design was around 154,000 square metres. That was the view we had as to how large the hospital ought to be. Then, through the process of discussion and involvement with the—

**Mrs Redmond:** You announced 170,000.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** Yes; I don't resile from that, and that's—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Madam Speaker—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! member for MacKillop, you are warned.

*The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Thank you. I thank the member for Fisher for his support. I say to members opposite that we went through a process of detailed design and the parameters and the scope and all of the issues were under active consideration through that whole process. When we got into the arrangements through the public-private process, we had a model in mind for a public build of about 154,000 square metres and, through the ultimate design process involving the private sector, it came in at 12,000 square metres more because we just could not fit the requirements into a smaller site, despite what we had initially thought.

It is true that we started off with a bigger site—that was the earlier scope—and we changed it over time. But that is what you do if you are building something as complex as a hospital of this size. If you think the first take is going to be the right take, you are seriously deluded. We have been honest about this the entire way through. I resent completely the claim made by the member for Davenport, who likes to be tricky when it comes to matters of fact in this place.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** We have been absolutely open about this the whole way through.

*Members interjecting:*

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

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister now admit that not all of the services currently provided at the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital will be delivered at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and that some of these services will be delivered at a lower level?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:51):** Madam Speaker, the member uses the term will I 'now admit', which I would have suggested is an argumentative way of putting a question. It shows how disorderly this opposition is when it comes to this matter. They have opposed every single stage of the development of this new Royal Adelaide Hospital, as everybody else is getting on board except them and their camp followers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** They are being left alone, like a shag on a rock, when it comes to this Royal Adelaide Hospital. Let me go through it again. The inpatient facilities in this new hospital will be 30 per cent greater than at the existing hospital. If you would like me to go through it line by line, I am happy to deal with it.

The outpatient facilities will be greater. There are 108 cubicles at the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital for outpatient services and there will be 132 cubicles at the new hospital. So there is an increase in capacity.

All of the existing inpatient services at the hospital will be continued, I am advised, and, of course, in relation to outpatient services, we are going through a process of making sure that we put outpatient services where they best belong. That's why—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Madam Speaker, once again, the opposition leader interjects when I am trying to speak, and others on the other side interject. They ask a question and, when you try to give a serious answer, they just want to play word games. What I am trying to say to the members opposite is a serious answer to the question. The vast majority of services will be transferred over. There are some services across the whole system that we are looking to put in our GP Plus healthcare clinics. For example, in the northern suburbs at the Elizabeth GP Plus clinic we are looking at putting—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** In the northern suburbs at the Elizabeth GP Plus clinic, for example, we are looking at putting a whole range of outpatient services there so that patients do not have to go to the hospital. There is a whole range of things that you need to get attention for that you do not need to go to a hospital for. Obviously, we worked this through with the clinicians because there are issues to do with teaching, division of time and resources, and so on, so we want to do this in an effective way.

But, we are not going to be constrained by some sort of artificial notion that whatever used to happen at one stage has to happen automatically in the same way in the future. We need to reform our healthcare system, and an absolutely fundamental part of that reform is putting more services closer to where people live. I want to put some of the services from the Royal Adelaide Hospital out at Modbury and at Lyell McEwin so that patients in that part of the world do not have to travel to Adelaide to get assistance. Of course, there is a bit of resistance to doing that because the people who provide those services do not want to do the travelling.

We will work through these issues appropriately, but this hospital will have more inpatient services, it will have more outpatient services, it will be a bigger hospital, providing 30 per cent more capacity for the people of the state. We need that extra capacity because, as the population ages, the demand for healthcare services are going up. We do not put all of our services in hospitals, of course. We put them in GP Plus healthcare centres, which creates greater capacity in the hospitals for doing the things that can only be done in hospitals.

What the opposition is saying, of course, is that they do not have a healthcare plan: all they do is to respond to the pandering of those who support them.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister is debating. The opposition did not say that at all.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down. I uphold your point of order. I think that the minister has finished his reply. The member for Morphett.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:55):** Again, my question is to the Minister for Health. Why does the government claim that it is impracticable to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital on site when on-site rebuilds have been done at the Royal London Hospital, the Royal North Shore Hospital in Sydney, the Royal Hobart Hospital, and here in Adelaide at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Flinders Medical Centre and three new levels are being added to the Gilbert Building at the Women's and Children's Hospital?

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:55):** Madam Speaker—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Norwood! The Minister for Health.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Madam Speaker, it is curious that the opposition, once the contract is signed, is still trying to debate the issues of the last election. They are obsessed by the last election, whether it is the hospital—



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** What was that, Isobel?

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There will be no questions like this across the floor.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Madam Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition just interjected. Now, I am going to have to respond to those interjections, otherwise there is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I will tell you what is out of order, Madam Speaker. What is out of order is the thinking in the opposition about health care in our state. We have plans in place to make sure that we have sufficient services to look after the people of South Australia. The question—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Point of order.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister has been asked a question. The minister said that he was going to respond to an interjection and now he wants to debate something, a third issue.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Sit down. That's enough. The minister is responding to your interjections. Minister, you will get back to the question.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** If they did not interject, Madam Speaker, one would not be put off track.

**The SPEAKER:** That's right. If they kept their mouth shut, we could all sit here quietly.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Madam Speaker, thank you for that advice; I hope that the opposition take it. The opposition asked why aren't we building on the new site. Well, I would have thought this would have been pounded to pieces over a number of years. The reasons—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

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

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is interjecting. I wish he would stop.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** If I can just summarise the arguments as to why you cannot build on the existing site: much of the infrastructure on the existing site is very old and needs to be replaced. If you want to replace—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** Madam Speaker, if you choose to replace it on the existing site, you would have to pull down the buildings on the existing site, which would mean that there would be no Royal Adelaide Hospital to service the public during the time which you constructed those buildings. The solution that the Liberals came up with, putting a multistorey building in the car park in front of the emergency department, might seem like it resolves the issues, but let me assure you that it does not resolve the issues. It would—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** —of course, mean that the emergency department could not be accessed by ambulances for the period of the construction, but that is a minor issue, I guess, if you are in the simple world of the opposition, in the simple-minded world of the opposition.

The infrastructure of the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital is broken. The underground services need to be replaced. They cannot be replaced without considerable dysfunction being caused to that site. If you were to do it, it would take at least 15 years to go through the work, and you would still end up with a second best fit. You would still end up with a hospital which is not big enough to meet the needs of the public of South Australia.

Let me just give some information in terms of the efficiencies associated with the new hospital. The Liberals like to throw around figures, but let me throw around a couple of my own. At the existing RAH the non-clinical services cost approximately, in 2016 dollars (which is the starting point of the new hospital), about \$212,000 a day. That is to run all the services that are non-clinical. On the new site the cost of those services will be \$198,000, yet we will have 30 per cent more capacity, so there is a huge efficiency—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the Leader of the Opposition! You are warned for the second time.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I know she is angry today. We heard it on the radio this morning and it is continuing through today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** From what I hear, she has really good reasons to be angry, but we will not get into that. The new hospital will create a very efficient delivery of non-clinical services—198 compared to 212 plus 30 per cent extra capacity. You do not have to be a genius to know that that is a better outcome. In relation to the clinical services, the advice I have received today is that to run the new hospital at—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. He is doing it again.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** To run the clinical services at the new hospital will require about 10 per cent more clinicians to get a 30 per cent improvement in throughput, so it is a far more efficient hospital that we get as a result of building on the new site. Even if we wished to build it on the existing site, it is incredibly impractical; it just could not be done in the time that would be required to do it. That is the simple reason. I know the Liberals have some fantasy about building a high-rise tower out the front, which would mean that helicopters could land on the site; it would mean the emergency department would not work and, of course, it would be a monstrous architectural statement right there on North Terrace. Be that as it may, we are pretty certain that we have made the right decision, and I am absolutely confident that the public of South Australia will support this.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister inform the house who is right—the Premier, who said on Twitter in regard to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, 'Every inpatient will have a single room with an ensuite and a river view' or the Minister for Health, who has said that not all inpatients will have river views, not all inpatients will have single rooms, and not all inpatients will have ensuites?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:02):** Breaking news: 100 per cent of inpatients will have a single room with an

ensuite. If the deputy leader had been observant, he would have listened to my question. We went through all of these things. Around 80 per cent, maybe a bit more—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —will have a room with a view of the Torrens and the remainder will have a room with a view.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:03):** My question again is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister name one promise made with regard to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital that has turned out to be true?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. That is plainly again argument.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order, Madam Speaker. He is interjecting again.

**The SPEAKER:** He is. That question was worded very badly, and I do not think that the minister needs to answer that question, but if he is happy to answer it then he can.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:03):** Madam Speaker, I am happy to spend the next five minutes of question time, if members like, going through all the promises that will be delivered in relation to the new RAH. It will be built and completed in 2016—No. 1 promise. No. 2 promise: it will be a bigger hospital. No. 3 promise—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** —it will be one of the best hospitals in the world. No. 4 promise: it will have a strong focus on research, teaching, medicine, the delivery of services, and it will be a hospital which all South Australians can be proud of. That is a promise I make today and it is a promise I stand by and will stand by forever.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE CUTS

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:04):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Minister for Police. Does the minister agree with Treasurer Snelling's comments last week that former treasurer Foley made a mistake regarding cuts to public sector entitlements for public servants including those in the minister's own department. I quote from Treasurer Snelling: 'We made a mistake. We freely admit that.'

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (15:04):** That decision was not a decision of one person: it was a decision of the entire cabinet. The entire cabinet went into that with its eyes open. We made the decision. I very well remember—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I very well remember the discussion around the cabinet table at the time. It was a difficult decision. It was not one that sat easily with any of us, and it is a decision that, upon reflection, the entire cabinet has made a decision that we will not proceed with it. This is not something about one person. This is about the cabinet as a whole coming to a collective decision that we should not proceed with that particular savings measure because it was going to have an adverse impact on the lowest-income public sector workers.

## BAROSSA VALLEY AND MCLAREN VALE

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:05):** My question is to the Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide. Can the minister inform the house about the work he is doing to introduce new legislation to protect the McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley regions?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:05):** I thank the honourable member for his question and I would like to say at the outset what a great effort he has been putting in over some time to draw to the attention of people the very great importance of the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley regions. Earlier this year, the Premier announced that we were going to take steps to protect the McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley areas. Since that time, we have been in consultation with the communities there and we revealed last week draft maps setting out the areas that will be preserved. Conversations are now about to take place with those communities and councils, in particular, and the groups with which the honourable member is associated, about exactly what the details of those maps will be. We are very interested in knowing what sorts of activities are going to be absolutely prohibited from being conducted in those areas and also what sorts of activities those communities want to see as enhanced opportunities for their communities from the point of view of economic development.

I want to make it clear that the intention of the government is that there is only one prohibition that we intend definitely to have in those provisions, and that is a prohibition against urban subdivision. What happens otherwise is going to be a matter for discussion between the government and the communities in terms of prohibited activities and in terms of activities that are going to be proceeding, we would hope, with a quicker approval process. We want to have that discussion with those communities.

I, of course, am very interested in seeing activities relating to tourism and hospitality being favourable activities there, and I know, certainly in the McLaren Vale region, there is a need perceived by the people there and around the place that there be more accommodation, similar to the accommodation that already exists in the Barossa Valley. That process is going now over the next six weeks or so. In due course I will get back to the honourable member and to the parliament and advise what the result of that consultation has been.

I encourage those members who, like the member for Mawson, have a big interest in this—the member for Schubert, in particular—but, if you have views about this, you should be engaging with your community and talking to your local government people, and let us know what you think about it.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### LOWER LAKES

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:08):** I rise today to address this house on the issue of the plight of the River Murray, and especially of the plight of areas around Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina. I will comment on an email sent to me by members of the Meningie and Narrung Lakes Irrigators Association, which consists of a group of very forward-thinking irrigators who have utilised metered water direct from Lake Albert, and some have used water metered from Lake Alexandrina.

These farmers are fully aware of the potential diversity of their region and the fragility of their environment adjacent to the Coorong and the lakes. The area has seen major developmental changes in irrigation since early European settlement and, with the threat of construction of a weir in 2006 and the subsequent drying up of the lake beds due to drought and mismanagement of the waters upstream, these same farmers were unable to access water and their businesses have been living in limbo ever since.

Irrigation has ceased and many farmers were forced to sell their water allocations to survive. This has left millions of dollars of stranded irrigation assets, centre pivot irrigation systems, pipes and electrics, both above and below the ground. The district has been decimated. Many farm businesses have closed up and moved on. Those that have stayed are diversifying but are still not

able to plan for a future with water. Property values have dropped. Who wants a district with no future? The flow-on effect to this community at the bottom end of the river and lake system has been devastating with the local Meningie Area School having the biggest loss of students in the state as people depart the district.

They have lived with the threat of acid sulphates as the lakes dried out and these people still live in fear of what decisions are being made by those who live further upstream, and they urge the state government to consider their future. They say that if Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina are not to be a part of a healthy ecosystem in the future, tell us now, so that we can plan ahead and get on with our lives.

It is unfair to think that these communities can live for so long in uncertainty. It must be remembered that South Australia has already lost a lot of its major irrigation regions and a lot of industry from areas like the Lower Murray swamps and the Lower Lakes irrigation and dairy industry, and the Riverland has also lost many irrigators. We need to be careful with the building of the desalination plant—if it is ever completed—that it will take a heavy reliance off the need for water for Adelaide. I believe that many in the eastern states would have thought that South Australia did not need any water during this four or five year drought before the river recovered had the city of Adelaide not been at the end of the river.

We need to be certain that people along the Murray-Darling Basin do not think that just because these things are happening we do not need water down through the system. The irrigation communities have felt the full impact of this, and the biggest problem that we have had lately is that the man-made interventions at Narrung, Clayton, Currency Creek and in Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert need to be removed immediately.

These are still causing major environmental problems, and major problems for access to irrigatable water for stock water, especially out of Lake Albert, where I believe the levels for the quality of that water is running at about 6000 EC. It is just not good enough that, even though the river stream has recovered, we still have these problems around Lake Albert, and people are paying a fortune for reticulated water.

People need to understand that there needs to be water flowing down the river and it has to go all the way, it has to go to these communities. Hard decisions need to be made to save the mighty Murray river before it is too late, and I must stress that all communities in the Murray Darling Basin are important and they all contribute to the socioeconomics of their own unique region.

This is a huge problem in this area and the government needs to be held accountable. Why haven't these bunds been pulled out? It has caused a major crisis in the area. People have had to either diversify or they have had to sell up.

**Mr Venning:** Are they still there?

**Mr PEDERICK:** They are still there. The government is attempting to pull out the one at Narrung, and it is making out that it is too hard to pull out the bunds at Clayton and Currency Creek. It is ridiculous. They need to get on with the job and support these Lower Lakes communities.

