

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday 8 June 2011**

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

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PRESCRIBED MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (11:02)**: I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: INSTITUTE FOR PHOTONICS AND ADVANCED SENSING

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:04): I move:

That the 402nd report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Institute for Photonics and Advanced Sensing, be noted.

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor, are you speaking on this?

Mrs VLAHOS: No.

The SPEAKER: Member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:05): We support the project regarding the Institute for Photonics and Advanced Sensing, and we support the motion by the member for Taylor.

Motion carried.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: SAME-SEX PARENTING

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Bedford:

That the 32nd report of the committee, entitled Same-Sex Parenting, be noted.

(Continued from 18 May 2011.)

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:05): I stand to support the recommendations put forward by this committee. I had the privilege this parliamentary term of being elected to the Social Development Committee and my first action on being elected to that committee was to contact the Chair (Hon. Ian Hunter in the other place) and ask if this committee could instigate an inquiry into same-sex parenting in South Australia. I am very pleased to say that the two of us were successful in getting this to be the first inquiry of the Social Development Committee in this parliamentary term.

The committee heard a number of witnesses, many of those whom, of course, were parents in same-sex relationships. We learnt from those hearings that in South Australia—which would surprise many, of course, who would remember the progressive nature of the Dunstan government in the 1970s—we are a long way behind other states when it comes to same-sex legislation, rights for same-sex parents and rights for the children of same-sex parents.

One of the inconsistencies is that in every state in Australia the non-biological parent in a relationship is entitled to be described as a parent on the birth certificate of a child who is conceived by the biological mother in an arrangement that is made by both parents, but in South Australia that is not recognised. So, in South Australia, we have well-meaning parents—parents who have gone to enormous effort and through enormous challenges to make the conscious decision to be parents—who are unable to give that child both parents. I think that in itself is of great concern in South Australia. I will not speak too much about this topic because there is a separate bill on the *Notice Paper* with regard to that particular recommendation.

I want to run through some of the recommendations of the Social Development Committee that I fully supported. The committee recommended that, as a matter of urgency, the Attorney-General introduce legislation to amend the Family Relationships Act to allow a female partner of a non-birth partner or birth woman who is undergoing fertilisation procedures to be legally recognised as the parent of a child, providing that the partner consented to the treatment by which the birth mother conceived the child. That refers to the points I made earlier.

The second recommendation was access to assisted reproductive technology. The committee recommended that the Minister for Health introduces legislation to amend the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act 1988 to enable same-sex couples to have access to that technology. I think it is important to remember that one of the issues raised is that, again, that is available to couples interstate but not in South Australia. We used to be a progressive social leader here in South Australia but, unfortunately, over the last eight or nine years, we have failed to move with the rest of Australia.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Well, the facts are that Labor has been running this state for 33 of the last 44 years, member for Florey. For 33 of the last 44 years, Labor has been running this state and the legacy has left us behind in many areas and social progressive policy is one of them. We were there for three years from '79 to '82 and we were there fixing up an absolute disaster that Labor left us in '93 with the State Bank for eight years, so it is a bit rich for members from the other side to say that we have been there too when we have only been there for 11 years of the last 44 years by the time of the next election.

These reforms need to come from the government, and I encourage the government to come back to the committee with their comments on the recommendations that were made by the Social Development Committee, which I say is a great committee. There are no politics played in the Social Development Committee. We are seriously interested in social development here in South Australia, and the fact that we had high attendances on a year-long inquiry into same-sex parenting issues I think is evidence of the goodwill that has been produced in that committee.

Of course the other recommendation here is that same-sex couples be granted access to screening and counselling and also adoption because we know that in other states adoption by same-sex couples is available. One of the quirks that we find here in South Australia is that same-sex couples can be foster parents but they cannot be adoptive parents, so the recommendation of the committee was that that be immediately changed. The committee also recommended that the surrogacy clause be changed to not discriminate against same-sex couples.

I support all of those recommendations and, of course, the final recommendation was an education awareness strategy. The committee recommended that the Attorney-General, in collaboration with the Minister for Health and the Minister for Families and Communities, develop and implement an education strategy to raise awareness of the rights and obligations of those directly affected by any legislative changes related to same-sex parenting.

It was a very balanced report. The Hon. Dennis Hood obviously did not support many of the recommendations; in fact, I do not think he supported any of the recommendations. He says here, 'I do not agree with any of the recommendations contained in the report.' There are obvious reasons when you know the Family First platform as to why he has made those comments in the report. Of course, he will speak on his own behalf in the other place.

I stand here strongly recommending to the Attorney-General and the Minister for Health that they have a good read of these recommendations, and let us once again make South Australia a leader when it comes to progressive social policy here in Australia.

Motion carried.

PUGLIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That the Economic and Finance Committee inquire into the government's investments and activities in Italy and in particular, the investments and activities in the region of Puglia and that the committee report to the house—

- (a) the total value of all expenditure across the whole of government linked to Puglia;
- (b) whether the memorandum of understanding signed between the state government and the region of Puglia has been properly implemented; and
- (c) what value South Australian taxpayers have received from the investment.

(Continued from 9 February 2011.)

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:13): I shall not be very long. I do rise in support of this motion of referral to the Economic and Finance Committee for some level of review to be undertaken in regard to the government investments and activities in Italy, and particularly the investments and activities in the region of Puglia, and that the committee report to the house. I do

so on the basis that I am a big supporter of the Economic and Finance Committee, as the Minister for Correctional Services knows.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well, we hope so, but it is important that this committee return to its all-powerful status, and the minister nods his head in agreement, so I am pleased. As soon as we get some industry development committee referrals to come through, that will be even better.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You want me chairing it, do you?

Mr GRIFFITHS: No; very happy with Michael Wright—very happy. It is important that some level of scrutiny occur here. I know there has been an enormous amount in the media in previous times about the Puglia area and indeed the level of investment made by South Australian taxpayers. However, it is an issue of accountability for me. It is the same as the Adelaide Oval and the amendment that we are proposing about Auditor-General scrutiny there. We are talking about accountability and the appropriate use of taxpayer funds.

I respect the fact that governments of any persuasion can make policy decisions and therefore allocate dollars, and then people will debate that ad nauseam. However, accountability is the important issue here and that is why the motion from the member for Waite is one that this house should support. It is to allow a review to take place in a bipartisan way—and there is a very strong bipartisan atmosphere that revolves around the Economic and Finance Committee at the moment—to ensure that all members can be aware of the issues, consider the input being made by taxpayer dollars, consider what the outcomes of those dollars are and make some form of recommendation back to the parliament on the appropriateness of that.

It is on that basis that I stand in support of this motion. I hope it is a motion that the government will support. No doubt there will be, in the report, opportunities for both sides to put a case. I am not pre-empting any level of minority report that might come from it, but it is important that this committee have that chance.

The Economic and Finance Committee has existed for many years. It has done some great work in the past. I read with jealousy some of the reports from previous years, in comparison to what we have done in recent times. It is important that we put a focus back on the Economic and Finance Committee, and this recommendation for a referral from the house to the committee is an opportunity for that. I hope that members on the other side will rise in support of this motion and that we get some good outcomes from it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mrs Geraghty.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: OSBORNE NORTH INDUSTRIAL PRECINCT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Piccolo:

That the 386th report of the committee, entitled Osborne North Industrial Precinct, be noted.

(Continued from 24 November 2010.)

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:17): I will resume the speech that was partially delivered by Mr Piccolo in relation to this matter, who was dealing with it before I became the Chair of the Public Works Committee. In conclusion, once the developed parcel of land at the Osborne precinct goes ahead, it will comprise 27 acres of land for sale and approximately eight hectares of public roads, stormwater swales and open space purposes.

Parcel 2 is zoned open Metropolitan Open Space System (Buffer) and will be used for stormwater management and open space purposes. It is located adjacent to the Mutton Cove Conservation Reserve to the east, the Outer Harbor rail corridor to the west, and the Pelican Point Power Station to the north.

Delivery of the development-ready land for the northern Lefevre Peninsula will support the generation of further economic benefits for this state in what is an important industrial land region. The serviced land provides the potential to consolidate further support industries engaged in the air warfare destroyer program at Techport and provides large-scale general industry opportunities not previously available in the northern Lefevre Peninsula.

Economic impact analysis undertaken in October 2007 by the Department of Trade and Economic Development indicates that the development of the state's industrial landholdings on the

northern Lefevre Peninsula over a 15-year period would contribute approximately \$1.069 billion to the gross state product and sustain an average of almost 2,000 jobs statewide.

Land will be released in two stages, with stage 1 expected to generate sales revenue of around \$27.709 million over three years. Subject to successful sales during this period, stage 2 construction is expected to commence in the 2014-15 year, and generate further sales revenue of an expected \$21.172 million over a two-year cycle of the 2015-16 and 2016-17 years, marking the completion of the project. Net sales proceeds—that is, sale price less sale costs—will be returned to the government.

Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the project proceed.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:19): Ma'am, we support the motion.

Motion carried.

STILLBIRTHS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. I.F. Evans:

That the Legislative Review Committee inquire into and report on the need for coronial jurisdiction for stillborn children and in particular—

- (a) whether 28 weeks gestational age or any period beyond 28 weeks is the point of which stillbirths should come within coronial jurisdiction;
- (b) whether some other criteria such as death by unexpected, unusual, violent or unknown causes should be applied to bring stillbirths within coronial jurisdiction; and
- (c) any other related matter.

(Continued from 15 September 2010.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:20): On his behalf, I advise the house that the member for Davenport is happy to withdraw this motion on the basis that, at his instigation, the Legislative Review Committee picked up an inquiry with very similar terms of reference. I therefore move:

That this order of the day be withdrawn.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, you are withdrawing the motion on behalf of the member for Davenport?

Mr GARDNER: Yes.

Motion carried; order of the day withdrawn.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW YOUTH TRAINING CENTRE

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Piccolo:

That the 383rd report of the committee, entitled New Youth Training Centre, be noted.

(Continued from 10 November 2010.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:21): In concluding my remarks (and I am not quite sure what time I have left on this), I indicate that when I previously spoke on this matter I advised the house (I am not sure whether it got to this stage) of the concern I had for the level of what was more than a \$60 million project for a 60-bed youth training centre of which, I think, \$6 million or \$7 million is proposed to be approved for the architectural fees alone.

Given the way in which these things progress, the architectural fees have already been incurred and therefore will need to be paid; but what does concern me is that we have a project where more than 10 per cent now of the value of the project is absorbed into architectural fees. I do not want to pick them out alone, but I make the point that, in these projects, tens of millions of dollars—often large slabs of the project—are absorbed in project management and costs associated with the supervision of the project and its development, including the architectural fees.

There was a time, I think, when architects had a bigger project management role in the supervision of projects—having developed the plan and design they remained very active in the project; and, in this instance, they may well again. However, we also have a very significant number of other professionals who now are involved in these projects, not only from the

department (obviously from an accountability point of view that is very important) but also other professionals are involved in that.

We are seeing an ever-increasing slice of the taxpayer dollar in these major projects go towards professional fees, and I think it is incumbent upon the Public Works Committee when it is reviewing these projects that it does seek some detail about what is actually going to be undertaken in exchange for the fees that are being allocated for these projects.

As I say, it is concerning me that it is ever increasing and, in certain new projects (that is, where there is a new design or a new type of development being undertaken), one might expect that a number of professionals need to come together. But when we are building similar model projects over and over again, whether they are fire stations or other projects for which we have a repeat model, I have to raise the question about the expense that is being allocated for these projects and ask that the Public Works Committee keeps a close eye on this and ensure that, as much as possible, the taxpayer dollar is allocated to the development and construction of the piece of infrastructure for which the Public Works Committee has this very important scrutinising role.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:25): In relation to this motion—and I have had a longstanding interest in matters relating to juveniles—I realise this is about constructing a 60-bed secure youth training centre, which is a euphemism for a prison. Hopefully, in that facility, there will be some positive outcomes, but I would like members to reflect on the reasons why we are having to resort to building an additional large facility. I guess the arguments also extend to why we have to keep building more and more prisons. There are some people you need to lock up, I do not argue with that, but I think we need to look at some of the underlying factors that lead to people ending up in detention, whether as a juvenile or as an adult.

If you look at the United States, we seem to be following the United States' pattern where they lock up more and more people every year. I think in California they have something like 140,000 people in a prison. Now, some of those need to be detained. I do not know whether any members saw a program the other night on television. I do not watch a lot of television, but someone who sexually assaulted two women on campus got a 99-year gaol term. Now, that would never happen here and they are serious crimes.

There are some underlying factors that, I think, we need to address. I have visited Cavan and the Magill Training Centre, and I have visited Yatala on many occasions, as a visitor. I know some people would like me to stay there but it did not happen. If you look at the statistics, you will find that probably half the people in detention have a very poor level of educational attainment, which makes it very difficult for them to be contributing members of society. We have a particularly high incarceration rate of young, as well as adult, Aboriginal offenders in our prisons, and the statistics for those people are even higher in terms of a lower level of educational attainment than for the non-Aboriginal population.

So, I think, one of the things that the community and the government, in particular, need to focus on is to ensure that all young people—Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal—actually get a good education. It is not a guarantee for keeping out of prison or not getting into crime, but it is a pretty much assured method of diminishing the chance of ending up in a prison or youth detention centre. If you cannot read or write, your chance of getting a job is remote and you are unlikely to get gainful employment. You cannot fully participate in society, therefore, I think that is one of the key areas that needs to be addressed.

I know this from experience within my family. My niece Carey (I will not use her full name) has fostered two Aboriginal babies from birth. One of them, Manuel, is now about 19 and has already fathered two children. I saw him the other day in a country town not far from Adelaide. He was in a car and had pulled up at the lights and I was alongside. I said, 'Manuel, what are you doing?' He said, 'Nothing.'

He and his brother, Royce, have both been affected by foetal alcohol syndrome as a result of their mother consuming alcohol during pregnancy. The chance of that eldest lad getting something meaningful is made difficult by the fact that he is a victim of foetal alcohol syndrome, but, critically, whether they are Aboriginal or non-Aboriginal, the fact that they do not have and have not had a good education hinders their success in life.

The younger lad, Royce, is studying at a Christian school, and I do not have a problem with that, obviously. I commend Families SA for funding him to go to that school. It is one of the lower cost Christian schools in a country town. I think young Royce is about 16 now. He is actually doing work experience at the Mount Barker Police Station, and he wants to join the police force. As a

result of getting a better education despite his physical disabilities—which are impairments in relation to his fingers and so on—he will almost certainly go on to achieve a lot more than his older brother is able to. In fact, young Royce has just joined the Air Force Cadets. I think it illustrates the point that, the better the education, the more chance there is that these young people—Aboriginal or otherwise—will be useful and constructive members of society.

As a society, we do not have an organised initiation—and I am not talking about cutting people to make them bleed, and so on—or an organised transition from teenager to adult. In fact, we basically throw young people out and let them, hopefully, find their way in the world. A lot of people call for things like national service as part of an introduction to adulthood. I do not object to that, but I think we could have a system where all young people—they do not have to be involved in military activity—could be involved in something like the Country Fire Service, St John Ambulance, or something, where they can learn a commitment and then practice a commitment to society, and where they can mix with people who can act as good mentors.

People say that our schools are not responsible for the values of our children. I do not accept that. The reality is that a lot of families have broken down. Marriages have broken down and children are growing up in an atmosphere where there is a deficiency of sound values: respect for oneself, respect for others, respect for property, and so on.

Our society was based on traditional Judeo-Christian values and, without getting into the extreme side of that, I think those values are still fundamental and very important. One does not have to be a fundamentalist or an extremist to acknowledge that the basic tenants of the Judeo-Christian belief system are good. Those good values are in other religions as well—Islam and so on. However, we have young people growing up without those core values being reinforced through schools and elsewhere to the extent that they should. As I said, you cannot blame schools for not doing that but, if young people do not grow up with those core values—if they do not get them at home and if they are not reinforced at school and in the wider society—we will end up with more young people being incarcerated.

We have young Aboriginal people who know nothing about traditional Aboriginal culture. When I was the minister for youth, we had a program taking at-risk young Aboriginal men out into the bush in a special vehicle owned by TAFE that cost half a million dollars. After those young people went out there and sat around the campfire—it was run by Aboriginal people—they caused little or no trouble following that experience. We were in the process of setting that up for young Aboriginal women, but, sadly, that program was cancelled.

Young Aboriginal men in particular have very few male role models. They know little about their own culture. They have not been integrated into society in the positive sense of being able to display positive Aboriginal traditional values or the ones that have come from the Judeo-Christian tradition. So, rather than simply focus on building more prisons, more places of incarceration, I think we need to look at some of the underlying causes as to why young people in particular—and adults as well—are going down this path of breaking the law. We need to try to steer people away from that through investment in education and other positive initiatives rather than simply doing what the Americans are doing: building more and more prisons to incarcerate more and more people. I accept that, in the short term, we may have little choice but, in the long term, we need to look at the underlying causes that lead to incarceration and deal with them in a positive way.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:35): Based on the evidence presented to it, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed work go ahead.

Motion carried.

MOUNT BARKER, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

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

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

(Continued from 23 June 2010.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:36): This matter has been overtaken by events. By leave, I withdraw this order of the day.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

YANKALILLA, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

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

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

(Continued from 23 June 2010.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:36): This matter has been overtaken by events. By leave, I withdraw this order of the day.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

ROBE, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

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

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

(Continued from 23 June 2010.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:36): This matter has been overtaken by events. By leave, I withdraw this order of the day.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

MID MURRAY, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

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

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

(Continued from 23 June 2010.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:36): This matter has been overtaken by events. By leave, I withdraw this order of the day.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

PORT AUGUSTA, MOVEABLE SIGNS RESTRICTIONS

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

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

(Continued from 23 June 2010.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:36): This matter has been overtaken by events. By leave, I withdraw the order of the day.

Notice of motion withdrawn.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (11:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982; and to make a related amendment to the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (11:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Correctional Services Act dates back to 1982. Since that time it has been regularly amended to reflect the changes in government policy, changes to correctional practice and to address community concerns. The changes to the act and regulations proposed in this bill are wide ranging and considered necessary to enhance public safety and the safety of staff, and improve the security and effectiveness of operations in prisons and community corrections. There is a particular focus on parole.

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

Leave granted.

The Correctional Services Act dates back to 1982. Since that time it has been regularly amended to reflect changes in Government policy, changes to correctional practice and to address community concerns.

The changes to the Act and Regulations proposed in this Bill are wide ranging and considered necessary to enhance public safety and the safety of staff, and improve the security and effectiveness of operations in prisons and community corrections. There is a particular focus on parole.

The changes proposed will make parolees more accountable for their actions by strengthening processes for offenders who have breached their parole order and are considered to present a high risk to the community. The changes will also improve the sharing of appropriate information between Correctional Services, the Department of Health, the Parole Board, and SAPOL about prisoners and parolees.

All references to 'Manager' in the Act and Regulations replaced with 'Chief Executive'

The Act currently assigns a range of powers to the 'Manager' of a correctional institution. These arrangements are no longer considered appropriate and the reference to 'Manager' has been amended to 'Chief Executive'. This will appropriately place the responsibilities for the administration of correctional institutions and allow the Chief Executive to delegate any power to relevant staff within the prisons, including the Manager.

Extending the criteria under which police may remove a prisoner from correctional facilities

Currently the Act provides for the removal of a prisoner from a correctional facility for the investigation of an offence if that prisoner is suspected of having committed an offence or have been charged with an offence.

The limitations imposed by the current wording exclude the removal of prisoners from custody for a range of investigations including interview as potential witnesses, as anti-corruption whistleblowers or as informants.

The Bill therefore provides an amendment to extend criteria for a prisoner's removal from custody to include for the purposes of assisting in the investigation of offences.

The amendment will further strengthen policies that contribute to improved public protection and will strengthen law enforcement processes.

Transfer the responsibility for the setting and review of prisoner allowances to the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services.

Prisoner allowances and remuneration arrangements are entirely operational considerations and should be separated from Government Policy.

The Bill therefore shifts the responsibility from the Minister for Correctional Services (with approval from the Treasurer) to the Chief Executive.

This is consistent with arrangements in most Australian jurisdictions.

Prevent a discharged prisoner depositing money into a prisoner's account and to establish a Prisoner Amenities Account

Presently, released prisoners can deposit monies into the accounts of other prisoners. Anecdotal evidence suggests that this is often done to pay back outstanding unlawful debts, such as drug dealing or standover or manipulative-type tactics.

To restrict payments for unlawful dealings and protect offenders discharged from prison being manipulated to provide funds to other prisoners, the Bill prevents a discharged person from depositing any money into another prisoner's account for 12 months following release from prison. This will allow the discharged person to retain their own finances, and will assist with their reintegration into the community.

Further provisions are included to formally establish a Prisoner Amenities Account where any surplus derived from prisoner canteen sales and other sources relating to prisoners will be deposited and used for prisoner activities.

Currently such arrangements exist through departmental procedures.

The surplus is used to purchase equipment and other goods for prisoners. Some recent examples are the purchase of table tennis tables, footballs, basketballs and other sports equipment, also guitar strings and picks for prisoners.

Include the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner as privileged mail

This amendment was initiated by the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner.

Currently the Act provides for certain mail to and from a prisoner to be declared privileged mail and therefore immune from scrutiny by authorised officers of the department.

Currently mail between the following entities are included under the Section:

- the Ombudsman; or

- a Member of Parliament; or
- a Visiting Tribunal; or
- an inspector of the correctional institution; or
- a legal practitioner.

The Bill appropriately adds the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner as an additional listed Agency under the Section to enable prisoners the legislative right to have private and confidential written correspondence with the Office of the Commissioner.

Strengthen the arrangements for visitors to prisoners, in particular for child sex offenders and visitor identification

Currently the Act does not detail the minimum standards for visits other than the frequency of visits for both sentenced and remand prisoners.

Accordingly, a new provision has been included in this section which will formally incorporate non-contact visits into legislation as a minimum standard to ensure the safety and security of the prison. A non-contact visit means the prisoner is behind a glass barrier and no contact can take place between the prisoner and visitor.

This section is further amended to provide for prisoners convicted of child sex offences to not be permitted to be visited by anyone under-aged. It is considered that this amendment will further enhance the protection of under-aged persons if they visit a correctional facility.

In addition, visitors to a correctional facility will be legislatively required to provide such evidence as the Chief Executive thinks appropriate to determine the person's identity.

In response to comments received during the consultation phase, to allow a degree of flexibility and ensure that persons who would have difficulties consistently providing personal identification, the Chief Executive (or delegate) can waive this requirement in genuine cases.

There is also a provision to prevent a discharged prisoner from visiting other prisoners within 12 months after their discharge. This measure is going to significantly contribute to increased security within the prison system. In the past, discharged prisoners have visited other prisoners who were then caught with contraband introduced into prison.

This will significantly reduce the frequency of such visits being used for inappropriate purposes and protect those discharged from prison being influenced by others to bring contraband into the prisons.

The Chief Executive can approve such visits where a genuine case exists.

Monitoring, recording and use of recordings of prisoner telephone calls

The use of telephones is not currently provided under the *Correctional Services Act*.

With the emergence of new technologies, all prisoner telephone calls, with the exception of privileged calls (e.g. to the Ombudsman's Office, legal representatives, the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner and other agencies determined by the Chief Executive) are now monitored and recorded and the recording is available to Correctional Services' staff and SAPOL.

While formal advice has confirmed that the departmental procedure for the recording of calls is legitimate it is considered that consistent with other jurisdictions, these arrangements should be contained in the Act.

The content of prisoner telephone conversations is regularly used for intelligence purposes both in relation to matters involving the correctional facility and in regards to general community safety.

The introduction of illicit drugs (and mobile telephones and weapons) into a prison to carry higher penalties

Currently the introduction of illicit drugs into a prison carries a maximum penalty of two years imprisonment.

The introduction of illicit substances into South Australian prisons is a considerable issue there have been instances of visitors trying to introduce drugs. There are also occurrences where those substances are thrown over the prisons' perimeter fence, in a tennis ball for example.

The Bill provides for an increased maximum penalty to five years imprisonment to deter such offending and bring the maximum penalty in line with community expectation.

In addition, the introduction of other items prescribed by the Regulations will also carry higher penalties than the current maximum of six months imprisonment. It is the intention to specifically prescribe mobile telephones and weapons. This is due to these items having the potential to cause significant issues within the prison system.

As a result, the introduction of these items into a prison will attract a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment. This is again, in keeping with community expectations.

Prisoners who have their parole order cancelled will be required to serve the remainder of their sentence unless the Parole Board makes a fresh decision to release the prisoner on parole

Currently the Parole Board can automatically cancel parole for a breach of a *designated* condition of a parole order. In that case the prisoner must serve the remainder of their sentence unless the Parole Board approves renewed parole release.

If a parolee breaches any other condition of their order, the Parole Board may cancel the parole order and may direct that person to serve a further period of imprisonment of up to six months.

The Bill removes the distinction between 'designated conditions' and non-designated conditions' of parole, to make the breach of any parole condition subject to a Board decision both in relation to parole cancellation and re-release.

The Presiding Member of the Parole Board suggested this change and is entirely supportive.

At times, a parolee's breach of a normal condition of parole might be considered far more serious than breaching a designated condition due to the nature of the breach and the background or offending history of the offender. For example, a parolee drinking alcohol to excess where his/her prior serious offending involved alcohol abuse.

Parolees will serve the remainder of their sentence in cases where the Parole Board has cancelled the parole order.

An analysis of prisoner numbers has determined that some prisoners will serve longer periods in prison following a cancellation of their parole order, but it is considered that the additional prisoners can be absorbed within the projected prisoner growth forecast.

This is a good amendment as it is particularly relevant for prisoners who pose an ongoing risk of reoffending.

Improve pre-release arrangements for prisoners serving life sentences

The Bill provides for the Parole Board to include a condition of parole for life-sentenced prisoners to undertake pre-release and reintegration activities at a facility under the operation of the Department for Correctional Services or an appropriate 'parole hostel'.

Applications for release to parole require a significant amount of consideration particularly in relation to assessing risk to the community.

The prisoner must have taken adequate steps to address their offending behaviour.

The Parole Board forwards recommendations for life-sentenced prisoners' release to parole to His Excellency, the Governor in Executive Council for consideration.

His Excellency may, on receiving the Board's recommendation, order that the prisoner be released from prison on parole for a specified period or the Governor in Executive Council may refuse the application.

Life sentenced prisoners who are not approved for parole transfer back to secure custody.

The Bill has an extra provision that enables the Parole Board to consider including a condition of the parole release that the prisoner participate in reintegration activities prior to release on parole to the community. The pre-release activities would occur at a facility operated by the Department for Correctional Services such as the Adelaide Pre-release Centre.

This will address any concerns about the increased risk of escape from a less secure environment if prisoners perceive that their parole application is likely to be unsuccessful and the expenditure of valuable resources on pre-release activities when life-sentenced prisoners are ultimately not released to parole and transfer back to secure custody.

The amendment will not change the decision-making for release to parole for life sentenced prisoners. The Parole Board would still make a recommendation to the Governor and the Governor would still maintain the decision for release. The proposed amendment gives the Parole Board the option to include pre-release activities for up to one year at a designated site as a condition of parole. Should the parolee not perform the reintegration activities satisfactorily, it would be deemed a breach of parole and the Board could return the parolee to secure custody.

Electronic monitoring as an optional condition of parole

To strengthen public safety it has been included in the Bill that electronic monitoring be provided as an optional parole condition for the Parole Board to consider including for an offender during a period of parole.

Electronic monitoring is a valuable tool currently used by the Department for Correctional Services for rigorously supervising offenders in the community.

Electronic monitoring is currently used for those prisoners on post-prison Home Detention and Intensive Bail Supervision. Post-prison Home Detention is for those prisoners that satisfy the strict criteria to serve the last part of their period of imprisonment on Home Detention, largely or entirely subject to electronic monitoring as a condition. Intensive Bail Supervision is court ordered Home Detention Bail, of which the vast majority have electronic monitoring as a condition.

Disclosure of offending as an optional condition of parole

There is a need to strengthen the requirement for convicted child sex offenders to disclose the nature of their previous offending to prospective employers.

This is to prevent these offenders using their place of employment to engage in further sexual offending against children who may be associated with the place of employment, such as the employer's children.

To provide that a report requested by the Parole Board about a prisoner or person on parole be prepared by the Chief Executive

Currently the Act provides that the Parole Board is to obtain a report from the supervising community corrections officer when considering discharging a parole order, varying or revoking parole conditions, or considering cancelling release on parole for a breach of parole conditions.

These provisions have been particularly problematic when the offender's supervising community corrections officer has changed and the current community corrections officer is not the most experienced person with that offender. In such a case a report may be better prepared by another departmental person.

The Bill enables the Parole Board to request reports about prisoners or parolees from the Chief Executive. The relevant delegated staff member on behalf of the Chief Executive can then appropriately prepare the report for the Parole Board.

The Chief Executive of the Department being able to issue a warrant for the arrest and imprisonment of a parolee

Currently the Parole Board is notified of a parole breach and a request for a warrant is forwarded to the Board, and the Board then issues a warrant.

This current provision restricts the issuing of the warrant to the Parole Board. This means the issuing of the warrant can be delayed if it is requested on weekends or out of hours. Parole Board members are appointed on a part-time basis and there is no expectation that they work out of hours or on weekends.

The Bill provides the authority to issue a warrant to include the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services.

The CE must then, within two working days, provide the Parole Board with a report on the matter.

The Bill also authorises the person to be detained in custody pending determination. The Presiding Member or Deputy Presiding Member must, within five working days of the person being detained, consider the report and review the warrant.

The Presiding Member or Deputy Presiding Member will have discretion to confirm the warrant and order the person continue to be detained pending appearance before the Parole Board, cancel the warrant and order the person be released from custody or issue a summons for the person to appear before the Board at a later date.

It is not anticipated that the amendment will result in an increase in prisoner numbers; it merely extends the authority to suspend a parole order and issue a warrant to include the Chief Executive.

When parolees are returned to custody on a Parole Board warrant as a consequence of reported breaches of parole, the Board has to consider the necessary action. The provisions in the Bill do not change this process.

Arrest of parolee by a police officer

The provision is not intended to provide SAPOL staff with the authority to arrest a parolee who has committed a technical parole breach on every occasion, but where there is reasonable cause to suspect the parolee has breached their parole order and poses an imminent and serious threat to public safety. In these circumstances, it is important that SAPOL officers have the ability to arrest that parolee.

To allow sufficient time for the warrant to be obtained and all necessary consideration to be given, the Bill provides for a parolee who is arrested under this provision to be detained for up to 12 hours.

Within that 12 hours, the Presiding Member or Deputy Presiding Member of the Parole Board or the Chief Executive of the Department (in the absence of such a Member) must be notified of the person's arrest, review the circumstances of arrest and take clear action. The person may be ordered to be detained pending appearance before the Parole Board, be released from custody or issued a summons to appear before the Board at a later date.

Powers of search and arrest of non-prisoners

The Act currently has provisions for the power of search and arrest of non-prisoners. Currently this is limited to persons and vehicles entering a prison.

To strengthen those provisions, the Bill removes all doubt that the powers of Correctional Officers to search persons and vehicles extends to other areas of the gazetted prison reserve, including visitor car parks. This will allow visitors to be searched prior to entering a prison to further restrict the introduction of contraband.

The Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services to release information on prisoners and offenders in certain circumstances

Section 85C of the Act governs the release of information relating to a prisoner or offender and affords penalties for those that breach the Sections of the Act.

Provisions to maintain confidentiality to protect prisoner and offender information are necessary.

There are situations when public interest however may outweigh the prisoner or offender's need for confidentiality. For example, when a prisoner has escaped custody or when a parolee has had a warrant issued for breaching their parole order and releasing information about the offender would assist in the offender's arrest, thereby further protecting the public.

The Bill provides for the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services to release information about a prisoner, probationer or parolee if the person poses a serious risk or threat to public safety.

SAPOL to be supplied with approved residential addresses for persons on parole and the conditions of their parole orders

Currently there is no provision in the Act for South Australian Police to be automatically notified of the approved residential address of offenders on parole and the parole conditions set by the South Australian Parole Board.

In certain cases this has resulted in Police being unaware that a person was subject to parole supervision and the conditions of the parole order. This can potentially result in the Police not being able to effectively contribute to the proper management and supervision of parolees.

For example, a person on parole may have a condition imposed that prohibits them from being on licensed premises. In such a case where Police become aware of a person effectively being in breach of their parole conditions immediate action could be taken to notify Correctional Services and the Parole Board which would then allow for appropriate action to be taken.

It is not intended that a person on parole who may have breached a condition of their parole order would automatically be arrested. However, ensuring that SAPOL has relevant information on persons on parole contributes to increased public safety and better monitoring of the parolee's compliance with the conditions of their orders.

The Bill therefore compels the Board to notify the Commissioner of Police on the place of residence of a parolee and the conditions of the parole order.

Better sharing of information between Health staff and Correctional Services staff about prisoners for the proper management of a prisoner

SA Prison Health Services is under the Department of Health. Processes and procedures to appropriately share information between SA Prison Health Services and the Department for Correctional Services have been significantly strengthened over the past few years.

However, State Coroners have continued to recommend that the Department for Correctional Services and the SA Prison Health Service, in so far as is considered necessary for the proper management of a prisoner, develop protocols and procedures for the sharing of information regarding the medical histories and clinical presentations of individual prisoners in Department for Correctional Services' custody.

It has further been recommended by the Coroner to introduce such legislation to overcome confidentiality considerations in respect of the implementation of such protocols and procedures.

To entirely respond to the recommendations, the Bill requires staff operating under the *Health Care Act 2008* and/or the *Mental Health Act 2009* to disclose relevant health information with Correctional Services.

As the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services has sole responsibility for the custody of prisoners in this State, the amendment is required to enable the rightful exercise of that responsibility by allowing all relevant information about a prisoner's health to be shared to enable proper management of prisoners.

Issuing of a weapon to specially trained Correctional Officers

Currently the Act is silent on the issuing and use of weapons by Correctional Officers.

In practice a small group of highly trained staff are issued with a firearm which they predominantly carry when they undertake high risk prisoner escorts. The authority is derived from the *Summary Offences Act 1953* without any legislative provision or regulation contained in the *Correctional Services Act*.

The Bill provides for the Chief Executive to authorise an officer or employee of the department to carry a prescribed weapon while on duty.

Correctional Services' dogs

Currently the Act is silent on the use of Correctional Services' dogs.

Passive Alert Detection dogs are used by Correctional Services and whilst their use is widely accepted it remains unlegislated. This could potentially result in persons objecting to being subject to a check by a Passive Alert Detection dog.

At the time the Act was originally passed there were no Correctional Services' dogs in existence. These highly trained dogs are now used more extensively, particularly for drug detection purposes.

Consistent with arrangements in other jurisdictions it is therefore considered necessary to have appropriate legislative provisions in place that provide for the use of these specially trained Correctional Services' dogs.

The Bill provides for the purpose for which a Correctional Services' dog may be used (for example to search for prohibited items, to undertake a scanning search of persons in a Correctional Services' facility, or a visitor for drugs, to search for prisoners or to restrain a prisoner).

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

These amendments relate to the definitions under the Act.

5—Amendment of section 5—Victims Register

References to 'the Chief Executive Officer' are substituted with 'CE' throughout the Act.

6—Amendment of section 7—Power of Minister and CE to delegate

7—Amendment of section 9—CE's annual report

8—Amendment of section 22—Assignment of prisoners to particular correctional institutions

9—Amendment of section 23—Initial and periodic assessment of prisoners

10—Amendment of section 24—CE has custody of prisoners

11—Amendment of section 25—Transfer of prisoners

These are consequential amendments.

12—Amendment of section 27—Leave of absence from prison

References to 'member of the police force' are substituted with 'police officer'.

13—Amendment of section 27A—Interstate leave of absence

These amendments are consequential.

14—Amendment of section 28—Removal of prisoner for criminal investigation, attendance in court etc.

The amendment to section 28(2) is consequential.

The amendment to section 28(4) extends the circumstances in which the CE must release a prisoner into custody of a police officer to include where the prisoner is suspected of having knowledge or information that might assist in the prevention or investigation of an offence.

15—Amendment of section 29—Work by prisoners

16—Amendment of section 30—Prison education

These are consequential amendments.

17—Amendment of section 31—Prisoner allowances and other money

Some of these amendments are consequential. Another amendment provides that the CE will fix allowances and rates of bonus payments for prisoners, and removes the requirement that the approval of the Treasurer be obtained.

The amendments that insert new subsections (5b) and (5c) provide that a person who has been released from prison may not, without the approval of the CE, within a period of 12 months of the person's release from prison, give money to a prisoner or deposit money in any account kept in the name of a prisoner (and require the CE to make reasonable efforts to return money given in contravention of new subsection (5b) to the person who made the payment).

18—Substitution of section 32

This amendment inserts new sections 32 and 32A.

32—CE may sell items of personal use to prisoners

Proposed section 32 provides that—

- the CE may sell any items of personal use or consumption that the CE thinks fit to prisoners;
- withdrawals of money from any account held in the name of a prisoner, at the discretion of the CE in accordance with section 31, may be made for the purchase of items for sale under this section;
- the CE is authorised in selling items under this section, to set prices that, in the opinion of the CE, reflect the costs associated with selling the items and, if a surplus arises from time to time, to retain the surplus and deposit it in the account established under section 32A.

32A—Prisoner Amenity Account

Proposed section 32 provides that—

- the Prisoner Amenity Account is established;
- the CE will be responsible for the administration of the account;
- the account will consist of any surplus deposited from time to time under section 32(3)(b) and any other money that the CE thinks may be appropriately deposited in the account from time to time;
- the CE may apply any money standing to the credit of the account towards the provision of amenities to prisoners.

19—Amendment of section 33—Prisoners' mail

Some of these amendments are consequential. Another amendment provides that a letter sent by a prisoner to the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner cannot be opened.

20—Amendment of section 33A—Prisoners' goods

This is a consequential amendment.

21—Amendment of section 34—Prisoners' rights to have visitors

Some of these amendments are consequential. Another amendment applies the following restrictions to a visit to a prisoner (including a remand prisoner):

- a person may not visit a prisoner unless the person provides such evidence as the CE thinks appropriate as to the person's identity;
- a person who visits a prisoner may see and speak with the prisoner but is not permitted to touch the prisoner, unless the visit is part of a contact visiting program approved by the CE;
- a person who has been released from prison may not, without the approval of the CE, within a period of 12 months of the person's release from prison, visit a prisoner;
- a person under the age of 16 years may not, without the approval of the CE, visit a prisoner if any part of the imprisonment for which the prisoner was sentenced is in relation to a child sexual offence.

22—Insertion of section 35A

This amendment inserts new section 35A, which provides that the CE may monitor or record a communication between a prisoner and another person and prescribes procedures relating to the monitoring or recording of communications under the section.

23—Amendment of section 36—Power to keep prisoner apart from other prisoners

24—Amendment of section 37—Search of prisoners

25—Amendment of section 37AA—Drug testing of prisoners

26—Amendment of section 37A—Release on home detention

27—Amendment of section 37B—Authorised officers

28—Amendment of section 37C—Revocation of release

29—Amendment of section 38—Release of prisoner from prison or home detention

30—Amendment of section 39A—Delivery of property and money to prisoner on release

31—Amendment of section 39B—Manner in which former prisoner's personal property is to be dealt with

32—Amendment of section 42A—Minor breach of prison regulations

33—Amendment of section 43—CE may deal with breach of prison regulations

34—Amendment of section 44—CE may refer matter to Visiting Tribunal

35—Amendment of section 45—Procedure at inquiry

36—Amendment of section 46—Appeal against penalty imposed by CE

37—Repeal of section 49

38—Amendment of section 50A—Prisoner must comply with conditions to which temporary leave of absence is subject

These amendments are consequential.

39—Amendment of section 51—Offences by persons other than prisoners

One of these amendments is consequential. The other amendment increases the maximum penalty for the offence of delivering to a prisoner, or introducing into a correctional institution, a controlled drug or an item of a kind prescribed by the regulations to imprisonment for 5 years.

40—Amendment of section 66—Automatic release on parole for certain prisoners

This amendment provides that section 66(1), which provides for automatic release on parole for certain prisoners, does not apply to a prisoner if any part of the imprisonment for which the person was sentenced is in respect of an offence committed while the prisoner was on parole (the prisoner having been released on parole following application by the prisoner to the Board).

41—Amendment of section 67—Release on parole by application to Board

These amendments are consequential.

42—Amendment of section 68—Conditions of release on parole

This amendment allows the Governor to make the release on parole of a prisoner serving a sentence of life imprisonment subject to a condition that, for the period of up to one year commencing on the day on which the prisoner is released, the prisoner must—

- reside at specified premises (including premises declared under the Act to be a probation and parole hostel or a prison); and
- undertake at specified places such activities and programs as determined by the Board from time to time to assist in the reintegration of the prisoner into the community.

The amendment also provides that the release on parole of a prisoner may be subject to a condition that the prisoner be monitored by use of an electronic device.

A further amendment provides that the release on parole of a prisoner serving a sentence of imprisonment for a child sexual offence must be subject to a condition requiring the prisoner, on making an application for employment, to provide the prospective employer with a report about the prisoner's criminal history.

43—Amendment of section 71—Variation or revocation of parole conditions

This amendment transfers the responsibility for providing a report to the Board in relation to a person under the supervision of a community corrections officer from the officer to the CE.

44—Amendment of section 72—Discharge from parole of prisoners other than life prisoners

This amendment is consequential.

45—Repeal of section 73

This amendment repeals section 73 to remove the requirement that the Board automatically cancel the parole of a person who breaches a designated condition of his or her release on parole.

46—Amendment of section 74—Cancellation of release on parole by Board for breach of conditions

Some of these amendments are consequential. Another amendment removes the 6 month limit applying to the period for which the Board may direct a person who has breached a condition of his or her parole to serve in prison. A further amendment provides that any period for which a person is detained in custody or in prison after breaching a condition of parole is to be counted as or towards the period that the person is liable to serve in prison under this section (and any date on which the sentence is to be taken to have commenced will be fixed accordingly).

47—Amendment of section 74AA—Board may impose community service for breach of conditions

These amendments are consequential.

48—Amendment of section 75—Automatic cancellation of parole on imprisonment for offence committed while on parole

This amendment provides that any period for which a person is detained in custody or in prison after committing an offence while on parole is to be counted as or towards the period that the person is liable to serve in prison under this section (and any date on which the sentence is to be taken to have commenced will be fixed accordingly).

49—Substitution of section 76

This amendment substitutes section 76 and inserts new sections 76A and 76B.

76—Apprehension etc of parolees on Board warrant

Proposed section 76 is in substitution of existing section 76 which relates to the apprehension of parolees on a warrant of the Board. Proposed subsection (1) provides that the presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Board may, if he or she suspects on reasonable grounds that a person who has been released on parole may have breached a condition of parole, summon a person to attend before the Board or issue a warrant for the arrest of the person (for the purpose of bringing the person before the Board).

Proposed subsection (2) provides a member of the Board (other than the presiding member or deputy presiding member) may, if he or she holds the relevant suspicion, summon a person to attend before the Board or apply to the presiding member or deputy presiding member, or a magistrate, for the issue of a warrant for the arrest of the person.

The remaining subsections provide for procedures relating to warrants.

76A—Apprehension etc of parolees on warrant of CE

Proposed section 76A provides that the CE may, if the CE suspects on reasonable grounds that a person who has been released on parole may have breached a condition of parole, issue a warrant for the arrest of the person. Such a warrant authorises the detention of the person in custody until the end of five working days after the CE has provided a report on the matter to the Board (which must be provided within two working days of the issuing of a warrant). The presiding member or deputy presiding member of the Board must consider the report and either issue a fresh warrant for the continued detention of the person (for the purpose of bringing the person before the Board) or cancel the warrant and order the release of the person (and the member may issue a summons for the person to appear before the Board).

76B—Arrest of parolee by police officer

Proposed section 76B provides that a police officer may, without warrant, arrest a person who has been released on parole if the police officer suspects on reasonable grounds that—

- the person has, while on parole, breached a condition of parole; and
- the person presents an imminent and serious risk to public safety.

Proposed subsection (2) sets out procedures relating to the arrest of a person under the section.

50—Amendment of section 77—Proceedings before Board

51—Amendment of section 82—Unauthorised dealings with prisoners prohibited

52—Amendment of section 83—CE may make rules

53—Substitution of section 84

54—Amendment of section 85—Execution of warrants

55—Amendment of section 85A—Exclusion of persons from correctional institution

These amendments are consequential.

56—Amendment of section 85B—Power of search and arrest of non-prisoners

Some of these amendments are consequential. The amendment inserting new subsection (14) provides that, to avoid doubt, a reference in section 85B to a correctional institution includes a reference to all of the land identified in a proclamation under section 18(1) relating to the institution.

57—Amendment of section 85C—Confidentiality

Subclause (1) amends section 85C to use the term 'disclose' in substitution for 'divulge'. Another amendment allows for disclosure of information if, in the opinion of the CE, it is necessary to disclose the information in order to avert a serious risk to public safety. A further amendment requires the Board, in respect of a prisoner released on parole, to notify the Commissioner of Police of—

- the place of residence of the parolee; and
- the conditions to which the release on parole is subject.

58—Insertion of section 85CA

This amendment inserts new section 85CA.

85CA—Disclosure of health information

Proposed section 85CA provides that the following persons must disclose to the CE such personal information about a prisoner as is reasonably required for the treatment, care or rehabilitation of the prisoner:

- the Chief Executive of the administrative unit of the Public Service that is, under a Minister, responsible for the administration of the *Health Care Act 2008*;
- the Chief Executive of the administrative unit of the Public Service that is, under a Minister, responsible for the administration of the *Mental Health Act 2009*.

59—Amendment of section 85D—Release of information to registered victims etc

60—Amendment of section 86—Prison officers may use reasonable force in certain cases

These amendments are consequential.

61—Insertion of sections 86A and 86B

This amendment inserts new sections 86A and 86B.

86A—Prison officer may carry prescribed weapon

Proposed section 86A provides that the CE may authorise an officer or employee of the Department to carry a prescribed weapon while on duty for purposes specified by the CE. Subsection (2) requires an officer to comply with any requirements of the CE in relation to the handling, storage and responsible use of the weapon.

86B—Use of correctional services dogs

Proposed section 86B provides that the CE may authorise an officer or employee of the Department to use a correctional services dog at a correctional institution or probation and parole hostel to assist in the maintenance of the good order or security of the institution or hostel. Subsection (2) lists some of the purposes for which a correctional services dog may be used.

62—Amendment of section 88B—Evidentiary provisions

One of these amendments is consequential. The other amendment inserts an evidentiary provision relating to correctional services dogs.

63—Amendment of section 89—Regulations

These amendments are consequential.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

1—Amendment of section 15—Offensive weapons etc

This is a related amendment.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

ADELAIDE OVAL REDEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 June 2011.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (11:40): Madam Speaker:

Almighty God, we humbly beseech you to bless this parliament and to direct and prosper our deliberations to the advancement of your glory and the true welfare of the people of this state.

It is a prayer that we commence each day of parliament with. It reminds us that we are here first and foremost to serve the people of this state and to look to their true welfare and that, in all of our decisions, we must think first about what is best for South Australians, for the state and for the city.

I have often reflected on the comment of John Howard that, when the federal Liberal coalition was in place and a federal Labor government came forward with proposals to privatise the Commonwealth Bank, to sell Qantas, and to deregulate the banking system, the federal coalition took the view that it was in the best interests of Australia for those things to happen, so they did not oppose them; they supported them, even though they were coming from a Labor government. He always took the view that if it was the good for the country it should be supported, and that in opposition one should be careful about the positions one took to ensure that the best interests of the people and the state were always protected.

That is why I am very pleased to be standing today, as part of a team that has decided to support this legislation, to enable football to return to the city. I think it is a sound decision by our side of the house, and we all look forward now to seeing football returned to the city. Of course, we will be moving important amendments to the legislation, and I sincerely hope that the government gives them due regard because, as always, legislation can be improved. I look forward to seeing this stadium built, and football returned to the city.

In doing so, I want to support comments made by my colleagues on this side earlier, that this was never the preferred solution, that a better solution would always have been a separate, stand-alone stadium, down in the rail yards site. I want to go over some of the history here, because it has been reinvented. I want to remind the house that the language of the Labor government in its first term of office, and in the first couple of years of its second term, was, 'We stand for police, health and education,' and nothing else.

The state Labor government virtually built nothing in its first four years of office and, although it produced an infrastructure plan—and various other glossy plans—it was clear that they were not focused on building a vision for the future of this state, or an infrastructure vision. I say that because some of the decisions they made were very curious. For example, after the 2006 election, one of the first announcements we had was that we would be building trams from Victoria Square down through North Terrace—something that had not been foreshadowed during the election campaign, and it seemed to be something that had been plucked out of the sky.

Shortly afterwards, we had the announcement that we would be building a new hospital down in the rail yards, something else that had not been floated during the election campaign. In

fact, the government had taken to the election the promise that it would rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital in situ. Thirdly, there was precious little being done about building roads infrastructure. There clearly was no plan to build.

The opposition took the view in 2007, 2008 and 2009 that we needed to transform the political debate onto ground of our choosing, and take it away from the Labor Party's ground, which they had staked as being simply a debate about health, education and police—important though those three things are. We set about a deliberate program to focus the debate on a vision for the future of the state, a vision for the future of the city of Adelaide, and on building to make that vision a reality. That is why we announced a master plan for Adelaide in early 2008 at the Press Club which called for, amongst other things, a revitalising of the city of Adelaide based around the City West precinct.

We argued that this should be our Darling Harbour, this should be our inner city precinct. Melbourne and Brisbane had done it and we did not want to replicate exactly what they had done, but we needed to reinvigorate this city and it now needed to face the River Torrens not Victoria Square, and we needed a completely new journey.

That was reinforced throughout 2008 by our call for things such as new roads and the electrification of the railway system, and the announcement in early 2009 of further detail of our plans for a separate city stadium in City West and our view that we needed a new hospital but it needed to be rebuilt where it was, around the current site, and that the best site for the catalyst for change in this city was City West and that is where the stadium should be.

Our master plan for Adelaide announced at the Press Club in early 2008 also called for the Convention Centre to be expanded. It called for the Entertainment Centre to be brought from where it is at the top of Port Road to be collocated with the new stadium and the Convention Centre extension. We saw an enlivened precinct at the rail yards facing the Torrens. We subsequently flagged the prospect of the casino being part of that new vision, with possibly a science and technology museum. There was a whole raft of new measures that could possibly have included hotels, cafes and restaurants and a complete reinvention of the city of Adelaide based around the Adelaide rail yard site.

Initially, it was described as not a vision but a squint, and the Labor Party did everything it could to dismiss our vision. They argued that the Convention Centre did not need to be extended at all and it was a waste of money. They are on the record time and again saying that. They argued that the Entertainment Centre could stay where it was and we did not need football in the city. They raced down to AAMI Stadium, in fact, with their chequebook and wrote out a cheque for, I think it was, \$150 million and they said, 'We will leave football at AAMI Stadium. That is the future for football.' They did everything they could to scotch the vision we set out.

What happened then was that the public debate started to change. Instead of talking about health, education, police and nothing else, the public debate started to move to the issue of a vision for the future of the city and this state, and the Labor government was drawn to a ground of our choosing and these issues became the compelling debates that led up to the 2010 state election. It was a very good example of an opposition getting results from opposition and causing a government to move its agenda to that being set out by the opposition. It is an absolute credit to everyone on this side that that was done. Let me remind the house of what then occurred.

Within months of the master plan for Adelaide being announced, the government threw \$50 million at the Entertainment Centre for a major facelift. It is an excellent development down there and it now looks great; but, to extinguish the concept of moving the Entertainment Centre, they threw \$50 million at it immediately. Next, as I mentioned, they went down to AAMI Stadium with \$150 million and did everything they could to convince the SANFL and the two clubs to remain at AAMI Stadium in the hope of extinguishing the momentum that was growing behind our vision for City West.

Subsequently, having scotched the idea of extending the Convention Centre, saying it was a waste of money and it couldn't be done, what have they decided to do? They decided to commit \$394 million to an extension of the Convention Centre. Finally, under the pressure of our arguments, they completely caved in in late 2009 and decided that football would move to Adelaide Oval. They were forced, kicking and screaming on every single issue we had set out before them, to come to our side of the argument.

The result was that, in the election campaign, we were not having an argument about whether we would have a new hospital: it was about where it would be. We were not having an

argument about whether we would have a new stadium and football would come to the city: we were having an argument about whether it would be City West or Adelaide Oval. These were positives. We were going to get good results no matter who won. Sadly, the better outcome that would have been delivered had we won is not that which will ultimately be delivered.

I steadfastly believe that the City West area should have been the site for a separate stand-alone stadium, that it would have been absolutely fantastic, that we should have extended the Convention Centre, brought the Entertainment Centre up and re-enlivened that precinct. It would have been our Docklands, our Darling Harbour. It would have been absolutely sensational, but sadly, in at least six seats, the people of South Australia did not see it that way and the result was that the Labor Party was returned.

There were some other events that changed the landscape. One was that we failed to win the World Cup bid—a sad day for Australia but, as a result of that, the investment that would have flowed from a successful World Cup bid was not there. The third thing that occurred was that there were floods in Queensland and various other financial disasters, mainly of the federal Labor Party's making, that predicated that the federal Labor government had no money to invest in a stadium and a number of other projects, having cancelled others such as, for example, the O-Bahn development.

This trifecta of Labor winning the election, our failure to win the World Cup bid and the federal Labor government's financial mismanagement causing an absence of funding meant that plans for a new stadium and a new hospital were shrouded in gloom. I note that the government has decided to go ahead with its hospital plan—a costly plan and one that I think will prove too costly. However, it has also decided to go ahead with its Adelaide Oval plan, and that reflects the three realities that I mentioned earlier.

The good news is that football will be coming to the city, and I must say that I completely agree that there will be benefits from that. People will have their own view on the economic case set out by the South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. I note that it talks of a nearly \$700 million additional benefit over the coming 10 years. Billions of dollars of economic activity will be generated at the new city stadium, and I think it will be a good investment.

I completely concur with our position that it needs to be capped at \$535 million. I would have hoped that it would be significantly less, but that is where we are. If the state government can get money out of the federal government and the AFL and put extra money in, that is their call, but I do not want to see a single dollar more than what has been pegged being spent.

However, I would simply say that if it is good enough to spend \$394 million on a Convention Centre which is there for the tourism, conventions and entertainment industry, if it is good enough to spend more than \$300 million on a ship lift down at Osborne, which is there for a particular industry, the defence industry (and I think it has been a very good investment), if it is good enough to spend \$50 million more recently at the Entertainment Centre and hundreds of millions of dollars before that at an entertainment centre for rock bands and concert performers, and if we see those investments as being good for the state of South Australia, then why can't we see this investment also being good for the people of South Australia? I think it is good and I am pleased that our side will be supporting the bill.

I also make this point: if the stadium remains active and vibrant for 80 years of the proposed lease, the amortised cost per year in 2001 dollars of the \$535 million investment being made by the government will have been around \$6.7 million per year. Even based on a 40-year life of the AAMI Stadium, the investment being made would be around \$13.4 million per year. If you look at the life of the project and the benefits in terms of economic activity that will flow from it, I think the case looks much stronger indeed.

Cricket and football are important and powerful businesses in this state. Thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions—in fact, billions—of dollars of economic activity over the next 80 years will be generated around them. I think the plans for the oval are exciting. They are not as good as the plans would have been for a separate stand-alone stadium. All those arguments have been put: it is not a covered dome; I think, in the fullness of time, it will be crowded down there with the AFL, cricket and soccer looking for new venues for international fixtures; it is one stadium. All of those arguments have been put by my colleagues.

If people had had the opportunity to see the exciting proposal we would have put, I think it would have blown the Adelaide Oval proposal away, but the fact is we are where we are. What this option will do is achieve the goal of bringing football back into the city, which was always the state

Liberal's goal. We would not be here today discussing this bill were it not for members on this side of the house. Were it not for us taking a lead on this issue, we would never have football in the city.

Not only can we claim credit for this decision but we forced the Labor government to get a result. Otherwise, we would still be here talking about their endless spin on bikies and the various other subjects that they were dribbling on with in their first two terms of government. We forced them to focus on revitalising the city and a vision for the city and the riverside precinct. It would not even be on their agenda were it not for us, and we can take full credit for this decision. It is not as good as it could have been, but at least it will bring football into the city.

I am proud to represent a party that is a champion of the Parklands. I also support the amendments that we propose to put that will help to protect the Parklands. I think this is a debate this parliament and this state need to explore more fulsomely over the next few years. The perception that the way things have been done in the last 150 years should be the way they are done for the next 150 years I think needs review. I think state governments, regardless of political persuasion, need to be much more active in supporting and preserving the Parklands, and in funding them.

I see a vision for the Parklands that puts them into the status of a major world parklands, along the lines of Central Park or any one of the major city parklands of Europe, but that will require a greater role from state government. That needs to provide for things such as the Adelaide Oval redevelopment and the Victoria Park redevelopment that was the subject of debate in the last parliament, because the Parklands, whilst being beautiful and whilst being preserved, still need to be used. They still need to have fixtures and infrastructure within them that attracts people to them, whether it is for the Clipsal, motor sport, horseracing, the zoo, cricket or football, but they also need to be preserved and protected as a green belt around the city.

I congratulate the SANFL, particularly Leigh Whicker, John Olsen and all of the board of the SANFL, for the effort they have put in to bringing football back into the city. I also congratulate the two clubs. There has been some bashing of football and cricket during the course of this debate. I am a complete supporter of football and cricket. I think they are fantastic for the state. This will be to their benefit, but will be to the benefit of us all. I congratulate Ian McLachlan and his team at SACA for the extraordinary effort they have put into this as well.

Although I am reluctant to say so, whilst acknowledging that we would not even be here debating this if it were not for the state Liberals, I offer some small congratulation to the minister. I struggle to say this. I am having difficulty with this, but I do want to pat the Minister for Infrastructure and the former treasurer on the back for one thing, and one thing only. That is that I suspect they have carried the debate in Labor caucus that has seen this initiative remain alive within the government.

I know there were forces within the government that would have been happy to rip it up, and the worst possible outcome would have been nothing. The worst possible outcome for South Australia would have been for cricket to have to go back to its corner, football to be left at AAMI Stadium with a struggling business plan, for the clubs to fall into chaos and for South Australians to get nothing at all.

To that extent, in the fact that the government has not gone weak at the knees on this, I give some small congratulation. I finalise by saying that this is a great proposal. I am pleased that we are supporting it, I look forward to seeing it built and let us now get on with it.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:00): I will take just a few minutes to make some brief comments in relation to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment bill. I think that speakers before me have outlined the debate and the issues quite comprehensively, but there are some points that I would like to make in relation to the bill.

I am no different from a number of members who were young boys in the 1960s. Some of us were born in the late 1950s and were young lads in the 1960s. We have all got fond memories of going to Adelaide Oval and watching what was then a really first-class level of football competition, the elite level of football here in South Australia, and those great teams of the 1960s with Sturt, Port, South, Glenelg and Norwood.

Clearly, I have fond memories of going to the finals and the grand finals at Adelaide Oval with my father, my grandfather and my uncle and viewing those great games. Also, at the end of the games, the actual ground was opened up and you could walk across the ground, over to the other side and walk off up to where the car was parked.

I have fond memories, as have a number of members in this place and no doubt thousands of South Australians, of what was the elite level of football, being the SANFL, and those great teams, as I said, playing at Adelaide Oval. We all know the history that took place, that the SANFL had issues with the South Australian Cricket Association, and they were not able to overcome their issues so that, in the 1970s, we saw Football Park built.

I still have a clear recollection of the very first time I went to Football Park. I drove past it and I was just amazed at the size of the stadium. It was only a very small part of what the infrastructure is now. The grandstand to the western side of the ground was the first part of the construction. I remember driving down and parking and, when I walked into the stadium, I was absolutely amazed at the purpose-built stadium to house football here in this state.

I have been a keen follower of football all my life, a keen follower of football at Football Park. I clearly remember the state games that were played between South Australia and the Victorians. I remember the game when South Australia beat Victoria; that was absolutely tremendous. I remember all the grand finals between Port and Sturt, Port and Norwood (again), Sturt and Norwood and Glenelg—all those great SANFL final series down at Football Park.

Let us fast forward a bit from those halcyon days of the SANFL to when South Australian-based teams entered the AFL. The scenario for football in this state changed significantly. The local situation did change significantly, but it did not change football's resolve, obviously, to stay at Football Park, or what we now call AAMI Stadium. As the member for Davenport and, I think, the leader yesterday said in their contributions to the debate, there was a document prepared by the SANFL only a couple of years ago that confirmed their commitment to staying at West Lakes.

Now, let us fast forward again to the period leading up to the 2010 election campaign. We have just heard the member for Waite outline some of the history in relation to that period. I believe that the government was panicked into doing something in relation to the Liberal opposition's plan to bring football to the city. In doing that, I believe it prematurely announced the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval and bringing football to the Adelaide Oval, because it did not have the stakeholders on board.

The SANFL was vehemently opposed. The Crows did not like it. I remember radio interviews conducted with Steven Trigg, the CEO of the Adelaide Crows. The Crows needed a lot of convincing that it was the right move. The government did not have the stakeholders on board and it has taken this period, from late 2009 to now, to come to this position.

We all remember the photograph on the Adelaide Oval. One of the media advisers or whoever told everybody that they should smile so that everybody looked like they were having a good time and everybody was agreeing with the proposal. We know that that was far from the case. There was still some quite strong opposition to the proposal to bring AFL to Adelaide Oval.

As time progressed, and the government committed its '\$450 million and not a penny more', SACA did become attracted to the proposition, with a view to having its debt repaid. As we know, \$85 million was added to the \$450 million to repay the SACA debt. Hence, we come to the current position where the cost will be \$535 million. In my opinion, SACA was obviously attracted to it because it was getting its debt paid off.

This is a half-baked measure. It was the Liberal opposition's proposal to have a purpose-built covered stadium for football and other related ball sports. This is a half-baked measure. Personally, I think it is taking the state in the wrong direction because, at the moment, as has been outlined by previous members, we are a two-stadium city and we are going to a one-stadium city.

I do not know how anybody can actually say that that is progress; you are reducing your stadiums by half. The member for Davenport, in his contribution, outlined that every other capital city in the country has two stadiums, if not more. I have been to Etihad Stadium in Melbourne and looked at that. I have been to the MCG a number of times for VFL grand finals in the early days, then AFL grand finals, so I have got a good understanding of the facilities that are provided.

