

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 21 June 2011

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

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

Mr Venning: Congratulations, Jack. You got some news, mate? You got the job?

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Schubert, behave yourself!

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PRESCRIBED MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (11:02): I move:

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

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 June 2011.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (11:02): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and can I indicate to you that I am the lead speaker on this bill for the opposition. I would like to say that it is a pleasure to get up and respond to the government's budget, but I would have to say that that would not quite be true given that this is now its 10th budget and it has delivered more debt, more deficit and more deceit for the people of South Australia.

Households and small businesses are struggling paying their bills and making ends meet. The government is increasing everything from water bills, motor registration, driver's licences, bus tickets, CTP premiums and levies. Not only are households struggling, businesses are struggling and, in fact, this budget comes in the wake of a Dun & Bradstreet survey, which examined the businesses that are moving to other states right around the country. Would you believe that, out of the whole country (and we have only a bit over 7 per cent of the population in this state), 22 per cent of the businesses moving to other states came out of South Australia.

I think that the history of this government and the way in which it has dealt with small businesses and families are ample reasons to explain why that would be so. The government seems not interested in looking at it, but in fact only 4 per cent of the small businesses in this state actually approve of state government policies. It promised the world for families and businesses, but it does not deliver it.

I want to look at why this government is so on the nose, and I think that this morning's information in *The Australian* and other newspapers indicates that the government is on the nose. Indeed, a member of its own side, Leon Bignell (the member for Mawson), indicated yesterday that the government is on the nose, and there is a reason for it. It is not just that they are unpopular because they are tired, arrogant and disinterested, and it is not just because of their infighting: it is because fundamentally it is the economic mismanagement of this state—which is typical of a Labor government—that is causing the problems and causing people to need to leave this state.

Last December, on 16 December I think it was, they had their Mid-Year Budget Review and at that time the government indicated that it anticipated that for the next year, that is, for the 2011-12 tax year, there would be an \$81 million surplus. They bring out the budget this month and what do you know? That \$81 million surplus has turned instead into a \$263 million deficit. So, in six months—in fact, it was slightly under six months by a couple of days—they have turned an \$81 million surplus into a \$263 million deficit.

When this government came into office, the state's income was roughly \$8.5 billion a year, and that has basically doubled. So we should be on easy street. We should be sitting pretty. With a doubling of income, they should be doing really well; but, in every year, every budget it has had, this government has spent more than it has budgeted. Over the nine years, it is a total of \$3.5 billion more than they budgeted, year upon year. They were warned about that. Time and

again, the auditor-general Ken MacPherson warned them, and the subsequent Auditor-General, Simon O'Neill, repeated the warning, that they were relying on unbudgeted-for, windfall income from GST and property taxes to make their budget balance, and still they could not make their budget balance, even with those revenues coming in.

So, what do they do? They put up taxes. We are now the highest taxing state in Australia. The government seems to think that being a high taxing state is just another mechanism to get more income to waste on our behalf instead of recognising that high taxes mean that people cannot afford to run businesses here and, hence, the 22 per cent of businesses nationally moving to another state coming out of this state.

Tax revenue overall since this government came into power has increased by 88 per cent. Tax revenue has gone up by 88 per cent. That is why we are the highest taxed state in the nation. Because of GST state revenue—which this government, of course, opposed but has been its great saviour—they have an extra \$5 billion per annum being paid to the state. Every state Labor government, by the way, is running a deficit budget and, guess what—every state Liberal government around the country is running a surplus budget. Funny, that!

Ms Bedford: Lies and statistics.

Mrs REDMOND: The member for Florey says, 'Lies and statistics'. I can tell members that the truth of this budget is coming home to roost with the people of South Australia, and the problem is that this government is deaf to the cries of business and families who are suffering because of the decisions that this government has made year after year in its term in office.

We already knew that the debt for this state was at about \$4.5 billion and that the government intended for it to go out. Of course, in his first day in the job in this chamber the new Treasurer said, 'Of course we intend to increase the debt.' So we knew it was going out from \$4.5 billion to about \$7.5 billion, but now they are going to take it out even further to \$8.2 billion. Of course, that does not include the new hospital at the rail yards.

The Treasurer stood there and said, 'What we don't want to do is run up a credit card debt for the children of today to have to pay. No, we won't do that, but we are going into this new rail yards hospital,' and when it is built the person who is 15 today is still going to be paying \$1.1 million a day for that hospital as they turn 50.

An honourable member: A day?

Mrs REDMOND: Every day: \$1.1 million a day. That is not for a doctor, nurse or any of the other good things about our medical system in this state: it is just to supply a new building because this government wrote itself into a corner wanting to have that new building.

When you include the debt from the rail yards hospital, of course, that adds another \$2.73 billion-plus to the \$8.2 billion debt, so we will have about \$11 billion in debt. But, when you add all the bits and pieces together—the whole lot: the unfunded superannuation, WorkCover, the public sector workers compensation liabilities, public sector long service leave and the new hospital—the total debts and liabilities for this state come to \$24 billion, or \$15,000 per head for every man, woman, child and baby in this state. It is \$15,000 a head, and this government says it has been a good economic manager. As I have said, the new Treasurer said on his first sitting day, 'I will not allow this state to run up a credit card debt which will be left for our children to pay,' but that is exactly what he is doing. Indeed, he is one who has signed us up for this new hospital.

So, having got us into this cash-strapped situation, what is the government going to do about? It has to do something like sell some assets. Of course, Labor promised, remember, that there would be no privatisations. But since then, of course, we now have the new Royal Adelaide Hospital contract—we own a hospital along the road—which is going to tie us up for 35 years of more debt and more credit card payments.

We have one consortium building six new super schools. We have wonderful community schools but, no, we are going to replace them with six super schools, built in private consortium's hands. They are going to forward sell the state's forests, which will decimate the economy of the South-East. That is why even the kids from the Kalangadoo Primary School have travelled up here time and again to try to make the government understand that that is not only a privatisation but something which will be a disaster for the people of South-East.

Now, of course, in this budget is the announcement that we are going to sell the Lotteries Commission. As I have said about each of those things, be it the state forests, which produced an

income for us last year of about \$40 million, or the Lotteries Commission, which produced an income for us last year of about \$86 million—the goose that lays the golden egg. Why would you sell them? In my view, you would sell them only for two reasons, one being that you are offered such a fabulous price that you would be silly not to take it—if someone came along and offered me \$2 million for my house in Stirling, I reckon I would take it because it would be so far over what it is really worth. That is not what is happening.

The other reason you would sell an asset that is producing an income for us is that you are cash-strapped, and that is what the case is here—that this government is so cash-strapped. I loved hearing about the fact that, if public servants want even a new highlighter, they have to trade in the old one to prove that they are not taking it away. Because we are so cash-strapped, we have to deal even with that sort of thing.

Not only has the government privatised things such as the hospital, the schools, the state forests and now the lotteries office, but it has also, in spite of its rhetoric, failed to bring back into public ownership the things it objected to being put into private contracts in the first place. With things such as the metropolitan bus services, the prison security services and the piping for the SA Water network and so on, it could have brought all of those back under government, rather than renew the contracts, but instead it opted to renew the contracts.

Before I move on to look at the public sector and what role the government plays (and I heard a new radio ad by Janet Giles as I came in this morning, which is still criticising this government—and with good cause), there is one other matter I want to mention, and that is a budget measure, or what the government is purporting to call a budget measure, which we intend to oppose on this side of the house, and that is an attempt to use the budget to take away a fundamental right of the citizens of this state.

The Statutes Amendment (Budget 2011) Bill seeks to amend the Summary Procedures Act 1921 by establishing a presumption that costs will not be awarded against the police in a summary prosecution even though the police prosecution has been unsuccessful. Historically, in this state, we have always worked on the basis that, if you go to court and win, you will basically have the costs paid. If you are a successful litigant, the other side will pay your costs in a civil matter. Equally, if you are taken to court by the police and you win, the police have to pay your costs. That is the way it has always been; that to me is a fundamental right.

What the government proposes is to remove that, to change that presumption. That is going to mean that the average person can be hauled into court by the police, who will face no adverse consequences, regardless of the outcome and regardless of how unjustifiable their case against you might be. There have been people in this state who have literally lost their home defending themselves. What the government now seeks to do is take away their right to be reimbursed their costs of having to go to court to defend themselves, no matter how wrong the police turn out to be. That is not a budget measure, it is not something that we on this side of the house are prepared to accept, and we will, in due course, move an amendment to seek to undo that.

I invite the government to reconsider its position on that, and I particularly invite the Attorney-General to stand up, as the new Attorney-General of this state, and nail his colours to the mast about whether he actually supports that budget measure. He is not only the Attorney-General: he is the would-be pretender to the throne. He wants the premiership just like the Treasurer, just like Jay Weatherill. They are all vying for it. Let's see where his colours are nailed to the mast on that issue.

I want to move on to the issue of the Public Service because, since Labor was elected in 2002, public sector employment numbers have increased by 18,105. They only budgeted for 2,500 of those employees but somehow, in spite of budgeting for 2,500 new employees, they have managed to employ over 18,000 extra.

Those of us on this side of the house who run our own businesses can only be gobsmacked at the idea that anyone running any sort of a business could put up a proposal and say, 'Well, we're going to increase our workforce by 2,500,' but then increase it by over 18,000 instead. Indeed, if they had been in the private sector, I am sure that their board would have sacked them by now. As if that were not bad enough, the fact is that most of the people that they have employed have just been extra bureaucrats.

I know that the member for Cheltenham (Hon. Jay Weatherill) loves bureaucrats. He actually likes to dismantle things like the Julia Farr Centre, the Independent Living Centre, the

Intellectual Disability Services Council and all those organisations and defund things like the Brain Injury Network—all those things in the disability sector—because his view of the world is that we are much better off with a big bureaucracy running all these things and hence the need for more bureaucrats.

We certainly have no more efficiency in the system as a result of doing that, but we do have a lot more bureaucrats. Out of that 18,000 extra people who have been employed, a total of about one-third—just over 6,000 of them—are actually front-line service providers like doctors, nurses, teachers and police, so about 12,000 are actually just new bureaucrats.

One of the other debacles that has been overseen by this government has been its so-called reform called Shared Services—and I refuse to give it the title of 'reform'. Costs continue to blow out. The Shared Services plan was supposed to cost an initial \$60 million as a once-off payment and save us \$60 million a year. Every public servant I know—and I know quite a few, and they are in different departments—complains about Shared Services.

It is not just bad in terms of its failure to provide the service that it is supposed to provide, it is bad for a range of reasons, amongst which is the fact that it takes business out of the country and our regional centres. Every time you remove one person from a regional centre with a government job, it can mean that a partner or a spouse loses a job locally because they all have to come back to the city. It means the kids are pulled out of the school. It makes the school less viable and you could lose teachers at the school. It has a ripple effect through those communities.

They originally said \$60 million was a once-off but it would save us \$60 million a year. That sounds like good maths but, just in this budget, an additional \$10.5 million is going towards Shared Services, and it is going to cost a whole lot more before we are through, because we know that at present there are fewer than 700 employees in the organisation but they are still planning to get to a 2,300-employee target in due course. It has blown out already by tens of millions of dollars. It is going to cost us another \$10.5 million this year and still we are getting no better management. Indeed, from all accounts that I have ever heard, we are getting much worse management of all those things in this state.

The other aspect of that, I might mention, is that, if you are a pay clerk out in a suburban area—say, at the Flinders Medical Centre—and you cannot be a pay clerk there any more because Shared Services is going to do it all centrally, and they have guaranteed that you will keep your job so you come in to work here, that means of course that the extra time and extra cost are impositions on you, the employee. That is where the impact of this is being most felt, apart from its failure to provide any decent service.

I said in a speech the other day that this budget deals with figures that are so large that none of us can actually comprehend the sorts of billions of dollars that we are involved with. So, we decided it would be a good idea to look at what the impact is on the actual household because, after all, the new Treasurer makes out that he is a family man—as if he understands life on struggle street—and that this is a family-friendly budget.

But, if you look at the facts, as I have already mentioned, every South Australian—because of this government's mismanagement of the economy—faces a debt of some \$15,000 per man, woman and child. So, in your average household with mum, dad and a couple of kids, there is a government debt of over \$60,000 for them to meet. And that is in addition to them paying their taxes, of course.

Madam Speaker, if you catch a bus, drive a car, consume water or electricity, pay insurance, or if you are looking to help your kids get into their first home, you are worse off under this budget. On our calculations (and we did them very conservatively) the average household will pay about \$750 extra per year in government taxes, charges, water and other utilities. Across the whole lot, it is an increase of 11 per cent year on year, which is well above the rate of inflation.

Can I simply first refer to water: we have already had the announcement pre-Budget that there would be a 65 per cent increase in the supply charge and a 50 per cent increase in the water rate usage for the base water rate. Even with a concession, the average pensioner is likely to face an increase of up to 74 per cent on their water bill. Indeed, there are businesses that are looking at having to close because of the increases in the water bills alone in this state.

Average water bills have trebled under this government and, on top of this, the sewerage charges are going to go up by 12 per cent this year, when you include the property prices. You would be aware, of course, that a couple of weeks ago we heard 'Darren the Plumber' who rang up

the radio station out of the blue. Darren was so sick of the rising costs of trying to get ahead in this state that he was leaving the state and going to Queensland, where he figures he will get an even break, because they will not give a sucker an even break in this state.

Today, I have been out to Newton meeting with another proprietor of a commercial laundry, in this case. This guy has a small business and employs nine or 10 local people. It is in the member for Morialta's wonderful seat out at Newton. Angelo and Rob Mignone run this wonderful business; they launder the towels—you know when you go to the hairdresser? I don't know about the fellows, but I assume you get the little towel around your neck. This guy launders about 9,000 of them a day. He supplies the towels to 300 hairdressing businesses around town, and he is looking at having to close his business because he has just had a 32 per cent increase in his water bill.

You can imagine that, when you are washing 9,000 towels a day, there is a fair old water bill, but going up by 32 per cent now, another 40 per cent on 1 July, and another 40 per cent on the next 1 July, it makes it an unbearable imposition on a business that has to use water because of the nature of the business. They cannot shortcut it; they have to provide a healthy, clean product for all those 300 businesses that they, in turn, supply. They cannot pass on the cost on a per towel basis, because most of their customers would simply walk away. So, that business is looking at having to close because of this government's increases just in the area of water.

Honourable members: Shame!

Mrs REDMOND: Add to that property taxes, which have more than doubled, primarily due to increased stamp duty and land tax. South Australia is one of the most expensive places for stamp duty. I have previously mentioned a constituent who recently came into my office in Stirling who has a \$15 million property portfolio in the residential market that he has built up over a lifetime's work, to provide rental properties to people in this state. He is now—because of the land tax regime in this state, and because of the other taxes and charges—moving the entire portfolio to the Northern Territory. So, he is selling everything in South Australia because he cannot make a quid at it out of this state.

That, in turn, affects not just him; it affects the availability of rental properties. It affects the people who are the most vulnerable and who have not managed to get into the property market themselves. They are the ones who are renting and they are the ones who will pay the price for this government. And yet, treasurer Foley and, no doubt, Treasurer Snelling following in his footsteps, think that land tax is simply something that rich people pay so you do not need to worry about it.

The reality is that land tax affects every single person in this state and that the nature of the tax regime in this state is forcing businesses out of the state, as evidenced by the Dun & Bradstreet survey. In this budget, of course, the \$8,000 first home buyer's subsidy on newly constructed home purchases has been slashed. What the government is trying to do, because it is cash-strapped, is actually get people who want the First Home Owner Grant to get into the market quicker than they would have otherwise done. A few weeks ago, you may recall, it reduced by \$60 million the amount of stamp duty it thinks it is now going to get. Everyone I have spoken to in the real estate industry says that is not a big enough adjustment.

We have got to try and stimulate the housing sector very quickly, so what are they doing? They are pulling the First Home Owner Grant, so that it is going to disappear—half of it next year and the year after that it will be gone. When they do that, that will mean that young couples—or young people generally; they do not have to be couples—trying to get into the first home market are going to move forward their decision and try to stimulate the housing economy that way. It was brought in only a few years ago. They reduced it last year and now they are going to slash it altogether.

What they will do, though, is price people out of the market. Can I compare it to Queensland, where first home owners, under the new arrangements there, can receive \$17,000 for their first home. In Queensland there is no stamp duty for first home buyers purchasing homes under \$500,000, so I wonder why people might choose to go to Queensland to buy their first home. Yet we know that from our population we are losing about 3,000 people a year interstate. We need to stimulate bringing people in here, especially with the ageing population. That means we need to get more people in the workforce age group into the state, but no; the government goes in exactly the other direction.

Land tax, as I have already said, has increased hugely: 346 per cent since they came in. It has more than quadrupled since they came into office. We have by far the worst land tax regime of

all the states and, as I have already said, it is not just a tax paid by the wealthy. The other more down-to-earth things, though: driver's licence renewal up 32 per cent, and speeding fines. This gets me, because the speeding fine increase is 29 per cent if you exceed by less than 15 km/h, so the highest increase is actually on the smallest part over the speed limit. It is not trying to get the really bad drivers. It is trying to get the people—

Ms Chapman: Creepers.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, all those signs. I would love to know how much those signs cost all around the state. It means that if you are caught driving at five kilometres over the speed limit, so you are doing 55 in a 50 zone—and I have arguments about those 50 zones anyway, because they promised us when they introduced them that it would be 60 on the arterial roads, then they made it 50 on the arterial roads. I have had innumerable people come into my office. They have had unblemished driving records for 40 years and suddenly they inadvertently get caught because they have been doing 54 in a 50 zone, not knowing it was a 50 zone.

Taxes overall all are up by more than double the rate of inflation; in each year of the forward estimates that is more than double the rate of inflation. It will amount to \$1.1 billion in extra tax revenue—and the government wonders why people, particularly young people, are going interstate! That is why our share of the national population is declining, and one of the reasons our share of the national economy is declining.

Under this government our share of the national economy has gone from 6.8 per cent to 6.3 per cent. That might not sound like a huge loss, but that is a massive loss when we actually still have over 7 per cent of the population. We were not even up to par, and now we have gone backwards under this government. Our national population has declined from 7.75 per cent to 7.35 per cent. I know that my deputy here mentioned the other day his own daughters, who qualified here, but have only worked professionally interstate, because they cannot get the jobs in this state. Why? Because of the tax regime of this government.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, 100,000 jobs! If we had kept pace with the national growth, we would actually have in this state, at this time, 38,000 more jobs than we have now. What is more, given the direction we are taking, Access Economics has forecast that jobs, economics, exports and population will all grow at less than the national growth rate for the next five years. Again, it falls on deaf ears with this government. If we do not look out, we will continue to lose and lose and lose. We will lose our voice on national issues because we will be considered just such a backwater, instead of being proudly and loudly, as we once were, the third-biggest state.

In terms of the overall economy, of course, this state relied on agriculture and, particularly post-World War II, manufacturing, but, 25 years ago, in each of the sectors of mining, manufacturing, farming and fishing, we had more jobs in South Australia than we do now. I will repeat that: 25 years ago, we had more people in mining, manufacturing, farming and fishing than we do now. Hopefully, the long-term outlook for the mining and defence sectors is very good in this state, but, for nine years now, Mike Rann has been spruiking a mining boom which has never amounted to anything more than a mining exploration boom. We are still looking for it to become a reality and to start to deliver the things that we have so long been promised by this government.

Can I let you know, Madam Speaker, that in May there were only 9,500 mining jobs in South Australia. Now, in Queensland, there were 62,000 and, in Western Australia, 88,000 mining jobs. So, if you compare our rate of royalties, for instance, we have achieved, I think, something in the order of just under \$200 million in royalties from mining—

Mr Williams: 154.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, \$154 million in royalties from mining last year. Next year, Western Australia expects to get \$4,790 million in royalties.

An honourable member: Big difference.

Mrs REDMOND: A big difference. The government does not seem to understand that it is not in our best interests to over-spruik our mining and our prospects for mining. In particular, I would question the value of putting up billboards in Western Australia. What the Premier and the Treasurer should be doing is going and actually talking to the mining companies and asking, 'What is it you need?' I think they will find that what they need is power, water, infrastructure and a trained

workforce—a pool of people who can work here. Instead of discussing that with them, they think the answer is to put up a billboard in an airport in Perth.

We do not just need mining, of course, in this state but also vibrant manufacturing, agribusiness, tourism and service industries. These industries are absolutely fundamental to our state and they will remain an important part of our state. We have to build on them, not neglect them, but this government thinks that they can just concentrate on spruiking mining, which they have not managed to bring to fruition as yet. We cannot afford to have the lowest proportion of exporting businesses of any state and we cannot afford to simply put all our eggs into the mining and defence baskets, as important as they might be. We cannot do that.

The government, of course, has always asked what we would do. It is a difficult question to answer because, for a start, we simply would not be proceeding with some of the things that this government is doing. We certainly would not be putting our children's credit card debt up by entering into this new hospital which—can I remind you, Madam Speaker—when it is built, is going to start costing those children \$1.1 million a day for 30 years for the building—every day for 30 years—without a doctor or a nurse included in that price. Of course, we would not necessarily proceed with the new Adelaide Oval—another \$535 million, plus the footbridge of \$40 million, plus the car parking. So, it is likely to be \$600 million.

We will have to deal with the state's finances as we find them when we come to office, hopefully in March 2014. To illustrate just how difficult it is to predict where that might be, I have brought down a graph which indicates the changing budget forecasts that this government has given us for the coming year. So, for the coming financial year of 2011-12, back when they did the 2008-09 budget, they said that, for the next year, we were going to have a \$424 million surplus. By the Mid-Year Budget Review, they had reduced that \$424 million surplus to a \$288 million surplus. By the next year's budget, they had reduced it to a \$96 million surplus.

Then, what do you know? In 2009-10, we were coming into an election. So, it will not surprise you that we had a slight recovery. In the Mid-Year Budget Review, immediately before the election, we went from a \$96 million surplus to a \$127 million surplus. Then, of course, it tailed down again to a \$55 million surplus and, as I have already mentioned, we then went from a \$81 million surplus in the Mid-Year Budget Review in December last year to now where, as the true picture comes out, we have gone to a \$263 million deficit.

Obviously we do not control the purse strings at the moment, and we cannot afford to make big spending promises. What we can guarantee is that, if elected, we will provide concessions for those who need to keep their house cool for medical reasons. We announced that, and what do you know? The government copied us on that particular promise. We have also announced our commitment to restore funding for the community hospitals in Keith, Ardrossan, Moonta and Glenelg.

We will make other policy announcements, we will set our agenda. Although this government is so bad that it deserves to be thrown out, people generally stick to the devil they know rather than the devil they do not know, so we know that we need to come up with policies, and on this side of the house we have the benefit that quite a number of us have run our own companies or firms. We have been engaged in business, and we know what it is like to put our own house on the line, we know what it is like to try to make ends meet, not to have holidays and to work seven days a week. We know all those things. I know what it is like to have to get money out of my savings account to pay my secretary because the people who owed me money had not paid it. I know what it is like to run a small business, and that is something that is sadly lacking on the other side.

We have a commitment to the good financial governance of this state because that is what underpins everything else. Unless you have a sustainable economy you will never have a sustainable social justice agenda, you will never have a sustainable environmental agenda. We have to have a sustainable economy, and this government has demonstrated, over the last nine years, that it is completely lacking in any ability to understand—let alone manage—the finances of this state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.J. Snelling.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2011) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 June 2011.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:37): As shadow treasurer I rise to speak on the 2011-12 state budget, a budget that is one of debt, deficit, division, deals and deceit. This is not a budget designed for families but a budget that is, indeed, targeted at families. This is not a budget that helps families; this is a budget that hurts families. This is a budget that does not grow businesses; this is a budget that hinders business. This is a budget that does not pay off the credit card, but rather increases credit card spending.

It is a Labor budget. How do we know that it is a Labor budget? When taxes are increased at twice the rate of inflation, you know it is a Labor budget; when the budget is in deficit to the tune of \$253 million, you know that it is a Labor budget; when the state debt increases to \$8,200 million, you know it is a Labor budget; when state liabilities are predicted to go over \$20 billion, you know it is a Labor budget; and when there is a backdown to the unions as the only new announcement in the budget, you know it is a Labor budget.

This is the 10th Rann government budget and, after 10 years, what do we have? We have more debt, more deficit, more division, more deals and more deceit. It is a budget that does not care for families. Indeed it is a budget that costs families. South Australians will learn, through the pain of their hip pocket, that the cost of Labor is the cost of their living. The cost of doing business in South Australia is the cost of the Labor government. Families in South Australia will be around \$750 a year worse off as a result of recent announcements in the budget, and we already know that South Australia is the highest taxed state for businesses in Australia. In South Australia, a small business is \$50,000 a year worse off than a business in the Northern Territory. A business in South Australia is \$25,000 a year worse off than a business in New South Wales or Victoria. This is a budget that hurts families and small businesses.

Treasurer Snelling tried to paint himself as a family man. There was even a photo of the family in the budget. In fact, from what I could tell, the only thing in the budget for families, other than cost increases, was indeed a photo of the Treasurer's family—the happy snap budget. The reality is that the Treasurer is not the only one in this parliament with a family.

My 26 year old, who rents a property, is outraged that the First Home Owner Grant is gone and home ownership has just got that little bit harder thanks to Treasurer Snelling. My 23 year old, who is a uni student, cannot believe that his driver's licence has gone up by some 32 per cent. It is now going to cost him nearly \$400, thanks to Treasurer Snelling. My 21 year old, who is also a uni student, thinks that a 29 per cent increase in speeding fines (from \$196 to \$252) is more about revenue raising, not road safety. My 18-year-old daughter is angered that her car rego and running costs have gone up.

My wife, like other managers of households, will have to find the extra money to pay for Labor's mismanagement, no better illustrated than the 50 per cent increase in water prices this year and the 50 per cent increase in water prices again next year. My parents, who are in their late 70s and 80s, are wondering just what they have done to deserve the cost of living increases in this budget after 10 years of Labor government. So, Treasurer, you are not the only one with a family that is impacted by this particular budget.

For a budget that was pitched at the family and where all the media hype was about the family, there was virtually nothing in this budget for families, other than increased costs. Listen to talkback radio, read the letters to the editor: South Australians are angry about the cost of living, and they have every right to be. After 10 years of Labor government, the cost of living is an issue in South Australia due to the government's own incompetence and poor management.

What the Treasurer was trying to say to South Australians was that somehow he was different from Kevin Foley (the former treasurer), that he was the family man. That, of course, is an insult to former treasurer Foley who himself is an avid family man. The Treasurer wanted to paint himself as something different because something had to be different in the budget, because the budget strategy and the policies were exactly the same. Everything in the budget—the policies, the announcements—were essentially a re-run of last year's budget. Something had to be different: it was the picture of the family in the budget. But make no mistake, the policies are the same under Jack Snelling or Kevin Foley. Treasurer Snelling is simply treasurer Foley without the nightclub. The reality is that the policy settings are the same—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It is the policies that hurt families, member for Torrens, and it is not the policies that are changing. There are a few things that have changed in the last nine months. You might remember that the Premier said, 'We're going to go out and listen after the election.

We're going to go out and listen and we're going to reconnect with the community. We are going to listen.' What changed? Only two things changed: the Deputy Premier changed and the Treasurer changed—they sacked those two. They went out and listened, and they sacked the Treasurer, effectively gave him the big push. If you believe the member for Mawson, they are not listening enough, because he wants the Premier sacked as well, but we will come to that in a minute.

The reality is that the budget settings in this budget are essentially a photocopy of Kevin Foley's with a family picture attached; that is the reality of it. There have only been four small changes since the budget of nine months ago, other than the change of treasurer. The Parks Community Centre: the decision was overturned—not by Treasurer Snelling but by treasurer Foley. There was a small Treasury saving. In fact, I must congratulate Treasury: it was the quickest give up of a saving measure in history. I think it lasted six weeks. There were some higher education changes. They were all made under treasurer Foley. The one change under Treasurer Snelling was the Public Service annual leave. Only that was changed in this budget. Virtually every other policy setting that Kevin Foley set nine months ago in that budget holds. They have changed the treasurer; they have not changed their policy.

On the idea that putting a family picture in the budget would somehow be different, I will make the point to the house that it is not the family favourite photo in the budget that hurts families, it is actually the policy setting in the budget that hurts families. Where have the policies got us? They have more debt, more deficit, more division, more deals and more deceit.

Let's talk about the debt. Last year the debt was projected to peak at around \$7,500 million over the forward estimates. This year the debt is projected to peak at \$8,200 million over the forward estimates. This increase in debt is after we sell all of our forests in the South-East. Kevin Foley told us in October last year:

An amount for the sale of the rotations is in the forward estimates. It is in 2011-12...What we are doing is selling forward the timber rotations to maximise a lump sum payment by which we can reduce debt.

The government has announced the selling of the forest. They have also announced the selling of the Lotteries Commission. If last year's announcement of the debt level at \$7,500 million already allowed for the debt reduction from the sale of the forests, it is fair to assume the announcement of \$8,200 million debt this year also includes the reduction from the sale of the Lotteries Commission. In essence, South Australia is selling well over \$1 billion worth of assets over the course of this budget forward estimates period, and we are still left with the debt increasing to \$8,200 million.

In this budget, the forward estimates show that the state liabilities will exceed \$20 billion. This \$20 billion figure does not include the unfunded WorkCover liability of around \$900 million, or indeed the liability that attaches to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. The total liability, according to this budget, will have more than doubled from \$9 billion in 2007 to over \$20 billion in 2014. It would have doubled in seven years.

When the Treasurer goes out and talks about debts and liabilities, this is where the first element of deceit comes into this particular budget. It is one of the great deceits that the Treasurer goes out and talks about a debt figure that is not the whole-of-government debt figure. He conveniently forgets (or deliberately forgets) to include the whole-of-government debt figure which includes all of the trading enterprises—for instance, SA Water.

When he talks about a debt level less than \$8.2 billion, he is conveniently forgetting the desalination plant debt. I say to the Treasurer that the public are not going to forget the desalination debt; the long-suffering taxpayers will not forget it. Every time the South Australians are there having a bath, 'Bubbles Snelling' and the 'Rubber Ducky of Desal Debt' will be there with them because it is going to cost them the earth. Water prices are going through the roof and it is hurting ordinary everyday South Australians. Why the Treasurer runs around refusing to use a figure that does not include the desalination debt is for him to explain, but the reality is that South Australia knows that the desalination project was bungled, has blown out in costs, and we are going to pay dearly for it through our water price increases over a very long time.

Let's talk about the deficit. The Leader of the Opposition in her excellent address talks, quite rightly, about every Liberal government in Australia running budget surpluses and every Labor government running budget deficits. They have all gone through the same global financial crisis and they have all gone through the claimed GST reduction, although I note (looking at the Mid-Year Budget Review) that over the next three years GST revenues actually go up by \$52 million and do not decrease.

All the states have gone through the same economic turmoil that they are claiming, but it is the Labor governments that are running deficits and it is the Liberal governments that are running surpluses; it is something in the DNA. Let me repeat the Treasurer's own words in his budget speech:

All of us know the dangers of borrowing to finance your day-to-day expenses—sooner rather than later those credit card bills catch up with you...to take on debt merely to pay for the running costs of government is tantamount to stealing from our children. It obliges them to pay tomorrow what we can't or won't pay today.

Really! Next year the government is predicting a \$263 million deficit. I mentioned \$253 million earlier; it is a \$263 million deficit. Go back over the last four years from that point: in 2008-09 there was a deficit of \$233 million, in 2010-11 a deficit of \$427 million and in 2011-12 a deficit of \$263 million. So, three out of the last four years going back from the 2011-12 year have delivered deficits—in fact, \$736 million worth of deficit going onto the government credit card—by the Treasurer's own definition of operating expenses.

So do not come in here saying in your budget speech that the government is not going to leave credit card debt for future generations to pay; they have put three-quarters of a billion dollars of credit card debt onto the debt due to their own mismanagement—not over one year, not over two years, but over three of the last four years. As the leader quite rightly points out—surprise, surprise—the one year that they orchestrated a surplus happened to be the state election year. Forgive the public for being cynical about the budget management of this government, but \$736 million has gone on credit card debt onto the state debt, helping lift it up to that \$8,200 million figure.

Let's put that in context. The state budget shows the transfer of assets for assets that regenerate. There is a line that is called, 'The regeneration of assets', so it is a value line. The only assets we can work out that actually regenerate themselves are the forestry assets. If you look in the budget this year, the budget figures show there is a \$682 million reduction in assets through the sale of the forests. So, we have spent \$736 million on the credit card running up government operating costs and now, as a result, to help pay for Adelaide Oval and other infrastructure measures, the government is going to transfer \$682 million of assets off its books.

I think it is a fair assessment if I put it as simply as this: if Jack's family had controlled the use of their credit card they would not have had to sell the income-producing family forest that had been in the family for generations. I think it is pretty clear that if they had properly managed their finances they would not have had to do it.

Of course, the government was warned—not only by the Auditor-General and the opposition—it was warned by minister O'Brien who, at a public meeting in Mount Gambier, had these words to say:

We are actually having to borrow to pay wages. Now that is unsustainable in the long term. We are in a position as a government if we were being financed by the banks, they would pull the overdraft on us because we are currently, year on year, operating in the red, and that is borrowing.

It is interesting to note that in the last four years the only budget to return to surplus was the election year budget. I note that in this current budget the government predicts it will go from a \$263 million deficit this year and—surprise, surprise—in the election year a \$655 million surplus suddenly appears ready for the next election, but I will come to that in a minute.

When governments run deficit budgets and they increase debt, borrowing costs also rise. When borrowing costs also rise, budget flexibility becomes an issue. With no budget flexibility, tax increases and budget cuts become the order of the day. The Treasurer (High Tax Jack as he is known in the community) is planning to tax families and businesses an extra \$1.1 billion over the next four years—\$1.1 billion in extra taxation over the next four years; that is taxation at twice the rate of inflation. In this budget, designed for families, High Tax Jack is putting up motor vehicle registrations by 4.3 per cent; compulsory third-party insurance up by 2.7 per cent; a 10-year driver's licence renewal up by 32 per cent; public transport multitrrips up by 3 per cent; speeding fines up by just under 29 per cent; water bills up 50 per cent and a rock solid promise they will put them up 50 per cent again next year; sewerage bills up by 12 per cent; Emergency Services Levy up by 2.7 per cent; the NRM levy up by 6 per cent; and the Save the River Murray Levy up by 3.6 per cent. As I said earlier, the cost of Labor is your cost of living.