#### MITCHELL ELECTORATE

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:13):** One thing that I believe all that sit in this chamber would agree on is that South Australia is a great state with much to offer for those who live here as well as those who come as tourists. It is easy to be passionate about our part of the country which is spectacular and beautiful—

**Mr Venning:** The Barossa!

**Mr SIBBONS:** Yes, and the Barossa, and Mitchell and Ashford and all of those. They are all beautiful aren't they? From our pristine sandy beaches to the grandeur of the outback, including the Barossa Valley. When it comes to Adelaide it is easy to be passionate about a place so liveable, one with sport in its blood and the world's best wineries on its doorstep, not to mention the iced coffee, the chocolate, or the beer. When visitors come to our town it is easy to be enthusiastic as we show them around and introduce them to what is unique or special about our city and state. Sometimes doing so can remind us to treasure what we are so lucky to have. I find it equally easy to be enthusiastic about my electorate of Mitchell, and I am sure all members here feel the same way about the patch of South Australia which they represent.

Recently, I had the privilege of showing Premier Rann and Deputy Premier Rau around my electorate of Mitchell. Premier Rann and I visited five schools: Reynella South primary, Woodend primary, Sheidow Park primary, Stella Maris parish school and Darlington primary. As their local member I have had dealings with all these fine schools previously, but for some it was the first time a premier had visited their grounds.

We took tours of the school and met with principals, teachers and students. Some took part in sports day activities, and others showed us projects they were doing such as the Stephanie Alexander kitchen garden and also put on wonderful musical presentations for us. Students grilled the Premier during question time and, I must say, put him in the hot seat. I will not go any further about the quality of the questions and how good they were—they were very good questions from the students.

After the visits the Premier talked to us about how impressed he was with the students and the schools, and also he had a very enjoyable day. I would like to congratulate all the teaching staff and students involved and thank them for their warm welcomes. Thank you to the staff of the Marion sports and social club as I was pleased to be able to show the Premier the great new facilities they have thanks to a partnership with various levels of government.

I took Deputy Premier Rau around Mitchell from the very southern end of Old Reynella to the northern end, including Marion and Oaklands Park. I would like to thank everyone who hosted our visit that day. I showed him the Lower Field River, a little-known area of great environmental promise and historic significance situated between Sheidow Park, Trott Park and the Reynella area. I told him of my hope that the area will be reborn out of its current degraded state into a healthy ecosystem with thriving native plants and birdlife, incorporating walking and cycling trails.

We visited the wonderful Reynella Neighbourhood Centre which hosts approximately 1,000 people each week through its long-time learning courses and groups which meet there regularly. Driven largely by volunteers, the centre:

...has a vision to be a place for the community to: meet friendly people, to value [and respect] each other's contributions, to recognise strength and difference in individuals, and provide opportunities for life-long learning, growth and fun.

What an inspirational motto by which to operate!

I also took the Deputy Premier to the historic old Reynella Horse Changing Station, a gem of a little museum that many a South Australian, unfortunately, has not yet had the opportunity to visit. Reliant on volunteers to staff, maintain and restore the station, it provides a window into the state's past from the car park of a modern shopping centre, the Old Town Shopping Centre.

We now finish the tour and I would like to thank the Premier and the Deputy Premier for their enthusiasm and commitment to continually striving to make Mitchell and South Australia amongst the best places to live in Australia.

### TARAC TECHNOLOGIES

**Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:18):** I want to support the urgent call by South Australian farmers for the government to allow the supply of cheaper mouse baits, and I note the minister is here. The shadow minister raised this issue in the house on the last sitting day. I urgently join the call for the minister to allow farmers to buy zinc phosphide and to be able to mix it themselves using their own grain.

Some farmers have spent in excess of \$60,000 on mouse baits; some cannot even get the product, which is called Mouseoff. What is happening is that farmers are mixing their own potions out of necessity, with much more environmental damage. Zinc phosphide has almost zero off-target damage—not so for most of the alternatives. Also, farmers are burning their paddocks, causing other environmental problems such as smoke pollution. So, minister for primary industries, please enable farmers to immediately purchase the zinc phosphide themselves to save money, to save the environment and to save our crops.

On a positive note, in the last two months I have been fortunate to receive two tours of Tarac Technologies' facility and its Beckwith Park site in Nuriootpa. The first tour was led by the Chairman of Tarac, Mr Fraser Ainsworth; CEO of Tarac Technologies, Mr Chris Zajac; and, CEO of Beckwith Park, Mr Jeremy Blanks. On the second tour in the Barossa, I was pleased to host the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. Paul Caica) to join me in a tour of the sites. Again, Chris and Jeremy accompanied us, providing an excellent summary of all they have to offer. I was very impressed with both facilities, and I think the minister was too. They are an absolute

asset to the Barossa region and to the state generally, and successful examples of an innovative and environmentally sustainable business. It was quite enlightening.

Tarac Technologies was established in 1930 and currently employs 60 staff, with an extra 20 casuals working during vintage. Tarac has four sites in Australia—two in Nuriootpa, one in Berri, and one in Griffith. Tarac offers services and solutions to the wine industry, such as processing winery waste and waste water treatment to assist the industry to become more environmentally sustainable by reducing the ethanol emissions and landfill. They also offer distillation services, including alcohol reduction, wine concentrations, etc.

In 2009, Tarac processed approximately 130,000 tonnes of grape marc, more than 55 million litres of liquid waste and 7,000 tonnes of solid waste. Tarac Technologies also undertake many projects and initiatives to ensure their own operations are as environmentally sustainable as possible. Projects include:

- The re-use of biogas to save the use of natural gas: a relatively new system which Tarac anticipates will reduce natural gas use by 18 per cent and reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 4,000 tonnes per annum;
- Upgrade of the distillery to reduce energy and water consumption;
- Company-wide water audits: Tarac has an in-house water efficiency team developed and tasked with developing plans to implement water saving measures;
- Sustainability rating: a five-star rating system which uses qualitative and quantitative data to provide specific ratings on current sustainability performance and recommendations for improvement.

Tarac also has plans in the future to conduct a feasibility study into the future, with the aim to recover energy from biomass to offset natural gas and electricity consumption, and return energy to the grid.

Beckwith Park is an innovative new industrial business park in Nuriootpa. Beckwith Park management is currently in the process of achieving green certification as the master plan is executed and new tenants take up residency. Beckwith Park offers storage, logistical services, showrooms, offices, light manufacturing, bulk wine storage and bulk liquid storage.

Once again, I would like to thank the Tarac management very much for taking the time to show the minister and me around the two sites and explain the process and services they offer. I wish them all the best for the future. I also hope that other members would like to visit the facilities. I am happy to arrange that, because I was very impressed, and I know that the minister was too. Many people would not understand or realise what goes on here, because the grape industry, in the past, was labelled an environmental concern in relation to odours and the by-product. However, here we have an industry which picks up almost all the waste and turns it into a valuable product.

To finish off, I was extremely impressed to learn that Tarac went out and bought grapes that nobody else could buy, took them in at cost, and then squashed them and made spirit out of them. The farmers received the cost of the picking—so they got some money for their unmarketable grapes—and all in all, it was a great success. I congratulate Tarac and look forward to cooperating with them in anything they wish to do.

#### **INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY**

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:23):** For some years now, I have endeavoured to hold a dinner to mark International Women's Day in the south. It is not easy for people who live and work in the south to get to some of the major celebrations in the city, so we have been holding our own for quite some time. A feature of this event is for members of the community to submit women who they believe should be recognised for their achievements in their own lives or for their contribution to the community. I have been pleased, over the years, to recognise what now must be around 50 women in the south for the work that they have done, their contributions to the community. I would like to record something about the women who were recognised by the 70 women who attended this year.

The first one was Toni Davis who had been nominated by the Woodcroft/Morphett Vale Neighbourhood Centre. They see her as a role model for other young women through the work that she has done, having come to the community centre at a time in life when she was feeling very vulnerable. She decided that she had to work to improve herself and the future for her children and

has now completed a Certificate III in Children's Services and Certificate IV in Community Development, and in 2010 was a graduate of the City of Onkaparinga leadership program. This is a considerable achievement for somebody who originally approached the centre for help with literacy.

Karen Christensen is now the chair of the board of the Christie Downs Community House. She also began her involvement as a fairly tentative volunteer, really not confident about her skills or her role in life. She started in the kitchen assisting in the preparation of community meals. By 2007, Karen was a paid employee and a team leader for the children's program. She completed her Certificate III in Children's Services last year and is now undertaking her Diploma in Children's Services.

Brenda Weir was nominated by both her daughters for her long commitment to volunteering in the southern area, and this is not the first time we have had women nominated by their proud daughters. Brenda has been a volunteer since 1962, and that has included roles in the Old Reynella Primary School, neighbourhood watch, and Flinders Medical Centre. During the time of her volunteering, she has inspired her family, especially as she managed to study at night to gain matriculation while working full-time and raising eight children.

Karen Bartel, while not coming from the south, was nominated because of the important role that she has played in advocating for the rights of low-paid women and, unfortunately, there are many women in the South working in low-paid occupations who, hopefully, will benefit from the pay equity case. Among Karen's 'firsts', she was the first female commissioner and then first deputy president of the South Australian Industrial Relations Committee.

Wendy Perry was nominated by members of the Southern Success Business Enterprise Centre. She is a very successful businesswoman who has been able to juggle her child-raising responsibilities while building a small company. She works on a national basis and employs four full-time staff and up to 60 service deliverers at times, and she does all this from home.

Eunice Hearne has volunteered at the Reynella Neighbourhood Centre for over 12 years and has been recognised for her extraordinary and longstanding commitment. Eunice spends much of her time helping other volunteers gain skills through her positive and encouraging approach and is a great asset to the centre.

Madam, I can see that I am not going to have time to pay tribute to all the women who were recognised on the night and I will seek another opportunity to conclude my remarks because I think that it is very important that we recognise the silent workers in our community who make such a difference to the world in which we live and who often overcome considerable obstacles to play their role in our community.

### **COMMUNITY EVENT LIQUOR LICENCES**

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:28):** I would like to take this opportunity just to highlight a difficulty in regional areas (and no doubt in metropolitan areas as well) with regard to volunteer community organisations getting liquor licences for community events that they run. I am talking specifically about limited licences for one-off events, which might be annual events. I am not talking about hotel licences or restaurant licences but, specifically, limited licences.

These affect groups like show societies, sporting clubs, hospital auxiliaries, church events, rodeos, RFDS fundraisers, music events and a whole range of community events that are run by volunteers. They are very important community events. Particularly in the country and more remote areas, having these events offers a terribly important gathering point. It is not only the event itself but the fact that the whole community—young, middle-aged and old people—can all come together to meet. Also, they are very, very important fundraisers, typically.

The Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner has a very hard job to do, and I do not for one moment want to suggest that it should be easy to get a liquor licence. I do not suggest for a moment that they should just be handed out willy-nilly. We do have very, very serious issues to deal with. We do not want to encourage drink driving and under-age drinking, or antisocial behaviour in general, and being careful that events do not encourage that is important. I am not suggesting that the rules that exist should be eased, but what I am suggesting is that, at times, the implementation of those rules upon community organisations is overzealous and, in my mind, occasionally inappropriate.

I have been given examples of community fundraisers, such as one RFDS fundraiser in a small country town, where the average age of the people who attend would probably be about



60 years. I would say that people in their 40s, like myself, would be in the vast minority. I went to one of these fundraisers at Jamestown, for example, about 2½ years ago. It was a tremendous event, but I would say that probably 20 or 30 per cent of the people who attended a cold town hall on a country night brought a rug with them to put over their knees. For an event like that to be required to have a security guard is over the top, when you are talking about responsible grown-up, serious people coming together for a night of music, auctions, fundraising and a few drinks and a nice meal.

Show society events have exactly the same situation, and certainly rodeos lately have been under great scrutiny. In the electorate of Stuart, we have four very important rodeos—at Carrieton, Peterborough, Wilmington and Spalding—and there are other rodeos further afield in country and outback South Australia. Those very important events have come under great pressure lately. I draw the house's attention to the difficulties experienced by the Carrieton and Wilmington Rodeo Societies—again, volunteer organisations. They are tremendous events, with anywhere up to 2,000 people attending. For example, to receive their liquor licences at the very last minute is just an enormous stress on the people organising these events. I am told that Rock the Mount (the country and western music event at Melrose), which is another very large event, getting 2,000 or 3,000 people, received its liquor licence the day before the event, which caused undue stress and strain.

The very, very important issue here is that the increase in the number of security guards these events are expected to have is killing them financially. These events raise tens of thousands of dollars every year for local communities—this is money that will not come from anywhere else. I do not say that running these events is not without risk, but putting the organisers under extreme duress, telling them that they have to double the number of security guards, is not appropriate. Security guards are important, but to try to squash these events and to say that every single risk that is out there on any night of the week on any street, whether it be Adelaide or a small country town, is now, on this night, the responsibility of the organising committee is completely inappropriate. I would really like to highlight how difficult this is for these communities and these volunteer organisations.

#### **INTERNATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK**

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:34):** As members of the house may be aware, International Men's Health Week for 2011 runs from 13 to 19 June, that is, next week. International Men's Health Week has been celebrated and recognised in Australia since 2003. Men and boys face different health concerns from those faced by women and girls, and this week of recognition is an opportunity to both acknowledge these differences and look for ways in which to improve the health and wellbeing of men and boys in our society.

In my view, men need to stop procrastinating and ignoring their health and undertake checks to ensure that they are aware of where their body is at. The statistics are quite staggering. On average, men live about five years less than our female counterparts (78 years compared to 83 years). Men are more likely to die prematurely. Premature deaths have a significant emotional and economic toll on families and society and, sadly, often are preventable.

The leading causes of premature death among men are heart disease, suicide and lung cancer. Prostate cancer remains the most common cancer among males at 23.4 per cent, followed by colorectal cancer at 14.6 per cent, lung cancer at 11.3 per cent and melanomas at 10.5 per cent. Together these four cancers account for 60 per cent of all registered cancers among males.

Preliminary results from the Florey Adelaide Male Ageing Study, conducted by Professor Gary Wittert from the Discipline of Medicine at the University of Adelaide, reveal that a large number of men are unaware of their health problems. The study clinically examined men aged between 35 and 80 years. It found that 47 per cent had high cholesterol but 14 per cent were unaware of it; 14 per cent had diabetes but 4 per cent of those were unaware of it; 60 per cent had hypertension and a staggering 29 per cent of them were unaware of it; and 18.5 per cent had depression but 6 per cent of them were unaware of it. Alarming, the study also found that 78.5 per cent were either overweight or obese, 61 per cent undertake insufficient exercise, and 57 per cent reported some degree of other dysfunction.

