

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 22 June 2011

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

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PRESCRIBED MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (11:01)**: I move:

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

Motion carried.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2011-12

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (11:04)**: I move:

That the 74th report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2011-12, be noted.

The Economic and Finance Committee has examined the minister's determinations in respect of the Emergency Services Levy for the financial year 2011-12. Section 10(5) of the Emergency Services Funding Act 1998 requires that the minister must refer to the Economic and Finance Committee a written statement setting out determinations that the minister proposes to make in respect of the emergency services levy for the relevant financial year. Section 10(4) of the act requires these determinations be made in respect of:

- the amount that, in the minister's opinion, needs to be raised by means of the levy on property to fund emergency services;
- the amounts to be expended for various kinds of emergency services; and
- as far as practicable, the extent to which the various parts of the state will benefit from the application of that amount.

Pursuant to section 10(5a) of the act, the Economic and Finance Committee must inquire into, consider and report on the minister's statement within 21 days after it is referred to the committee. The committee has fulfilled its obligations under the act. The committee met with witnesses from the departments of Treasury and Finance, SAFECOM, the Country Fire Service, Metropolitan Fire Service and the State Emergency Service on 2 June to hear evidence on the proposed levy for 2011-12.

The committee notes the total expenditure on emergency services for 2011-12 is projected to be \$225.3 million. There will be no increase in levy rates, either for owners of fixed property or for owners of motor vehicles and vessels, in 2011-12. The committee notes total expenditure for 2010-11 is expected to exceed the original estimates by \$8.3 million, reflecting remission and pensioner concession costs on fixed property, exceeding budget by \$4.7 million, mainly due to higher than expected growth in property values, and contributions from fixed property owners exceeding budget by \$3.6 million, also mainly due to higher than expected growth in property values.

The committee notes cash balances in the Community Emergency Services Fund are expected to reach \$8.8 million by 30 June 2011. The committee notes that the 2011-12 target expenditure of \$225.3 million on emergency services is made up of the following components:

- the ESL inclusive of remissions will fund \$223.2 million. Private owners of property are expected to contribute \$126.9 million, with the balance of \$96.4 million being met by the government;
- interest earnings and revenue from the sale of certificates will fund an estimated \$1.9 million; and
- the balance of \$0.2 million will be funded via a run down in the CESF cash balance.

The Economic and Finance Committee has maintained an interest in the collection costs of the Emergency Services Levy and has been vigilant, year after year, in questioning the department on this matter.

The committee was told that the collection of the Emergency Services Levy will be integrated into the new RISTEC IT system developed within RevenueSA. As a result, payroll tax, land tax, stamp duty and the Emergency Services Levy will be covered by the same system, rather than the levy having its own dedicated IT platform. The committee was told that moving to a single system, with only one set of costs, will provide further and ongoing efficiencies with respect to collecting the levy.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all members of the committee and departmental representatives, who have worked together to assist the committee in fulfilling its statutory obligation in a timely manner. Given the above, and pursuant to section 6 of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Economic and Finance Committee recommends to parliament that it note this report.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (11:08): I am pleased to rise in support of the motion of the Hon. M.J. Wright that the 74th report of the Economic and Finance Committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2011-12, be noted. As I said, I am pleased to speak to the motion on this side of the house, being a member of the Economic and Finance Committee.

As outlined by the Hon. Mr Wright, the report has highlighted that the committee was advised that the total expenditure on emergency services is projected to be \$225.3 million in 2011-12, of which, as previously highlighted by Mr Wright, the Emergency Services Levy, inclusive of remissions, will fund \$223.2 million. Private owners of property—that is, land, buildings and motor vehicles—are expected to contribute \$126.9 million, with a balance of \$96.4 million being met by the government.

Second point: interest earnings and revenue from the sale of certificates showing the emergency services levy status of individual properties will fund an estimated \$1.9 million, and the balance of \$0.2 million will be funded through a run-down in the Community Emergency Services Fund cash balance.

There has been a table provided in the report that members will be able to view themselves outlining the estimated outcome of the 2010-11 year to the proposed table of the 2011-12 year. There is a net increase in total revenue comparing the 2010-11 year of \$222.4 million to that of the 2011-12 year of \$225.3 million and, even though the levy is going to raise \$225.1 million, there is a \$3.3 million decrease in the CESF cash balance to result in that final total of \$225.3 million proposed for the 2011-12 year.

As I just outlined, the 2011-12 target expenditure of \$225.3 million is at \$2.9 million higher than the estimated outcome, and that is mainly due to the ongoing funding of the Prepare. Act. Survive. initiative that we know that the CFS rolls out prior to and during the bushfire season. I just want to focus on section 28(4)(a) of the act and on where the proposed payments are to be made.

The South Australian Country Fire Service is to receive \$64.4 million. That is a marginal increase from the previous year. It is the same with the Metropolitan Fire Service (MFS), \$99.9 million. This is all obviously reflected in this year's budget that has just been brought down. The SES is to receive \$13.4 million; Surf Life Saving, \$1.7 million; volunteer marine rescue organisations, \$0.6 million; SA Police, \$19.3 million; and other organisations (SA Ambulance, Department for Environment and Natural Resources, State Rescue Helicopter, Shark Patrol and others) totalling, by my calculations, \$5.3 million.

As usual, we had a significant number of public servants: the chief officers of the three emergency services (the MFS, the CFS and the SES) all come with their respective officers from those agencies. We also had officers from Treasury, the Under Treasurer and those public servants come along as usual where the committee is outnumbered by about three to one in relation to the members of the committee compared with the bureaucrats. In terms of their providing evidence to the committee in relation to the Emergency Services Levy, there have been a number of issues that were highlighted through those meetings that are 'of interest'—let me put it that way.

All in all, members on this side of the house are relatively satisfied with the report so we are prepared to support the motion moved by the member for Lee.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BOWDEN URBAN VILLAGE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:14): I move:

That the 404th report of the committee, entitled Bowden Urban Village, be noted.

The Public Works Committee has heard from the Land Management Corporation about Bowden Urban Village, and the project will result in many things for the state. I would like to outline them here today before moving this part of the agenda forward.

The private sector development in this new high density, walkable community will provide more than 2,200 dwellings and associated retail, commercial and community facilities on about 16 hectares of inner city land held by the LMC; the creation of a wide range of serviced allotments by LMC for sale to a variety of developers and builders for higher density housing and retail and commercial uses; affordable purchase housing and high needs, low income and moderate income housing to meet the needs of the state housing plan targets; and funding by LMC for high-quality public realms areas incorporating parks, water recycling and sustainable development initiatives, including an iconic cycle pedestrian bridge, a tri-generation local energy system and the upgrading of adjoining parklands, plus an integrated community with an eventual population of more than 3,500 people and the provision of 1,000 jobs, as well as the demonstration of the climate smart precinct for the state.

Some of the characteristics of the new urban form envisaged in the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, which are the key characteristics of the Bowden Urban Village proposal, include a concentration on housing in existing areas to take advantage of the existing infrastructure and reduce new infrastructure costs; locating new housing and new jobs in transport-oriented corridors to make sure that the transit is connected to the city; the establishment of TODs as the centrepiece of a new open form; increasing densities in and around the rail, bus and train stations and transport interchanges; placing emphasis on good design and creating unique precincts; creating vibrant mixed use precincts with a greater mixture of building uses for the community; revitalising major activity centres, including the City of Adelaide; and achieving a diversity of dwelling types and forms.