The Treasurer's real challenge, of course, is to control expenses, something this government has been terrible at for the last nine years. As previous treasurer Foley admitted in estimates last year:

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

I make the point that the Treasurer has predicted a \$655 million surplus at the next election year. Out of that \$655 million going forward for the next four years after the election (or whatever that surplus ends up) has to come the \$397 million a year average payment for the Royal Adelaide Hospital—it becomes an operational payment.

So \$655 million sounds like a large figure—it is almost as much as they have put on the credit card over the last three years—but out of that figure has to come the payment for the Royal Adelaide Hospital. So the budget is going to be tight even at that point because the government has not been able to control its expenses over nine years. The big question for this government is: having not controlled your expenses over nine years, will you be able to control your expenses in years 10, 11 and 12? That is the real test of this budget.

This budget delivers more division for the government. This government is bitter and divided. The government hopefuls of the right faction are being undermined by the no-hopers of the left faction. Just as Treasurer Snelling is out trying to sell his budget, the member for Mawson decides to deliberately undermine the Treasurer, deliberately undermine the Deputy Premier, and deliberately undermine his Premier for his factional colleagues and leadership hopeful, the member for Cheltenham. In a planned attack, the member for Mawson gave media interviews to undermine Treasurer Snelling's budget a week after the budget was put out.

One week after the budget was put out, why did the member for Mawson pick that particular timing? It was to undermine Treasurer Snelling, a leadership rival of the member for Cheltenham, to undermine his media message. That is what it was all about. Let us make no mistake, it was a deliberate planned attack. The member for Mawson went out and said that no-one was listening: they are not listening to the government. Just in case they did not hear it, he went out and did not one interview, not two interviews, not three interviews but four interviews. He went out and said, 'People aren't listening. Listen, listen, listen. People aren't listening. You've got to listen to me. We have to get rid of Mr Rann.'

Why would the member for Mawson do that a week after Treasurer Snelling (leadership hopeful and rival of the member for Cheltenham) other than to undermine Treasurer Snelling and the Premier? This government is bitter and divided; there is no doubt about that. The member for Mawson will have to explain his actions to his colleagues as to why he seeks to undermine Treasurer Snelling, the great hope of the right faction.

Let's not forget what treasurer Foley told us last year. Treasurer Foley told us last year time and time again, 'Hey, don't blame treasurer Foley for this budget. My good friend the member for Cheltenham helped me draft it.' Time and time again in question time, when criticism came from the union movement and criticism came from the left wing of the Labor Party, Kevin Foley would point to his right and say, 'There's the guy that helped me draft it, the member for Cheltenham, the great hope for the left wing of the party to take over the leadership.'

So, let's not have any crocodile tears from the left wing of the Labor Party that somehow this budget, or last year's budget, is simply the doing of the right wing of the Labor Party. The reality is that Jay Weatherill sat there during the budget and helped design the cuts to the Public Service, helped design the cuts to entitlements and helped design the tax increases that are going to hurt South Australians, and Kevin Foley made it crystal clear to everyone that that was exactly what happened last year.

Members of the right wing are reported in the media as having called the member for Cheltenham a coward. Having helped design the budget last year, the member for Cheltenham is now trying to peddle himself to the voters as a softer option. He undermined the government, of course, on the WorkCover changes, and he has undermined them this budget in relation to the entitlement cuts.

The great tragedy is that Premier Rann's leadership is now insipid. He is insipid. He will not sack the member for Mawson for what has been a clear breach of party solidarity and a direct attack on his leadership. Could you imagine Premier Rann not sacking his parliamentary secretary for health in the first term of the government? Could you imagine the parliamentary secretary for health sitting there in the first term of government making those particular comments? Premier Rann would have had the strength and confidence in his position to sack the parliamentary secretary.

However, the great tragedy of this budget is that we are not quite sure who is going to end up delivering it next year. Is it going to be Premier Rann? Is it going to be Treasurer Snelling in a new role, Deputy Premier Rau in a new role, or the great white hope from Cheltenham in a new role? We simply do not know who will be delivering this document next year.

Labor Party leadership is paralysed; it does not know what to do. Mike Rann does not want to sack the parliamentary secretary because he is not sure of the ramifications internally. Mike Rann does not want to step down. He is on the longest lap of honour since Cliff Young ran from Sydney to Melbourne. He is on the longest lap of honour. Mike Rann is trying to hold on so that he can put on his CV that he got a record. Do we really have to hold the South Australian public to ransom just so that Premier Rann can get a record of being the longest serving Labor Premier?

I have a message for the Labor MPs: the Rann government and this budget are hurting South Australians. They are not interested in the Premier's long service record; they are more interested in their cost of living. The great tragedy, of course, is that the member for Cheltenham keeps running around not talking about the leadership by giving media interviews, saying, 'I'm going to talk about leadership but, of course, if a vacancy occurs I'm going to stand.' We all know what that is doing. He may as well go to the minister for mining and get a mining licence, because he is undermining the Premier as quick as he can go, and the real tragedy is that the Premier's leadership is now insipid. The Premier will not act on the issue.

The other issue in this budget is the deals. In an act of desperation, when Kevin Foley was not in cabinet (a snubbed former treasurer Foley), Treasurer Snelling caved in to the unions and reinstated the annual leave loading for the public sector. Treasurer Snelling said it was about Christmas presents under the tree. Treasurer, give me a break! You have been in parliament since you were 24. Are you saying that it did not occur to you or anyone else in cabinet who had been there for ever and a day that by cutting the 17½ per cent loading it was not going to have an impact on families? Give me a break.

The cutting of annual leave for Public Service last year was agreed by cabinet; it was signed off. It was no accident; it was deliberate, you meant to do it. The reality is it was not about Christmas presents under the tree this year. The reality is that it was a backdown to the unions and nothing more. While we are on Christmas presents under the tree, how do you think a \$750 extra cost to every family in the state is going to play out for your Christmas present under the tree scenario that you talk about for the Public Service?

It was interesting, of all the protests since the election—and there have been more protests on North Terrace than cars this year—which one have they taken note of? Did they listen to the people from the Keith hospital? No. Did they listen to the people from the other community hospitals: Ardrossan, Moonta, Blackwood? Did they listen to the people about Ward 4G? Did they listen to the people about the parent helpline? Did they listen to the people from the South-East about forestry?

The one group they listened to was the unions. Of all the protest groups the government listened to, it was the unions. The government could not find, in a \$16 billion budget, \$360,000 for the Keith hospital, but it could find \$22 million a year to reinstate annual leave. I make the point that I do not think that \$360,000 out of a \$16 billion budget is a big issue for the government. It says something about this government's philosophy.

Earlier, I mentioned deceit. One of the great deceits in this budget is the no privatisation promise. Poor old Mike Rann, as Premier, what does he stand for anymore? In 2002, he put out the pledge card saying that there would be no more privatisations. We on this side of the house now call it the hedge card because he is hedging his bets both ways. He promised that there would be no more privatisation.

When the public transport tender was up for renegotiation there was a vote in this house, and the Premier voted for privatisation. When the SA Water contract was up for renegotiation, the cabinet, led by the Premier, re-signed the private enterprise to run the water contract. That raises a very interesting question. The Premier ran around for about five years saying, 'It's outrageous. They've sold all the SA Water assets.' If they had sold all of the SA Water assets how did the Premier then renegotiate for the private sector to continue to manage them? It puts a lie to the Premier's argument of years gone past.

We now have the privatisation of the Lotteries Commission. The government is saying, 'It's not a privatisation. We are still going to own the asset; we are just going to lease it out.' It is going from public sector management to private sector management and, by the Premier's own words, it

is the same model used for SA Water, so if that is a privatisation then, by the Premier's own words, this is a privatisation.

The interesting thing about the Lotteries Commission is: how is it that this business has suddenly become a risky business only since Treasurer Snelling took over? In the crisis budget last year, when they were selling everything that was not nailed down, including the forests, even Kevin Foley did not sell SA Lotteries. Treasurer Snelling takes over on 8 February of this year and all of a sudden the Lotteries Commission is a risky business. It has been run perfectly well for decades (40 years) then all of a sudden it is a risky business. On this side of the house, we want to explore exactly what this supposed risk is.

The other deceit relates to the hospital. We know that before the election the government went out time and time again saying, 'It is a \$1.7 billion hospital.' We now know that it is more like a \$2.8 billion hospital. I understand that about \$2.8 billion will come onto the debt figure after the next election, which gives a clear indication of what sort of cost there will be to the taxpayer.

Recently, I was explaining to my daughter, who is 18, when discussing the budget, that when she is older than me she will still be paying \$1.1 million a day for the hospital. So, when the Treasurer says that he does not want to rack up a credit card debt, I do not understand what the difference is, in the sense that he is racking up a liability for the family to take on.

When the Treasurer talks about debts on family homes in the budget, what he forgets to mention is that dad has gone down the road and leased another house for 35 years, for which the kids are obligated to pay, and they will have to pay \$1.1 million a day for that 35 years on the other house that they cannot get out of. So, he talks about a debt on one house, but he forgets on the other hand that they have taken on this other obligation. It is a deceptive argument. The other obligation in this case is a \$12 billion cost over the contract term of 30 years—a \$12 billion commitment.

I will finish with one last point. We on this side of the house are very proud of our support of small business and our background in small business. However, it was interesting to note that in Jack Snelling's first budget as Treasurer he could not utter the words in the budget speech 'small business'. He could not get there. It would be the first time, I would suspect, in many a day, that a state Treasurer has given a budget speech without actually mentioning the words 'small business'.

In this state there are about 100,000 small businesses and we are, indeed, a small business community. How a Treasurer cannot mention small business in his budget speech is beyond me. Of course, Labor's small business policy is very simple: you take a big business and tax it, and that will turn it into a small business.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You are going to tax them to pay for the Easling royal commission.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: If the former attorney wants to give me an Easling royal commission, I am happy to have the taxes pay for it. They also pay for defamation cases, former attorney.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Or pay for sexual harassment in electorate offices.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Really?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Croydon, order! Take your seat, please, member for Davenport. Member for Croydon—

Mr Pederick: You're going to cop it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: 'You're going to cop it.' This isn't a school, despite what you think. Member for Croydon, take it easy.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. The lack of mention of small business in the budget is in this context: in the South Australian economy we had the largest fall in business confidence in May 2011, we had the largest fall in housing finance commitments in the last 12 months, the highest youth unemployment rate of all states, the largest fall in job ads of all states in the last 12 months, the lowest proportion of exporting businesses of all states, the largest fall in quarterly business investment in all states and the worst quarterly performance in state final demand. We are also, of course, the highest taxing state in Australia.

It is staggering that the budget was silent on small business and had nothing for them, particularly when you look at the predicted economic settings going forward of lower economic growth, lower population growth and lower employment growth. It is small business that drives the economy and it is small business that has largely been ignored.

There are two clouds on the horizon, other than those I have mentioned. The first is the carbon tax. There is no impact of carbon tax in this budget. They will have to wait to see the colour of the eyes of the federal parliament in relation to that. The other issue is the GST review, which is being undertaken by the federal government, for which this Treasurer says we have nothing to fear. We will have to see the outcomes of those two issues to work out the budget impact going forward.

This budget is not about families and is not helpful to families; it hurts families. It delivers more debt, more deficit, more division, and more deals and deceit. It is a Labor budget and it hurts families.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:14): In speaking today, I wanted to concentrate my efforts—after the sterling speech that I enjoyed from the member for Davenport, my colleague and the shadow treasurer, who spoke very broadly about all things that are wrong with this budget—on the areas that I am responsible for, that is, education, training and employment. Before I do that, I mention some of the references the member for Davenport raised, in particular, the fact that the debt does not include the desalination plant—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, point of order! Excuse me, member for Unley; if you could take your seat. Member for Torrens.

Mrs GERAGHTY: We are currently dealing with the Statutes Amendment (Budget 2011) Bill, and you must speak strictly to the bill. This is not the Appropriation Bill. You must stick strictly to the bill in this debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is relevance.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I think that you might need to explain to the house. There is some confusion as to the process. This side of the house wishes to respond to the budget as in the Address in Reply. You might need to get that bill before the house, whichever is the appropriate one.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If the Treasurer speaks he closes the debate, the debate being, I might add, the Statutes Amendment (Budget 2011) Bill.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (12:17): I thank the member for Davenport for his remarks, and I look forward to the committee stage of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

The CHAIR: Member for Davenport, are you the speaker on this debate, and what is your area of interest? Is it clause 18?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We can do part 2, the amendment to the First Home Owner Grant. I want to ask some questions generally about the First Home Owner Grant. Clause 4 is the start of the First Home Owner Grant section.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I wonder what consultation the minister had with the HIA and the MBA about the abolition of the grant and what, if any, economic modelling was done as to the impact on likely take-up of new home starts.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I did not have any direct consultation with them on this measure. I have spoken to the HIA previously but I had not foreshadowed taking this measure and removing this bonus. It is important to remember, to make a distinction, that the first home owners grant still exists. That is the \$7,000 grant that is provided to all first home owners regardless of whether they are buying an existing home or building a new home, and I think it is under a certain value. It is anything under \$575,000. So this is simply the bonus.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes, that is our money but it is part of the agreement we have with the commonwealth as a result of the GST. So that remains in place. This is simply the bonus. The bonus, I think for some years, had been \$4,000 and was available for all first home owners. As one of last year's budget measures to remove it, it was only for new builds but it would be increased for new builds to \$8,000. That provided a significant saving to the budget. I cannot remember exactly how much it was, but it was a significant saving.

The bonus will be phased out but will remain in place at \$8,000 for the next 12 months. So, you will still get your \$7,000, plus you will get the \$8,000 for the next 12 months; at 1 July next year you will still get the \$7,000 but you will only get \$4,000 for 12 months; and then, as from 1 July 2013, you will only get the \$7,000 grant. In terms of consultation, I have certainly met and spoken with Robert Harding in the HIA but I have not specifically foreshadowed to him this measure.

Was there any economic modelling done? There was none specifically, but I think the evidence that this does anything for housing affordability is, at best, mixed. I think, with regard to the budget, there are better things that we can do to increase housing affordability than spend \$20 million every year for first home buyers of newly constructed homes.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Do you have any idea of how many people had taken up the grant per year? How many people will now miss out as a result?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We anticipate that, and what we have budgeted for, is about 1,400 people will take it up in the 2011-12 financial year. When we made this decision I had a look at how many people took it up. I do not have the exact figure in front of me but it was roughly the 1,000 to 1,200 mark, from memory, but in terms of what we have budgeted for in the 2011-12 financial year, it is about 1,400 people.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Chair, on a point of order on a process question, my recollection—and I might be wrong—is that the house always used to do the budget debate first, then, having passed the budget debate, we debate the legislation that attaches to the budget. In this process we are passing the legislation that attaches to the budget and then we are going to debate whether or not we like the budget. It seems to me to be the reverse order. Surely, the house has to pass the budget first before we can debate the legislation that attaches to the budget.

The CHAIR: You have a longer corporate memory than I do in this matter. Bear with me while I consult with the Clerk.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am not fussed. If you want to deal with the Appropriation Bill first, it makes absolutely no difference to me; I do not really care when we debate this. As I understand it, in discussions between the leader of the house and the opposition, this was agreed by the parties. In terms of process, I do not think there is anything to prevent us from dealing with the budget bill. They are separate bills; they stand on their own. It was certainly my understanding that we were going to deal with the budget bill first and that that is what had been agreed between the government and the opposition.

My only concern about not proceeding with it is that, because the budget bill deals with so many different areas, a number of public servants have been dragged from their office down to the house so that I can answer the opposition's questions on various parts of the budget bill, and it would be a bit inconvenient if we have to send them all back and then bring them all back later in the week. Certainly, my understanding was that this is what had been agreed to between the government and the opposition, through discussions with the office of the leader of the house.

The CHAIR: From the advice given to me by the clerks, this is not unorthodox or, indeed, impermissible. The clerks have made it very clear that, in terms of process and what is permissible and right, it can be either way round.

Ms CHAPMAN: Madam Chair, can I seek some clarification on that? As I understand it, the advice you have received is that it is permissible. There is no question that any bill can be dealt with in the order the parliament might determine. I have been here for only a short time, and I have never known a situation where we have passed legislation to implement the measures that have been announced in the budget prior to our completing the Appropriation Bill.

I have been here for only nine years; it may be that there is some other precedent for it. It seems rather peculiar that we would not deal with the Appropriation Bill and that each member in this house and in the other place would have an opportunity to speak on it. It may be that, at the end of that, the government or the treasurer of the day, with his cabinet, would reconsider whether

they might even progress some announcements or any part of the legislation foreshadowed in the budget amendments, which is the second bill scheduled.

What you will see on the schedule is that both bills are listed each day. My understanding was certainly that we would be speaking to them together and that issues would be raised. In fact, this morning, our lead speaker (the Leader of the Opposition) addressed one of the issues, namely, the reform in relation to the police costs aspect, and then she traversed all of the issues in the Appropriation Bill, as she would normally do in relation to the budget—an excellent submission, I might suggest.

What I would say is that this is being raised in this instance because, as the member for Unley was about to speak, it was then announced that he could canvass issues only under the reform legislation because, as the whip pointed out, we were then dealing with the Statutes Amendment (Budget 2011) Bill. Either we are dealing with these either concurrently or we are not. If the government insists that we deal with the legislation that is to implement the budget first, so be it, but it is not with our concurrence.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I do have a point of order. I have already provided the Opposition Whip with a copy of an email that went from the Leader of Government Business's office to the Opposition Whip where it showed that we were dealing with the budget bill first and then the Appropriation Bill. They would be dealt with in that order. Then there was a follow-up phone call to the Opposition Whip's office agreeing that that would be how it was: budget first, then appropriation. Indeed, certainly from a discussion I had with him, the member for Davenport was aware that that was the order it was going to be dealt with.

I am not sure how it has ended up on the paper in this order, and my understanding is also that the same information that went to the Opposition Whip also came to me to show me the order and also went to the clerks. I am just asking for more copies of those emails because I have already provided a copy of that. That was the order we were dealing with them: budget bill and then appropriation. Indeed, as I said, from my discussion with the member for Davenport, he was aware of that.

The CHAIR: I point out that there was nothing in terms of process to stop these bills being debated in the way that they were. I understand that there has been agreement between the Leader of Government Business, the Government Whip, the Leader of the Opposition's office and the Opposition Whip that it would progress in this way. If certain parties wish to change that suddenly on the floor, so be it. The Treasurer is being extremely accommodating in agreeing to let that occur.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In checking with the Leader of the Government's office, my advice is that the order in which business was being conducted was certainly made clear to the opposition. Nonetheless, so as to make things move as smoothly and as quickly as possible, I move:

That progress be reported.

The CHAIR: Thank you very much, Treasurer. I think that is extremely accommodating of you.

Motion carried.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:34): It is lovely to be back here once again. In the previous debate, my colleague the member for Davenport, the shadow treasurer, spoke on a broad range of issues as to why this is a Labor budget, high in debt, high in taxes, high in deceit. His description of the off balance-book debt, such as the desal plant and the hospital, reminded me very much of a story back in the days when I was an employer.

I had a very talented young cabinet-maker working for me who we were paying well above award wages. He said, 'Well, I just can't live on the salary that you are paying me. I need a pay rise.' I said, 'Let's sit down and do your budget; let's see where your money is going.' So, we ran through rent, electricity, food, entertainment and all those other bills. Then we got to petrol and he said, 'Petrol does not cost anything because I put that on the credit card.'

When the member for Davenport reminded this house that the desalination plant and the hospital commitments are not included in the \$8.2 billion debt, it reminded me of that story, that, 'No, don't worry about the petrol, I don't pay for that, that goes on the credit card.' I think that is exactly the attitude that this government has to the budget. We have seen debt increase year after year after year under this budget. We are now heading to a stage, once the hospital kicks in, where there will be over \$3 million a day that will be spent on debt and other finance commitments.

If we look at just what is in this budget for education—and, remember, it was the member for Ramsay, as the leader of the opposition, who said that he wanted to be the 'education premier'. We had a 30-minute budget speech from the Treasurer, and we had about three minutes that related to education in that budget, and it was to boast of a school electricity cost in the budget implementations section of the budget; \$16.59 million, or just over \$3 million a year from this year onwards.

To understand how disingenuous that promise was as a new spending initiative, you have to go back to 2008. I have some media here from *The Advertiser* of 8 July 2008, where it is reported that the South Australian Secondary Schools Association principal, Jim Davis, said:

The rise in electricity bills and the loss of up to \$18 million in bank interest because of the state government's decision to keep the interest for its coffers would have an impact on school budgets. According to the South Australian strategic plan, all state government agencies are required to meet a target of 25 per cent reduction of all electricity usage based on 2000-2001 payments.

So, this was the great 'green plan' of the Premier, Mike Rann: let's be green, let's reduce the amount of electricity that schools can use by 25 per cent in 2008, of what they used in 2001. Of course, it was not long before we saw schools struggling to manage their budgets with such a dramatic cut and no offsets.

The minister of the time, the Premier and the cabinet suggested, 'Don't worry about those cuts in your budget, because we are going to give you \$3 million in green grants that will help you with the solar schools program,' and, of course, wind turbines on schools were going to generate electricity as well. Then in October of that same year in a Public Works hearing we found out about an extension to the Victor Harbor High School, where the wind turbines simply did not work. Wind turbines were planned to go into the school but they were not going ahead.

It was not long before that Public Works hearing that we heard that the Premier, Mike Rann say that the turbines would be monitored for a 12-month period—these are the ones on the various buildings around the place. He told *The Advertiser* that they did not know how much electricity was being generated from the project. Then, of course, Mr John Chadwick, the department of education's infrastructure director, told the committee that turbines would not be installed in the new capital works program—despite the promise and the cuts to electricity prices to counter that—because there was a problem with the contract, and they weren't available. He went on to say:

I understand a government contract has not come through and, of course, plans across the whole of government had collapsed for the wind turbine programs.

So, the justification for the cuts in electricity was, 'Don't worry about it—solar panels, wind turbines on schools and green grants will be able to make up the difference.' Just a few months later, we work out that the wind turbines do not work, and we were also told in that same Public Works Committee meeting that the solar panels were purely for demonstration. As a matter of fact, if the wind turbines did work, you would actually need a sunny, windy day to generate enough electricity for a single computer. Yet that was the justification for the government cutting \$18 million out of the budget in 2008 for electricity and removing the interest that schools gained on their accounts as they were forward planning and managing projects, whether they were maintenance projects or whether they were education projects in their schools.

Then we had this good news announcement this year—this came out before the budget, because it was good news—that there is about \$3 million a year for electricity in school budgets. We need to go back to a media story in *The Advertiser* on 22 June 2009, where figures for five government schools showed they were more than quarter of a million out of pocket because of the cuts to electricity funding in the previous year. Urrbrae Agricultural High School, which is basically a working farm, an industry, was \$124,500 out of pocket; and other schools ranged from \$15,000 to \$33,000.

I was on the governing council of Unley High School, and it was \$26,000 in deficit, which equated to \$26 for every child at the school, in order to pay that missing electricity money. Here we see this as being a new initiative, but what it is is an acknowledgement of a mistake that was made.

The government simply could not take the pain of it any longer and so we saw that money being put back in the budget.

To really see the impact the budget has had on education, we need to go back to last year's budget, which was only nine months ago, where we saw cuts to the adult re-entry program, saving \$20.3 million over three years. There is still enormous confusion as to just what products are available to students at the adult re-entry schools throughout South Australia. We saw cuts to the basic skills tests grants. These are state government grants that were there to help kids who were struggling with the NAPLAN testing, and the excuse given there was, 'Don't worry about it because there is federal money coming,' but guess what: in the last federal budget that federal money was cut as well.

That is a shame for South Australia, because in last year's NAPLAN testing we saw South Australian schools failing to meet the national average in 19 out of 20 categories, and years 5, 7 and 9 had the worst performance in numeracy of all mainland states. So we need that resource; we need that money, but this cruel government has mismanaged our budget for the last nine years. It said it has made the tough decisions to correct its mistakes; it has cut basic skills testing grants for schools in last year's budget.

We saw bus services in regional areas cut in last year's budget. We saw money supposedly saved by amalgamating schools, and then we saw outcry in schools right across the state, whether in the member for Goyder's electorate or in the seat of Florey with Modbury High School, which put up a very good fight and so far believes it has prevented the amalgamation of Modbury South Primary School and Modbury High School.

A very important point was made by Julie Caust, the chair of the governing council there, that in that area, where there are super schools all around as the only other choice, it is the only traditional high school left for parents, and its enrolments are increasing because of that. She ran a very strong campaign, and I congratulate her, but she is still waiting for confirmation in writing that that school will not be forced to amalgamate. I notice that money has been brought forward for school amalgamations in this budget.

Despite the fact that a lengthy process was put in place in the legislation by this government back in 1998 to ensure that there is an inclusive process and that schools agree to the amalgamations, we are seeing more money being brought forward in the budget to fast-track that process. So, we are seeing more desperate measures from a desperate government.

We go back to the measures that affect this year's budget that were announced last year. The green schools grants: as I mentioned earlier, there is \$4 million being saved. There are multi and dual-campus savings through there and that, of course, affects my colleague, the member for Morialta, with the Norwood Morialta High School losing hundreds of thousands of dollars towards leadership in their two campuses.

New arrival support in schools: at a time when we are seeing increases in new arrivals into South Australia, we are actually seeing \$1.9 million of cuts to the budget over the forward estimates. They start kicking in in this 2011-12 budget year. New arrival transport services: you would think that the first thing you would want to do when new arrivals come to South Australia is engage them in the community as quickly as possible so that they have the confidence to learn and become members of our community at a very early rate. Here we see \$5.4 million being cut from that program.

The out-of-school-hours care program: there will be more costs for parents because, of course, if we are seeing less government money in those projects, we will actually be seeing more money coming from parents. We know that these programs cost money to run. The money comes from two areas in the school system: it comes from the government or it comes from parents. It is interesting that this budget announces that more than \$25 million will be collected in extra school fees over the forward estimates—an extra \$25 million from parents in school fees.

The DECS annual report also identifies that we are still seeing increases in students going to non-government schools. You have to ask yourself why that is happening. We would argue it is because parents want to have a say in their children's education. They want to be involved in their children's education. They want autonomy for their governing councils, they want autonomy for their principals and, under this government, we are going backwards. We are going backwards with school autonomy. It is harder for principals now to even form a committee to move a teacher from one classroom to another or to designate that classroom for a different use with their personal advisory committees that come into play this year. It is even harder for principals to manage the

very small amount of discretionary income that they have in their resource entitlement statements for the benefit of the school.

We saw policy development funding support cease for very important programs such as drug education in schools, health food guidelines and responsible gambling programs. So, here we have a situation where the health minister goes to France, spends tens of thousands of dollars flying to France and travelling in luxurious trains and meets up with the designer of the French EPODE program—which they have renamed OPAL here in South Australia—who happens to be a director of an advertising company whose major clients include Coca-Cola, McDonald's, Nestlé and others. The minister brings a program back to South Australia at a cost of \$22 million, of which they are going to spend \$4 million evaluating. We were told, in a briefing that we had with Dr Borys and the health minister, that the program works, yet we are spending \$4 million evaluating it here in South Australia—20 per cent of the cost of that program—after we see in the budget that there have been cuts in the education budget to support these particular programs.

Then, of course, we see, with preventative maintenance programs, that they are not going to really attend to school maintenance until the buildings are virtually falling down. The rental assistance program: we struggle to get experienced teachers, in particular, into our rural and regional areas, yet we are seeing it is going to be even harder to attract those teachers because they are saving \$3.8 million through rental assistance programs being taken out of the education budget.

Security grants: here we have a situation where, almost monthly, particularly during school holidays, you will see vandalism occurring in our public schools, yet we are saving \$2 million in school budgets by skimping on security. Of course, more money is pulled out of small schools and there are more cuts in teacher professional development programs. We have an advertising campaign telling everyone what a wonderful profession teaching is, yet the minister does not recognise that in real terms because he is saying, 'We are not going to help you develop your skills further for the benefit of the students you are teaching in schools.' I think there are some real issues for education in this budget. It is a long way from an education budget, and, as my colleague the member for Davenport said, it is not a family budget. There are more costs being pushed onto families who are sending kids to school.

Getting beyond the school process and into TAFE, you will see that the budget is collecting an extra \$57 million in fees over the forward estimates. I am very concerned about the budget meeting its targets, because the budget figures also tell us that there 30 extra people working in the minister for further education's department this year than there was last year, despite the fact that the government had earmarked savings of several hundred people who would be offered voluntary separation packages. We know that it is a very top heavy department and has been poorly managed for a very long time.

The budget figures show that it is struggling to manage its budget, with increases in TAFE fees, and we are seeing increases in staff at a time when all other offices have been told to shed staff. The government announced 3,750 voluntary separation packages for last year and this year added another 400 of those packages, yet the man who is to implement those savings has actually had a growth in his further education and employment department.

This is not good news for South Australians. This is a budget that has resulted from nine years of excesses, nine years of budgets that have been saved only by windfall surpluses. The government has not been able to keep its spending within budget in any previous budget; as soon as the money comes in, it is out spending it. What we are seeing now is a government saying, 'We have to make some tough decisions for tough times.' Every other state in Australia is in the same tough times, but for some reason South Australia has the highest unemployment on the mainland, the highest youth unemployment.

Youth unemployment has been at very high levels for a very long time. Only 40 per cent of our apprentices are completing their trades, yet we have a huge skills shortage in this state. I was up at Nyrstar on Friday and they were very concerned there about two things, the carbon tax and skills shortages. However, if the carbon tax is introduced, I do not think they will have a skills shortage because there will not be jobs for the people they are planning to utilise in their Port Pirie smelter. This is a bad budget for education, a bad budget for TAFE and further education, and, as the member for Davenport explained, it is a bad budget for small business, the major employer in this state.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:53): Today I speak on the Appropriation Bill 2011 and in anticipation of the Statutes Amendment (Budget 2011) Bill in which there are amendments to legislation to ultimately facilitate the announcement of the Hon. Jack Snelling 10 days ago in the budget. I indicate that I will address the some \$1.5 billion allocation in this budget—out of a \$16,000 million budget—for the provision of services under the Department for Families and Communities. This is a department responsible for the protection of children, for services to the disabled, for the provision of juvenile justice facilities and, substantially, for services to the aged.

I wish to thank all of the parents, husbands, wives, partners, carers and guardians in this state who provide services to other members of the community who cannot provide for themselves—that is, children, some in our community who have a disability, the frail aged, the homeless, the poor and those who suffer some impediment—so that they are able to be financially independent and/or living independently.

I also wish to thank those in the community who are neighbours or friends, or even those who are transient in a street or community, who observe from time to time those in our community who need help or protection and report that to the Department for Families and Communities. The department is part of our government services to South Australians who are legally and morally responsible for a number of those in the community who need that support, notwithstanding that the overwhelming majority in the community either provide for themselves or for members of their family and community without assistance. We are talking about a relatively small number overall in the population who actually rely on the direct services of the Department for Families and Communities, but all of the community expects it to do its job properly and make sure that it provides for those in the community for which it has responsibility.

That responsibility essentially rests with the cabinet of the government of the day. There are some key players in that area of responsibility. We have the Treasurer, we have the Minister for Families and Communities and we have the Premier. Let us start with the treasurers. I say it in plural because, for the last nine years, the Hon. Kevin Foley was the person with the responsibility of carving up the money and, with the blessing of his cabinet, he has done so.

Every year, we have seen an increased allocation to the families and communities portfolio, which is hardly surprising as we have had an increase in the overall budget. We have had an increase from about \$7 billion a year to a budget now of over \$16 billion a year. It is hardly surprising that, as a major area of responsibility of the government, the overall cost would go up. One would hope that, with the initiatives announced by the government, there would be a corresponding decrease in the number of people utilising services in that area of responsibility, or that, if they did use the services, they would be better delivered and more efficient.

I will not dwell on Mr Foley as the former treasurer, suffice to say that, over the term of his office, that amount of funding increased but that, over this period, the service delivery actually decreased, and I will refer to that shortly. He has, of course, been relegated to obscurity or, as I heard this morning, 'consigned to the dustbin of history', I think it was. I thought that was rather cute. In any event, he is out of the picture. He has some other roles in government, but he has been taken away from the money, thank goodness. Whilst he will, of course, say that he had a great era of maintaining AAA credit ratings, I think he has been an embarrassment to the government overall and a failure in his financial management of the state. Quite simply, in his era, he has spent all the money, run up the debt, sold off most of the assets and, what few are left, he has announced they are to go.

We then come to the Hon. Jack Snelling who, if one were to read the budget speech and look at the impressive presentation of these budget papers, would be seen as some financial phoenix rising from the ashes. He has presented himself as being conscious of family views and values and he believes that this is a budget sympathetic to them. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am sorry, father Snelling, but you will not get the Father of the Year award for this. Plucking out a photograph from the album and applying it like some band-aid to a gaping wound is not going to resolve what is a massive financial insult to the people of South Australia, particularly those who are most vulnerable in the community. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

RAIL COMMISSIONER (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MINING (ROYALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ARKAROOA WILDERNESS SANCTUARY

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Presented a petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to prevent exploration and mining in the Arkaroola Wilderness Sanctuary.