I strongly urge men, particularly those aged 40 years and above, to schedule a health check today. Men make only half as many visits to the doctor for prevention compared to women. If

not for themselves, men should see their doctor for those who count on them. Men's health is important.

**Dr McFetridge:** Last week.

**Mr PICCOLO:** Yes, very good. Men are fathers and dads, husbands and partners, brothers and sons, so they do matter. Healthy men, both physically and emotionally, are important if we are going to have healthy families. We need to gain a better understanding of why men do not access the health system as much as they should. We need to move beyond blaming men for not giving sufficient attention to their health. While Anglo male culture and socialisation are a factor, there are practical reasons why men do not access health services. For example, many health services do not have opening hours that reflect men's working arrangements. We need to start telling men from a very young age that men do matter. They are integral to families, communities and society at large.

Health SA is supporting a range of activities during Men's Health Week, and they are on the health website. South Australian Health also continues to support men's health and issues and this year has supported the following projects:

- the Understanding Men's Health Service Needs project under the auspices of the Freemasons Centre for Men's Health;
- the Man Alive! Festival; and
- the Aboriginal Male Health and Well Being Project Officer.

Also, the health minister has granted sponsorship for the Australasian Men's Health Forum's 9<sup>th</sup> National Men's Health Conference and supported other activities.

In my own electorate of Light, a local medical practice, Hyde and Partners, is making it easier for men to have a basic health check. Hyde and Partners are promoting Men's Health Week by offering free health checks for existing and new male patients during next week with a practice nurse. The basic health check includes blood pressure, blood glucose level, body mass index, weight and free advice on men's health issues. I hope and trust that men will avail themselves of this opportunity. I think that men need to take more control of their own health. Men's health is important because, in the end, men do matter.

#### **ADELAIDE OVAL REDEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:40):** I rise today to support the redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval upgrade. I do have some reservations with the way in which this upgrade has been portrayed by our government, particularly with the numbers that have been portrayed, with the starting figure at \$450 million. Suddenly, we are seeing increased costs, and they seem to be swept under the carpet by this government that seems to have plenty to hide with a project that is going to impact on every South Australian.

Obviously, it has been reported that the timber industry in the South-East is going to have a significant contribution to this Adelaide Oval, but, again, I think that every South Australian—particularly regional South Australians—is going to contribute to a project that will least benefit them. This stadium to date has been based on, I think, systemically a lot of mistruths. We look at the previous minister responsible for the upgrade who has now been taken away from the role of this project, and we now have the Minister for Infrastructure stepping into this stadium issue.

I congratulate the minister because he has had a pretty tough job getting this back on track; and now, with the support of the opposition, I would expect that it be supported—with the scrutiny of the opposition, of course. I think that it is the opposition's role to make sure that this project is scrutinised in every way, shape and form with its huge cost.

The \$535 million after all is only for an upgrade. We are not looking at a new stadium. We are looking at something that is going to have significant works done to it. But, again, I look at the upgrade of the western side of the Adelaide Oval, and we look at the friendly game of soccer between Adelaide and New Zealand less than a week ago. It was with disbelief—listening to people on radio and watching people on TV—to see people there who had paid good money to go along to watch a world-standard game being absolutely drenched with rain.

It beggars belief that we have had a significant amount of money, a significant number of engineers' reports and a significant amount of expertise put into an oval upgrade, and we have people paying good money to get wet to watch a world-class event. That is something that I really think needs to be put on the table as one of the high priorities.

It is obvious that it is a cricket venue, and I think that is what needs to be highlighted. The Adelaide Oval has traditionally been a cricket venue. It is there to shade people, traditionally, in hot weather. We see very little rain coming to big events that happen at the Adelaide Oval. One of the big problems was highlighted on the weekend—people watching soccer, getting very, very wet.

Again, I look at the \$535 million, and it makes me, as a country member, ask questions. I am a member of the Adelaide Oval. We are looking at a \$535 million cost, as I believe it, for an extra 12,000 seats. I have reservations with the parking issues that will impact not only on the people who want to go to this touted world-class venue but also on real estate values—those homes, those properties, that surround the Adelaide Oval.

Suddenly, we have a venue with people jammed into it without adequate parking facilities. I remember going to the cricket as a lad and you would park anywhere, because that is what you did to get close to the venue, to get in there and watch the game. You would just park anywhere. I have grave concerns that real estate values will decline with the invasive traffic that will set upon the people of North Adelaide particularly, the people of Adelaide and those nearby suburbs.

I do acknowledge that Adelaide's population will not sustain two world-class facilities, and I think that has been fairly well supported on both sides here. Again, we look at football and cricket that are going to be almost subsidised by this \$535 million upgrade of Adelaide Oval. Why are cricket and football being subsidised when we look at a world game, such as soccer? Where are soccer's subsidies? Where is the funding, where is that financial input? I guess that football and cricket nowadays are a business, they are a big business.

We look at soccer not being subsidised as these two sports are, so what is Adelaide going to become? Is it going to become a two-sport town? That is something that people who are supporters of soccer, people who play soccer, people who travel the world supporting soccer are asking. Again, the disappointment will be if it is a true world-class stadium, is it FIFA compliant? Is it going to attract world-class sporting events? These are some of the issues that this government has to acknowledge when we are looking at the touted world-class facility. Will it be a world-class received arena?

I would like to think that we will see spin-offs. There will be people who will benefit from this facility. There will be businesses within the precinct of Adelaide that will benefit. The people of Adelaide and the businesses right around the CBD of Adelaide will benefit from the spin-offs of people coming into the city, going to one of these sporting events, taking a short walk to take advantage of great restaurants or great bars (whether it be the Casino or other businesses) that will complement this Adelaide Oval.

I would also like to think that every South Australian will benefit from the investment that this government will make on the Adelaide stadium. I do not want to see the Adelaide stadium benefiting the people of Adelaide only; it has to benefit every South Australian. It is a bit like the desal plant. Every South Australian is paying for a desal plant that puts water into Adelaide. It does not take any reliance of take away from the River Murray, yet every South Australian is paying for it, particularly the irrigators on the river who have been denied support by this government in this last water year. They are still paying for the desal plant—the increased costs of the desal plant and the increase uncertainty of water supply to Adelaide—but we do not see any reliance taken off the River Murray, and that is something that is dear to my heart. That is something I will be watching very closely: that the benefits of this huge investment are for every South Australian.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (15:48):** I will make a brief contribution. The reality is that this redevelopment is going to happen, therefore I think the sensible, rational thing is to make the outcome the best possible outcome for the people of South Australia. I have to say that building a sporting stadium would not have been my priority. I surveyed the people of my electorate and I had back 400 replies out of 23,000—and I am not arguing that it is statistically valid because to do it properly you would have to use proper statistical methods such as stratified random sampling—but the people who did respond, and I suspect most of them are in the older age group, were not supportive of spending this amount of money on a stadium.

However, I can see the logic in having a stadium in the city. It is a pity that from day one we did not have a bipartisan approach to an agreed site and an agreed facility. As I said, this is what

we have and let's make the best of it. Parking is obviously a key issue concerning the City of Adelaide and a lot of people in the wider community. It is hard to know what they will end up looking like, but I hope they do not end up looking like an asphalt jungle or concrete jungle. One would imagine that, if you are going to use parking during winter for a winter game, then clearly the surface would have to be sealed in some way, otherwise it will be four-wheel drives only. My concern is that, in providing the car parking, proper regard must be had to the aesthetics. We must also remember that it is parkland, but you cannot have cars parked there and have shrubbery all over the area; that would be nonsensical.

I have not seen the detailed plans for the car parks, but I trust that in this day and age we will get car parks that are in keeping with what you might call the semi-rustic character of the area, that it is properly landscaped, that it looks attractive, and that we do not end up with asphalt or a concrete slab that looks ugly and out of place.

Another point that I am sure others have made or will make is that it is surprising that the AFL is contributing so little, thus far, to this project, when you read that their media rights were recently signed for something in excess of a billion dollars. We know now that the trend is less on people attending functions and more on the television rights. I do not know whether members saw this, but recently there was a big soccer match up at Gosford, I think it was, where they were asking for or requiring non-attendance because they said that was irrelevant. What they wanted was to televise the game, because that is where the money is. I am surprised the AFL is not putting in more than a figure of \$5 million or something like that, which is what I have heard. That is, literally, peanuts.

I think the community has raised the issue of priorities, and I have touched on that briefly. With the new hospital, I think you can say that that is something that is going to be used every day for enhancing quality of life. I love football. I do not barrack for the Crows or Port Power. I barrack for Carlton, and have done since—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** Carlton have been going long before those two new chums on the block.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** I have been supporting Carlton long before the Crows or Port Power were given berths and I do not intend to change now. I love football. I do not often go to the matches. I think the last time I went to an AFL match was probably 10 or 15 years ago, but I do like to watch it and I take an interest in it, and I think sport is a great thing. One of the reasons we have a civilised or semi-civilised society is because people get rid of their frustrations and anger on the sporting field rather than out on the streets or shooting people, as happens in some places.

It is a great game. I think AFL is the greatest game. We know that cricket will be played there as well. Cricket has a lot of cultural aspects to it, some of which have been eroded away, but there is the idea of playing honourably and that sort of thing. I think it is an integral part of our culture. So, we have this project. I think it will add a new dimension to life in Adelaide. I do not see it as a great stimulating factor for shopping. If people are going to the football, I do not see them venturing out afterwards to go shopping. The shops will probably be shut anyway. Depending on what time the matches are scheduled, they might go shopping beforehand. However, it will certainly bring the city to life.

I would still like to see the minister commit to a tram going down past Adelaide Oval and eventually out to North Adelaide. I have mentioned this before. I think, off the top of his head, he gave me a cost of \$100 million. I think you could do it a bit cheaper and do it for less than \$100 million. It is something that needs to happen in the longer term anyway, but you could shift a lot of patrons with modern trams going past the oval.

I look forward to seeing this project underway. With the planning and provision of the parking, which I guess is the most controversial aspect now, outside of the question of the large amount of money and priorities, I hope that those parking facilities are done in a way that is compatible and attractive so that it does not take away from what is currently a generally very attractive area and that the semi-rustic character is retained.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:54):** I rise to concur with the previous speeches by my colleagues on this side. I am very comfortable with the position that the Liberal Party has taken with this piece of legislation, and the bottom line is that the government does not need this legislation to

go ahead with this. It is a massive development, like the hospital, and it is a lot of money, so let us make sure that we get it right, and that is what the Liberal Party is aiming to do here. It wants to scrutinise, it wants to oversee and it wants the taxpayers to be able to see in an open and transparent way that we are getting value for money. It is important not only to SACA, the AFL and the SANFL but also to every South Australian, because you cannot just build hospitals, you cannot just build prisons and roads. You have to have other facilities for sport and recreation and other activities like that.

I will say right from the start, though, that I sat with some senior members of the Glenelg Football Club at dinner on Saturday night. I said to them, 'What is in this for you?' and they were quite blunt. They said that, unless the Crows and the Power start winning games, not very much at all. It is going to be so dependent on the Crows and the Power to make sure that they add to the whole attraction of that arena. AFL has a huge following but it is only as good as the games that the spectators get to watch.

Consider some of the attendances at some of the recent games. I think they only had 33,000 people at the last Showdown. I remember with Showdowns 1 and 2 that tickets were sold out weeks before. We need to get those clubs back up and going. Good facilities will go part of the way. They have a huge facility at AAMI Stadium and, I understand, the future of that is still a bit up in the air. The SANFL owns that and it is looking to get bigger and better attendances and financial results with the development of Adelaide Oval.

As I said a moment ago, you cannot just build hospitals, prisons and roads—you need to build other things. I say that because our biggest industry is not mining, it is not motor vehicles and it is not even defence: our biggest industry is the experience industry. The experience industry is tourism, performing and visual arts, and sport and recreation, and when you put all three together, the opportunities and the experiences in South Australia are absolutely phenomenal. I am a parochial South Australian. I represent one of the best electorates down the Bay at Glenelg. We have three million visitors a year. I would like to see Adelaide getting a greater share of the tourism dollar, and the experience industry dollar, as well as the rest of the state. I hope that building facilities like this development will go some way towards building that industry.

The experience industry employs about 30,000 people—some part-time and some full-time. If you offer a five-star experience, whether it is watching a top athletic football match or some other event, you will get really good attendances, and people are willing to pay for that experience, not only locals but also people from interstate and overseas. They offer jobs, prosperity and an industry that cannot leave South Australia.

This development is part of that. It is not one that I would have put up there as a top priority. In my opinion, I think it could have been done better. I was obviously looking for a more modern enclosed stadium. The history of Adelaide Oval is a proud, long history (and I will talk about that in a few moments), but we need to make sure that, if we are going to go down this path and not down the alternative path that we have proposed, we get it right. That is why I will be strongly supporting the amendments of the member for Davenport.

Let us look at Adelaide Oval for what it has been and where it has come from. It has a long and proud history. The oval was established in 1871 and it is of local, national and international significance. I am reading from the South Australian Cricket Association submission to the Adelaide Park Lands Bill 2005. Mike Deare was the then CEO of SACA. That has changed but Ian McLachlan is still there. I will read a bit more about the history of SACA so members can appreciate that there is a long history there. The submission says that Adelaide Oval has been a major focus for the development of sport within South Australia since inception, providing a central venue within the Parklands of Adelaide for the games of cricket, football and other sports. The place is of high social significance due to its association with famous sports people and events, and is held in the highest esteem by the community. That is why we need to get this right: because this is an iconic place.

I have been there many, many times as a young bloke watching West Adelaide get done, and watching the Bays. We had some great moments when we actually won some grand finals, and our time is coming again with Glenelg. We need to safeguard the strong association with the Parklands, and that is what is in some of our amendments here.

In addition to sporting events, Adelaide Oval has hosted major civic and entertainment events, displays and celebrations involving several generations of the community at various times. As such, it has strong associations for a wide range of the community and admirably achieves the

intent of Colonel William Light's vision that the Parklands would be for the 'healthful recreation of the inhabitants of the city'.

Going back through some of the more memorable moments, it would be interesting to calculate what these pound values are in current dollar terms—I think that would be quite amazing. In 1871, SACA leased 12 acres from the Adelaide City Council, surveyed six acres and completed an oval for £200 in 1872. In 1882, for £3,093 they built what is now known as the George Giffen Stand—it was a new grandstand then. In 1884 they constructed a bicycle track and earth mounds around the oval. The bike track has gone but looking at the layout of the oval they tell me it is quite easy to see how they modelled it on a bike track.

In 1889, for the sum of £2,674, a new grandstand was erected, and it was altered later on. That was known as the Sir Edwin Smith Stand. A switchback railway and toboggan track were built at the southern end—which were later demolished in 1891. Why you would want to build a switchback railway and a toboggan track at the Adelaide Oval—well, it makes what they are doing now look quite sane, but there must have been reasons back then!