This project is anticipated to generate a total project revenue of \$289.6 million, with a CSO revenue of \$52.8 million, against a total projected expenditure of \$264.7 million to produce a net development margin of \$77.8 million. Based on cash flows at today's prices, the project internal rate of return (IRR) is forecast to be 9.9 per cent, and the project NPV is minus \$0.24 million (that is a discounted rate of 10 per cent).

Construction, including the civil construction and public realm construction, is planned to be completed in or around January 2013, with land release beginning in November 2012. Based on the evidence presented to it, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed work.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:17): I would just like to say a few words regarding the Bowden Urban Village. Although it is not in my electorate, it is directly next to my electorate and would greatly affect the people in my area. As you may well know, it is the Liberal Party's policy to build a second campus of Adelaide High School on that Bowden site, and I would just like to highlight the importance of area being set aside, preferably at the front near Park Terrace, so it is across from the playing fields, to allow for a public high school.

As mentioned, 3,500 extra new residents are expected to move into the area. Already, over 400 people a year try to get into Adelaide High, so we already know there is a huge demand, and building up this area will only increase that demand. There is actually no high school in the whole of my electorate other than Adelaide High, so there is already a huge need, and I want to make that extremely clear.

I certainly welcome the high and medium density housing that is proposed in this purpose-built TOD, and I hope that it will take the pressure off all the urban infill in areas like Walkerville and Prospect. People move into the area specifically for the character and the size of the block, and I think that under the 30-year plan there are some serious concerns about the loss of the whole character and the reason they bought in those suburbs if we keep splitting every little piece of land in half. I think the Bowden Urban Village is a wonderful way of getting inner-city living that is close to amenities that already exist, such as the railway and the tram stop that are right there, and the bus, which is also why it is a perfect location for another high school—because it is so convenient and accessible. So, I just wanted to commend the project and say I think it is a great idea, but please do not forget to save land for a public high school.

Motion carried.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw the attention of honourable members to a group of students in the gallery from Nazareth Catholic College, guests of the minister and member for West Torrens. It is very good that you can be here when your minister is here also. We hope you enjoy your time here.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: BOLIVAR WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:21): I move:

That the 405th report of the committee, entitled Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant Energy Use Optimisation, be noted.

The Public Works Committee has heard that the optimised energy use of the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant is proposed to alter the current energy supply configuration for that precinct by connecting natural gas to the Bolivar site; converting existing gas turbines to run solely on natural gas; installing new reciprocating engines to create more electricity from the available biogas (digester gas) created as a by-product of the sewage sludge treatment process; providing a chemical dosing plant adjacent to the Bolivar digesters to reduce the formation of hydrogen sulphide in the digester gas; and undertaking necessary electrical modifications to enable connection and synchronisation of the generating plant with the ETSA supply.

The estimated cost of this project is \$25.9 million and will result in net annual operating savings of \$1.3 million. Additionally, electricity market revenue of \$0.7 million per annum will be earned and around \$0.9 million worth of additional renewable energy certificates (RECS) will be created each year. The project provides a 25-year net present value improvement over the 'do nothing' base case of \$14.2 million. The capital payback is estimated at eight years. The project will also result in significant reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the Bolivar site, by more than 11,000 tonnes CO₂e per annum.

Specifically, the proposed works in this project comprise: supply and install approximately 6MW of reciprocating engines in the Bolivar powerhouse to run on digester gas supplemented with small amounts of natural gas by economic supply; supply and installation of a ferrous chloride dosing plant located adjacent to the Bolivar digesters; the conversion of the existing turbines to operate on high-pressure natural gas; establishment of high-pressure natural gas supply to the site by the SEAGas pipeline; provision of high and low pressure natural gas metering to the Bolivar powerhouse; supply of natural gas to the reciprocating engines to supply supplementary fuel and existing gas turbines as a primary fuel; and connection of new generating plant output to a value of 11,000 kV switchboard to the powerhouse which will connect to other existing 11kV switchboards in the wastewater treatment plant.

The main orders pursuant to the project are expected to be placed in July 2011, with construction commencing in January 2012 and completion in July 2012. Based on the evidence presented to it, pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee recommends to the parliament that the public proposed work be put forward.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:24): Many years ago I used to take students on various educational tours and one of them was to Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: As you do.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The minister is talking a load of crap again! Many members may not realise, but for many years at Bolivar they have been generating electricity by the production of gases there. For those who have never been there to look at the facility, I urge you to do so because it is a great example of maximising the benefit from, in this case, waste products providing electricity for the running of the plant.

I know that for years there were problems. ETSA was reluctant to allow any surplus electricity to be put into the main grid, which I think was a bit short-sighted, but members should appreciate that many years ago we had some forward-looking officers within the old E&WS who ensured that it was not just a treatment plant for sewage but it actually generated electricity which then ran the plant itself.

This is an excellent additional initiative. Other countries such as Singapore generate a lot of their electricity from burning rubbish. We may not be quite at the point yet where that is economical, but I think we should be looking at every opportunity to maximise energy production from what is often classified as waste products or waste materials, so I commend SA Water for this. I think it is a fantastic additional initiative to build on the excellent work which has already been

done at Bolivar and which has been in operation for many years, producing their own electricity on site.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE TAFE SA CAMPUS

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:26): I move:

That the 406th report of the committee, entitled Adelaide TAFE SA Campus, be noted.

The Adelaide TAFE SA Campus redevelopment will involve approximately 2,500 square metres of under-utilised space at the Adelaide TAFE SA facility in Light Square. This will allow TAFE SA to pursue a consolidation of programs at the most modern and accessible TAFE SA sites to ensure that students can not only easily access the facilities, and reduce the ongoing maintenance costs of the development, but will also benefit from having a concentration of expert knowledge based there.

This project will see the business services and health and community services programs, currently both running at Panorama and Adelaide TAFEs, consolidated into the Adelaide campus in the heart of the CBD, creating a new centre for business services. The project will also incorporate the creation of a new client services area that will provide a shopfront on Currie Street for current and potential students to obtain course information and enrol in TAFE.

The cost of the building and associated work has been estimated at \$4.2 million by cost consultants Davis Langdon. Funding will be provided by the approved 2011-12 DFEEST capital programs, and the operating costs for the refurbished areas will be met from the existing programs and facilities operating budgets. Construction is anticipated to commence in July this year and will be completed around December 2011. It is anticipated that the new educational facility and client services will be open for the start of the 2011 TAFE year to accommodate existing student numbers from Panorama.

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

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (11:28): The opposition supports this matter, as we have the preceding two matters, and commends it to the house. In speaking to it, though, I make the point that as a CBD development this sits with the earlier proposal we considered about the former Clipsal site and the new Bowden Urban Village. Combined, these two developments are new initiatives in the city, and I urge the government to consider its vision for the CBD and the inner-city fringe more completely.

I urge the government to bring something to the parliament and to public debate about a revitalised vision for the city because what we seem to have are piecemeal offerings, welcome though they may be, like this proposal for a new and revitalised TAFE CBD venue and the Bowden village. We have the new oval proposed at Adelaide Oval and the hospital proposal. All of these things, when you look at them, will change the nature of the City of Adelaide and move the momentum from probably the east of the city, to some degree, to the west of the city. That is going to change the dynamics of the Adelaide CBD.