WESTERN MOUNT LOFTY RANGES WATER ALLOCATION PLAN

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Presented a petition signed by 23 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the Minister for Environment and Conservation not to approve, or attempt to implement, a new water allocation plan for the Western Mount Lofty Ranges until detailed social and economic analysis is undertaken, and the recommendations of PIRSA and industry bodies are properly considered.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of guests from the Wynn Vale Probus Club, who are guests of the member for Florey, students from the Adelaide Secondary School of English, who are guests of the member for Croydon, and also a young group of students from the School for Vision Impaired, a lot of whom I think are from the country, who are my guests today. Welcome to you. It is lovely to see you in here. We hope you enjoy your time here.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
Public Sector—Application of Act

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Associations Incorporation—Fee Increases 2011
Bills of Sale—Fee Increases 2011
Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—Fee Increases 2011
Business Names—Fee Increases 2011
Community Titles—Fee Increases 2011
Co-operatives—Fee Increases 2011
Coroners—Fee Increases 2011
Cremation—Fee Increases 2011
Criminal Law (Sentencing)—Sentencing—Fee Increases 2011
District Court—Fee Increases 2011
Environment, Resources and Development Court—Fee Increases 2011
Evidence—Fee Increases 2011
Fees Regulation—Public Trustee Administration—Fee Increases 2011
Magistrates—Fee Increases 2011
Partnership—Fee Increases 2011
Public Trustee—Fee Increases 2011
Real Property (Commonwealth Titles)—Fee Increases 2011
Registration of Deeds—Fee Increases 2011
Security and Investigation Agents—Fee Increases 2011
Sexual Reassignment—Fee Increases 2011
Sheriff's—Fee Increases 2011
Strata Titles—Fee Increases 2011

Supreme Court—Fee Increases 2011
Worker's Liens—Fee Increases 2011
Youth Court—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Act—
Development—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fees Regulation—Proof of Age Card—Fee Increases 2011
Harbors and Navigation—Fee Increases 2011
Motor Vehicles—
Expiation Fees—Fee Increases 2011
Fee Increases 2011
Passenger Transport—Fee Increases 2011
Road Traffic—
Approved Road Transport Compliance Schemes—Fee Increases 2011
Heavy Vehicle Driver Fatigue—Fee Increases 2011
Miscellaneous—Fee Increases 2011
Miscellaneous Expiation Fees—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fee Increases 2011
Valuation of Land—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Authorised Betting Operations—Fee Increases 2011
Dangerous Substances—
Dangerous Goods Transport—Fee Increases 2011
Fee Increases 2011
Employment Agents Registration—Fee Increases 2011
Explosives—
Fee Increases 2011
Fireworks—Fee Increases 2011
Security Sensitive Substances—Fee Increases 2011
Fair Work—Fee Increases 2011
Gaming Machines—Fee Increases 2011
Lottery and Gaming—Fee Increases 2011
Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare—Fee Increases 2011

By the Minister for State/Local Government Relations (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Local Government—Fee Increases 2011
Private Parking Areas—Fee Increases 2011

Local Council By-Laws—
Adelaide City Council—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Local Government Land
No. 4—Roads
No. 5—Waste Management
No. 7—Dogs
No. 8—Cats
No. 9—Lodging Houses

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles)—Fee Increases 2011
Expiation of Offences—Fee Increases 2011
Firearms—Fee Increases 2011
Hydroponics Industry Control—Fee Increases 2011
Summary Offences—
Dangerous Articles and Prohibited Weapons—Fee Increases 2011
General—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Fire and Emergency Services—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Public and Environmental Health—
Legionella—Fee Increases 2011
Waste Control—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances—
General—Revocation
Pesticides—Fee Increases 2011
Poisons—Fee Increases 2011
Tobacco Products Regulation—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Freedom of Information—Fee Increases 2011
State Records—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Adoption—Fee Increases 2011
Building Work Contractors—Fee Increases 2011
Conveyancers—Fee Increases 2011
Land Agents—Fee Increases 2011
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Fee Increases 2011
Liquor Licensing—General—Fee Increases 2011
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians—Fee Increases 2011
Residential Tenancies—Fee Increases 2011
Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers—Fee Increases 2011
Travel Agents—Fee Increases 2011

By the Minister for Housing (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
Housing Improvement—Section 60 Statements—Fee Increases 2011

By the Minister for Ageing (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
Retirement Villages—Fee Increases 2011

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. P. Caica)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—Fee Increases 2011

Crown Land Management—Fee Increases 2011
Environment Protection—Fee Increases 2011
Heritage Places—Fee Increases 2011
Historic Shipwrecks—Fee Increases 2011
National Parks and Wildlife—
 Hunting—Fee Increases 2011—
 Wildlife—Fee Increases 2011
Native Vegetation—Fee Increases 2011
Natural Resources Management—
 Financial Provisions—Fee Increases 2011
 General—Fee Increases 2011
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—Fee Increases 2011
Radiation Protection and Control—
 Ionising Radiation—Fee Increases 2011
 Non-Ionising Radiation—Fee Increases 2011

By the Minister for Water (Hon. P. Caica)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Fees Regulation—Assessment of Requirements Water and Sewerage—Fee
 Increases 2011 Assessment of
 Sewerage—Fee Increases 2011
 Waterworks—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Mines and Works Inspection—Fee Increases 2011
 Mining—General
 Opal Mining—Fee Increases 2011
 Petroleum (Submerged Lands)—Fee Increases 2011
 Petroleum and Geothermal Energy—Fee Increases 2011

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Brands—Fee Increases 2011
 Fisheries Management—Fee Increases 2011
 Livestock—Fee Increases 2011
 Plant Health—Fee Increases 2011
 Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—
 Citrus Industry—Fee Increases 2011
 Meat Industry—Fee Increases 2011
 Plant Products—Fee Increases 2011
 Seafood—Fee Increases 2011

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Land Tax—Fee Increases 2011
 Petroleum Products Regulation—Fee Increases 2011

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VISITOR AND TRAVEL CENTRE

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) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: On 25 February 2011, the South Australian Tourism Commission announced plans to license a private entity to manage services currently provided by the commission's SA Visitor and Travel Centre in King William Street, Adelaide, which the commission indicated would close on 1 July 2011. This approach was designed to fit with the commission's

increasing focus on its online marketing strategy while still providing a resource for those consumers who wish to research and book travel via more traditional means.

The commission commenced a tender process for the licence in March this year. On 15 June 2011, the commission announced that it had selected Holidays of Australia as the successful tenderer. On 16 June 2011, I requested that the commission provide me with full details of the process of the commission used in selecting and appointing the successful licensee and the probity controls governing that process. The commission provided this information to me on 20 June 2011.

I have been advised by the commission that procurement processes were followed in line with the State Procurement Board guidelines and that an independent probity consultant was engaged to ensure that the process was fair and transparent. I am also advised that the final contract and commercial terms were prepared in conjunction with the Crown Solicitor's Office. However, given the significant industry and community interest in this issue, I believe it is appropriate for this process to be reviewed independently. As a result, I have asked the Auditor-General to review the information provided by the commission and the control protocols that were put in place.

WATER TRADING LAWS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am pleased to inform the house officially that South Australia and Victoria have settled the constitutional challenge to Victoria's water trading laws. A combination of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —previous and agreed new actions by the Victorian government and changed circumstances in water availability in the Murray-Darling Basin system have enabled a mutually acceptable settlement to be reached between the two states. I want to commend the Victorian Premier, Ted Baillieu, and also commend our water minister for the agreements that he has negotiated with his Victorian counterpart.

Since the government's decision to pursue a legal challenge to restrictions on water trade out of Victoria, we have seen the Victorian government voluntarily remove its 10 per cent absolute cap on water trade out of a district. Victoria also struck an agreement with the commonwealth government—

Ms Chapman: How much did it cost?

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —to allow purchase of water for environmental purposes. These moves significantly ameliorated some of South Australia's concerns with Victoria's water trading rules.

Through negotiations we have now been able to reach an agreement that gives South Australia the unrestricted right—the unrestricted right—to purchase water from Victoria to meet any potential shortfall in our critical human needs supply.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Victoria has also committed unconditionally to remove the 4 per cent annual cap by 30 June 2014.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You obviously can't read.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, I warn the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The states have also agreed that Victoria will immediately sign the relevant schedules under the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement, which provide South Australia with permanent rights—permanent rights—to store water in upstream storages such as the Hume and Dartmouth dams.

The last point is particularly important as it will enable us to develop a long-term carryover policy for South Australian irrigators and for our critical human needs. I am advised that permanently securing the storage rights of up to 300 gegalitres is of major benefit to South Australia for the future. The total removal of restrictions in 2014, combined with other agreed changes and greatly improved water availability in the basin, means that there is little to be gained from either state continuing to pursue the lengthy and expensive matter through the courts.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Oh, apparently we should never have embarked on it. That's interesting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I remember when they said that we should never embark—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —on challenging the Howard government over a nuclear waste dump because we didn't have a snowball's chance in hell—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —of winning, but we did: 3-nil in the courts.

Mr Whetstone: They're still laughing at you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg!

ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:17): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Earlier this year the government became aware that the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia was experiencing financial difficulties. Since that time, the state government has continued to work with the zoo to identify ways in which to assist it back into a sustainable position. The society is a non-government, not-for-profit organisation that is governed by a volunteer board on behalf of its members. The society operates three sites: the Adelaide and Monarto zoos and Warrawong, each being unique in their own way. Adelaide Zoo is the only major metropolitan zoo in Australia not run and owned by government. Monarto Zoo is the largest open-range zoo in the world.

The society's incorporated body is run by a board made up largely of people elected by the membership, with provision for the Governor to appoint up to three board members. The society produces an annual report and is the subject of an audit each year by the society's auditor.

Both zoos are institutions that not only are much-loved by many thousands of people but also undertake important animal, environment and conservation work and are tireless in their efforts to protect endangered wildlife, both here and across the world.

In 2008, the society and the commonwealth government entered into negotiations with the Chinese government to house two giant pandas, Wang Wang and Funi, for a period of 10 years at a cost of \$10 million, to be paid by the commonwealth government. The society made a decision to seek government and private support to build an appropriate panda enclosure and to develop a new front entrance to cater for an expected increase in visitor numbers, and a new external wall for greater security and protection of animals.

The society developed a business case, based on it being able to raise funds through events, fundraising activities, increased membership and a surge in attendances. The state government contributed \$18.9 million as a one-off capital grant to help build the new front entrance facility and external wall. The capital grant, the largest ever given to the zoo, was in addition to the \$3.126 million in operating funds granted by the state government annually.

As at 31 March 2011, the society had a Westpac debt of \$24.4 million, an amount larger than it originally intended borrowing. I understand the reason for this was, in part, because the amount the zoo had hoped to raise in private sponsorships fell well short of projections, largely due to the effects of the global financial crisis. The government has recently been informed that while the pandas have indeed attracted many more people through the zoo's gates, including from interstate and overseas, and its revenues have increased in the form of a rise in sponsorships, memberships and events, these revenues have not been able to match the increase in the zoo's operating expenses.

As a result, the state government is now working with the Royal Zoological Society of South Australia to build a framework for a long-term sustainable business model. In the interim, the state government has advanced \$2 million of the 2011-12 allocation to the zoo, which will help to ensure its operations. The government in the meantime is prepared to assemble a review team to work with the zoo board, and its management, and Westpac, to assess the critical issues which led to the financial difficulties and develop a framework that will lead to restoration and maintenance of an appropriate financial base at the zoo and the implementation of practices aimed at preventing these circumstances arising again.

I am advised that Westpac has established its own financial review to also assess the critical issues that have given rise to the current financial difficulties. The government is obliged to ensure taxpayers' money is protected, with appropriate controls on future operations and investment decisions. In the interests of the protection and care of wildlife, public education, important conservation programs and the hundreds of zoo staff and volunteers, as well as its viewing public, this government is committed to working with the society to help it through its current problems, and to re-establish a sustainable operating position for the zoo's long-term future.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:23): I bring up the 50th report of the committee on the Kangaroo Island Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal 2011-12.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 51st report of the committee on the South East Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal 2011-12.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 52nd report of the committee on the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal 2011-12.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 53rd report of the committee on the Northern and Yorke Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal 2011-12.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 54th report of the committee on the South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal 2011-12.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 55th report of the committee on the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal 2011-12.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 56th report of the committee on the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board levy proposal 2011-12.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

MEMBER FOR MAWSON

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the parliamentary secretary for health. Why does the parliamentary secretary for health think that the community has stopped listening to the government's message on health?

The SPEAKER: That question is out of order. Questions are asked of ministers, not of parliamentary secretaries.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The member has been appointed as a parliamentary secretary, and he is making public comments—

The SPEAKER: Sit down. There is no point of order there. I have been here for 14 years and I have never seen a parliamentary secretary answer a question. It may not be in the standing orders but the convention is, so I would ask you to sit down.

Mrs REDMOND: I know that it is possible to ask a member of this house a question, and so I will ask my question to the member for Mawson. Could he explain why he thinks that the community has stopped listening to the government's message on health?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The member for Mawson has no responsibility to this house for his views on matters that are not his responsibility.

The SPEAKER: Absolutely. I was about to bring that point up, also. No, there is no point of order there.

Mr WILLIAMS: Can I seek a point of clarification?

The SPEAKER: You can seek a point of clarification, and you have been here as long as I have, member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: I have, indeed. Madam Speaker, what is the point of having a parliamentary secretary? Do they have any purpose at all?

The SPEAKER: They are certainly not here to answer questions in the house. Questions are asked of ministers or the Premier, and you know that.

Mrs REDMOND: Madam Speaker, in that case I will ask a question of the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the member for Mawson that South Australians are no longer listening to the government's message; and, if he doesn't agree with that assertion, will he sack the member as the parliamentary secretary for health?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:27): The answer is no and no.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As members know, we do not ask people who are not ministers questions in this house. I have never seen in my time here anyone who was not a minister answer a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: The minister for agriculture in the previous parliament asked the member for Hammond a question, so I cannot let you say that you have not seen it in this place.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order. It is argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry, I did not hear what the Minister for Transport said, but I can say in response that the speaker did allow the question but then ruled later that it was out of order for him to answer that question, and we can go through and find the *Hansard* if you require that. Minister for Transport, did you have another point to make? I did not hear—I was discussing with the Clerk that issue.

Mr PEDERICK: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. What point of order?

Mr PEDERICK: It is 303: point of clarification.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will give you the benefit of the doubt.

Mr PEDERICK: I would like to seek clarification, Madam Speaker, because I was certainly asked a question by a previous minister for agriculture, and I was quite happy to take it and I did, as I was allowed to by—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: —the former speaker, and I did answer it.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I said, it was ruled out of order afterwards.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will get back to sensible questions and serious questions for the day. The member for Taylor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SYNTHETIC CANNABINOIDS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:29): Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise what action the government is taking to crack down on the availability of synthetic cannabinoids?

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:29): Oh, he doesn't want to know. In recent months there has been growing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sure that members have had this occur in their electorate. Can you please listen to the Premier in silence. Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Apparently, drugs are a laughing matter to the opposition. In recent months there has been growing evidence of the increasingly widespread sale of synthetic cannabis by those wishing to skirt around the state's tough drug laws. These products, which have been

legally sold under product names such as Kronik, Spice and Northern Lights for approximately \$40 per gram, are every bit as dangerous as natural cannabis and, indeed, possibly worse. The synthetic cannabinoids are products which are often added to herbal mixtures and then smoked by users, producing similar effects to natural cannabis which is known to cause a range of serious health problems.

According to leading pharmaceutical experts such as Professor Jason White from the University of South Australia, these substances have been developed by pharmaceutical companies apparently for research purposes. These are chemicals that I was told by the professor may not have been tested on humans whatsoever—may not have even been tested on rats, someone else told me—so there is no evidence of their health effects in terms of anything positive. In fact, it is suspected that the effects of these chemicals will be stronger than THC—and I know some people are talking about possibly up to 10 times stronger—which is the active chemical in cannabis.

The reports from both here in Australia and overseas are of users of these synthetic cannabinoids experiencing paranoia, anxiety, racing thoughts and irritability, hallucinations, tremors, convulsions, slurred speech, dilated pupils, elevated blood pressure, vomiting and chest pain. In fact, I read a report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I read a report in, I think, the *New Zealand Herald* which talked about up to two presentations a day at the emergency department of Auckland Hospital. I know that the New Zealand National Poisons Centre, which I think is based in Dunedin, was talking about the incidence in other hospitals around the country.

There have been also reports of withdrawal effects and dependence associated with the use of the product Spice Gold. Northern Lights Herbal Incense, manufactured again in New Zealand, has recently been sold in a retail outlet in Whyalla, and there has been a report of a person being treated at Whyalla Hospital as a result of its consumption.

However, Madam Speaker, I am not only concerned about the harmful health effects of these products but also the possibility that users are driving under their influence, posing a serious danger to themselves and others. I am advised that it is actually quite difficult for the synthetic cannabinoids to be detected by roadside drug testing units, which only further highlights why we need to remove these products from the market. That is why, last Friday, along with the Attorney-General and the Minister for Health, we decided to act swiftly and decisively to ban these products immediately.

As an interim measure, the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse has issued a notice under the Controlled Substances Act 1984. The notice immediately bans the sale, supply, possession or administration of the known synthetic cannabinoid substances. The maximum penalty is \$10,000 or two years' gaol. The Controlled Substances Advisory Council has been asked to advise the government on the quantities that should be considered commercial and/or trafficable. This will be included in amendments to the Controlled Substances (General) Regulations which, subject to cabinet agreement, could be introduced as early as this Thursday.

This is a serious matter and some people ask why there was not greater notice given. Greater notice would have just simply given people an opportunity to buy up big. Of course, members opposite—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That is not true, actually. You would be aware of what happened in Western Australia when notice was given—chronic parties.

LABOR GOVERNMENT

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): My question is again to the Premier. Given that the Premier announced after the 2010 election his intention to reconnect with the community, could the Premier advise the house when he intends to start?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:34): I do it all the time, and I have to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have just announced that there will be a caucus election for a minister on Thursday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: That will result in a consequential reshuffle. So, I invite the Leader of the Opposition to help reconnect with her backbench and maybe consequentially have a reshuffle of her own, so that the member for Norwood—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —and the member for Stuart can join the front bench and replace those that brought their former leaders down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members on my right, also; order! The member for Bright.

OPEN SPACE FUNDING

Ms FOX (Bright) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide. Can the minister inform the house about the latest investment the government is making to provide better open space and more places for people around the state?

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) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her question. Last week I approved more than \$4.4 million of grants for local councils to improve public spaces from Andamooka, in your electorate, Madam Speaker, to Victor Harbor, in Finniss, I believe.

These grants have a focus on providing spaces for unstructured recreation throughout our state. Included in the latest round of grants is \$3.3 million to bring the Coast Park even closer to completion. I note the member for Bright's interest in this matter, with more than \$1 million being provided to the City of Holdfast Bay for work from North Brighton to Kingston Park.

More than half the Coast Park is already finished, providing pedestrian and cycle pathways, as well as improved grass areas, additional play equipment and links to the existing parks along the metropolitan Adelaide coast. When completed, Coast Park will provide a 70 kilometre linear park from North Haven to Sellicks Beach. But, this work is not just about Coast Park.

I also approved funding projects like the Tramway Park in the member for Ashford's electorate, \$555,000 for the Mike Turtur Bikeway; a greenway in the member for Unley's electorate—so this is being distributed around, member for Unley—\$165,000 for the Glen Osmond Creek Open Space Rejuvenation; and three projects to a total of \$125,000 in the member for Goyder's electorate, including stage 1 of 'Walk the Yorke' from Tiddy Widdy Beach to Macs Beach.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: This latest investment all over the state is on top of the protective legislation the government will provide for the Barossa Valley (in the member for Schubert's area) and McLaren Vale (in the member for Mawson's area). Funding this grant program highlights that we are committed to balanced and sustainable development in this state. Development that gives us the benefits of a bigger, more vibrant state while also providing and protecting open space.

We understand that South Australians need attractive open spaces to relax and enjoy, as well as to improve their health. That is why the Rann government has now invested more than \$87 million in the past nine years from the Planning and Development Fund to develop public space and help rejuvenate degraded areas, plazas, public squares and linear trails. We will continue to work with councils and community groups throughout the state to identify, plan and develop the parks, open spaces and places for people our growing state will need.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Davenport.

LOTTERIES COMMISSION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier's broken promise that he is now privatising the Lotteries Commission, having previously—

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

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

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Standing order 97: it plainly contains argument.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point of order. Can you be careful about your question?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will reword the question to try and keep the Minister for Energy happy. Is the Premier's promise that he is no longer keeping, that he would not privatise the Lotteries Commission but now he is going to privatise the Lotteries Commission—

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

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Maybe he needs a break to rewrite the question, but that is, again, argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Speaker, the leader of the opposition said in 2001 that he would not be privatising the Lotteries Commission.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I ask you—if you would like to hear it again—to rule that when he says 'that he was not going to privatise and now has' is argument; it is pure argument.

The SPEAKER: It is argument. I would ask you to perhaps reword your question and be careful about it. I am sure you—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: But, Madam Speaker, it has been announced in the budget.

The SPEAKER: Order! A person of your experience in this place understands that we do not have questions that involve argument, so I would ask you to seriously look at your question. I am sure you can do it very quickly there now.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will ask it this way, Madam Speaker: is the Premier's promise to privatise the Lotteries Commission an example of why members of his own party believe the public is no longer listening to the government's message? The Premier promised as opposition leader on 15 June—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The argument that still exists in the question is accusing the Premier of privatising the Lotteries Commission. That is a matter of argument.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, you wish to answer it without his completing the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:40): No.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SPORT, MATCH FIXING

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister advise of recent moves to stamp out match fixing in sport?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, can you sit down?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members for Finniss, Waite, MacKillop and Norwood! We will have some order. The minister will not answer the question until we have quiet on my left. Minister.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Premier with South Australia's Strategic Plan) (14:42): I thank the member for Mitchell for his question. I am happy to inform the house today of national moves to stamp out match fixing and ensure the integrity of sport in Australia. All Australians expect that the sport they watch or participate in is played honestly and to the ideals of fair play and good sportsmanship, especially the Mighty Mighty 4th Grade Rugby Union competition here in Adelaide.

Match fixing in sport, and the associated fraudulent betting, is an emerging issue globally, posing the greatest threat to the integrity of Australian sport since doping. It is insidious by nature, and we cannot let it become part of our sporting landscape as has occurred overseas. Match fixing involves the manipulation of an outcome or contingency in a sporting contest and is often motivated by the opportunity for significant financial or other personal gain through betting on the result.

At the recent Sport and Recreation Ministerial Council meeting in Queensland, all states and territories agreed to the breakthrough National Policy on Match Fixing in Sport. The South Australian government strongly supports this national policy which sends the strongest possible message to any would-be match fixers and shows how committed we are to stamping it out before it gains any traction in Australia. The policy is underpinned by the following agreed principles:

- a nationally consistent approach to deterring and dealing with match fixing in Australia;
- information sharing between governments, major sports, betting operators and law enforcers;
- consistent national code of conduct principles for sport; and
- active participation in international efforts to combat corruption in sport, including an international code of conduct.

The policy will provide the platform for action against match fixing underpinned by legislation, regulation, codes of conduct and industry standards.

The next step is for a working group, chaired by the commonwealth, to provide an implementation plan to sports ministers within three months which will include an assessment of readiness of the sporting organisations and the betting industry to pursue the requirements under this policy.

It should also be acknowledged that the sports betting industry and the major sporting organisations, including the Australian Olympic Committee and those represented by the Confederation of Major Professional and Participation Sports, have shown strong support throughout the development of this policy. This is important as we are also seeking to ensure that there is better information sharing between betting agencies and sporting organisations so that any suspicious activity is swiftly identified.

Australia has well-established sporting traditions to uphold and respect, and I am confident that the actions being taken to stamp out match fixing will ensure our reputation as a great sporting nation is not diminished in any way.

PUBLIC SECTOR LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Education. Does the minister agree with the government's policy of cutting long service leave entitlements for public

servants in his department? The then treasurer Foley said on 11 November 2010 that minister Weatherill and the then treasurer were:

...team mates on this budget; that everything we did, including issues to do with workplace reform, both Jay and I did together. Jay was quite comfortable in every decision that we took, in fact supported and put forward some of the initiatives that have been controversial since.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:45): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He has noticed last year's budget.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. I thank the honourable member for his question. He has clearly caught up with a budget initiative from last year, apparently in the last few moments. I've got some horrible news for him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: I can't hear this excellent answer because of the member for Unley.

The SPEAKER: Order! I agree. Minister.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I've got some horrible news for him: events have moved on. In fact, this budget set up a process for dealing with the question of the long service leave issues for teachers. We do acknowledge that teachers have some concerns about changes that I think are to come into effect on 1 July, and we have a process set up to talk to them and a number of other union representatives who represent public servants who are affected by those changes. That is the late breaking news for the member for Unley. I am sure that, as the relevant secretary of the union (Corenna Haythorpe) has said publicly, she has committed herself to negotiations. The Treasurer has committed himself to negotiations and I am sure they will reach a settlement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TOBACCO CONTROL MEASURES

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. How are tobacco control measures progressing in South Australia?

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) (14:47): I thank the member for Little Para for this question. I am really pleased to announce that South Australia was recently placed third, with a score of 65 out of 100, at the Australian Medical—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —yes, bronze medal, as my colleague says—at the Australian Medical Association and the Australian Council on Smoking and Health annual National Tobacco Day Control Scoreboard Awards. This was a big improvement on the year before when we received a score of 48 and, in fact, won the Dirty Ashtray Award, something I was absolutely determined we would never do again. We increased our score to 65, which was just a few behind the most successful of the states. Dr Andrew Pesce, the Australian Medical Association federal president, made special mention of South Australia's efforts over the past year. He said:

Special recognition is noted for South Australia for commitment to action and important developments throughout the past year.

I would like to say, and I believe it is the case, that generally these measures are bipartisan. I know a number of members on the other side in both this place and the other place have strong views about reducing the amount of tobacco in our community, and I commend all members for that.

South Australia also received praise for its comprehensive legislation on smoking restrictions in enclosed public places and the great initiatives for smoking cessation support such as Quit-on-Q.

The tobacco industry was awarded the 2011 Dirty Ashtray Award 'for its desperate and deceptive campaign to oppose effective public health measures', in particular, its campaign against plain packages. I note in passing that the federal health minister, Nicola Roxon, has been strongly attacked by the tobacco industry but has won a World Health Organisation award for this initiative.

Western Australia was ranked as the best state for tobacco control because in their 40 to 49 year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Madam Speaker, I thought it was bipartisan but I might be wrong. If the members opposite do not support these initiatives I am happy for them to say so. Western Australia has won on a number of occasions and it certainly did again this year because in their 40 to 49-year-old age group only 16.8 per cent are daily smokers compared to 24 per cent in our state. They have made massive improvements over recent years in this area and we need to catch up. A lot of that work was the initiative of my former colleague, the Minister for Health from that state, the Hon. Jim McGinty, who was a zealot when it came to anti-smoking initiatives.

South Australia is now implementing many of the same successful measures. In the past year, the government has announced that point-of-sale retail displays will be banned by 2012. Specialist tobacconists will have a couple of years extra to remove point-of-sale displays. We have also increased social marketing, which has had a demonstrated effect on reducing smoking prevalence and uptake. We have maintained an average of 700 targeted audience rating points (TARPs) per month since last July, which is the level the experts say is required to have an impact on smoking rates.

On World No Tobacco Day last year, all South Australian health facilities became smoke-free, including, I am pleased to say, facilities such as James Nash House, which is a forensic mental health facility. I spoke to someone in James Nash House, and he said how terrific it was that the policy had come into place because it meant he was now healthier as result of it. These are mostly people who smoke a lot: they are all now smoke-free. We also note that 39 per cent of all adult smokers also live with mental illness.

On 31 May this year, we launched the South Australian Tobacco Control Strategy 2011-16, a five-year strategy. Smoking is still the main cause of ill health and premature death in South Australia, killing 22 people each week—on average, three people a day die as a result of smoking-related illness. It costs the state taxpayers around \$2.5 billion each year. In fact, it is estimated that one in every two smokers will die of a smoking-related illness. The South Australian Tobacco Control Strategy focuses on five key areas:

1. Reducing smoking prevalence across the state's population; that is a broad goal.
2. Reducing smoking prevalence in Aboriginal people. It is particularly noticeable that many Aboriginal people smoke, including those who are pregnant.
3. Reducing smoking prevalence for people with mental illness or those from low socioeconomic backgrounds.
4. Reducing involuntary exposure to tobacco smoke.
5. Minimising the promotion of and reducing access to tobacco products by children.

Actions that have been incorporated into the strategy include the government's recent announcement to ban smoking within 10 metres of children's playgrounds, ban smoking in undercover transport waiting areas, and allowing councils and other bodies to apply to have an area or event declared smoke-free.

The government, as the largest employer in the state, has recognised that it needs to take the lead to reduce passive smoking experienced by many of its employees. The government has decided that all government agencies will be smoke-free by 2015, though we recognise there may be challenges and particular needs when it comes to restricting smoking in prisons, so we will work with prisons to help develop policies in the longer term.

Additionally, it is expected that the majority of publicly funded arts and sporting events will become smoke-free. I also intend to introduce legislation into this place shortly to bring into effect some of these measures. Further, the government is working with the hospitality sector to implement a 100 per cent smoke-free outdoor eating and drinking area at all venues by 2016.

A key objective of the strategy, which is carried through many of the actions, is to decrease smoking prevalence and exposure to passive smoking and, pivotally, to reduce children's perceptions of smoking as glamorous or normal. That is the major thing we need to do because we know that most people who take up smoking are, in fact, children, and they take it up because they think it is glamorous or something that everybody else does.

The government is taking the issue of tobacco control very seriously, and we will continue to vigorously pursue other measures to ensure that the rate of smoking in young South Australians declines to 16 per cent by 2016. I look forward to working with all members of this place to further those goals.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REDUNDANCIES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Education. Does the minister support forced redundancies for staff in his department after the next election?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:54): The honourable members opposite know that a budget has just been handed down, and there have been a number of declarations made in that budget, including a very important commitment that there will be no forced redundancies between now and the end of the term of this government. I remember when we—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear the minister.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I remember when I had carriage of the Public Sector Act there was a lot of squawking from those opposite wanting to make changes to the act. In the course of that debate they appeared to try to create friends, if you like, with the PSA. They were offering themselves as the new friends of the PSA. I remember saying at the time, 'Be very careful of your new friends, because they are unlikely to be with you in the long run.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The real question on this is what is the attitude of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What is the attitude of those opposite to circumstances where an employee has been offered alternative duties—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Question time is about the opposition asking the minister questions. It is not about the minister asking the opposition questions.

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. The minister can answer the question any way he chooses, and I do not think he is asking the opposition questions, he is developing an argument, I think.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Precisely, Madam Speaker. For those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: For those opposite, it is a device called the rhetorical question, but just sit down and listen to it.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr WILLIAMS: I agree with you, Madam Speaker, he is developing an argument; that is called debate.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, it's not; it's supplying information. This is an important point because, when an employee becomes displaced as a consequence of a decision within a state government agency, we have an obligation—and, indeed, it is our intention—to try to find them alternative duties. That is obviously the first way in which we deal with it. Another option is that, because we have a turnover, I think, of something in the order of 7,000 people per annum in the public sector, other jobs are available for people to be placed in.

This savings task that has been identified by the government is a relatively modest one in the context of a turnover of 7,000 people per annum. But for those employees who, after considering all the options of vacancies, after considering the alternative duties and the opportunity maybe even to retrain and find some alternative careers—and with all of those options and if they perhaps are not participating or cooperating in the placement in other areas, are those opposite seriously saying that they support people sitting around in some transit lounge somewhere in government receiving an ongoing salary? Is that the proposition that those opposite are seeking to develop?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think we are entitled to know what their position is in relation to that question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT REDUNDANCIES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:58): Supplementary, Madam Speaker, if I may. Will permanent teachers be subject to forced redundancies after the next election?

The SPEAKER: I think that's a question; that's not a supplementary question. Minister.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:58): We have a need for teachers. Through the last budget, we have created an extraordinary extra number of teachers that are required in the system. We have an ageing teaching workforce. We have a workforce where 53 per cent of our teachers are over the age of 50. We are going to have teachers cascading out of our education system in the coming years, so we will be needing teachers. It will not be a question of making teachers redundant.

The changes that have been brought about through the budget have not been directed at teachers. We are adding teachers. We are adding front-line services. The question just simply does not arise. The question does not arise. We have expanded the number of teachers, and any of the savings measures that are contained within the budget are focused entirely on those positions that are found in our head office and our regional offices. So, the question simply does not apply and I stand by the government's policies in relation to these matters announced at the budget by the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WATER PRICING

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Water. What advice does the minister have for the commercial laundry in Newton whose water usage bill has increased by 32 per cent since last year, from about \$8,900 to now \$12,000?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:00): I did see the opposition leader's press release that

was a bit like her last newsletter—hardly based in fact with respect to the figures that were used—I don't know how that one got through. Quite simply, we have made it clear that the costs with respect to ensuring that we have security of our water supplies now and into the future, that allows for reducing our reliance on the River Murray but also allows for the very important expansion of this state's population and its business—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, quite simply, we are not going to subsidise businesses with respect to their water consumption.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta.

WATER PRICING

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:01): My question is also to the Minister for Water and it is also in relation to the commercial laundry in Newton whose water bill is increasing. Given that the business's water bill has increased from \$8,900 to \$12,000 this year, and will increase further next year from 1 July, and 40 per cent more from 1 July the year after, to about \$20,000, what advice can the minister give this laundry on how they are supposed to survive?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Water.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:02): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and I agree with my colleagues here—he should be on the opposition front bench.

Mr Pengilly: Get Biggles to answer; he has an answer for everything.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Finniss!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: Not only was it an objective of the state government to ensure security of water supplies for potable water for critical human needs, and I believe that largely has been done, it is also through Water for Good, an objective to ensure that we diversify our water supplies to ensure that those water supplies—diversified water supplies being, amongst other things, the re-use and recycling of stormwater, the re-use and recycling of wastewater, and, of course, in doing so, to provide an alternative fit for other purposes, and also to reduce our reliance on potable water supplies.

Quite simply, as I have said and been transparent about, the price and the cost of water has increased and will continue to increase next year again. I have also made it clear to the many that I have met with, whether they be irrigators in Clare or, indeed, irrigators down Narrung way, that we as a government will not be subsidising businesses in regard to their water supplies. To do so, if we were to do that, would only mean that would then further increase the cost of water for other users, those in metropolitan Adelaide, those in country South Australia, the families and others. We don't intend to do that and have made that perfectly clear.