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Don't you need snow for tobogganing?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I think you do need snow for tobogganing, minister. However, they built this switchback railway and toboggan track there, and they spent quite a bit of money on it. It was £2,674, as part of the grandstand there. In 1901 the iconic Moreton Bay figs were planted by the Duke of York. It is great to see that those Moreton Bays are still held with the respect and esteem now that would have been thought about when they were first planted in 1901.

In 1911 the scoreboard that we hold with great reverence also was built, at the cost of £1,540. It was constructed to the design of the notable Adelaide architect, F. Kenneth Milne. In 1923 the John Creswell Stand was completed at a cost of £13,327, and then in 1924 the Mostyn Evans Stand was constructed at a cost of £8,137.

In 1930 the Sir Edwin Smith Stand was extended, the George Giffen Stand with additional committee rooms was completed, and the Mostyn Evans Stand with additional seating was upgraded at the cost of £22,946. This is in 1930—I do not know what the dollar value in what I think they call 'net present cost' would be. I am not an economist but I know that it was a lot of money in those days.

To jump ahead—in 1990 the Sir Donald Bradman Stand was completed and opened for \$9.5 million. I was driving down North Terrace on Saturday night and the lights were on at Adelaide Oval and they looked quite spectacular—but we remember in 1993 that the city council approved \$6 million for the erection of the telescopic light towers, and what a disaster they were.

In 2003 there was the redevelopment of the eastern side of the ground, including two new grandstands, a new corporate entertainment platform, service bunkers, kiosks, bars, merchandise stores, a new gatehouse and ticket house, new gates and the new video screen which were erected at a cost of \$22.1 million. So, a lot of money has been spent over the years, a lot of cost. It would be interesting to see what the actual dollar values are today, in looking at where that money has gone. It is interesting to look at the South Australian Cricket Association's submission to the Adelaide Park Lands Bill 2005 in which, on page 10, it said:

From 1993 to 2000 approximately 2,657,000 people have attended various events at the Adelaide Oval, including:

- International Cricket;
- SANFL Football;
- Rugby League;
- Various concerts, from Michael Jackson [and] Elton John...

In 2002, there was a Rumba concert there—I did not go to that, and I do not know whether anybody here did. I did go to the Rugby 7s on a lovely, warm night, and it was a great event. Of course, one event that was transferred to the Adelaide Oval I was not very pleased about, but it has come home again, and that was the Bay Sheffield. It was transferred there for a few years, but the Bay Sheffield is back where it belongs, down at the Bay.

The Adelaide Park Lands Bill 2005 was a result of the 'Management of Adelaide's parklands' report, which was put together by the Adelaide Park Lands Management Working Group in January 2003. Page 17 of that report talks about the need to provide legislation to:

...change the laws to block the state government's overriding of proper planning processes by the use of major project status to impose developments in the parklands.

Major project status is not being used here. In the legislation that we are seeing before us today, the government has decided to go down this path, and I just hope that we do get it right.

The part that I am really quite pleased to see as a flow-on from this—and it would have happened with our proposed development down on the rail yards—is that the Riverbank development is to go ahead. In 2004, I spoke in this place about the possibilities and probabilities for the Riverbank development. I had some different ideas as I had been overseas and had a look at various cultural art centres and museums. I visited the Guggenheim offices in New York, and they were very keen to come down and develop a Guggenheim here on the riverbank.

Having visited the National Science and Space Museum in Leicester, England, I believe the next step would have been to develop a modern version of our Investigator Science Centre and build a national science museum—the Andy Thomas Space and Science Museum. Next to that would have been a pet project of Malcolm Buckby and Joan Hall (former members of this place)—that is, a children's museum. If you want to see a very good children's museum, I recommend that you go to the Helen Strong National Museum of Play in Rochester in New York state. You do not have to go there, as you can log on. It is an absolutely fantastic facility. It is not just a museum of play, it is like the Investigator Science Centre on steroids—it is just fantastic. Combining that with a national science and space museum would have given us weatherproof attractions that would have really done something for that precinct.

We have moved on from that, though. I understand some plans were drawn up by Serco—one of the providers of management and construction services—for a three-level development. The bottom level was electrified trains. The next level up was car parking and a complete Riverside development with retail and restaurants—a fantastic development. The next level up was the same level as the Convention Centre, and that would have then allowed the Convention Centre to expand over Morphett Road and then go into the Guggenheim, the national science and space museum and a national museum of play, and then onto a sporting complex down there. In our opinion, that was going to be a state—

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Point of order: very interesting, member for Morphett, but I thought we were talking about the oval. You seem to have wandered miles off down the track. Perhaps, at another time, you could share your thoughts with us on those issues.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I am disappointed at my good friend for pulling me up on this because the Riverside development is a crucial part of this whole oval development. It is a part that has been spruiked, and I think that in today's paper there is an article about the Casino and its development: the footbridge will be going across to link Adelaide Oval with the Riverside development.

You can do all of that. It has been around for a while. We are getting a variation on the theme now, and I look forward to seeing that development, rather than just the old rail yards that we have going down along the river. It is very, very important that, if we are going to do this development, we do it properly. Let's make sure that we do spend the \$535 million, and that is all it has to be—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Vlahos):** Can I suggest to the member for Morphett that he brings his questioning back to the matter at hand?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** \$535 million, ma'am—I'm talking about it.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I suspected that you were diverging, perhaps, on the museum section, but could you bring it back to the money?

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** It is all about money. It is all about the bill; it is all about the developments. You cannot look at Adelaide Oval alone. The government's own vision for Adelaide Oval is to make that part of the whole of the Casino and Riverbank development. It is not in isolation. Go and look on your own flyovers and pictures of what is going on, and the Adelaide Oval is an integral part of the rest of the development.

What we need to do is make sure we get all of that right so that we get best value for money, and \$535 million is a lot of money. We need to make sure that that is capped and that is what we are seeking to do. We want the Auditor-General to be able to go in and make sure everything is going as smoothly as we would like it to be and, to enhance that, we also want the

Public Works Committee of the parliament to have a good look at this and make sure that everything is open and transparent.

The Liberal Party, in one of our amendments through the member for Davenport, is proposing that rent be paid to the city council, and I think that is a good idea. That will give the city council some opportunity to participate in the provision of what could be a good facility if it is done properly and if it is handled by this government in the way it should have been handled from the word go.

I would have liked to have seen a covered stadium there and I will just quickly finish off by saying that, a few years ago, when I was at the replay of the grand final between Glenelg and Central Districts, they were redoing the western grandstand and so the formal dinner was being held under the Chappell Stands. The tables were laid out, and it was silver service. I was sitting at the very back table, tucked in the back corner. I was in opposition and just the shadow minister for sport and recreation at the time.

It was raining and it was blowing the crabs off the beach—it really was. I was getting soaked right at the very back of those stands. I remember wiping my plate down so that the waiter could put my bread roll on there. This is the concern that I have: 70 per cent of these seats are under cover but, when it pours in Adelaide, it really pours and it blows, so it may not be the stadium that we really should have had and could have had.

Lastly, I would like to finish off by saying: make sure that the cost of this stadium is not reflected in the ticket prices, because if the families cannot come up there and watch footy and cannot attend sporting events, then what is the point of it? If the Crows and Port do not start winning, people may not come but if they are winning, let us make sure that they can afford to get in there to support those football teams, and they can afford to watch the cricket and all the other events that will hopefully be going on at this facility. The Liberal Party is just putting in these safeguards. Let us make it work. It is a lot of money: let us make sure that South Australia is getting value for money on this redevelopment.

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (16:13):** First, I would like to congratulate the minister on the job he has done so far with getting this up to where it is in this house. However, just going back a bit, both sides of politics at the last general election went to the general public with an oval as part of their program. The Labor Party went through with the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval and the opposition went through with an enclosed stadium. They both went to the public itself with the same thing but at different venues. Both of those would have been in excess of \$500 million. The government has now capped it at \$535 million.

**Ms Chapman:** We are. We're going to cap it.

**Mr BROCK:** You are. We in this house will be capping that at \$535 million all up. In relation to the opposition's undercover one, it has been mentioned before that an undercover stadium would have been great. However, there is really an unknown factor on that one there.

I am a great follower of football. I follow the Crows, and the member for Morphett is correct: if the Adelaide Crows and Port Power do not start winning, then we will not have anybody coming to this new facility. I am a great lover of football. I am a great lover of cricket and we do need a great facility to be able to have those sports being played there, to be safe for the players and also have great surrounds and comfort for the paying public because it is the paying public who make or break the sporting venues.

As the member for Fisher has already indicated, this venue will go ahead. The Labor Party won the election. It has the mandate and this will go forward.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr BROCK:** They won the election, and they have formed government. They have the opportunity to be able to get this through and, as the member for Finniss has indicated, we need to make certain that we get this right. However, I have done a survey in my electorate. When this first came up, obviously, from a country member's point of view, I got a lot of flack, and I have to stand here today and support my electors out there.

I believe that the redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval (and this has been mentioned on many occasions) would be nice to have, but there are lots of other issues confronting this state, out there in regional parts of South Australia, that really need attention. They need roads and lots of stuff out there. It is like my own home budget—there are lots of things I would like to do but there



are priorities I have to maintain, and I have to keep telling my partner Lyn that. The fact is she thinks she is in charge of the household, and she is.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr BROCK:** She takes notice of me nothing! However, there are certain things we have to put back into the budget, and we have to plan and program for those things—and I think the Adelaide Oval redevelopment should be one of those things. We should be able to get all our other infrastructure up not only in the city of Adelaide but also in regional South Australia. The priorities must take precedence over lots of issues—not only for the state government but also in our own household. As I said earlier, in relation to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, we would love to be able to have that oval up and running and also have all the facilities in the country areas completed.

I want to elaborate on a few things in my own electorate of Frome. As I said earlier, I have many rural state-responsible roads that have not been maintained for many years, and both sides need to take responsibility for that because over many, many years they have been allowed to deteriorate. These roads have been neglected, and I will mention a couple of roads.

The Gladstone to Yacca to Clare road—if anyone has travelled on that road, they would know that that road is an absolute disgrace, and that road leads into the Clare and Gilbert Valleys region. It has just been mentioned that they have increased their interstate and overseas tourism by a fair bit, and it does not gel well with overseas visitors seeing those roads. I would hope they will come back again, but they may not.

The Port Broughton, Bute and Kulpara road is deteriorating so much that the fact is that, when the grain harvest goes through there, they are finding it hard and it is becoming a danger. I will be talking to the minister on Thursday about the main street of Bute. The main street of Bute has now got to the situation where it is lifting and lifting dramatically, and DTEI has classified that problem as a low priority. However, I will be talking to the minister about that on Thursday, together with the local council. Also, in relation to the completion of the Tarlee-Kapunda road, in the first year I was a member of this house, I was fortunate enough to get 2½ kilometres of seal, and in this year's budget, another 2½ kilometres of reconstruction, but that needs to be completed.

There are other uncertainties in regional South Australia with regional health services. I know that the minister has indicated and made public that he will not close any further hospitals in the regions. However, we need the uncertainty to go away that the current services are not only maintained but improved—and that is a cost factor that we need to address. At the same time, I have been trying with the minister to get some extra money for the PAT scheme, which has been the same since 1971.

There have been long delays in replacing a noncompliant diagnostic mammogram machine at the Port Pirie Regional Health Service, and the money that is being spent on the Adelaide Oval could be used to replace that machine, but they keep saying that it is part of a whole of state contract arrangement. That machine has been out of action for 18 months. We also have long delays in the child abuse helpline because of the lack of staff or training in the Families and Communities Service. Again, the money for the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval could have been pushed towards that issue.

There have been long waits for people requesting Housing SA homes. What has happened there is that, over the years, those houses have not been maintained. So, over the last few years, governments have been selling off those homes to bring in more funds. We should be doing it the other way around. There is a waiting list and some people have been on the waiting list for five to 10 years. That is not really responsible government.

There is also a lack of infrastructure out in the regional areas, and I am not only talking about berths but also natural gas pipelines, road infrastructure and rail to accommodate the growing resource opportunities in regional South Australia.

Just recently, as part of its inquiry, the Select Committee on the Grain Handling Industry went to the Mallee area, and a couple of rail lines there have speed and load restrictions. Again, that is hampering the regional areas and processing of grain. It has been a record year this year, and hopefully will be next year, so that is another area that we should be putting this money into.

I want to talk about rural bus services. As soon as the number of passengers comes below the magic number of 10 on a bus, qualified or accountable, the service is cut off. I know of many schools that have been affected. Because their numbers have gone down to nine, the department

has ceased the bus service, and I have had to talk to the minister's department on many occasions. To their credit, we have come to a compromise, but we should not have to do those sorts of things. These sorts of things should be maintained in regional South Australia because we deserve exactly the same as in Adelaide.

What I am trying to get around to is that the Adelaide Oval redevelopment is great. I think it is going to be a terrific thing for Adelaide itself and the sporting public. However, there are certain things in regional areas that we need to maintain, improve and give a lot more certainty to. I will be fighting for that as much as I can, and that is my contribution to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment bill.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (16:21):** It is my pleasure to rise to speak in relation to—

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** —the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill.

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** Of course, the attorney is trying to heckle me from the other side of the—

**An honourable member:** Former attorney!

**Mrs REDMOND:** The former attorney, sorry. I got so used to it over such a long period. The former attorney is trying to heckle from the other side of the chamber as though there was some problem but, indeed, if you talk to anyone who was at that meeting you will find that it was, indeed, a very productive meeting and that, unlike on that side of the chamber where you have to ring Don Farrell to find out what your position is going to be on any particular issue, we actually have mature debate and reach a very calm conclusion about what the party room wants to do. That is exactly what we did last night. Indeed, a number of people who have been here for a considerable amount of time have commented that it was about the best party room meeting they have ever been in, so well was it managed in terms of the team and the way we approached this problem.

It is a problem because the solution the government has come to has always been the second-best solution—it may be, indeed, the third-best solution. You may recall, Madam Acting Speaker—you were not here, of course—that football was played at AAMI Stadium and, according to the former treasurer, now police minister, that was the home of football. We started talking about bringing football into the city, and that was something that the public and the football community wanted to see happen. But, as the shadow treasurer outlined earlier today, the football community wanted that by way of a second stadium. That was always their preferred option.

In November 2009 I gave a speech at the Hilton Hotel to a leaders' lunch—there were hundreds of people there—and we showed our vision for what this city could be like if we put a new stadium on the old rail yards site. That was so popular that the government, a few months out from the election, suddenly thought, 'We have got a problem here. We had better do something about this. So, we are going to do something to the Adelaide Oval.'