The previous Liberal government established the west of the CBD as an arts precinct when we moved not only TAFE there but also a number of other arts institutions, particularly to the Hindley Street part of City West. Now is the appropriate time to look at how all of these developments—the Bowden village, this TAFE proposal we are considering now and the other initiatives the government has announced—are going to change the way City West functions and operates. I would like to see a more encompassing vision from the government about how they see all that happening.

For example, I imagine that once this TAFE proposal, Bowden and the hospital are in place there will be a lot more movement during business hours in the west. There will be a lot more people looking to have lunch, to have coffees, to do retail shopping. Doctors' precincts will need to be established. There will probably be new residential opportunities along Hindley Street and in that western part of the city, flowing from the fact that we are moving people into Bowden, into the hospital and into this TAFE facility that is now being built and which is before us now.

So, how is that going to impact on public transport? How will that impact on development opportunities? Are we sitting down now with developers to look at the need for things like car parks,

new commercial and tourism opportunities in the west of the city, and new residential opportunities flowing from the hospital development? As we know, a lot of short-term rental developments have occurred in the east of the city to hinge off visiting families and so on as they come to see their loved ones in the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There are a whole lot of other implications. We already have in City West a large amount of student accommodation infrastructure, which I am sure will interconnect with this TAFE proposal that we have before us today.

While I welcome this proposal and the opposition fully supports it, having sat through it on the Public Works Committee, what I am looking for is a grand vision, an encompassing vision, one that brings together these piecemeal developments that we are seeing at Bowden, the hospital, this TAFE proposal and a range of other initiatives into a broader plan for the west of the city, because things are going to change. When we bulldoze the existing RAH and build this new one, people and momentum will shift.

That is going to have an impact on businesses in the east of the city, who I am sure will suffer, to be frank. I am sure they will lose activity as a result of these changes, but the winners of course will be businesses, developers and developments in the west of the city, and we need to manage this process. I encourage the government to come back to the parliament with something that brings this and other proposals together into a master plan that we can look at and consider.

We all know we need to have greater density within the city. We are all aware of the need to try to stop the urban fringe from exploding outwards into areas like Gawler, McLaren Vale and so on, and to pack in a little the nature of developments in Adelaide and the immediate city fringe. Let us now see greater detail of that.

As I mentioned, that needs to include not only public transport, but I would also like to see proposals for traffic management flowing from these developments, such as Bowden and this TAFE proposal. There is already a need for an inner ring and an outer ring road in the CBD. I see that need becoming even greater as a result of these developments that the government is announcing that bring people and activity into the city. With those remarks, I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:34): I rise to support this report. Anyone who has been involved in TAFE, as I know you have, Madam Speaker, or has had the privilege of being the minister responsible, would have strong feelings about that organisation. I used to regard it—and I still do—as one of our best-kept secrets. TAFE is a leading provider of training in this state. Sadly, in some ways it has been knocked around in recent years by governments of both persuasions.

Mr Pengilly: You were the minister.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Yes, but not for all of that time, unfortunately. It got knocked around a bit by people who did not understand. Even today, I do not know whether the community and the government fully understands the potential of TAFE. We need to upskill our community a lot more than what we have been doing. We need to put a lot more emphasis on training. Australians need to live off their brains and use their brains. We cannot just be a nation that digs holes and extracts minerals, important as that is, and even if you want to do that you still have to have skilled people to do it.

I am staggered that after at least 15 years when the cry was, 'We need to upskill and train more people', we still hear industry saying that we do not have enough highly skilled and trained people to do the tasks that we need. With a population like ours, we should have the most highly skilled and highly trained people in the world. There is no reason why we cannot do that.

Adelaide TAFE has always been a centrepiece of that organisation. It is a very large campus, in terms of numbers. It provides a whole range of training options. I remember as minister walking around town looking for a site to put the Arts Centre and we decided (the group of us) that Light Square was the place to put that facility.

We know there have been some adjustments. The hospitality training has been taken out, which I think in some ways is a pity. It has been consolidated at Regency. Regency was always a fantastic hospitality training centre. I think it is important, whilst this project is basically about modifications, renovations and a bit of tizzying up, that TAFE is given a much more central role in training.

There is a place for private providers. They can do training, obviously, and some of them do it very well, but TAFE should be, and should always be, the backbone of training in this state. It needs to be properly funded and equipped to do that job.

So, I commend this renovation and upgrade, but it is only a small amount in terms of what is really needed. I hope that what happens down the track at Tonsley Park reflects a strong commitment from the government and community to ensure that TAFE is able to deliver for not just South Australia but the country as a whole when it comes to training.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:38): I rise in support of this report. As the member for Adelaide this TAFE facility is in my electorate. In fact, about a year go I went to the opening of the new fashion area, which was also part of the consolidating and efficiency building moving from Marleston, and that is a wonderful facility.

I believe that due to cookery and hospitality moving to Regency Park that has left a large area available, so the business services and community services that are currently provided at two sites (Adelaide and Panorama) will now be consolidated into one, creating a centre for excellence in business services, I am told. It will also allow for a shopfront on Currie Street, which I think is a great idea and a good way of accessing potential students because you have a nice area where people can call in and find out about all the courses that are available.

I am very supportive of investing in our TAFEs. Not everyone wants to go to university and, as the member for Fisher said, it is important to upskill as many people as possible to take up the job opportunities that are arising, particularly in mining and other areas. So, it is important that we encourage upskilling as much as possible. I commend this motion to the house. I am very happy to see any efficiency and accessibility improvements in education.

Motion carried.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: LEVY PROPOSALS 2011-12

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:40): I move:

That the 50th to 56th reports of the committee relating to the Natural Resources Management Board levy proposals 2011-12 for Kangaroo Island, South-East, Eyre Peninsula, Northern and Yorke, Arid Lands, Murray-Darling Basin, and Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges, be noted.

One of the Natural Resources Committee's statutory obligations is to consider and make recommendations on any levy proposed by a Natural Resources Management Board where the increase exceeds the annual CPI rise.

Of the seven proposed increases in division 1 land-based levies for 2011-12, all were higher than the CPI rate which, for the current financial year, is 2.6 per cent. All bar one of the division 2 water levy proposals were also higher than CPI. Considering that these levies presented a challenge for the committee, and, while we were sympathetic to the desire of natural resource management boards to increase their funding bases, members believed that, in principle, above CPI increases should be the exception rather than the norm.

In this instance, the committee has determined not to object to the levies, while also suggesting that arrangements around the setting and collection of levies should be reviewed as part of the board's budget planning process for 2012-13. Some reflections on the individual board proposals follow.

The Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management region continued its equalisation process begun in 2009-10 to bring all division 1 levies to parity by 2012-13. Prior to 2009-10, levies ranged from about \$17 to \$47 dependent on the local government area. The committee supports the equalisation concept. Once the equalisation process is completed, the committee will expect future increases to be limited to CPI.

The committee accepted the South-East NRM board's argument that it needed to increase its division 2 levy to offset reductions in water allocations which are under review. In the case of the Arid Lands NRM region, the Natural Resources Committee objected to the proposed 900 per cent increase in its division 2 levy back in 2009, suggesting a more moderate increase and also an increased division 1 levy in order to spread the impact. The levy proposal was consistent with those suggestions.