WATER PRICING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): My question, again, is to the Minister for Water. Has the government undertaken any economic modelling on the impact on small business and jobs of South Australia having the highest water price rises in the nation and, if so, what are the results of such modelling?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:04): I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition might know this but I was approached previously by, amongst others, the Clare irrigators—and I will just put it in context and remind everyone that the Clare irrigators had drawn very heavily on their underground water there to the extent that that water was no longer suitable for, if you like, irrigation purposes. As a consequence of that, augmentation was provided through that area to

allow access to potable water supplies that would also be allowed and permitted for irrigation. That ensured the survival of their operations in that particular area. I also might add that they signed a contractual arrangement that they would pay whatever the price was that was set by SA Water then and into the future.

What we did was that we convened a review group. That review group included representatives of PIRSA, representatives of DTED and representatives of SA Water, and it was asked to undertake a particular analysis of the impact of the increase in prices on those particular businesses up there. What it showed was, yes, the increase in water prices was having an impact, but it was just one factor having an impact. The others, of course, were the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —glut in grapes (amongst other things), the then price of the Australian dollar, and they were in turn having an impact. I think that one of the things that needs to be understood—and I will go back to the basis of my answer in the previous two questions—is that the government is not going to subsidise businesses in South Australia with respect to the—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —cost involved with the—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. P. CAICA: —supply of water, but we are willing to continue and will continue to work with businesses and others to make sure that underpinning the South Australian marketplace as it relates to water will be access to diversified, fit-for-purpose supplies of water that may mitigate against the costs involved with using potable water supplies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light.

YOUTHCONNECT GRANTS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:06): Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Youth. Can the minister inform the house of the recipients of the 2011 *youthconnect* grants?

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) (15:07): I would like to thank the member for this very important question, and I acknowledge the outstanding work he does in his community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I was thrilled to announce recently the recipients—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a lot of background noise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Finniss, you are warned.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I was thrilled to announce recently the recipients of the state government's new *youthconnect* grants. This is the first grant round designed to support the state

government's new youth policy, *youthconnect*, which is a plan for young South Australians for the next four years.

The grants have been awarded with a particular focus on promoting young people's health and wellbeing, education, employment and skill development, and, of course, engagement and participation. Normally, we would allocate about \$500,000 to this grant program, but we have been able to increase that to just short of \$600,000. I am thrilled that we will be able to assist about 18 organisations from across our state in assisting young South Australians. For instance, the Service to Youth Council will be getting a grant of nearly \$50,000—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: The member for Bragg said 'Sorry.' I think it's a first. I accept your apology. The Service to Youth—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: They should take a leaf out of her book, Madam Speaker.

Mr Pengilly: Come on, get on with it.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Well, if you're quiet, I will. The Service to Youth Council will get a grant of \$48,000 so that it can run a project called the Next Step, which is a therapeutic and educational project being run in conjunction with Zoos South Australia to assist young people with mental health issues or physical health problems.

The Peterborough Youth Network—the member for Stuart might like to pay attention to this—will receive a grant of about \$30,000, thumbs up, to engage young people in the design and redevelopment of the outdoor space at the Peterborough Youth Centre. The centre will be redeveloped to create a versatile open space with landscaped grounds, a beach volleyball court and a leisure space incorporating an urban art initiative. I am sure that will be welcomed by the member for Stuart's community. I know the member for Fisher is a very strong advocate for improved youth centre facilities, and I hope he will join me in welcoming this initiative as well.

Also, with these grants, we are supporting young people from diverse ethnic communities. UnitingCare Wesley in Port Adelaide will receive a grant of nearly \$30,000 to deliver its Afghan Youth Project. This project will support around 200 young Afghans to improve their physical and mental health, engagement with their community and conflict resolution.

These grants will no doubt go a long way to improving the opportunities and prospects for young South Australians. I am very happy to offer to all members in this place a briefing on these grants.

CHILD'S DEATH

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Given that it is now 13 days since a little boy died in a government house at Modbury Heights, will the minister now tell the house how many times her department received a notification or advice on this family?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:11): Whenever a serious incident occurs involving the death or serious injury of a child, the processes and procedures, the information available and the actions taken by the Department for Families and Communities and other agencies that might be involved in their lives (such as the Department of Education and Children's Services or SA Health) are scrutinised in detail, both within the department and by the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee.

The death of this little boy has seen someone charged and they are before the courts now. I have asked for legal advice on what I can and cannot say while the trial is underway and I am told

that, as the matter is before the courts, I cannot make any comment on the case. The worst outcome—

Mr Williams: The question wasn't about the case.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, it is about the case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The worst outcome would be for me to make comments publicly which will jeopardise this case, but what I can—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: What I can tell the house is what we have done in relation to child protection. First and foremost, we have increased the budget for Families SA from a piddling \$90 million a year to now almost \$300 million a year. We came into government and reviewed the child protection system. We have had the Layton review, we have had the Mullighan inquiry into children in state care and on the APY lands—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —we established the position of Guardian for Children and Young People, we established the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee to examine child deaths and serious cases of harm, we established the Council for the Care of Children, and we established the Health and Community Services Complaints Commission. We are constantly assessing and reviewing what we do and, quite frankly, we cannot have—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Transport!

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order.

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

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: That is my point of order. I cannot hear the minister for the rantings of the Minister for Transport.

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. It is very difficult to hear. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would you please be quiet and listen to the minister?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We have trebled the funding for child protection, we have put in a range of processes and procedures—

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a point of order.

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

Ms CHAPMAN: About five minutes ago the minister told us she could not answer the question on legal advice, and now we have all this drivel. Sit her down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, would you finish your answer.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We are the ones that set up the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee to independently assess circumstances in which a child may be injured, so that—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —we can improve, where we can, the protection of children here in South Australia. The Department for Families and Communities is open to scrutiny—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —and is constantly being scrutinised, but I am not going to put this trial at risk, in jeopardy, just to satisfy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —the member for Bragg.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Child protection is a very serious issue and we should treat it that way and stop this political point-scoring.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy leader.

FORESTRY SOFTWOOD PLANTATIONS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Forests. Is the minister aware that a Victorian company has been exposed for exporting whole logs from Victorian forests in shipping containers—timber which was supposed to be processed locally within Victoria—and does he agree that this undermines the conclusions drawn from the ACIL Tasman Regional Impact Report into the sale of South Australian forests?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:16): I thank the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: I thank the member for the question. I am aware, and this is very much part and parcel of the management of all softwood plantations in Australia. As it occurred with ForestrySA in the not-so-distant past, when local demand is at a low ebb because of a contraction within the local construction industry, export markets are sourced to ensure that contracts can be met, that individuals can continue to be employed in the South-East—particularly in logging and transport—so there is absolutely nothing new in that particular proposition. It is very much part and parcel of astute management of a softwood plantation. It has been done in the past and will continue to be done in the future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley.

CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:17): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the house how many enrolments Adelaide's Carnegie University has for August?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Croydon!

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:18): It's good to get a Dorothy Dixier. Carnegie Mellon University, Heinz, Australia has advised—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —the following points: for the August 2011 intake, a total of 52 students have been offered, and accepted, admission into CMU Adelaide's two masters programs, with more expected to accept offers before applications close.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is anticipated the new students—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —will bring the total annual enrolment at CMU for 2011 to more than 130. Since December 2010, Carnegie Mellon University has held 10 Advanced Education Program courses and workshops, with a total of 93 enrolments from the public and private sector. Each course is limited to eight to 12 participants to maintain quality and promote interaction with the faculty. Additionally, a group of 25 international public servants have enrolled in an intensive course which will take place in June and July.

Carnegie Mellon University is a small, executive-style campus with capacity for a maximum of 200 people, including staff and faculty. Annual enrolments have doubled since the university opened, from 55 students in 2006 to 113 in 2010 and, of course, you would have just heard that they are expecting more than 130 this time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley! The member for Bragg.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:20): My question is also to the Premier. Will the Premier explain why last weekend he said he was looking forward to receiving Monsignor Cappelletti's report on the Parks Community Centre when, on 2 May, his office issued a press release stating that the government had received that report?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:20): I am looking forward not only to reading the report but releasing the report.

BAROSSA VALLEY AND MCLAREN VALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide. Which statement in relation to the proposed McLaren Vale and Barossa Valley legislation made by the minister is correct?

This legislation will not override local townships' planning decision—

or from the statement made by the minister recently in the parliament—

There is only one prohibition that we intend definitely to have in those provisions, and that is a prohibition against urban subdivision.

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) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for her question. It would be a lot easier to answer the question if I had a blackboard, or whatever you have these days, but never mind. Basically, if you can imagine a balloon and inside the balloon—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Why is it so? Inside the balloon, if it is to the north, you have the member for Schubert; if it is to the south, you have the member for Mawson. Now they are in the balloon—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, they are not in the same balloon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They are in different balloons—except the member for Unley who is a Walloon, but that is different.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Is that an animal? Even I'm struggling with this one.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is somebody who is on the Orient Express.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is a man who was on the Orient Express. Can we go back to the balloons?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You can pick your own colours later. But if you imagine the balloon, that is the perimeter of the area. Bear with me: it will be worthwhile. This is another leap of imagination. Imagine that inside the balloons there are ping-pong balls. It is getting complicated, isn't it? Ping-pong balls inside balloons.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I said, if we—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What's inside the ping-pong balls?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He's got the right question! What is inside the ping-pong balls are the townships. So the ping-pong balls continue to behave as if they were not inside the balloons, and the bit between the outside of the balloon and the ping-pong ball is the preservation zone. Are you still with me? Are you with me? I will have to get a blackboard.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The Deputy Premier is asking are we with him; he needs his people with him, not us.

The SPEAKER: Sit down. There is no point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That point of order was out of order. You could be named. Member for Unley.

NURSE TRAINING

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:24): I don't speak French nor Belgian, Madam Speaker. My question is for the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Will the training places being funded by the state government to train nurses in Vietnam for South Australian hospitals be counted towards the 100,000 training positions promised by the government?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:24): Several years ago now I made public statements about our intentions to make sure that we were not caught short, as it were, in terms of nurse numbers in the future. We know that in Australia over the next 30 years or so there will be shortages in certain key professions and we will not have sufficient numbers of young people within Australia to take on those jobs.

We are reasonably confident that there will be sufficient numbers of medical practitioners, but we are very concerned that there will not be sufficient numbers of nurses coming through the system over the next little while. That is because something like 40 per cent of current medical and health workers are likely to retire over the next 15 years. We know that the growth in the population

which is under the age of 15 is only about 2 per cent so there is going to be a shortage of people who are available to fill those jobs. So what—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition, order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: So what we know from history is that, when we have shortages in health professions and elsewhere, we go to the developing world and recruit staff from those places. To me—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: The question had nothing to do with recruiting people for the health department. The question was: will these people being trained in Vietnam be counted towards the 100,000 training places?

The SPEAKER: I believe that the minister is incorporating this into his answer to that question. Minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is important that they understand the background because the question has to be seen against that background.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We know that we will need to recruit nurses in the future and the most likely place to recruit those nurses will be from Third World or developing countries. To ensure that we do this on an ethical basis we have signed a memorandum of understanding with the Vietnamese government to work with them to make sure that we can help them train nurses in their country, within their health institutions, so that some time in the future, if there is a shortage of nurses in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —we will have people who are trained to international standards who will want to work in South Australia and who will be able to work in South Australia, and we will work with them to make sure their institutions are at a high standard so that the people who are likely to come here will be able to work seamlessly in our system.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

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

Mr PISONI: The question was specifically about a numbers count. The Premier—

The SPEAKER: Order! I can understand where you are—

Mr PISONI: —made a promise at the last election that there would be 100,000 new training positions in South Australia and I—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: —asked the further education minister, not the health minister, whether those Vietnamese-trained nurses will be included in those training places. It is a very simple question.

The SPEAKER: Sit down. No, there is no point of order. The minister can answer the question, and it is relevant.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: To conclude my answer, the answer in a succinct word is no.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

COMMUNITY EVENT LIQUOR LICENCES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:27): I would like to speak again on a very important issue, that of liquor licences for community events in country areas. My speech should be

heard and read immediately following on from the grievance speech I made on Tuesday, 7 June (exactly two weeks ago) on the same topic. I would just like to continue on this very important topic. At the outset I would like to restate my very clear view that I do not support under-age drinking, drink-driving or any other antisocial behaviour that may be connected to the consumption of alcohol, and that is very clear. I think all people who consume alcohol must do so responsibly.

It is also very important that all agencies which regulate liquor licensing must do that in a responsible fashion, as well. The enforcement of our laws must be done in a responsible fashion, not in a draconian, overzealous way, and certainly not in a way that may seem, at the outset, to make life easier for the agencies or easier for the police or easier for the communities when, in actual fact, it will just make life harder in the long run.

Community events that require liquor licences, so that adults can fully enjoy them, are indeed for families. There are people all the way from young babies through to grandparents and great-grandparents. I am talking about agricultural shows, rodeos, country horseraces and many other styles of events in the country. These events do three key things: they provide the activity in country and outback areas; they provide the event which people can attend and enjoy; and, in many cases, they keep sports and activities and people's skills up in those areas, as well. They certainly provide that very important community event for people to go to—to get out of the house, get off the farm and interact with each other.

They also provide very important commercial benefits to local businesses. All of the businesses in the towns and districts that hold these events benefit purely by virtue of the fact that the crowd is there. Whether it is a smaller crowd, from 100 or 200 people to a larger crowd of 2,000, 3,000 or 4,000 people, local economies benefit enormously from these events. The third one, of course, very importantly, is the fundraising. These events are typically run by volunteers raising funds.

I would like to go through a couple of examples of situations where I consider that the liquor licensing laws, with regard to the acquisition of liquor licences by these community groups, have been dealt with completely inappropriately. I am reading an extract from an email sent to me by the secretary of the Jamestown Show Society about the Northern Agricultural Show's Association Annual Presentation Dinner on 26 March in the Jamestown Hall. It states:

When notifying the local police of the event we were told that we had to have one security guard for up to 150 people and two for over 150.

Due that information the committee chose to set the limit at 140 guests mostly aged 60 and over...The President applied for the licence online 6 weeks prior to the event.

After hearing nothing from the department two weeks prior to the event she rang...only to be told that she would definitely receive confirmation before the event and that they would only be processing the application during the week of the event.

She received the licence by email two days before the event.

The president assumed that getting the application in 6 weeks prior to the event [she] would receive the licence well before the event was held.

I understand that you only need to get this in three weeks beforehand. So, this puts people under enormous stress and pressure.

I would also like to touch very quickly on rodeos. This year both the Carrington and Wilmington rodeos' licensing areas for alcohol were caged in—segregated—so that if you wanted to go into the area where you were allowed to have alcoholic drink only people aged 18 and over could go in there, and there was a six-foot high fence separating them from their families. That meant that parents and grandparents who wanted to come to a family show and watch a rodeo, could not enjoy a beer, a glass of wine, or something like that, at the same time without leaving their kids.

So, what that does is separate families, it separate the enjoyment of the event enormously, and it also hurts the fundraising. It significantly impacts on the fundraising that these events are allowed to undertake. That sort of application of liquor licensing laws by the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner and the police makes life incredibly difficult for these events and it makes them unworkable into the future. I ask the government to direct a change to the application of the policy.

PREMIER'S COMMUNITY INITIATIVES FUND

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:33): The Premier's Community Initiatives Fund is a fantastic initiative of the Rann Labor government as it provides financial assistance to South Australian-based not-for-profit organisations which help disadvantaged, disabled or socially isolated members of the community. I was particularly pleased to see that really worthy group from my electorate of Mitchell has recently received a grant under the fund, and I would like to speak about this organisation today.

Known as the Sammy D Foundation, its mission statement is to encourage youth to reach the maximum life potential with an emphasis of empowering young people to make safe and positive life choices. The foundation was established a couple of years ago by parents Nat and Neil in honour of their son Sam Davis, a 17 year old young man from the southern suburbs who died as a result of a violent assault at a party in May 2008.

It was a reminder, as was the death of cricket legend David Hookes four years earlier, that one punch can kill. What a tragedy, the loss of a young man with so much passion for life, so much love for his family and friends and so much talent for sport. I knew Sam and his father Neil through playing indoor cricket at the Morphett Vale ICA. Sam was a hard working and talented young man. He played his most loved Aussie rules with underage teams at Happy Valley and the South Adelaide Football Club, indoor and indoor and outdoor cricket with the Morphett Vale Sharks and he made state soccer teams at an early age. He went to rugby sevens, indoor netball and even carpet bowls. He was simply outstanding at anything physical.

As well as being a great sportsman with a blossoming football career at the Panthers, he was also a loyal friend, always willing to stick up for others. It is hardly surprising that, due to the impact he had on virtually everyone he met, as many as 2,000 people attended his funeral. His family, including his parents Neil and Nat, has tried to ensure that some good comes out of Sammy's tragic death. They knew that it was his wish for his organs to be donated. The fact that the family had had this conversation before it was too late meant it was easier for them to ensure other people would have a second chance at life.

As I mentioned, a great deal of good also comes out of the Sammy D Foundation. Its principal aim is the prevention of harm, specifically from physical, emotional and substance abuse. While its programs offer simple advice to equip people of all ages with ways to prevent harm, its main target group is young people aged eight to 24, a group at high risk of being victims or perpetrators of these types of abuse.

Through the Sammy D Impact program, the foundation gives interactive presentations in schools and for community groups to raise awareness about risky behaviours, poor choices and situations that can lead to violence. The Connect program teams at-risk youth with sports clubs, community groups and schemes that promote positive life choices and getting involved. It is based on the premise that being part of positive, structured activities can reduce the incidence of alcohol and other drug addiction and lead to positive social and development impacts. Those in Connect are mentored and provided with financial and social support while they are part of the program. The support continues with a further follow-up in the years following their involvement.

The third arm of the Sammy D Foundation's harm prevention activities is Partywise. This is a program aimed at providing safe party strategies. The foundation has begun developing information packs with guidelines for holding safer parties. These will be available at foundation Partywise forums, with Partywise also featuring in senior school workshops. In an age in which social media dominates communication channels among young people, it is crucial to be aware of the dangers of party invitations going viral.

As a parent, I cannot comprehend the pain of losing a child, but I can acknowledge the path, courage and determination Nat and Neil have taken to establish and grow the foundation. There are many lessons to be learned from Sam Davis's death and his life. I would recommend that anybody who wants more information or who wishes to support the foundation makes contact with the Sammy D Foundation.

MARINE PARKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:38): Yet again, I find myself in this place calling seriously into question the marine parks process and the exclusion zone process. Interestingly enough, a member spoke to me today about the subject I am going to discuss—the doctoring and changing of

records, minutes and website maps regarding the proposed zones. If this was not so serious, it would just about be funny.

A week or two ago the Chairman of the Kangaroo Island Marine Park Local Advisory Group (LAG), Mr Andy Gilfillan, made a number of statements in the local press claiming—and I think correctly—that Marine Park LAG minutes of meetings had been doctored, that maps had been amended, that things were in no way where they should be or should have been and that indeed things had gone awry. I have had my concerns about this for some time.

It was interesting to see that last week the government came back and claimed, 'No, they are not being doctored or they are not being amended,' and actually tried to pooh-pooh Mr Gilfillan. You seriously wonder whether this is a direction straight from the department. Is this, 'Direction No. 4: discredit the person who makes a statement. He is harbouring a grudge against the department. He is a publicity seeker'?

Mr Gilfillan is none of those. He is a hardworking gentleman who has done a fantastic job. So, is it then the direction from the department to undermine what he is saying, that what was in the paper is not really a basis for long-term decisions or not sufficient information on which to base a valid assessment? Once again, we have a department running riot.

They have then tried to discredit the evidence that has not been published by saying it leaves important questions unanswered, much of the evidence is inconclusive, the figures are open to interpretation, certain findings are contradictory, and some of the main conclusions have been questioned. Mr Gilfillan has asked all those things. Then you refuse to put things up on the website one day, you pull them down the next, then you put something else up. I can tell you, and I can tell the house, that I am very pleased that the upper house is moving for an inquiry into this matter because it is going to flush out a heap of nonsense. It is going to flush out absolute bastardry in the department of environment and absolute crookedness, in my view, in the marine parks group that have been putting this together under the department.

I think it is disgraceful, it is outrageous, and it should never have happened. The department and this marine parks group have a strategy of passive deflection. They go along with the mood of the meeting and tell you what will happen, then they ignore you for a couple of weeks and then they send you something which is the opposite of what you agreed, but, by the time you get it, it is too late to do anything about it, so they post their version on the website. Then they say they have consulted and there was no objection. For example, at one meeting it was agreed that one particular area would be left out and everyone was happy about it. Then they go to the next meeting and the area is included and they did not receive any objections. It is like something straight out of *Yes Minister*.

They did not disclose the key documentation but they came out quoting a letter by Mr Allan Holmes. The letter was the key piece of documentation, but magically no-one had received the letter. Yet they received everything else. There is a recognition that the Kangaroo Island situation is unique. Other places do not seem to have had the same kind of shenanigans but I think it is going to lead to that, and I think that is going to come out through the upper house inquiry.

I have to seriously question the green group. They are very suspect. The aims of the LAGs is to whittle down the choice to a couple of alternatives acceptable to the community but the greens vote for everything and that gives DENR the option to do what it wants. It is outrageous, absolutely outrageous. Then they go out and trash people like Andy Gilfillan, Michael Fooks, Bevan Patterson and others on the Kangaroo Island LAG who have put an enormous amount of effort and experience into it.

I do not know where this is going. The minister might think this marine parks thing has gone quiet, trust me. But I tell you it has not; it is going to come back and bite him and this government like something they would not believe. This departmental group has not had it right from the start and, as far as I am concerned, they have misrepresented the meeting outcomes from particularly this group and other groups, and I hope that other members rise to their feet and talk about this. It will almost need a judicial inquiry. It is going to come back and bite this government like they would not believe, trust me. It has not gone away. We are just waiting to see what they come out with next, and I can tell you it is not finished.

EMILY'S LIST

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:43): I am a very proud member of the organisation EMILY's List, as are a number of Labor women in this place. In addition to Prime Minister Julia

Gillard, many women across Australia—particularly members of parliament—are members of EMILY's List. On the weekend, I had the opportunity to be part of the celebrations to commemorate some of the EMILY's List trailblazers. The event, called Premiers Event, celebrated the work of Rosemary Follett AO, who was the chief minister of the ACT from 1989 to 1990 and then from 1991 to 1995. Not only was Rosemary Follett the ACT's first chief minister and treasurer, but she was also the first woman to head government at that level in Australia.

We celebrated Professor Dr Carmen Lawrence, premier of Western Australia from 1990 to 1993. Dr Lawrence came into politics from a research psychology background at the University of Western Australia, and it is interesting that she has gone back into academia since retiring. She was also in federal and state politics for 21 years and held many portfolio responsibilities in both state and federal parliament.

She was the first woman premier and treasurer of a state government, and I know that Western Australia holds her in very dear stead for the work that she did. She was the national president of the Labor Party in 2004.

We were also celebrating my absolute 'shero' and mentor Joan Kirner AM, who was the premier in Victoria from 1990 to 1992. She was the 42nd and first woman premier in Victoria, and that happened in August 1990. She is a founding member of EMILY's List, and she was also the inaugural national convenor from 1996 to 2006. She is now an ambassador for EMILY's List.

I think that anyone who has met Joan Kirner, where ever they come from in the political spectrum, would agree that she has always been a great role model to everyone about how a member of parliament should behave and the work that is needed. She is a great role model.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: She is also a very good rock'n'roll singer, as the member for Bragg points out. I understand reliably from the member for Florey that she had a birthday yesterday. I thought that she was 70 something, and the member for Florey says that she is 73. To see someone operating with such activity is pretty impressive.

Clare Martin was also celebrated. She was the chief minister of the Northern Territory from 2001-07. She had a background in journalism. She was a broadcaster in TV and radio, particularly with our beloved ABC. She was elected into parliament in 1990; and, as she said on the weekend, it was a shock in 2001 not only for Labor to get in as the government but also that she became the chief minister, a position she held for six years. She has gone back into academia at the Charles Darwin University, and she is involved in an important program looking at alcohol management in the Northern Territory region.

Anna Bligh is our first popularly-elected female Premier in Australia. She was elected on 21 March 2009 in the Queensland election. She also served as Premier in that state from 13 September 2007 following the resignation of Peter Beattie.

I also need to mention Lara Giddings MP who became Tasmania's 44th and first woman Premier in January 2011. I also mention Katy Gallagher, the second woman Chief Minister in the ACT, who attained that role in May 2011 after the resignation of chief minister Jon Stanhope.

STUDENT PERFORMANCES

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:48): Whenever I get the opportunity to speak at citizenship ceremonies or, indeed, visit schools in my electorate, I often take the opportunity to point out that those are two of my absolute favourite things that I have come across since getting the opportunity to do this job; and I see the member for Taylor nodding her head. I am sure that it is an experience felt and shared by many members of this house.

When you talk to new citizens of this country and when you talk to schoolchildren, you get the opportunity to see people experiencing the joy, the optimism and the hope for the future, and you can share with them how they are going to help build our state and our country into a better place. It is an absolute thrill.

One of my favourite parts of even that part of the job is seeing schoolchildren perform, because I think that cultural performance is a very significant part of an ideal education system. I think that it adds a great deal to our cultural fabric to see students doing extra curricular activities and offering their best, and it is quite enjoyable as well. I take the opportunity today just because I have had three recent experiences that particularly brought this home to me.

The first was at the graduation and registration ceremony for the Ethnic Schools Board, which brought both the themes of new citizens and schoolchildren performing together, because our ethnic schools are very important. They are very special. I first encountered the Ethnic Schools Association when I was still at university doing temp work and I got the opportunity to spend a few months doing part-time work in the Ethnic Schools Association offices which were then in Hectorville at the East Torrens Primary School, working with Inta Rumpé on preparing some of their materials for the year ahead. I have been pleased to maintain some sort of connection with them over the 11 years since, and it is something I particularly appreciate.

I enjoyed the opportunity to join with the member for Ashford, the Minister for Education, the member for Waite (Martin Hamilton-Smith), the member for Bragg (Vickie Chapman)—and happy birthday to the member for Bragg: it is a great day—the member for Norwood, I believe, and of course the member for Unley (David Pisoni, the shadow education minister), in whose electorate the ceremony was held.

These ceremonies are very important. They give an opportunity for the Ethnic Schools Board to appreciate the registration of their teachers in their schools for the year ahead. John Kiosoglous, of course, is the Chairman of the Ethnic Schools Board, and a great South Australian who does a tremendous job in supporting the ethnic schools in the work they do.

In saying that, our ethnic schools give children from different ethnic backgrounds the opportunity to reconnect with their cultures and learn the languages of their parents' homelands. I think there are more opportunities the department of education could help them out with. It could help them find more rooms within DECS schools, for example, and make them available so that more ethnic schools could flourish.

Putting that aside, I thought the performances were outstanding of the School of St Nicholas Parish of the Russian Orthodox Church, the Sinhala Buddhist School, the Alexander Pushkin Russian School, the Adelaide Kurdish Ethnic School and the Chinese School of the Chinese Welfare Services, and I commend those children.

A couple of weeks later, on 2 June, I was pleased to be involved in the Festa della Repubblica celebrations at Fogolar Furlan in Felixstow. On that occasion the Brighton Secondary School, as it always does, performed magnificently, in sometimes trying circumstances. Jeffrey Kong is a great South Australian, and he is the head of music at Brighton Secondary School, of course.

Mr Sibbons: A great man.

Mr GARDNER: A great man, as the member for Mitchell says. He led his students in trying circumstances. The Brighton Secondary School Choir and String Ensemble, with soloists Mark Oakley and Hannah Greenshields, performed despite the fact that some of the VIPs were wandering around the room and talking (some of my colleagues who will remain nameless, unfortunately). Nevertheless, they played on, and Carolyn Lam on the violin was extraordinary and played beautifully in very trying circumstances.

In the last 30 seconds remaining to me, I will mention one of the best high school musicals that I have seen in my life recently, and I have been involved with a few. I commend the students of Norwood Morialta High School for their tremendous performance of *The King and I*, led by Danielle Greaves, in particular, as Anna, and Justin Rowe as the king. I go to a lot of high school musicals in my electorate and have been involved with these for years, but I can particularly say that was fantastic and I commend all of those students in all of those groups.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:53): I start by thanking the member for Mitchell for his comments about the Sammy D Foundation. It is, indeed, an instance of great good coming out of great tragedy. Like the member for Mitchell, I could not imagine what it would be like to lose a child, particularly in those circumstances. Both Nat and Neil have shown the strength to go on but, very interestingly, many of Sammy's friends have continued as volunteers in that organisation, showing both their commitment to Sam and their commitment to thinking that we can live better lives without violence. One instance I have been involved with recently is the work they are doing to assist children who are in the care of the minister, and that is worthy work indeed.

I continue with my recognition of a number of women from the southern area whose contribution to the community was recognised at our International Women's Day dinner some time ago. I had got as far as identifying Eunice Hearne for her contribution to the Reynella

Neighbourhood Centre. The next person to be recognised is Deb Upright. Deb has been the number one ladies recurve archer in the world and, after a shoulder injury, she changed to crossbow competition, and yet again became number one in the world in her division. Unfortunately, not enough people in Morphett Vale know that one of our number has held those world titles on two occasions.

Ms Bedford: No-one knows.

Ms THOMPSON: As the member for Florey says, it is just not known in South Australia. Her contacts and her influence recently brought the world crossbow competition to the south, being hosted by the Southern Vales Archery Club in Morphett Vale. My thanks to the City of Onkaparinga which assisted in the arrangements for that, as did a series of Active Club grants.

The next person to be recognised was Shirley Paull. Shirley was one of the people who initially developed the Pink Ribbon Campaign. It was through her work with the Breast Cancer Network of Australia, in which she became involved as a result of her diagnosis with breast cancer in 1988, and she then started a support group in Willunga. Her activities grew and developed such that she was involved with the SA Breast Cancer Consumer Advisory Group, spoke with Flinders University medical students about loss and grief for breast cancer patients, and, as I said, became part of the founders of the group that promoted Pink Ribbon Day. This award was made posthumously, sadly, and Shirley is greatly missed by members of the Southern Women's Community Health Centre.

Jan Parslow was recognised for her contribution to the welfare of veterans through her long-term activities at the Morphett Vale RSL sub-branch. She is now the president of the women's auxiliary, having been involved in many activities at the community and RSL level and has been a joint partner with her husband, Darryl, who has extended his contribution to council and Rotary through many years.

Angela Beauchamp was recognised for her involvement in promoting healthy eating, and she was part of the original group of Community Foodies when it started in 2001. Community Foodies is a group of people who, with the assistance of the dieticians from the Noarlunga Health Service, became involved in modelling good food practice within the community.

They went to schools and various community organisations to show people how they could easily produce good, nutritious food, at a budget price. They are now working with organisations such as Anglicare to provide not just food parcels but real meals, with instructions with each food parcel so that a family can eat good, healthy meals even though their money is short. My congratulations and thanks to all these women, whose recognition was well deserved.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

MENTAL HEALTH FACILITIES

15 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010).

1. What steps are taken at all mental health facilities in South Australia to ensure that patients do not consume alcohol or illicit drugs?
2. What steps are taken to ensure that patients take their prescribed medication and do not pass their medication onto other patients or visitors?
3. How many instances of violence caused by patients to other patients, staff and visitors occurred in 2008-09 in mental health facilities and during these instances what was the security on these occasions and what compensation has been or will be paid?

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

1. All staff working in mental health facilities follow the 'Drug and Alcohol Abuse and Possession' procedure to ensure all appropriate steps are taken should consumers be suspected of consuming alcohol or illicit drugs.
2. All staff working in mental health facilities follow the 'Medication Management' procedure, which includes the appropriate dispensing and administration of medication to the

correct consumer. Consumers are observed taking their medication and this has been standard practice for many years to avoid any possible misuse of prescribed medications among consumers. Senior staff are required to ensure all staff comply with the 'Medication Management' procedure. All nursing staff are required to adhere to the Nurses and Midwifery Board of SA Standard for Medication Management.

3. During 2008-09 the Department of Health recorded 648 incidents of violence caused by mental health patients to other consumers, staff and visitors. The incidents are categorised in the Department's Adverse Incidents Management System as insignificant, minor, serious and significant. Of these incidents, 4.9 per cent fell in the category of serious or significant. The number of serious or significant incidents compared to total mental health separations represents 0.24 per cent.

A risk assessment determines the level of supervision for mental health consumers (detained or voluntary). The outcome of the risk assessment determines if a patient is allocated a security guard, a nurse or is managed by general observations. Security guards are used across metropolitan Adelaide hospitals (and a small number of country sites) to provide a safe and secure environment for the public, consumers and staff. Security guards work under the direction of medical and nursing staff.

In 2008-09 there were 24 claims about instances of violence lodged by staff. An amount of approximately \$130 000 was paid against these claims. There were no compensation payments made to the public.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

19 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). How many health staff are employed within the South Australian Healthcare System and the South Australian Department of Health, respectively, and in each case, how many full time equivalent health staff are classified as administrative or other?

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

1. At June 2009 there were 36,659 employees (28,888 FTE) engaged in SA Health. Of which:

SA Health	No. of Employees	FTE
SA public health system	34,441	26,812
Department of Health	987	938
SA Ambulance Service	1,231	1,138

At June 2009 there were 5,078 FTE in the administrative and clerical stream of the SA public health system.

In addition to undertaking administrative and clerical functions, employees included under Administrative and Clerical staff also provide specialist functions in support of key health programs that contribute to an agency's service delivery objectives. This includes:

- the coordination and management of many community and primary health projects and programs (including Health and Welfare Research and Project/Policy Officers (Mental Health, Early Intervention and Aboriginal Health), as well as vast majority of Community and Aboriginal Health Workers)
- the operation and maintenance of office systems
- the provision of advice or services to customers
- exercising of delegations
- enforcement and prosecution
- policy development and implementation
- detection and investigation of breaches of legislation
- the development of financial systems

- the collection of Government revenue and/or payment of Government monies and related management functions.

CENTRAL NORTHERN ADELAIDE HEALTH SERVICE

30 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). Has the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service achieved the \$3 million in savings (as outlined in the 2007-08 Budget) for the consolidation of after-hours hospital services and emergency surgical services and if so, how was this achieved?

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

1. The Central Northern Adelaide Health Service, now part of the Adelaide Health Service, was required to meet savings as part of the 2007-08 Budget of \$4.133 million over the four years 2007-08 to 2010-11 relating to the consolidation of after-hours emergency surgical services. The savings target to 2009-10 is \$3.066 million with \$1.067 million required in 2010-11.