The question I would ask is: when the Adelaide Oval redevelopment takes place, what is going to happen to Football Park? What is going to happen to AAMI Stadium? I do not think the SANFL teams will play there every week. They want to play on their home grounds. Port will want to play at Alberton, Sturt will want to play at Unley, Norwood will want to play at the Parade, Centrals will want to play at Elizabeth and the Bays will want to play at Glenelg. So, what will that mean? They will obviously play the finals series there and the grand final. What will that mean for

Football Park? Will it be in mothballs? Will it be left dormant for 11 months of the year and only come to life in September and early October when the finals series are played?

For a multimillion-dollar facility and the multimillion dollars worth of infrastructure that have been invested in that facility over the last 40 years, is that a good use of infrastructure? Clearly, the answer is no. I have seen the SANFL plans and I know that down the track it will be reduced down to local sport and then some will be sold for residential development. Over the next decade I think that is quite a poor use of a multimillion-dollar facility.

It is evident that there has to have been some pressure placed on the SANFL for them to change their position. I heard the Minister for Police say yesterday that once it realised the benefits and so on of moving into the city that it gradually changed its mind, but there must have been some pressure placed on the SANFL in some way for it to change its position. As I stated earlier, it was vehemently opposed to it less than 12 months ago so there must have been some pressure, some coercion placed on the SANFL for it to change its position and agree to have football come to Adelaide Oval.

I want to talk about the SANFL competition and how that relates to football played around the state. In the Hills Football League competition, players are being paid to play in that competition at a higher level than some in the SANFL. They are getting more money to play country football than the players in the SANFL are.

That raises the question of what the SANFL is doing to promote the competition at the league level—when you have quite good league players (who are playing in the first 22, in the ones at the league level) leaving those clubs and going to play for country clubs and getting more money. I fully understand that players are attracted to the SANFL because it provides the avenue into the AFL, but that is not the case in every instance.

There are lads who get picked up from interstate country leagues—the VFA comp, and over in the west, but also from the country competition right around the nation—particularly states that have Australian rules football as their predominant winter sport. It is not necessarily the only avenue for lads to enter the AFL, but I know it is viewed as a good way of being identified and drafted or picked up and put into the AFL.

The majority of those players who play in the SANFL have aspirations to play in the AFL, where the lads who have left the SANFL comp and gone to the country have perhaps made a decision that they do not aspire to the AFL. I think those points are relevant.

What we are getting for our \$535 million is a C-grade outcome for an A-grade game and event. We all know that the AFL is the elite level of Australian rules football, but what we are getting in the redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval is a C-grade outcome.

We are still going to get rained on. It is played in the wintertime and it rains in the wintertime—everybody knows that. As the member for MacKillop said, when he was at the soccer last Sunday he was more towards the rear of the stand than he was to the front of the stand and he was getting rained on.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We all know that down at the South-East it rains 300 days of the year and drips off the trees on the other 65! Be that as it may, we are getting a C-grade outcome, where people will still get rained on when games are being played.

The other question is: how do we pay for this \$535 million price tag? Call me a conspiracy theorist, but it seems less than coincidental that the day after the SACA vote was taken—and SACA members voted at the meeting to support football coming to the oval—the Treasurer announced the sale of the South-East forests. That will mean that the economy of a significant part of regional South Australia will be placed in jeopardy to pay for the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

The member for Flinders says they are being sacrificed. We have seen two massive rallies held on the steps of Parliament House here on North Terrace opposing the sale of those forests. So, what we are seeing is a significant part of South Australia's regional economy being placed in jeopardy to pay the \$535 million—100-plus years of income from the South-East forests is being used to pay for this. As I said, the Treasurer coincidentally made that announcement—and I know the member for Davenport made some public comment himself in relation to this—a day after the SACA vote. Anyway, we are where we are. The project is progressing.

As has been pointed out, this legislation is not absolutely necessary or absolutely required for the project to proceed; however, we find ourselves here in this situation. What the opposition intends to do through its amendments is really make the best of a bad situation.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (12:17): I rise to speak on the much anticipated and, I would argue, much overdue bill on the redevelopment of the Adelaide Oval. I am strongly in favour of football moving into the city. It was, of course, a Liberal initiative in the first instance. It was a Liberal policy position leading into the 2010 election, and it remains a Liberal policy to this day. Of course, this policy has brought a vision to redevelop and regenerate the Riverside precinct here in the centre of Adelaide.

This is an area in which the government has been negligent over the nine years it has been in office to date. The state government has a valuable role to play in continually revitalising our infrastructure in South Australia. This goes back to governments of both persuasions over a long period of time—Steele Hall, with his initiative to establish the Festival Centre; Don Dunstan, outdoor dining; John Bannon, of course, with the ASER project for the Adelaide Station and Environs Redevelopment; and the Brown and Olsen governments, with their manifold redevelopments within the precinct of Adelaide. This is an area where the government has been very poor. It has not done a lot to revitalise our city, Adelaide. The initiative to bring football into the city is much overdue, but we applaud the government for finally getting around to making a move on this.

There is no doubt that football in South Australia is in a very lacklustre state at the moment. We are one of the only places in Australia where attendances are falling for AFL, where viewer numbers are falling. Our two teams are at the bottom of the AFL ladder, and supporters are disenchanted with the performance of football in South Australia.

There is no doubt that we must urgently progress the move of football into the city. I note with this proposal that the government is always talking about rushing this through with great alacrity. The simple fact of the matter is that the first game is going to be played in 2015. I hardly call that a speedy response to what is an increasing imperative for football in South Australia.

The current proposal by the government is undoubtedly a compromise. It is a sub-optimal option for this imperative to move football into the city as quickly as possible. They would have been far better off sticking with the Liberal proposal for a separate stand-alone FIFA compliant stadium. A two-stadium option for South Australia, quite frankly, is the only way to move forward. There is no doubt about that in my mind whatsoever but, unfortunately, politics got in the way. The Labor Party could not see itself accepting another policy suggestion from the Liberal Party and implementing that so it had to come up with an alternative. This is, as one of my colleagues pointed out yesterday, a 20th century solution to a 21st century opportunity, and South Australia deserves more.

The government proposal was, of course, very hurriedly put together in announcing the lead-up to the 2010 election, and many of my other colleagues have gone through the history of our announcement which preceded the government's by more than a year. The government's initial response was to continually restate that South Australia could not afford to move football into the city and that AAMI Stadium was the home of football. In fact, it spent a lot of money. Originally it proposed spending \$100 million redeveloping that site. I understand that it spent something like \$10 million on the early stages of that before it finally gave up on that failed and flawed policy in response to our initiative, and it capitulated to the overwhelming support of general members of the public for moving football into the city.

As I said, it is undoubtedly a compromise; it is undoubtedly a rush job and it falls down in several major areas. First, it is not a covered stadium, and, secondly, there is clearly not enough parking for this project. There is no obvious opportunity for expansion. As I said, this is a very short-term response for our city. What are we going to do when we want to expand this down the track, or are we saying that we will never ever need to move beyond 50,000 people sitting in that stadium? So, what do we do? Do we get rid of the scoreboard; do we get rid of the Moreton Bay figs?

There are limited opportunities now on this site to expand the capacity beyond the 50,000 that it is proposing with this current project. We are still no wiser as to what the total costs of the project are. We have been told that there is a new cap of \$535 million but we do not really have a clear picture of what the total cost of bridge, car parking and other incidental items are going to be.

We also have very little knowledge about what the environmental impacts will be for this project. My understanding is that there has been no environmental impact statement released and, in fact, no environmental impact statement has even been commissioned. We also do not know what the effects of this project are going to be more broadly, not just on the Parklands but also in terms of historic preservation, and the Minister for the Environment has been particularly silent on this project to date.

In round terms, this proposal is to spend \$535 million to move from a 30,000-seat stadium to a 47,000-seat stadium undercover. We have already heard this weekend that many of these so-called undercover seats are not really weatherproof. They might be shade-proof but we heard yesterday that many people attending the Soccerroos games were wet in the western stand. Hopefully, that will be rectified as we move forward with Adelaide Oval.

My biggest problem is the equation of value for money. When the federal government spends money on infrastructure, it is required by legislation to actually do a cost benefit analysis for any infrastructure spend, I think, over \$10 million. There has been no cost benefit analysis done on this project to my mind and it would be good if it could be done. The reason why it could not be done is that I do not think it offers a sound cost benefit result for South Australia.

How could you say that it is a good result for an extra 9,000 undercover seats at a cost of \$535 million? In round terms we are talking about spending \$60,000 per additional seat. These are the most expensive additional seats in a stadium anywhere in the world I would proffer here today in the parliament. So, that is nearly \$60,000 per seat and, of course, these seats are not going to—if you go on current crowds and attendances—be used all that often. So the cost every time somebody places their derriere on the seat is going to be very high indeed.

I also think that this is not a stadium which will stand the test of time. To my mind, I would be happy to put money on the fact that, within the first 20 years, we will be unequivocally talking about moving football from the redeveloped Adelaide Oval to a new, separate, stand-alone stadium in the centre of Adelaide. There is no doubt that this the way forward; there is no doubt that is the 21st century solution—one which is obvious to most, except for the government. What will that actually leave us at the Adelaide Oval? What it will leave us with at the Adelaide is a massive stadium and capacity for cricket which, of course, is not really something which cricket has been seeking for their cricket spectators, so I really worry about the long-term affects there.

Let's have a quick look at the legislation which the government has finally brought to the parliament. The government introduced the legislation towards the end of the last sitting week. The Liberal party room met on Monday night, in our very first party room meeting after the legislation was introduced to the parliament, and we resolved to be supporting this legislation in this place. The government basically wants to position the Liberal Party as this big bunch of blockers and knockers—people who do not want to see football enter the city. Well, nothing could be further from the truth.

The simple fact of the matter is that it was a Liberal initiative from day one, and this government had to be dragged, kicking and screaming, to also support this concept of bringing football to the city. They love to actually present us as being the ones who have been slowing down this process. The simple fact of the matter is; they announced this policy position back in 2009. They said, in the lead-up to the 2010 election, that they would be finalising the deal—a \$450 million public spend—by 30 June 2010. Do you know what? It is now June 2011, and they have finally brought some legislation to this parliament.

They rabbit on all the time in the media about, 'Are the Liberals slowing down this process?' and, 'Why did the Liberals spend three hours in their party room to discuss it?' They have actually taken 14 or 15 months to bring the legislation to us. I think it is completely appropriate that the Liberal Party takes three hours to consider the legislation which they have brought, and I completely refute the government's suggestions that we are in any way trying to stifle or slow down this process whatsoever. It was a Liberal initiative and the government—if they were doing their job properly—should have brought in this legislation many, many years ago.

This legislation basically gives government the ability to effect their proposal to enter into a long-term agreement with the Stadium Management Authority, to control the Adelaide Oval and the surrounding parklands and also, importantly, to override the existing planning laws in South Australia.

I personally believe that this is particularly poor legislation, and there is no doubt that there are amendments which are necessary, and it is a pity that the government did not see this in the

drafting. As I said, they have had plenty of time since the March 2010 election—14 months—where they could have been considering this, and the legislation is deficient in many areas.

The Liberal Party has already put on the record in this place that we will be proposing a series of amendments, and they are being drafted at the moment. The legislation as it stands at the moment certainly gives too much power to the minister for the period 2011 to 2015. We will propose that the existing state planning laws are followed in this case. The current proposal is in direct contravention of the Adelaide Park Lands Act 2005, which was of course introduced to this parliament by the current government.

In fact, the proposal in this legislation is far less satisfactory than even major project status, which is already a method that allows planning to move from orthodox planning to a fast-tracked planning situation. This proposal moves even further away from existing laws. We cannot see any evidence put up by the government as to why we should bin all our planning laws in South Australia to fast-track this proposal.

We will also be insisting upon the ongoing scrutiny and reporting by the Auditor-General's Department on this project. This was an idea first suggested by the Labor opposition in the lead-up to the 2002 state election when it put this idea forward for ongoing public scrutiny by the Auditor-General's Department of infrastructure spends in South Australia. It was a good suggestion and, of course, it is one that the government has not implemented since it came to power in 2002, and we certainly will be insisting upon this concept of public scrutiny being incorporated into the final legislation. It is an important safety mechanism to ensure that this project is delivered in a way that is not detrimental to the people of South Australia.

We will also be insisting that this goes to the Public Works Committee. Again, when this was raised by the Liberal Party yesterday, the government said, 'Of course it is going to go to the Public Works Committee. Are the Liberals crazy, or something? Of course it is going to go to Public Works.' Let me tell members that the Royal Adelaide Hospital has not gone to the Public Works Committee. There are plenty of things that have not gone to the Public Works Committee under this government, and they should. There has to be full parliamentary scrutiny of these projects when taxpayer money is being spent.

The government has also made comments in the media about the Liberal opposition's suggestion that a rent should be paid. We do not think that it is outrageous when the government is planning on spending \$535 million worth of taxpayer funds. The interest payments on that (because, of course, we do not have \$535 million sitting in the Treasury) are going to be in the order of \$20 million, \$25 million or maybe \$30 million a year. We do not think it is completely out of order that the people who are going to be the major recipients of this capital investment in their sports should not make a contribution back to this state.

Also, a major area of our concern reflected in the amendments that we are moving relates to Parklands preservation. This is an area that is of particular importance to me in Norwood. Many people have contacted the office regarding this point in particular. We believe the Adelaide City Council remain the best people to control a large part of those Parklands. They have looked after the Parklands and been their custodians on behalf of the people of South Australia for a long period of time and I believe they have done this particularly well. So we will certainly be adjusting the full apron that this project will be sitting on and making sure that the most sensitive areas remain under the control of the Adelaide City Council.

We will, of course, also be insisting on a legislated cap to the project to protect any further blowouts occurring from this already mismanaged project. Finally, we will be insisting on a sinking fund. Again, yesterday during discussions in this house, the minister said, 'Yes, of course that is going to be part of it.' We would like to see it legislated to make sure that it is incorporated into the legislation.

I believe that all the amendments which are proposed by the Liberal opposition and being drafted at the moment are reasonable. I do not think anybody could say that in any way we are trying to stifle or slow down the progress of this proposal. There is no doubt that these are important safeguards and measures for the people of South Australia. Many constituents have made representations to me about the project and I thank the people of Norwood for making those representations. I have had meetings, phone calls, emails and a lot of letters on this issue. Many people think that this is not something that we should be spending money on at the moment.

I think the basis of their concern is that many infrastructure projects in South Australia have been neglected over a long period of time. Many services have been neglected. I do not subscribe

to the view that \$535 million should not be spent on this so that it can go directly to other services and infrastructure projects. I think this is an important project for South Australia. It is an important project for Adelaide. Whether we like it or not, people evaluate and judge cities by the stadia that they have, and I think that this is an important development for South Australia.

I do think, though, that we need to ensure that there is adequate funding for ongoing grassroots sport and recreation in South Australia. This is another area where this government has failed over a long period of time. In my electorate, the Norwood Cycling Club is a fantastic institution. We still do not have a permanent criterium track here in South Australia. There are seven in New South Wales and none in South Australia.

The Norwood Swimming Club has completely inadequate facilities. Yes, the government has put infrastructure into the Marion swimming centre, but that is hardly centrally located and, really, Norwood is a large swimming club with very poor facilities. The Norwood Basketball Club has quite rightly been making representations to all levels of government over a long period of time asking them to address the severe lack of indoor recreation facilities in South Australia.

I do not think we should stop spending \$535 million on the Adelaide Oval to spend money on this. I would encourage the government to look at its spending and cut out waste so that we can support worthy projects like grassroots football, but I certainly do not for one minute suggest that we should not be going ahead with the Adelaide Oval and bringing football into the city.

I understand that the project will not be finished until 2015, so there has already been a delay on the project since it was originally announced that it would be completed by 2014. It is going to be completed in 2015. I think it is ironic that the Labor government—which I personally do not believe will be sitting on those benches in 2015—will not be actually tossing that coin. I think it is completely appropriate that Isobel Redmond who will be premier in March 2014 will be the person who tosses the first coin for the first game.

It is after all a Liberal initiative to bring football back to the city and I cannot think of anything more appropriate than to have Isobel Redmond, the first female premier of South Australia, tossing the coin for the very first game held on the redeveloped Adelaide Oval.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:37): I rise to speak on the bill at hand. I reiterate that I am still definitely against the view that this was the right use of public money. I think that going from two ovals to one and being the only mainland state to have just one oval is a backward step and certainly not a forward-looking step. I am desperately saddened that we do not have a second oval that has a roof, that is a multifunction and multipurpose stadium and one that does not require parking on the Parklands but actually has its own parking available.

The Liberals, after our three-hour meetings—which have been discussed a few times—have made the best of what is a bad situation or a bad deal for South Australians. The Liberal Party was united in that it wanted football in the city, and I still want football in the city. I just do not think this is the best way and the best use of public money. For not much more, we could have built a covered purpose-built stadium that is multiuse and does not rely on the Parklands.

All that being said, we have made the best we can of this legislation. The Parklands surrounding Adelaide do not belong to the Adelaide City Council, nor do they belong to the state government. The Parklands belong to the people of South Australia and have been managed by the Adelaide City Council for some 160 years. Following a council meeting on 22 February this year, the Lord Mayor announced the council's unanimous decision to support the redevelopment at Adelaide Oval, stating that the council was looking forward to negotiating with the state government and other stakeholders.

The government's bill as it presently stands means there will be little need for the government to negotiate at all with the Adelaide City Council. It would seem that the council has been blindsided by the Rann state government and that, under this bill as it stands, the council will lose control of a significant portion of the Parklands to the Stadium Management Authority and the rightful owners of the Parklands—the residents of South Australia—will be silenced.

I presume that none of the councillors, when they unanimously supported this decision, predicted that the government had planned through legislation to seize this precinct, protected by the council for so long, and hand it over to a private consortium. Ironically, it is now the Liberal opposition to whom the council and the public of South Australia turn to protect the Parklands from this development. To quote the Lord Mayor:

[The Bill] is over-reaching with respect to the powers provided to the Minister to effect the Development. As a consequence, the Bill is not considered by Council to provide legislation that would be for the benefit of both present and future generations of all South Australians.

The federal government's Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities recognises that the Adelaide Parklands and the city layout was a masterwork of urban design and signified a turning point in Australia's settlement. It did this by bestowing the Adelaide Parklands with Australia's highest heritage honour by including the area on the National Heritage List on 7 November 2008.

This government clearly does not acknowledge the national heritage recognition of the Parklands and this government is content for the Parklands to be handed over to big business, to private hands and be turned into a car park. So much for moving forward. This state is moving backwards under the care of this Labor government, and in the process we are destroying a beautiful world-renowned oval in a nationally heritage listed area. What is the point of being nationally heritage listed if a minister can come in and redevelop the whole area, including changing the form of the land?

After consultation with the City Council and in consideration of interested parties, the Liberal Party seeks to put forward amendments to this bill. It insists that this project become more accountable and have the regular planning processes applied. That is, third party involvement by the Development Assessment Commission to ensure that there is an independent assessment of the particulars of the development. The bill in its current form gives carte blanche powers to the minister to do as he pleases without consultation or consequence.

We also require the Auditor-General be given powers to audit the project and regularly report to parliament, and that the legislation requires the Adelaide Oval project go to the Public Works Committee so it is placed under the same scrutiny as any other public works. We also believe that it is fair that the legislation require a licence or rental for the SMA to be charged.

For example, in 2015 that would be \$250,000, rising in 2016 to \$500,000, and \$1 million by 2017. This should be reassessed every three years by the Treasurer as to whether this is the appropriate amount. I believe SACA are currently paying \$25,000 per annum to the Adelaide City Council, which is less than you would pay to lease a small office in the city area.

We also believe it is in the best interests of all South Australians that the legislation cap the state's contribution to the project. This includes the amount for inside the licence and the core areas, including any contribution to SACA debt, and that this should be capped at the \$535 million that the Labor government has already said it should be capped to.

We believe that there should also be included in the legislation a sinking fund, to be established to ensure proper maintenance of the facility and capital being available for future works. The Auditor-General should oversee the sinking fund and recommend amounts required to be placed in the fund, and the Treasurer should have the final say on how much the SMA put into the sinking fund.

Items that we think should be removed from the licence area include Colonel Light's Vision and the line of trees south of the vision and the area that runs adjacent to the roads. They should definitely be removed so they remain under the control and care of the council. The Pennington Gardens and the Cresswell Gardens should also be removed from the licence area and remain under the council's care and control, and managed in accordance with the Community Land Management Plans, with the Development Assessment Commission resolving any disputes. This would also enable the protection of Australia's oldest World War I memorial tree. There is also a requirement to protect the Moreton Bay figs.

We also support the council's request to legislate that the council must licence the minister for the two licence areas on an 80-year maximum. I would recommend that a 20 x 4 term would be the best way to go. The minister must manage them in accordance with the Community Land Management Plans, including 1,450 car parks as agreed with the council. If there is a disagreement on the plan, the legislation could provide for an appeal to the DAC as the final authority who would approve the plan. There would be no third-party appeals. Any development in the licence area must be in accordance with the approved management plan and approved by the DAC. That legislation also should be amended so that the core area have a maximum of 80 years—again, preferably 20 plus 20 plus 20.

My office has received numerous pieces of correspondence in relation to this proposed legislation, and I just would like to read into *Hansard* some quotes. I quote the Park Lands Preservation Association:

This association has grave concerns about this outrageous bill...This bill represents an audacious attempt to privatise and commercialise Park 26...for cricket and AFL/SANFL football interests. This represents the biggest alienation and desecration threat to Adelaide Parklands in living memory.

I quote from one of the many letters from an individual constituent:

The Parklands are held in trust for all South Australians and I do not believe that a body should take them over and make money out of the car parking on a frequent basis. This will cause great damage and ruin the ambience of these Parklands.

Finally, I will end with a quote from the South-East City Residents Association:

It is astonishing that a democratically-elected government could produce such an undemocratic and draconian document. To place this area of Adelaide's unique heritage-listed Parklands under the control of an unelected commercial entity, the SMA, which is free to do what it wants with them, is in effect privatising that area of the Parklands. This action is abhorrent and not in the interests of the people of South Australia.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:46): Many of my colleagues have run through the detail of the legislation. I would like to spend some time talking about the politics. The situation we have at the moment reminds me quite a bit of the situation that we had at the federal level in the lead-up to the 1993 election. We all remember that John Hewson had put forward his GST package well in advance of the federal election, and, of course, what that did was to give the new but still tired Keating government the ability to counter what the then Liberal opposition at the federal level was doing with a new vision for Australia—a new tax package.

The government decided that it was going to oppose the GST. It ran an enormous scare campaign, and I think that was a lesson for many political parties about going out too early with your detail. What was interesting about that, of course, was that, immediately after the election, the very first budget after the election when that Labor government promised no GST if it was returned, we saw wholesale changes to wholesale sales taxes in South Australia.

I remember that because I was in the furniture business, and that was a victim, if you like, of a very complicated and recessive wholesale sales tax regime that the GST was going to replace. What we saw, in typical Labor style, was all the wholesale sales taxes lifted. Wholesale sales tax is a hidden tax. Most people do not know that it is being paid because it does not appear on the retail price ticket, it does not appear at the retail level. It is paid from supplier to retailer or from wholesaler to retailer, and appears as a separate item on the invoice. They know they are paying it.

It does affect the price, of course, and it taxes every business. We know what is happening there. It was very visible for business people but it was not visible for the public. What the Keating government did immediately after the election, when it promised no GST (because GST would affect the cost of living), was to broaden the net for the wholesale sales tax system. The government took it out into much broader areas and lifted the rate.

If we come back to the Adelaide Oval debate, when we made the announcement nearly two years out from the election that we wanted to bring football to the city, the then sports minister, the Premier and all the key players in the Rann government and football itself said, 'No, West Lakes is the home for footy. The Liberals are dreaming. People don't want football in the city. West Lakes is where it is going to be; and, by the way, SANFL, here's a \$100 million cheque to upgrade your stadium.' We all remember that.

Of course, it obviously engaged Hawker Britton, the focus room started and the feedback was coming back that no, people want footy in the city. The SANFL, we know, wanted its own stadium. It put a submission to the Premier that it wanted its own stadium in the West Parklands. His response was, 'No, you can't have that. It is too much like the Liberals' plan. Come up with something else. Cobble something else together.'

Cobble something else together, a bit like Keating did after the GST election. He played around with what he had rather than a new vision and a new start for the Australian tax system. He just tinkered around the edges and that is what we have got here. We have got the result of a government reacting and responding to a good policy from the Liberal Party, from the opposition, and coming up with a second-best choice for the people of South Australia.

We need to understand the way that the Labor Party works and to understand the hypocrisy of the legislation that the government says it needs for this to go forward. We know it

does not need the legislation. There are other things open to it, but we agreed to the legislation, with some amendments, because we want to be in the tent on this. We want to see what the government is up to. We want to be there to critique the government. We want to be there to hold it accountable.

If we go back to the promises, remember the 2002 election? The Labor Party did not have the seat of Adelaide. It wanted the seat of Adelaide; it preselected Jane Lomax-Smith as its candidate and then it produced 'Labor's plan to save the Parklands'. Remember that? 'Labor's plan to save the Parklands'. There is an executive summary here on the front. I will not go through that because it is not as exciting as some of the points that it made in its policy. The executive summary starts off:

Labor acknowledges the need to protect and expand appropriately open space throughout metropolitan Adelaide and beyond, including the Hills Face Zone and the coastal region.

What is one of the first things they do when they come to office? They sell off half of Glenside—a key area. I mean, that is in metropolitan Adelaide. It is open space. It is in a part of Adelaide that is under pressure from urban consolidation. There is less and less private open space in and around the Unley area, through Glenunga, Glenside and Parkside. Of course, one of the first decisions they made was to sell off a big chunk of open space that is there for the public to use.

That is what they said in opposition, and we know that what they say in opposition and at election time is completely different from what they do when they are in government. They then go on to say that they will 'change the law to block state governments overriding proper planning processes'. And here we are. It suited them when they were in opposition.

This came from, of course, the 14 pages of *Hansard* that the then leader of the opposition, Mike Rann, used as a political tool in the Wine Centre debate when he decided that that was a strategy for winning the seat of Adelaide. They won the seat of Adelaide, of course. The member did a very poor job in representing those people and that is why they now have a very good member for Adelaide. She was thrown out with a 15 per cent swing at the last election. Remember that: a 15 per cent swing.

Now, of course, Labor has worked out that maybe they do not need the seat of Adelaide. So, let's screw them,' they say. 'Let's ignore everything we said when we were in opposition because we are not very genuine. We are pretty disingenuous as a political party. We say things we need to say at the time we want people to listen, but don't ask us to deliver, don't hold us to our word because, when we are in a position to do that, we will do what we like as long as it keeps us in office.' That is the way that this government operates.

If you want to get some idea as to just how much this government milked the Parklands issue in the lead-up to the election, here we have a *Sunday Mail* article, titled 'Rann picks up pace of reform'. This is where he is introducing a range of measures to protect things such as the River Murray and the Parklands—legislation to protect the Parklands from future development—so it was a key platform. How do we know it was a key platform? Because here we have a *Sunday Mail* article on 20 January 2002 in the lead-up to the election, 'Labor's greening plan':

A \$1 million Youth Conservation Corps and the protection of Adelaide's parklands from further development are the centrepiece—

not just a side policy—

of Labor's plan for a greener city.

Of course, the then opposition environment spokesperson, John Hill, vowed to change the law to block state governments from overriding planning processes to build on the Parklands—that is what he vowed to do. I wonder what sort of involvement the current environment minister has had in this project.

On 24 December 2001—we are going in reverse chronology here—we have another story in *The Advertiser* on 24 December, so a bit of a Christmas present to us all, I suppose:

A state Labor government would investigate a World Heritage listing for city parklands and would give a single minister responsibility for the River Murray issues, Opposition Leader Mike Rann said yesterday.

This is why he says it is important to have a single minister for the River Murray—I digress here but it is in theme with the management of this state by this government and, consequently, the management of this Adelaide Oval project and why we are insisting on our amendments:

Mr Rann said he would be pressing other states to follow SA's lead and believed having Labor governments in SA, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland would lead to a more unified approach to management of the river.

That is what he said, and here we are 10 years later further behind where we were when he made that statement on managing the River Murray. After having Labor governments both federally and statewide, that is where we are. We are further behind where we were when he made that statement.

Back on 19 September 2001—this was actually a press release from Mr Rann, the then opposition leader:

State Labor Leader Mike Rann says the proposals—

to protect the Adelaide Parklands—

will include legislation blocking the state government from imposing developments on the parklands, working out a program to return land to parklands and investigating the creation of a new independent body to manage the city parklands.

We have that part of it, I suppose—the SMA, an independent body owned by the SANFL and SACA—quite a profitable independent body, and, of course, part of one of the most profitable businesses in the country, AFL football.

In typical Mike Rann style, and you can just imagine him pounding on the podium when he is making this speech and addressing this release:

That's why we've put forward this draft plan for community consultation, because the Parklands belong to the people and to future generations.

Among the key proposals are:

Blocking state governments from overriding proper planning processes by the use of Major Project Status to impose developments on the Parklands.

I can just imagine him getting stuck into that at the podium while he was making that announcement.

So, you can see it was a big part of their plan to win the seat of Adelaide, and it worked—congratulations, it worked. But now that they are in a position where they can go forward they are telling the people of South Australia, 'What we told you in opposition is no longer relevant.'

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. P.F. Conlon.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2011) 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.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Navigator College, Port Lincoln, who are guests of the member for Flinders; students from Pulteney Grammar School, who are guests of the member for Adelaide; and also a group of students from DFEEST, who are guests of the Treasurer. Welcome to all of you. It is nice to see you here.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Rules made under the following Acts—

Gaming Machines—

Responsible Gambling Agreements—

Notice No. 7

Notice No. 8

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:03): I bring up the 25th report of the committee.

Report received.

QUESTION TIME**MINISTER'S REMARKS**

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources Development. Will the minister deny that he is the person that the media has reported as calling the Minister for Education 'a coward'?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have some problems with that question in that I do not think it is up to the minister to deny or confirm anything that is reported in the media, but if he chooses to answer it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:04): The only person I have called a coward is the Hon. Terry Stephens.

ABORIGINAL VETERANS COMMEMORATIVE SERVICE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:05): My question is to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs. Can the minister advise the house of commemorative events and other ways in which South Australia is acknowledging the contribution of our state's Aboriginal veterans?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Premier with South Australia's Strategic Plan) (14:05): I thank the honourable member for her question. I know she is very interested in veterans' affairs having travelled to commemorate the Battle of Crete just recently. As a nation we recognise, commemorate and honour the servicemen and women who have served our nation in conflict. We especially commemorate those who have made the ultimate sacrifice. It is quite pertinent in view of recent days as we have lost a number of servicemen in the last few weeks and it is important that we remember them. We honour their ANZAC spirit, their courage and adversity, their service, mateship and self-sacrifice.

A group of veterans who have not received as much recognition in the past as they should have is our Aboriginal veterans. Aboriginal veterans have served with honour and distinction in every conflict involving our nation—from the Boer War, Gallipoli and through to more recent conflicts including Iraq and Afghanistan. Regulations which restricted Aboriginal Australians from enlistment were only abandoned in 1949. This meant that, at the time of their enlistment, many Aboriginal veterans were not even considered to be Australian citizens. They actually had to deny their Aboriginality in order to serve. Because of this, it has been very difficult to ascertain exactly how many Aboriginal servicemen and women have served in our armed forces or who they were.