In the case of the Murray-Darling Basin region, the NRM Board receives considerable funding from the Australian government for water projects. The board is concerned that this funding may decline or cease once a new Murray-Darling Basin plan has been adopted. Consequently, it has sought to increase its levies to offset the risk.

A number of other factors were raised by boards in their appearances before the committee as part of their justifications for above CPI increases. First, staff wages will increase by

2.5 per cent under enterprise bargaining arrangements in the coming year. Maintaining wages, salaries and staffing is important, and these are a significant proportion of the board's budget.

Secondly, commonwealth funding is uncertain beyond 2013. The Caring for our Country program provides 23 per cent of total funding for all the South Australian boards. It is the second biggest source after the regional NRM levy, which contributes 40 per cent on average.

Thirdly, NRM boards have differing chances of attracting additional funding. Some boards (for example, the Arid Lands board) have been successful in negotiating generous grants from mining and pastoral companies, while other boards have only very limited opportunities to target private sector funds due to the size or their location.

On another matter, members recently heard from the Presiding Member of the Northern and Yorke NRM Board, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, who was also a former member of our committee. Members heard that the requirement for the boards to review their business plans and levies annually is onerous and resource intensive. The quote I am about to give is long, but members of the committee believe that it is an accurate reflection of the experiences of the majority of NRM boards. I will now quote from Ms Schaefer's evidence to the committee:

I spent some six years on your committee, and one of the issues that always bemused us was the amount of time that it seemed to take for an NRM board to achieve anything. Now that I am wearing a different hat, I thought it may be opportune for me to tell some of the frustrations that I, my board and, I suspect, public servants, feel in terms of the maze of checks and balances that are in place, I think, to the exclusion of efficiency.

As an example today, I will run through the process that is required by legislation for us to bring this business plan to you. The business plan is a revolving plan of the three years, but is renewed annually, as this is the requirement. In order to review it annually, the board meets a minimum of two, probably three times, when they discuss what its priorities will be. So, when we start looking at our plan for 2012-13 in about July or August of this year, we will have two or three board meetings. We will set priorities. We will send the draft to DENR. DENR will then see that our priorities are not at odds with the priorities of the government of the day, and they will send it back to us.

We will then be obliged to hold a minimum of three public consultations, but they have to be advertised first. By this stage you are getting to around about Christmas. Blind Freddy knows that, in the country, people are reaping, then they go to the beach. So, you have to have that advertising in prior to that, because you must have public consultations before the end of February.

We send a request that we can advertise these publications for this amount of time. DENR in fact chooses what size advertisements will be put in. This year we are treated to about a quarter page in the local press, and a thumping big one in Saturday's *Advertiser* which we as a board paid for when, frankly, a public notice in the local press would have covered the same people.

The advertising is done. We then have three public consultations. This time they were in Clare, Maitland and Orroroo. We can have to disseminate what we learnt from these public consultations, plus take written submissions from anyone who chooses. We have a cut-out of date, some time in February...There are almost always, I am assured, a couple of late submissions, notoriously from government departments, but that's beside the point.

We then have to have a couple of board meetings to assess what those submissions have said to prioritise them, to draw up a final draft, which then goes to Adelaide, through DENR. If they believe it is compliant, it then comes back to us, then it comes to you and, at the same time, it comes to the minister. The minister, if you have no objections, usually provides our draft plan and it becomes our business plan.

So, our business plan which is, in fact, really any that levy (which is very little change from previous years), is taken from August to May to become a working document for us to use. I do not necessarily have any answers to that but, as I see it, if that was some sort of business out there, with two or three layers of that process cut out, it would be more efficient. It ties up a huge amount of resources within the board which, in spite of public perception of NRM boards, is neither over-staffed nor over-financed. It takes a huge amount of time of board members, and I don't believe it could possibly be the most efficient process.

I have to say that our committee unanimously concurs with the Hon. Caroline Schaefer that, based on her description, the process of any review of the levies appears to be onerous and inefficient. In the interest of addressing some of these points, we have sought a meeting with the minister to discuss the process and ways in which this can be improved.

I would really like to commend the members of our committee: Mr Geoff Brock MP; Mrs Robyn Geraghty MP; Mr Lee Odenwalder MP; Mr Don Pegler MP; Mr Dan van Holst Pellekaan MP; Hon. Robert Brokenshire MLC; Hon. John Dawkins MLC; and the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC. Finally, I would like to thank the committee staff for their assistance. I commend these reports to the house.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (11:49): I will be very brief.

Mr Pengilly: Good!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I think there is an echo in here somewhere, Madam Speaker. It sort of comes from Kangaroo Island way. I notice that the NRM Committee is looking at the levy proposals. It used to be done by the so-called powerful Economic and Finance Committee. The point I make is I think is a good thing that we have scrutiny over agencies and semi-government agencies—whether you want to call them—quangos or whatever.

The irony is that we do not apply the same scrutiny to government departments that spend millions and millions of dollars. People say, 'You've got estimates,' but estimates is not really a forum where you can apply the same rigour, the same intensity, that you can in a committee and as used to happen with the Economic and Finance Committee when it came to NRM levy proposals.

I think the concept is good, and every agency, large or small, should be held to account for expenditure of taxpayers' money. I make the point that this is good but that we do not apply the blowtorch equally to other larger government agencies that spend many more times the amount of money than these boards do. I challenge anyone to show me that the estimates committee does that job. I do not believe it does, so what we have are millions of dollars in government agencies that are not really subject to any detailed scrutiny.

You will see in a few weeks when agencies front up that some of them spending \$600 million or \$700 million will only get supposedly scrutinised for a few minutes. It is farcical. This is a good process, I believe, but I have never understood why the NRM boards are put through the hoop and others just are put through some little minor consideration.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:51): As a member of this Natural Resources Committee, I am keen just to say a few words. It was interesting to hear the contribution from the member for Fisher. I think there should actually be the opportunity for slightly more scrutiny of the natural resources management boards when it comes to approving their levies. As our chair has suggested, we have approved all the levy increases that were put to us, but I think it is very fair to say that the committee approved them with some concern.

Certainly, on my own behalf, I should say that I am not comfortable with the process that is set up by legislation to go through and address the increases that were put to us. I think the time frame is far too short from when the reports are received to when the decision has to be made, and that is not a fault of the NRM boards in any way. They are fitting into the legislation the same way the committee is, but the time frame is too short, and the opportunity for the Natural Resources Committee to scrutinise the information is quite short.

I am also very concerned with what I see as a reversal of the original intention with regard to increases in excess of CPI. It was certainly established that increases in excess of CPI would be the exception, that they would be addressed by the Natural Resources Committee and that there could be a thorough interrogation or discussion with the board, looking at the reports to see whether or not that was justified. Then the committee could determine whether it wanted to approve it. That all makes sense.

What has actually happened, though, is that now we are really in a situation where all the levy increase requests are in excess of CPI, and it is the exception to try to hold them back. The system has been turned inside out, and I think that is inappropriate. This issue has been discussed within our committee, and I am sure that we will as a group address that together. I think it is very important that we do.

I think it is worth saying also that these NRM boards are in a very difficult situation. They are trying to do work for which, at one level, it could be said there would never ever be enough funding to do all the jobs that would be on their plate, so it is quite natural that they would always be seeking as much funding as they can possibly get. It is quite natural that they are hungry to do a good job and that they would always seek increases above CPI, so that is how the system has been turned inside out.