This savings target has been achieved recurrently by the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service. The majority of this savings target has been achieved through the maintenance of after-hours Operating Room rosters, changes to on-call staffing instead of 24 hour staffing and further reviews of rostering arrangements.

These management strategies have not been directed at reducing frontline health care services.

CENTRAL NORTHERN ADELAIDE HEALTH SERVICE

31 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). What savings initiatives are required from the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service in 2009-10, how will they be achieved and what is the total amount of savings identified for 2009-10 and 2010-11?

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

1. The savings requirement allocated to the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service (CNAHS) in 2009-10 was based on savings initiatives approved by Cabinet as part of the 2009-10 State Budget, as well as the continuation of savings targets approved as part of previous budget processes.

The CNAHS 2009-10 funding allocation includes savings targets associated with the following items:

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

2. The total allocation of savings requirements in 2009-10 to CNAHS is \$56.15 million. Total savings requirements for the Adelaide Health Service for the 2010-11 financial year have not yet been finalised, and therefore can not be provided at this time.

CENTRAL NORTHERN ADELAIDE HEALTH SERVICE

32 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). Has the performance agreement with the Regional Chief Executive Officer and the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service been completed for 2009-10 and has this resulted in any changes in funding arrangements and/or activity targets?

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

The performance agreement with the Regional Chief Executive Officer and the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service has been completed for 2009-10. This did result in changes to funding arrangements and activity targets.

INDIGENOUS HEALTH

38 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). How does the government expect to achieve greater ambulatory and primary health care services, mental health service, Breast Screen SA services and SA Dental Services to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders within South Australia?

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

SA Health is currently finalising the Aboriginal Health Care Plan. This plan sets out actions for a strong and resilient continuum of care from prevention to better primary health care services to more access to tertiary services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people within South Australia.

New GP Plus Health Care Centres are due to open to the public at Elizabeth and Marion over the next few months. Both GP Plus Health Care Centres are committed to providing appropriate services for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

In country South Australia, GP Plus Health Care Centres are being planned and built in Ceduna and Port Pirie. In Ceduna, the GP Plus Health Care Centre will be a part of the redevelopment of the Ceduna Hospital, collocated with the local community controlled Aboriginal health service. The GP Plus Health Care Centre planned for Port Pirie will consolidate a number of existing individual services on to one site. Both GP Plus Health Care Centres will have a major focus on Aboriginal health, with accessible and culturally appropriate services to be provided by Aboriginal health workers.

Services to be provided from all these GP Plus Health Care Centres include: general practice, breast screening, dental, allied health, primary care, mental health, and drug and alcohol counselling.

Two GP Plus Super Clinics are currently being built in South Australia in partnership with the Australian Government. Both the Modbury (via its Gilles Crescent Spoke Site), and Noarlunga GP Plus Super Clinics will have Aboriginal specific services and designated teams of Aboriginal health workers to focus on meeting the health needs of their respective local Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people communities.

The services to be provided from these GP Plus Super Clinics include: general practice, which will target chronic conditions (for example, diabetes), allied health, lifestyle and nutrition, sexual health, dental and mental health support.

Under the Closing the Gap National Partnership Agreement, a range of primary health care services are being delivered to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people throughout the State. Key elements of this initiative include improved access to health checks, a focus on environmental health in remote communities and sexual health services.

The Indigenous Early Childhood National Partnership Agreement delivers new and expanded services aimed at improving the health and wellbeing of young Aboriginal people. Services delivered under this initiative include sexual health screening, maternal and infant care programs and school-based sexual health education in remote schools.

COUNTRY HEALTH

43 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010).

1. Have administrative efficiencies savings of \$3.52 million in Country Health (as outlined in the 2007-08 Budget) been achieved and if so, how was this achieved?

2. Have service delivery savings of \$20 million in Country Health as outlined in the 2007-08 Budget been achieved for 2008-09 and 2009-10 and how will a further \$10.4 million in savings be achieved in 2010-11?

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

1. The administrative efficiencies of \$3.52 million in Country Health (\$1 million for 2007-08, \$1.02 million in 2008-09 and \$1.5 million for 2009-10) have been achieved through a reduction in country health administration and project positions foregone through natural attrition, resulting from the reduction of seven regions to one.

2. The Country Health service delivery changes of \$10 million per annum indexed in the forward years, comprise a range of strategies, which include the transition of State nursing home funded beds to Commonwealth funding and a range of administrative changes, which reflect the new organisational management structure of Country Health SA. The total savings requirement across 2008-09 and 2009-10 was \$20.2 million (\$10 million in 2008-09 and \$10.218 million in 2009-10).

During 2008-09, the finalisation of negotiations with the Commonwealth Government occurred later than initially expected and this impacted on the total savings achieved with a shortfall of \$4.5 million experienced due to this delay. In 2009-10, additional Commonwealth revenue and restructuring of Health unit management was achieved, along with a portion of other identified savings strategies in 2009-10. However, \$1.738 million in 2009-10 has not been achieved.

The savings requirement for 2010-11 of \$10.44 million will predominantly be achieved using existing savings strategies. However, Country Health SA has also developed a range of other savings strategies to move to a balanced budget position.

HEALTH SAVINGS

46 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). Does the government still expect to achieve the \$1.65 million in savings from the transfer of paediatric and obstetric services from Modbury Hospital to the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Lyell McEwen Hospital?

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

This initiative was aimed at improving the efficiency of service delivery across the State and to address workforce issues, particularly in relation to obstetric anaesthesia.

The obstetric service at Modbury Hospital did transfer to the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Women's and Children's Hospital by February 2008. Paediatric services at Modbury Hospital remained at Modbury in the form of outpatients, emergency services and 23 hour inpatient services. Children requiring a longer length of stay are transferred to the Women's and Children's Hospital or Lyell McEwin Hospital.

Savings of \$400,000 were achieved in 2007-08, \$409,000 in 2008-09, \$415,000 in 2009-10 and projected \$427,000 in 2010-11. Total savings are projected to be \$1.654 million.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

52 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010).

1. What reforms will be undertaken in emergency departments, sub-acute services, indigenous health services and health workforce development activity based funding?

2. Will these reforms generate savings and if so, how much is expected and how many full-time equivalent staff will be reduced as a result of these reforms?

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

1. There are a range of reform initiatives currently being undertaken by SA Health in relation to services to support emergency departments, sub-acute care, Indigenous health and workforce development.

Emergency department clinicians have been engaged to provide advice on enhancing services in emergency departments. In particular, service redesign activities have been undertaken to improve the number of emergency patients being treated in clinically appropriate times.

Statewide Service Plans for Palliative Care, Older Person and Stroke Services that have been developed by clinicians, will inform reforms in sub-acute services. The plans have all advocated for establishment and/or expansion of integrated services, which will operate across primary, chronic and acute care services. The implementation of these reforms is being progressed through regional health services.

The State Government is investing \$53.8 million into the National Partnership Agreement on Closing the Gap in Indigenous Health Outcomes. A State implementation plan has been approved detailing a range of strategies to be implemented that address the five priority areas outlined in the National Partnership Agreement. These include:

- tackling smoking
- primary health care services that will deliver services for Indigenous people fixing the gaps and improving the patient journey
- healthy transition to adulthood
- making Indigenous health everyone's business.

The COAG Indigenous Early Childhood Development National Partnership Agreement has also been established to improve outcomes for Indigenous children in their early years and it contains three elements:

- enhancement of Children and Family Centres, which is administered by the Department of Education and Children's Services
- improve access to and use of antenatal care services by young Indigenous mothers and support young Indigenous women to make informed decisions about their sexual and reproductive health
- increased access to and use of maternal and child health services by Indigenous families.

A national approach to health workforce reform, through the now established Health Workforce Australia, will deliver significant benefits in the consolidation of jurisdictional efforts. Examples of the benefits anticipated will be the development of:

- enhanced undergraduate clinical training and increased clinical supervision programs
- increases and improvements in simulated learning environments with a focus on accessibility to regional and rural centres
- consolidation of jurisdictional international recruitment programs to a single program covering all health professionals
- enhanced workforce design strategies to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the health workforce.

Finally, the National Activity Based Funding initiative aims to develop a national framework and model to facilitate activity based funding in the hospital sector. Eight work streams representing the main patient types (for example inpatient, outpatient, emergency department patients) and functions (for example research and teaching) have been identified and work is underway to develop an agreed national approach to the classification and costing of these services. This will provide the basis for the future funding of hospitals should COAG agree to implement a national activity based funding system.

2. These reform initiatives are, in the main, about enhancing and expanding services to our communities and to ensure that we have the right staff in the right place to provide the right care, and not about generating savings.

NURSING AND MIDWIFERY PROGRAMS

64 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). How many mothers are currently on the waiting list to utilise nursing and midwifery programs provided by South Australia's public hospitals?

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

As at the end of June 2010, there are 162 women due to give birth between July and December 2010 on the waiting list for the Midwifery Group Practice.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH POLICY

67 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). What complexities were encountered in Aboriginal health policy and program planning for the recruitment and retention of staff?

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

1. The following complexities were encountered in Aboriginal health policy and program planning for the recruitment and retention of staff:

(a) Recruitment Issues

- It is well documented that Aboriginal people still face significant educational disadvantage compared to the non-Aboriginal population, limiting employment opportunities for Aboriginal people and their ability to undertake further education and training.
- Due to the nature of the services SA Health provides, a highly skilled workforce is required to deliver these services.
- There are insufficient numbers of skilled Aboriginal people to recruit to SA Health.
- There is a limited number of entry level positions in SA Health for people with no formal qualifications.

(b) What We Are Doing To Address The Issues

- SA Health has developed a number of Aboriginal specific employment and training programs to develop an appropriately and highly skilled Aboriginal health workforce supply.
- A key initiative has been the Aboriginal Centres of Learning. Notably, the Pika Wiya Aboriginal Learning Centre in Port Augusta, which has trained and improved employment outcomes for many Aboriginal people in health related areas since its inception in 2002. There is also a Learning Centre within the Port Lincoln Aboriginal Health Service and planning is currently underway to establish an Aboriginal Learning Centre in Ceduna.
- Other important recruitment initiatives include Cadetships and Traineeships, which offer training combined with on-the-job skill development and employment pathways into SA Health.
- SA Health has recently developed a pre-employment program for Aboriginal people in the Southern Adelaide region. This program provides participants the opportunity to develop their skills and learn about SA Health in preparation for employment. On successful completion of the program, individuals are assessed and appointed to appropriate vacancies within the Southern Adelaide Region of Adelaide Health Service.
- SA Health also offers Aboriginal health scholarships for Aboriginal people undertaking undergraduate or postgraduate health disciplines. Scholarship graduates are recruited in SA Health.
- SA Health is promoting the use of the Aboriginal Employment Register from the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology to enable direct recruitment of Aboriginal people into SA Health positions.

- SA Health has recently obtained a further three year exemption from the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 to prefer Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people for appointment to Aboriginal Health Worker positions in South Australia.
 - SA Health is also investigating a similar approach for new health worker roles that are being created specifically to implement the COAG Closing the Gap National Partnership initiatives in South Australia.
- (c) Retention Issues
- SA Health recognises that cultural respect and safety are crucial factors to the retention of Aboriginal employees.
 - Burn out of Aboriginal front line staff due to increased complexity of work roles and Aboriginal community expectations and demands on their roles.
 - Difficulty with holding onto skilled Aboriginal staff—there is competition between Government agencies and other industry/sectors for skilled Aboriginal people.
- (d) What We Are Doing To Address The Issues
- SA Health has implemented and is developing further strategies to support the retention and development of Aboriginal staff in SA Health:
 - The implementation of the Metropolitan Aboriginal Family Birthing program and state-wide expansion of the Port Augusta Aboriginal Family Birthing program are examples of creating ongoing positions for Aboriginal people, particularly in the delivery of clinical services to the Aboriginal community.
 - Identifying targeted training and development opportunities for current Aboriginal staff, which will provide greater career pathways and opportunities.
 - Increasing Leadership development opportunities for Aboriginal people and providing mentoring support where possible for middle management positions.
 - Identifying and providing opportunities across the health division for Aboriginal people to work in mainstream services where opportunities for cross cultural education and support for Aboriginal workers are enhanced.
 - Aboriginal Health Division is improving cultural safety by focussing on implementing The Aboriginal Cultural Inclusion Framework, which is a Social Inclusion Unit Board initiative. Aboriginal Health Division has identified the key activities that need to be undertaken and developed draft supporting documents and tools to complete the implementation of the framework across all SA Health divisions.
 - Aboriginal cultural awareness training for staff has been delivered at several SA Health sites and specific measures, such as the development of culturally respectful policies in human resource management are being considered (for example, culturally appropriate leave policies, Aboriginal providers in the Employee Assistance Program etc).

Over the past 18 months a number of divisions have developed or are in the process of developing Aboriginal Workforce Reform Strategies that further facilitate improved outcomes in workforce recruitment and retention activities.

HEALTH SERVICES, WAITING TIMES

81 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). How many people have been referred to, how many are on the waiting list, what is the average waiting time for patients waiting to receive their first consultation or appointment from the date of referral and how are patients prioritised for treatment for each of the following services—North and West Child and Adolescent Mental Health, Child and Youth Health, Women's Health Statewide, Second Story, Yarrow Place Services, Hospital Links, Child and Family Integration Services and Child Protection Services?

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

1. How many people have been referred to the service? (2009-10)

Health Service	
Women's Health Statewide	1338 Healthline clients (self referral)
	129 clients referred for Counselling
Second Story, Youth Health Service	2,122 Unique clients received 6,011 occasions of service 1:1 and there were 2,293 group attendances
Hospital Links	180 (total of unique clients)
Yarrow Place Services	3,030 (total number of services)
Child Protection Services	1,509
Child and Family Health (CaMHS)	19,322 Universal Contact Visits
Child and Family Integration Service (CFIS)	203
North and West CaMHS	Northern 854; Western 493

2. How many are on a waiting list currently?

Health Service	
Women's Health Statewide	No waiting list
	Counselling: 4
Second Story, Youth Health Service	There is no waiting list if clients fit the criteria of the service.
Hospital Links	No waiting list
Yarrow Place Services	No waiting lists. All clients who meet the service criteria are allocated to an appointment
Child Protection Services	39
Child and Family Health (CaMHS)	No wait list
Child and Family Integration Service (CFIS)	No wait list
North and West CaMHS	Northern 34; Western 0

3. What is the average time for patients waiting to receive their first consultation or appointment from the date of referral?

Health Service	
Women's Health Statewide	Healthline: 0-30 minutes
	Counselling: 2-4 weeks
Second Story, Youth Health Service	1-2 weeks
Hospital Links	Within 5 working days
Yarrow Place Services	For recent rape or sexual assault (having occurred within the last 3 days): client is seen for crisis counselling and medical/forensic service within 2 hours. Requests for on-going counselling: recent assault (within past 12 months) 3-4 weeks wait; past assault (12 months ago or longer) 4-6 weeks wait
Child Protection Services	Psychosocial Assessment—32 days Therapy—36 days Medical (routine)—4 days Medical Urgent—immediately
Child and Family Health (CaMHS)	89.77 per cent within 2-4 weeks, 96.97 within 4-6 weeks
Child and Family Integration Service (CFIS)	1 week
North and West CaMHS	Average of 8 days

4. How are patients prioritised for treatment?

Health Service	
Women's Health Statewide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All services are for women. <i>Healthline</i>: is a telephone assistance line
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Counselling is based on need, women with mental health problems, such as suicidal ideation and the effects of violence and abuse, are given priority.
Second Story, Youth Health Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All clients have a risk assessment Clients at high risk receive a service within 24 hours Extreme risk receive an immediate response/service
Hospital Links	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Homeless young people and suicidal clients receive a service immediately.
Yarrow Place Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Triaged according to the time since the assault occurred: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within 3 days Within past 12 months 12 months or longer Suicidal clients will receive a service immediately.
Child Protection Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medical Forensics Examination—Immediate Urgent Psychosocial—within 2 weeks. Assessments are prioritised based on safety of child, age of child, circumstances, and urgent cases seen within 1 week. Therapy is prioritised depending on child safety, child needs and urgency of referral Keeping Them Safe—within 8 weeks
Child and Family Health (CaMHS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clients are assessed at the Universal Contact Visit and then the appropriate pathway or program is identified to best meet their needs.
Child and Family Integration Service (CFIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff respond to client needs and while there are no wait time issues with CFIS, priority is given to families who have a new born or young infant where there are child safety issues or concerns.
North and West CaMHS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients are prioritised for service based on a range of factors, including severity of the presenting mental health issue and the impact on the functioning of the child and family/carer. Those children and young people at highest risk receive priority allocation. There are specific population groups who are prioritised on the basis of known vulnerability factors. These groups include Aboriginal children, families from culturally and linguistically diverse communities and children under the guardianship of the Minister for Families and Communities.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

- 87 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 June 2010). In the each year since 2002-03—
- how many doctors and nurses were employed by the Department of Health; and
 - how many extra public servants (and FTE) were employed by the Department excluding doctors and nurses?

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

(a) The number (and FTE) of Doctors and Nurses/Midwives employed in the SA Health public health system from June 2002 to June 2009 is as follows:

Financial Year Ending	Doctors		Nurses/ Midwives	
	Actual	FTE	Actual	FTE
2002	2,181	1761.4	10,976	8,599.5
2003	2,353	1825.6	11,608	8,960.6
2003	2,353	1825.6	11,608	8,960.6
2004	2,388	1879.0	11,752	9,118.7
2005	2,498	1893.0	12,190	9,378.9
2006	2,674	2039.4	12,767	9,890.7
2007	2,895	2231.2	13,361	10,335.8
2008	3,083	2359.3	13,859	10,752.6
2009	3,255	2527.5	14,668	11,337.0

From 1 July 2007 Modbury Hospital transferred back to public management. To accurately report the workforce for 2008 and subsequent years, the estimated doctors and nurses/midwives at Modbury Hospital for 2002 to 2007 have been included in the base calculations for the total public health system.

(b) As per the definition of 'public servant', which refers to those persons who are employed under the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* (PSM Act) in the Department of Health, it excludes all employees of the Department of Health under other awards, including doctors, nurses or those engaged through weekly paid or non-awards. The following response refers to the number of PSM Act employees located in the Department of Health (central office), which represents approximately 3 per cent of the total SA Health workforce.

Financial Year Ending	Administrative ⁽¹⁾ , Operational, Technical Services, Professional Officers and Other PSM Employees ⁽²⁾	
	Actual	FTE
2005	747	709.6
2006	789	748.2
2007	762	724.5
2008	823	774.7
2009	918	872.4

(1) Includes employees engaged through the South Australian Government Youth Training Initiative.

(2) Includes all executives engaged under the executive management structure and South Australia Executive Service, Medical Scientists Award and Legal Service Officers.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

99 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (1 June 2010). When will the South Australian Ambulance Service publicly release a copy of the original epidemiology questionnaire and material safety data sheets on the chemical composition of those affected uniforms?

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

SA Ambulance Service has provided the epidemiology questionnaire to all staff, and the family of affected staff, who wear the operational uniform.

Material safety data sheets are referenced in the report entitled Investigative Chemical Analysis and Risk Assessment, by CETEC Pty Ltd. This report is available to all staff on the SA Ambulance Service intranet site.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

110 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 July 2010). What is the total expenditure for advertising and promotion of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, including expenditure for the

formerly named 'Marjorie Jackson-Nelson Hospital', since it was first announced for the Adelaide rail yards site?

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

Department of Health advertising expenditure as at 6 September 2010 associated with the new Royal Adelaide Hospital totals \$164,962 (see table below).

Advertising Expenditure as at 6 September 2010:

	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	Total
Advertising Expenditure	\$62,978	\$85,456	\$13,028	\$3,500	\$164,962

Community consultation and awareness was a large part of the advertising expenditure. This included a questionnaire, website, signage and brochures.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

111 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 July 2010). In relation to the storage of radioactive waste at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, including contaminated equipment and waste from clinical radiotherapy procedures—

- (a) when was the last audit undertaken and what were the radiation level results; and
- (b) what will happen to the radioactive waste stored in the basement when the Royal Adelaide Hospital is demolished?

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

(a) The last audit was undertaken in October 2009. Log books are kept of all individual radioactive waste containers. The log books are in continuous use and audited annually.

Radiation levels around all radioactive waste storage areas are well below radiation safety standard levels and are close to natural background radiation values.

(b) All radioactive waste will be transported to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and stored in purpose built on-site storage facilities.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

135 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 July 2010).

1. What is the net increase in nurses (full-time equivalent positions) in the South Australian public health system for each year since 2002?
2. How many of these nurses were from overseas and what countries did they come from?
3. What is the net increase in doctors (full-time equivalent positions) in the South Australian public health system for each year since 2002?
4. How many of these doctors were from overseas and what countries did they come from?

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

The following response is based on the standard 'full time equivalent (FTE)', which is used to describe a part-time employee as a proportion of an employee in an equivalent full-time position. This FTE description is based on the number of hours paid/worked by an employee as depicted in their pay summary, divided by the normal award full-time hours per pay period for that position. For the purposes of this definition, an employee can not be greater than 1.0 FTE. It excludes any overtime hours or allowances not reflective of hours worked (for example, travel allowance).

The South Australian public health system, for the purposes of this report, includes all health regions and entities of the SA Health portfolio, excluding the Department of Health (central office) and the SA Ambulance Service.

From 1 July 2007, Modbury Hospital transferred back to public management. Previously the variation in doctors and nurses/midwives at Modbury Hospital prior to June 2008 had not been included in the reported figures.

To accurately report the workforce for 2008 and subsequent years, an estimated doctors and nurses/midwives at Modbury Hospital for 2002 has been included in the base calculations for the total public health system.

Doctors include all persons employed as medical officers, medical practitioners, medical consultants, medical administrators, casual medical officers, trainee medical officers or visiting medical specialists. This report excludes those engaged as Clinical Academics.

Nurses and Midwives include all persons engaged under the *Nurses (South Australian Public Sector) Award 2002*, and includes all registered nurses/midwives, enrolled nurses, enrolled nurse cadets, nurse specialists, undergraduate nurses (assistants in nursing), nurse educators, clinical nurses and nurse managers.

Given the above definitions, the following information is provided:

1. The standard FTE of Doctors and Nurses/Midwives employed in the SA Health public health system from June 2002 to June 2010:

Financial Year Ending	Doctors	Nurses/Midwives
FTE at June 2002	1,761.4	8,599.5
Net Increase 02-03	+ 64.2	+ 361.1
Net Increase 03-04	+ 53.4	+ 158.1
Net Increase 04-05	+14.0	+ 260.2
Net Increase 05-06	+ 146.4	+ 511.8
Net Increase 06-07	+ 191.8	+ 445.1
Net Increase 07-08	+ 128.1	+ 416.8
Net Increase 08-09	+ 168.2	+ 584.4
Net Increase 09-10	+ 43.8	+ 533.2
TOTAL		
Net Increase 02-10	+ 809.9	+ 3,270.7
Per cent Increase 02-10	+ 46.0 per cent	+ 38.0 per cent

2. At June 2010 the Doctors and Nursing/Midwifery FTE workforce in the South Australian public health system reported the following Country of Birth and Arrival Dates to Australia prior and post June 2002;

Country of Birth (COB)	Doctors	Nurses/ Midwives
Australia	607.0	5,562.4
Unknown (COB)	811.7	3,955.4
Overseas Country of Birth	1,152.6	2,352.4
-Unknown Arrival Date to Australia	688.2	1,092.1
-Arrival Date to Australia prior June 2002	190.8	639.3
-Arrival Date to Australia post June 2002	273.6	621.0
-Country of Birth post June 2002 Arrivals to Australia		
- Austria	1.0	0.0
- Bangladesh	4.0	1.2
- Belgium	2.7	0.0
- Brunei Darussalam	1.0	0.0
- Canada	8.0	2.5
- China	0.0	99.2
- Colombia	0.0	0.5
- Czech Republic	0.0	0.2
- Denmark	2.0	0.0

Country of Birth (COB)	Doctors	Nurses/ Midwives
- Egypt	1.0	0.0
- Ethiopia	1.0	0.0
- Fiji	0.0	2.0
- Germany	3.0	3.9
- Ghana	0.0	1.0
- Hong Kong	0.7	7.6
- India	73.2	139.5
- Indonesia	0.0	2.0
- Iran	9.0	1.0
- Iraq	1.0	0.0
- Ireland	1.0	4.7
- Japan	0.0	6.2
- Kenya	1.0	6.2
- Korea	0.0	43.0
- Kuwait	1.0	1.0
- Lebanon	0.0	1.0
- Liberia	0.0	0.8
- Macedonia	0.0	1.0
- Malawi	0.6	0.8
- Malaysia	55.9	14.4
- Maldives	0.0	0.9
- Mauritius	1.0	2.9
- Nepal	0.0	6.0
- Netherlands	0.5	2.0
- New Zealand	5.3	10.5
- Niger	0.0	1.0
- Nigeria	0.0	3.9
- Northern Ireland	2.0	0.0
- Norway	0.0	2.5
- Pakistan	9.7	0.0
- Philippines	20.5	72.8
- Poland	1.5	1.0
- Romania	1.0	0.9
- Saudi Arabia	1.0	1.0
- Scotland	0.0	13.7
- Singapore	3.7	4.3
- South Africa	3.9	18.3
- Sri Lanka	18.7	2.9
- Southern & Eastern Africa	0.0	1.0
- Sudan	0.0	1.4
- Swaziland	0.0	1.0
- Sweden	1.0	0.7
- Switzerland	1.5	0.0
- Syrian Arab Republic	0.0	0.8
- Taiwan	1.0	6.1
- Thailand	1.0	4.0
- Trinidad And Tobago	0.0	1.0
- Ukraine	0.0	1.0
- United Arab Emirates	1.0	0.0
- United Kingdom	25.0	71.8
- United States Of America	5.0	3.3
- Venezuela	1.0	0.0
- Vietnam	0.4	5.0
- Wales	0.0	0.8
- Yugoslavia	0.0	1.0
- Zambia	0.0	1.0
- Zimbabwe	1.0	36.7

Country of Birth (COB)	Doctors	Nurses/ Midwives
Total FTE Workforce	2,571.3	11,870.2

(a) Country of Birth is based on the Standard Australian Classification of Countries (SACC) defined area. (Australian Bureau of Statistic (ABS), Australian Standard Classification of Countries (SACC), second edition (category number. 1269.0)).

(b) Country of Birth and Arrival Date to Australia are not compulsory fields in the Human Resource Management System (CHRIS), and relies on self identification, therefore discretion should be used when analysing these numbers.

FAMILY HOME VISITING PROGRAM

138 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 July 2010). How many visits have been undertaken as part of the program in both metropolitan and country areas since its implementation?

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

As at 30 June 2010, 5,459 families had been accepted into the Family Home Visiting program since its inception. Of these, 918 were in country regions and 4,541 were in the metropolitan area. Each family receives approximately 34 visits per family by a child health nurse.

HEALTH ADVISORY COUNCILS

141 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 July 2010). What advice have the Health Advisory Committees given to the minister since their formation?

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

Since their formation, local Health Advisory Councils (HACs) have provided advice to me in a variety of ways, including through:

- the Country Health SA Board Health Advisory Council Inc
- the biennial combined Health Advisory Council Conferences
- reports
- correspondence
- direct representation.

The HACs have provided advice to me on a wide variety of issues, including:

- feedback and reporting on community responses
- the development of the Strategy for Planning Country Health Services in SA
- the potential impact of national health reforms on country health services
- issues relevant to their specific communities, as well as on issues related to the governance and administration of the HACs themselves.

Additionally, all HACs provide annual reports to me, advising of their activities in the preceding financial year.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

143 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (27 July 2010). What advice have the former Central Northern Health Service and the Regional Board given to the minister regarding the Modbury Hospital?

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

As the body previously responsible for running Modbury Hospital, the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service provided information to the Minister for Health on a range of issues as was required.

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

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

205 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15 March 2011). How many departmental employees are employed in briefing units in each of the following entities—SA Health, Adelaide Health Service, Children's, Youth and Women's Health Service, Country Health SA, Royal Adelaide Hospital, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Lyell McEwin Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, Office of the Chief Executive and Office of the Minister, and in each case—

- (a) what are their positions;
- (b) what are their salaries; and
- (c) what are their qualifications?

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

The Department of Health does not have any briefing units within any of its entities.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

227 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15 March 2011). How many Department of Health employees located at the City Centre Building are categorised as nurses?

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

As at 25 February 2011, there were 31 employees located at the Citi Centre Building who were categorised as nurses.

OVERSEAS VISITORS, HEALTH SERVICES

228 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15 March 2011). What is the cost of providing hospital care for overseas non-Australian citizens who attend South Australian public hospitals and what is the outstanding unpaid amount?

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

SA Health does not capture in its systems a specific patient category of overseas non-Australian citizens and, therefore, is unable to determine the cost of providing hospital care to this specific patient group.

INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS, HEALTH SERVICES

229 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15 March 2011). In each year since 2005, how many international students had pregnancy terminations in South Australian public hospitals by country of citizenship, and what is the total cost incurred and fees collected from these international students by country of citizenship?

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

Information on whether a woman requesting a termination of pregnancy is an international student is not available as this information is not collected by hospitals.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition)** (27 May 2010).

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

The site investigations to date continue to reinforce SA Health's view that the site can be remediated to an appropriate level for a hospital and associated uses. These investigations also reinforce the original cost estimates and, as I have already advised this house, are included within the forecast project budget.

All site reports have been provided to the two consortia who have bid back a Site Remediation Plan as part of their Request for Proposal submission. These submissions were received on 20 May 2010.

At the completion of all remediation work, the bulk of which will be undertaken by the successful consortia as part of the construction of the hospital, an audit report is required from the independent environmental auditor certifying that the site has been remediated to the extent necessary for a hospital.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (16 September 2010).

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

The extent of the loss of data and the associated risks took some time to determine. Once a preliminary view had been reached the responsible senior public servants advised their Ministers, which included me.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (7 October 2010). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations): I have been advised of the following:

(a) Abolished

Department/Agency	Position	TEC Cost
DTEI	Manager Professional Services	\$108,484
DTEI	Manager Safety Strategy	\$101,573
DTEI	Manager Property Planning and Management Services	\$101,573
DTEI	Manager Materials Technology	\$108,484
DTEI	Manager Professional Services	\$101,573
DTEI	Manager Public Transport Investment and Planning	\$108,484

(b) Created

Department/Agency	Position	TEC Cost
DTEI	Manager ICT Business Integration	\$104,490
DTEI	Director Communications and Community Relations	\$137,914
DTEI	Director Projects	\$137,914
DTEI	Director Projects	\$137,914
	Manager Transport Analysis	\$104,490
DTEI	Project Director, NRSR	\$190,958
DTEI	Legislation and Policy Reform Coordinator	\$137,914
DTEI	Senior Contract Manager Rail	\$101,573
DTEI	Senior Project Manager	\$101,573
DTEI	Manager Safer Vehicles*	\$101,573

Note: *This position is part of the portfolio of the Minister for Road Safety.

TransAdelaide

(a) Abolished

Nil

(b) Created

Department/Agency	Position	TEC Cost
TransAdelaide	Rail Rules Manager	\$109,430
TransAdelaide	Rail Car Depot Relocation	\$169,222

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (7 October 2010). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations): I have been advised of the following:

Department/Agency	Position	Classification	TEC Cost
DTEI	Economist	ASO8	\$102,626
DTEI	*Senior Project Manager	ASO8	\$102,626
DTEI	Project Manager	ASO7	\$108,169
DTEI	Senior Policy Officer	ASO7	\$95,084
DTEI	Coordinator, Sustainable Initiatives	ASO6	\$94,220
DTEI	Project Officer	ASO6	\$84,220
DTEI	Auditor	ASO5	\$76,731
DTEI	*Graduate Officer	ASO4	\$38,908
DTEI	Project Administration Officer	ASO3	\$57,543
DTEI	Business Performance Support Officer	ASO2	\$31,479
DTEI	Customer Services Officer	ASO2	\$49,947
DTEI	Administrative Officer	ASO1	\$43,798
DTEI	Project Administrative Support Officer	ASO1	\$49,372
DTEI	Construction and Maintenance Worker	CMW4	\$44,642
DTEI	Surveyor	PO1	\$70,266

Note: *These positions are part of the portfolio of the Minister for Road Safety.

TransAdelaide

Nil

SCHOOLS, RESOURCE ENTITLEMENT STATEMENTS

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy): Future Resource Entitlement Statements for each school will be published on an annual basis following the End of Year reconciliation. The Resource Entitlement Statements for the six new Education Works schools will be published in 2012 for the 2011 school year.

SCHOOLS, PINNACLE EDUCATION

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy): The Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) has received the first two invoices relating to the PPP payments for the first four schools in respect of which DECS took control over in October and

December 2010 and January 2011. The first invoice covers the period 21 October 2010 to 14 November 2010 and the second invoice covers the period 15 November 2010 to 14 February 2011.

Each invoice is made up of two components. The first is the capital component of the project, that is, the cost of providing the buildings and fixtures, furniture and equipment. This includes interest costs and the repayment of the liability. The second element is the cost of providing the annual services based on the number of days the services have been provided and includes the CPI index factor. The services include building maintenance, utility management, waste, security, grounds maintenance, pest control, cleaning, catering, janitorial and general portorage, the maintenance of fixed play equipment and ICT infrastructure maintenance.

The first invoice represents a 25 day billing period and is based on the percentage that the first two sites represent of the total buildings as defined in the Project Agreement. The two components of the invoice can be determined by using the number of days in the quarter each site has been available and the CPI index factor for the quarter. The component of the invoice that includes building, equipment (capital component) and interest is \$262,610.95 and the service component is \$56,129.46. The total invoice is \$318,740.41 plus GST.