A register of Aboriginal veterans of South Australia is currently being compiled to identify, as best as possible, Aboriginal South Australians who have served our nation. A team of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal veterans, supported by the Council of Aboriginal Elders of South Australia, the Returned and Services League (SA Branch), Reconciliation SA and Veterans SA, is attempting to create a document that will, for the first time, identify Aboriginal South Australians who contributed to the defence of our nation. I believe the Register of Aboriginal Veterans of South Australia has so far identified about 400 Aboriginal South Australians who served our nation. Some made the ultimate sacrifice, some were decorated for gallantry, some were taken as prisoners of war and many were wounded.

It is fitting then, as we honour our Aboriginal veterans, that the fifth annual Aboriginal Veterans Commemorative Service was recently held at the South Australian National War Memorial on North Terrace. This service was first held in 2007 as part of National Reconciliation Week and received support from the state government through Reconciliation SA and Veterans SA, and has also received much encouragement, support and coordination from the RSL in South Australia.

I am pleased to advise the house that the Aboriginal Veterans Commemorative Service was well attended by a wide cross-section of the community, who stood shoulder to shoulder to honour the service of our Aboriginal veterans. At the end of the service, five veterans stood on the marble steps of our South Australian National War Memorial. They were proud Aboriginal veterans of World War II, Korea, Malaya, Vietnam and Afghanistan. This was a unique gathering of veterans.

After the commemorative service, and as part of Reconciliation Week, a short film entitled *For Love of Country* was launched. This film chronicles the contribution of Aboriginal servicemen and women in the defence of Australia. The film features interviews with a number of Aboriginal veterans who explain why they fought so hard to serve our nation when they had not been afforded the full rights of Australian citizenship and legally were not allowed to enlist. This important project was sponsored by Veterans SA in partnership with Reconciliation SA, the RSL and the Department of Veterans' Affairs. I am very pleased that this film will be provided to all primary and secondary schools across South Australia as it is an important record of the personal experiences of Aboriginal veterans who served our nation.

It may also be of interest to members that Aboriginal veterans will soon be recognised by an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial. I am advised that planning for an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial is well underway and is expected to be located adjacent to the Torrens Parade Ground. This will be a welcome addition alongside other memorials unveiled in recent years honouring our servicemen and women.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Treasurer. Why won't the government release all the Ernst & Young reports into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, given the Treasurer's comments to the house yesterday, and I quote:

We have been completely open and completely frank and...South Australian people know up-front exactly what this project is going to cost. We know exactly what we are getting into.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:09): It is certainly my intention that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the Treasurer's response.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is certainly my—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Leader of the Opposition and the minister for defence! Treasurer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is certainly my intention that the Ernst & Young reports all be put up on the website. If that has not already happened, I will find out why.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CERTIFICATE OF EDUCATION

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:10): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the latest SACE board data, including data relating to students eligible for further education?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:10): I thank the honourable member for his question, and for his particular interest in vocational education. Yes, Madam Speaker, I did have the pleasure yesterday of tabling the SACE board's annual report for 2010, and it contained some data that reflected very well on the South Australian education system.

So, it was with some surprise today that I saw the member for Unley's remarks being recorded, where he told the South Australian community that fewer students in South Australia are completing year 12 and getting their SACE. He also criticised the increase in the number of students who were, in fact, achieving their TAFE selection score, and he concluded that the education system therefore had failed. He relied, for his conclusions, on the SACE board report that I tabled yesterday. The report, in fact, discloses the opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, the number of South Australian students completing their SACE has increased from 12,521 to 12,692; not decreased, as the member for Unley has asserted.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, the member for Unley is completely wrong. He has used the wrong table. He sent out a press release so we can see his chain of reasoning—so we can see how he got it wrong. He has actually used the wrong table in the report. He has used a table in the report which not only does not deal with SACE completions, it also aggregates Northern Territory and overseas students as part of that table. He has helpfully concluded that the education system has failed, and he has also added for good measure that I have failed my first test, and Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is worth pausing for a moment to reflect on this. This is the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I appreciate there is a degree of embarrassment by those opposite for the member for Unley—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, the students and teachers, and the families that are responsible for these impressive achievements; that is, getting a student through year 12, or getting them on to further education through the TAFE system, are entitled to feel proud of their children. What they should not have to put up with is somebody who is named by the opposition as their education spokesperson promoting publicly the denigration of their good efforts and achievements. The member for Unley—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, this does bear on the capacity and competence of the member for Unley.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It bears on his—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: At least he used a genuine document.

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Transport!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It bears on his capacity to take a report—a published report—to read it, to read the numbers and the words, and draw conclusions from them and actually promote those accurately. He did it with some confidence, so he was aggressively wrong; he wasn't just wrong. He asserted it with some confidence and—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, as I said, this is not the first time that he has attacked our public education system. He has done it on a number of occasions. He has, of

course, famously described our education system as rotten to the core, which is an appalling denigration of the fine teachers and their efforts in achieving the outstanding results.

Madam Speaker, can I address the other error that is contained in his public remarks because it is an egregious one? He has suggested that somehow it is a matter of criticism that there is an increased number of students receiving a TAFE selection score, something I would have thought should be celebrated, not denigrated. We are in this state on the edge of a massive transformation in our economy where the opportunities for young people are absolutely endless if they gain the skills that are needed by the new economy. We know that about 60 per cent of the jobs that will be created in this transformed economy will require the sort of skills that are dealt with and provided by the vocational education system through our TAFE.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Finniss!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, I appreciate there is a degree of embarrassment for the member for Unley, who cannot get—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I don't want to upset the man. He's had a bad enough day as it is. Madam Speaker, the honourable member has criticised—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The honourable member has criticised those students for making an intelligent choice. He has criticised them for making an intelligent choice.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He has implied that it is a second-class choice to choose a trade or some vocational choice.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr PISONI: I am a tradesman myself, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: And they have never let him forget it. He's ashamed of it and he's walking away from it. This is the opportunity—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr PISONI: The member is inferring improper motives of the member for Unley. I am very proud of my trade heritage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear what you are saying.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, happy enough to throw a punch—'have failed my first test'—happy enough to throw a punch but having a little bit of trouble taking it back when he has made an obvious and blatant error. We know the research demonstrates that if those

young people who are going to leave school get some trade or other qualification, their lifetime earnings are likely to be a million dollars higher than their counterparts who did not complete school. How dare you denigrate their choice of improving themselves—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and taking advantage of the opportunities that we have played a significant role in creating in this state.

The SPEAKER: Order! This is not a classroom. In fact, it is far worse behaviour than in the classrooms of some of those young people in the gallery, I am sure. The Leader of the Opposition.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is again to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer confirm that all reports regarding the new RAH and any reports which may compare costings, including any which may concern comparison with the existing RAH site, are or will be published in full on the government website?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:19): As far as I am aware—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You will listen to the Treasurer's response.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: As far as I am aware, all the work that was done by Ernst & Young for the government which provided the rationale on which we made the decisions will be made available on the website. If they are not available on the website, I will immediately after question time find out why.

DISABILITY FUNDING

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Disability. Will the minister provide an update to the house on the first phase of disability self-managed funding?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:19): I thank the member for Little Para for his question. Last year I had the honour of signing off on the first four self-managed contracts in South Australia, and we are seeing early successes in this project and the implications of its importance. We plan to limit the involvement to 50 participants in the first phase. We have already had 36 people managing their own funding and a further 13 developing personal support and expenditure plans.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, that's right. It's 50.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: You just need to listen.

The SPEAKER: Order! We will not have a slanging match across the floor, member for Bragg.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg, you are warned.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Madam Speaker, she was silent for the first two minutes of question time.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, ma'am: who is the minister referring to as 'she'?

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

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The member for Bragg was silent for the first two minutes. Her counterparts are quite fearful of her silences. The last time she was silent, she refused to rule out a challenge to her leader.

The SPEAKER: Minister, back to the question.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They are quite momentous. Whilst in its early stages, the initiative is designed to give people with a disability more control over how funding allocated for their needs is spent. As a result of both the success and the interest, I have now asked the department to increase the number of contracts up to 70.

We are working to ensure that the early success continues and this is happening primarily in two ways. An independent evaluation of phase 1 will be completed later this year. The evaluation will ensure that we learn all we can from stage 1 and enable us to improve and expand future stages of self-management. Feedback is also being sought on an ongoing basis from a consultative committee made up of people with disabilities, carers, service providers and advocates. The focus of this committee's work is to inform the development of future stages of self-management here in South Australia.

I know that many people are keen for self-managed funding to expand quickly but, as this is a major reform, I want to be certain that we have the nuts and bolts in place to ensure that we get it right the first time. By allowing a further 20 people to participate in the first phase, we can address the current demand whilst the scheme is finalised. In saying this, I want to be very clear that the decision to self-manage is optional and people will be able to choose if they wish to take part.

Self-managed funding will not suit everyone and existing arrangements will continue for those people who prefer that. Even in this first phase, clients are welcome to trial the program and revert back to their former arrangements if it just simply is not for them. Having said that, self-management gives people with a disability control of the funding that has been allocated for their support needs. It allows them to choose how, where and when they receive the support they need.

The initial participation rates are encouraging and it shows that people are making the most of the flexibility that self-managed funding offers. We have already received positive feedback from people who have made the decision to be involved. For example, one participant is using some of the money to purchase voice-activated computer software to help him communicate more freely and keep in touch with family and friends.

At the signing of the first contracts, I was greatly moved when the father of one child entering into this said to me that it was like he had been given his life back. I am also encouraged by the Productivity Commission's draft National Disability Insurance Scheme, where a self-managed funding proposal was included that bears similarities to the South Australian scheme and includes a focus on consumer choice by providing people with a disability an individualised funding package that they can choose to manage themselves.

If any of the people in this house have a constituent whom they feel may benefit from self-managed funding, I would strongly encourage them to contact the Department for Families and Communities.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:24): My question is to the Treasurer. Following the Treasurer's claims that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital contract transfers risk away from the taxpayer, is it the case that the contract exposes the taxpayer to increases in interest rates and labour costs which may result in the government payments of more than \$1.1 million a day increasing, and are there any other contract provisions that may expose taxpayers to increased costs?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:24): I inform the house that the two Ernst & Young reports which we relied upon for the information I provided yesterday are on the website. The systemic risk report and the operational expenditure comparison report are on the website, I have been informed by my office, so the information is all there. You just go on the internet—it's the computer; it's that thing sitting on your desk. Perhaps google Health SA and you might find it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, don't come in here making accusations that things are not on the website that are. In regards to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You are just creating silly mischief. With regard to the service payments—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker: we cannot hear the Treasurer, there is too much noise.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am having similar problems. Treasurer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: With regard to the service payments, the service payment is \$397 million a year, on average, over the 30 years of the contract. That will vary slightly from year to year. There is a periodic refurbishment of the hospital, which is all part of the deal, which means that the hospital is kept in as-new condition. So, in the years of those intervals—I think they are about 10 years—the payment is elevated in that year, but through the whole 30 years the payment is, on average, \$397 million a year.

There is a clause in the service payments which provides for some flexibility, because the government would not want to find itself in a position where the consortium was sort of creaming off a profit over and above what it was costing them to provide the ancillary services to the hospital, so those are subject to periodic review. Of course, while it can go down, it could potentially go up a little, but the clause in the contract says that, if the consortium want to increase that component of the service payment for those ancillary services, then there has to be an opportunity to go to market to make sure we get a market price.

So, the reason for that clause is simply to make sure that we are paying a fair price and that the consortium are not ripping us off over the course of the contract. Likewise, if the cost of providing those ancillary services goes beyond what you would normally expect over the life of the contract, there would be an opportunity for them to raise it, but the government would also have an opportunity to go to market to make sure we got the best value for money. I think that is all the information that I have to hand. But in terms of the risk, the interest payments and paying the capital off, those are all set in the contract; those cannot vary.

RIVERINE RECOVERY PROJECT

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:27): My question is to the Minister for the River Murray. What long-term improvements to the riverine environment will follow the securing of significant funding for the Riverine Recovery Project?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. The federal Minister for Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities and I recently announced \$86.7 million for the Riverine Recovery Project. The Australian government has committed \$78 million to the project, which is supplemented by the state government's commitment of a further \$8.7 million. This funding is in addition to the \$9.2 million Riverine Recovery Project's early on-ground works package the federal minister and I jointly announced in March.

The Riverine Recovery Project is a component of the Murray Futures program and aims to achieve measurable long-term improvements in the health of the riverine environment between Wellington and the South Australian border. The project will also enable more effective use of environmental water and help to secure the future of regional communities by undertaking a range of projects to key flood plains, anabranches and wetlands along this section of the River Murray, which I understand is in a lot of the member for Chaffey's area. His constituents, along with the whole state, will benefit from this program.

The Riverine Recovery Project is a critical project for South Australia as it will position us to more effectively implement necessary actions arising from the upcoming basin plan, in partnership with the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder. The project builds on the Living Murray First Step Decision to optimise environmental water delivery and maximise environmental outcomes while minimising impacts on other users. The Riverine Recovery Project is also linked to the Murray Futures long-term plan for the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth by extending the efforts to build resilience and address river health across the whole of the River Murray system in South Australia.

The Riverine Recovery Project aims to improve ecological outcomes for flood plains and wetlands, use environmental water more effectively, provide social benefits and, of course, deliver up to 15 gigalitres of water savings to the commonwealth to help protect or restore environmental assets in the Murray-Darling Basin.

The project is one of the first aimed at improving the efficiency of environmental water use and reallocating these water savings for the benefit of the environment. I am pleased to inform members that the Riverine Recovery Project funding will be used to undertake activities across a suite of project elements. These include the improvement of flood plains through the provision of critical infrastructure for enhanced environmental flows, fish passage and habitat, and connectivity of the flood plain and the river channel.

Activities like these aim to reverse the effects of degradation and restore the ecological health of two significant flood plain sites: Pike and Katfish Reach. Another project element involves undertaking necessary investigations and installation of infrastructure to reintroduce more natural wetting and drying cycles for wetlands to improve ecosystem health and resilience.

In addition to these benefits, river operations will be enhanced by varying the timing and delivery of environmental water, and there will be, of course, through that, improved information management. This significant project is another clear demonstration of the government's commitment to respond effectively to the critical situation experienced in the Murray-Darling Basin in recent years and to improve the river's health for the benefit of future generations of South Australians, and I know that the member for Chaffey is very supportive of this particular project.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HEALTH PARTNERSHIP

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is to the Treasurer. Is the legal and corporate entity of South Australian Health Partners, HoldCo, being set up in Victoria to avoid the high stamp duty and tax regime here in South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:32): They would make their own decisions about where they set up, and they would have their—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —own reasons.

KANGAROO ISLAND SURFING COMPETITION

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the Minister for Tourism inform the house about the surfing competition to be held on Kangaroo Island this November?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Tourism.

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) (14:32): I would like to thank the honourable member for that question. As all of us know, and in particular the member for Finnis—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Finnis! I can see him in the surfing competition, but he will be quiet while the minister answers the question—old hippie from way back!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have to say, Madam Speaker, that the member for Finnis is, in fact, an enthusiastic supporter of this great event, which is going to happen on his beautiful island,

part of his magnificent electorate. It is going to be at Vivonne Bay. We are going to have some world-class surfing identities coming to Australia.

It is actually very exciting because this event will be occurring just before the final event in Hawaii, and, at that event in Hawaii, the people who will have just been to Kangaroo Island will be assembling their final round of points for the championship. So, it will be absolutely critical for these surfers to get down to Kangaroo Island and be involved in the event.

It is going to be in November this year, between the 4th and the 9th. We are expecting there to be as many as 5,000 people travelling to the island over the course of that period to have a look at what is going on. It is actually a magnificent event for Kangaroo Island. I am hoping that, perhaps, the member for Finniss, or some of the other members opposite, might get out those big boards they have got in the shed and wander down to Vivonne Bay. The one person I can confidently say we will not be seeing down there with his great board and long shorts is the Hon. Terry Stephens because he, very unkindly, described this as a second-rate event and a waste of everybody's time. I can imagine the embarrassment of the member for Finniss who, quite rightly, is proud of his magnificent island, when his colleague just fires off with such an uninformed and silly comment as that.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Who is he? Terry who?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He is a chap from the other place. He obviously does not know much about Kangaroo Island or surfing. So, anyway, all of us are looking forward to this and I would encourage all members to join the honourable member for Finniss and me down there in November with our big surfboards.

Mr Pengilly: Bring the Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think the Premier will be there; he is keen. It is going to be a fantastic event.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss in a wetsuit—yes! The member for Waite.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:35): I am just recovering from the thought of the member for Finniss in a pair of budgie smugglers, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: We all are.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Auditor-General have the powers he needs to audit all aspects of the Royal Adelaide Hospital PPP throughout its construction and operation, or does the government intend to avoid his scrutiny?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:36): I have no reason to think otherwise.

MINERAL EXPLORATION

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources Development. Can the minister inform the house of South Australia's mineral exploration expenditure in relation to the rest of the nation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:36): Yes, I can, and I would like to thank the honourable member for this very important question. I am pleased to make it known that South Australia's mineral exploration expenditure continues to improve with the year-to-date spend exceeding \$200 million, according to the ABS figures released today.

Ms Chapman: You have got to dig it up first.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: With mining, size does matter, member for Bragg. In original expenditure terms, the total mineral exploration expenditure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —across Australia—this is important—fell by 8.3 per cent in the March 2011 quarter, but South Australia's mineral exploration expenditure rose by 5 per cent

to \$62.6 million in the same quarter, bucking the national trend. Now, I know this is bad news for the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: I can't hear the honourable minister because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the deputy leader!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —of the incredibly rude Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the deputy leader will keep his voice down.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Finniss, think about your wetsuit and be quiet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I cannot add to that, but, as I was saying, South Australia's mineral exploration expenditure rose by 5 per cent to \$62.6 million in the same quarter, bucking that national trend. Now, South Australia's mineral expenditure—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know that upsets the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order, the Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know it upsets the Leader of the Opposition, but the March quarter is second only to Western Australia and ahead of expenditure in the Northern Territory and Queensland (excluding coal exploration expenditure).

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order: just because the member for Croydon is not voting for the minister, doesn't mean he should be interjecting on his answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think that was a frivolous point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If there is an expert on not getting voted for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —it is the member for Davenport. Mayo preselection—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —deputy leader, deputy leader vote and the leadership.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will stop the shouting across the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are the expert. South Australia led the country in copper exploration.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Finniss, you are warned.

Mr Pengilly: I didn't say a word.

The SPEAKER: Well, you were about to. You looked like you did.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Industry and Trade.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Good old-fashioned Labor Speaker: round up the usual suspects, ma'am. South Australia led the country in copper exploration expenditure in both the March quarter and for the year to March 2011. South Australia's exploration expenditure for the March quarter is primarily targeted at copper and iron ore, although other commodities include base metals such as silver, lead, zinc, nickel and gold.

The South Australian government has worked hard in the last eight years to create a climate of certainty in this state that provides investors with the confidence they need to plan long-term investments in the mining sector. The government's Plan for Accelerating Exploration has been an incredibly successful program delivering extraordinary growth in the minerals and energy sectors for South Australia. Our new PACE 2020 initiative will continue to be a key driver for sustaining economic development through the minerals and energy sector.

PIRSA has approved mineral drilling projects in the 2010 calendar year totalling more than one million metres, an increase of approximately 35 per cent when compared with 2009 drilling works approvals. These figures are a credit to the government which has ensured this third consecutive rise in exploration expenditure. This is also double the South Australian Strategic Plan's target of maintaining exploration expenditure above \$100 million per year. This government makes no secret that it is pro mining and I look forward to updating the house at every opportunity on our continued progress in this important industry sector.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before we go to the next question, I do not usually draw attention to groups in the gallery apart from school and education groups, but members who have been here for some time may recognise some former members of our catering staff who were here for lunch today and have come back to see the place and to see how we are going. So, welcome to you—it is a pleasure seeing you here today.

QUESTION TIME

SA HEALTH

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:41): In fact, the catering staff have done a great job. I was told I am putting on weight but I think I am just getting a thicker skin!

My question is to the Minister for Health: will the minister advise the house why Mr Martin Turner, Chief Executive of Adelaide Health Service, has resigned? Mr Martin Turner was 18 months into a five-year contract and his resignation follows other senior health executives who have recently resigned: Dr Tony Sherbon, CEO; Dr Karleen Edwards, CEO of Central Northern Adelaide Health Service; Ms Cathy Miller, CEO of Southern Adelaide Health Service; Mr George Beltche, CEO of Country Health SA; Mr John O'Connor, Executive Director of Finance, SA Health; and Mr David Miller, General Manager of the Lyell McEwin 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) (14:42): What a surprise in a department of 26,000 people that there are some resignations from time to time!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I'm next, am I? You wish, you wish, you wish!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In relation to those people there are very good reasons, in each case, why they resigned. Dr Tony Sherbon went to get a promotion in Canberra and he has now gone into that role. George Beltche retired—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: They do. It is sad to contemplate that retirement is upon us all at some stage. John O'Connor has set up his own consultancy. He is now doing some work to assist the Keith hospital to work through its problems (which we are paying for), but he is nonetheless doing that to help the Keith hospital. So, all of them have left on good terms.

Martin Turner's resignation is an interesting one. Martin came to Australia and was recruited to run the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service. We then combined the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service and the Southern Adelaide Health Service. Martin came to me and said, 'Look, we have set this up with three clusters of hospitals'—which paved the way for the LHNs, the local hospital networks that the commonwealth wanted. He said, 'I don't think we need to have an AHS; I am prepared to fall on my sword.'

He decided that that level of bureaucracy was no longer needed and he decided to go back to England where he is from. I thought that was a fantastic move on his part: he put the organisation first. So, we left on extremely good terms and I wish him all the very best back in Britain.

DUKE OF EDINBURGH'S AWARD

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:44): My question is directed to the Minister for Youth. Minister, could you update the house on how the government is supporting young, disadvantaged and vulnerable South Australians to participate in the Duke of Edinburgh's Award program?

Ms Chapman: Not in Port Augusta, she's not!

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (14:44): I am delighted to inform the house of the remarkable achievements of 21 young South Australians who were very recently (on Thursday 26 May) presented with the Duke of Edinburgh Gold Awards by His Excellency the Governor. Members in this place would be familiar with the Duke's program, which is a personal challenge for its young participants, allowing them to gain very important life skills, increase their self-confidence, develop connections with their communities and gain SACE credits.

The Gold Award is a wonderful achievement, there is no question about that, and it was this year in particular for one young man, James Wagner, who is the first Duke of Edinburgh Awards participant to achieve the honour from the Reach Your Dreams program. The Reach Your Dreams program is important because it facilitates young disadvantaged and vulnerable South Australians to participate in the Duke's Award. We do this by providing organisations with a grant of up to about \$400 per individual to assist them in competing for this award.

I would just like to take a couple of minutes to outline the achievements of this young man. James, who is about 18 years old, undertook a very diverse and ambitious program to achieve his Gold Award. It included being a peer group mentor at Operation Flinders, a team member of the Curramulka, Minlaton, Stansbury (CMS) Crows football team on the Yorke Peninsula, a participant in the One and All youth tall ships sailing development program, school leadership roles and involvement in the Kokoda Youth Leadership Challenge.

This would be an amazing achievement for anyone, let alone someone as young as James, and I am sure members would join me in congratulating him and, in fact, all of the 21 participants on their achievements.

PUBLIC SERVICE CUTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:46): My question is to the Treasurer. What is the latest advice to the Treasurer on how many of the 3,750 jobs targeted in last year's budget have now been cut?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:47): I do not have the exact number on hand, but it is important to remember that the 3,700-odd jobs that were announced in last year's budget would be reduced partly through TVSPs—through separation packages—and partly through natural attrition. So, as people resign from the public sector, they would not be replaced.

I presume what the member for Davenport is getting at is how we are going in terms of people who take up the TVSPs. It is important to remember that the packages have only been on

offer since early this year—I think February or March—so it is still early days in terms of establishing how successful those packages have been in attracting people to take them up and to separate from the public sector. Certainly the early data is quite good. I am certainly happy with where it is at, and the advice that I am getting from Treasury is that the numbers are quite good in terms of—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —the government meeting its target of a 3,700-odd reduction in TVSPs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PUBLIC SERVICE CUTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:48): If the Treasurer is happy with where it is at, he must have had some briefing on the number. Can he give us the latest number? I do not need today's number; I just need the latest number you were briefed.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It's the same question again.

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, do you want to answer that?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:48): I don't carry the number around in my head. I will happily come back and report to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

INDUSTRY CAPABILITY NETWORK

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (14:49): Can the Minister for Industry and Trade tell the house about the contribution of the Industry Capability Network—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Finniss!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —to the state's economy?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:49): As a matter of fact, I can. I would like to thank the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —for this very important question and note his keen interest. Several weeks ago I was fortunate to attend the 25-year anniversary of the formation of the South Australian Industry Capability Network along with the shadow spokesperson, Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith. In 1986, the then government opened the industry supplies office in South Australia, which was the forerunner to the Industry Capability Network. It was an auspicious occasion for industry development in this state, and subsequent achievements of the ICNSA have been vindicated through the foresight shown at that time.

In 2005, it was renamed the Industry Capability Network to reflect the aim of maximising South Australian industry participation in investment projects and global supply chains. Today there are ICN offices in every Australian state and in New Zealand, with federal government support through the national coordinating body ICN Limited, and I can safely say that it is bipartisan support. A true mark of the ICNSA success is the fact that it has surpassed the \$1 billion mark of contracts awarded to South Australian companies.

In addition, Madam Speaker, if you take the entire Australasian network in that time, a further \$381 million of work has come our way. I am advised that these numbers equate to more than 18,000 jobs created or maintained in South Australia. In the past financial year alone, local companies have won over \$227 million in contracts thanks to the ICN. I am further advised that this is a return on investment for the government and the community of over \$200 for every \$1 invested in the ICNSA. It is now working with companies as they are preparing to take advantage of SA's rapidly expanding mining industry and nearly \$80 billion worth of other infrastructure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Stop the background noise. It is very difficult to hear the minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and major projects either underway or in the pipeline. Clearly, at no time in the state's history has the ICNSA's role been more critical in terms of the services it provides.

The next phase of ICNSA's evolution is to build the value chain from our major projects to ensure all South Australians benefit from what is happening now and in the future. It has been my long-held view that government and industry must continue to develop and lengthen the value chain from major projects. This is best achieved through local industry participation and by building a skilled workforce that local business and major developers need to complete their projects.

I restate my congratulations to the Industry Capability Network. I applaud the shadow minister for being there to celebrate 25 years of invaluable contribution to our state's economy—bipartisan support, I might add, for the ICNSA's work. I think it is important that both sides of government look at this role in a bipartisan way and not politicise it, and I wish it every success for the next 25 years and beyond.

POLICE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister now confirm whether it is standard practice for a police investigation into a violent incident at a school to cease when the investigating officer goes on leave? On 6 April 2011, I asked the minister the same question and he said he would bring a reply back to the house, but he is yet to do so.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Motor Sport, Minister Assisting the Premier with the Olympic Dam Expansion Project) (14:53): I will refer that matter to the police commissioner and get an answer for the member.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NARRUNG BUND

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Water. Can the minister explain why his federal counterpart, Tony Burke, only received last Friday the relevant documentation from the South Australian government necessary for the removal of the Narrung bund, as Tony Burke revealed on Adelaide radio this morning? Since September last year, the minister has been telling the public that the government has the removal plans in place, and he also told the house on 10 February this year, in relation to this matter, and I quote:

We expect the matter to be resolved fairly quickly and, even as we speak, we have representatives over there talking with their Commonwealth counterparts...

It is now June.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for his question. I did not hear my friend and colleague Tony Burke on the wireless this morning—

An honourable member: It's called the radio these days.

The Hon. P. CAICA: —the radio—but I think that it has been common knowledge for some time. I think that Tony has said this previously, and I presume that he said it again this morning—it is something that I have said as well—that it has been a pretty tortuous process with respect to the level of bureaucratic involvement with regard to getting a decision made. I stand by what I have previously said. I think we have probably sent numerous proposals through to the

federal government department on issues relating to the removal of the Clayton regulator, as we did with the Narrung regulator. As I understand it, Tony, like I, is sick and tired of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —the inability, if you like—and I understand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: I understand that it is very important that due diligence is undertaken when we are spending other people's money, particularly taxpayers' money, but the delay has been totally unacceptable, and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: You asked me a question; you're not interested in the answer, really.

Mr Williams: Yes, we are.

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, you're not. You're not; otherwise you would just shut up.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Sorry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P. CAICA: What, 'shut up'? Is that a swear word, is it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: I'll check. No, it's not. Tony, like I, has said it was unacceptable. He or his department received another series of documents on Friday in relation to the conditions, and South Australia's conditions that we say ought to be involved, and what the commonwealth requires regarding the removal of that bund. I understand that he will be considering that soon. That has been the trouble with this process—mostly from a bureaucratic perspective—it is always 'soon'. But, at the expense of being—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: This deputy leader insists on standing orders and is interjecting again. It is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is aware of the standing orders and he needs to be very careful. Minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA: He is certainly aware of them, Madam Speaker, but it is quite clear that he does not observe them. I would go as far as to say that the final decision-making process of the commonwealth government is imminent.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General explain how he can possibly deliver an effective independent commission against corruption when the government has committed only 10 per cent of the amount that it previously claimed, on numerous occasions, an ICAC would cost?

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) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for the question. The story about this is a very simple one, and I will explain it again because it obviously has not been settling in very well. The story is this: we announced last year that we were going to examine the question of public integrity in South Australia. We did an internal review, asked various agencies what they thought might be useful, and we prepared a discussion paper. The discussion paper was put out in November. The discussion paper was—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, listen to the answer.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The discussion paper was put out in November of last year. The discussion paper proposed a model. The model in the discussion paper was subject to a rough guesstimate at a costing at that time, and that is, for the time being, where the forward estimates place the cost.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have not said anything of the sort, and—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition can debate in a grievance if she wants to afterwards but not across the floor now.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I was saying, what we are doing now is going through all of the responses we have received to that discussion paper. We are looking at those responses, examining them against the model and considering any recommendations made—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Have you finished, Attorney?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They are not interested.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop and the Minister for Transport, be quiet. The member for Kavel.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for State/Local Government Relations. Will the government now lift the freedom of information ban on matters relating to the Burnside council inquiry, given that Mr MacPherson is now finalising his report and no longer taking evidence?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:01): I am not sure what is referred to as the 'ban'. My understanding of the circumstances around the Burnside report are these: a number of former Burnside councillors took action in the Supreme Court of South Australia, I believe, on a number of matters. One of those matters involved—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I always love this. As soon as you start talking you immediately get all the advice on that side on how the question should be answered. Perhaps they should just stay among themselves and chat among themselves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If somebody would like to play some lift music while I wait for them to stop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will do that again. The council took a matter to the Supreme Court. As I understand it, one of the consequences of that action was an interim suppression order on the report.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Madam, they know better than me. Perhaps I should just sit down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It wouldn't be you, Mitch. If there is some other matter, I am quite happy to talk about it. Can I say this: as I understand it, there was a matter in the Supreme Court. One of the orders sought was that the report of the—

Mr Pengilly: You're worse than Gago.