There have been issues addressed in this chamber in regard to overzealous and officious pursuit by NRM officers. I think that will probably be mentioned in speeches by members following me. I would have to say though, in fairness, I do not see that and I do not have complaints of that coming to me with regard to the NRM boards that operate within my electorate. If anything, it is a bit the opposite. People come to me and say, 'Look, we've got these problems, we've got these issues that need to be addressed. Why aren't the NRM boards doing it?' Again, that comes back to funding. The NRM boards are really stuck with regard to how much work they can do with the

budget that they have. I am not making any excuses for them; they do as much work as they can. The member for Ashford, our chair, has given an extensive quote from the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, who both was on our committee and also is now a presiding member, highlighting some of the problems that the NRM boards have to work with.

The reality is, they would never ever have enough money to address all the natural resources and environmental issues that they would like to address and the community would like them to address. Nonetheless, if there is a process in place that is meant to set how their funding increases are provided, we need to stick with that process, and if it is not working, as I believe it is not at the moment, that process needs to be addressed.

Finally, I would like to pay tribute to the member for Ashford, who, in my opinion, is a very effective, very diligent, very fair committee chair. I appreciate her work on behalf of our committee.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:56): I rise to speak to the report on the Murray-Darling Basin, the report of the Natural Resources Committee relating to the Natural Resources Management Board levy proposals. I note a former interest of my family in natural resources management. My wife did have a senior position. She was on the Integrated Natural Resources Management Board in the Murray-Darling Basin and worked there for several years.

Over that time I believe staff have quadrupled, and I stand corrected if someone wants to correct me, but since those early days staff have quadrupled in relation to the work of the board. So you have to question how much money is raised out of these levies that goes to those wages? How much work of the board does actually hit the ground? This is what bothers me with natural resources management. Now we have the Department of Environment and Natural Resources moving in with them it is becoming a pseudo government department; it is essentially becoming a government department. Are we having landholders funding activities that should be funded by government?

It is outrageous that in the Murray-Darling Basin proposal there is a proposal for a 38 per cent increase for division 1 levies and a 10 per cent increase for division 2. With the division 1 levy, it goes from \$1,448,500 to \$1,993,500, up by 38 per cent, and then we see the division 2 levy go from \$5,779,250 to \$6,350,822, a rise of 10 per cent. Once again, we see landholders, good people, good operators, people involved in agriculture, being hit up with more levies to a state government. These are people already reeling under 50 and 60 per cent increases in costs. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

NATIVE VEGETATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (11:59): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Native Vegetation Act 1991. Read a first time.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (11:59): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In July 2007, new directions for the management of native vegetation were announced with the aim of strengthening biodiversity conservation in the state, while at the same time supporting sustainable development. At that time, a comprehensive consultation process was conducted on a draft bill to amend the Native Vegetation Act 1991.

Subsequently, the Native Vegetation (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2008 was introduced to parliament in the spring session of 2008. The House of Assembly approved the bill without amendment on 26 November 2008, and debate on the second reading of the bill commenced in the Legislative Council. While this 2008 bill was generally supported, no further debate was conducted after May 2009 and the bill lapsed. The bill before you today builds on the lapsed 2008 bill.

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

Leave granted.

The continuing health and prosperity of all South Australians depends on the health of our environment, our landscapes and our biodiversity. In turn, improving and restoring the health and resilience of our environment will rely on the good will and endeavours of all South Australians.

The extensive modification of the South Australian agricultural landscape—necessary to support the strong rural base for this State—will not sustain viable populations of many plant and animal species in the limited habitat remaining. With climate change placing increasing pressure on our native species we face the risk that South Australia could lose up to 50 per cent of our terrestrial biodiversity over the coming decades. Innovative and strategic changes are needed to connect and accelerate the effort to support the 'no species loss target'.

The *Native Vegetation Act 1991* remains a key legislative instrument supporting South Australia's Strategic Plan 'no species loss' target. The central purpose of the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* is to control the clearance of significant native vegetation in this State and to ensure that where clearance occurs to support economic development, the loss of biodiversity is offset by a significant environmental benefit. The amendments proposed are not intended to alter the central purpose of the Act.

The key features of this Bill are to:

- Increase flexibility in the delivery of significant environmental benefit offsets for vegetation clearance;
- Add new expertise to the Native Vegetation Council;
- Update evidentiary provisions to reflect modern technology;
- Ensure that offences constituted under the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* lie within the criminal jurisdiction of the Environment, Resources and Development Court;
- Make minor modifications to existing powers and penalties to improve the administration of the legislation and to provide better integration with the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*.

Significant environmental benefit offsets

The requirement in the Act for the clearance of native vegetation to be offset by a significant environmental benefit is in itself an innovative way to support necessary development for this State while also achieving biodiversity conservation objectives.

All remnant native vegetation has value and it is important that the impacts of a proposed development on native vegetation should be avoided or minimised. Requirements for significant environmental benefit offsets provide a mechanism for redressing impacts that cannot be avoided or minimised.

A number of amendments are proposed in this Bill to provide more flexibility for the delivery of significant environmental benefit offsets, including:

- providing for offsets to be delivered where they are most needed, including outside of the region of the original clearance;
- providing that the Native Vegetation Council, when considering a proposed significant environmental benefit offset outside the region of the original clearance, must have regard to guidelines prepared and published in accordance with section 25 of the Act;
- making it clear that a credit may be registered, against future requirements for offsets, where an offset is delivered that exceeds that which is required to offset the related clearance of native vegetation;

In normal circumstances, the loss of biodiversity associated with clearance of native vegetation should be offset by works on the same property or within the same region that clearance has occurred. However, there may be circumstances where clearance occurs in well represented habitats and a more significant environmental benefit might be achieved by regenerating less well conserved native vegetation associations (eg vegetation that provides critical habitat for threatened species) outside the region where the related clearance occurs.

Such decisions should not be taken lightly and it is necessary that the Native Vegetation Council be satisfied that, where an offset for native vegetation is proposed in another region of the State (from that where the clearance occurs), it will result in a more significant environmental benefit than if undertaken in the region where the clearance occurs.

The Bill establishes a requirement for guidelines for the operation of the out-of-region offsets. Draft guiding principles have been endorsed by the Native Vegetation Council that clarify that the offset mechanism is limited to avoid the potential for critical habitat to be offset with habitat that is already well conserved. The draft guiding principles will be an interim measure pending completion of the formal consultation process required by section 25 of the Act.

Offset credits

The Native Vegetation Council has a policy of recognising conservation works previously undertaken when considering offset requirements. Consistent with this, the Council has supported, and sometimes encouraged, a landholder to undertake offset works that exceed requirements. Reasons may include:

- conservation outcomes being delivered before they are needed to offset clearance;
- maximising conservation outcomes—e.g. feral animal control can only be effective if applied over a larger area;
- minimising impacts—e.g. a requirement to fence a small offset area within a larger area may result in more clearance.

The provisions in the Bill make it clear that the value of a 'credited offset' is determined at the time it is extinguished (i.e. when it is used to offset clearance).