The second invoice represents a 92 day billing period and is based on the percentage that the first four sites represent of the total buildings as defined in the Project Agreement. The two components can be determined by using the number of days in the quarter each site has been available and the CPI index factor for the quarter. The component of the invoice that includes building, equipment (capital component) and interest is \$1,711,338.38 and the service component is \$367,252.35. There was a small credit of \$15,131.51 on this invoice as a result of a delay in transferring one of the sites to DECS. The total invoice is \$2,063,459.22 plus GST.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:59): Next, we have the ministers responsible for Families and Communities. I was referring earlier to others in the cabinet who were responsible for these matters. In this area, we have had a number of them. We had the Hon. Stephanie Key, who was a minister in this area, and I applaud her era, particularly in relation to the Robyn Layton report on child protection—an important initiative. She got on with the job quickly, and it was an excellent report. We have had probably six or seven other major child protection reports since, including by the former Justice Ted Mullighan QC. Commissioner Mullighan undertook considerable work in this area.

We then had the era of the Hon. Jay Weatherill. His time covering families and communities would have to be best described as one which took all the services in-house. This was his grand plan. He clearly had an utter, undisguised hatred of the private sector coupled with his complete dismissal of the NGO sector when he had this grand plan to bring in all the services in-house and take control. What I now find from the stakeholders in these areas is that, in fact, that great formula, much as it was presented as being the answer to more efficient and streamlined services, has ended up being a disaster and is now under review again.

Probably the other thing that he is most famous for in his management of the portfolio at the time was the 'stashed cash' incident when, for two years in a row while minister, considerable sums of money—and I am talking about millions of dollars—were paid from the department out to an NGO, which did not have any power to authorise or provide services for disability equipment, which was then given back to the department in little licks and drip fed out to the people who were eligible for equipment. That is a matter now which is the subject of inquiry in another place, and currently evidence is being taken. They are the distinctive features of his time.

Now, of course, we have minister Rankine. If today's performance was not a classic example of her incompetence, then nothing is. Here we have in South Australia, 13 days ago, a little boy who died in a government-owned house and the minister was able to speak to the media at that time, notwithstanding the mother of the child being charged. The minister was able to come into the house 12 days ago and say to the house that she is undertaking an inquiry, some information about what happened with her department, etc. But today, when she was asked a very simple question: how many times did your department receive a notification or advice about this family? What did he say? 'I have had advice and I cannot say; I cannot speak.' That is an absolute disgrace.

Let me remind members of the house what happened when Sue Vardon was the CEO of the Department for Families and Communities. Only a few years ago when the—

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I think we are addressing the Appropriation Bill. Relevance?

The SPEAKER: It is the appropriation debate and very often we have a wide range of subjects that are included in this. I will give the member the benefit of the doubt and ask her to continue.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Child protection takes up at least one third of the families and communities budget. If this is not one of the most important aspects of this jurisdiction, then frankly we may as well not be here. The importance of protecting children and the funding that is allocated to it responsibly is a critical service of the government and it is one which, as I was saying to the house, is comprehensively represented by a minister who is incompetent at best in circumstances where children are continuing to die.

I have said previously that her approach to this—back in the Sue Vardon days, when we heard about the 'House of Horrors' and the promises then that departments would act and that they would have resources available to make sure that children would not die, we had Sue Vardon at that stage say to us that she celebrated the fact that the department was doing what it should be doing by having found out this family. Children are continuing to die, and it is not acceptable.

The minister came into this house to say that she cannot answer that, but more importantly in respect to this budget she is saying she is going to spend more money for the protection of children—the provision of accommodation, for example, for alternate care for children who are under her guardianship. She is spending more and more money, yet we continue to have child abuse cases where the numbers are up; children in alternate care, numbers up; waiting lists for housing, numbers up; waiting lists for disability services equipment, numbers up. The only thing that is going down is the amount of public housing we have in this state.

Under her watch, more and more money is being spent, with more and more demand but less and less service being provided. That is my point. In addition, what we have is a situation where the minister says that these resources, of course, are available to everybody. For example, we have had announcements that the alternative care provision is for accommodation for children under her guardianship. We have heard all the terrible stories about children in motels, but she says there will be no more children in motels and delivers a multimillion dollar announcement in this budget about funds to build accommodation for them.

They are spending nearly \$30 million a year on these children in motels—they could have bought a couple of motels in the time that they were spending that money. What is worse, having said that she is going to make provision for this in the budget and build this accommodation for these children, it is not going to be ready until 2015. What is going to happen to these children in the meantime? There is \$8 million for that, but it will be 2015 before these children are accommodated.

We have disability funding, and it sounds great when the Treasurer comes out to announce that it has made provision for emergency equipment for the most critical people—about 800 of a list of over 2,600. They are the people who are on the list now, let alone the ones who are going to come onto the list. You say that this minister is doing her job—or the claim is that the budget is going to be a family-centred budget—and we have a minister who makes these promises but then does not even deliver on what she did last year.

For example, last year she said that she was going to spend nearly \$69 million in that year on capital works in Families and Communities, but we find in the published budget this year that only \$23.5 million of that money has been spent. We have very important precious resources needing to be available for an ever-increasing demand and she does not even spend what she has. It is completely unacceptable, and she has let these people down.

Finally, the Premier's priorities in this have to be lined up. For example, in this year's budget the Premier announced his pet project, the film hub down at the Glenside Hospital site—the \$43 million development of a property into a film hub, now called Adelaide Studios—an acquisition at a cost of \$2.5 million out of his budget. Up to about \$45.5 million is going to be spent on the development of this hub for him to have his own pet project. What do we find in this year's budget? We find that he is going to spend another \$1.6 million on that pet project. That is his priority.

In addition, over the same time frame that he says there has to be a delay in the building of the hospital on that site, he funds \$6 million towards the TACSI. For those members who are not aware of it and do not know about it, this is The Australian Centre for Social Innovation. He has spent \$6 million on the centre over the last three years. I do not know what it has done, and I have been to the website—it has made a few ads. Monsignor Cappo happens to be on the board of The Australian Centre for Social Innovation. Perhaps it has failed and perhaps that is why he has cut off the funding. In any event, \$6 million has been spent at a time when such resources are precious.

Then, of course, in November last year we had the announcement by the Premier, alongside Monsignor David Cappo (the Commissioner for Social Inclusion), that they are going to have a new publication called Digging Deep about the social benefits of mining in South Australia. There are 500 pamphlets or booklets that have been printed up at a cost of \$20,000, promoting mining companies in this state. Mining companies, frankly, can do their own promotion.

The reason we have this is because it is glossed up with a big picture of the Premier at the front talking about the social benefits of mining, endorsed by Monsignor Cappo as the Commissioner for Social Inclusion, and another nearly \$20,000 spent on pamphlets to be spread out to send the good message about the Premier. All of this is happening while the Premier is taking away the \$30 that pensioners receive from the federal government in the assessment of their pensions for the purposes of their rental in housing trust houses. All of this has been taken away when he rips off the disabled in this community who have had services from Disability SA on the management of their funds invested in Disability SA. He says, 'Bad luck, no longer available, go to the Public Trustee or somewhere else, pay for it yourself. Blow you people, you don't get that—'

Mrs Geraghty: You're misleading the house now.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, that is not correct. All this is at a time when the last treasurer announced that 44 financial counsellors in this state are going to be sacked. They are going to be sacked as of 1 July. They have got a few days left—sacked. All the NGOs have to pick up this responsibility.

How can the Premier, with any ounce of humanity in his body, accept that he can parade out this money, spend millions of dollars on his own pet projects, and slash away the very basic provision of services for the disabled, the mentally unwell, the people in this state who are aged, and the people who are on pensions, and these are the pensions, I might add, which when writing to the federal minister he promised he would never touch. Yet, he comes into his house, sits in cabinet, supports the Treasurer's announcement, by which these people have been raped financially.

It is an absolute disgrace to the cabinet, to the Premier, and the minister—useless as she is. Monsignor Cappo, for all the good work he does, is just paraded out there as some bandaid to all of this. He is some human shield for the Premier to give it some kind of credibility, to give it some kind of authority, to give it some sort of human face, when, in fact, it is an indecent and unconscionable act by this government, led by a Premier who is prepared to put forward his priority film hubs for his own little pet projects—increased in this year's budget—while he rips off the disabled, the aged, the pensioners in this state. He does not give a tinker about these people who are about to face the biggest assault in the cost of power and water in this state.

Utility services, concessions, are not even a pinch on what the increased costs are going to be on these. Yet, these people out in the community are expected to survive in an environment when they are having it raped off them for the purposes of the Premier's pet project. The Treasurer has the cheek to come into this parliament—parading with his wife and children in photographs—trying to tell us that somehow or another this is a budget for families. That is a nonsense.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:12): Once again, the presentation of the state budget has changed. I think that every year I have been in this place the presentation has changed. There has been a mix and match of various areas of health. This year we have seen the Adelaide Health Service put in the budget. It was obviously a combination of the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service and the Southern Adelaide Health Service. Next year, that will disappear, because we are going to have local hospital networks. We are going to have three local hospital networks.

Every year, it is a different presentation. The targets are presented differently, the whole budget process just seems to be one of trying to hide the real facts of what is going on in South Australia. It was interesting to see that the Parliament Research Library put out a document recently by Gerry McInally entitled 'Budget Scrutiny in South Australia'. The summary states:

The consideration of the Executive's budget is arguably the most important role that Parliament plays in a Westminster system of government. The South Australian system has been in place since 1980, and by general consensus there are deficiencies inherent in the process which prevent the scrutiny of the budget being as effective as possible.

I am looking forward to the estimates committee in the next few weeks, although I have only got 4½ hours on health. That works out to \$1 billion an hour, when you look at the health budget this year, being \$4.63 billion. The need to examine the budget in detail is something that cannot be in any way downplayed, because this government is not giving us the truth; they are not showing us the true picture.

South Australians should be scared to death. Be afraid, be very afraid of what the true picture of the state of the state is, what the state of the health of the state is. What we are seeing is not the real picture; it is one of gloss, it is one of spin, it is one of cover-up, and it is one of deceit and deception, which is a sad, sad thing to say about any government in any Westminster parliament, but particularly in South Australia. We should really be getting what we deserve, which is a lot better than we are getting at the moment. This year, again, the budget is presented in a convoluted way. I described it as the height of prestidigitation in my first budget speech, and there is still the sleight of hand and trying to deceive the reader.

The example I will start with is how much is the health budget? In the budget speech there was \$133 million extra over four years, \$33 million extra per year. That is what was said in the budget speech. It works out at about 0.07 per cent, I think it is, of the health budget. The health inflator is acknowledged at about 9 per cent. The former treasurer did say in January last year it was 12 per cent. Some people say it is about 8 per cent. It is certainly not the 3 per cent CPI that we have for our groceries and household income; it is a much bigger figure than that.

The commonly accepted figure by the federal government for their National Health and Hospital Reform is 9.3 per cent. We will say 9 per cent. So, the pittance of an increase in health funding this year is way behind what it should be. In fact, in real terms health spending is going backwards under this government this year. There should be about an extra \$400 million going in, just this year alone, not the \$33 million that is being put in.

In a glossy brochure sent out by the Minister for Health, it says that the health budget is \$4.63 billion, which represents an increase of \$174 million. So, \$174 million in the glossy brochure here, but \$133 million in the budget speech. Then, in Budget Paper No. 3, page 32, it talks about an extra \$100 million, and it gives a figure of \$4.715 billion as the total health spend. So, we are getting differences all the time in the gross amount, what is being put in and what is not.

Let us try and get our act together and let us present the actual figures for South Australians. They deserve to know the truth. They deserve to know what they are getting. They deserve to know what they are getting this year, not in 2014, 2015 and 2016, because so much of the spend has been pushed out. The slippage is terrible. I will go through a bit later on the number of projects that have been delayed and pushed out.

The underspend from last year almost equates to four years of the extra money that the Treasurer says is being put in. It is about \$133 million. Well, there is about \$130 million underspend from last year, and some of those projects have been pushed out even further. We have looked at the total health spend and we do not really know what it is; whether it is \$4.715 billion or \$4.63 billion. It is a lot of money, and it is a disgrace that I am only getting 4½ hours in estimates to look at that. It is about a billion dollars an hour.

I will now turn to country health. In a letter to the Presiding Member of the Hills Area Health Advisory Council (HAC) on 14 May, the minister said—and it is signed John Hill, Minister for Health—'In 2010 alone, we are spending \$714.5 million on public health services in country South Australia.' That is the letter to the Hills Area HAC. Then, in the glossy brochure put out by the minister, *Country Health Budget 2011-12*, it talks about putting in \$719.8 million. So, there is a \$5 million difference there. What is the real figure?

The minister, in his glossy brochure *Country Health Budget 2011-12*, talks about the fact that an extra \$339.5 million—89.3 per cent—will be spent on country health services compared with 2001-02. We all know in 2001-02, nearly 10 years ago now, the Liberal government were in. We had suffered the legacy of the State Bank collapse and we managed to get the state back on track. The Labor government came in by default, thanks to the former member for Hammond, and it has been downhill ever since.

However, when you put in the health inflator of 9 per cent now—say it was even 7 or 8 per cent back then—back in in 2001-02 as to what should have been spent on country health, you should have been spending about \$740 million last year. Let us say \$720 million this year as a round figure, so we are underspending again. We are underspending in health in this state, and who is suffering? The South Australian taxpayer.

What we are seeing every day in our hospitals in South Australia is people waiting longer, people having to wait just to get on waiting lists in the first place. When they do get to finally see a specialist, they wait longer to get on the elective surgery waiting list. Then, if they get on the elective surgery waiting list, they will hopefully get their surgery on time, but in a lot of cases it is being delayed and being re-categorised. The fiddle factor is coming in to make the figures look good. The South Australian public—the taxpayers—are continuing to suffer.

Even today, if you look at the figures coming out of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and other hospitals around metropolitan Adelaide, you will see that they are full to bursting. Go and look at the CapPlan, the capacity planning program for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and see what the average waiting times are in the emergency department. They are not, as the minister would have you believe, way down and reaching their four-hour targets (which is an absolute farce, and I will talk about those a bit later), they are way out there at 20-plus hours. I saw one recently where the average waiting time in an emergency department back in March was 27 hours, and that is in the government's own CapPlan documents.

The inpatient and emergency department dashboards—the documents which are put out every day and which show the capacity and the flow-through of the various hospitals and the various departments within hospitals—are categorised in a traffic light system: green is less than 80 per cent, amber is 80 to 95 per cent, red is 95 to 125 per cent, and white is 125 per cent capacity. That is the number of people in the hospital compared with the number of available beds, and many of those hospitals—in fact, on some days most of those hospitals on most days—are either in the red zone (90 to 125 per cent capacity) or, unfortunately, in the white hot zone (125 per cent capacity).

Our hospitals are being pushed to the limit, and we have seen an underspend by this government. They say they are spending more, and they are spending more in dollar terms, but in real terms they are spending far less than they should. What are we seeing? We are seeing the same old, same old. When you look at the budget documents regarding the Adelaide Health Service, the number of urgent cases, which should be seen within 30 minutes, went from 64 per cent last year to 63 per cent this year. It is getting worse.

I was pleased to see that the Women's and Children's Hospital's emergency department figures in the budget documents show a significant improvement. I do not believe the degree of improvement. I think there is some gaming or some fiddle factor going on there, and I will be asking the minister about that in estimates, so I am happy for him to take that on notice. If he wants to call it a Dorothy Dixier, fine, but he had better explain what is going on with some of these figures, such as the satisfaction rate for our hospitals, which has been 85 per cent for the last three years—it has not changed, and I do not believe that either.

The big issue in the health sector in this state at the moment is not in the main part of the budget. We have \$30 million for some site preparation at the rail yards, we see some money spent on advertising and public education, but the big serious dollar is for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital down at the rail yards. I remember that on 10 March and 19 March in 2010, the minister told Leon Byner on FIVEaa that it was \$1.7 billion for the hospital when he knew (because the Auditor-General told us) that in November the year before they had signed off on \$1.8 billion. But, as treasurer Foley said, 'What's \$100 million?'

Even then we knew that that was not the real picture. We were getting hints about the real cost of that hospital down on the rail yards—a cost of over \$2 billion. We now know that it is \$2.7 billion in the documents that Macquarie Bank has issued, and the government is saying \$2.1 billion. That is only just the tip of the iceberg with this PPP because, when you factor in the non-clinical support contracts, the equipment supplies, the staffing levels—everything from the help desk to the security guys on the wards—it is going to be far more than that.

The amount of \$11.1 billion over the life of the PPP is \$1.1 million a day for 35 years. It is a disgrace for this government to have to admit it has mismanaged the rebuilding of health facilities to the extent where it has entered into a contract like that and tied up South Australians like my kids and my grandchildren—little Harry is two on Friday and he will be 37 when this hospital is paid off. I

will be on a Zimmer frame by the time that hospital is paid off. I just hope the heck that they have the services there, and if that hospital is still functioning as a hospital then (and not as was put to the Institute of Architects that, after 40 years or so, it has outlived its worth and you could probably turn it into an art gallery or museum), I just hope that it will be providing the services that this government tells us it is going to provide, because we know it is not going to provide anywhere near the services that you can currently get at the world-ranking Florey precinct down at the current Royal Adelaide.

One little factor that is not being put out there very much about the cost of the new hospital, though, is the opportunity cost. The opportunity cost of moving down there is that you are going to bulldoze a billion dollars down at the Florey precinct—a billion dollars is going into the dust. Is the government going to keep some of it open, and we are hearing that? We know about pathology, ophthalmology, women's services and diabetic services. I heard today that the lymphoedema unit at the Flinders Medical Centre is closing. Is that going down to the new Royal Adelaide? I do not think so.

We know that a lot of the services that are at the current Royal Adelaide are not going down the road. The minister admitted in this place in the last sitting week that some of the services were going to be elsewhere. We know that some of the pathology services are going to be down at the IMVS, some are going to be down at the rail yards and some are possibly going to be over at the bioscience precinct at Thebarton—some may go elsewhere. What else is going out there?

Where are the outpatients going? We know that this government has failed in its review of outpatient services. Where has that committee gone? Where have the reports gone? They were going to save thousands and thousands—millions—of dollars by outsourcing 10 per cent of outpatients in the first tranche, which was going to be 150,000 outpatient appointments in the first tranche and then moving to 50 per cent; that is, 650,000 outpatient appointments were going to somehow miraculously go to private specialists in their rooms who were not going to charge a gap, who did not have waiting lists, who were going to instantly get these people onto elective surgery waiting lists in our hospitals. What a lot of rubbish! Anyone who thought that was going to work needs to really look at the advice they are giving this government. They should not be in the positions they are in if they actually believe that advice. It was never going to work.

The new Royal Adelaide Hospital is going to be a lead weight around this state's neck. It is State Bank mark II. I was reading a wall poster from the 1993 election about 'never again', and it was about the state budget blowouts. There was an article by Randall Ashbourne about the massive blowouts in the State Bank then. There was another article about the blowouts and the mismanagement in health services then, and, under Labor, we are seeing the same thing again. The commonwealth is going to put in a lot of money this year (a lot more than it has in the past), but it is still not enough to manage the health system in South Australia. Almost \$1 billion will be received in 2011-12, and then nearly \$155 million in national partnerships' funding for the national health-care reform under COAG.

National health reform has brought in the local hospital networks. A couple of years ago we saw the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service and the Southern Adelaide Health Service combine to save money. That was in 2008. The local hospital networks were being talked about then. So, we have the Adelaide Health Service out of the combined service, and now the Adelaide Health Service is gone and we are having three local hospital networks.

Where have the savings gone? Where was the forward planning involved there? Where was the forethought about money that was going to be wasted in, first, the amalgamation and now the separation again? That is the sort of incompetence that we cannot tolerate in managing health when you have a nearly \$5 billion budget by this time next year.

The funding cuts that we are seeing are everything in a \$17 million reduction in public health expenditure. A 12 per cent decrease will be reflected in everything from public health education to shop and manufacturing inspections, and last year we saw how the government did not do the inspections that it was supposed to do. We saw a real failure there. The government gets stuck into local government but it was not doing that.

We will see a zero increase in spending on pharmaceuticals, medical aids and appliances. We will see a zero increase in spending on health research, despite increased royalties from SA Health from the research fund. They were going to sell Medvet. They should have a look at the returns from some of the royalties and the income from some of the stock market activity from Medvet. It is millions and millions of dollars.

They are hitting the soft targets. There are \$2.3 million in cuts to volunteer ambulance stations and a \$1.6 million cut to the ambulance vehicle replacement. The South Australian Ambulance Service is the shining light in South Australian health, yet we see them getting a budget cut this year. Ray Creen and his mob down there are doing a fantastic job. Apart from all the ramping and other issues they have to put up with, they are doing a great job but they are going to suffer. South Australians will not only suffer because of poor mismanagement but also they will have to wait much longer to get services delivered.

As I said before, there was nearly \$130 million underspend in capital projects last year. I am looking forward to the minister explaining this to me in the estimates committee when we get there. There was a \$27.5 million underspend on the Lyell McEwin stage C. That is not going to be finished until 2016. We need the beds now, minister. Have a look at your cap plans; have a look at your dashboards, minister. The hospitals are fit to bursting.

People are dying as a direct result of delays in emergency departments. Ask the College for Emergency Medicine. It is more than the road toll every year, and 2016 is not acceptable. There was a \$13 million underspend on the Whyalla hospital last year, and that will not be finished until June 2013. The Berri hospital, fortunately, one of the good bits, is being brought forward. There was an \$11 million underspend on new Royal Adelaide site works last year, so God help us with the whole project. What is going to happen there?

A really despicable piece of work by this government is the \$11 million underspend on James Nash House. That will not be finished until December 2012. I visited there the other day and the people staffing that facility are doing a fantastic job. They deserve better from this government.

It is Glenside campus, Modbury Hospital, QEH stage 2, the Modbury GP Super Clinic, the Women's and Children's cancer centre, the Women's and Children's upgrade, the Repatriation General Hospital, the forensic mental health step down facilities, emergency departments, Port Pirie GP Plus health centre (which is not much at the moment: in fact, it has not even started yet) and it is Hammill House. It goes on and on. People have to wait longer and longer because of the mismanagement and underspend last year. That cannot be allowed to happen this year.

The minister needs to look at where he is going and, if he cannot do the job, he should hand it over to someone else who can do the job, because this is not good enough. I am looking forward to estimates because there are a lot of questions. There is not much time at \$1 billion an hour, but we are going to make the most of that because there are many issues for South Australians who have been suffering far too long under this minister and government and their mismanagement of health.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (16:32): This budget is presented to the house at a very interesting time internationally. It is worth reflecting back to the international economic environment into which this government first found itself in office. It was a buoyant international economy, particularly in the United States and Europe, with China and India emerging strongly as great markets and great buyers of Australian products. It was an extremely buoyant national economy, championed by a very competent federal coalition government under John Howard that had delivered record low interest rates, a buoyant property market, a booming share market and extraordinary growth in both infrastructure and industry development, particularly in areas such as mining, food, manufacturing, etc.

These were very good times from 2002 through until 2008. These were the times that this state Labor government enjoyed. Of course, we have had the former treasurer crowing about what a good treasurer he was during these times. I can assure members the proverbial drover's dog would have been a good treasurer in 2002 through to 2008. How could you not have been a good treasurer in those years with buoyant revenues literally collapsing across the table at the treasurer of the day? As the Auditor-General frequently observed, out of control expenses were, year after year, being rescued by windfall unexpected revenues flowing from this buoyant international and national economic scene.

But, of course, the previous treasurer, and the government with him, got caught out in 2008 because the international climate and the national climate changed dramatically with the global financial crisis. It is interesting now to look at the context within which this budget is framed because, indeed, things have changed. We have had this spectacular reduction in state government revenues and net wealth as a consequence of losses on international sharemarkets from government entities. We have had a federal government that has had to tighten its belt as a consequence of the international and national scene extant today.

Of course now, after an 18-month to two-year period of uncertainty, which saw a stimulus package coming out from the commonwealth and low interest rates to line up with the global financial crisis, we have seen a staving off, if you like, of the inevitable. There was money about being spent in schools (Building the Education Revolution), cheques being sent to households so they could rush out and spend it on retail, tourism, cafes and restaurants, etc., services consumption.

Coinciding with that, we saw record low interest rates which held off foreclosures, which enabled people to go and borrow against equity to see themselves through and which enabled small businesses to go and borrow more easily against home equity and business assets to see them through the global financial crisis and its disruptions. Of course, those stimuli have come to an end. The federal stimulus package and the BER are virtually winding up. Interest rates are now creeping up again and, of course, internationally, there are now worrying signs of a possible second dip.

I am watching with great interest the events taking place in Europe, and particularly in the United States, as we debate this budget. Let me start with Europe where, as members would be aware, the euro zone is literally tiptoeing on thin ice. We have the great fear among euro zone governments, reported in *The Australian* today, and in the international press, that the ECB, or the euro zone, is:

...concerned about a debt default by Greece that could undermine the bond market's trust in other cash-strapped euro members. Ireland and Portugal are already struggling to rebuild investors' confidence, despite rescue loans from the EU and the IMF. If panicked investors flee from Spain, a \$US1.6 trillion economy, the country could prove too big to save. At the Luxembourg meeting held recently, finance ministers were also working on outlines of a new loan package for Greece. As before, it is to be tied to the ever-deeper fiscal cuts required of the Greek government.

These are fiscal cuts that the Greek government is struggling to meet. The article continues:

One year into its multi-year fiscal program, Greece is running out of steam. The budget is off target, thanks to a tanking economy and persistent tax evasion. In Germany, politicians have worried for months that Greece will end up defaulting in a couple of years. By then, the European taxpayer would have replaced the bond market as Greece's main creditor, thanks to the loans euro zone countries are giving Athens to pay bondholders.

German taxpayers and other taxpayers in the euro zone stand to lose if Greece defaults, and there could be a contagion effect across Europe. Do not think that will not affect this budget: it will affect this budget in the out years significantly, should it occur, and there will be confluent effects across the Atlantic to the United States, where the banks are interconnected.

The debt levels currently being carried by the American taxpayer are at absolute record levels, and the signs of recovery in the American economy are bleak, to say the least. So, the international context within which this budget is framed is one of great concern—great concern indeed. Yet, this budget seems to fail to recognise that international context and that national context. In some respects, it is quite an optimistic budget with growth projections and income projections that I believe are probably going to prove to be unsustainable, but we will see.

So, the history of this government's budgets since 2002 has been a history of a tightening of the belt, to be fair, in budget one and budget two, while the former treasurer assessed the situation, but by budget number three he had quickly begun to let out his belt as fast as he swallowed the cash. As we have heard from earlier speakers, during that period, they started to grow the size of government.

As has been outlined by my colleagues, bit by bit, sliced by slice, layer by layer, there were new hirings in the Public Service; there were new projects undertaken, many of which blew out and proved to be unsustainable. There were a whole host of broken promises and a whole host of wasted government initiatives. Of course, those extra public servants—18,000 of them and only a handful are police, nurses and teachers, leaving thousands more unexplained—are at the core of the government's problem.

Having let go of the rope when it came to the growth of the business of government, they are now trying to wind that back by cutting back thousands of government jobs one way or another. Of course, the right thing to do from the outset would have been to contain the costs of government—not to let government grow out, not to let that number of employees be hired, not to let the business of government become more expensive and more costly than it should have been. But no, they could not do that and, in each year, expenses have quickly matched income.

It is just basic business fundamentals. During the good times when revenues are strong and the money is coming in, if you hire extra staff, take on extra business expenses, roll out your costs of doing business, instead of allowing a profit margin to develop which you take to the bank, then what you risk is that when the income tightens in tougher times and your cost structures are still too high you are caught in a deficit. That is exactly what has happened. Every small business person in the country and in the state knows the risk that the government took and understands how they have been caught out.

A \$263 million net lending deficit, a \$1,182 million cash deficit and a \$1,252 million net operating deficit—the government has simply been caught out by its own financial mismanagement. As the ship has listed to starboard, they are now trying to yank it back over to the port, and the old ship is seesawing on the ocean from left to right as the government tries to right the ship of state which is floundering in uncertain seas.

The former treasurer was not a brilliant treasurer, he was not the great treasurer he pretends to be, and he does not deserve the credit that some in the media tend to try to give him in his self-description as, after Paul Keating, the world's second greatest treasurer. As I said, the proverbial drover's dog would have been able to run a successful budget up until 2008. It only took two budgets in tough times to completely bring unstuck the former treasurer's career—full stop, end of story.

Enter the current Treasurer and this current budget. Its strategy is intriguing. In some respects, it reflects a complete change of direction. The language of the government in its initial budgets was all about health, education and police. That is all they wanted to talk about. In their first term of government, they virtually built nothing and did nothing. They were a minority government, they simply spruiked the mantra of health, education and police—law and order was tucked in there—the grand proclamations, and they got themselves a second term.

In their second term they seemed to meander aimlessly, not knowing what to do. We had the grand glossy brochures, we had the grand publications, but nothing really materialised until, in response to the opposition setting the agenda, a government agenda started to emerge towards the end of their last term. We now have the big build in this third term. They are going to have the big build. This budget shifts direction from this aggressive and at times belligerent determination of the past to a strategy under the current Treasurer of minimising cost increases by creeping up revenues and achieving savings through program delays, capital works rescheduling and underspending—combined, of course, with additional debt.

Suddenly now we have a family government, the family-friendly government. Can I just observe (and I really do like the current Treasurer) that I do think it was a little self-indulgent having these pictures of the family splattered all across the state's budget. I do not think we are really that interested in all of that and I think it was a little self-indulgent. We would really like to know what the Treasurer has to offer the state, although I am sure it helped to lift his profile in any leadership meanderings that might be going on in the Labor Party at the moment as to who might be the next anointed king.

Debt has featured as an issue in this budget, and it should do so. I draw the attention of members to warnings today from David Murray, Chairman of the Future Fund, about the level of national and state debt. The states combined now have allowed their debt to surge by almost \$102 billion this year to \$135 billion next year. Combined with federal government debt it is well over half a trillion dollars. This state is starting to run up its credit card and this nation is doing likewise at a time when the economy is already in debt and the terms of trade are at an all-time high causing capacity constraints in the economy, incremental indebtedness of governments that risk crowding out the private sector as it seeks to borrow to build the infrastructure we need to grow the economy.

As I mentioned, the crisis in Europe has forced governments to cut public services and pensions while in the US the administration is struggling to raise the \$14.3 trillion debt ceiling in order to avoid defaulting. There are messages here about debt and unfunded liabilities that this state government needs to heed.

I wonder, as I read this budget, what this government thinks its legacy will be. I think in the first term it had no idea at all; in its second term I think it had no idea at all; I think it has realised, in its third term, it needs to build a legacy and I think it hopes it will be a desalination plant, an Adelaide Oval and a new hospital. I am sure it would have liked to have called it the Mike Rann Memorial Hospital—perhaps not now.

It is interesting that two of those three things were creations of the opposition: football in the city and the desalination plant. One of those ideas—a hospital in the railyards—was the government's idea, and probably the one that carries with it the greatest fiscal risk of all to this state and its finances, for reasons that my colleagues have mentioned. But I do ask what this government thinks its legacy will be, because I do not see this budget putting a light on a pathway to that vision and to that legacy.

What is sadly missing from political debate at the state level at present and, to a degree, at the national level, is a long-term vision for the future of the country and a long-term vision for the future of the state. Forget all the glossy brochures and state strategic plans, I am talking about meaningful plans, ones that set out a program of what is to be built, when it will be built, how it will be built and how much will be spent building it.

Instead, we tend to career from budget to budget, from election cycle to election cycle, looking a few years ahead but never looking out to 20 or 30-year windows, as we should be doing, and working budgets and programs into a broader plan for the future. It is a feature of concern in state political debate, and one that I believe this parliament needs to remedy and remedy soon.

During budget estimates I will be going through a range of issues that relate to the portfolios of industry and trade, science and information economy, motor sport and defence industries. Can I just say that in these uncertain national and international economic times, I think the government has done a poor job of reinventing and rebuilding the state economy. I made public comment recently about ABS findings that the manufacturing sector has now slipped beneath the services sector as the greatest employer in this state, with 4,000 manufacturing jobs lost.

The harsh reality now is that there are 103,000 people in South Australia working in hospitals, dental surgeries, optometrist offices, aged care and social assistance. It is the biggest employer in the state. The real export industries upon which the state economy depends—manufacturing, our food producers, minerals, those things we export, that we get revenue from, that bring the wealth into this state that we can then spend on services—are in decline.

We have had all the rhetoric about mining and defence, a lot of it unrealised, and overstatements of the benefits of the defence investment. We have won a \$6 billion to \$8 billion air warfare destroyer contract, but we find out later that only \$1 billion of that is being spent here in South Australia over 10 years. There is mining expenditure that is still yet to happen—in fact, mining has been in decline—and you have let manufacturing, food, and these other industries wither on the vine. There is very little in this budget—precious little, if anything—for the reinvention of manufacturing, of tourism, of services industries, of food for the future, and of adding value to our products so that we can prosper and thrive as a state and as a nation.

In that regard, it is what is not in the budget rather than what is in the budget that is of most concern. This state desperately needs an innovation and science-led reinvention of its manufacturing sector, of its food sciences sector, and of its services sector in regard to profit-making industries like tourism, education and a raft of other professional services where we can do better. All of that needs to hinge around our ability to export and create wealth for this state by running thriving, vibrant businesses.

I must say, when I look at this budget, I look forward on behalf of our children and our grandchildren and I see nothing but fog. I do not see any clarity of vision. I would appeal to this government in the time that it has remaining in this term of government to come up with some more visionary budgets, come up with something that is more meaningful and get the expenses of government under control. You may be surprised at the support you might get from not only the parliament but from the public if you do so. By creating a buffer that you can invest in, invest in the future. This budget does little to achieve that outcome.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:53): I rise to speak to this budget with great disappointment. As some, hopefully, senior members of the government have rightly pointed out, nobody is listening to this government. That has been happening for some time. In response to that, this government believes that it can rejig itself, remake itself, and renew itself. Unfortunately, my disappointment arises because the Treasurer who has handed down the budget—it is a different face, it is a different voice, it has the photo—has handed down the same budget. As my colleague the member for Davenport said, this Treasurer is just like the last one without the nightclub. I think it is a very apt description. The Treasurer, in the opening statement of his budget address, stated:

All of us know the dangers of borrowing to finance your day-to-day expenses—sooner rather than later those credit card bills catch up with you.

Absolutely right. It is the most sensible thing that the Treasurer said in his budget speech, apart from quoting himself in the penultimate statement of his budget speech. He said:

The day I became treasurer of our state I said...