The Adelaide Oval option was always not the best solution, because it was never going to be a roofed stadium. You need only ask the people who paid \$83, \$84 or \$85 last weekend to go to the soccer at the Adelaide stadium how wet they got at that particular venue while watching the soccer. You need only ask the Socceroos, who apparently have said they are never coming back to play at the Adelaide Oval.

What we proposed, of course, was a FIFA-compliant, retractable roof stadium, but the government said no to that and said, 'We will go to the Adelaide Oval.' My personal opinion is that they stand the risk of destroying what is known around the world as a wonderful iconic venue. But that is what they decided to do. They decided they would do that, having had some years in the meantime of Kevin Foley—sorry, the former treasurer—standing on the other side of this chamber saying, 'The home of football is AAMI Stadium.' Again and again he said it: 'The home of football is AAMI Stadium.' But, suddenly, a few months out from the election they were going to do something to Adelaide Oval and that was going to provide the stadium for football in the city.

Well, of course, they said at the time, '\$450 million, not a penny more. Absolutely, \$450 million, not a penny more.' And then, after the election—and they won the election—they suddenly said, 'Oh, not a penny more—we actually need \$85 million more'—\$85 million extra. So, \$450 million—

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order. With the deputy leader interjecting, I cannot hear the leader properly.

**Mrs REDMOND:** The Minister for Infrastructure will do anything to try to stop the flow of debate given that he does not want to hear us repeating for the public of South Australia that there was a solid promise. As usual—

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mrs Vlahos):** Leader of the Opposition, would you like to resume your speech?

**Mrs REDMOND:** —the government told us one thing before the election and then comes out with a completely different thing after the election, but, don't worry about it, it's only \$85 million. Of course, the \$450 million originally was to include all the car parking and the footbridge. After the election, not only is it \$85 million more (after being not a penny more) but it does not include the footbridge (that is only another \$40 million, or so) and it does not include the car parking—the car parking, which was always one of the prerequisites for football to move into the city.

So, what are we going to have? We have the government saying that that is what we are now going to have—not more than \$450 million, we are now up to \$535 million, but we have not figured out yet where the footbridge is to come from (or, indeed, where it is going to be placed) or the car parking. We have 3,400 car parks shy at this stage. The big question and the question that this bill seeks to address is: who is going to control the area?

Under the bill, of course, this all gets basically given to the minister who then gives it straight on to the Stadium Management Authority. Now, the Stadium Management Authority in turn consists of two private sporting bodies: the SACA (the South Australian Cricket Association) and the SANFL (the South Australian football league), because they actually own the AFL licences for Port Adelaide Port Power and the Crows. So, they own those licences.

I read today a report which I found quite interesting. It was actually reported online in *The Sydney Morning Herald* but it comes from *The Age* in Melbourne. *The Age* in Melbourne talks about the AFL and the fact that the AFL wants to help Port survive, and so on, and I quote from this article, which is by Ashley Porter in Adelaide today—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** It has already been refuted by the Casino.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Not the bit about the Casino; I know that.

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** Well, I don't know; I'm just telling you—

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** Madam Acting Speaker, it is disorderly for the minister to be interjecting.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Maybe you should stay on your own speech and ignore their interjections; and could the members on my other side please allow the debate to continue.

**Mrs REDMOND:** So, again, I quote from this article by Ashley Porter online today from *The Sydney Morning Herald*:

It means the AFL would become a stakeholder in Adelaide Oval with the newly-formed Stadium Management Authority with SANFL General Manager, Leigh Whicker, as its General Manager. The AFL involvement would certainly further irk a reasonable portion of the SA Cricket Association members.

I have no doubt it would, because their whole agenda in participating in this is, of course, that they want to get rid of the debt they have incurred in building the wonderful new western grandstand—you know, that western grandstand that has got the members' bar and no toilets on that level; that wonderful investment.

That is where we have got to, and that is what this bill is really all about: who is going to manage that precinct? We took the view that, rather than allow this government to continue down the path that it was going down (because if we rejected the bill, I have no doubt that the government was still going to go on with the project), it would simply compulsorily acquire the area and have no accountability, no transparency and no answerability to the people of this state.

I do not see how the government can possibly object to the conditions that we seek to put into this legislation. The amendments that we seek to put in may be generally divided into two different tranches, if you will: one is to allow the Adelaide City Council to maintain control and to

meet the requirements that it puts on. It thought that it was negotiating with the government prior to a couple of weeks ago and then suddenly found out that that was not the case at all. It now has agreed to certain things, but it wants certain conditions.

A number of the conditions that we seek to put in simply seek to give the Adelaide City Council the degree of control that they wish to keep. For instance, the council wants to exclude the areas like Light's Vision, the Pennington Gardens West, the Creswell Gardens and also that bit of land down the hill from Light's Vision where there are trees along the edge of the roadway. Furthermore, they want to control through community land management plans the areas that remain outside the Oval itself but within the four streets that bound the area. We think that there is some sensibility in that, rather than handing it over to the government.

We have decided to amend the legislation (or seek to amend the legislation). It will be interesting to see where the government goes with these amendments, but we seek to amend the legislation to accommodate the requirements and wishes of the Adelaide City Council as expressed to us. We think that they are quite reasonable because they maintain the ownership of the area ultimately with the existing situation, not handing it over holus-bolus to the government, particularly to the minister.

However, more importantly, we seek to bind the government to the commitments that they have made with respect to this oval. They have said they can do this; they are not going to spend a penny more than \$535 million. They have already spent some setting up the Stadium Management Authority; they have not finished the design. Indeed, when we met with the Stadium Management Authority, we specifically asked: how much is this new beautiful thing that they have shown us going to cost? The answer was: 'We don't know how much it is going to cost, but what we will guarantee is that we are not going to go over \$535 million. If it is not what we are showing you, well we are going to downgrade what we are going to produce.'

It may well be that the public who have voted in favour of this—particularly the SACA members and so on who have voted in favour of it—will find that they have been sold a pup because this thing is going to be scoped down, just like the Royal Adelaide Hospital, to keep within the budget. Do we trust this government in terms of staying within the \$535 million? Why would you when before the election they said not a penny more than \$450 million, and that was to include the car parking and the footbridge? So, we are well in excess of what they formally promised.

We said, okay, let's put in the legislation and, furthermore, let's put in provision for there to be accountability, both through Public Works Committee—because this matter should always, in my view, have gone to the Public Works Committee, if you read the legislation regarding what should be referred to that committee. We have always thought that should be there, but the only way to make sure this government actually does what it says it will do, we believe, is to put it into legislation.

Furthermore, we think it should have the Auditor-General able to keep an eye on this process because I have a feeling that this process is by no means done in terms of where this government is going to try to wheedle around how much money they spend and where—a bit like the Royal Adelaide Hospital. One of the things they did was take \$6 million out of the health budget to build a tram stop. They were going to have a train station underneath but then they decided against that, so they took \$6 million from the health budget. We cannot afford \$1.174 million to fund the Keith, Ardrossan, Moonta and Glenelg hospitals but we can afford \$6 million for a tram stop out of the health budget.

We believe it is necessary to put into this legislation the imperatives that the government apparently has already said they agree to. This is what they said they want. This is what they have said they are going to do. Indeed, where we have said that we want to establish a sinking fund, that is not something we have made up. The Stadium Management Authority at the briefing actually said they would be having a sinking fund, so we want to make sure that they do have that sinking fund. I do not see where the government can actually object to any of the things that we are suggesting because what we are suggesting is simply putting into legislation what they have said they are going to do, because we know that this government cannot be trusted when it comes to providing anything in this state.

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** No, you can't be trusted with regard to anything. The former attorney is absolutely right when he says that this government simply can't be trusted in relation to anything really; that is absolutely correct. As I began by saying, the opposition took the view—and you may

try to beat up all sorts of things, but the reality is that we had an extremely good party room meeting last night. We did not have any difficulty with each other.

**An honourable member:** Why do you keep talking about it?

**Mrs REDMOND:** Because the government keeps trying to beat it up as though there is some sort of problem.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** She protesteth too much.

**Mrs REDMOND:** No, not at all. You talk to anyone who was at the meeting and you will find that it was absolutely—

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

**Mrs REDMOND:** You think people are talking to you; people are talking to us. The public sector has turned. People out in the community have turned. No-one trusts this government any more. It is for that reason that we decided that the only way to go forward with this was to say that we will pass this legislation, but subject to certain conditions, which we say are the conditions that the government has already said that they are going to be binding themselves to anyway. It is just that we cannot trust them; we will put it into the legislation. That way they will be accountable to the parliament, to the Auditor-General and to a range of other people, including the Adelaide City Council, so that we have proper care, control and management, and that we have transparency and accountability, because this is a vast amount of money being spent to fund football and cricket in this state. It is time that this government was held to account over this issue, like so many others. With those few words, I will conclude my remarks.

**Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (16:36):** I would like to say, first of all, that I think some of the people in the regions find it a bit hard to understand why we would be spending this sort of money on an oval when some of our services, such as health services, the PAT scheme, mental health services, housing shortages, etc., are deficient. However, you must also bear in mind that any government has to have a balance between what it spends on social services and what it spends on infrastructure.

That balance right throughout the history of governments throughout the world has always had to be there, and it is the governments that have built the infrastructure at the right time that have made sure that their communities live a good life. If you look right throughout the world at the various infrastructure that has been built, no doubt they were all built at times when the money was not there. However, if we leave this go for another 10 years, it will cost a heap more dough and those social needs will still be there.

I must say that both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party prior to the election did promise that they would be bringing football back to the city centre, the Labor Party through the Adelaide Oval redevelopment and the Liberal Party with a new site. Personally, I support the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, in that it will cost less money and it will bring football back to the city centre for sure. It is quite unfortunate that people in the South-East have linked both the forestry sale and the Adelaide Oval redevelopment together. I think they are both completely divorced of each other and, whilst I do not support the forestry sale, I do support bringing football back to the city centre.

I think the great benefits will be that people will be able to walk to the football from the city centre and you will encourage a lot more people from the regions to come to Adelaide to go to the football. Also, for interstate visitors coming to Adelaide to go to the football this will be much more akin to what they do in Melbourne, where you can stay in the city centre, walk to Etihad or the MCG and walk back to the city centre. The city centre is a much nicer place to be than coming to Adelaide and having to get transport right out to AAMI Stadium. It just does not feel part of the ambience of the city.

I certainly support the fact that the Adelaide Oval redevelopment will be happening. I am encouraged by the fact that it will bring people into the city and that it will bring Adelaide up to the standard that some of our other capital cities have, so I will be supporting this bill.

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:40):** I rise to speak on the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill 2011 and indicate, as other speakers have, that I will be supporting the bill. In essence, this is a bill to facilitate a program brokered and signed off between the government and elite sport in South Australia to secure premises in the city for the presentation of that sport. There are a number of winners in that exercise: those who are members of the clubs that are being

supported and those who derive an income from them; and those who both now and in the future will have the capacity to enjoy that sport at the new facility that is proposed at Adelaide Oval.

There are always winners and losers. The losers, of course, are the taxpayers now and in the future who will not participate in or enjoy the benefit of any revenue stream from this facility, and they are a great number. Many of them live in regional South Australia, and it is not surprising to me to hear today that there are cries from representatives of those regions who are currently exhausted with complaint to the government about the lack of service and support that they have in regional South Australia. Those plaintive cries have gone unheard and it is concerning that we have a decision of the government to progress this project, perhaps even to announce it, back in late 2009, which I think was an attempt to avert what was an excellent proposal by the opposition as we went into an election.

It seems to me that the government at that stage was suddenly born again. It went from having a \$100 million project to inject into AAMI Stadium—and that was going to be the home of football and developed for that purpose—but after the opposition made an announcement, the government seemed to be born again and decided that it was going to development its own idea.

In any event, the idea is before us. The legislation is outlined here for the parliament's approval. As has been said, it is not actually necessary for the government to have legislation if, in fact, it presents a proposal subject to all the same rules. This aspect of the proposal, though, is puzzling to me and, I am sure, to a number of others; that is, why, when government members heard of the opposition's proposal to amend the legislation, did they not go out and make an immediate public statement to welcome these initiatives and say, 'We apologise to the people of South Australia for either refusing or failing to develop this bill properly,' and making sure that the bill was in order before they brought it to the parliament, demanding that we deal with it all in a hurry?

The areas of reform which have been outlined in detail by the lead speakers on this, and I will not repeat them, are essentially to restore in the process of this development—a \$535 million taxpayer development—all the normal planning processes that currently apply to any other major development of this kind in this state. To avoid that raises the question: does minister Rau have any confidence in his own planning processes in this state? Is the law or the governance that is already there adequate or not? If it is not, why is it not being applied in this situation? Why has the government not welcomed this level of capacity to be able to properly proceed with developments? It seems to take the Julia Gillard approach, that is, stuff the proper processes of planning, we are going to move in, whatever it is, a shed in a school or anything else, under the control of the minister, and we have seen what complete stuff-ups that precipitates. It puzzles me that not only did they attempt to avoid it, but even when we suggested it is necessary to be there they are hiding in the cave.

The next point is in relation to having proper scrutiny with the Auditor-General and the Public Works process. What is wrong with those processes? What is wrong with the Auditor-General's process? It is a level of accountability for all other major projects in the state, as is the Public Works. Why are we having to avoid this? Nobody has given any explanation for that.

We need an explanation as to why they have stripped this particular project of any scrutiny whatsoever. Here we are near the end of the day and we still have not even had a welcoming statement by the government to say, 'What a great idea. We are sorry we were too dumb to pick that up in the first place,' or, 'We shouldn't have tried to sneak it through, but having been alerted to it we will get it right and we will accommodate those amendments.'

Then we have the whole question of it being for free. Why is it that the taxpayer has to pay for all this? We have only heard from Demetriou and the other players out there—and there has been a lot of public comment about that. I am not here to argue about who should be making those other contributions, but when it was decided by this government to give the National Wine Centre to the University of Adelaide so that it could use it, provided it gave other universities some access to its facilities and have the benefit of all that income, did it give it over for free? No, it required that it pay rent—a multimillion-dollar piece of infrastructure in this state handed over to the University of Adelaide with a rental stream obligation.

Why is this any different? I think the government needs to explain that to us. SACA alone currently pays \$25,000 a year to the Adelaide City Council. Why is there not a little bit—not millions of dollars but nothing? The government needs to provide an explanation. Again, I would have thought we would welcome a revenue stream for that.

The cap is for obvious reasons; that is, in 9½ years the government has demonstrated, over and over again, that it cannot be trusted with money. If it says that it is not going to spend a penny more, then we need to put it in the legislation. We have had yet another disaster of fiscal mismanagement exposed today with the proposed hospital build, which demonstrates the need to have some security of a legislative cap.