Membership of the Native Vegetation Council

The Bill changes the membership of the Native Vegetation Council. Since the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment decided not to continue to nominate a representative to the Council, the Bill proposes to replace the Commonwealth Minister's nominee with a person who has expertise in planning or development nominated by the Minister responsible for administering the *Native Vegetation Act 1991*.

This reflects the importance of the interaction between native vegetation clearance and the housing and employment priorities of the 30 year plan for Greater Adelaide and associated regional plans. The Minister is provided with appropriate flexibility in nominating a suitable person for appointment and persons from other sectors who have appropriate expertise will not be excluded from nomination.

Offences under the Act to lie within the jurisdiction of the Environment Resources and Development Court

The Bill includes a provision that offences constituted under the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* lie within the jurisdiction of the ERD Court. This will bring the Act up to date with more recent environmental legislation and ensure that a Judicial Officer will have wide practical knowledge of and experience in the preservation and management of native vegetation thereby avoiding lengthy explanations in a technical context.

Miscellaneous amendments

The Bill includes other miscellaneous amendments that:

- ensures the admissibility of evidence derived from remotely sensed imagery unless proof to the contrary is produced.
- make minor modifications to existing powers and penalties to improve administration of the legislation and to provide better integration with the NRM legislation;
- provide that a breach of a heritage agreement is a breach of the Act to correct an inadvertent omission resulting from changes made in 2002;
- clarify that the Act applies to that part of the City of Mitcham consisting of the suburbs of Belair, Bellevue Heights, Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Craighburn Farm, Eden Hills, Glenalta and Hawthorndene.

Conclusion

The new directions for native vegetation management in South Australia, announced during 2007 are supported by the amendments included in this Bill. The *Native Vegetation Act 1991* remains a key legislative instrument supporting South Australia's Strategic Plan 'no species loss' target. The amendments update the Act and ensure consistency with the State's other environmental legislation. They will strengthen landscape approaches to biodiversity conservation in the State and support economic development by providing improved flexibility for business.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Native Vegetation Act 1991*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes consequential amendments to the definitions of certain terms used in the Act.

5—Amendment of section 4—Application of Act

This clause inserts new subsection (2ab) into section 4 of the Act, setting out the parts of the City of Mitcham to which the Act applies (being the suburbs of Belair, Bellevue Heights, Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Craighburn Farm, Eden Hills, Glenalta and Hawthorndene).

The clause also makes consequential amendments to the section to reflect the inclusion of new subsection (2ab).

6—Amendment of section 7—Establishment of the Council

This clause inserts a new subsection (3) into section 7 of the Act. The new subsection provides that the Native Vegetation Council is subject to the general direction and control of the Minister, but prevents the Minister from directing the Council in respect to advice or recommendation that the Council might give or make, or in relation to a particular application that is being assessed by, or that is to be, or has been, assessed by, the Council.

7—Amendment of section 8—Membership of the Council

This clause deletes paragraph (f) of section 8(1) of the Act (which states that 1 member of the Council must be nominated by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment) and substitutes a new paragraph (f) that provides that 1 member must be a person with extensive knowledge of, and experience in, planning or development nominated by the Minister.

8—Amendment of section 9—Conditions of office

This clause inserts new paragraph (e) into section 9(2) of the Act, which allows the Governor to remove a member of the Council for breaching, or not complying, with a condition of his or her appointment.

9—Amendment of section 14—Functions of the Council

This clause substitutes a new subsection (2) into section 14, requiring the Council, when performing a function or exercising a power under the Act to take into account and seek to further the objects of the Act and the relevant principles of clearance of native vegetation, and also to take into account relevant NRM plans. The new subsection also requires that, in any event, the Council must not act in a manner that is seriously at variance with the principles of clearance of native vegetation.

10—Amendment of section 21—The Fund

The clause inserts new paragraphs (cc) and (cd) into subsection (3) of section 21 (which sets out what the fund consists of) to include amounts paid into the Fund in accordance with an order under section 31EA of the Act (inserted by clause 17 of this measure) and any provision made by the regulations.

The clause substitutes a new subsection (6) (which sets out how certain money in the Fund must be used) so that money may now be used to preserve etc existing native vegetation in the region where the relevant land is located.

The clause also inserts a new subsection (6a), which enables the Council to use money of a kind referred to in subsection (6) to be used to establish etc native vegetation in a region of the State other than the region where the relevant land is located if the Council is satisfied that the environmental benefit to be achieved in the other region will outweigh the value of achieving a significant environmental benefit within the region where the relevant land is located, the native vegetation satisfies certain criteria and the establishment etc of the native vegetation is carried out in accordance with relevant guidelines adopted under section 25 of the Act.

The clause also inserts new subsections (6b) and (6c) which set out procedural matters related to the operation of new subsection (6a).

The clause also amends the definition of relevant land in subsection (7) to include (if new subsection (3)(cd) applies) land on which the native vegetation that is relevant to the operation of the particular regulation was grown or was situated.

11—Amendment of section 25—Guidelines for the application of assistance and the management of native vegetation

This clause amends section 25 of the Act, adding the establishment etc of native vegetation under section 21(6a), and any other matter required by the regulations, to the list of matters for which the Council must prepare guidelines.

The clause also inserts a new paragraph (ab) to subsection (2), requiring the Council to submit draft guidelines prepared by the Council to the Minister for comment.

12—Amendment of section 26—Offence of clearing native vegetation contrary to this Part

This clause increases the expiation fee for an offence under subsection (1) or (2) of section 26 to \$750, up from \$500.

The clause also extends the time within which the Council must initiate civil enforcement proceedings following conviction of an offence against those subsections to 6 months, up from 21 days.

13—Amendment of section 28—Application for consent

This clause makes amendments to section 28 of the Act that are consequential on the insertion of new section 28A by this measure.

14—Insertion of section 28A

This clause inserts a new section 28A into the Act. The new clause enables a person to be credited with having achieved an environmental benefit if the person has achieved an environmental benefit other than as required in relation to a consent to clear native vegetation or under any other requirement under this Act. A person can also be credited if, acting in accordance with a consent to clear native vegetation, the person achieves environmental benefits that exceed the value of the minimum benefit needed to offset the loss of the cleared vegetation. In both cases, the Council must be satisfied that the benefit or excess benefit (as the case requires) is of significant value.

Having been so credited, the new section allows the credit to be offset against such requirements in relation to a future application for consent to clear native vegetation.

The clause also sets out procedural matters in relation to determining and applying such credits.

15—Repeal of section 31

This clause repeals redundant section 31 of the Act (the substance of which is now effected by the definition of *breach* in section 4 of the Act, as amended by this measure).

16—Amendment of section 31E—Enforcement notices

This clause amends section 31E of the principal Act to extend the time within which an authorised officer can give a direction under the section to two years, up from 12 months. The clause also makes a consequential amendment to the section.

17—Insertion of section 31EA

This clause inserts new section 31EA, which allows a person to whom an authorised officer has given a direction under section 31E(1)(b) (that is, a direction that the person make good the breach in a manner, and within a period, specified by the authorised officer) to apply to the Council for a substituted direction if it is not reasonably practicable for the person to comply with the direction.

Subsection (3) sets out the directions the Council may substitute for the original direction, and the clause makes procedural provision in relation to such directions.