The SPEAKER: Member for Finniss!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Finniss, the only man I know sacked from the front bench by Twitter, or whatever it was—by social media—is reflecting upon my competency. As I understand it, a suppression order was sought on the report of the former auditor-general and was granted on an interim basis.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Finniss, you are warned this time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What I understand is that our lawyers, as a result of a court finding that some of the terms of reference of the inquiry were beyond the power of the minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Now I am getting legal advice from both the member for Finniss and the member for Bragg. Of course, the member for Bragg's great achievement in this place is to start up there and progressively get further away, so you will forgive me if I don't take that advice.

Members interjecting:

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

Mr PENGILLY: Standing order 98: the minister is debating now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I wouldn't debate if they didn't interject.

The SPEAKER: I refer the minister back to the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have got half a minute left of question time. Be quiet.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Can I say this, that today our lawyers are in court on the matter of the Burnside inquiry and that court case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They are in court today. I will lead up to this. They are in court today on that matter on the question of costs and on the question of whether the report should continue to be suppressed. Can I say that I have therefore not made a statement about that matter until that court case is concluded and our rights particularly as to costs—the sort of thing that would not concern you because you are reckless and foolish—are determined.

I therefore hope that the court case today will have been wrapped up, and I look forward to bringing a statement on the entire Burnside matter to this parliament by way of a ministerial statement tomorrow where I will deal comprehensively with every single issue. I am sure you look forward to hearing it tomorrow.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

LIVE CATTLE EXPORTS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:05): I see that the federal government today has introduced a temporary ban on the live export of cattle to Indonesia and I am pleased that this has happened. It is a week overdue. In fact I would have thought that this ban should not be necessary because the investigation that has been undertaken overseas into the slaughter of cattle is not something that is new to the knowledge of both the federal government and Meat and Livestock Australia.

As people know, before I came into this place, I was a veterinarian and not in my wildest dreams would I have thought that Australian cattle were being slaughtered in the way they are in Indonesia today. As a third-year vet student in 1980, I walked onto the floor of the Robb Jetty Abattoir in Western Australia very early one morning, and I saw a steer hung up by its back leg and its throat cut with a very long knife as part of halal slaughter.

I was shocked at that. That is no longer going on in Australia and I am very pleased at that. That should never have been allowed and should not be allowed to continue in any country in the world where Australian cattle are being exported. What we saw on television on *Four Corners* was completely unacceptable. Anybody who is complicit in any way with having allowed that to continue the way it has for many years now should hang their head in shame. In fact, they should resign.

We saw what happened in Egypt with animals being exported over there, and there are issues in the abattoirs there. We put in programs to educate and upgrade abattoir workers and their facilities over there, and conditions have improved significantly. I just hope that there is no way that Australian live exports of cattle, when they arrive in Egypt, are being handled in any way near what we saw in the footage in the *Four Corners* program the other day.

In the 2009 estimates questioning in the federal parliament, there was a question about the slaughter of live cattle in Jordan in 2006. At the Amman abattoir in Jordan, there was a device similar to what we saw in the footage on the ABC—a restraint box. I think it was a Mark I type restraint box and all it was doing was restraining the cattle which then could be tripped over to have their throats cut as part of halal killing.

Halal killing is not hacking away at an animal's throat. Halal killing involves one single clean cut across the throat to cut the oesophagus, the trachea, both jugular veins and both carotid arteries. There is a sudden drop in blood pressure. The animal is unconscious within a matter of seconds. It is not what we would like to see. We want to see the animals stunned first. What we have seen in the footage from Indonesia is absolutely atrocious.

What was asked about in the estimates hearings in February 2009 was the situation in Jordan in 2006. You would have thought then that the people in the MLA and the people in the department of agriculture would have said, 'Well, we better just check and see what is going on elsewhere.' I know some of my colleagues both in the federal government and other places do not agree with the ban on live cattle that has been put in place. Well, I certainly do. You cannot allow cattle to be exported and slaughtered under those circumstances.

The question put during federal estimates concerned the installation of the restraint box that was done in conjunction with the government, Australian industry, MLA and LiveCorp. You

would have thought that MLA and LiveCorp would be watching this very carefully because, as they are getting \$5 a head for every beast that is slaughtered in Australia, they should be making sure they are protecting the Australian industry, and I feel sorry for the producers who are suffering. A report was put out by the RSPCA in December 2010, I think, so it is at least six months old. It comments on a report that was produced by Schuster Consulting for Meat and Livestock Australia and LiveCorp. It was talking about the Indonesian islands of Java and Sumatra. This is about the export of cattle to Indonesia, about the 773,000 cattle that are exported to Indonesia.

We need to make sure that the slaughter of cattle overseas is done in a way that is restrained. What we need to do is make sure that our producers in Australia are not the victim of circumstances that have been allowed to come as a result of animal activists. This should have been looked at a long time ago. It should not be at this point where our producers are going to suffer as a result of other people's incompetence. Let us remember, the MLA directors are getting over half a million dollars a year in directors' fees.

The report to the RSPCA makes interesting reading. It condemns every aspect of the slaughter of cattle in Indonesia, apart from in a very few abattoirs. It talks about the tripping over of the cattle from these restraint boxes, the head slapping, the hacking at their throats and the complete inhumane slaughter of cattle. It is not recent. This has been going on for a long time. It has to stop and it has to stop now.

Time expired.

TITANIC COMMEMORATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:10): On Tuesday 31 May, the Adelaide Arcade was transformed into a piece of history. With the help of the spectacular backdrop created by a national team of balloon artists, the 125-year-old arcade itself remaining a marvellous example of a shopping precinct of its era, became that wonder of its time, the RMS *Titanic*, pride of the White Star Line. This commemorative celebration marked the centenary of the launching of the then world's largest moving object. It glided from the No. 5 gantry of Harland and Wolff's shipyard, into the Belfast lock and into history. Few people have not heard of the *Titanic* story, whether by now-rare personal accounts, books, TV or one of the many movies produced. All have enjoyed success because of the idea of and romance—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What was the last port it called at?

Ms BEDFORD: Well, the bottom of the Atlantic Ocean, I believe, sir—of sea voyages, the opportunity they offered for pure tourism or the chance of a better life in another world. The unsinkable ship suffered a terrible fate when, less than a year later on the night of 14 April, it struck an iceberg and sank, with the loss of around 1,500 souls. Perhaps it is because so many stories survived from that night that the legend of the *Titanic* remains so strong.

For many years, Adelaide has played an important role in remembering those who were lost and the lessons history has given us. The *Titanic* society first came to my notice before I was elected, through the enthusiasm of Mark Kasperski and Margie Monk. Mark is, I think, a world authority on the *Titanic* and I had the pleasure of being present at one of his talks. Few could fail to be inspired and engaged by his passion for this remarkable ship and the events that surrounded it.

Margie is an equally passionate Titanicist—this is a new word for today, I think—and it is through her that I have remained involved at such a great level. It is a special privilege for which I am very grateful. She is a balloon display artist and has managed to enlist similar people from all over Australia and beyond to use their creative skills and give their time to be involved in a year of planning, which will culminate at the dinner planned for Saturday 14 April 2012 at the Adelaide Convention Centre.

Adelaide will be the first place in the world, because of its place near the International Date Line, to commemorate the centenary, showcasing South Australia to the world. The event has been commissioned to raise awareness of cancer and to celebrate those who have found or are trying to find themselves again following trauma associated with this illness. National Breast Cancer Foundation and Prostate Cancer Foundation of Australia will benefit from the night's activities where, again, the balloon display artists will play a crucial role. They will do the work necessary to see an attempt for the Guinness World Record for what has been called the 'Balloon Drop of Courage'.

Guests will be encouraged to participate during the year in a variety of ways, with attending the dinner a highlight. The dinner will give the opportunity to dine in similar circumstances to those

who embarked on the voyage a century ago. The captain's table will provide sumptuous food and amenity, the White Star class will provide a fine dining experience, and steerage will feature a hearty meal. The evening promises to be a night to remember—pun intended.

The event would not be possible without the dedication and commitment of many: the board of 1912 The Event, Balloon Artists and Suppliers Association of Australasia and countless other sponsors. Channel 9, Coast FM, VK5MGY, Mix 102.3 and Cruise 1323 AM are all involved, as are Alpen, Anagram, Premier Party, Qualatex, BOC, Contents Celebrations, Supagas, the Titanic & Steamship Historical Society of Australasia, Scouting SA, Harland and Wolff, Digital Print, Jet Oysters, Marina Pier, Life. Be in it, Pulteney Grammar School, Marryatville High School, Vili's, Wendy's, and many other groups. They will all be out in force to make sure the event is a success.

The *Titanic* launch workshops and reception on the night of Tuesday 31 May was also a success. Sir Eric and Lady Neale were there, along with my colleague the member for Schubert, to witness Mr John Jungfer (a descendant of SA *Titanic* survivor Evelyn Marsden) weigh a balloon anchor in Adelaide Arcade. It is still on display, along with a stylised Titanic hull and other balloon art, and I urge everyone to go along to visit.

The night also provided wonderful period music and dance performed by people in authentic period costume, and members of the Victoriana Society and the Australian Costumers Guild are to be thanked. I also thank the government (and, in particular, the Hon. John Rau), Tourism SA, Rundle Mall and Adelaide Arcade management, staff and retailers, TAFE SA, maritime artist John Ford, Chantelle Learey and waiting staff, and all other volunteers who generously donated their time and effort and the families supporting them.

REGIONAL TOURISM

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:15): I would like to grieve today on regional tourism. As many people here in this house today would understand, it is one of the jewels in South Australia's crown. The regional tourism industry has been a very large economic driver within South Australia's economy for many years. Just to make members who are in the chamber today aware, within the regions of South Australia \$1.92 billion is generated. That is the third largest industry within this state behind mining and, of course, agriculture. What that represents is about 11.5 million nights spent in the regions of South Australia, exploring some of the beauties that the regions do offer.

Last night I was given the opportunity to go back to my electorate in the Riverland and attend a meeting of councils and tourism operators to support a move within the tourism industry to move the area of the Riverland forward into the next phase of what tourism will mean to the region.

Within that meeting we had about 150 tourism operators and they overwhelmingly supported the local control of the development within the tourism industry. It was unanimously decided that the South Australian government and also the South Australian Tourism Commission must support the progression of the tourism industry, particularly in the Riverland region.

During that meeting we had the council sitting side by side. As many members would know here today, local government can be very parochial, but what I saw last night were three local councils and a regional development board sitting side by side, supporting one another, supporting the region, working hand in hand, and it was great to see.

The message was sent clearly to the Minister for Tourism (and I have spoken to him prior to speaking today), and he has endorsed that he will monitor the progress of this newly developed support base to set up a local tourism board, that it does move ahead and that we can actually put the Riverland back on the tourism map. For many years—for the last 10 years—the tourism industry has been in a decline.

It has been quite sad to watch the lack of numbers coming to the region, and it is primarily driven through bad press, bad media, out there in the mainstream, telling everyone that the river is dry, that there is no water, that there is nothing to see—it is a state of dust, doom and gloom.

Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, that the river is flush. The environment is looking magnificent. People's enthusiasm has been reinvigorated. There is just a spring in everyone's step to think that the river is back. The opportunities within tourism are there, and so we must move ahead.

Today I would like to make members aware that there is a vision within the electorate that we are moving from around annually 451,000 visitors to the great region of the Riverland, and our target is to try to achieve 1.34 million visitors annually to the year 2020. I think that is a very

achievable target. So, I am there supporting the tourism industry, the councils and the progress of this newly-elected board.

What I would like to do is just endorse what the regional tourism industry offers this great state and the nation, and the international tourism numbers that visit this great state of ours. Some members might know, but some of the city people who do not get out often might not understand. We look at some of the experiences on the Limestone Coast, down at Mount Gambier and in the Coonawarra. Obviously, we look at the magnificent Blue Lake and the great wine regions of the Coonawarra.

We look at the Murraylands with the expansive farming country, the blue skies and the fresh air. We look at the Fleurieu Peninsula with its lush farmland and its boutique food industry, particularly the dairy industry. We look at the Barossa Valley, particularly the wine sector and the historic iconic identities within that great region. In the Adelaide Hills, of course, we have those lovely boutique wineries and the history of our state. I am barely halfway through my grievance, but I will sit down and continue on another day.

The SPEAKER: Your time has expired. You can come back on some other occasion. Member for Ashford.

SEX INDUSTRY REFORM

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:21): In the past two weeks, I have been very busy in the community of Ashford with regard to the establishment of the Bikini Girls Massage Cafe. I have spoken in this house before about some of the issues that have been raised by locals about this. I have attended a number of community meetings—two in the last couple of weeks—and also a school council meeting, about this particular business.

In addition, many complaints have been made to the Marion council and the first of a number of petitions has been presented. From memory, around 200 people have petitioned the council with regard to this particular business. I say the first petition because I understand that others are being compiled as we speak and also that there is a Facebook page. Not being a Facebook participant, I have not had the opportunity to look at that, but there has been a lot of discussion within the community of Ashford about the establishment of this business.

It seems to me that the emphasis for us in this chamber is the appropriateness of the current legislation with regard to the sex industry. While I think it is quite well known that my view is that sex work should be decriminalised, I think there also need to be complementary changes with regard to planning and development to make sure that there are suitable locations for premises where this type of work is provided. I think consideration should be given as to whether or not children—under 18 year olds—are likely to be regularly in the vicinity, for example, because of schools and facilities for children and youths, and whether there should be legislation that makes sure that such a business cannot operate in such a location.

I am pleased to say that, despite all the complaints I have heard and the community meetings that I have been to about this particular business, residents, including the school community, have made it clear that they think that the sex industry should be decriminalised but that we really do need to address the issue of location and the appropriateness of where the different sorts of sex work premises are located.

Speaking of petitions, yesterday I tabled a petition about the need to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Summary Offences Act that I was given at a rally I attended last Thursday. That petition was:

...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.

So, this issue is alive and well and I think it is about time that we, as members of parliament, addressed it—not only for the residents in our respective electorates but also to make sure that we have a modern system of dealing with this particular industry.

LAND TENURE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:24): I rise today to speak on the issue of land tenure; that is, the way by which land is held and owned in this state. There seems to be a dedicated effort to undermine land acquisition in this state by the current government. A number of types of land tenure exist in South Australia. Freehold title exists over a large area of the state, but there are also

a number of leasehold type arrangements. There are perpetual leases, pastoral leases, war service leases, miscellaneous leases, and I am sure there are some other types of lease arrangements as well.

Generally, leasehold properties can be bought and sold, as can freehold. Freehold title is highly sought after. On the other hand, some leaseholders, in the past, have had the opportunity to gain freehold title to their properties. For some that opportunity no longer exists. I suggest that those who took the opportunity when it was presented were indeed wise because for some that opportunity no longer exists.

One would have thought that freehold title gave some sort of security, but it seems not. The example I give is that landowners in my electorate with freehold coastal property—generally farmland—have seen that rezoned (with no consultation) into a so-called coastal conservation zone. What that means is that those landowners who have been freehold title owners for that property—often for many years and sometimes up to 100 years—no longer have the right to develop that property. Any plans they might have had are no longer an option for them.

An obvious example is that many people I have spoken to have had in mind to develop their properties in lieu of superannuation. That opportunity has been taken away from them with the stroke of a pen. Most recently I have heard examples of miscellaneous leases, upon expiry, being reissued as licences—a licence to occupy the land for five years—to manage the land but not to improve it, to own as a licence but with the very real possibility that that licence will be withdrawn once the licence expires. In fact, that has been indicated to them.

What does this mean for landowners? Most importantly, landowners are having their equity reduced; the value of their asset is reduced, as I said, by the stroke of a pen in an office far away—it is wrong. The intent appears to be that, upon the expiry of these licences, the government is looking to gain control of this land and to lock this country away. My point is this: with 22 per cent of the state already locked up, the government seems intent on increasing this percentage with no end in sight. To what end? What do we gain? This is socialism.

Producers take their responsibilities very seriously. I know they feel the responsibility to feed the world and they understand their role as land managers, but they also need to stay in business. I am one who believes the environment does need managing. In fact, we as a species have reached the stage where we can no longer expect not to manage our environment. I firmly believe that the terrestrial landscape is more sustainable the more productive it is. When this land is locked up it will not be well managed; the gate will be shut. Despite its best intentions, DENR simply does not have the resources to take on any more land management.

Mr Venning: Weeds, vermin!

Mr TRELOAR: The member for Schubert quite rightly mentions weeds and vermin. The gate will be shut and the place will be overrun with weeds and vermin—rabbits, wombats, kangaroos and horehound.

If the government's intention is to turn this state into one giant theme park then it is doing a good job! Once again, unfortunately, we have an arrogant and out-of-touch government making decisions without consultation and locking up country without any regard for the views of the landowners and for no gain whatsoever.

BAROSSA VALLEY AND MCLAREN VALE

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:29): I rise today to inform the house about a very important announcement made late last Friday by the Minister for Tourism and urban planning at the National Wine Centre. I was very pleased to be there because it was the latest chapter in many years of work that has been done to preserve both the McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley regions. This has been something I have worked hard on for—

Mr Venning: I didn't get invited.

Mr BIGNELL: The member for Schubert says he was not invited. I might tell the member for Schubert that I have been working very closely with his community for the past 18 months. He has never shown much enthusiasm for it, but we hope to get you on board now, member for Schubert, because it is a very good idea and there are a lot of people in your neck of the woods who are very happy with what the government is doing.

The minister announced that a discussion paper would be out until 22 July so that people could make submissions on what they think the agricultural and tourism preserve should look like,

both to the north of the city in the Barossa Valley and to the south in McLaren Vale. It is very important that we preserve these agricultural and tourism lands, not just for the sake of the local economies and the state economy, with hundreds of millions of dollars being poured into our state's coffers through both regions, but also for the sake of our state in terms of food security.

Both areas are well known for their production of grapes and wine, but I think what we will see over the next few years and decades is perhaps even more crops being planted and different horticultural pursuits as people cash in on the great names associated with McLaren Vale, the Fleurieu Peninsula and also the Barossa Valley.

When the Premier announced his reshuffle earlier in the year, I think the addition of a food marketing portfolio was very much aimed at telling people just how much we value food in South Australia, how important it is to reward primary producers now and also into the future, and to just say that, as a government, we are right behind them. So, I think both McLaren Vale and the Barossa Valley will benefit from that.

We have had a lot of victories along the way in trying to preserve McLaren Vale. Bowering Hill is land owned by the Land Management Corporation which sits west of South Road, in between Maslin Beach and Port Willunga. It is a very big open piece of land that has been cropped for the past several years. There was a plan to put 8,000 gutter-to-gutter houses on that land. Many of us in the local community stood up to the government about that. We were very pleased when, in 2009, the Land Management Corporation and the minister announced that those 8,000 gutter-to-gutter houses would not go ahead. So, that was seen as a victory.

We also had a victory in the 30-year plan when we locked in the town boundaries around McLaren Vale, McLaren Flat and Willunga. The local community down there is happy to see growth within the town boundaries, but what we did not want to see was the edges of each of those towns being extended on a year-on-year basis. So, McLaren Vale would grow one year and then Willunga would grow the next year and, in a few years, you would have no vines at all between the two towns; they would just be joined up. That would just absolutely ruin our area. As we all know, people do not go to suburbs for their holidays; they like to go out and see open spaces, get involved in pursuits like tasting wine, eating great food, eating at fantastic restaurants. That was one of the wins.

What I found out, though, was that people were a little cynical in terms of how politics work. While they were happy with those victories, they said, 'What about when you're no longer the local member of parliament or we no longer have a Labor government? What's to stop a future politician or future bureaucracies redrawing the lines on the map?' So, that was when we decided to put our thinking caps on towards some legislation. Originally, I was going to do a private member's bill here after discussing with the people from the Barossa about what we wanted. What we needed to do was lock in—

Mr Venning: I never got invited to those, either.

Mr BIGNELL: Well, I will tell you what happened. The people in the Barossa came to me and said, 'You're doing a good job down there. We can't get much interest out of our bloke; can we join your project?'

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: You asked for it; I am telling you what happened. My plan was to lock it in so that it would have to get past both houses of parliament, with plenty of notices to the local people who have been pushing for these protections. So, I look forward to lots of people putting in their submissions to this discussion paper between now and 22 July, and I hope that one day people will look back at the leadership that has been shown by the group here with the same affection they have for Colonel Light for protecting our Parklands.

MINING (ROYALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION (CHARGES ON LAND) AMENDMENT BILL

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) (15:35): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Legal Services Commission Act 1977. Read a first time.

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) (15:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends section 18A of the Legal Services Commission Act 1977. To confirm the status of the Legal Services Commission's statutory charge over land under the Real Property Act 1886 and so remove potential impediments to the recovery of legal aid costs secured by such charges. Case-related funds are an important source of funding for legal aid. Legal aid costs to the current value of \$4.7 million are secured by charge under section 18A and the amount is increasing.

Section 18A creates a statutory charge that the commission may take over land to secure the payment of a legally-aided person's contribution towards legal aid. It allows the commission to notify the Registrar-General of a charge over land so that it is noted on the title. The Registrar-General registers that notice by entering a memorandum of charge in the register book or register of crown leases. The intended effect is to make the title of every registered proprietor of the land subject to the charge, and to give notice of the commission's interest to anyone considering acquiring an interest in the land.

Section 18A also provides that if there is a default in payment of the contribution, the commission has the same powers of sale over the charged land as a mortgagee would have under the Real Property Act 1886 in respect of a mortgage when there has been a default in payment of the principal. The commission's practice is to let the charge remain over the title indefinitely until the property is re-financed, further mortgaged, transferred or sold, or until the owner dies. Until then, payments towards legal aid costs are not usually required.

However, uncertainty about the status of the charge may impede the commission's ability to recover the costs secured by the charge when it is sold by the holder of another interest registered on the title. The purpose of this bill is to remove that uncertainty.

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

Leave granted.

The doubt arises from the fact that despite the purpose of s18A—that the charge be treated as an interest registered under the *Real Property Act 1886*—the recording of the memorandum of charge by the Registrar-General does not, of itself, amount to registration of the charge under the *Real Property Act 1886*. This has resulted, on occasion, in disputes over the Commission's entitlement, under the Real Property Act, to a share in the proceeds of the sale of the charge land by a prior registered mortgagee or encumbrance. Continuing uncertainty may diminish the effectiveness of the charge.

One way of dealing with the problem would be to legislate to permit the Commission to secure legal assistance costs by registering an encumbrance over the land under the *Real Property Act*, rather by imposing a statutory charge under the Act. This would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and the additional fees and costs would increase the amount owed by the legally-aided client.

Another solution would be to make the Commission's charge a first charge, giving it priority over all other registered interests regardless of the date of registration. But there are no compelling public policy reasons for giving this particular charge, as opposed to charges created under other legislation, that priority.

The solution taken by this Bill will clarify the intention of Parliament that the statutory charge be taken to be a registered interest on the title and as such to have a priority with respect to other interests that is consistent with the scheme of registration in the *Real Property Act*. The amendments will ensure that:

- the statutory charge, once noted on the title, has the priority of an instrument registered on the title under the *Real Property Act*;
- when there is a default in payment of the contribution secured by the charge, the Commission has the powers of sale of a mortgagee under the *Real Property Act* and in selling the charged land is governed by provisions in that Act relating to mortgage sales; and
- the statutory charge is to be treated as an encumbrance registered under the *Real Property Act* for the purposes of the allocation of the proceeds of sale when the charged land is sold by someone other than the Commission.

The amendments will have retrospective effect. They will apply to the charged land whether the charge was created before or after the commencement of the Bill. Without such a transition provision, there would be an inconsistency in the priority rules for mortgages registered after a statutory charge, depending on whether they are registered before or after the commencement of the amending legislation, and that this might cause confusion in years to come.

The legal effect of the charge will be apparent on the register. In addition, the Commission will ensure that its written notification of a charge to prior registered mortgagees or encumbrancees will refer to the legal effect of the charge, and the Registrar-General will advise Lands Titles Registration Office clients about the legal effect of the Commission's charge by issuing a 'Notice to Lodging Parties'.

In summary, these amendments will remove impediments to the recovery of contributions towards legal-aid costs that are owed to the Commission and are secured by a charge over land. There will no longer be any doubt that:

(a) the holder of an interest registered before the noting of the charge on the register who sells the charged land will be legally obliged to pay the Commission, from the proceeds of sale, the amount secured by the charge in the priority of distribution set by s135 of the *Real Property Act* as if the charge were an encumbrance under that Act, and deal with any surplus remaining after paying amounts currently due under the charge in the manner described by s135A of that Act; and

(b) when a later registered mortgagee or encumbrancee sells the land, the transferee will take it subject to the Commission's charge, unless that interest has been discharged by payment from the proceeds of sale.

The Commission estimates that the enactment of these amendments will result in an annual 5 per cent increase in the average amount of legal-aid costs secured by charge that it recovers.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Legal Services Commission Act 1977*

4—Amendment of section 18A—Legal assistance costs may be secured by charge on land

Section 18A of the Act provides for legal assistance costs to be secured by a charge on land. This clause amends the section—

- to provide that the charge will be taken to have been presented for registration at the time the notice of the charge was lodged with the Registrar-General (thereby ensuring that the charge can be given an order of priority as against other registered interests);
- to ensure that the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886* relating to a sale by a mortgagee would apply to a sale of the charged land by the Commission; and
- to ensure that sections 135 and 135A of that Act will work properly in relation to the charge if the charged property is sold by some other party who is the holder of a mortgage or encumbrance over the land.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

The proposed amendments are to apply in relation to charged land whether the charge was created before or after commencement of the amendment.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Venning.

ADELAIDE OVAL REDEVELOPMENT AND MANAGEMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (15:39): At the outset, I declare that within our party room I opposed this bill. I opposed the expenditure of the \$535 million because I did not think that I, with any credibility, could support spending at least \$535 million on a sports stadium when the people of the Barossa cannot get \$50 million to \$60 million for their hospital—one tenth of the price of this—and it is a hospital that they desperately need. If ever there were issues which show the city-country divide, it is this and the new RAH. I know this is a very good project, but it certainly has a lot of people in the Barossa very concerned. I believe that \$535 million could have been better spent to the advantage of all South Australians, especially the one-third of our people who live outside Adelaide.

I know that people from the country will use this facility, but projects such as dualling the three major highways to our borders would definitely save lives and time. We could also seal the link roads in the Mid North of our state, particularly around Tarlee. There are projects really screaming for the money, and I cannot see how \$535 million is going to make a huge difference to the sporting codes or sport here in South Australia. After all, the Adelaide Oval exists and already

has a fantastic reputation exactly as it is—or, I should say, exactly as it was before we did the last upgrade.

We need an upgrade for our country hospitals and, dare I say it again, a new Barossa hospital. I challenge the members of this house to come and have a look at this hospital. I have been banging on about this for nearly 10 years, and nothing has been done. Nothing has been spent on it because it is not worth spending money on such an old, worn out facility, and yet it stays the same. I will be very curious to know whether there is any mention in the budget tomorrow. I very much doubt it, but I would be extremely grateful for any mention at all because it has been the single most important project to me as a member.

I also believe, in instances like this, whether support for the Keith, Moonta and Ardrossan hospitals has to be reconsidered. The amount of money we are spending on the Adelaide Oval—coupled with the money spent on the new RAH—means that finances are going to be so strapped that there is not going to be any money for these community projects. Also, there are many communities looking for vital town infrastructure right around our state, such as halls and meeting rooms. I also bring to your attention the state of some of the roads, particularly on Yorke Peninsula. Some of those roads are pretty ordinary, to say the least.

Irrespective of that, I have been here for 22 years, and I was most impressed with our meeting and debate in the Liberal Party room on Monday night. Even though I lost this battle, I now back the decision. I pay tribute to the member for Davenport. It was a great deliberation, a great paper and a great presentation. I pay tribute to that because it was very well done, and it was not divisive. The first vote was basically the only part that was divisive—the rest was almost unanimous, and that is the absolute truth. I remind the house that this legislation is not essential to enable the project to continue, and no doubt it will continue anyway.

I certainly hope that we are able to amend this bill, as the opposition's amendments will ensure transparency and accountability for the \$535 million of South Australian taxpayers' funds that will be spent on this project. We support the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill 2011 subject, as you have heard before, to a number of conditions, including the following: first, that the legislation cap the state contribution to the project at \$535 million (I hope they come under that, and it would be a nice surprise if they could); secondly, that the Auditor-General be given the powers to audit the project on a regular basis at the Auditor-General's call; and, thirdly, that the normal planning process applies and the project also be considered by the parliamentary Public Works Committee. I believe that should be automatic. With a project of this size and magnitude it should be automatic, and I am pleased that apparently the government is going to agree to that.

After consulting with the Adelaide City Council, we will introduce conditions to leave Light's Vision, Pennington Gardens and Cresswell Gardens under the care and control of the council. I cannot see that as being contentious at all. The licensed areas covering proposed car parking to the north of the oval and Adelaide Oval No. 2 will be subject to the community land management plan to be agreed with the Adelaide City Council. I have received many letters and emails in the last couple of days congratulating us on that position because, after all, the Parklands are sacred to many people in Adelaide and they are very concerned about that.

I also note a lighter side to the discussions in our party room. The member for Adelaide fought hard and strongly and won the day in relation to the retention of the fig trees and also the line of trees to the north. The member for Adelaide is a breath of fresh air when it comes to negotiating things like this, and that decision was carried unanimously in our party room. It is good to have the member for Adelaide who has her feet on the ground and is in there fighting for the big issues and the little issues. It is important, and I was impressed by that.

We have a problem with our sport at the moment, and we are all a bit concerned about our football. I do not think the Adelaide Oval is going to fix the problem so much as the performance of our teams. The Liberal Party has always supported football and our initiative is to bring football back into the City of Adelaide. I remind the house that is a Liberal initiative. But I believe the biggest solution to this is to get our teams performing better. I am sure if the Crows and Port Power were at the top of the premiership list there would be a lot more fans going to football, there would be a lot bigger crowds and there would be a lot more money to go around.

I have to declare I am one of those people who was a member of Port Power for many years and I have let my membership lapse. I think it behoves people like me to bite the bullet and, when the teams are down, go and rejoin. I think I should, and I will. I say the same to many other

people in this place who I know are no longer members of either Port Power or the Crows—we should, in their desperate hours, join in, and that may encourage other people to do the same.

I think the success of those clubs, both Crows and Power, will be the success of this venture, more so than building a stadium. They have to get to the top of the table and be competitive. As I say, their supporter bases are under severe stress at the moment and therefore they are under financial stress, too. So we need to lift the supporter base of both clubs. I have made my commitment, and I will do it.

I do believe it will be better to have Australian Rules football in the city. I have to say that I have only been to two football matches at Football Park in the time it has been there (20 years) because I was not inclined to put up with the inconvenience of getting there and getting out. I have been to two matches. That certainly will change because it is much more convenient to either walk down the road and go across or park my car in the city and walk across; and, after the football, there are many facilities around here to attend and be entertained with your friends, etc.

I say again that members should not forget that bringing football back to the Adelaide Oval is a Liberal Party initiative. We might have lost the battle in relation to the two stadiums concept but we are realistic. We lost the election and, on this issue, we lost, too. I think it was our initiative in the first instance that brought the idea of bringing football back to the city and Adelaide Oval. That should never be forgotten.