The job of the Treasurer is to look at the financial state of the government and to make sure that our policy settings are right so that we're not living off our credit card and accruing the sort of debt that is going to be left to our kids to pay.

Two prophetic statements. This Treasurer has delivered us the same budget that we would have been delivered had there been no change in Treasurer, but the spin machine has been working overtime.

The Treasurer has tried to present himself as a sensitive family man with young children and that he is the same as everybody else living up and down the street. I point out to the house that I entered this parliament on the same day as the Treasurer back in 1997. At that time, I had a wife and four children, the eldest of whom had completed her education, and a significant business overdraft. I know what it is like to lie awake at night worrying about the mortgage, wondering how you will meet the payments at the end of the month, agonising over what the wool price, the cattle price, the sheep price or the wheat price will be in a few months' time. I know what that is like.

The Treasurer, who would have us believe that he is like every other family man up and down the street, entered this place as a 24 year old. I do not know whether he had a mortgage at that stage. I know he had not been operating a business. He was a single man and his life experience since then has been on a fairly comfortable wicket. That is the reality of the experience of the Treasurer. For him to have us believe that he knows what it is like up and down Struggle Street I think is a very long bow being drawn by him. I put that because I want to put this into context.

My colleague the member for Davenport referred to the new Treasurer as 'high tax Jack', and I think that epitaph may indeed stick, because it aptly describes this Treasurer on the form that we have seen so far. On many occasions I referred to the previous treasurer as 'Mr Borrow and Spend', and he used to interject across the house that I did not know what I was talking about. I think I know what I was talking about. I think all of South Australia knows what I was talking about. This government, for nine years, has been doing just that. It has been spending every cent it can get its hands on, and when it ran out of that money it has gone out and borrowed some more, and when that became difficult it started flogging the state's assets. This state has been very poorly managed for a number of years, in fact, ever since this government has been in office.

It was quite interesting this morning when the leader noted that across this nation every state that has been governed by a Labor government has a deficit budget and every state that has been governed by a Liberal government has a budget in surplus. It is in the genes. It is in the DNA. It just happens time and time again. It is a great pity.

I lament when I hear the Treasurer say that our net debt will peak at \$4.2 billion in 2013-14. What really makes me angry, though, is that the Treasurer does not tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. The actual indebtedness of this state, of the government of South Australia, is much greater than that. The Treasurer conveniently omits to talk about the debt in public corporations such as SA Water.

I have been arguing for years that this government has made an art form of sucking cash out of SA Water and causing SA Water to borrow money to provide that cash. It is not just me that has been saying it; the Auditor-General has been saying it for years. Everybody knows that SA Water has been used as a cash cow. However, the Treasurer does not acknowledge SA Water's indebtedness when he talks about the state's debt. If you put in to the numbers the indebtedness of those public corporations, which are owned by the state, the actual debt figure will peak at some \$8.2 billion in 2013-14.

That is a significantly higher number than the Treasurer would want us to believe. It gets even worse than that because we have an unfunded superannuation liability of around \$9 billion. Just because it is unfunded does not mean that it is not a liability. I suspect that there are some people on the other side of the house who do not understand that. I think they go home and think it is unfunded, it does not really matter, we do not have to count it.

The reality is that every one of those dollars will have to be found by those children that the Treasurer referred to, and will have to be paid to our public servants as they retire—about \$9 billion worth, and that has been growing rapidly in recent years. If we add that to the \$8.2 billion, and if we add the unfunded liability of WorkCover—if we add the liability to the public sector WorkCover scheme—we see that the total liabilities of the state are in excess of \$20 billion.

The Treasurer makes the analogy—he made it in the house, he made it on public radio—he says our indebtedness is not a problem. If we were a householder and we had an income of \$100,000, we would have a mortgage of some \$26,000. That is the analogy the Treasurer uses, because he is only referring to the \$4.2 billion, not the total indebtedness of the state.

In reality, if we want to use the householder analogy with an income of \$100,000, the mortgage would be \$125,000. That is before we add in things like the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. That would add the best part of another \$20,000 to those numbers. It would be getting towards a \$150,000 mortgage.

The analogy that the Treasurer uses is out by a factor of about six. The scenario he paints is about one sixth of the true picture. Not only is this Treasurer similar to the last one because he delivers to us the same sort of budget, he couches it with the same spin. This Treasurer will be seen to be out of the exact same mould as the last Treasurer on every assessment you can make. We have the same spin. I suppose within a year or two this Treasurer will have us believe that he is the greatest Treasurer the state has ever had. We all know that is a very fallacious claim with regard to the previous treasurer.

The state's indebtedness continues to rise. The rate of increase of our indebtedness is only matched by the voracious appetite for cash from this government. This government continues to increase taxes across the board; taxes which impact on South Australians' daily lives. Transport is a fabulous place for this government to tax. Some governments work strategically, and they say, 'If we are going to try to make the impost of transport costs less on the state into the future, we will encourage people to use public transport.'

Some governments might say, 'Look, we will increase slightly the taxation on motorists and we will use that as a lever to get them onto public transport.' This government, because it does not think strategically, and it does not act strategically, has done half of it. It has increased the impost on motorists through registration fees and through licence fees, and through fines.

The reality is that, when you increase dramatically the level of fines for those who inadvertently just go over the speed limit (inadvertently, in most cases), it is obvious what you are up to. It is obvious that you are up to collecting revenue. Our roads have become tax roads. That is what they are; they are tax roads. The fines for people who inadvertently go over the speed limit (and it is so difficult to understand what the speed limit is because it varies so regularly, even on our arterial roads), and the collection of revenue from that source, is increasing by millions and millions of dollars year on year.

You would have thought that might have been used as an opportunity to get people to move to public transport. No, not this government. 'We'll increase the cost of public transport fares as well.' You cannot do anything with this government in charge of the Treasury without paying more tax. The Treasurer got it wrong when he tried to paint himself as 'family friendly'.

I want to talk, again, about that cash cow of this government, SA Water, and just bring people up-to-date with another insidious way in which water rates have increased this year. During the height of the drought, I raised the issue that the less water you used the more you paid for it; that is, the smaller the amount of water you consumed through any meter the less you paid per kilolitre. The government kept arguing, 'No, no, no. We have an inclining block tariff regime where the more you use the more expensive it is.' That is right if that is all you pay, but the water account is made up of two components: a fixed charge, a delivery fee or a service fee; and the actual usage charge.

When you add the total cost together, the reality is that, throughout the drought, the less water you used the more you were paying per kilolitre for it, and we were trying to get people to reduce their water consumption. Magically, a couple of years ago, the government in one of its water increase announcements increased the price of the tariff rates for the various blocks and decreased the service fee, and it was very clever because I used to do an analysis and work out how much it cost per kilolitre for a consumer of 100 kilolitres, 200 kilolitres and 300 kilolitres of water, etc., and the government got it right.

It made it such that the cost per kilolitre of water was identical at every point—at 100 kilolitre consumption, 200 kilolitre consumption, 300 kilolitre consumption and upwards. Now that the drought is over, now that people are not continually talking about water (particularly in trying to save water), the government has gone back to its old game and tried to maximise its revenues. In the latest water rate announcement, with the newest prices (which will apply as of 1 July), again, we will see that the less water you use the more you will pay for it.

If you happen to use 120 kilolitres of water, you will pay \$3.88 per kilolitre; if you use 200 kilolitres of water, you will pay \$3.43 per kilolitre; if you use 300, it will be down to \$3.20; at 400, it will be down to \$3.09 cents; and at 500 kilolitre consumption, it will be down to \$3.02 per kilolitre—a significant reduction.

You might ask, 'Why would you set the water rates like that? Why wouldn't you set them to encourage people to reduce their water use?' The reality is that it is set like that deliberately because most people are trying to do the right thing. They are trying to reduce their water consumption. The average consumer does not use 500 kilolitres of water, they use much less than that, and the government is trying to maximise its returns by charging a higher rate when you use less water than it charges when you use more water. Nothing has changed from the previous treasurer to the current Treasurer. He is up to the old tricks of maximising the revenues because this Treasurer has no more idea about reining in the expenditure of this government than the previous treasurer did.

As recently as last December in the Mid-Year Budget Review the government was predicting an \$81 million surplus for the next financial year. Only six months later we now have had a prediction in this budget that we will have a \$263 million deficit. That is a turnaround of a lazy \$244 million. The figures cannot be fiddled when you get that close, and the government has had to come clean and admit that its finances are yet again in a mess. What really amazes me is that the government cannot predict within \$244 million the position only six or seven months out, but the government predicts that by 2014-15, three years' time, we will have a surplus of \$655 million.

I am very concerned. I have gone back through the budget papers for the last four or five years and the government's predictions are not within cooeee even a year or two ahead, least of all three or four years ahead. I will not bore the house by going through the whole table of figures but, as the Treasurer said, these numbers bounce around a bit. I reckon that is a bit more than bouncing around a bit. I reckon that is a gross understatement. The state will need a surplus of \$655 million in the years 2014 and 2015 because that is when we will get to the point where we will have to start paying for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

My time is running out and I will not have time to go into that disaster, but the decision to build that hospital will nobble this state for many years to come. This state has been going backwards relative to our cousins in the other states right across this nation. It has been going backwards at a rapid rate, and I suspect that that rate of digression will be even accelerated. We flogged off the forests, we are flogging off the Lotteries Commission and we are building a new hospital which is an absolute waste of money. It is a very poor budget.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:13): It is really a dubious honour that I think I have, being in my 10th year as an elected representative in this parliament, to speak to the 10th Labor government budget since its election in 2002. As has been previously stated, this is a typical Labor budget, but I also want to make the point quite clearly that the manner in which this government runs this state in terms of its structural, financial and administrative operation is also typically Labor. We see a continual centralisation of services, supported by massive bureaucracies. That has been the trend for the last 9½ years that this government has been in power. That is a very expensive way to operate the state's finances and administration.

At the end of his contribution, the member for MacKillop touched on the new hospital being built at the rail yards. That is a glaring example of the centralisation of services. It is a hospital that will have fewer beds and facilities than the current RAH when the government first came into power back in 2002, and it will burden this state for 30 years with a payment of \$1.1 million per day. That is a significantly massive financial burden, for 30 years, that will be placed on my children's generation.

As has been pointed out, it will cost \$1.1 million per day for 30 years, and all the services that are currently provided at the current RAH site, as we understand it, will not be provided at the new site on the railyards. It will be a money pit; it will suck money from the health services budget

and from the other hospitals—metropolitan hospitals and country health services—to support this new hospital here on the railyards site. It is a glaring example of how this government operates.

As we have witnessed over quite a number of years, we have seen a massive increase in bureaucracy. Some 18,000 additional public servants have been hired under this government. We know that about 6,000 have been doctors, nurses, teachers and police, but that obviously leaves the balance of 12,000 additional public servants who have been hired by this government.

When this was highlighted a number of years ago, there were some lame excuses made. There was some shilly-shallying around by ministers on the other side of the house who were trying to make some excuses about how this could actually take place, but there has been no mistake made. The government has consciously hired these additional 18,000 public servants, and that has obviously put enormous pressure on the state's finances.

I just want to focus on this for a minute or two. There are 6,000 additional doctors, nurses, teachers and police—those 6,000 have been absorbed into those professions, but what actual benefit has the state gained from the additional 12,000 public servants that have been absorbed into the system? What actual benefit does the state receive from those 12,000 additional people hired?

I can tell you that the only thing that I have personally witnessed that may be an improvement in service—even though I do not actually need it—is when you go into the motor registration office to renew your car registration; there is a person that stands at the finger-touch console which says, 'Press here if you want to renew your registration, or you want to renew your driver's licence' or, for any other service, you press another little window on the screen.

Now, I can read, so if I need to go in and re-register my car or renew my license, I push that button, get a ticket and sit down and wait for half an hour before I get called up to the window. So, this person stands at that console and asks me what I want to do, and I tell them, and they say, 'Well, you press that button,' and I am very courteous to them and say, 'Thank you very much,' even though I, as I said, know what to do. That is the only tangible benefit that I have witnessed that is evidence to me of a benefit from these 12,000 public servants.

Now, I do not know how many motor registration offices there are in this state—there might be half a dozen. Those people obviously have a lunch break and so on, so you might need another 12 people to fulfil that role, not the 12,000 people who, as we have seen, have been absorbed into the system who are not a doctor, a teacher, a policeman or a nurse.

We can see that this uncontrolled spending has obviously put pressure on the budget, and we are going to have a look at some statistics here, Madam Deputy Speaker. In terms of the fiscal position and outlook that this budget presents, the three measures that are applied to a budget are all in deficit. The net lending measure is in deficit, the cash position is in deficit and the net operating position is also in deficit. This year, 2011-12, every state Labor government in the nation has a budget deficit, contrasting significantly to the state Liberal governments in the country which have a budget surplus.

We have been highlighting this for many years in relation to this government not being able to control its spending. We have seen record revenues received by the government as a direct benefit from Liberal Party policy in terms of the GST, and when we were previously in government getting the financial issues and the economic issues within this state under control. For the first seven years of this Labor government, there have been record revenues received as a direct benefit of Liberal Party policy.

The government has been unable to control its spending, as I have highlighted previously, and it has been going over budget by a total of \$3.5 billion since 2002-03. In nine out of its nine budgets so far, actual spending has exceeded budgeted spending. Spending blowouts, not falls in revenue, are the main reason that the government's budget has slumped into deficit. The current rate has been highlighted previously. The interest bill that we are all going to pay on this debt is approaching \$2 million a day, and that is on top of the forecast \$1.1 million per day for 30 years for this new hospital.

That is obviously money that every South Australian who is earning an income pays in taxes, and that is obviously soaking up money that could be spent on further health services, education, law and order, transport infrastructure and other areas, and I will come to that later if time permits. That is the scenario; that is the situation that the state is in under the current Labor government.

As I said, that is a stark contrast to every other state Liberal government that has a budget surplus and a stark contrast to how the federal Liberal government performed economically and financially. We have a look at the Howard and Costello years. They actually made a conscious decision to pay off government debt. It got them out of the borrowing market; that had a beneficial effect in driving interest rates down because they were not in the market placing pressure on that sector. They were able to actually put some money aside in the Future Fund to be able to cater for budgetary impacts into the future.

What do we see that this government is providing the state? The state is actually going to saddle us with enormous debt into the future. I do not need to go over those figures because they have been quite satisfactorily highlighted on this side of the house by the leader, the shadow treasurer, the deputy leader and other members on this side. That is the way governments, I think, should model themselves on the Howard and Costello years. They paid off debt, they were out of the market, they were not placing pressure on interest rates. Interest rates came down.

That actually freed up money in the household budgets that those households could go out and spend on other goods and services and increase what they call their discretionary spending. That obviously created a demand out there. People had to make the product to meet the demand; that created additional GST. So, you do not have to be a professor in economics to work that out. That is how the previous federal Liberal government operated to the absolute benefit of this country economically.

As the leader pointed out previously, you need sound economic management to be able to create enough funds within the government's control to spend on all the social justice areas like the disability sector and the public housing sector—all those areas where we know the government is really struggling to provide any level of satisfactory support to the less fortunate in our society. That needs to be underpinned by strong economic management. Unfortunately, the government does not seem to understand that or does not seem to get that basic principle and put it in place.

What have we seen in the last two budgets? Even though the federal Treasurer, Wayne Swan, said that, through the stimulus, the BER and other supposed initiatives, he was going to shield us from the global financial crisis, that has not worked, has it? That has turned into a massive mess over in Canberra. He has enormous issues to deal with economically. We have seen a supposed reduction in GST receipts.

Anybody knows (and this was exhibited in the Howard-Costello years) that you need to cater for the years when you experience a downturn. We all know that there are going to be some good years and there are going to be some bad years, but what have we seen under this government? It has just wasted those seven years when we were getting record revenues into the Treasury coffers—rivers of gold as it has been described. We have wasted opportunities, and now what do we see? We see the budget in deficit from an \$81 million surplus only seven months ago plunging to a \$263 million deficit under this budget.

How is the government proposing to deal with this? Again, it is typical Labor Party policy of high taxation—high taxing and high spending, typical of Labor governments. I have said this on many occasions in the house previously, that this is the hallmark of Labor governments going back to the early seventies when Whitlam first came in; then we had Hawke, Keating and Rudd, and now we have the current Gillard Labor government and we have experienced it under this Rann Labor government—high taxing, high spending. That is how it is going to try to get through this problem. As we said, we are the highest taxed state in the nation. The government cannot control spending. We have seen a downturn in the GST so taxes and charges go up.

As has been previously highlighted in the house, the Treasurer may be a family man in his private life but that does not translate to his public life. We have seen water, energy, car registration and insurance, fuel, rates, charges, fines and levies all increasing. We are going to see the Treasurer jackhammer more tax, more fines, more fees and more levies out of families. He may be a family man in private (and that is a good thing) but it does not translate to his public life. This is a budget that will hurt families, not a budget that will help families.

The government knows that it is in trouble. This is clearly evidenced by its infighting. We see the member for Mawson breaking out, breaking ranks and making public statements. There is obviously clear tension between him and, obviously, the right, and the previous treasurer, the Minister for Police. We see that the minister for agriculture has broken ranks and made public statements about how it is unsustainable to borrow money to pay wages to prop up operating costs.

The Premier we see hanging on for dear life. He is boldly out there saying that he is going to be running as the Premier at the 2014 election and beyond. Well, I have got some news for the Premier. He might not know it, but I think those decisions about his future are going to be taken out of his hands. We clearly see that that is taking place now, with the member for Mawson publicly supporting the Minister for Education.

Obviously, some of the right faction can see the writing on the wall, that their hopefuls in the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer are not quite up to scratch, are not quite making the grade to be elevated to the position of Premier. They have obviously jumped over from their previous position within the right faction, and they have swung their support behind the Minister for Education.

I think in the next few months, maybe not that long, we will see the Minister for Education sitting in that position on a permanent basis, not just there as the duty minister for the afternoon session here at 5:30 this afternoon, not just as a duty minister, but we will see him there permanently. That is what we think is going to happen and, clearly, that is what the media and the papers are reporting.

The Premier is hanging on for dear life, and as a consequence his leadership is drifting and the state is drifting—it has no direction. The state in terms of policy is directionless. They cannot make up their mind. The majority of the caucus cannot make up their mind, even though the right have swung behind Jay, who the new premier really will be. They are all at sea.

There is party disunity, they are fighting amongst themselves, and that is breaking out. As a consequence the state is suffering. So, all in all, once again for the 10th consecutive year I have the dubious honour of speaking to the budget. It is a typical Labor budget, and the way that this government runs the state is typically Labor.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (17:33): I can but only imagine that one day I will have the capacity to follow some of my colleagues in the comments that they make, put so eloquently here and with the history that they bring to this place. I must admit that it becomes a bit of a struggle to sit here in an afternoon—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am trying to be nice. It is a bit of a struggle to sit here in an afternoon and listen to so many words from only one side of an argument. That is my great frustration. When I contemplated the opportunity to come in here, I thought this place was about debate, where great minds would come together, talk about issues, try to get the absolute best solution in mind and, hell, it is a different world to that.

There is absolutely no doubt that it is a very different world to that, and it is a shame. It is a shame, because this should be the place that people in South Australia aspire to when they want to serve the public in some way. They should see the parliament as being the ultimate dream for them, and they should want to come in. But if they came in and watched us from the gallery sometimes and listened to the debate they would wonder where they were.

This is the sixth budget that I have had the opportunity to have some level of review in. I have enjoyed reading the documents—there is no doubt about that—and reflecting upon the history and future visions that will be in place and, at a later date, reviewing those visions and determining how they came to be and what level of account was taken in this place by the Auditor-General, by the opposition, or by the government itself when they try to review performances—but, wow, it is interesting.

I want to relate the comments that I make to real people and the people in my community and other communities that I have the opportunity to meet with on a very regular basis—thank goodness that I do, because it helps keep me sane—and the thoughts and comments that they make to me. Those are the people that we are here for. It is those people a budget is set in place for. It is those people that government and oppositions and all political parties determine policies for and put their grand visions out there for, and it is those people that we have a responsibility to absolutely do our best job for. It is those people who have come to me and other members of the opposition. That is why we are standing here putting an alternative view to what you on the right-hand side of the Speaker might think today, but it is important that the debate occur.

I look forward to members from the government actually standing up and expressing how they feel about the budget and the feedback they have had from people in their community and from business operators in their community, because the feedback we are getting is one of

continual frustration. The comment I hear often is, 'How do we get rid of that mob? How can we get rid of them? Is there any form of constitutional crisis that can occur to allow that to happen?'

Mr Odenwalder: There's an election.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well, there was—every four years, the third Saturday in March every four years. The tide will turn. I am a glass half full type of person, I must admit. I look at the budget and at what I think are quite reasonable investment strategies, and indeed quite reasonable policies in some cases, but then I come back to my core frustration of the increased cost that this budget represents to the people of our state.

The opposition has put out some press releases that talk about \$750 per family per year in additional costs from this budget. I am generous enough to discount the \$141 in that amount that goes in council rates, recognising that the state does not have control over that, but the state does influence the other \$609. It clearly influences the other \$609. I recognise that those \$609 will not equally impact all families in the state, but that is the average situation, and it really does concern me.

It affects the basic needs of our society, such as water, electricity, driver's licence and vehicle registration costs, and employment costs for business. I will make some comments later on about the need to support business more. It comes down to the basic level of what it will do to a family. All of us aspire to create an environment where there is an opportunity for a family to prosper. In everything I have ever done, be it in my years in local government or the opportunity I have here, I have considered what the impact will be upon people and, by association, on families. That is why I am really concerned about what the impact of this budget will be.

I understand as much as anybody—not quite as much as probably some of the ministers who deal with an immense workload every day—that there are a large number of competing demands upon a budget figure. It is \$16 billion. It has increased exponentially since 2002. There is a large amount of outgoings, and a large amount of incomings also, that create that environment that gives a collective amount to provide services and infrastructure for our state, but how do we get it right?

There will always be differences of opinion. There will always be people who have very strong points of view about what level of money needs to be expended or, indeed, what level of money needs to be received. How do you do it? Do you create an environment where you tax continuously, or do you create an environment where there is a capacity to expend funds, which then creates transactions? It is from those transactions that the government receives a reasonable amount of dollars.

The people I talk to say, 'Look, Steven, we recognise there is a need for governments to be supported and for them to provide us with what we need, too. The only way they can do that is via taxation. We are comfortable in paying a reasonable level of taxation.' The frustration that continually comes through to me is that the level of taxation acts as such a negative and puts a wall around any opportunity that might exist for them, and it is taxation across all different levels.

I understand that there has been tweaking of some figures. I also appreciate the fact that incomes are expected to increase for the state over the next four years, and it is those incomes that need to be managed very carefully. You want to create an environment where, yes, you present a balanced budget, where you provide an opportunity for business to be successful and where private enterprise drives the economy of the state. It has to be that way. Governments are there to provide a framework, but it has to be private enterprise that is successful. I believe that in my heart, and I will never deviate from that thought because it is one that we need to work around.

I understand that government priorities need to ensure that we live well, that we can get a job, that we can get a good education, and that we can learn the skills that we need as we progress along career paths, and we need to be provided with the infrastructure and the social services to give us everything that we need. While people are prepared to pay a reasonable level of taxation, there is a limit that they will reach, and in my eyes they have certainly reached that. Unless we manage to grow our economy through a large number of people coming here, we are going to face a lot of challenges. We face that challenge anyway when it comes to workforce issues, and we have an ageing cohort of people who work within our state—a large number of those being baby boomers—who will retire within the next 10 or 12 years or so, and it will create a big challenge for us. When I reflect upon the last nine years, and I try to be objective about this, I am saddened by many of the things I have seen.

I want to comment on a few specifics about the sorts of things that people talk to me about, and they might seem minor when it comes to government eyes in some of the expenditure or income areas, but they are things that really tweak a thought bubble in people's heads and it makes them question a government. One of these is community hospitals.

We on this side, because we represent those communities that have suffered from the decision of the budget of September last year—be it Keith, Blackwood, Ardrossan or Moonta or Glenelg hospitals—were very disappointed about that. I have two of those hospitals within my electorate. I am frustrated immensely when the Minister for Health continually says 'private hospitals'. They are not private hospitals, they do not derive a profit, they are community driven.

For example, the Ardrossan Community Hospital has some wonderful, dedicated people in the op shop there and they make something like \$40,000 or \$50,000 per year that provides an opportunity—and a hell of a lot of work makes that sort of money—to keep that hospital afloat. They have a permanent group of people who are out there organising events to try and keep their hospital going. They do it on the smell of an oily rag. They hope for a bit of support from the government. That had been in place following the 2006 election, and it has now been removed as of 30 June this year.

It is that \$146,000 that they will try and work through. They will try and ensure that they get a greater return from some of the aged care facilities they provide. They will try and ensure that they can provide accident and emergency skills locally, on a very busy road that probably carries hundreds of thousands of people per year. It really does make you question the pettiness of decision making, when that level of investment—across Keith, Moonta and Ardrossan—of \$800,000 cannot be found out of a state budget of \$16 billion.

The state forest sale is, again, a very difficult issue. People from the South-East have continually been in contact with all members of parliament questioning the logic behind this decision. The Leader of the Opposition quotes very often when she speaks at public functions—and I have been at a lot of those—that the profits of ForestrySA bring in some \$43 million per year into Treasury funds.

I have grave fears, indeed, for the economy of the South-East as a result of that, and it is those grave fears that have been demonstrated to all of us who have bothered to go out the front and look at the people from the South-East who have come up here in their hundreds and their thousands to protest about what they think is determining their future, in a negative sense.

These people do not make that trip because they like to come up and yell and scream. These people make this trip because they know that, unless they yell and scream in a public place where there is a chance for a lot of people to hear, and with the media opportunity to get their message out there, their voices are going to be lost.

They will not give up the fight and I commend them on this, because they are passionate about where they have come from. They understand their history, and they know what their future chances are. They are facing a lot of economic challenges with industry that is deciding to leave, but the basic necessity for them is to ensure that the state forests remain in government control and that job opportunities abound in the South-East.

Others will speak on that. No doubt the member for Mount Gambier is going to talk on it too, but it is those people that I listen to, because they are passionate. They do not just continually say, 'This isn't good enough, this isn't good enough.' They demonstrate solutions, such as, 'I know the forward rotations, three of those, 37 years each one.' The financial figures I saw indicated that it was worth \$1.59 billion, I think, to the economy every 37-year rotation. That is the economy of the South-East so, please, I ask for consideration of that. I know that the shadow treasurer in his excellent contribution earlier today has highlighted the fact that even with the revenue streams and writing off the asset of \$630-odd million or thereabouts, member for Davenport—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: \$682 million.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, \$682 million—thank you for correcting me on that. So removing that asset from the valuation of the state government's assets listing—and assuming therefore that that is what level of expected revenue is going to be, that is still not a good return. The member for MacKillop has certainly posed some questions about the economic modelling report that was done on that which justifies the sales. The Treasurer comes in and talks about the fact that he will not go ahead with it if there is a negative for the community. Clearly, either he is not reading the brief

properly or he is not asking the right questions, or he is not talking to the right people, because we have a very different position.

I also want to talk briefly about the marine parks. Other members speak about this constantly. I come from the basis of, yes, wanting to support the marine environment, but I have great concerns about the economic future of the regions where the sanctuary zones are going to be established, and it is those people across South Australia, in the 19 marine parks, who have fought fantastically.

You might say that it was political opportunism to have that public meeting at Burnside, 1,100 people there and all that sort of stuff, but they were not only people who were fearful of losing a recreational opportunity that they love—and we know that there are nearly 300,000 rec fishers in South Australia—but also there were people from communities across South Australia who were worried about their economic future if recreational fishing opportunities were taken away from them and suddenly they did not have that influx of people coming in to go fishing.

I am from a community that has 20 per cent of the state's boat ramps. It has agriculture as its main base. There is a little bit of developing mining exploration industry occurring there, too. Tourism has always been a very strong focus, but the tourism market has been driven by rec fishing opportunities. So, the linkage is there, I understand, and I just hope that the eventual outcome from marine parks is one that the whole parliament and the people of this state can be proud of and that we get outcomes that do not kill communities off. That is my great fear.

I do have to talk about our road network. I note that the DTEI budget is significant, no doubt about that. I look, though, in new expenditure areas, and I think that there is only \$23 million in the 2011-12 financial year and \$5.5 million in the 2012-13 financial year. In discussions with the chair of the board and two senior staffers (including the CEO) of the RAA only about three months ago, they confirmed with us that, yes, they had done a report in 2005. They had a \$200 million backlog. Now the latest figure for them is something in the \$400 million range; and any person who drives out in the regions will know that that \$400 million is justified.

Trying to find the money to fix that is not easy, especially in a budget that is not well managed, has cost overruns and where individual ministers, much to my frustration, do not take responsibility for controlling budget expenditure within their own departments. But it has to come, because it is not just the social fabric of a community that suffers from that, economic opportunities will be lost, too.

Mining will be a big part of our state's future, no doubt. I hope that it grows to the level that actually allows us to ensure that we have a far greater amount of royalties coming in; that we have thousands of people working in the mining industry who do not currently work in that area; and that our regional communities benefit from being seen as home opportunities for those people who do not want necessarily to live in the mines but who want to live in a nice town, and I have lots of communities across my electorate that would suit that need wonderfully well.

We have got to make sure that we have got the infrastructure that supports mining, too, and it will take a significant effort by government and private enterprise to come together to provide the forum and opportunity for that investment to occur. Government cannot fund it all; it is not expected to fund it all. Certainly, private enterprise will raise the capital where needed internationally or within Australian sources to ensure that it gets the infrastructure it needs to create that export opportunity of that raw product. I hope that more value adding occurs, too.

It will create that forum to do that, but states have to ensure that they create the mindset—that they sit down, they talk to people, they calculate what the risks and the opportunities are and they get a positive outcome from it, because, if we don't, we are going to miss out on tremendous growth opportunity for this state. We see ourselves as having a very strong mining future.

I read a figure today in the State of the Regions report, which was released in Canberra at the weekend at the Australian Local Government Association's national congress and which talks about the fact that mining actually is 20 per cent of the nation's economy. South Australia has a small part of that pie at the moment. I certainly hope that grows exponentially, but we need to make sure that we provide the forum for us to be a part of that vision.

Other members have spoken at length about state debt figures. As a person who previously used to look at the books quite closely, that concerned me immensely, and that is why I am sure that I have got a lot more grey hair now than I had 2½ years ago. The forward estimates

show a level of debt of \$9.2 billion; and, indeed, if you look at all liability areas, some \$20 billion. If you equate that back to every man, woman and child in the state, it brings it down to \$15,000 per person, and that is frightening.

If you have a growing economy that can afford to and will create the environment to service that level of debt and still carry out investment in services and infrastructure, well and good, but I am fearful that the climate that exists in South Australia is somewhat the opposite of that. When, indeed, that \$9.2 billion figure does not include a SA Water debt of \$1.7 billion, and potentially more, attached to the desalination plant, I have fears, and I think all South Australians will also.

We are talking about dollar amounts that are beyond the capacity of people to understand. They relate their own experience back to the level of debt in their home, and they can appreciate hundreds of thousands of dollars in that case and they worry every time there is an interest rate rise or, indeed, any time that their job might be seen as being at risk. The state also needs to be very concerned about that, and that is why we on this side will continually raise debt issues as we move forward, because it is important.

I want to talk briefly about the funding cuts to Regional Development Australia and the business enterprise centres announced in last year's budget, in September—and the minister is still in the chamber, so I appreciate that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Bipartisan support.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Not at all times. I am concerned that the BEC network, and there are nine of them, has something like 70,000 contacts per year. The minister acknowledges that with a head nod. He understands that. I read an *Advertiser* report, I think last week, that talked about restructuring the support necessary for small business enterprise in South Australia and taking from the BEC network some \$1.35 million. There will be some change occur and out of the ashes I hope will come four BECs that will have a strong future. I hope they will have a level of financial support from the state to ensure that the federal money they get, and some level of revenue that will come from charges that they will place upon the industries and businesses they provide support to, will be sufficient.

Regional Development Australia is a frustrating issue. We had the structural change to the regional development boards only two or three years ago. Regional Development Australia was formerly the area consultative committees, the federal government arm of economic development, and now we find on 30 June 2013 that their dollars are being taken away. In this case, it is a little under \$4.1 million, and that is not good enough, because they are there to support small business.

The member for Davenport in his contribution earlier today picked up on one very important component of the Treasurer's speech which I find extremely disappointing—and the Minister for Small Business, who is in the chamber, should acknowledge this also—that is, the lack of recognition in the Treasurer's speech and, indeed, in the budget papers about the need to support small business. Overwhelmingly, it drives our economy.

There is a large number of people out there who want to grow their small business and they need some support in that, but to suddenly find that in a \$16 billion budget there is only \$1.9 million—I will repeat that: \$1.9 million—to support small business is disappointing in the extreme. These people are good and hardworking. They work long hours and, when they need support, they want to get it quickly. They do not want to be stuck with a situation and have no solution in mind and, indeed, no-one to ring or contact about it.

That is why we need support mechanisms provided by the state government to help these business opportunities, to allow small business to expand, to give them the chance to be successful and to employ more young people. We want to see more young people employed in small business and, indeed, for it to be one of the products of the grand vision for all of us to be successful in this state, whether it is working in the Public Service, in private enterprise of any size or, importantly, the small business component. It is without that level of support that I have grave fears.

[Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.W. Weatherill]

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:54): I rise today to speak on the budget handed down by this Labor government and how it affects my constituents and South Australians in general. Given that we have had 10 years of financial mismanagement, it is no wonder this budget hits all

South Australians by penny-pinching in the extreme. This budget contains measures that spare none in order to pay for unnecessary, very expensive capital projects that have all gone over budget, some even before starting.

If you drive a car, catch a bus, use water and have a shower or a bath, this government is going to tax you, and what they do not increase in taxes and levies and take away by reducing services, they are going to privatise. People who have been conservative with their water use—those who have saved up and installed rainwater tanks—will be rewarded with an increase in water supply charges of 65 per cent from 1 July this year. That is 20 times the rate of inflation.