18—Substitution of section 33

This clause substitutes new section 33 to allow civil enforcement proceedings (being proceedings where the respondent has expiated or been convicted or found guilty of an offence under the Act) to be commenced within 6 months after the date on which the respondent expiated, or was convicted or found guilty of, the offence. This prevents commencement of the proceedings from being barred where the length of a trial, or the delayed detection of an offence, exceeds the time allowed for commencement of such proceeding (changed by this measure to five years to ensure consistency with other provisions in the Act).

19—Amendment of section 33A—Appointment of authorised officers

This clause repeals paragraphs (b), (c) and (d) of section 33A(3) of the Act, varying the information that must be printed on the identity cards of authorised officers.

It also removes the requirement that an appointment of an authorised officer be for a fixed term.

20—Amendment of section 33B—Powers of authorised officers

This clause repeals subsections (4), (5) and (6) of section 33B of the Act in order to make the section consistent with the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*.

21—Amendment of section 33D—Provisions relating to seizure

This clause amends subsection (2) of section 33D of the Act to increase (from six to 12 months) the prescribed period relevant to the section, making the section consistent with the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*.

22—Substitution of section 33J

This clause inserts new sections 33J and 33K into the principal Act.

Section 33J allows the ERD Court to be constituted of a magistrate and a commissioner if the Senior Judge of the Court so determines, and further provides that offences under the principal Act lie within the criminal jurisdiction of the ERD Court (rather than the Magistrates Court).

Section 33K makes procedural provisions regarding what can happen in respect of making orders under the Act (in civil enforcement proceedings) if criminal proceedings for an offence against the Act are also on foot.

23—Amendment of section 34—Evidentiary

This clause amends section 34 of the principal Act to allow for certain remotely sensed images (for example, an image captured by a camera mounted on a satellite) to be accepted as proof of certain certified facts in the absence of proof to the contrary.

24—Amendment of section 35—Proceedings for an offence

This clause amends section 35 of the Act to increase the time within which proceedings for an offence under the Act may be commenced to five years, up from the current four years (or six years in exceptional circumstances). This provides consistency with similar provisions in the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*.

25—Amendment of section 41—Regulations

This clause amends the regulation making power in section 41 of the Act to increase the maximum expiation fee under the regulations to \$750, to enable the regulations to provide for certain amounts of money to be paid into the Fund and to enable the regulations to create offences with fines of up to \$10,000 and make evidentiary provisions in relation to those offences.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2011) BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 21 June 2011.)

Clause 4.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: For the clarity of the committee, there are four elements to this budget bill, and I think the Treasurer and I have agreed that we will ask questions on the four elements because then the four sets of different advisers can come and go and make it a simpler procedure. The first element, which is under clause 4, which we are dealing with as from yesterday, is the First Home Owner Grant scheme. The Treasurer mentioned that the \$7,000 scheme would still remain, and I think he said yesterday that that was all state money. Is that right, or is that money transferred from the commonwealth for this particular purpose?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will double-check, but my understanding is it is state money. But it is money that we do under an agreement with the commonwealth. When the GST was introduced part of the IGA with the GST was to have this First Home Owner Grant, the \$7,000, to basically offset the GST. I will double-check but we do not get specific-purpose grants from the commonwealth to do it; it is part of the GST agreement.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The \$7,000 figure is not capped: there could be 1,000 homes or one million homes eligible for that, it just depends on the market conditions in any particular year, and we get reimbursed through the GST for the \$7,000 contribution, so it is cyclic in that sense. Is that how the system works? It is not capped at 10,000 homes or 5,000 homes a year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Any first homebuyer buying a home under \$575,000 gets the \$7,000 grant, regardless of whether it is a new home or an existing home. There is no cap on that. Regardless of how many first homebuyers there are in any particular year they will get that \$7,000 grant and they will continue to get that \$7,000 grant.

Mr GRIFFITHS: If it is part of the IGA is there a consistent approach by every state in the nation so that it is \$7,000 for each?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes. Each state will have its own terms for bonus grants, which is what we are talking about here—the states differ.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Is the \$575,000 figure that you mentioned a figure set by the commonwealth as part of the conditions of the IGA or is that a level set by the state? Who sets the rules around the eligibility for the \$7,000? Does the state have any discretion to change the rules or are the rules solely at the discretion of the commonwealth?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: This is aside from the bill, but I am happy to answer questions and I will double-check that what I am saying to you is correct. My understanding is that all of the provisions for that \$7,000 grant are set out in the IGA, the intergovernmental agreement that the states and the commonwealth have as part of the GST. So, no, we do not have any discretion; we could not unilaterally change it. Any changes we had to make would have to be by renegotiating the IGA with the commonwealth.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 10 passed.

Clause 11.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 11 deals with changes to the Liquor Licensing Act. As I understand it, the government seeks to impose an annual licence fee for premises and events covered by liquor licensing. The current provision is that there is an application fee for a liquor licence but not an ongoing annual fee for pubs and clubs. This legislation introduces an annual fee for what I will call pubs and clubs, those premises that are licensed.

It also introduces a different fee structure for events such as the Clipsal 500 and the Big Day Out. I will question the minister in due course about whether it covers events such as Glendi and other big community festivals.

The government says that this will collect—from memory, it was around \$15 million over the forward estimates. I think it is about \$3 million or \$4 million per year, and it is to do with the compliance of Consumer Affairs and their inspectors, etc., to do with liquor licensing. That is the background to it.

I have some questions for the minister in relation to clause 11 and the principle of the liquor licensing. So, it may well be not only clause 11 but also the other clauses, but on this topic of liquor

licensing. What is the current cost of compliance for the government, and is the government seeking full cost recovery or will this fee only be partial cost recovery?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: What I have is the 2011-12 budget for regulation of the sector. It is \$4.548 million for the 2011-12 financial year, so this annual fee will basically recover that \$4.548 million. That is the intention. There are some additional costs that this will not recover. There is some investing expenditure of \$972,000 for the 2011-12 financial year that will not be recovered as part of this fee. SA Police also have their own Licensing Enforcement Branch that this will not cover the cost of, which has a budget of \$3.6 million. I beg your pardon, we will recover part of the investing expenditure of \$972,000. So, the amount that is not recovered is \$599,000, plus the \$3.6 million that SAPOL spend on the Licensing Enforcement Branch.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: On what basis did the government decide what to charge in and what not to charge in? What is the delineation and how do clubs and pubs know they are only getting charged for the administration of their section?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is the operating expenditure for the liquor regulatory services, so that is what we are attempting to recover through this. It is the operating expenditure of liquor regulatory services undertaken by the Attorney-General's Department.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: One assumes these licence fees will apply to not only clubs and pubs but also restaurants.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: There will be a different fee structure. My understanding is that clubs that operate late at night will have a higher fee structure than clubs or pubs that do not trade late at night. I know some of my country electorate members will want to know the fee structure that is proposed for small country pubs and community clubs. So, can the Treasurer please outline what is the actual fee structure proposed?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We have not finalised the fee structure, but what I envisage is basically this: the licensed premises that will pay the bulk of the fee will be the bigger licensed pubs, particularly those that trade late. The restaurants and smaller clubs will pay a relatively nominal fee, but we are in talks with Clubs SA and the Australian Hotels Association.

We are aware of the issue with country pubs, and the regulations under this act will provide the commissioner with the power to grant an exemption to small country hotels. So, depending on the circumstances of the individual hotel, they will either pay a reduced fee or nothing at all.