I support football in the city but I firmly believe we should have built a new stadium with a roof and left the historic Adelaide Oval for cricket. As I said, it is a unique cricket arena, known and respected the world over. All will be lost. Only the scoreboard will be left in its original condition. It is going to look a bit like a pimple on a pumpkin, this lovely old heritage scoreboard sitting among these modern, futuristic buildings. We all bring different skills to this place. I would hope that mine is a business background and covering my exposures and my risks, and I feel that the government should be doing the same.

I feel that the government is now very much exposed financially especially after hearing yesterday that the new RAH will cost about \$2.8 billion—that is the minimum—or \$1.1 million per day for 30 years. I heard a figure today that was even up as high as \$3.26 billion for the building only. It is a disgrace. If that was my business, I would be very concerned indeed. I would be looking to take out insurance and looking to cover my debt, because you would be very close to bankrupt.

If the decision was up to me, I would be bringing football back in two years, not four. Why wait four years? Bring it back in two years and get on with the job. Do not do the major upgrade yet. Yes, build the bridge. I have had a good friend of mine, Bob Ahrens, look at that project and he is very enthused. He says it could be built, it is a great idea and a great project and he believes it should be built for a lot less than what is quoted but I understand, too, before the minister interjects, this bridge has to be safe.

I know that there would be a lot of people pouring over this bridge after the match so I understand that, yes, it would want to be a very good quality bridge. I would say in the first instance, build the bridge, certainly—straightaway. Put in the car parks. Yes, put the car parks in and paint the place, upgrade the food outlets and the toilets and leave the rest of it. Test drive that venue for two to four years and, if it works, do the rest. If not, save the state from huge debt and ongoing cost.

We also have concerns about the maintenance costs, observing the concept plan there, that the white sail concept will be high maintenance and will architecturally date. It is all very swish and groovy now, but I am sure that within 20 years' time, it will look very much out of date. Also, it does not keep patrons dry which is a great concern as well. I would have preferred a much more conservative design with a roof that keeps people a little bit dry. If we only spend a quarter of the money—

Ms Thompson: It's good to be exposed to the elements. Good for the mental health.

Mr VENNING: I will stand on my record on things like this in my life. If I am about to go into a major project and I am not sure, I will go in half first to see, especially if you have got the right to continue. If you can lock it in, you should and would, but if we only spend a quarter of the money, road-test football back in Adelaide and, if it is all go, in four to six years' time you can then decide to either finish the project like it is or build the second stadium with a roof. That is a choice you can have depending on where we are and what we can afford.

Finally, I do not believe that this will solve South Australia's economic woes, but it may help our teams to have greater success. I note the Minister for Police is here and he has been a very good supporter of Port Power, I will give him that, and the Port Adelaide Magpies and I presume he is still a member. He knows the song. No comment? My membership has lapsed and I should do something about it.

We need to be positive and, even though I lost the debate in my party room, I am happy to support the team decision on this side to support the project to make sure it is delivered on time, and hopefully it will do the job. As always, I may not have always won my point of view, but I choose to be positive and I hope this will work out for the best for everybody in South Australia.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:54): I rise to support this bill and to put on the record the fact that I and many of the constituents in the seat of Mawson cannot wait until AFL football is being played at the Adelaide Oval. It has been long time coming, and it is a tribute to the Minister for Police, the Minister for Infrastructure and the Premier that they have brought together two sides that have not always seen eye to eye for the past 40 or 50 years—that is, the SANFL and the SACA. I think the people in both of those organisations need to be commended as well for putting the past behind them and for getting on to build what will be a great asset for future South Australians.

The redevelopment ties in with a lot of other infrastructure that is being built around the place as well. By the time the oval is redeveloped, people will be able to catch a train from the Seaford rail station. It will be a brand-new station with electric rail and comfortable, clean and environmentally friendly trains that will take them from Seaford to just outside the Adelaide Oval within 35 minutes on an express train.

They will also have the choice that they do not have now, that is, if they want to go to the football, the length of time to get there depends on whether the expressway is going the right way or not. By the time the Adelaide Oval redevelopment comes around, it will not matter what time of day or night the game is, people will have the choice to take the car and get there as quickly as possible. However, I really do think that we are going to see a lot more people leave their cars behind, go to park-and-ride facilities in the south or the north, or wherever else, and take advantage of the great, new \$2 billion worth of public transport that this government is investing in South Australia.

For anyone who has ever been to Melbourne, part of the ritual is actually getting on the trams or the trains and getting in to either Richmond station or the city and then walking with those great tribes down the hill to the MCG. The tribalism that comes with the football is as good as the game almost. People have the scarves and there is fantastic banter between the supporters. You might go and see a Port versus Carlton game and there will be people in their Richmond scarves or their Melbourne scarves. That is what Melbourne is all about; it is a tribal society that has a great football knowledge, and the MCG is the mecca for football in Melbourne.

I still call it, from my ABC days, the Docklands Stadium. I know there is some sort of commercial name it goes by now, but the Docklands Stadium, too, has added a new dimension to football and other events that they hold there. However, the MCG is the place that has so much history and it is the place that is so much part of the culture of football, not just in Melbourne but the rest of Australia.

I make the point that the first grand final I went to at the MCG was in 1990. Collingwood broke the drought against Essendon, and it was a great game. I stood in the old southern stand and my body was facing a different direction to my head, because we were trapped in there like sardines, and I was sort of looking over my left shoulder to where the oval was. It was too bad if you had too many cans, as you could have cans in those days, because there was no way you were getting out to the bathroom and getting back to your position in the southern stand.

Mr Treloar: So what did you do?

Mr BIGNELL: I held on, as Collingwood did that day. People so often say we cannot do anything with the Adelaide Oval because of the heritage and this and that, but I went to both the grand finals at the MCG again last year and there was not a single grain of sand or cement in the whole stadium that existed there in 1990. Every part of the MCG had been taken down and rebuilt. We want to talk about the history of the Adelaide Oval and, yes, it has a fine history and some great events have happened there, but I think just as many great events have happened at the MCG. Not only has it witnessed epic test battles and football matches but during World War II it was also where the US army was stationed.

Ms Bedford: How do you know that?

Mr BIGNELL: I have been there a few times. All the areas under the stands were full of camp stretchers where the American soldiers were billeted.

An honourable member: Nothing is too good for our mates.

Mr BIGNELL: Exactly. So, if the people of the MCG—and I can tell you there are some people there who are fairly conservative—thought it was all right to redevelop the MCG from 1990 when they pulled the old southern stand down and started work on the Great Southern Stand then it is not too much for the people of Adelaide to expect that there will be some change here. I think that change has been planned for, taking into consideration the great history that the Adelaide Oval has.

I was really happy to be at the vote of SACA members when 80 per cent of SACA members approved the redevelopment. In itself, it was a little bit like going to a sporting event. For the people there, there was this sense of expectation. Who was going to get up? There were people putting up odds of whether the 75 per cent would vote in favour or not. There was actually widespread joy in the room that night, and it was good to hear some of the people there say, 'Look, even though I was running the "no" case, the decision's been made and we'll live with that decision.' I think that, up until this point, everyone has behaved very well; respect has been shown for both sides.

It is great to have the opposition coming on board now as well, and I think that now we have to get on with it. We do have to keep an eye on the costs. Stadium costs, as we know, around the world—we look at Wembley and other places—do have a propensity to blow out sometimes, and we need to make sure that is all managed well. I am sure that the Stadium Management Authority and those people who run football and cricket in this state, along with the people in government who have been entrusted to look after this project, will be keeping a close eye on all that.

I went to Football Park once this year. I took my son down there. It was his 13th birthday. He is a mad Port supporter, so we went to see them get beaten by West Coast. I have to say that I have hated going to 'pleurisy park' for years. It is cold and it is damp. I spent a lot of time there as a sports journo in the comfort, I suppose, of the press box, but Tuesday and Thursday nights when you had to go down for training and stand there in that big, cement cavern was not a very pleasant place to be—and it is a long way out of the city as well.

I think that bringing football into town will see people going down there in their droves on Friday nights and over weekends. I do not know how many people here went to see the Rams when they played there. I do not know much about rugby league, but I used to love going to see the Rams play on a Friday night because there were people running around on an oval under lights and we could all get together, have a few beers and enjoy the sporting spectacle. I think that the Rams used to get pretty good crowds, which is not bad in a city that is not known for its support of rugby league. I think that it was actually something that people took to heart—that there was sport in the heart of the city and they were keen to get down there and have a look.

I had never been a member of Adelaide Oval until I saw the Premier and the then deputy premier walking across the grass with a few other sporting people a couple of years ago. I went online and downloaded an application form. I filled in one for myself and one for my son because I was that excited that I would get to watch footy at the highest level at Adelaide Oval.

Cricket, I do not mind it too much. I would buy a ticket every now and then to go along to the cricket. However, now that I am a member, we were down there a few times over the test match and thoroughly enjoyed the new facilities; and I saw many familiar faces in here out the back and also in the stands. The cricket is a great part of life in South Australia. I am looking forward to many summers of cricket at the Adelaide Oval and many winters of football. As I said, I support this bill wholeheartedly.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16:02): It gives me some pleasure to speak on the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill 2011, along with, I would estimate, probably in excess of half the members of the house at this stage. It is good that so many members have taken the opportunity to speak on this bill that affects the Adelaide Oval, because the Adelaide Oval is very important to so many of us in South Australia.

It has been an icon for me for most of my life. I am pretty sure in saying—well, I am certain—that I am the only member of the house who was born some years after the departure of

the SANFL final from Adelaide Oval. I was not there in 1973 to see Graham Cornes take that mark and win the grand final. I do not have that sort of history; I do not have that sort of memory to fall back on, but I am sure it was terrific.

There is certainly a lot to be said for the idea of football in the city. My memories first and foremost of the oval are of cricket. Although I was going for some years before, when I was about 10 my parents were kind enough to take out membership of the oval for me, but the first game that I remember was a little earlier than that. It was the West Indies playing here and Craig McDermott and Tim May were batting, and they did an extraordinary job. It was outrageous that that umpire saw that nick and paid the wicket.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: It did not help that he did smack it, as the minister says, but it was a tragic day for a young boy whose eyes were opening to live sport. Fortunately, I enjoyed the drama, put the tragedy out of my mind and kept going. My parents, like many migrants to Australia, were not Australian Rules aficionados. They both came from England. My mum had a passing interest in soccer, my dad a bit more of an interest in rugby.

So, again, it was not until I was about nine or 10 that I had my first experience of Football Park. One of my best friends at school at the time was the son of the North Adelaide team doctor and they took me over to Football Park to see North Adelaide play West Torrens. I just thought, 'What an incredible spectacle this is. What a game! Where have I been?'

So, for 23 years since, I have developed a passion for football—not for North Adelaide, thankfully. In more recent years, I have taken out membership with Norwood. I am happy to support the Redlegs and have enjoyed going to suburban football at Norwood Oval. I have occasionally had a Crows membership at AAMI Stadium. It is not one that I have had for a few years. Because you do not get a chance to go to many games, it has not seemed worthwhile.

Frankly, I think, from a selfish point of view, I can see great merit in football being in the city. I know many people who will be more likely to go to the games than if they remain out at West Lakes. I appreciated the Minister for Police's comments agreeing with the idea that, even though it will hurt his constituents who want to go to the football more easily, for the majority of people in Adelaide and, probably, South Australia, Adelaide Oval and, more pointedly, the city, will be better than the current arrangement.

It would want to be, for \$535 million. Really, you would prefer it to be the best stadium that you could possibly have, the best outcome you could possibly have, for such an extraordinary financial imposition on the South Australian people. For cricket, for football, for all sorts of people—for the people who might want to run concerts there, for people who might want to run soccer there, for rugby—it is a second-best option.

The member for Kavel called it a C-grade option. It is not the ideal solution, but it is the one that is on the table and it is in that context that we look at the bill that we have before us. Of course, we also have to consider the fact that the government could press ahead with this anyway, irrespective of the legislation. So, let us try to make the legislation a bit better.

The amendments that the opposition has been talking about are being drafted at the moment and I look forward to them being presented, if not in the House of Assembly then, hopefully, the government will consider them favourably when they are presented in the Legislative Council. These amendments do some important things.

It is important, for example, that normal planning processes will apply, rather than making the minister, effectively, the planning authority by himself. It is very important that the Auditor-General have powers to audit the project on a regular basis. It is extremely important, given some of the recent projects that this government has put forward, that the parliament's Public Works Committee be given the opportunity to consider this project. It is tremendously important, as the member for Croydon pointed out yesterday, that we have the opportunity to cap the spend on the project at \$535 million.

These accountability measures are extremely important because the fact is that not everybody in South Australia trusts everything that comes out of the mouths of ministers in this government. We are looking at a second-best option. It is second best for so many people, coming from, of course, a second-best government, on a good day.

Other measures that the opposition will insist on are, after consulting with the Adelaide City Council, we will have conditions leaving Light's Vision, Pennington Gardens and the Cresswell Gardens under the care and control of the council. Of course, the member for Schubert has already talked about the sterling work of the member for Adelaide in relation to those beautiful fig trees.

The \$535 million price tag though, is very high. So, it is appropriate that the opposition has considered that the Stadium Management Authority should consider at least paying some rent—giving something back to the community for the incredible largesse which they are potentially being given and the great opportunity for making profit that they will therefore be given.

I think about some other projects or what could be done with this sort of money. If anyone is crying poor in this, it is obscene, given this opportunity. I think of the Campbelltown Leisure Centre, for example. State Swim, Squash SA, Fussball SA and the Norwood Basketball Club, and the Campbelltown council managed to raise \$7 million and the state government has kindly provided \$3 million. Going into the election the Redmond opposition promised \$4 million, but thank you for the \$3 million that you promised.

That is all a bit meaningless without a further \$6 million from the federal government, which would provide a really significant indoor recreation and sporting facility in the eastern suburbs, of which there is a significant lack at the moment as has been demonstrated by so many of those groups. It would provide serious international quality fixtures for some of these sports and facilities that would be able to host national competitions for some of them—all for the lack of \$6 million which currently we are hoping, cap in hand, for the federal government to provide. That is the sort of thing that the state government could consider looking at with the opportunities available.

I think of the extraordinary work that the volunteers at the Campania Club have done recently in raising an awful lot of money to build their own bocce courts. I know the member for Flinders is particularly interested in coming to the Campania Club, which is in the member for Florey's electorate but which so many of my constituents attend on a regular basis. I hope the member for Flinders comes up from Port Lincoln to play some bocce at the Campania Club.

At present the Campbelltown Memorial Oval is just a couple of million dollars short of being able to do a significant redevelopment involving hard courts for netball and tennis, extra cricket nets to service that community, directional lighting and sensitive landscaping so the local community is not disadvantaged by an increase in the use of that night-time facility, and urban design that is sensitive to the water needs of such a project. All these things could be done for a single number in the millions—less than 2 per cent of the cost of the project that we are debating today—and would have significant community use at the grassroots level for tens of thousands of people to actually play, not just to spectate.

Footy in the city is important but it is coming at an extraordinary price tag. I am not sure the government is putting its best foot forward here, but it is the option on the table and all we can do is try to improve the bill, so try to improve the bill we will. I urge the government to consider seriously and favourably the amendments being put forward by the opposition.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:13): Today has been quite a long day, there have been many contributions, and the public debate has raged on this Adelaide Oval project for quite a long time now. I believe that in many respects this has dominated the public policy debate at the expense of other important areas such as health, education, infrastructure and investment in small business.

Mr Whetstone: And the River Murray.

Mr TRELOAR: And the River Murray, as the member for Chaffey reminds me. Whether the government admits to it or not, football in the city was thrust back onto the agenda by the state Liberals. Our plan for a purpose-built covered stadium struck a chord not only with the South Australian people but with the football community as well. At one time the South Australian National Football League sought to develop its own covered stadium but was told by the Premier to go back to the drawing board as it was too similar to the proposal put forward by the Liberal Party. Unfortunately, on that occasion the Premier put his own political interests ahead of the interests of South Australians.

In the short term, the sporting community will lament the missed opportunity to develop the stand-alone covered stadium which we as the state Liberals proposed. I do believe that one day South Australia will move towards a second world-class stadium, and it will be in the very long term.

Eventually South Australia will not have any doubts about developing another stadium for the needs of soccer particularly, and maybe rugby, as the popularity of those codes continue to grow. Many have pointed to the example of Melbourne. In fact, it has been referred to here today with the recently built AAMI Park. AAMI Park is more of a boutique 30,000-seat stadium for soccer and, once again, the rugby codes. Although I have not been there, I understand that it is a brilliantly designed and functional stadium which coexists with the magnificent MCG and Etihad Stadium at Docklands.

I have on occasion been lucky enough to visit the MCG. In fact, I am going with my family this coming long weekend. I am just tossing up as to whether I am going to wear my old football guernsey which resembles a Collingwood guernsey. Given the weather, I probably will take it. There has been a lot of reminiscing here. I appreciate the contribution of the member for Morialta, who recognises his rather limited memory, I guess, due to his age and I also thank him for his invitation to join him in a game of bocce at some point in the future.

I remember the first time I saw Adelaide Oval as a young boy and avid footy fan, and particularly a follower of the South Australian football league. I visited the Adelaide Oval in 1974 and saw Glenelg playing some team. I cannot recall who it was; it may have been North Adelaide, but I think it was more likely West Torrens or Woodville, member for Chaffey. So, I have fond memories. I did from time to time see footy games at Adelaide Oval. In more recent years, I have spent time at cricket games, particularly test matches, although I have not spent anywhere near the amount of time there as many other members of this house.

With respect to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment and this piece of legislation, I am personally very pleased with the position we have come to as a party. I congratulate our shadow treasurer and, indeed, all of my colleagues on their contribution to this debate so far. Given that this part of the debate, at least, is drawing to a close, I do not want to rehash what others have already put on the record, although I think there are probably a few pertinent points that I need to put on the record for the constituents of Flinders.

I am on the record previously as talking about the people of Flinders and their understanding of the fact that Adelaide's population commands the lion's share of the state's resources and projects, such as this. However, the electors of Flinders were told by the Labor Party during the 2010 election campaign that the taxpayer contribution to this project would be \$450 million and, I quote, 'not a penny more'. So, I understand and have heard their frustration at being deceived by the government during that campaign and when the project cost was revealed more recently to be some \$535 million. This is a significant blowout, and it was a deliberate ploy. That is why I am now very supportive of capping the taxpayer contribution at that stated \$535 million, and that is why the Liberal Party is seeking to include it in the legislation—because this government has shown that it cannot be relied upon to ensure there are no cost blowouts on major projects such as this.

The other crucially important point for the community of Flinders is community sporting facilities in my electorate. Local sports is the cornerstone of social activity. I have been involved for many years in local sport as a junior player, as a senior player and now as a parent. I understand and recognise the importance of local sport, particularly Saturday sport, to the social fabric and cohesiveness of local regional communities. It is not just football or cricket, it is other sports as well. Recognising that community and local sport is so important, the Liberal Party has called for an audit into sporting facilities around the state. As I have already indicated, I believe we need to invest in the grassroots of sport generally, not just football and cricket but any of the many other popular sports that are played right around this great state.

Therefore, I believe a proposal to direct rent or a licence fee paid by the Stadium Management Authority back into recreation and sports facilities grants programs is an excellent idea because most local clubs rely on grants programs to continue, particularly to upgrade their facilities which are often beyond the scope and ability of clubs in small towns. They rely on such grants programs and those programs need to be well funded by government. This is a way to do that and it makes eminent sense because the many sporting and recreational organisations in Flinders could benefit from this.

I believe the Auditor-General should be given powers to audit the project, and I believe any government should be open and accountable in that respect. We will be pushing for that as part of our amendments so that the Auditor-General can report to the parliament on those issues and with those powers. It is also important that the normal planning processes apply. Various organisations

and individuals in Flinders adhere to the proper planning laws when developing projects so it is only right that this project is subject to those same planning processes.

The parliament itself needs to play a role here, as I think we are. This government seems to forget the importance of the proper accountability measures enshrined in legislation, so I am very supportive of the measures to ensure that the Adelaide Oval redevelopment is given proper scrutiny in the Public Works Committee. I believe my colleagues have canvassed the other issues in detail over today's contributions, and many have spoken about their own experiences, mostly pleasurable, and the place that Adelaide Oval holds in their memories, their hearts and the lives of South Australians. I will reiterate the importance of community and recreation and sporting groups in rural and regional areas, and trust that they will get a good deal out of this because it is vital that they do so. With those few comments, I indicate my support for the legislation with the proviso that amendments are accepted.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:22): I rise to make my contribution to the debate on the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill 2011. It is interesting how far we have gone to get to this point in time and I sincerely think that the only reason that we are debating the Adelaide Oval redevelopment is because the Liberals—our party on this side of the house—had a far better proposal going into the 2010 election. We proposed to build a covered stadium. We proposed to make it part of the Riverbank precinct and have an entertainment area along that strip of land next to the rail network, and it would have been a far better venture to have in the rail yards area than where the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is going.

We must remember with regard to this debate, as far as budgetary measures go, that we were going to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital where it is and save well over \$1 billion (and climbing as we hear different announcements from the government every day) for this state's population. Sadly, we did not win the election, so we have come to the point where, in my opinion, we are going to desecrate one of the best grounds, if not the best cricket ground in the world. I have been to Adelaide Oval for a few games of cricket—not a lot—and I can remember the days when you would sit under the historic scoreboard on the hill—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I notice a mention from the member for Finniss. Yes, they used to serve full-strength beer 23 years ago. I don't know whether you would call it entertainment, and I do not condone unruly behaviour, but that is why they only drink mid-strength beer there now, as several people were ejected.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: No, not at all, and I certainly was not one of those ejected.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I will keep going, Mr Acting Speaker. The oval has always been a fantastic sporting venue, and it was certainly good in those earlier days to go and witness a game of cricket. I mean, going back into history, I know my father either played cricket on that oval or the No. 2 oval in country carnivals many years ago—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Well, seeing as he is 91, it was many years ago. So, it has had a lot of history in this state. It is a world-renowned venue. The issue that we have here today is that the Labor Party had to come up with their own policy to come up against our A+—or better than that; A++ policy. They had to come up with something because we were winning the support from across the state, on bringing football to the city.

That is the thing; we agreed to bring football to the city, but we said, 'Have a properly built stadium where you could close the roof.' You could attract other functions throughout the year on wet days, and you could have a vast range of ways in which the venue could be hired out.

What we have seen over recent years is the different stands being renewed at the Adelaide Oval, and we have seen the members stand—where it is at the moment—go through a recent upgrade, and I think that is where some of the architectural problems with the development will start.

I am no architect, but I believe the new members and function areas will be on the east side of the oval. My problem with that is there is a reason the AFL always wants the TV cameras on the western side of a ground looking out, because you don't want to be looking into the sun.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Well, they're on the western side.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: The TV cameras always have to be on the western side, but the function centre will be on the eastern side of the ground.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: I am talking about the media box. But as far as the function centre and members stand are concerned, with this new development, I believe they will be on the eastern side. I think that is because we have not had a ground-up development. We have a development that has been partly started, and now we are coming in over the top. I think that is an issue.

We had our briefing with the Stadium Management Authority and they said, 'We're doing all the work to make sure everything is under control and that there will not be too much glare,' but, look, as long as I have stood on this earth, the sun always sets in the west. So, if you are looking from east to west, you are going to be looking into the sun if there is an afternoon footy game or an afternoon cricket game. That is just how it is going to be, so I think it falls down in that regard.

Certainly, there have been people involved in the building of stadiums that believe that, for \$535 million, we could have built a new stadium, of a very similar design, from the ground up. So, it does intrigue me that there has been \$85 million spent, we have increased the ground to 38,000, and for another \$450 million on top of that—because you have to remember the \$85 million that goes on top to get to the \$535 million forgives the SACA debt on the recent redevelopment, and their other debts. So, you have to wonder what sort of development we are going to end up with. It will be a C-grade development, and that makes me extremely sad for this state and extremely sad for Adelaide Oval.

It intrigues me—when I mention the figures of \$450 million and the \$535 million—the former treasurer came into this place and said, 'We are only going to spend \$450 million and not a cent more.' There were also questions as to whether he had spoken to Leigh Whicker, and he had forgotten that he had only had lunch with Leigh a week or two beforehand. So you have to wonder what messages this government was not bringing to this place.

But then, suddenly, there was a brainwave and they said, 'Hang on, it is \$535 million,' so I wonder whether someone in the maths department forgot to add the \$85 million of debt that was to be forgiven. I ask these questions because it is important for the citizens of this state to know where their money is going. They were told in one instance that \$450 million was going to be the spend and not a penny more.

At the end of the day, it is going to happen, but I have talked to a lot of people involved in football circles and a lot have said to me off the record, 'We would have liked another development, we would have loved a closed stadium, but we have been offered \$535 million,' so you cannot blame them. You would not look a gift horse in the mouth. You cannot blame them for taking the money. I just hope people are not disappointed in the end with what they get, because I fear they will be.

I am sad about the position Port Power is in. I must note my interest. I am a Port Power supporter and have been for many years.

Mr Pengilly: I'd say it quietly.

Mr PEDERICK: No, I say that quite proudly in this place. I have been a Port Adelaide supporter. I also note my interest in football. I used to play for Border Downs at Coonalpyn, who were black and white before they amalgamated with Tintinara and went to Crows colours in 1992.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: The jumpers are quite all right, thanks minister. They do stretch. I could tell you a funny story about an oldies match, but I will not go into it.

Mr Treloar: Tell us.

Mr PEDERICK: Okay. We have plenty of time so I will briefly digress. We had an old players' match one day and we did not have enough jumpers to go around. There was a bloke who was a bit bigger than me and when I came off the bench we had to swap the jumper. That was quite a scene for everybody to put up with. Some good strong players come from the bush. It was a great day, and that is what country footy is all about. It is not just about your good playing days when you are young and fit. I played for the juniors from about 1975 until the time I played my last game of football in a reserves trial game in 1993, I think it was, when I smashed my right knee.

An honourable member: Are you that old?

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, I am that old. I have had a lot of interest in the sport, and I am proud to say my two lads are now playing at Peake and doing a great job in the under 9s and under 13s. It is always a joke at the local footy that the under 9s is the real game at half time in the A grade match, and those kids do a great job.

While we are talking about football and the progression of regional sport, I must say that it is great to see all the kids involved, as I do pretty well every weekend when I can get there. You see the young girls as well in the Auskick competition, and they can play footy as hard as any lad, and probably harder. The girls have to be reminded that they are not supposed to tackle. That is great for country sport.

I hope country sport gets something out of all this, after we go through the pain of the money coming out of the state's coffers and from the taxpayers. What we have heard in our briefings with the Stadium Management Authority and others involved in the Adelaide Oval redevelopment is that, if this did not go ahead, regional funding of regional sports was at risk. I just hope it is not at risk. I hope it is expanded. We are putting up amendments along the lines that money should be channelled into regional sports right around the state.

In my electorate there are towns such as Pinnaroo, Lameroo, Karoonda, Peake and Meningie. I have the northern side of Meningie in my electorate. There are places such as Jervois and Murray Bridge, where we have two teams—Imperials and Ramblers. There is Mypolonga, and there would be a few Mannum players who come from the east side of the river where my electorate is who would play for Mannum. I hope those teams all get their fair share of funding. Not only that, I hope all the cricket teams that are aligned with those same towns and others get their sports development, and not just those sports but all the other sports that are in regional areas: soccer, hockey, basketball, etc. I just want to make sure that our youth have something to do, so that it keeps them actively involved and gives them something to look forward to during the week and on the weekends.

I am concerned about this proposal. I am concerned that it will not be anywhere near as good as it could have been and I know that the concerns are echoed right throughout the state from people who are suffering at the hands of this government. There are the people in the South-East who are facing the sale of the forward rotation of the forests. With regard to that—because the sale of those forward rotations has been linked to the upgrade of Adelaide Oval—I just hope that the government comes to its senses and cancels that flawed policy because, at the end of the day, the little bit of money it will get back from fast-tracking 111 years of forestry could probably be got back in less than 10 years if it kept the forest and put the normal profits back into Treasury, as it could, if it retains them.

I truly believe that that is so because the current rate of return for those forests is \$43 million and it would not take long for that to grow to double or even further. It would not take long to get the perhaps \$600 or \$700 million that I believe they would get for the forward sale of the forests. It is a heavily discounted figure, I believe, for what they are really worth, in the government's fire sale of these assets. I know that there are corporations scouring the South-East trying to snap up a bargain.

Also, I talk about the public servants and certainly the ones from primary industries and the 179 jobs that supposedly were targeted voluntary separation packages. I have not talked to too many who have lost their jobs that were actually voluntary, but they were certainly targeted. I would like to think of the rural industries across the state that are going to have to find more and more money to pay for this government's blunders, more and more money just to operate their businesses and to contribute to sectors in rural industry like the \$3.5 billion grain industry when we have a good year, as we did last year. It just hurts me.

I look at the road funding that could happen out there. I keep seeing the Dukes Highway that runs past my place at Coomandook and it keeps getting some more overtaking lanes and

some more rest stops. They are a very good interim measure, but we are still only just frittering around the edges. Instead of keeping on investing money in these things, we should be putting in dual lanes all the way to the border—191 kilometres—and whether it costs \$1 billion in time, perhaps that is the cost we have to pay to make sure that we get roads with the right capability.

I do feel for the people of this state who do have to put up with these cuts and who have to pay for these policy measures. They have to pay for the desalination plant which is another big impost on the people of this state. It will be somewhere around \$2.2 billion when it finally gets going, and I am not holding my breath for that. It could have been built for less than half the price and half the size, and it would have been good enough for this state.

There are a whole lot of issues that need to be dealt with, but I am concerned that we are going down the wrong path with what will be constructed. However, the people of this state have to realise that we did our best and, yes, we fell short at the last election so the Labor government here is inflicting on us what they will. Our party had a very good meeting the other night for several hours, and we put together quite a range of amendments that will be moved in the parliament in the near future.

These amendments go along the lines that the normal planning process will apply to any planning matters involved with the Adelaide Oval redevelopment; the Auditor-General is to be given powers to audit the project; the legislation will require the Adelaide Oval project to go to the Public Works Committee, because we have seen the Royal Adelaide Hospital dodge that committee.

We want the legislation to require that a licence fee be charged to the Stadium Management Authority to make sure some return comes back to the state. We want to make sure that the legislated cap against the state contribution is \$535 million, because rest assured we will find there is need for another \$40 million or \$60 million to finish the project off.

We want the legislation to require a sinking fund to be established. We also want to see Colonel Light's Vision, Pennington Gardens West and the Cresswell Gardens removed from the licence so that they remain under council care and control and are managed in accordance with the Community Land Management Plans, with the Development Assessment Commission resolving any disputes. There will also be other amendments that the member for Davenport will bring forward.

We must also remember that the AFL are very keen for this project to go ahead because, at the end of the day, because of the financial problems with the Power and the Crows, they will end up with the two licences. We get assured in the media that that will not make any difference to the Stadium Management Authority because the SANFL and the SACA will still have a say. I wonder what will happen, because you will have the AFL with their billions of dollars—and good on them, they get those TV rights; that is good business—come in over the top and want to wield the big stick. Andrew Demetriou has said, 'Well, if there's any shortfall, we will fill it in.' Why wouldn't you? You are getting a \$535 million free kick for a stadium to play footy at.