The provision for any revenue stream to be invested back for the benefit of taxpayers goes with that. The opposition will move amendments regarding the protection of various places of heritage and importance, including the natural heritage of trees and the like, which have been identified. It has not escaped my attention, as I am sure it has the member for—where is he, Port Adelaide?

**An honourable member:** At the moment, this week.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I know, 'the fossil', yes. When the Premier was in opposition, he described the Parklands in South Australia as, 'Parkland isn't cheap land, it's priceless.' They are the words of the now Premier. He made ministerial statements and contributed to the Parklands structure that we have dealt with in this parliament over the last nine years. He said it was important that we protect the Parklands, yet this piece of legislation seeks to avoid all the protections that have been set up under that legislation.

That demonstrates complete abandonment by a Premier who has pretended to South Australia that he gives a fig (in particular, a fig tree) about the Parklands, yet is prepared to circumvent that. No demonstrable argument has been presented to us as to why the Adelaide City Council should be removed from having responsibility for managing these areas. It has done it for 100 years. It has made provision for the facility and access to these Parklands over a long period of time. They have asked for some, I think, reasonable amendments so that they might preserve their management and governance of this area of responsibility.

If the government has some secret information that suggests that they are incapable or unreliable, or simply should not be left with this responsibility, then let's hear it. But, at this stage, we have had all the sounds of silence from the government about why they should be able to have complete control of \$535 million, when other public monies are not given that benefit, which is then handed over to a minister to give to a proprietary company entity which has no accountability to this parliament and no accountability back to the people of South Australia.

I think that their refusal to even identify this is an insult to this parliament, and an insult to the very people out there who are going to be paying for this in generations to come. So, I say to the government: the silence is deafening in their failure to embrace what I think are reasonable reforms which have been outlined today, at length.

Let me say this: the Premier has form when it comes to stating one thing and doing another. We have had the mirage in the desert and now, of course, we have the Roxby Downs redevelopment, which is going to be the saviour of the state. Our parkland is not cheap, it is priceless, and then we have, 'Ignore all the legislation, we are going to do what we like, when we like and with what money we like, and bugger the rest.'

We have had the Minister for Police (the former treasurer) who went through the exercise of making an announcement which was obviously throwing all the taxpayers into the deep end. There was no explanation, nor any attempt to get any money from anywhere else. I think it is the only stadium in Australia that has all taxpayer money and no other private or invested stakeholder funds.

I suppose that he is the one who had the responsible portfolio, as treasurer, but he forgot about meetings, he wasn't quite sure about what meetings he had, and he was unsure about the money. He got sacked, of course, from that role, so he is probably irrelevant in the scheme of things—the fossil from the Port'. I think he may as well disappear and fill out a few more job applications. He is probably irrelevant, so I do not need to worry about him, but minister Conlon we do have to worry about.

Minister Conlon is the person, under this legislation, who is to be the grand Caesar of the whole auditorium and the whole development. He is going to have control of the lot, and the SMA are going to report to him. He is the one, as he says, who is going to have all the power under this piece of legislation. Clearly, he is, but he has an obligation and the opportunity—mostly the obligation—to protect the taxpayers of South Australia, and this bill and the way it is currently drafted utterly rejects that level of responsibility.

For someone who has been in this parliament for so long, who has understood the important accountability procedures of the Auditor-General, Public Works and other aspects, and has demanded them in other projects when in opposition, it is just unconscionable that he should even attempt to present such a piece of legislation.

The other two in which I am very disappointed are these: Minister Caica—where is he when you need him? He is the Minister for Environment and Conservation, for goodness' sake. He has completely disappeared on this subject and we have not heard a squeak out of him. Obviously, he does not give a fig about the fig tree or anything else. He is supposed to be our minister for heritage.

Then, of course, we have the Treasurer himself. He is the one who is going to be handing over \$535 million to the other minister, who is then going to hand it over to someone else, who is going to develop it for a private interest. Yet, the Treasurer himself has to come into this parliament every day and be accountable for every other dollar that he allocates in budgets for the purposes of infrastructure to this state. If it is over \$4 million, it has to go to Public Works, and if it to any other public entity, it has to go through the audit process.

So, the Treasurer has to stay under scrutiny, but this bill is going to hand over \$535 million—that he has to go out and borrow because he hasn't got it, remember. So, he has to go and borrow it, he has to go and suck up to somebody to get the money, then hand it over to minister Conlon, and then it goes off the radar as far as any accountability is concerned.

Finally, we have the Deputy Premier and minister for planning. What is it that is so defective about our legal protection under planning, our provision under the Development Act and the capacity or responsibility of DAC or anyone else in the structure of planning that is so hopeless, that is so incompetent, that we cannot use it for this project? Where is the Deputy Premier on this, as the minister for planning? What is wrong with his legislative framework? What is wrong with that governance? What is wrong with that planning procedure that we should so alienate just this project from it?

Even the government, while saying the desal plant was a PPP, said, 'Well, even though we don't have to go to Public Works, we will anyway. We're going to show how transparent we are and we're going to hand that over and we're going to do it.' We have not had quite the same open, honest, accountable approach with the Royal Adelaide Hospital, of course. We still have not seen that contract. Mind you, we still have not seen the contract for the desal plant, but at least the process has gone through Public Works. There has been no offer for Public Works' scrutiny for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and none either for this, so I do wonder where our minister for planning is.

The legal structure that is being established here in some way would keep some link with the people of South Australia, but as Attorney-General, the minister is completely silent as well. All the senior people of this cabinet have utterly failed the people of South Australia in the bill that they have presented us. They have had plenty of time to develop it and draw it up, but all of them have utterly failed South Australia. If they do not accept the opposition's proposed reinvestment of scrutiny to protect the people of South Australia, they will have not only ignored the opportunity to do so but also failed the people of South Australia in not doing so.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (16:56):** I am in favour of top-level football at Adelaide Oval. I have the fondest memories of top-level football of the 1960s and 1970s at the Adelaide Oval. I attended my first grand final there in 1965 when, notoriously, Port Adelaide defeated Sturt by five points.

**The Hon. M.J. Wright:** Three.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Three, was it? Under a goal.

**Mr Pengilly:** What happened the next year?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** The next year, Sturt prevailed easily.

**Mr Pengilly:** 66,000 people.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** 66,000 people. That's right.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** My first grand finals were '71 and '72 and we got flogged by Barrie Robran.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yes, that's right. The Minister for Transport interjects that Port Adelaide was flogged by Barrie Robran. I should add that in the 1971 grand final, Port Adelaide,



with that traditional lack of guts and determination, failed to score a goal to half-time. Then in 1972, they were beaten by even more.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** But then we had the Woodpeckers.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yes, and I have happy memories of—

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Do you remember the Woodpeckers?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yes, I remember the Woodpeckers, the Minister for Police. I do remember the Woodpeckers because it was a great year—1973—when Woodville won the Reserves grand final at Adelaide Oval, and Glenelg, in the greatest grand final ever played in the history of the SANFL—the last grand final at Adelaide Oval—prevailed over North Adelaide with that magnificent mark by Graham Cornes.

I am all in favour of the top-level football of today—AFL football—coming back to Adelaide Oval, but I am only in favour of it at a certain price. I think it will be good for the whole of the central business district that AFL football be played at Adelaide Oval. I think one of the great virtues of Adelaide as a city is that most people who live in Greater Adelaide use the central business district at one time or another. The return of football to Adelaide Oval will mean that an even greater proportion of people who live in Greater Adelaide will use Adelaide city and that is a good thing because I have been to cities in the world where people who live quite close to the central business district have, nevertheless, never visited it.

An example that springs to mind is Liverpool, which has a lovely CBD. But people who live in Bootle or Birkenhead, or even many people who live in Kirkdale, almost up alongside the CBD, have never been to the Liverpool CBD; they have never found a reason to go there. So, I do not like that segmentation in some cities in the world. I think it is a tremendous thing for Adelaide that nearly everyone in the Adelaide metropolitan area would have a reason, at some time during the year, to use the Adelaide central business district.

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

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Indeed. So, I am a supporter of this proposal.

**An honourable member:** In soccer terms.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It just means Real Madrid; that's what it means. So, I am in favour of it at the stated price of \$535 million, which is, of course, a very, very large sum of money. I am glad that the Liberal Party is now aware of my motion in the parliamentary Labor Party and seeks to place it in legislation. It is very flattering.

The problem I have had with some aspects of the Adelaide Oval proposal is the attitude of its supporters, the big end of town—the measures they were prepared to take to make sure that this proposal got up. I am a supporter of AFL football at Adelaide Oval, but I find the News Limited coverage of the topic comical. News Limited, by which I mean the *Sunday Mail*, *Adelaidenow* and *The Advertiser*, has a policy that all of us must support AFL football at Adelaide Oval and, if we do not, we need to be hounded out of public life—and I will give an example. If go back to just before the last election, the now Deputy Leader of the Opposition (the member for MacKillop) came out and stated, quite truthfully, that the parliamentary Liberal Party had not made a binding budget decision to support a city stadium. It supported a city stadium on principle, but it had not set aside money in its budget projection, should it come to—

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

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Well, he may, as the Minister for Transport said, have said it more bluntly. The response of News Limited was to publish an online poll, where the member for MacKillop was named, and what he had said was summarised in the poll. Then you had the choice (and forgive me if I do not get this exactly correct) of saying that he was an idiot, moron, wally or git, and there was nowhere to click to say that you actually supported him or thought that he was a good fellow, which was the option I was looking for at the time.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** And the difficulty is?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** The Minister for Transport says, 'And the difficulty is?' But it is just an illustration of how we are not well served by News Limited in its coverage of civic affairs in this state. In fact, I wrote a letter to the *Sunday Mail* just recently, which was not published, so I will share it with you all. I said:

Last week, the *Sunday Mail* published 'sources have told the *Sunday Mail* that 'Up to 60 p.c. of SACA members have given their support to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment through their proxy votes.' If this report had been true, which it wasn't, SACA would have been falling at least 15 percentage points short of its 75 p.c. target and the redevelopment would now be dead. The headline placed on this story in the edition I bought was 'Resounding yes vote for oval'—

Megan Lloyd claims that the heading was 'Big yes vote for oval'; be that as it may—

The headline misrepresented the story underneath, which was telling us that the yes vote was failing. In my opinion, the headline was just more of the News Limited boosterism that plagues its reporting of civic affairs in our State.

That the headline turned out to be true and the story false had nothing to do with ethical or competent journalism. If a story predicts such-and-such will not happen and the headline says it will happen, one is bound to be right. There are many reasons why I buy the *Sunday Mail* and *The Advertiser* (such as the death notices, the footy scores and the weather, which editorial management has not yet taken to distorting), but I do not buy them for competent and accurate reporting of the civic life of the state. With every story on civic affairs, the reader must interpret the story through the prism of News Limited's commercial interest and the personal likes and dislikes of editorial management.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Thank you for agreeing with me, member for Finniss. I read out an earlier letter which Megan Lloyd refused to publish in the *Sunday Mail* when she had been on the *Spin Cycle* saying, 'How dare the caucus, the parliamentary Labor Party, put a cap on the spending on a city stadium. How dare they? Who are they to put on a cap?', and then she canvassed with another News Limited employee the need for the taxpayer to spend up to \$1 billion on a city stadium.

Let me turn to the Adelaide City Council. The first thing to say about the Adelaide City Council is that it is the last of the rotten boroughs. It is like a rotten borough in England circa the 1830s, or perhaps before the Reform Act. The Adelaide City Council lives off the rate revenue of the Central Business District—off the businesses that are carried on in the City of Adelaide. It lives off Rundle Mall, David Jones and Woolworths, and all the many enterprises that occur in the CBD and North Adelaide. It gives the residents of the CBD and North Adelaide an enormous rate reduction based on the 'terrible inconvenience' of living in the CBD. Then, of course, these people who benefit from this rate rebate elect the councillors and they prevail, in any election, over the business interest in the CBD.

*Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yes. So we have, in a sense, householders in North Adelaide determining the policy of the Adelaide City Council. What happens in the context of Adelaide Oval is that some householders in North Adelaide see top level football and cricket and large crowds at Adelaide Oval as diminishing their residential amenity. That is all they look at. So, of course, the Adelaide City Council is going to try to give the Adelaide Oval proposal the death of a thousand cuts. Councillor Moran has not even started to think of all the things that she can do to obstruct this Adelaide Oval proposal.

So, the Parliamentary Liberal Party is saying, 'Why don't you do what the Adelaide City Council says? Why don't you go through their normal processes?' If we do that with this Adelaide Oval proposal, it is sure and certain to fail.

**Mr Marshall:** Down with democracy!

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** No, I am afraid I must interrupt the member for Norwood there. Thank you for your contribution during my contribution. But the Adelaide City Council is anything but democratic. It is the opposite of democracy.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Norwood, according to the piece of paper in front of me, you have already been warned once, is that correct?

**Mr Marshall:** I am not aware of it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, you have been. Yes, you are. You were warned during question time.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! And, I have to admit, never having had the opportunity to do so, I wouldn't mind throwing you out. I can see that it upsets the member for Finniss. It does; it upsets him. I am not going to because there is a special system by which you are given chances. But, member for Norwood, you do seem to interject an awful lot. That's all. Carry on, member for Croydon.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** So, remember, this is not just the Adelaide City Council that closed Barton Road. It is the council that considered closing War Memorial Drive and it is the council one of whose long-term plans is to close Jeffcott Road. We have councillor Moran saying that we could not build the new Royal Adelaide Hospital on the rail yards because the rail yards were Parklands. So, at some point, presumably, councillor Moran wants to rip up the railway tracks and to prevent trains from coming into Adelaide because they are travelling over parkland.

**Ms Thompson:** It brings in the great unwashed!

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** It brings in the great unwashed, as the member for Reynell rightly says. I do think that we must be wary in this Adelaide Oval debate of being dictated to by over-mighty subjects, such as the News Limited management and the Adelaide City Council. We must act in the interests of taxpayers and the whole of South Australia, and that means standing up to News Limited; it means standing up to vested interests like the Adelaide City Council.

The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bragg cried crocodile tears about some parkland being used for parking and how terrible it would be if people parked on parkland. Clearly, the Leader of the Opposition has no memories of the great grand finals leading up to and including 1973, because you had 65,000, 66,000 people coming to Adelaide. Where do you think they parked? They parked on Pinky Flat. They parked on the lawns north of Adelaide Oval. My own father used to sneak a park in St Mark's College or in some pub car park.

**Ms Thompson:** And they caught the train and the trams.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** And they caught the train and the tram and the buses that used to gather in Victor Richardson Drive. Remember this: this government, the Rann Labor government, is in the process of returning the whole of the EWS depot opposite the police barracks to parkland. We are actually walking the walk on Parklands' preservation and extension.