Per kilolitre water charges will increase by 40 per cent. Sewerage rates will be up by 12 per cent, and, worst of all, water gets cheaper as you use more. I thought we were trying to discourage overuse of water. This budget measure hits people hardest the less water they use. The average household will pay \$189 more for water next year. Average water bills have trebled under the Labor government despite households being more and more careful with water usage. There is no escaping the cost. Even if you do not use a single drop of water from SA Water, you will still bear the brunt of this government's increased water costs through the increase in connection charges.

For concession recipients, the increase will equate to a price rise of up to 74 per cent after concessions. Why are we paying for this? The government's excuse is that we need to pay for our not-yet-operating desalination plant, the plant that South Australians will pay up to \$130 million per year to operate, on top of the \$2.2 billion construction cost. We do not even have anywhere to store the water, so we could possibly be paying a huge price to pump water out to sea.

From a recent survey sent out to my electorate, 76 per cent of respondents were concerned about the cost of electricity and 69 per cent were concerned about the cost of water, even before the latest increases were announced. A further 45 per cent were concerned about current land taxes.

Each year since the desalination plant was announced, our annual water bills have risen well above CPI. We have seen successive years of water bill increases from 16 per cent, to 21 per cent, 25 per cent and now, this year, 40 per cent. That is unsustainable for South Australian families. It is cruel and punitive, and people are suffering. Water is an essential item; none of us can function without it, so the government is abusing this need by increasing charge rates, for this financial year alone, 12 times above CPI.

South Australia is the highest taxed state in Australia. Total taxes are up by 88 per cent since Labor came into government. GST was meant to lead to reduced state taxes. What do we have to show for all the GST windfalls? A tram to nowhere. Land tax has increased by 346 per cent under the Rann Labor government. The previous treasurer would always use the line that, if the land tax was too much, just sell the property, but that is just simplistic.

The cost of land tax is shared by everyone. It means there are fewer mum-and-dad investors keen to enter the property market. This means less affordable rental housing due to the disincentive to invest in rental properties due to the land tax and aggregation laws. It means that investment leaves our state because we are uncompetitive. Why invest here when you can pay less tax in other states?

The uncompetitive climate in South Australia is not limited to those who invest. South Australia's vehicle registration costs are not competitive with other states. This budget includes an increase of 4.3 per cent in registration costs, the cost that is burdensome to those on pensions and low incomes. Ten-year car licences are increasing by 32.1 per cent, up from \$280 to \$370—a huge increase. Again, this government is taxing for maximum effect, trying to strike at costs and services that are unavoidable and affect nearly everyone.

If you are in Victoria, your renewal would cost \$162.20 for 10 years (less than half that of South Australia). What about the massive increases in speeding fines for zero to 15 kilometres over the speed limit? This is clearly a money grab and is not about safety. No wonder, of all businesses nationally that moved their place of business, 22 per cent departed South Australia.

Why is this government imposing such punitive measures on South Australians? The answers are within the electorate of Adelaide. Adelaide Oval was going to cost \$450 million—not a penny more—prior to the election, and that cost was to include the footbridge and parking. It is now \$535 million after the election, to include SACA's debt, and now the projected cost does not include the footbridge or parking. This stands to benefit two wealthy organisations.

Football could be played this weekend at Adelaide Oval with no extra cost to taxpayers. Round 12 on 11 June was the last time the Adelaide Crows played a home game, against the West Coast Eagles, and the crowd was 31,412. This game could have been played at Adelaide Oval with no need to spend \$535 million. The average Crows attendance for home games so far this year has been 35,309, for home games in 2010 it was 35,764, with the average for Port Power home games so far this year being 23,155 and home games in 2010 at 24,256. Clearly, Adelaide Oval is more than adequate for the numbers that we are getting at these football games.

Why is it so urgent to spend taxpayers' money we do not have to expand an oval when we cannot even fill Adelaide Oval now? This decision will take us from two ovals that we have sustained for 30 years to one oval, and we call this progress. This is a horrendous waste of money that is completely the wrong priority for our state at this time. The Liberal Party supports football in the city but not at the unnecessary expense of hurting everyday South Australians.

I think it is worth noting that the selling of the forests in the South-East was announced the day after the Adelaide Oval was announced. There is a transfer of assets that regenerate out of the budget at a figure of \$682 million. We can only assume this is a forward rotation of the forests in the South-East being sold to pay for the Oval.

Bizarrely, after such a massive investment of private infrastructure on Adelaide Oval under the guise of bringing tourism to our state and to our city, the government in its wisdom has decided to slash spending on tourism. All three program areas—destination development, tourism events and tourism marketing—suffer a loss of government funds. In 2009-10, the actual costs for these three programs were \$61.74 million. The budget for 2011-12 is reduced to \$53 million. I cannot understand this government's logic that you would significantly reduce spending on tourism while at the same time making a significant outlay of taxpayers' money to the tune of \$535 million to upgrade the Adelaide Oval in the hope of attracting more visitors to Adelaide. The decision is nonsensical.

This brings me to Adelaide High School. Many times in this chamber I have talked about the struggles of Adelaide High School. The school is overcrowded, with hundreds of children on the waiting list. Just four days prior to the March state election in a last-ditch effort to attract votes, the state government announced a promise to expand Adelaide High School by 250 students and to increase the zone to include Prospect and Walkerville without encroaching on the Parklands. Given the reality that Adelaide High School is already over capacity by more than 200 students by the latest benchmarks and that it cannot fulfil its current in-zone demands, this was a piecemeal and makeshift solution at best.

Out of the five suggested expansions, four encroached on the Parklands. The preferred solution, as discussed last week at the governing council meeting for Adelaide High School, almost encroaches 100 per cent on the Parklands, not to mention the cost of \$17 million to give 250 extra places (less the 200 overcapacity that they already are), meaning that only 50 extra students will gain access to the very popular Adelaide High School at a cost of \$17 million and more land will be alienated from the Parklands.

There will still not be any sibling rights for special entry children, and how this will allow for any expansion of the zone further north to include Prospect or Walkerville as promised at the election is yet to be seen. The government knows that all the inner-city primary schools of Gilles Street, Sturt Street and even North Adelaide are bursting at the seams. They know that many of the families who have children currently in middle primary school years are hoping their children will progress to Adelaide High School.

The government's 30-year plan so dramatically increases Adelaide's city population with the building of 15,040 new dwellings in the Adelaide city area. Where will these children go to school? The government must face the fact that we need a second inner-city public high school. The Bowden Urban Village would be perfect, yet not mentioned in the budget.

For another reason the government is penny-pinching we need to look no further than the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. The new projected cost of \$2.7 billion is \$1.1 billion (or \$1,100 million) over the election promise. This is without paying for doctors and nurses. After the build it will cost South Australians \$1 million per day for 30 years. How can you leave this legacy for the next generation to pay? This will be a debt that children who are not even born yet will be contributing to for over 10 years of their working life.

Our state debt will be up to \$20 billion by 2014. Interest on government debt is approaching \$2 million per day. Imagine what we could do with this money. We are delaying the Riverside

precinct by two years to begin in 2015 and taxes are up by more than double the rate of inflation. The legacy of this budget is more debt and more pain for South Australians. Generations of South Australians will be paying for a desalination plant, with no extra capacity to store water; for an oval that we cannot afford that relies on parking in the Parklands; and a rail yards hospital that will replace a hospital that has already had significant recent infrastructure spending.

Ordinary South Australians will suffer through paying extra costs they will be unable to escape from. They will have no choice but to pay increased water supply and connection charges. They will have no choice but to pay for increased motor registration and licence costs. If they choose to give up their licence, they will be hit with increased public transport costs. This budget is shameful. Despite the family pictures on the cover, this budget has contempt for South Australian families, South Australian small businesses, South Australian employees and contempt for every South Australian.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (18:05): I rise today to speak on the Appropriation Bill for the 2011-12 budget, a budget that delivers infrastructure investment of \$9.1 billion over four years for South Australians. I note the comment of the member for Adelaide across the chamber about many of these things, particularly the Adelaide Oval, and I will come back to that later. Across the forward estimates, the capital program is, on average, \$2.3 billion each year. This continues the record infrastructure investment of recent years, providing jobs for South Australians today and providing a building block for a strong economic growth into the future for our state. It is a building block program that is aimed at providing the transport and healthcare infrastructure needs for all future South Australians into the years ahead.

In 2011-12 alone, \$3.369 billion is to be spent on the capital program, supporting an estimated 10,000 full-time equivalent jobs in South Australia. These are real jobs supporting South Australian families—just as the Northern Expressway provided jobs for people in the north during the GFC. This represents a major investment in the infrastructure in this state, and our government is proud to be putting this program forward—in contrast with the last years of the Liberal government, when the actual infrastructure spend was about \$0.7 billion—\$0.7 billion.

The Liberals barely invested in maintaining the infrastructure we had, let alone invest in the future prosperity of our state. However, I do recall that the honourable members opposite built a one-way street to the south. The government is spending around \$445 million to fix this short-sighted mistake for those in the southern suburbs. This \$445 million duplication of the Southern Expressway is welcomed by the people in the south. It is part of a \$1.1 billion package of road investment and improvements over the next four years to be undertaken in partnership with the commonwealth government.

This program and package will significantly improve traffic flows on the north-south corridors and includes the new South Road Superway. Many of these things are needed by the whole state, particularly those living in Adelaide. In addition, the government is also investing \$100 million in the South Eastern Freeway and the Dukes Highway making improvements for people in regional South Australia.

There is \$35.5 million for sealing road shoulders as a high priority for rural roads. This is welcome in my electorate, and I know the member for Light and many other seats neighbouring mine welcome this investment, particularly the people who have trucking and family businesses that grow agricultural produce and complain about these things to me. There is \$80 million to complete the McLaren Vale overpass which, again, is welcomed by the people in the Southern Vales.

The government is not only investing in roads, it is also investing in public transport, something that my electorate cries out for, and it is very happy about these new facilities that are to be provided. We will be providing more buses, more trains and more trams. The government is spending \$1.2 billion over the next four years upgrading the train network, including the electrification of the Outer Harbor line, upgrading and electrifying the Gawler line, which goes through Elizabeth South in my electorate, and extending the Noarlunga to Seaford line, in addition to its upgrade and electrification.

The government is also doubling the capacity of the Klemzig and Tea Tree Plaza O-Bahn park-and-ride facilities, as well as improving passenger accessibility and safety along the O-Bahn corridor. The government is also spending approximately \$100 million on new and replacement buses for the metropolitan network, buses that can be used free of charge by the state's seniors during interpeak times, something the Labor government has provided.

This government is also about investing in our schools—\$394.6 million over four years will be provided to improve facilities and expand the capacity of our schools. This includes \$52.4 million to co-locate special schools onto existing school sites around the state. The people in my electorate of Taylor care passionately for education, and they are very pleased with the new facilities they are receiving under this government that are needed and warranted and building for their children's future.

The government is also investing in public and social housing, with \$953.2 million over four years being spent primarily on construction and development. South Australia already spends significantly more per capita on public housing than the national average, and this investment will continue the strong history we have in this area.

The government is also spending \$393.7 million to upgrade and expand the Adelaide Convention Centre and the Riverbank precinct, which will be a welcome boost for the state's tourism prospects and amenities for all South Australians who use the riverfront precinct. The wider upgrade of the Riverbank precinct also includes the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Adelaide Oval development. Most of the spends on these projects are in addition to the \$9.1 billion capital program over the forward estimates and will provide more jobs for South Australians in their construction.

The new Royal Adelaide Hospital will provide the best quality of care for South Australians for generations to come. It will be the most advanced hospital in the nation. It will provide more beds than the old hospital. It will have more theatres than the old hospital, and these theatres will be larger and of better quality for our future and the needs of future medical processes that we are yet to envision.

In total, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will have a large footprint of 167,400 square metres of floor space. Delivering this new state-of-the-art hospital, together with the upgrade to the Adelaide Oval, which will bring football back to the city, will be delivering on key election commitments made by this government at the last election.

Whilst I note that the member for Adelaide raised the issue of Adelaide Oval, it is interesting to note that the member for Waite earlier in the day raised the idea that they thought the Liberals had placed this item on the agenda. The matter is in the public domain. We were elected, and we are delivering on our promise.

The government's commitment to infrastructure spending for the future of this state is commendable and much better than the record of the opposition Liberal Party. I urge his house to pass the Appropriation Bill and to allow the record investment for the people of South Australia to move forward and be delivered.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson): The member for Fisher.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (18:13): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. You certainly have a multiple-skills capability. I guess in time you will be on this side of the house as you seem to be moving east.

This is a fantastic budget if your family gets around on only a pushbike, does not shower and does not water the garden. If you come into that category, it is a fantastic budget, but if you do not, then it is not a good budget, because contrary to the government's label of being a 'family budget' one would have to consider that to be a bit of cruel, humorous labelling. There is nothing in this budget that really, in my view, is pro family; in fact, there are a lot of things in it that I think are very negative.

There are some good things. I should start, I suppose, with the positives. The electrification of the train lines is continuing, and, hopefully, the extension of the tramline, the tram network; that would be a good thing. I believe in time that the hospital will prove to be a great asset, although one can query the capital cost and the running cost. I think there is merit in having a hospital on a greenfield site rather than trying to modify the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital.

I have argued in the past that I think it would have been better to build up existing metropolitan hospitals and have a much smaller central hospital with a couple of specialties. Build up Flinders, Modbury, Lyell McEwin, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and so on because that is where the people are, and have a smaller, central hospital. Anyway, the decision has been made. I think what needs to happen now is to make the best of it.

The budget contains some other good measures and, time permitting, I will come back to them. There are some things that should have been highlighted and provided for. I think the government needs to significantly expand the traineeship scheme. Many members here have had trainees in their offices, and probably still do. It has been a fantastic system. All of the trainees I have had have gone on to have very good jobs, and that concept needs to be expanded much more widely throughout the public sector. It brings proven results and the government really needs to push that along. I look forward to the day when we might see some special provision for young people in regard to youth centres, police youth clubs and so on—not in this budget, but one day maybe that will happen.

In terms of health, there is a lot of money going to the new Royal Adelaide, and I have said before—it is not novel—that if governments, and that is all governments, including the federal government, do not address the issue of what is sometimes called 'preventative health', a funny term—the wellbeing of people through awareness of medical issues and so on—then no amount of money will be available in the future to deal with the health problems that are going to accrue. I have argued for a long time that there should be provision for health checks for all school children at different stages throughout their schooling.

To the credit of Lea Stevens, when she was a minister, we had the initiative, which I was very keen to encourage, of the home visits for newborns. That was a great initiative and I was very supportive of that. The concept needs to be taken further because, for example, children can have things like scoliosis and hernias, and all sorts of things which are not necessarily picked up by parents.

I may have mentioned the example of my middle lad who is totally deaf in one ear and partially deaf in the other. Even though his mother (my first wife) was a double-certificated nurse, and I thought I knew quite a bit—I have learnt over time that I know less than I think—we did not pick that up; it was picked up by the health assessment team at Coromandel Valley school. They sent a note home saying, 'We think your son has nerve deafness,' and it turned out to be correct.

In a lot of areas where people do not necessarily access GP or other medical services children can have undiagnosed conditions, and likewise many children at the secondary level are showing signs of early problems of a mental nature. I am dealing with a case at the moment of a 15 year old who is running away from home, out with older men and that sort of thing. We believe that young lass has a condition that needs to be assessed by a psychologist or a psychiatrist.

If you have proper screening through the school system you will pick up those issues and get to them before they lead to chronic depression or some other issue. I am a great advocate for awareness and screening at the school level; not every year but maybe at mid primary and early secondary.

Likewise, screening in the workplace, and the progressive private organisations are doing it. In countries like the Netherlands it is mandatory: every employee has to have a health check covering a whole range of issues. I think we should be moving the same way. If you do that and get onto issues quickly—you can encourage people, for example, who are smokers and so on to get off that habit—then you will save lives and money as well.

Greater focus needs to be put on physical education for primary schoolchildren. We know that a lot of children do not walk to school. They are at greater risk in their car with their parents than they are walking to school, despite what people might think about paedophiles and so on. Not enough children are playing sport, and many members would agree that if young people play sport they are less likely to get into trouble later in life through misbehaving or inappropriate social behaviour.

In terms of public transport, I commend the government for the electrification of the rail system and the tram system, but there are some areas that could be further improved. We do not have an adequate bus connection from my area at Aberfoyle Park to Marion shopping centre. We have asked for it, but we have not had any success with that.

I have lobbied the Minister for Transport for bus shelters for some years. You cannot expect people to catch a bus in this weather if they are drenched before they get on the bus or in summer if they look like a roasted parsnip when they get on the bus. I am pleased that the government has over time provided money for bus shelters, and I hope that it continues, as it is very important. Some of my elderly residents say they just want to be able to sit down while they are waiting for the bus, and I do not think that is an unreasonable request.

In regard to roads and signage, the government has thus far refused to provide better access and egress to the soon-to-be duplicated Southern Expressway in the vicinity of Kenihans Road and Panalatinga Road. A lot of people in my area, and I guess some in the areas of the members for Reynell and Mawson, want to be able to travel in both directions on the Southern Expressway, and I make that request to the government. I do not believe it is currently funded. The government has done a study and is still being very stubborn in terms of not providing greater access and egress in the vicinity of Kenihans Road. I welcome the duplication of the Southern Expressway but, if you are going to do it, let us do it properly. Let us make sure people who want to use it can actually get on or off it at the appropriate place.

I understand the land adjacent to Flagstaff Road, where SA Water has storage tanks, is becoming available because those tanks are about to be decommissioned. I would make a plea to the government for the transport department to get that land and convert Flagstaff Road into a permanent two-way system, with a dual carriageway each way. I had the unfortunate pleasure a week or two ago of going down there in the correct lane to find that someone was coming up in the incorrect lane. Reversible lane systems are fine, providing that people can read the signs and follow the instructions.

Ms Bedford: What did you do, Bob?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Being a gentleman, I got out of the way of this oncoming four-wheel drive because I was only in my humble Toyota Celica. I got out of the way because I did not want to have an argument. It has happened to a lot of other people, and I have written to the minister asking for better signage at least in the interim.

In terms of roads and so on, I argue that there generally needs to be much more improved signage. The other night I was at Tea Tree Gully talking to the Rotary Club and, from where I live, it is a cut lunch and a water bag job. I know the area roughly but, if you did not know the area or if you were a tourist, you would have no idea which main road you were about to approach, and that applies not just to the arterial roads but to some of the collector roads as well. I think we need better signage in advance so that people are not put in a situation where they are likely to be a risk to themselves and others and can know in advance that a particular arterial road is coming up and that they need to turn off.

Likewise, in relation to speed limits, it is fair enough to ping people who exceed the speed limit if they know what the speed limit is, but in some cases it is not quite clear. People say we have a default system. What we need is something like they have in New South Wales: when you enter an area that is 50 km/h, there is a clear indication on the perimeter that that is what it is, because you can turn off an arterial into what looks like another arterial and, before you realise what you are doing, you can be subject to a penalty. For members' information, prior to the recent allegation which I dispute, I had never had a speeding fine in my life.

I turn to the issue of law and order. I notice in the budget there is provision for 300 extra police over four years. I would argue that is not necessary. I am told that at the moment we have close to 4,400 police. I have seen no evidence of extra police anywhere. I do not know what they do, where they go or how they are utilised.

I do not believe that this idea of increasing the number of police, as they have done in Victoria, is necessary. What you need is for the police who are there to be used efficiently and effectively. I query why you need the police to be doing road vehicle escorts. That could be done by the private sector. I do not think you need police doing that. I do not believe that you need 300 extra police, particularly when you have cut 300 out of the Department for Environment and Natural Resources.

I am quite concerned at this government, unlike some of its predecessors, where you had people like the Hon. Don Hopgood who did a lot to establish the national parks and conservation parks system. Now we seem to have a government that talks about the environment but at the same time is cutting staff left, right and centre out of anything to do with the environment. So, that is a negative which is continued in this budget.

Bushfire prevention, I think, is good. It is another positive in the budget. The increased cool burns, or preventative burns, is a sensible thing to do, particularly if it is done in accordance with ecological practice. I believe that the community and government agencies are getting better at cool burns and appropriate burning, so I do think that is a good measure provided it is done in a way that is sympathetic to the environment, and that should be the case.

In terms of the environment generally, I do not see much money allocated for species protection. The government has had a policy of no species lost for a long time. I do not see a lot of commitment, financially, towards helping ensure that that happens.

With regard to education, and I see the minister sitting here, I am very passionate about education. I believe the minister is a good Minister for Education. He does listen and I think he has the interests of students and the community at heart.

I notice that in Queensland they have committed to having all year 7s in high schools. Traditionally, that has not happened here and one of the reasons is the cost factor because once you put more students into a high school setting then you are faced with things like expanded library and laboratory facilities. It will not be cheap, but I think it needs to happen and the government needs to be actively pursuing the transformation of the year 7s into a middle school setting in a high school.

Some schools are set up for that. Reynella East college, as it is called now, has 1,600 students on campus. It is a one-stop shop. The parents like it. Their children do not have to change schools when they go from preschool to primary or from junior primary to primary or from primary to secondary, and that is the obvious trend.

I notice that the government is going to put more preschool centres in with primary schools. I think that makes sense because you do not have any trauma when a child has to change location simply because they are going from preschool to primary. There are other savings as well.

In respect of my own electorate, the Salvation Army, which is a great organisation, has to relinquish the property it owns at The Hub and I am urging the government to buy that because it would give Aberfoyle Park High School a fantastic extra area, and I believe the government could also put some of its regional staff in there as well. So, I think the government could get a good deal by purchasing that from the Salvation Army.

Water recycling. Water rates have gone up and a lot of my self-funded retirees are telling me that it is hurting. I will quote from one constituent, Eric, who lives on Ackland Hill Road. He says:

Dear Mr Such,

The steep increase in water rates for one...

He is talking about self-funded retirees. It continues:

Self-funded retirees don't get a concession on water rates, nor on a driver's licence, car/caravan registration, dental care, hearing aids or numerous other services.

He is not the only one, there are others. One constituent (who acknowledges that he is a right wing type person) from Aberfoyle Park is highlighting his concerns about high taxation. An increase in council rates, we know, is not the responsibility directly of the government, though local governments say that the state government is putting more and more responsibility onto them. I think that is only partially true. I think that some councils have forgotten what their core business is. When you put that together with increased water pricing, water rates, increased licence fees for licences and heavy penalties for minor traffic infringements, you are really putting the screws on the ordinary citizen.

It is fine for us in here. We are all on good incomes. We should not forget that there are a lot of people out there who are doing it tough, and, if they have young children, or children of any age, and they are on a basic income, they are struggling. There is a groundswell building up, and the government—and I would say the opposition, as well—ignores that at its own peril. But the public are getting very angry at the increases, and this budget does not do anything to help in that regard. It puts the pressure even further on the families and others, particularly people like self-funded retirees who do not really have any avenue to ameliorate some of those extra costs.

This will come in by way of a separate bill, but this defect policy the government wants to introduce, I think, is absolutely draconian. To fine someone who might have a faulty wiper blade \$125, or maybe \$250, means that they then have to take their vehicle down to Regency Park. I can guarantee that, when it is inspected, they will find another fault or three. They will have to take the vehicle away to someone to get it fixed and then come back; then, if it is approved, they then pay a release fee, and they have copped a fine.

The people who are going to get hurt will not be the people in here, it will be the poor battlers in the outer suburbs in particular who are struggling to make ends meet; and farmers and

others with their trucks that drop one spot of oil will be off the road and down to Regency. I was talking to someone at Strathalbyn only last week. He had a faulty horn on his truck and, by the time he got it all sorted out, it was \$2,700.

Some of these things are becoming ridiculous, and I think that it is going to backfire. I have expressed this to the police commissioner that police are increasingly going to be seen in a hostile way by the public (that is, the traffic police), because they become tax collectors for the state government.

Time expired.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (18:32): Yes, I, too, rise to speak on this 2011-12 budget, which really does worry me, particularly coming from the regions. What really does bother me is what is not in the budget. I think that most people today have spoken to the deficiencies of the budget to support the state, to support the regions, but it is about what is not in the budget. It is clearly lacking financial management. It is clearly lacking a real business backbone behind it to give some vision of what this state could produce with a government that was dedicated to leading the state into a prosperous future.

The question is: why is there a continuing debt? We continue to see this government driving the state into oblivion with increased debt. Again, as many speakers on this side have said today, their children and their grandchildren are going to be paying off this debt for many years to come. I do not want to stand here today and just bag the government on its lack of vision or its lack of financial management, but to get a prosperous future, to get business boiling, to get business on the move once again, we are looking at incentives for people to stay in South Australia.

As a food producer living in the regions, I see people moving from the regions, people moving interstate from the city because they are getting more support and more incentive to go into business elsewhere. There is just no incentive whatsoever to come to South Australia. There is no incentive to invest in South Australia, particularly in the regions. The amount of foreign investment that is coming to South Australia is of major concern to myself as a regional MP, but it also should be of major concern to every MP in the South Australian parliament.

We see the threshold of \$232 million as the exposure point of investment coming into Australia. I think that highlights the lack of understanding of why we need to have a better regime. We need to have a land area regime to know when foreign investment will come into this state and this country so that we can actually keep viable agricultural businesses that drive the state and country's economy here.

Again, the lack of investment in South Australia is clearly dragging this state under. We see continual red tape that gets in the way of people who want to come to this state. The cost of living in this state has now increased by \$750 per family. My office is continually getting people saying in desperation, 'There's got to be some way of getting this government out of office before 2014. We just can't take it any more. We've got no incentive to continue within our business. With the lack of support and increased costs, we've got no reason to continue, and it's just becoming harder and harder to live on a daily basis.'

We need to hear what people in all electorates are saying. It is not just the opposition electorates; it is all electorates here in South Australia. South Australian voters are becoming sick and tired of the excuses and the lack of support of this Labor government, and the polls show that. The polls show that people in South Australia are sick of a tired Labor government. Again, I do not want to stand here and bag the government, but it is just plain and simple common sense. It is the lack of financial management and the lack of a real business backbone that is making people in this state lack confidence.

Particularly in my electorate of Chaffey, the high dollar is affecting exports, tourism and investment, but it is not the only reason for food producers in particular. Irrigators have been tarred with the same brush as irresponsible water users. Farmers have been tarred with a brush—particularly people who are unaware; I would not say particularly in the cities—that they have created the problem and they have to live with it.

I now call on people—farmers, irrigators, fruit producers—to just look and reflect. Perhaps they could be South Australia's gardeners. We can be part of South Australia's garden, producing the food and the agricultural products that everyone expects when they sit down to a meal.

It is not only about the high dollar and the lack of government support for agricultural businesses in South Australia, but the number of businesses that are closing and the job losses

that we are incurring at the moment. That all revolves around the lack of support, particularly in the regions. I reflect on that in every second sentence because the agriculture, mining and fishing industries are the backbone of this economy. Over the last 10 years, the manufacturing sector has been almost decimated.

We see small businesses being cut to the bone with taxes. Again, why would small business want to invest in South Australia? We have the highest payroll tax in this country. We have the highest land tax in this country. Costs and red tape are driving those businesses away. The small business sector is one of the vital components of the state's economy. It is a vital component of the future of this state's economy. Again, it has to be recognised that it needs support to get us through these tough economic times.

We look at the general items of the budget and the debt has risen to over \$8.2 billion over forward estimates. That is absolutely outrageous, as the member for Hammond regularly says. We had a \$263 million deficit in 2010-11. The financial liabilities are forecast to be up to \$20 billion by 2014. With the way the government's performance is being reflected in the polls, 2014 will be a year of change. It will be a year that perhaps a new government will have to come in and sort out the mess that this government has left.

As I have said previously, the cost of living is up by about \$750 per family. Again, that is making it harder and harder to live in this state, and I say: why? Again, it is obviously the financial mismanagement and the business backbone that this government clearly does not have.

An additional 400 public sector job cuts follow 3,750 in the last budget, and that budget was only nine months ago, not a full 12 months ago. These two budgets, rolled into one, are a reflection of what is going on. It is two budgets of bad news for this state in nine months. We look at payroll tax, which is up \$91 million in 2011-12. We are already the highest taxed state in the country. There are funding cuts for years 11 and 12 students of \$163 per student. That is outrageous and it is more impost on a family's budget.

Again, we look at cuts to Primary Industries. This is an example that shows this government has no clear understanding of long-term benefit. Primary Industries is there for the long term. It is there for the research, development and support of agriculture, horticulture and aquaculture. It is clearly being cut to the bone and it is almost getting to the point of no relevance. The flesh that has been cut off PIRSA's bones is a clear indication that the government must have an agenda. It has an agenda to make PIRSA almost not relevant, and that is of real concern to every agriculture-based region and every food-producing region in the country.

Again, we look at Labor's inability to control its spending. It is selling off these money-making assets such as the state's forests. SA Lotteries is now being privatised, essentially. We are told it is not being privatised and the government will just sell the rights to SA Lotteries. These are credible assets to the state; yet they are being sold off, and for what? It is just to prop up mismanagement of spending. It is very hard to conceive that the state's South-East forests are to be sold off to upgrade Adelaide Oval—a football oval and a cricket ground, for goodness sake. People will be paying this off for many years to come.

There are solutions. The short-term solution to the Adelaide Oval, a \$535 million spend, is to trial football at Adelaide Oval before we put in the big, whizz-bang, shiny grandstands with the special bars and corporate facilities that will be looking into the sun and the wind. Let's get football to Adelaide Oval this year. Let's not beat around the bush and buggerise around with this state's economy. Get the footy to Adelaide Oval and trial it now. We are seeing decreasing numbers going to West Lakes and decreasing numbers at a lot of sporting events.

For the government to go out there spending willy-nilly \$535 million—it is not the right economic climate to be out there flinging \$535 million into a stadium, which will need a huge amount of this state government's expenditure. It is not just the \$535 million on the stadium; it is about accommodating the people who come to the stadium, and it is about the businesses which will have to invest in that stadium and support the cafés, bars and hotels. All the support structures that revolve around Adelaide Oval will have to have money spent on them, too—things such as road upgrades.

I do wonder whether we will see depreciated land values around Adelaide Oval because of the invasion of people parking willy-nilly. Will we see the people who come to Adelaide Oval turn up at the parking areas? We say that we are going to see special parking areas. Well, goodness me, the Parklands will be affected; there is no doubt about it. Again, that is something where the

government could show some initiative. Instead of putting up the \$535 million, which everyone has to pay for, let's just trial it, for goodness sake.

Again, moving along, we see tax increases: \$1.1 billion on extra taxes over forward estimates. Tax revenue is up by almost \$2 billion since 2001-02. What are they doing with all of that extra tax? Again, in this budget, payroll tax is up \$441 million. Conveyance duty has more than doubled, over \$446 million. Land tax is up \$485 million, which is a 346 per cent increase, and that is affecting every electorate in this state. It is not about the opposition giving the government a bit of a kicking over it; it is about every MP being responsible for the extra taxes.

Motor vehicle tax is up \$185 million; property tax is up \$81 million; insurance taxes, \$164 million; and gambling tax is up \$108 million. There are huge increases in those taxes, yet we continue to see this state slip into a decline of more and more debt.

If we look at some of the big ticket items for Adelaide, we see the \$2.2 billion for the desal plant. That is something that has been very high on my agenda. If we break that down, we look at the \$1.8 billion cost to the desal. I am sure that, by the time we get it up and running, that \$1.8 billion will have blown out further in cost; I do not think we will see much change out of \$2 billion by the time we actually get a drop of water out of that desal plant. Every South Australian is paying for that desal plant, and they have been for two years, yet what are they getting for that money? They are getting a bad deal.

Look at the \$400 million interconnector so that we can pump water out of the desal plant into the northern areas of Adelaide. We can also look at the projected 65 gigalitres of stormwater recovery over the next period of time and the 60 gigalitres of water reuse. What are they going to do with that water? We are being told that, if we want a warranty on the desal plant, we have to run the desal plant at 75 per cent capacity for the next two years. That is a huge burden on the people of South Australia.

I say that, if they are going to spend \$400 million on an interconnector and \$2 billion on a desal plant, let's look at putting some of that water underground and storing it for when the rain is not there. For goodness sake, do not let the desal plant operate in order to get the warranty and pump the water out to sea. Let's not see it wasted. There has to be an opportunity to store that precious and very expensive water from the desal plant; it has to be pumped underground. Yes, it is not just a straightforward exercise of hooking up a pipe, some flanges and some valves and pumping it into the aquifer, but it can be done. The government needs to look outside the square with this desalination plant.

There is a solution there, with what the state is forking out with this desalination plant. Every South Australian is paying for it. Even if you live in the Far North of the state, far away from any SA Water mains, it has to be acknowledged that the desalination plant has to be put into relevance and, if it is, it needs to have a bigger picture behind it. We cannot have irrelevance happening once the people of South Australia have forked out that money.

Regional South Australia continues to miss out and, again, I say that the research and development programs that this state has depended on historically have kept it at the forefront of agriculture and at the forefront of water use. South Australia has been a leader in agriculture, a leader in horticulture and a leader in the primary industry-driven commodities that keep us on the national stage, and yet we continue to see this government cut the guts out of PIRSA's funding and make the thriving region's programs irrelevant.

Regional programs have been underspent by \$5.3 million, so that is helping to prop up the budget to make it look good, and that really does make me shake my head. If we look at the \$5 million a year over four years for the Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund, again the government is not spending the money; the money is not hitting the ground to make a difference, and that is something I will be taking up not only with the government but also with the relevant ministers, to get an impetus to actually spend that money to help generate and stimulate this state's economy. I think that the electorate of Chaffey—the people in the Riverland—have the capacity to help generate more economy and generate a stimulus to help get this state out of the ridiculous debt that it is currently in and going further into.

If we look at the government funding for drought assistance and look at the FaB Scouts program, which has gone from a mere \$75,000 to deal with mental health, they have contributed a measly \$5,000 into the FaB Scouts program. The funding for rural counsellors has been reduced to almost nothing. Again, that is looking after the mental health of our farmers and our regional

people. Those rural services have been cut to the point of irrelevance, and this government continues to do that because they are a minority.

Regional tourism is a \$1.9 billion industry. It underpins one of the largest drivers into South Australia's economy, and they have now underpinned it with a \$1.4 million budget. That is absolutely pathetic and, again, I say that is outrageous.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Thompson.

At 18:53 the house adjourned until Wednesday 22 June 2011 at 11:00.