For what we are going to get, I hope it does do the job. I do not think it will and I just hope we do not have a major disappointment, which I believe could happen. I certainly hope that both Port Power and the Crows do prosper. Whether or not the Adelaide Oval is the magic pudding—because it may not even be that—is something we will see in the future. I am yet to be assured whether it attracts the crowds or not, because the price of going to the football is pretty high and going up all the time, and it is getting too easy for people to sit and home with the Foxtel, pay your subs and just get your footy beamed in at home. That is my contribution for the Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Bill.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (16:43): I thank all of the members for their contributions. I do think I got to hear every member of the opposition speak. As a charitable man, I am not going to rate them, although I must say that my view is that a reshuffle on merit would be an interesting thing, but I will not go any further than that.

This is an extremely important bill for both South Australia and me personally, having invested a great deal of time in the last year in the process. I do feel personally very strongly about the bill we have brought to the house. I will say at the outset that, despite all that has been said and many arguments and because both I and our government are very deeply committed to achieving this outcome, we have sought to minimise what we do with this bill to minimise the likelihood of conflict or the likelihood of it failing.

I will make it absolutely clear that, despite what was said by a number of members of the opposition, we do not have any plans for a compulsory acquisition. We do not believe it would work. If this bill fails, there will not be the return of AFL football to Adelaide Oval, if we cannot achieve the minimum that we have set out in this bill.

For the benefit of the house, I remind you that that minimum is to get a long-term lease for the Stadium Management Authority, to be able to give licence rights to the two codes to play there, to get the capacity to build in a timely fashion and to give some certainty about car parking to football in particular when it makes the move there.

Can I say that we have had very constructive discussions on occasions with the council, which, by and large, supported a great deal of what we have sought to do, and that issue of car parking has been one. I have said before, we have known in the past with the Victoria Park issue in particular, that the council in that case gave us planning approval to build a stand but then the same council would not give a lease. That has occupied people's minds. Whether it is unfair to hold that against the current council, there was a view and there remains a view that you simply must have some degree of certainty. What we have sought as a minimum is not all of the car parking that currently exists; it is car parking only where it is done at the present, in the northern stand on oval No. 2, but we do need to give some certainty to those people.

I have heard a great deal and I will say this: I want to avoid engaging in too much criticism of the opposition, even though I think that some very unfair things have been said. I must address some of them because we do want to achieve this. Frankly, for all that I have heard about whose idea it was and all that, I do not care who gets credit for this. I just want it to happen because it is very good for the state, it is very good for the sport and it is very good for the city. I will point out that, if I can use my humble efforts to get this through this chamber and the other house successfully, I will never claim credit for it. I will be happy to give it to any number of people, because, frankly, I think it is a bit bigger than all that.

On that basis, can I say that I do not have the suggested amendments of the opposition before me. I understand from the member for Davenport why that is the case, but I might indicate to him before I make some further comments the government's views on those amendments as we understand them.

First, I did have a bit of a giggle about the amendment to cap the government contribution at \$535 million. I am not in the least bit fussed about that, as long as we are not going to play any silly games of what it is for, and we are talking about a \$450 million construction cost for the oval, for the built form of the oval, and \$85 million for the compensation to SACA.

Can I say that I have no problem with that cap. In fact, I would invite you to put that in and, perhaps, move an amendment that obliges me as minister not to get any taller, because both are about as necessary. I am not likely to get taller and there is absolutely no likelihood of the government providing more than \$535 million. I make the point if that is what will lead to the opposition progressing this in a timely fashion. We do need this before the long break in the middle of the year so that we can go out to tender and start construction. If that will help the opposition support this in a timely fashion, then we will not have difficulty with it.

With respect to the amendment suggested to make the project susceptible to examination by the Auditor-General, not only do we have no difficulty with that but our officers of our own accord approached the Auditor-General, I think, some two months ago. They had a meeting with the Auditor-General about this project fully expecting it to be audited. I think that we were a little surprised that the Auditor-General suggested, perhaps, on initial view that it was not a project that he would audit. In our view we have done everything every step of the way with a view to it being audited by the Auditor-General.

The only word of caution I would say about any amendment is that I know from past experience with the Auditor that, if you suggest that the Auditor should review it on an ongoing basis and give any oversight to the project on an ongoing basis, he will not do that. Successive auditors-general have made it clear to us that they examine what has been done: they do not give advice on what you should be doing. With that word of caution, we have always expected it to be overseen by the Auditor-General or audited by the Auditor-General, and we have no difficulty with that at all.

As for the proposed amendment that it should go to the Public Works Committee, again, no difficulty whatever. It was always our intention that a project should go to the Public Works Committee. We think that it is a good project, and we have got no difficulty in that regard at all. I

note that some of the amendments are impossible for me to address at the moment. With some suggestions about management plans and stuff, I will have to see the detail. What I will say about management plans, in terms of the Parklands, is that our bill imposes obligations on managing the Parklands that, we believe, are stronger than those that exist at present. So, we have no fear about anyone licensed to do car parking having to do it to a proper plan; that was always going to be a licence condition.

Just on that, with what was said about the minister being able to do anything they like, the only thing that we have sought to do outside of the core area is allow the government minister, the minister at the time, to give licences for certain activities. One of them is car parking. The other will be that—we have been very open about this—because cricket wants to play while there is a build going on, we may have to license some temporary activities in the surrounding Parklands to allow the build to go on. If you cannot be in the stadium when they are playing cricket, you are going to have to be somewhere.

Some areas, I think, the opposition has referred to as wanting to give to the council. The only activities that have been contemplated for those gardens in issue are those that already happen during test cricket matches. I think there is some entertainment and some marquees on game day. You might want to set up some stalls on game day at the football. These are temporary activities and I think they simply enhance what goes on. I am not fussed about how that is done, as long as there can be certainty that you can actually maximise the event for South Australians going to the football.

I want to stress that everything that we have done with this bill seeks to maximise the Parklands setting for the football and cricket. To that extent, you will see that there are obligations in there. We will impose any licence obligations and, in fact, have already had a number of discussions with the two codes to achieve a very significant contribution of funds to landscaping from the two codes, to improve the robustness and the quality of the Parklands as they are at present, prior to activities taking place. Make no mistake, as time will tell with this, everyone involved—and I think they are very decent people—has a genuine belief that the beautiful Parklands setting for Adelaide Oval is what gives it such great value. So, in terms of a management plan, we will not have a difficulty with that.

Finally, I think there was something said about the ordinary development processes. Can I say that I am more than happy to accept an amendment that would make the Development Assessment Commission the assessing authority for a planning application. That is all well and good and certainly fine by me. Given that I take the opposition at its word that it will support this development, what I would have difficulty with is if we were to be required to undertake a ministerial rezoning before we could make that application. If that is done as a standard rezoning, you will add around 12 months. The only way to shorten that is if, in fact, you have an interim effect of that rezoning, which will still add two to three months.

My argument is, given that you agree it should proceed, I cannot understand why you would not do that with this bill as it would be an absolute necessity before we can make an application anyway. Can I say, my fear would be that, even if we used the interim effect, to get the planning amendment going, we either need the request of council, which we would have to rely on them doing, or use a head of power of significant social importance.

Now, we could do that, but what concerns me is that that, in itself, may be challenged by judicial review on the part of anyone disaffected. We have seen that there are some disaffected. I would say to the opposition that, if it wants to cap the cost, if it is concerned about the cost, do not impose unnecessary delays in the process because delays in the process will increase the cost.

The real issue about the cost—and most of us think the \$450 million for construction is around the mark—is escalation over time and, in particular, I am very concerned that, if we get out into that period when the mining industry is hotting up and Olympic Dam is underway, we will have capacity constraints. I just say to the opposition: if it genuinely supports it, I am happy to take an amendment which makes DAC (shall we say) the assessing authority, but do not put some unnecessary rezoning in when we can do it simply in this bill. I cannot understand why that would be the case.

I indicate that although we plainly have the numbers in the lower house and we have some support from the crossbenchers upstairs, we are going a long way to accepting what we believe have been the concerns of the opposition.

I want to come to the issue of rent: I cannot agree with the opposition on this. Football and cricket have been rather unfairly maligned in this process by members of the opposition. Some people in the opposition like the idea of rent for two reasons—we will get a kind of kneejerk response from those who do not think about it too much, but it is also a way of punishing sports for having had the temerity not to do what the opposition wanted them to do.

Whether I win this argument or not I make it clear that these are not for-profit organisations that are making money and paying dividends to shareholders; they are running sports and they are funding sports. Football puts \$6.2 million a year into community sports, including Indigenous, regional, youth and women's football. The money that is made by football goes out to the clubs and into sports. I point out to the member for Davenport that the Sturt Football Club (of which he is a passionate supporter for a number of very good reasons) has had support from the SANFL for financial issues in the past—that is what they do.

What we said to the codes is we expect that when they have this built form they will put that money into the Parklands and into a sinking fund for the maintenance of these assets. Frankly, I prefer that these people put the money into sports, into junior sports, into the Parklands and into the assets, rather than into my friend Jack Snelling's coffers—I think that is a better outcome.

I acknowledge you may win this on some sort of kneejerk response, but it smacks of punishing the codes for having the temerity to resist what you believe should have happened. We have no problems with a sinking fund because it is in the licence conditions anyway. If you take all of that into account what the government is saying is that it accedes to the vast bulk of what you say you want to amend, so I ask that you are therefore genuine in your support and you help us to achieve a speedy passage through both houses of parliament and we look forward to seeing your amendments in the other place.

I want to now address some of the issues raised and put on the record a few comments, because this is a very important occasion for sport and football. Having listened to every member of the opposition speak, if this is support for a bill I would not like to see opposition because there was a welter of negativity from a number of members.

I will separate some of them out. The member for Davenport has a difficult task and is doing it well. The member for Goyder, the member for Chaffey and the member for Waite all made contributions—I will pay credit to the member for Waite. I disagree with a lot of what he says but he does at least have the courage to stand by what he said a long time ago.

For a number of other members on the other side I am reminded that I think it was Oliver Wendell Holmes who said that, 'A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds.' What I have heard is that we should not be spending this money on the stadium because there are other priorities, but we should have built a stand-alone stadium more expensively somewhere else. Now, I have difficulty reconciling those two viewpoints. I have heard from the opposition that we cannot be trusted with the Parklands, that we are attacking the Parklands with this development, and we should not do it. What we should do instead is build a new stadium somewhere else in the Parklands where there isn't one.

I will give the member for Davenport credit for being the only person to suggest that that is at the back of Adelaide High School. I cannot reconcile how building a stadium where there is one is attacking the Parklands when building a stadium where there is not one—where there is only Parklands—is not, but perhaps I am too simple for that logic. A number of other things have been said.

The other thing I thought was more an issue of bipolarity than anything else was the notion that this was all their idea in the first place—they will take credit—but it is a really bad idea. I have struggled with that as well. I invite anyone who thinks I am exaggerating—should they have the courage—to read all the contributions in the *Hansard*. I think a number of members of the opposition have been very genuine about this. I think the member for Adelaide, from her perspective, genuinely prefers something else to happen. That is perfectly understandable, but I cannot let go of some of the comments, particularly by the Leader of the Opposition.

It has been said over and over that they are going to put all these things in because they cannot trust us. I have drawn this from the website today. It is still on your website—the State Liberals' Plan for a New Stadium at Riverside West. It states:

...a world-class stadium either by renewing Adelaide Oval or, if this proves untenable, by creating a new purpose built facility.

This is in 2009, and Adelaide Oval was a great idea in 2009. I will come back to some other things, but it goes on, and this was the position:

If the AFL, SANFL, SACA and Soccer can agree on this solution—

and they are talking about Adelaide Oval—

it would fulfil the State Liberals vision for a world class stadium in the city and would receive our full support.

If this is the full support, I would not like to get partial support from the Leader of the Opposition who has, I think, been quite unfair on sports and, in particular, on football. In the same document, which has the Leader of the Opposition's name on the front cover—at least it has isobel redmond.com.au—it states:

The SANFL is a top 100 company in SA with turnover of around \$44 million and which directly sustains over 120 jobs.

That was what she said then. Actually, I think it is closer to a top 50 company. Just two weeks ago, when there was some question of a bailout, the Leader of the Opposition went out and said, 'Why put money into these two sports, both of which are going broke?', or words to that effect.

Can I assure the Leader of the Opposition that the economic position of the SANFL is much stronger than, for example, the economic position of the Liberal Party. The fact that the SANFL has debt that it services on its books does not mean that it is in any danger of going broke. What it does mean and what it did say about certain bailouts is that, if it was to add more debt, then it would, of course, have to reduce expenditure on other activities. That is a different thing. However, I assure the Leader of the Opposition that the SANFL is in a much more superior position to the Liberal Party in terms of its financial state, and its supporters I might say, too, but I will not go there. I want to avoid picking a fight, but I think we need to get clear on some things.

Again, I do not want to go far into this argument, but the notion that we suddenly thought of getting all these people together to play football at Adelaide Oval after the Liberals announced it is just not right. Evidence has been given in committees by Ian McLachlan and other people about how long ago these discussions started. As I say, I think it would be better if we all stopped trying to take credit for it and just got a good project up for the state and for South Australia.

One criticism is that we need two stadia. We have more than two. You do need two stadia: you need a main stadia and you need ones to play other events. I think SANFL has more stadia than it can deal with realistically at present. AAMI stays under this model for the foreseeable future as a home base for the Crows where they have the Crows Shed and their training facilities, and it is more than ample for any alternative venue needed for things like NAB cups. It is simply not an issue.

Before I talk about some of the really important features of this, I want to place on the record my appreciation at having worked over the last year with a number of people on this. One of the things that everyone in this place should remember is that football was played at Adelaide Oval for a lot longer than it was not played. I ask people to consider why football stopped being played at Adelaide Oval. Because it was an unsuitable venue? No. Football stopped being played at Adelaide Oval because of a fight between human beings. One of the problems with that argument is that the people involved were some of the great South Australians with great abilities, great stature and, when they had a fight, it was a great one.

One of the things that I think is terribly important about this whole process is not just getting football back at Adelaide Oval, which is fantastic. My first memories of football at Adelaide Oval are as a Port supporter—got the duffle coat on, got on the train at Alberton station. I do not know why you had to wear a duffle coat. It did not matter what the temperature was, you had to wear a duffle coat and it was bloody stinking some days. We got on the train, we went up to Adelaide Oval and it was packed to the gunnels, and I saw the great Barrie Robran just take us apart two years in a row, and then Cornesy got North Adelaide the next year, I think, in 1973, taking the most memorable mark.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Who kicked the ball to Cornesy?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Who kicked the ball to Cornesy? No mate, you are too good for me.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Marriott.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Craig Marriott. So, all of that was there. I think the great thing about getting the football back there is not simply seeing all of that again; it is the final resolution of this argument between great South Australians. Like I said, it was a great argument because they were all such big personalities, and if you think about some of the personalities who were involved, there are some big names there.

Can I place on the record that what is very pleasing in this process that we have been through is that both the family of Don Brebner and the family of the great Don Bradman are reconciled. In fact, they have voiced their support for this return and I think SANFL has a letter from Don Brebner's family pointing out that, before he was no longer able to, the man himself supported this move. I think it is great to see that reconciliation between—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: People like the member for Croydon have longer memories than others. I think an important part of this is that reconciliation—maybe not between everyone—but the fight between some great South Australians that had to come about for this to be possible.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If I could be protected from the member for Croydon! I make that point strongly. The thing that stopped football at Adelaide Oval was not that the venue was not right. Of course it is right. It was people arguing, and it is great that that argument has been resolved after all of these years. That is not to say that there may not be arguments in the future but let us hope we manage them better than we did in the past.

I would like to put on the record my respect for some people in this process who deserve credit for what has gone on. I think too many people in here are throwing their shoulders out trying to pat themselves on the back. I would like to give credit to some of the people out there. I will give credit to one person in here: Kevin Foley got this thing started, and there is no doubt it would not have started without Kevin Foley. Kevin is, by any standard, an interesting character, but I will say this for Kevin: whether you like Kevin Foley or whether you do not like Kevin Foley or whether you hate Kevin Foley, there will be people going to football at Adelaide Oval if we get our way. In a few years' time they will be going there because Kevin Foley had the guts to get it started.

Mr Marshall: And then you sacked him!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: See, you can't get far in this without some churlish comment, can you? You just can't. The member for Norwood is an expert on everything in this place. I listen to him at question time: if the question is on water, he has the answer; if it is electricity, he has the answer; if it is the Burnside council, he has the answer.

Can I say, the member for Norwood has delusions of grandeur. I have never seen a bloke sit further back and make more noise. It is small-minded in the extreme, in a debate that we have just been having without rancour, for him to pop in and then start yelling. The mouth goes long before the brain engages, with this bloke. Frankly, I think the people of Norwood deserve a lot better. They deserve a lot better than this—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And they had a lot better before.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And they may well get better, because let's face it, Liberals in Norwood don't last long. Can I put on the record my appreciation for some decent people who do not just come in and make noise, but put the work in. When we started out on this process—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He's still going. If we could only share his opinion of himself. I would just like to meet someone, one day, as smart as the member for Norwood thinks he is. That would be interesting. Will you please be quiet now? Good; thanks, son. I would like to put on the record my appreciation for the people in football and cricket who have worked enormously hard on this matter.

When I first went down to see the league commissioners and the league directors—it is a large body of people who runs the various things in the SANFL—there were, as a result of those relationships over time, a great deal of suspicions about what was happening. It has been a genuine pleasure to see that turn around over the period of the last year and see the way that football has whole-heartedly and enthusiastically embraced this opportunity.

In recent times, getting the phone calls from the footy guys to check whether everything is going all right has been a real turnaround from where we had been when we started, and can I say that they work with enormous—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Thank you, member for Croydon. I want to come to that issue of cost in a moment, because the genius of Norwood has a view on that too. It would be nice if he could just be quiet while we are talking about his betters, you know. Those people at football worked enormously hard while SACA had its vote on.

I will turn to SACA. I have been through this process sitting with John Olsen and Ian McLachlan for most of the time. I look around and I cannot find anyone other than a former Liberal premier or a former Liberal minister as far as the eye can see—Rob Kerin is down there. Those people did enormous work to convince people in SACA and the nay-sayers in the state of the value of this project. They did a terrific job.

Ian McLachlan led a travelling roadshow where he went out and told people the truth and the benefits of all of this. We had people telling less than the truth about the dangers of it, but he did a terrific job, and they have to be given credit for us being able to be here today. Make no mistake; I said to these people that I think it will be very hard for us to achieve legislation on this unless there is genuine support from the sporting community and the broader community. We have that, and that is why I believe we will be successful in getting legislation. It could not have been done if those people had not put in that work and developed relationships of trust—I would not go far as to say 'warm friendship' yet—and friendship, and I am sure they will grow over time.

The member for Norwood talks about the cost or talks about us giving them money. It is funny, isn't it? Again, I will talk about the bipolarity of some members on the other side. Apparently, this is too much free money for sports, but a stand-alone stadium for one sport, with a roof, would not have been too much. The only problem would have been that they would not have started it until 2015, according to their documents, and finished it in about 2019. I am not quite sure how many football clubs would still be around waiting for the stadium that was going to be provided.

But I want to put this on the record, also. I am grateful that I have a university education and some people consider me somewhat of a snob in some areas, but the truth is this: we as a government fund massive infrastructure projects at the moment, this is not a big ticket item, and the benefits of this project to the broader city easily outweigh the present cost of it. Before you even think about the sports, the benefits to the broader city outweigh the cost.

Can I just point out that we have \$2.6 billion rolling out in public transport, billions in roads and billions in health. The recurrent budget of health is approaching \$5 billion a year. This is not a big ticket item. But I will go further and point out what I am talking about regarding snobbery. Every year we as a government, quite rightly, fund the art gallery, the museum and the opera. You would like to see how much subsidy you need to put a bum on a seat at an opera, as opposed to a football match. I can tell you it is considerably—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: A hundred bucks a ticket.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, a hundred bucks a ticket, not a few bucks a ticket. It is considerably more. We put on the *Ring* cycle and it is a wonderful thing as long as you don't have to watch it. It goes longer than this debate went for, for goodness sake. From my perspective, why would you want to go and see Wagnerian fake heroics over a long period of time, pretend heroics, when you can go and see real heroics at the football ground? You can see Roger James smother the ball in the dying minutes of the match against St Kilda to put us into the 2004 grand final, which we subsequently won. Sport has been giving me and many South Australians great memories for many years, and I do not apologise for the fact that it should get some support from the government as well. I can confess it has not given me an enormous amount of joy in recent times.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, you don't win all that often, do you?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No. But I do not apologise for the fact that things that ordinary people like and some of them live for and take a great deal of joy from every single week should be supported by the government. We do it for the high arts, so why can't we do it for sports?

I have to say this about sport, also. I am going to be happy if my children go to grand finals of sport because it is healthier than some of the other activities they may engage in, so we will not apologise for that. The benefits of this are far broader.

The argument about two stadiums is one thing but, in terms of the location of a stadium, having been through this project, you could not pick a better one. If you were to start from scratch with a stadium near a city that you could deliver people to in an appropriate location, with the bridge, you would pick where Adelaide Oval is. When that footbridge to Adelaide Oval is built, I think the distance will be 300 metres between Adelaide Oval and North Terrace where the main rail station, tram stations and bus stations are, and it will be even closer to the riverfront precinct, which will come to life under this plan.

That is much closer than any other stadium in Australia—the MCG and Etihad Stadium are further from public transport—and it is closer to the CBD and the entertainment district of this city than anywhere else in Australia. You could not pick a better site, which I suspect is why Adelaide Oval is where it is, particularly when the footbridge is there. It means it is right next to where we deliver most of our public transport.

Believe me, the day of the motor car is going away. Getting people to games by public transport is the future, and there is nowhere (including the member for Davenport's site on West Terrace) where we can deliver more people by public transport than Adelaide Oval. The central rail station and the tram station are there, and we will be putting extra money into public transport. Please do not count on the \$535 million, because that is our job, anyway: we run public transport. We will be putting on extra buses and we have a capacity to do what we started at AAMI Stadium, that is, putting public transport on ticket prices and running free buses. We cannot say we can do it yet, but certainly we can do what we could never do at AAMI Stadium, and that is increase that dramatically. We could get 50 per cent of people there, if we can change the culture, and we will be seeking to do it.

In regard to the argument about car parks, there is an enormous number of car parks in the city that often are not used at game time, and modern technology has the capacity to direct people there. So we are very excited about that. I want to close by talking about the opportunities for this precinct. We have a line-up of people in the private sector wanting to talk to us about the possibility of investment in the precinct. There is no-one in this house who has not heard over decades ideas for revitalising our riverfront area, and it is a great idea. John Olsen was one. The member for Waite had a plan for it. We have all wanted it to happen. The game-changer is people going to the football. Whether people like this answer or not, Martin Hamilton-Smith had the courage to say this and he knows it: the game-changer is bringing those people regularly to the football, and it will trigger investment on the riverfront precinct.

We have a new convention centre going in. The Casino, despite Ashley Porter's quite bizarre stories, has confirmed again yesterday its willingness to invest up to \$250 million. There is the Intercontinental and a number of private sector people. We are master planning at the moment some very exciting stuff about a strip of entertainment, restaurants, that sort of thing, on the riverfront. This is a great outcome for the city.

I am going to wrap up in a moment, but I wanted to get all this on the record, but that is the reason I say to you with some passion that, despite the fact that many of you think me a most difficult and obstreperous fellow, I am going to bend over backwards to try to accept as many of your amendments in good faith that will allow us to get this a speedy passage through the house. I have said that I do not like the rent one; you may win it anyway. I will have to talk to the codes when you do that. In relation to the planning, I just ask you, if you are going to impose a cap (and I agree with a cap because I cannot get any more money anyway), at least give us the ability to do the job in a timely fashion and control escalation.

For all those reasons, I will accept as many of your amendments as I can and I have outlined acceptance of a great many of them. What I would ask in return is that the opposition gives us a speedy passage of this bill. In particular, it has to pass by the time we go to the long break so that we can go out and start letting contracts to do this. Can I say, if you are worried about the election in 2014, there is no prospect. The footy season in 2014 does not start until after the election in any event. I think the NAB Cup is on then so there is no concern about that. I know the member for Norwood wants Isobel Redmond to toss the coin. I hope the codes have forgiven her by then and invite her if she is in that position, which I hope she will not be, of course.

In all genuineness, we will support as many of your amendments as allow us to achieve those minimum things that I say we have to achieve, and what I ask is that we get a speedy resolution. I will close by saying that I assure you that, if we cannot get a bill that does those minimum things, it is all over. There will not be a process. I cannot imagine how we could make compulsory acquisition work because we might get the oval, but we cannot get a long-term lease

and then we have to do all the things surrounding it and I just do not think there is any prospect. In fact, I do not even know what the handicaps are because I have never thought about it.

My great fear is that, having come this far, having SACA vote for it, having sport support it, having broad community support for it, the nay-sayers win and somehow this is defeated and we do not do it, because I can tell you that this would be terrible for the psychology of Adelaide if we cannot do something that is so obviously in Adelaide's benefit, and I think people elsewhere in the world would shake their heads in bewilderment that we would refuse to do it. My great fear is that, if this falls over, it would be a terrible psychological blow and would just reinforce those painful nay-sayers who like to think that Adelaide as a city has some baleful, animistic influence on how we do things.

We can do anything in Adelaide that the rest of the world can do and this is one of the things we can do. I stress that \$535 million for this outcome may seem a lot of money, especially if it is used in knee-jerk arguments, but the truth is that, when you look at the annual spend of a state government and the long-term return you get for this, what happens in the city, what happens in the state, the maintenance of our football, I make no bones about it—football is in big trouble if we cannot get something like this for them.

With all that, what I would say is that this is a very good sound investment, and I pledge to the opposition my genuineness in supporting amendments that we can support in pursuing those minimums and what I would ask them is to be genuine in the speedy passage of this bill.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I move:

Page 3, after line 12 [clause 3, definition of *Adelaide Oval Licence Area*—after paragraph (c) insert:

- (ca) land that is laid out (on the commencement of this Act) as Light's Vision on the corner of Pennington Terrace and Montefiore Road, North Adelaide; or

I indicate to the house that the series of amendments that I am moving are as a result of discussions with the Adelaide City Council and attempt to address some of the concerns that it had about our ambitions in the oval. The first amendment merely gives the protection to Light's Vision on the corner of Pennington Terrace and Montefiore Road that was mentioned by the council both to us and the opposition.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: On behalf of the opposition, we are supporting this amendment, because the principle is that it takes Light's Vision out and leaves it under the care and control of the council, which is something the member for Adelaide argued very strongly for. We are pleased the government has agreed to that provision.

Ms SANDERSON: I want to clarify that Light's Vision not only is the car park area at the top of Montefiore Hill but also includes the line of trees along Montefiore Road, because the council specifically requested that.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I think you will find that a subsequent amendment deals with that anyway. My amendment No. 2 defines the areas for car parking, which will exclude the area on Montefiore Road I think you are talking about, and there is a map attached to the amendments.

Ms Sanderson: I could not tell.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is not easy but, yes, that is the intention of that amendment. The intention of the next amendment is to define where parking will occur, and that is where it occurs, in that northern car park, at present, in any event.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 4 deals with the Adelaide Oval core area, which in simple terms is the stadium area proper. Under the particular provisions under clause 4(3), the minister must ensure that the area vested in the minister, which is the stadium area proper, continues to be named Adelaide Oval. I am just wondering how flexible that clause is. Is it able to be named, for

instance, Telstra's Adelaide Oval, or some prefix before the words 'Adelaide Oval'? To quicken the process, I will add in the second part of the question. Why has the government decided not to allow football to continue to have naming rights?

I can understand why cricket does not want naming rights because Adelaide Oval is its brand worldwide. However, modern football always has a branding for football. I am just wondering why, given that you are dividing the lease area up into two distinct seasons, the government has decided to restrict for both seasons and not just the cricket season?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We did consider during football season allowing it to be called Port Adelaide oval, but we could not get agreement on that. The truth is that Adelaide Oval was Adelaide Oval when football was played there before. It can be Adelaide Oval. Can I say that the answer to the first question is no, it is not going to be called someone else's Adelaide Oval. It is going to be Adelaide Oval.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Under the act, is it possible?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No. My understanding is that it is not, but, if there were any doubt, we would tidy it up. As far as we are concerned, this is Adelaide Oval and it will not be anything else. We believe that what we will do with this will put football and cricket in a sufficient position to run their codes without the need for selling naming rights to our oval.

Maybe if you are charging them rent they might want to start selling naming rights to make up for the rent; but, no, it is our view that that should not occur. The answer to the second question is: no, we do not believe that it should be called anything else at any time. We do not believe that they need to sell naming rights.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Clause 4(3)(c) refers to the fact that 1,200 square metres is to be retained as open space. I asked this question during the briefing, and Mr Delgado was good enough to get back to us and confirm that the current area is 1,400 square metres, which I understand to be grassed. Can the minister confirm that the 1,200 square metres designed to be retained as open space is going to be continued as grass, or will it be paved or concreted?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is the grassed area that we are speaking of. In fact, I think that you will see in the paper today reference to being able to kick the footy on the grassed area, and things like that. The 1,200 metres is the grassed area. The full 1,400 metres involves some other stuff. It will be 1,200 metres grassed area.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I do not want to get technical on this, but we are—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, I just want to clarify. I always look at legislation as to what someone with the power can do in 40 or 50 years' time, when all the good intentions in the chamber may not necessarily be here and some smart lawyer gets holds of it. The '1,200 square metres of open space' does not dictate grassed area. If the intention of the government is to make it grassed area, then it should clearly state that, because you can bitumise it, you can concrete it, you can put any treatment you want on it in 20 or 30 years' time and you still meet the provisions of the act.

The reason that the member for Goyder asked the question, I think, was to establish that principle. That is something we can talk about between houses if the minister wishes, but I am sure that the SACA members did not vote for it on the basis that it was going to be concrete or bitumen but open space.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I understand what you are saying. We will take advice between the houses. If it is necessary to put 'grassed' in there, I am perfectly happy with that. My view is that the attraction of it is the grass. It is not going to be as attractive if you do something else, and the people running the stadium do not have an interest in making it unattractive. But I will take advice. When I said that you always do check the technical points, I am not complaining. I think it is the role of everyone in this place—particularly the opposition—to make sure that the parliament gets it right and does what it intends to do.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you for that, because there are lots of suburban ovals that used to be grass that now are terraced, bitumen and open space. Clause 4(4) is the clause that allows temporary buildings to be placed on that area from time to time for events, and I understand why that provision is in there. I assume that it is the SMA that makes the decision as to what is a temporary basis in relation to subclause (4)(b), which provides 'on a temporary basis for the

purposes of a special event or activity prescribed by the regulations'. There is no time frame in relation to that. So, if, in 20 years' time, the SMA decides that a temporary activity is for the whole of the football season, they could theoretically erect a stand there for six months. The way I read it, it is that open. So, who makes the decision and how is it restricted?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: To be fair to parliamentary counsel and these people, they are trying to write a bill for things that are not foreseen at present; for example, a World Cup that might involve you playing there for more than a month and require something else. So, that is the intent of it.

If it is a power made by regulation, it remains in the power of the parliament, of course, to put some restrictions upon the regulation. What we do not want to do is make the people running the oval unable to do an event because of an unnecessarily restrictive piece of legislation that would require changes in here. I think it would be unfortunate if there were a major international event and we had to go and change the act because the oval could not accommodate it on a temporary basis.