**The Hon. J.M. Rankine:** But that's in the west.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Of course, as the member for Wright interjects, it is in the west, in the western suburbs, so it does not matter. So, no-one who matters notices it. It is not the way that Adelaide City councillors go home, or it is not the way that News Limited executives go home.

**Mr Pengilly:** They can't get through Barton Terrace West, you see.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Watch this space, member for Finniss, watch this space. Yes, I am a supporter of AFL football at Adelaide Oval. I am not a supporter of it at any price. But I welcome the fact that the parliamentary Liberal Party has come on board for the proposal, because it means making irrelevant those people in the other house who would have obstructed this meritorious proposal.

**Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (17:13):** I am never quite sure whether it is a good idea to follow the member for Croydon, but there were some issues there with which I actually agree with him. The die was cast well and truly on 18 March last year when the government won the majority of seats in the house, though it did not win the majority of the vote.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** Still hurts?

**Mr PENGILLY:** Yes, it does hurt. Yes, absolutely. However, the reality also is that a decision has been made to get on with Adelaide Oval. Let me also add that last night—and I pick up on what the leader said in her speech—was one of the best meetings of the parliamentary Liberal team that I have attended in my five-odd years here. Despite the best efforts of the press to garner some sort of nonsense about what went on, it was very balanced, and I pay tribute to all my colleagues who took part in that discussion.

Obviously the Liberal Party is going to support this legislation and get on with it, and I sincerely hope that Adelaide Oval as an AFL venue will be a great venue and will contribute significantly to the wellbeing of South Australians. However, in saying that, let me also add that in my electorate I have received copious, numerous and regular comments from my constituents that

they are totally opposed to the expenditure of \$535 million on this project. In fairness, there are also some members of my electorate who support it; that is no surprise.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr PENGILLY:** No, they are not actually. That is no surprise to anybody. We need to remember that this project is only going to benefit 1 to 2 per cent of the South Australian population who attend this venue for whatever sport they choose. It is also of great concern—and it has been raised by members on both sides, as I recall—that currently, with the way the Port Adelaide Power and the Adelaide Crows are going, it is a struggle to get too many people to football at all. It is a major concern, and I blame a lot of that on the current hierarchy of the AFL.

I think that when Wayne Jackson was there it was a much more amenable and fair organisation. I think it is totally biased towards Victorian sides. It was a deliberate strategy. Mr Demetriou was put in place to carry that out. If you can remember a few years ago, they were squealing like stuck pigs because they thought they were not going to have any sides in the finals and they have turned that right around, so perhaps they are a bit smarter than we are.

I hope that out of this there will be considerable funds coming back through SACA, SANFL and the Stadium Management Authority to country sport. I think that is a really critical issue. I know that right across South Australia, but indeed across my electorate, the junior sports that are played—whether it be at Encounter Bay, Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, Yankalilla or Kangaroo Island; it does not matter where—are all desperately in need of additional funding and promotion. It is imperative that this be put in place to provide country junior cricketers and junior footballers (or whatever) with more money to help them develop themselves. There is no greater training for a young child than to be involved actively in a well-run football, netball, tennis or cricket club where they learn some disciplines, and it has worked time and time again.

One of the major concerns that I have is simply the cost of attending AFL football. It is getting beyond the ordinary working-class family to be able to attend. It is getting to become a horrendous cost. If you run through at the moment where we are—and there was quite a bit of discussion on the media this morning about the increases in council rates—we have water rising alarmingly, we have power costs going through the roof, we have the price of fuel relatively high even though it did drop a bit last week. The cost of living is so high. I was rather bemused to read in the paper on the weekend, with the picture of the Treasurer and his family, that they are claiming to have a \$400 a week grocery bill, that he knows how tough it is. Well, on \$240,000 or \$250,000 a year, I have had a bit of trouble swallowing that one, I have to tell you.

The opposition wants this project limited to \$535 million, and we will pursue that. I hope the government does come to some sort of an arrangement with the opposition, whether in this house or another place. On that matter, I am pleased that the project is going to Public Works Committee; I think that is an ideal situation. It will allow the project to be sussed out in that committee and, should there be any attempt to try to hijack that hearing and make it much shorter than it should be or any other such stupid action, the government will pay the price on that one. It is important that it is going there—indeed, the hospital should be coming there as well, but that is another story.

It is vitally important that this project is scrutinised and that South Australian taxpayers get accountability; that is a major issue for this side of the house. So, once again it is up to the government to agree, either in this place or when it goes to another place. I am sure it will happen up there whether they like it or not. I reluctantly support this legislation. I heard what the member for Frome had to say earlier. He said a lot of the things that I could translate immediately to my own electorate, as could other country members, I am sure. However, I will support it, because that decision has been made by the Liberal Party and we need to get on with it. As I said, I want it to be a highly successful venue and I want it to be successful for decades to come, but we will wait and see on that. It is a lot of money.

Sport is almost the most important community activity in rural and regional areas, but it is poorly invested in. I say again, sports clubs in electorates need that inflow of money. The SMA is set up as a non-profit proprietary limited company. I would hope that the profits are invested in rural and regional sport. It is a great opportunity for country sport to be better funded. This Rann Labor government, and whether it be a Rau Labor government, a Snelling Labor government or a Weatherill Labor government—

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

**Mr PENGILLY:** Or a Conlon Labor government—I don't think so, and it definitely will not be a Fox Labor government. This government has a totally shambolic record with respect to building projects. You only have to look at what has happened with the desalination plant. It has blowout after blowout. It could not organise a good chook raffle or a Liberal Party function, quite frankly. That is a great reason for the Auditor-General to have oversight over this project. The Auditor-General told the Public Works Committee that he cannot have oversight of the hospital, and that is totally unacceptable. However, that is history as well. The project going through Public Works will ensure that the parliament as a body is kept informed.

Adelaide City Council took a bit of a pasting from the member for Croydon a few minutes ago. It is interesting that Adelaide City Council seems to be the convenient whipping boy over all of this. I do understand, to some extent, the hiccups that may have occurred had this gone through the ACC planning process, so I am very pleased that it is going to the Development Assessment Commission. I believe that it will give it proper oversight, adjudicate on what category it is, make a determination on that, go through the proper processes and come out, no doubt, with an approval. However, it may well put conditions on it.

As I said, the Adelaide City Council took a flogging here a few minutes ago. I noted that, earlier in the afternoon, there were quite a number of them in the upper gallery, but they are not there now. The member for Adelaide, no doubt, will pick up on that when she has her two bob's worth on this motion. However, just at the moment I believe that the planning side of it needs special attention. It is critical that it does go through the proper planning process and that that takes its course. The heritage nature of the ground, the scoreboard and the fig trees have all been mentioned.

This is still very much going to be a B-grade stadium. You only had to hear what members who went to the soccer over the weekend had to say, where they got wet sitting in particularly good seats. I do not think that is the right outcome for the place. Quite frankly, it is a joke, and I think we run the risk of having a joke of a stadium in South Australia because it is not going to be as good as it should be. However, we are supporting the project. I say again that we do hope that it is successful. The decision was made to get behind it and push forward with it, but I place on the record once again the fact that I do think that we could use money in other places, quite frankly.

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (17:24):** It is my great pleasure also to make a contribution to the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill 2011, and it is really hard to consider where to start. The attitude in this place is rather interesting. The contribution by the member for Port Adelaide earlier today was one of the better speeches I have heard. While I did not agree with everything that he said, I appreciated the manner in which he put it, where he actually put some things into historical perspective as he understood it, and other issues, too. It demonstrates to me that, with this confrontational attitude that seemingly exists within the parliament all the time, when you try to take the politics out of it and talk about real issues, you can have a dialogue that is going to get a good result.

I will declare from the very start that I am a bit of a sports tragic. I would love to have been much better at sport than I turned out to be. I have one uncle who won six Mail Medals. He played a few games of league footy until he got a knee injury. I was a pale shadow of him, but I did love the game. I was lucky enough to play in a couple of A grade grand finals at centre half forward—

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

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** I could kick with both feet, minister. I had some skills but not all that I needed.

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

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** No, both feet. I played cricket until I was 42 and I loved that game also. I have the odd game, but these days it is limited to the opportunity of the media vs the parliament game. One of my greatest sporting pleasures was to play on Adelaide Oval No 2 three years ago in a match against the media. I did so because I have always been very much a fan of Sir Donald Bradman, and to have had the opportunity to play on an oval so close to where so many of his exploits were witnessed by thousands of Australians and South Australians gave me a great sense of pride.

It is interesting to reflect on sport and the importance that it plays in South Australia's psyche, and it is a particularly important one. We are very proud when our football teams do well, when our basketball team does well, when our cricket team does well, when our netball teams do

well, lacrosse, hockey, all of those sports, because we are a community that takes up a vast number of sporting opportunities, and it is appropriate, indeed, that the government and the parliament work to provide the best possible sporting opportunities and facilities that we can.

That is why the debate has occurred over the last three years—since Martin Hamilton-Smith, as leader of the opposition at the time put his vision forward about an Adelaide CBD sporting facility, and there was the committal of that as part of a major speech from Isobel Redmond as Leader of the Opposition in November 2009 with the opposition's vision for riverside west development, for a covered stadium with a 50,000 capacity, \$750 million, and underground car parking opportunities, as part of a revitalisation of that whole part of Adelaide, and to open it up for the people instead of it being a wasteland as it had been for decades and decades.

It brought the debate into the public realm, and anybody who has had a radio or watched a television or read a newspaper in the last two years would be very aware of the effort that the media has put into promoting the debate about sporting facilities in the city.

I take on board the member for Port Adelaide's earlier comments, when he talked about the opportunity for Adelaide to be a vibrant city within the next five years. I translate that also into the hope that all of South Australia's regional communities become vibrant communities too, and it is important that we provide the forum for that to occur. That is where government decisions and government policy, and opposition decisions and policy, really come to the fore.

It is important that we have the absolute best level of sporting facilities. We recognise in the main that only the elite sports people will play in those ones but it creates an ambition opportunity for all of us, and that is what I am driven by. I want every young sporting person, male or female, to strive to be the absolute best that they can, and if they do well in sport they will do well in life. I believe that there is a strong connection between the two.

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

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Fair view, it's true. It creates an attitude, and communities work hard at providing sporting facilities. The Adelaide Oval and the South Australian Cricket Association has worked hard for over 100 years to have the absolute best facility there. The decision created in the early seventies when the SANFL decided to build a stadium at West Lakes, then called Football Park, and then AAMI Stadium, was one they made in the fullness of what they wanted to do for football too. But, indeed, the merger to come back is the best one.

Both parties prior to the 2010 election wanted to create that opportunity. We certainly espoused our vision firmly in November 2009. Within about three weeks the government was there with all the media opportunities in early December to again talk about Adelaide Oval and what they were intending to do, and that is the opportunity that is provided to government that oppositions do not have. We can talk about visions but we cannot talk about the real dollars being available straightaway, and to pull those people in, because we do not have that chance. It was important, though, that the debate started to occur and it meant that it was an opportunity for Adelaide Oval or a central stadium to get the recognition that it needed.

Like a lot of members who will speak on this bill, I recognise that there are many competing demands for the \$16 billion that currently makes up the state's budget. Certainly, regional people want to see a lot of money expended in their area and metropolitan people want to see money expended close to them, too. You could argue that only a relatively small number of the population will get the benefit of any facility that is built, but in essence the opportunity is there for any person to have access to it.

That is why governments, historically, have invested in a range of social infrastructure—because they want to see that opportunities exist for people no matter what their interests are. You could argue that art galleries, museums and libraries are all an example of this social infrastructure, and sporting facilities should be equally so.

History records the fact that the government has had several changes of perspective on this. Three years ago I think the budget papers showed—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** What about you?

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** True. Three years ago the budget papers showed a \$100 million commitment to an upgraded AAMI Stadium, and some \$10 million or thereabouts of that was expended on some projects there. After we made our preliminary announcements, the SANFL did

some review work into a stadium in a CBD location. I believe that was \$643 million. That did not go very far and then the government managed to pull people in.

The debate has been held around the community. The SACA vote was an important effort to ensure that there was a definitive statement made by a collection of people. You could argue whether it was the SACA vote or the vote in March last year that determined the result—but it was March last year's vote. Clearly, that was the defining moment for it.

In relation to the SACA vote, it really surprised me that only about 50 per cent of SACA members chose to take up that opportunity to express their position, and 80.3 per cent of the vote or thereabouts voted in support of the motion. Media comments prior to that Monday seemed to indicate that it was going to be a big struggle, so there must have been a lot of people right at the end who put in proxies or made the effort to vote, and that turned it around a bit. It really showed that the majority wanted it.

You could argue that only half voted but the reality that confronted us during detailed discussions in the Liberal Party room last night (and it was a very robust debate, a good three hours) was that the majority stood and put their position on various aspects of the legislation under consideration as proposed by the government.

It was one of the best meetings I have ever been involved with because we came out with an agreed position in that we thought public accountability was the key thing, and it came down to what had been committed by the government as part of its proposal to the people and what it was going to be held to account on. That is what the amendments outlined by the member for Davenport in his shadow ministerial responsibility were and the position of the party to support the bill, which comes with a lot of reservations—I am sure people would understand what it comes down to.

There will be no easy answer to this. The opposition intends to move quite vigorously on these amendments. I hope that minister Conlon, in his consideration, acknowledges that these amendments are worthwhile. They are made to ensure that public accountability is there and to ensure that scrutiny is available, because that is what should happen when you are expending this level of funds.

Budgets are tight. We have an increasing debt level which is going to create an enormous interest impost upon the public purse for many years to come. In many infrastructure projects that are being funded to a large degree by level of debt borrowings, accountability must be in place. That is why we want to ensure that the Auditor-General's office is involved in the review of expenditure on this project. It cannot expect to suddenly go through \$535 million without ensuring that the outcome as to commitments that have been given is the best possible one.

When the tender prices come in (in October or November, I believe) I will be interested to see how closely they align to the financial capacity that exists. When opposition members had their briefing from the Stadium Management Authority the question was posed, 'What do you do if it is more than \$535 million?' The answer was basically that they have to scale back the project to make it fit within the dollars.

I strongly support the idea that the responsibility for determining the appropriateness of a development should be transferred to the Development Assessment Commission. I am uncomfortable with a minister having the level of responsibility proposed by this bill, because it makes the minister of the day the all-powerful, all-seeing one—the autocrat who has total control—and that is not a situation I like to see in place. Again, involving the Development Assessment Commission, who are experts in this field and who will base their decision upon what the development plan says—and because it is a sporting precinct already, I see that as being no problem—they will ensure that the outcome is the right one. The difficult job will then be to match the dollars versus what the project needs are and to make it all fit. Getting that right is not going to be easy.