So, the provision exists for those things not foreseen that may come up. I cannot give you an example because they are not foreseen yet. Unless you want me to quote, who was it? Dick Cheney. Who did the known unknowns?

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Rumsfeld.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Rumsfeld and the known unknowns. This is an unknown unknown, I think.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister will be pleased to know that I do not know what you do not know either. An example of a temporary structure that takes six months is, of course, the Clipsal grandstand.

Ms Chapman: No, nine months.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Nine months?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I think the house is trying to get up by 6 o'clock so, in the interests of trying to help people out, we might get on with it. I just make the point to the minister that my reading of that clause means that, as long as the SMA thinks something is temporary, it can be there as long as it wants. I do not think that is the minister's intention.

If the SMA decides it wants to put up temporary grandstands for football for the whole of the season, it can and it still meets the provision. I am not sure that that is what the minister intends. All I am saying to you is, between the houses, you may want to look at that provision because a smart lawyer in 30 years' time is going to say, 'Well, we have kept the open space.' I know that the clause says for 'a special event or activity', but that is a special event or activity in the opinion of the SMA. As long as it thinks it is a special activity, it is in.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No. There are two protections. One is that it is on a temporary basis. You might argue that we are all temporary and everything ends, but it is a temporary basis and it is 'for the purposes of a special event or activity prescribed by the regulations'.

I am quite happy to examine it for loopholes in between, but what I cannot do is make it so restrictive that we find that we cannot do something. You would know that the first part of that clause is for things like test matches where they put—I have been in one—really good temporary facilities at the northern end, looking back behind the bowler's arm. This is for corporate facilities for the Ashes match or something like that.

The other thing may be something like a World Cup soccer match, where you may have three games over a period of several months, and you need facilities. I do not know, but I am happy with the intention, as we have stated, and we will check for loopholes.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I have a question on subclause (6). It relates to the finalisation of the lease between the Adelaide City Council and the SACA. I ask this question on behalf of SACA members who have spoken to me in my electorate. I understand that the existing lease has some 48 years still to run, I think, but, other than the exclusivity of—

An honourable member: Forty-seven.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Forty-seven? Okay, I stand corrected. Other than the exclusivity period of use, are there any conditions proposed in this lease that we will refer to later on with a diminishing of opportunity for the SACA? I am not sure if I have expressed it overly well, but it is just where the conditions attached to the lease are less than what they have at the moment, other than exclusivity of use.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No. I hope this helps, I am not quite sure. The lease to the SMA in itself is principally about being able to place the assets on the balance sheets of the SMA or the codes, because obviously a leasehold for a long period of time satisfies accountants. It is a bit artificial in the sense that the balance sheet for these sorts of things is far more about the revenues they can show than any asset values, but the principle of that lease is to place asset values—so the long-term lease to the SMA. The rights of SACA to run cricket are set out in the licences that are given to the two codes for that period of time.

In many ways, while they shorten it in time, the lease and licence arrangements probably leave them freer of any interference than they would be at present with the Adelaide City Council. It certainly gives them the exclusive capacity to run cricket during that time. The MOU and those licence conditions were the subject of some lengthy discussion. If you are seeking to protect the rights of SACA, I can assure you that they spent many, many months doing so themselves.

Ms SANDERSON: I know we have already covered clause 4(3)(c) but, for example, with the 1,200 square metres I was wondering why the Moreton Bay figs were not included in that particular area or if they are going to be included somewhere else.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I understand you have an amendment to include them.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: By their individual names!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If you help me any more I am going to have you evicted! The original intention about the Parklands—and it obviously has not satisfied people—was that we are going to impose by licences some very strict obligations on them. Your preference is to have the fig trees mentioned in the legislation; that was not our original contemplation. I am going to look at it and if it is workable we have no problem with it, because our intention is to protect and to improve the Parklands.

As I said earlier, there will be very significant investment made by the two codes in landscaping and making them more robust before anything starts, and I think that is a good thing. I have no problems with protecting the fig trees; what I cannot do, as much as I think very highly of myself, is prevent things that God controls like them getting diseases or something like that, so I warn you about that!

An honourable member: Ringbarking!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We will not be doing any ringbarking. Obviously, the Moreton Bay fig trees are an essential part of the look and we believe that adds to the value of the whole precinct. We will have a look at the amendment you suggest. Our intention is to keep the fig trees in the best state of health that we can.

Ms SANDERSON: Could there be a specific entry to protect the war memorial oak? I know that if our amendment to remove Cresswell Gardens and Pennington Gardens is successful then it will be protected, but is it worth having it specifically mentioned because it is a very significant tree?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We are happy to have a look at what you suggest, but we have tried to steer away from trying to pick out plants and stuff like that. Our view is that we will impose very serious obligations on the protection of the Parklands. If people feel that is not on, we are happy to look at it. I think we are concerned about things that are not at risk. We want the Parklands preserved through this, and I stress we believe that not only because it is a good thing in itself but it adds to the actual value of the oval in its setting if the Parklands are as good as they can be, and the precinct for that matter.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 5 allows for a lease for 80 years. Is it the intention of the minister to do the lease for 80 years and, if that is the intention, are you going to put into the lease set periods of review so that the lease can be periodically reviewed during the 80 years?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is our intention to give a lease for 80 years. There will be terms in the lease like in any other lease. I am not quite sure what you mean by a review. It was not our intention to have a rent for the lease, so that—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, I think we have to realise what the purpose of the lease is. The lease is purely for putting assets on the balance sheet. So the real guts, if you like, of the rights of the oval are the licence rights for the two codes. All of the activities at the oval will actually be governed by that.

The SMA, of course, runs the oval for events other than football and cricket and manages them. As people have probably noticed, there will be capacity to make revenues through entertainment, functions, special events, concerts, and those sorts of things, at the oval, and the SMA would do that. However, our intention would be that there is a lease with terms given to the SMA for the 80 years. I am not quite sure how much would need to be reviewed in that because, as I say, the activities are governed by the licence conditions, and the licence is given to the two codes.

Ms SANDERSON: If, for example, in 20 years cricket and football have a falling out and it comes time to make the decision whether they are going to sell AAMI Stadium—because I believe they are planning on keeping it for about 20 years—and they are in an 80-year lease, how would they get out of that? Is it wise to not have any review period, like a 20 plus 20? In 40 years, soccer could be the main sport; cricket could have died off. We do not know. Eighty years is such a long time to lock us all in.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The leases to the SMA are owned by the two codes. I think cricket is going to be at Adelaide Oval for ever and ever. God forbid that anything else should ever happen. Say you convince football to go somewhere else, under our model, the lease would revert to SACA to play cricket at the Adelaide Oval. You cannot make people play football if they do not have the money or the interest anymore, if football goes broke or they do not want to do it. In those circumstances, it is fully reasonable, too, I should say, for a government to revisit the circumstances.

However, I think the most likely outcome is that both parties are going to be there for a very long time. If football were not to play there any more, SACA would go back to running Adelaide Oval. And before anyone gets too agitated about 80-year leases, I do not think anyone contemplates that SACA would not be at Adelaide Oval. Goodness me, what a terrible thought. It would upset an awful lot of people.

Ms SANDERSON: Just one more question on that. Under a normal commercial lease—being a business owner who has been involved in many commercial leases—80 years means that you are locked in and, if there is a fee, a licence fee or rent, if SANFL wants to get out of this in 20 years, it would have to pay for the next 60 years. SACA might say, 'Well, you still owe the other half of our rent. So you've got to pay for 60 years if you don't have a 20 plus 20.' You cannot just change who is on the lease very easily, so I think 20 plus 20 would be wiser and safer.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I come back to the fact that we do not have a rent in the lease. You might wish to impose one, and I note that you have a provision to review it. The truth is that this is a long way from being a normal commercial lease. In fact, the entire model is unlike any lease model in that the lease is almost an empty shell for transferring assets onto a balance sheet when the lease, as under the legislation, is conditioned by the licence rights, and the rights are in the licences.

The issue you raise—would the government force them to pay a rent if they had to leave early—I do not think that is a real risk to anyone. I point out that it is not us: we have never suggested imposing a lease on the rent, and I stress the nature of this is not anything related to a commercial lease. This is simply the method to satisfy the accountants by getting the assets on a balance sheet. The real rights of the parties are those determined in the licences.

Ms SANDERSON: I believe that even the wine centre, now owned by the University of Adelaide, pays \$1 million a year, so I think it would be wise.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: \$1 a year.

Ms SANDERSON: I heard it was more for the wine centre. I think it is fair for the people of South Australia funding this project to expect some kind of money back to the coffers.

[Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. P.F. Conlon]

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: In answer to the honourable member's question, there are two reasons why you pay rent under a lease: one is for the value, and the other, in terms of the National Wine Centre, is to give consideration so that there is a legally enforceable lease, because, no consideration, no contract, no lease. We have here a legislative lease so we do not need the consideration because it is created by legislation. What we have said, and my understanding of the consideration of the wine centre is \$1 a year. That is purely by the nature of a peppercorn to give it legal effect.

Our view is that this development will return massive opportunities and increase revenues in the city of Adelaide. That is the return for us out of this investment. It is much more than the small amount that you would impose as a rent anyway. We also believe that the sports do a good job in sports, and that sport in itself is a valuable thing, and it is good for our kids.

As I said earlier, SANFL at present spends \$6.2 million a year on community football with Indigenous kids, with kids, out in the regions, including \$1 million from the AFL. We know, for example, from cricket—you see the letters from Ian Ravenscroft, he is a great bloke, and the former publican of the Moonta Hotel, and the head of regional cricket—who has said how important this is for getting money into regional cricket. We believe that that is a better use of the money than paying rent to Jack Snelling, but you will have that argument upstairs, I assume.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I think what the member for Adelaide was trying to establish in her earlier question was, is there going to be an exit provision available for football in the licences so that if football in 20 years' time—do they have the option to say, 'Thanks for this, it hasn't worked for us and under the licence we give some notice' and they can exit, or is there going to be some provision like that?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Perhaps I should have pointed out before and, again, as I said, the real guts of the stuff is in the licences, the rights. Our view there would be to make—particularly in football's position—the licence for 20 years renewable, which would address the issues that you are talking about.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: It is difficult to imagine an occasion when this might arise, but would you envisage the SMA being able to assign the lease? Could you imagine a circumstance where it might seek to assign the lease and, while I do not see anything in the bill, would there be anything in the lease itself which would constrain an assignment of the lease?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, of course there are lease conditions, and one of the conditions that we would impose—which is a common one—is that you could not be assigned without our permission. So, you would need our permission, and you would need football and cricket (who own the SMA) to agree to assign it to someone else. I cannot imagine circumstances in which that could happen. I cannot imagine getting SACA out of Adelaide Oval without dynamite, so I do not see it happening; however, the safeguard is that a lease arrangement can be assigned, but the condition on our lease would be that it could not be assigned without permission of the minister or the government of the day.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I suspect I know the answer to this question, minister, but for the sake of getting it on the record: in relation to the two periods where football controls it for six months and three weeks, and cricket controls it for the remainder, if there is some event that wants to come to Adelaide and neither of the sports wishes to cooperate with the government to allow that event for some reason—who knows what the administrators are going to be like in 40 years' time—I assume there is a government override?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The arrangements with them is that the government would be allowed three events per year at cost, because we are contributing significantly to this. We do not know what those events would be. We asked for five, expecting to get three, so they demanded three and we said yes, so we thought that was rather good. So there are those. There are also other events, of course, that the government may not want, but that the SMA or the two codes may agree to do in each other's period.

Most of these things would be so much in the interest of the two codes that they would want to do them anyway, but we have reserved the right for the government to have up to three events per year, run at cost—for them not to make a profit, but we would cover the costs of the

event if costs were incurred, but we would have the right to have those three events. Of course, anyone dealing in it would have to be reasonable, and you would not pursue an event that so undermined the other parties' use of the stadium that it destroyed its value. These things have been thrashed over for a very long time—who leaves the ground in what condition after events, etc. The entire arrangement has to be structured so that everyone's rights are protected from the activities of others.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Minister, you mentioned that the licence between the SMA and the clubs might be 20 years. I am not sure whether you just postulated that figure. Am I understanding correctly that there is nothing in the bill that might stop the two football clubs in the future, for instance, getting together with soccer and deciding to move to a second stadium they might seek to build? I am not imagining that that would happen in the near future, but in 10 or 20 years' time, is it your understanding that they could walk away from the arrangement and leave the SMA with cricket as its only customer at the oval, or is there something in the bill or the proposed licence arrangements that would bind the two football clubs to the Adelaide Oval and SMA no matter what?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: My understanding of it is that, if they want to stop playing AFL football, they can go somewhere else, but if they are going to play AFL football, they are going to play it at Adelaide Oval for the duration of that licence agreement. So, if you have a licence agreement for 20 years and you want to play AFL football, you will play it for 20 years in the licence.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 6 deals with the development authorisation. Essentially, the bill gives the minister power to authorise any development on the site. In fact, the bill, as I understand it, says that any development approved by the minister is authorised.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: In the core area.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, this is the core area, which is essentially the main stadium area, as distinct from the Parklands parking area. Once this is passed, of course, that means that any building work at all can be undertaken there and it is automatically approved.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We intend building a stadium, that is all: not anything else.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Fine. I just think it is an extraordinarily broad power. In giving the power, if the parliament so decides, we are taking a deep breath that the codes and the minister are not going to come to some arrangement to build something there that we have not envisaged. Most of us have seen the model, but even the model did not have the final roof structure design when we were briefed on it and, of course, there is no guarantee that is the model we will end up with. For instance, in Perth they are talking about apartments and office blocks next to the WACA. What is the intention? AAMI Stadium has the Crows facilities and tavern with poker machines. Is it the intention to allow poker machines at this venue?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No-one has asked us about that, but can I say that the only reason this is here is to overcome the risk of substantial delay in the planning process. I have indicated to you that I am quite happy to substitute DAC for the minister's sign-off on it. Our intentions would be that I would have done this on the advice of DAC, anyway, as it happens. What I would say is: if you want DAC to do the authorisation, I am quite comfortable with that.

I stress that what we do not want to occur is the lengthy process of rezoning, or what can be a lengthy process. As I said, the ordinary process is 12 months, interim effect of two to three months; and, given this project, there is a danger of someone seeking judicial review and holding it up. If we lose a year on this, it will cost us much more. Escalation is the single biggest issue. I am quite happy between the houses to look at some process whereby DAC can sign off on the application, but what I would say is, if we agree we should build a stadium there, let's not go through the rezoning process for no reason.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I seek some clarification on this, and I come from some planning background within local government. I presume that the majority of the core areas are appropriately zoned already and that it is only the areas in schedule 1 identified as A, B and C in which the zoning is wrong?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, it is not. Regrettably, the core area is Parklands and it is seriously not complying. I do not know why it is that but that is what it is, and that is what I am told by the planning officers that it is and that is what has to be changed. Apparently, the fact that there is an oval there and it is current use does not apply. There is an extension of the eastern grandstand into the Parklands, too, but the oval itself is Parklands. So, we can keep what we have there and we can build on it, but whatever we build is non-complying at present.

All we are saying is we should make this build complying, where there is an oval already, and then DAC can authorise it. I would not dare, as a minister, authorise this on my own advice, anyway. I reckon I am a smart bloke, but I know bugger all about planning.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My question relates partly to clause 6 but also to clause 8. It has to do with any future decision by the SMA to build underground car parking. For example, if the SMA finds at some point in the future that its business operations are profitable and there is revenue and it is working, and they make a decision to build underground parking, for instance, either under oval 2 or under the tennis courts that are between the Next Generation gym and oval 2, and they are able to find the funding for that—noting that that is outside the \$535 million—is there any clause in the bill that would prevent them from making such an application?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There is no clause that would prevent them, but there is nothing that assists them either. They will just have to front up to the processes at the time. The authorisation processes that we have suggested for the core area expire on 31 December 2015, so there will be no benefit from those, but there is nothing to prevent them. There is nothing more to prevent them than exists at present. There is nothing created in the bill that would prevent them, so they will just be where they are at present, and I am sure people will deal with that on its merits at the time.

I might point out about this, for the benefit of the member for Davenport, that when they first sent this development authorisation section to me wanting to make sure that it was comprehensive, it would have caused you more questions than it does now and I asked them to pare it back. I had the right to authorise something by regulation somewhere else and I thought, 'I don't think they'll like that, and I think we'll take that out,' so it is already pared back from the first model that was suggested to me.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I just want to explore clause 6(7) which provides:

The expiry of this section does not affect—

- (a) any development completed before the expiration; or
- (b) any development commenced before the expiration,

and the Minister may, despite the expiration, vary any conditions applying to an authorisation under this section by notice in the Gazette.

That is a confusing clause. I am just interested to know: at what point does a development commence? For instance, what I am trying to cover off is this point: can a minister approve a development and have a forward date for that development to kick in?

If the answer is no, because the legislation says that it runs out on 31 December 2015, where it provides that a minister can, in the future after the expiration, go back to the decision and vary the conditions applying, can that provision override that date? What I am trying to cover off is that a minister cannot forward approve developments for years 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 somehow without going through what would be the proper process.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The intention of the two together—'any development commenced before the expiration' is just in case the thing is not finished. If you have something unforeseen and the matter is not finished, then we want to be able to bring it to completion. I am reliably assured that the meaning of the subsequent words are such that, if there is an expiration and something has not been completed, the minister will still have the ability to have appropriate controls over the thing that has not been completed. Is that the best way of putting it?

If you did not have the provision after subclause (7)(b), then the thing could continue but the minister would not have the ability to have proper controls over what was occurring. It is to make sure that, if something is continuing after the expiration date, the minister has an ability to have the appropriate controls over it. I am quite happy for people to give you a more detailed legal explanation as to why it is drafted that way, but that is certainly the intention.

Mr GRIFFITHS: This question relates to clause 6 and clause 11. Clause 11 deals with the closing of Victor Richardson Road and then that reverts back to Parklands, but it impacts upon the car park access. I believe that 400 car parks will be created under this new eastern side structure. If the road access to the site is being closed, how is it intended that these will get into this car park? Is it over some area of Parklands which you have to assign some right to?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I need you to look at the schedule. There is a drawing there. You will still need the road access, but it will not be anywhere as wide as the Victor Richardson Road is now. If you have been in there, it is very wide. I think there is some angle parking on the side. It is realigned a little bit, so there will be a much smaller road. There is road access, of course, to the car parks, but it is a much smaller one. In schedule 1 you will see the Victor Richardson Road as it will be. The intention was to return as much of that bitumised area to parkland as was possible while leaving a road access.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am still confused. So schedule 1 is how Victor Richardson Road will be, not as it is at the moment?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It will be closed as a public road, but it will allow access to the car parking on a much narrower strip.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am confused, because clause 11 says that Victor Richardson Road is closed and reverts back to council control.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There are many driveways that are not roads, if you know what I mean. I am not allowed to drive on your driveway, for example.

Mr GRIFFITHS: You would be welcome any time. Who has legal responsibility then? What if an accident were to occur driving down this road, track or whatever it is to get into the car park? Who has to accept responsibility for it, because I cannot see that it is actually defined in schedule 1.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Most road accidents are primarily controlled by the ordinary laws of negligence, conditioned by the Road Traffic Act in terms of damages, and I do not understand why that would be any different. It is no different to going down Pennington Terrace, as I pointed out. These things have existed for a very long time. Accesses that are not public roads have existed for a very long time in various places.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Piccolo): Member for Goyder, you are indicating you are not quite sure about that answer.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is very good. There is a lot more parkland than there used to be.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am not querying that. It is just that I would have thought that a roadway provision would have still been required to access the underground car park, under the Roads (Opening and Closing) Act, not just a right of way across some Parklands.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There is a Roads (Opening and Closing) Act and you have to close it under that. This bill gives access. This bill allows you to get access. So, it is not a road for the purposes of a public road, but there is legislated access.

Ms SANDERSON: I have a quick point on that. 'Realign' was a word you used a minute ago. Does that mean it could actually move to the left or to the right of where it already is, therefore taking out some of the trees and gardens that are already there?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It will be a smaller piece of road than there is at present. I am not quite clear on the explanation myself. I might try and get someone to give you a proper briefing in between, but I can guarantee that it is much smaller than the current bitumised area.

The ACTING CHAIR: Are you asking whether it is within the existing alignment?

Ms SANDERSON: Yes. If it is within where you already have it and it just got smaller then that is fine, but if you have moved over to the left or right then it takes up existing lawn and trees.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I think it is, but I will have to get you a briefing on it. I cannot see why it would not be, but I will have to get a better answer.

Ms SANDERSON: Is there a definition of 'commenced', and I refer to subclause (7)(b) 'any development commenced before the expiration'? Does 'commenced' mean that you have

signed a legal document, you have discussed it at a lunch, you have had a briefing, you have got plans drawn up but you have not made a decision yet? What does that mean?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Our understanding is physical work commenced on site. It has not started. It has not commenced on site. It has not commenced. Again, I am quite happy to check that for you. We will check it for you, but there is common law around planning in those terms, and we will get it for you.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I move:

Page 6, after line 14—After subclause (4) insert:

- (4a) Public car parking provided under subsection (3)(a) must be limited to the area designated by the letter G according to the map set out in Schedule 5.

This amendment is an attempt to make the Adelaide City Council more comfortable—and others—about the parking. It merely makes clearer which part of the licence areas would permit a licence for parking, and I point out that they are the existing northern car park, what is colloquially referred to as the northern car park area, on oval No. 2.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The opposition is happy to support it in this house and look at it between houses, as we are with a number of amendments with the government; but, for the sake of progress, we are happy to support it.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I think that this amendment improves the bill considerably, but I ask whether the government considered in the long term some sort of a sunset clause for this granting of the right to park in this particular section of the Parklands if the SMA decided at some point in the future that it would rather build an underground car park? Having since 2007 visited a number of these stadiums, particularly Etihad Stadium, which has, I think, a car park for 2,000 cars underneath that stadium and relies more heavily on public transport, it would seem a better vision (given that this is an 80-year term we are talking about) for us to put some pressure on the SMA if it runs a profitable business to build that underground car park under the tennis courts or the No. 2 oval, cover it over, restore it and then, perhaps, give up this site so that restoration can be made as sort of Parklands, not used for car parking. Has any consideration been given to that?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The way that it would be dealt with is that, of course, the act itself does not automatically give a licence to the SMA to do car parking. That is then a licence with conditions and for a term given by the minister. So, it can be for a term and it can have conditions; and it certainly will have, I gather, conditions about protection of Parklands, for example, and an ability to revoke a licence if those conditions are not met.

Certainly, there would be a capacity to undo that in the future. There is a capacity to set it for such term as it is viewed. For the sake of certainty, I would imagine that the first term would be considerable. I mean, we would not be giving them just a couple of years because people have to have some certainty, but you could do that.

My view is that you will find over time that more and more people use public transport rather than park; and, because of the ability to evacuate the cars, more people will prefer to park in the city than they will there because it is much easier to get out of the city than it is to get out of a large crowd around there. I think that you will see that over time. The one proviso I would say is that it may well be that you will want to keep the option, if there is some really big special event, of using that in the future.

In short, we would control it by the issue of licences on conditions and terms at present. It may well be that people do not want to park there. My fond hope is that far fewer people will go in cars than do at present because I think that is a good outcome. Certainly, there is an option in the future for a licence to be cancelled, revoked, altered by agreement—all those sorts of things.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You have mentioned 20 years again. Is a 20-year licence the expected licence term in the first instance? How would you respond to the point that, by granting this space in schedule 5 to the SMA as virtually a free open space for car parking, we might be granting them space for a good car parking business and thereby taking away the incentive for developers to build those car parks in Adelaide that you speak of, or perhaps up O'Connell Street on the Makris site and those sorts of things?

In your first licence, you could say, 'In 10 years from now, access to this area for car parking, except in really major events like the World Cup, will be reviewed,' and there could be some financial imperative put on them to look at the underground car parking option. Would you consider doing that and, if so, what time frame do you think would be appropriate?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Firstly, we have not really had the discussions about the length of time for a licence for parking yet. I am not sure we have the right yet. Obviously, that would need to be in sufficient time to give the codes certainty that they were going to have that right. There will be issues about renewal.

Can I say, our view is that—and I think the codes share this view—the obligations that are going to be imposed upon the maintenance of the grounds will make it not such a great business. There will be revenues but not as much as if you were just to charge for car parking without putting the money back in. There will be quite high standards imposed on the management and landscaping. So, because of the cost of management, we do not think it will be a major part of anyone's business there.

My own view on the issues you raise, having been through this for a very long time, is that people are going to find it more attractive to park on this side of the river. The riverfront precinct itself may well deliver a large number of extra car parks which will be available on game days. So, it may well be that what you talk about is the case.

As I say, I think that, with what people will experience with the traffic—if you have been to the Twenty20 match you will know that getting out from around the oval itself is much harder than getting out of the city, which is designed for large volumes of traffic. So, I think there is the possibility of what you say occurring, in that it will not be as attractive to park there.

I do not think it is going to be a strong enough business or a strong enough part of their revenues for you to fear it being an incentive to invest elsewhere. I point out that our discussions with the private sector indicate a very keen interest on developing car parking on this side of the river which, I think, would be a more attractive undercover proposition for people.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Just on the car parking, clause 7(3)(a) talks about the capacity to provide for car parking which, obviously, the facility needs. Is it the intention to allow 24/7 car parking or just event-based car parking?

The way I understand it at the moment, the SACA is essentially restricted to event-based car parking. So, if they have an event there you can car park but, once this is established, it appears to me that there is nothing in this bill, at the moment at least, that says that you cannot do a park-and-ride there on the days when there are no events. I am just wondering how you are going to restrict that.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We give licences with conditions and they will be very specifically about events such as football events. The ordinary day-to-day car parking for non-events will be the 400 underground. Really, if you have not got an event, that is pretty much all you need.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Minister, clause 7(3)(c) talks about, under the licence, allowing, 'other activities that are ancillary to the redevelopment or use of Adelaide Oval.' Doesn't that need to be other activities that are ancillary to the redevelopment or use of the Adelaide Oval core area? I think you have restricted it to the oval proper and I would have thought it was the broader area.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is certainly intended to refer to the Adelaide Oval core area construction. If I can go through the licence rights sought: for car parking, to assist construction (particularly if cricket want to play) and there are also others to do with putting up marquees on event days which happens at present at the cricket, and some of the stuff we talked about in the gardens—stalls or selling footy Budgets, all of those things you do. It has been a long day; can you remind me what the point of your question was?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The point was, and it is a simple point, that your legislation says that you are going to allow under the licence the other activities that are ancillary to the redevelopment or use of Adelaide Oval—this is under the licence.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: As I say, it refers to Adelaide Oval but some of the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Can you answer all the rest of your questions!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No. The member for Adelaide wants me to ask what is the proposed surface treatment for the car parks. Have you talked with football or cricket about whether they are going to bitumise it? The fear is that they are going to bitumise it, and that is why I ask. There is a community concern about the treatment of that.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I thought I had made this clear—I will. The first step before any parking occurs is that the codes, through the SMA, will undertake extensive landscaping to make the grassed areas more robust, but it will be grassed areas and there will be significant funds expended before anyone parks (on the best possible advice) to make sure that that grassed area is as robust as it can be and suitable for parking, and that money will be spent before anything occurs.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Sibbons): I draw members' attention to a clerical error in subclause (7). The word 'part' should read 'chapter'.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 8 talks about development authorisations, and specifically there is a reference to Adelaide Oval No. 2, where there will be automatic approval of certain development on Adelaide Oval No. 2. I want to get on the record that my understanding from the briefing is that the government's intention is to allow half the Clem Hill Stand to come down to Adelaide Oval No. 2 and to put some change rooms/toilets underneath. Is that the only development envisaged?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The only development contemplated is to make use of that. There will be more activity at Adelaide Oval No. 2 and they want to use it there so it makes good sense to us.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Piccolo): I draw members' attention to clause 9 where there is an error. The word 'part' in subclause (3) should read 'chapter'.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

Clause 12.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 12 deals with the identification of land. It gives the minister power to, by instrument deposited in the GRO, identify or delineate any land in connection with the operation of this act. Can the minister explain what the purpose of that clause is, and does it allow him to bring land not adjacent to the precinct under the control of this particular provision?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The provision has to be operated in conjunction with the act and under the terms of the act. It is for the purposes of any confusion in identifying the areas. I cannot change the areas. It has to be the areas determined by the act. I cannot go beyond the act. I do not know in what circumstances it would need to be done. I think it is some sort of boilerplate clause, as far as I can ascertain.

Clause passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: When do you envisage the SMA actually taking over the control of the precinct? I am not sure where this fits in the bill, but at what point is the SACA debt going to be paid off—immediately on the passing of the act or three years down the track? Is there a date when SACA will get its money?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, there are two questions. Firstly, we are in discussions at the moment. It will not be for some time that the SMA will take over from SACA. In terms of the \$85 million, it would not be immediately upon the passage of the bill, but we would contemplate some time in the next 12 months. As soon as we have a more pointed answer for you, we will get it.

Clause passed.

Clause 15 passed.

Schedules 1 to 4 passed.

New schedule 5.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I move:

Page 12, after Schedule 4—After Schedule 4 insert:

Schedule 5—Car parking area [with plan]

This merely describes the area that we referred to in amendment No. 2 about the car parking licence area. With the forbearance of the committee, I will take this opportunity to thank two people I should have thanked before: Rod Hook and Manuel from my office, who worked enormously hard on this for the last 12 months. I would also like to thank Richard Dennis who, believe me, was amending and drafting at very late notice right up to walking into the place. He is, I think, the doyen among our parliamentary counsel. Thank you for that, and thank you to the rest of you.

New schedule inserted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (18:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

As my second reading speech went for some time, I will not add anything more at this point.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (18:34): I just want to support the bill as it has come out of committee, but I will make one observation, and that is that, sadly—and I know this is a function of the coordination in this parliament—we have not had the chance to move our amendments as an opposition, and debate them fully in this house. I know this is a trend that is emerging into a pattern of consistency which I think is not good for the House of Assembly. It is partly a consequence of the fact that, on our side of the house, we have country members and it is a bit harder to organise a joint party meeting.

I commend the member for Davenport, who has handled this bill and has done an outstanding job. However, the problem is getting our people together in time to consider the matter, process the amendments, and then have them debated. I say to the government that in future instances it would be great if a bit more notice could be given, because if we have a week before our party room meeting we could draft the amendments and then we could debate them in the house. Without that, it means that, sadly, we, the members of the lower house, do not get to fully explore those issues with the government.

I think this is something, in the business of good law-making, that we could do better. I know our friends in the other place will do a great job but, unfortunately, we in the House of Assembly will not get to enjoy the debate surrounding those amendments. Having said that, I think the minister clearly knows where we are coming from with the amendments. I just say to the minister; please don't mess up the building of this stadium, because I am sure the opposition will be holding you to account on the costs and the timeframe.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Piccolo): The member for Little Para should be in his seat if he wants to be heard. Does anybody else wish to speak? Minister, if you speak, you close the debate.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (18:36): I thank everyone, and can I say that, not to disparage the Legislative Council, I would really have enjoyed debating the amendments down here. The problem is the way our friends in the other place work: if I cannot get the bill up there this week it increases the difficulty in getting it out before the long break. I would have been quite happy to have a longer debate on the amendments here. I

think it would have been very helpful. I regret that we have not been able to do that, and I understand the comments. I would have preferred to have more time myself.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:37 the house adjourned until Thursday 9 June 2011 at 10:30.