The Auditor-General's review does have some precedent. I am advised by the Hon. Rob Lucas that this level of involvement has occurred in other projects. I think it is a good one. There has been a lot of debate as to whether this project and the RAH will go to Public Works. As I understand it, the government has committed to a Public Works review which involves three-monthly updates—and the minister might want to correct me on that. That is a really good outcome and I hope that that allows parliament to be involved in the process on a continuing basis. The Auditor-General's involvement allows the people of South Australia to have some confidence that a completely independent person is reviewing the process. In addition, the opposition is going to

move an amendment to put in place a cap on expenditure. This all comes back to public accountability.

We can all stand up and talk for hours about the debate that occurred prior to the election regarding what our proposal was going to cost, what the government's proposal was going to cost, and whether the member for Port Adelaide had a conversation with Leigh Whicker five weeks before the election in which he was updated on what the additional costs would be above the \$450 million. We know the end result of that and the fact that the minister is no longer responsible for the project and a variety of other things. It comes down to the public wanting to ensure that this cap is met. They were promised \$450 million and not a cent more on one occasion. It is important that these constraints are put in place to ensure that we get some outcomes.

I just want to talk about some other issues that are associated with this. I am pleased that the Stadium Management Authority also recognises the importance of country support for footy in the city. There are thousands and thousands of people from regional South Australia who love going to Crows and Port Power games, and long may they have the opportunity to do so. I do recognise that the public transport options that exist within a CBD location are a vast improvement on the West Lakes facility—there is no doubt about that. The system is designed to bring people into the city.

I hope that there will be key parking areas for people catching public transport from the north, south or east of the city so that they do not all have to drive into the city and try to find car parks—and the minister nods in agreement. I know the SMA is focused on that too. I am not sure whether the Tea Tree Plaza option that I was told about by the SMA is necessarily a solution for people coming more directly from the north, but they will work through that.

People want to support footy, they want to support cricket, they want to make sure that our teams are successful, and they want to ensure that they have the best possible opportunity to go to a stadium that complies with all their expectations. We are an increasingly demanding community who want to see the absolute best everywhere. Now, the minister knows better than I, but even from an outside perspective so many demands come in all the time that you just shake your head and wonder how the hell you can actually meet all these priority demands when you do not have the dollars.

No matter how successful the economy is, as a society, we will never provide everybody with what they need all the time. It is the difficulty of determining priorities which makes the job of a minister very hard and, indeed, that of a treasurer very difficult. I hope one day to have an opportunity to be involved in that at some level.

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

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Yes, true. That is about the challenge. Members will talk about the fact that sport is fighting for its survival at the moment—footy more so than any other. We are a very fickle lot. We like to see success continually, and when that is not there, we suddenly get very upset. Port Power's Dean Brogan was quoted as saying, 'Don't jump on the bandwagon when we are doing well again, support us now while we are challenged.' Adelaide Crows supporters need to have that same attitude, instead of talking about sacking the coach.

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

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** True, I know. There will be amendments moved by the opposition. There will be lots of questions raised in the committee stage. There will be very pertinent points and we will put forward our position quite passionately. I am hopeful that the minister will recognise the worthiness of some of these amendments, and I am sure that, when it reaches the upper house, a lot of effort will be put in to ensure that our amendments are supported, because we need to make it right.

I acknowledged after the election, 'Okay, the result has gone the way I didn't want it to but the result has gone that way.' When we had the party debate, I spoke relatively early in the piece and put forward my case about my level of frustration at things said before and after the election and the result, but the fact is that, as a society, we have to be prepared to move on.

I would love to see half a billion dollars devoted to a hell of a lot of projects around the place, but a priority was determined by both major political parties going into the election that the key points for them were going to be the Royal Adelaide Hospital and a central sporting facility and the result occurred, so let's make it happen.



The minister will have a lot of interesting challenges over the construction period, no doubt about that. Time demands will be placed on him because no doubt he wants to ensure that the official opening occurs as close as possible to before the 2014 election.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** There's no chance of that, no matter what we do. I wouldn't worry.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The minister confirms that there is no chance of an opening before the 2014 election 'no matter what we do, don't worry'. Building companies have been known to—'Hurry up a bit, boys, we want to make sure we get this finished on time. We want to have a nice opening.'

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

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** It could be like the Northern Expressway opening. You had about three of those, I reckon.

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

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** That's right, yes: a lot of money goes into it. Our building industry is going to be challenged to make all this happen with the things that are occurring at once, but there are going to be some economic spin-offs. I have some concerns about the impact on the West Lakes area. The economic modelling that we have been shown talks about a great spin-off opportunity for the CBD area. What is it going to do to West Lakes? There will need to be some support for them there, also.

The fact that both parties wanted to bring major sport into the CBD on nearly a weekly basis is an example of the fact that they recognise the importance of the city of Adelaide as an economic driver for our whole state. It provides an entertainment forum and a recreational forum, and it means that people come to the city and actually get to enjoy a far greater degree of what the great aspects of the city of Adelaide truly are.

Many other contributions are going to be made. Government accountability is an important issue for the opposition. I am particularly attracted by the fact that there will be an expectation of some level of rental as part of this legislation from the amendments put by the opposition and indeed that those funds are to be devoted to the Recreation and Sport Fund because I know, with only about \$6.5 million per year and there being so many competing demands, we need a lot more money going to rec and sport around all of South Australia.

I am a little bit interested in, and I will ask some questions of the minister during the committee stage about, the 400 car parks that are intended to be created under the corporate section on the eastern grandstand and the access point for that. Is that coming through the alignment of Victor Richardson Drive or is there another intention to take it through some parkland area? How is that going to get there?

A lot of detailed questions will be put to the minister in the committee stage, but it is only designed to ensure that the outcome of the project is the best that it can be. I would have loved it to have been a brand new stadium with a covered roof to provide the absolute best of facilities for the sporting spectator in South Australia, but the government has decided to go ahead with this project. The responsibility of the parliament is to ensure the absolute best outcome from it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. P.F. Conlon.

### **MOTOR VEHICLES (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No.1. Long title—Delete ' '; and to make related amendments to the *Civil Liability Act 1936*'

No.2. Clause 4, page 3, lines 3 to 8 [clause 4(1)]—

Delete subclause (1)

No.3. Clause 4, page 3, lines 9 to 13 [clause 4(2)]—

Delete subclause (2)

No.4. Clause 4, page 3, lines 14 to 20 [clause 4(3)]—

Delete subclause (3)

No.5. Clause 4, page 3, lines 25 to 33 [clause 4(6)]—

- Delete subclause (6)
- No.6. Clause 5, page 4, lines 16 to 18 [clause 5(2), inserted subsection (7aa)(c)(ii)]—  
Delete subparagraph (ii)
- No.7. Clause 5, page 4, lines 29 and 30 [clause 5(3), inserted paragraph (c)(ii)]—  
Delete subparagraph (ii)
- No.8. Clause 5, page 4, lines 38 and 39 [clause 5(5), inserted subsection (7ab)(b)]—  
Delete paragraph (b)
- No.9. Clause 5, page 5, lines 1 to 31 [clause 5(5), inserted subsections (7ac) to (7ae)]—  
Delete inserted subsections (7ac) to (7ae) (inclusive)
- No. 10. Clause 5, page 5, lines 36 and 37 [clause 5(6), inserted paragraph (d)]—  
Delete paragraph (d)
- No. 11. Clause 7, page 6, after line 20—After subclause (1) insert:  
(1a) Section 124(3)—after paragraph (b) insert:  
or  
(c) if the defendant has not given notice of a particular detail as required by subsection (1)—that the defendant, having made reasonable inquiries, complied with the requirements of subsection (1) to the best of the defendant's knowledge, information and belief.
- No. 12. Clause 9, page 7, lines 36 and 37 [clause 9(2), inserted paragraph (c)(ii)]—  
Delete subparagraph (ii)
- No. 13. Clause 9, page 8, lines 8 and 9 [clause 9(5), inserted paragraph (aa)(ii)]—  
Delete subparagraph (ii)
- No. 14. Clause 9, page 8, lines 17 and 18 [clause 9(7), inserted subsection (2b)(b)]—  
Delete paragraph (b)
- No. 15. Clause 9, page 8, lines 21 to 40 and page 9, lines 1 to 13 [clause 9(8), inserted subsections (4) to (6)]—  
Delete inserted subsections (4) to (6) (inclusive)
- No. 16. Clause 12, page 10, lines 16 to 40 and page 11, lines 1 to 7—  
Leave out the clause
- No. 17. Clause 13, page 11, lines 18 and 19 [clause 13(3), inserted paragraph (h)]—  
Delete paragraph (h)
- No. 18. Schedule 1, page 11, lines 23 to 29 [Schedule 1, clause 1(1) and (2)]—  
Delete subclauses (1) and (2)
- No. 19. Schedule 1, page 11, lines 30 to 35 [Schedule 1, clause 1(3)]—  
Delete subclause (3)

### **SUMMARY OFFENCES (PRESCRIBED MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to grant a conference as requested by the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council named the hour of 11am on Tuesday 7 June 2011 to receive the managers on behalf of the House of Assembly at the Plaza Room on the first floor of the Legislative Council.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (17:45):** I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council agreeing to the time and place appointed by the council.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH BILL**

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendment No. 4 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed and made amendments relevant to amendment No. 4 to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly. The Legislative Council did not insist on its amendment No. 6.

Clause 90, page 56, after line 1—After new subclause (7) insert:

- (7a) The following provisions will apply in connection with an application under subsection (5):
- (a) the making of an application does not suspend the operation of a direction to which the application relates (and the Magistrates Court must not suspend or stay the operation of the direction pending the outcome of the proceedings);
  - (b) the Magistrates Court must consider whether 2 or more applications by separate individuals may be joined or heard together taking into account:
    - (i) the extent to which it is impractical or unreasonable for individual applications to be heard separately in view of the number of applications before the court; and
    - (ii) the extent to which there are questions of fact or law that are sufficiently similar or common across a series of applications; and
    - (iii) the extent to which the directions across a series of applications are the same or similar; and
    - (iv) such other matters as the court thinks fit in order to best manage the applications in the circumstances of the emergency;
  - (c) the Chief Magistrate may make such orders as the Chief Magistrate thinks fit (either in a specific case, in a specific class of cases, or generally with respect to applications under subsection (5)) to assist in dealing with the management and hearing of applications under subsection (5) (and any such order will have effect according to its terms).

After subclause (12) insert:

- (12a) The following provisions will apply in connection with an appeal under subsection (11):
- (a) the making of the appeal does not suspend the operation of a direction that has been confirmed by the Magistrates Court and the District Court may, as it thinks fit, make any other order with respect to the operation of any other direction that has been varied or revoked by the Magistrates Court (including, if the District Court thinks fit, to reinstate or vary an original direction on an interim basis pending the outcome of the appeal);
  - (b) the District Court must consider whether 2 or more appeals by separate individuals may be joined or heard together taking into account:
    - (i) the extent to which it is impracticable or unreasonable for individual appeals to be heard separately in view of the number of appeals before the court; and
    - (ii) the extent to which there are common questions or issues across a series of appeals; and
    - (iii) such other matters as the court thinks fit in order to best manage the appeals in the circumstances of the emergency;
  - (c) the Chief Judge may make such orders as the Chief Judge thinks fit to assist in dealing with the management and hearing of appeals under subsection (11) (and any such order will have effect according to its terms).

After subclause (15) insert:

- (15a) A person subject to a direction who is a party to proceedings before a court under this section is not entitled to attend those proceedings but is entitled to be represented at any hearing by a person (who need not be a legal practitioner) nominated by him or her.
- (15b) A court must, in dealing with proceedings under this section, take into account the need to ensure that its proceedings do not unduly hamper the work of public officials in dealing with an emergency.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I move:

That the disagreement to amendment No. 4 be no longer insisted on and the further amendments to amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

I inform the committee that the government will support the South Australian Public Health Bill in the form that it comes from the Legislative Council after its second visit to that esteemed establishment. There has been an extensive and fruitful set of discussions with the opposition on the points which were in contention when the house last examined the bill. I am happy to say that, through a spirit of compromise and reasonableness on all sides, we have reached agreement. I particularly acknowledge the fine efforts of my colleague the member for Morphett, who I know has worked hard to ensure that his side reached a resolution with us. I thank him for that.

The effect of these amendments is to protect, as much as possible, the state's ability to manage significant public health emergencies. They insert four qualifications in the application of appeal rights to clause 90. These, in effect, are: that a public health order is not suspended on the lodging of the appeal and neither could it be suspended pending the outcome of the hearing; that the person who was the subject of the appeal is not entitled to be present in court during the hearing of an appeal but may be represented by a person nominated by them; where there are two or more appeals of similar class, unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary, the court will hear the appeals jointly; and the courts must be mindful of the circumstances of a public health emergency and take steps to ensure that any proceedings do not unduly hamper the work of public officials during the emergency.

Of course, this was not the ideal position we wanted, but we think it is manageable. We are particularly pleased that the opposition did not proceed with its other amendment, which would have tied the hands of the police commissioner in an emergency which was based in a health matter. We can live with this compromise and, in the nature of all compromises between parties, it is something that probably neither side thinks is perfect, but we can both live with it. So, that is a good thing.

The passing of this legislation brings our capacity to respond to public health challenges into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We now have the tools to face the unpredictable and newly emerging threats which confront us, whether they be new infectious conditions, non-communicable diseases, injuries, contaminants in our environment, threats from climate change or problems caused by the very shape and form of our cities and towns.

This legislation would not have been possible without the support and clear leadership of local government, in particular, the staff and elected members of the Local Government Association. It is because of that support we can now turn with confidence to the process of implementation. I want to put on record my thanks and gratitude to them.

This is a piece of legislation which has been under consideration actively for 10-plus years, at least 10 years, so it has been really worked over very thoroughly. I know that my department has already commenced planning for this and has done so with the same commitment to partnership and collaboration used to develop the legislation.

Because of what we do today, in the coming months and years we will see new approaches to public health developed, we will see existing public health programs strengthened, and we will see greater effort across all levels of government working together to both protect and improve the public health of South Australians.

Once again, I thank the opposition for the approach it has taken to this and I also thank, in particular, my officers in the health department who I know have been looking forward to this for a very long time. They have worked very hard to achieve this. I commend the bill to the house.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I congratulate the minister on getting the bill through the place. It has only been 11 years since Dean Brown started the review of the bill and, as can be seen in Europe now with 20 people dead and 600 people in intensive care, public health is an extremely important issue. The E.coli outbreak in Europe is one that we need to be wary of because it is going to hit us some time, somewhere, some day. This legislation will go a long way to making sure that we are able to control those sorts of outbreaks and give South Australians the health services and watchdog they deserve.

Motion carried.

**RAIL COMMISSIONER (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:53 the house adjourned until Wednesday 8 June 2011 at 11:00.