With regard to clubs, there are restricted and unrestricted clubs. Anyone can go into unrestricted clubs and they will probably pay a higher fee, because there are some clubs that are quite profitable. The smaller clubs, the restricted clubs, will, again, pay a rather nominal fee.

We are structuring the fees so that the greatest burden will be imposed on those licensed premises that cost us the most to regulate by virtue of their size, ability to pay and the fact that they trade late. Restaurants, restricted clubs and country hotels will pay a relatively small fee, in fact a nominal fee, if they end up paying anything at all.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It sounds to me as if it is being designed as we speak.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Well, it is.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Then I am not sure how we can legitimately vote on something for which the structure we do not know, or even the size of the fee we do not know. The way the second reading explanation is written, it states that the only criteria which the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner will have to reduce or exempt from the annual licence is hardship provisions. Is that right? Is the only criteria to reduce the fee or have the pub or club exempt from the fee under hardship provisions? If not, then what other provisions is the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner going to take into consideration for a reduction in or exemption from the fee?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will clarify what I said earlier: restricted clubs will in fact be exempt; they will not have to pay anything at all. So, the small restricted clubs which only provide a service to members will be exempt from the fee entirely.

With regard to the powers of the commissioner to grant exemption from or a reduction in the fee, what the member for Davenport says is not correct. The commissioner will have a wider discretion to provide an exemption from or a reduction in the fee. That will be done. Hardship is one of them, but, also, upon application, a licensee will be able to apply to the commissioner for an

exemption or for a reduction in the fee, and the criterion that the commissioner will use is basically the risk of noncompliance on the part of the licensee. The commissioner will be able to have a look at the application; if it is the sort of premises where you are not likely to get problems with compliance under the liquor laws, the commissioner will be able to grant an exemption or a reduction in the fee—so, a far broader discretion to the commissioner than just hardship.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Will that apply to the clubs and pubs that trade past 4am, or the late night? Will a club or pub that has an exemplary record be able to get an exemption on the basis that, over the last two or three years, they have had no breach of their liquor licensing provisions and therefore get a reduction or exemption, or is that only going to apply to smaller clubs and pubs or country clubs and pubs? How is this system actually going to work?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I do not envisage that there would be circumstances where a licensee who was trading until 4 o'clock in the morning would be given an exemption simply by virtue of trading until 4am. That puts that premises as a high-risk premises with regard to noncompliance. I think it highly unlikely under those circumstances; nor would I envisage that the commissioner would give an exemption to a licensed premises that, on a regular basis, was trading until 4am.

The sort of premises where I expect the commissioner would either reduce the fee or provide an exemption would be a small country hotel, bowling club or a golf club. They are the sorts of circumstances where I envisage the commissioner would use his or her powers to grant an exemption. I do not see that it would happen for even the most exemplary licensed premises trading until 4am. Just by virtue of being a licensed premises trading until 4am puts that licensed premises at high risk.

As well as that, I should say that the government still incurs a cost with respect to the managed taxi ranks, and all those sorts of services, which we are expected to provide by virtue of that premises trading until 4am.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Could I seek some clarification from the minister? As a regional MP who has a vast number of communities that have small clubs (bowls, basketball, cricket, footy, all those sorts of things), which generally do not trade beyond midnight (there are some exceptions beyond that), are the exemption criteria then that the commissioner will use be based upon hours of operation, turnover or profitability? I know that I will get people coming to me, saying, 'We've received this bill in the first instance. Okay, it might say underneath that we have got the opportunity to apply for an exemption,' but they need a bit more clarification on the detail.

Most of these premises would be closed by 1 o'clock at the latest. Most, certainly, would not operate 12 months of the year; they would have seasons in which they operate. They also rely upon volunteer staff who have undergone, I think, responsible officer training and all those sorts of things that are involved. They are a major driver of the economic opportunity for that club; so, is this going to be an impost that will affect them, or are they going to be exempt from it?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Most of these clubs you are talking about would be restricted clubs, so they would be exempt in any case. The small clubs that you are talking about would generally be restricted clubs, so they would be exempt from the fee in any case. You may have some larger clubs in your electorate. I would envisage that they would be charged either no fee or a very nominal fee indeed, because they would be at such low risk. The government is in talks with Clubs SA at the moment to exactly work out the structure.

This is certainly not designed to hit up clubs in any significant way. What we want to do is cost recover from those licensed premises which have the greatest cost to government to regulate, by virtue of them being in the night strip, trading until the early hours of the morning. So, I can provide comfort to those country clubs in your electorate that, if they are a restricted club, they are exempt, they will not pay anything at all. You may have a few clubs that have an unrestricted licence, and those clubs would pay either a very nominal fee or no fee at all.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Thank you, Treasurer, for that explanation. I apologise for the fact that I am a bit vague on the definition of restricted clubs. Does that relate to hours of operation or, indeed, who is able to be served? These clubs are membership-based, but certainly they invite guests there who do not have to sign in, as I understand it, but are normally brought in by either people who might be members, or just visit by their own choice. Are they able to be served, and does that impact upon the restriction classification?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The restriction refers to who they are serving and whether people can just come in off the street, or whether it is just for members and guests. I suspect some of your clubs do not strictly adhere to the rules and people are coming in off the street, but, nonetheless, they still have a restricted licence; they would still be exempt.

Mr WHETSTONE: In the seat of Chaffey, every community has a club, a community club, where members and guests are required to sign in. How might they be impacted on? Also, we have small tourist centres up there that have restricted liquor licences and cellar doors, in particular, at small niche wineries that might have a very small number of tourists pass by. I ask whether they will be impacted on. There are also a number of commercial houseboat operators up there that have a liquor licence for their guests. Will they be impacted on?

Mr VENNING: Before the minister answers that, can I also just add that, in the Barossa Valley, the same question applies in relation particularly to the Tanunda Club. We have many—

The CHAIR: Member for Schubert, this is probably not the right time to add in that question or make that comment. We will gain an answer for the—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Perhaps we will come back to you, member for Schubert.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: A similar situation would apply to the Barossa Valley in relation to the—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Don't be so disrespectful.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: I would like to remind all people in this chamber, leader, that you will have a certain amount of respect for the chair. I am not 'she', it is not a 'nonsense ruling'. I respect the procedures of this house, as do you.

Mrs REDMOND: Madam Chair—

The CHAIR: Is this a point of order? Are you making a point of order?

Mrs REDMOND: No, it is a point of clarification. I seek clarification as to why you would seek to interfere in the asking of a question when the member got up, clearly making it obvious that he was merely trying to add in the question so that the minister would not have to answer the same question twice, saving time and effort for the minister. But, you took it upon yourself to interrupt that, and my suggestion is simply that, therefore, it is entirely appropriate for the minister to answer the question and then have the member for Schubert ask the question in his form again, and not save the time.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Heysen, Leader of the Opposition. I would remind you that you do not run this chamber. I would remind you that the question came initially from the member for Chaffey, it went to the Treasurer, the Treasurer began to answer that, and he was then interrupted by the member for Schubert—

Mr Venning: No, he wasn't on his feet.

The CHAIR: He was then interrupted by the member for Schubert, and I am sure that if the Treasurer does wish, as he has indicated, to answer that interrupted question, he may do so. I would like to say that I do take some exception towards your attitude towards the chair, okay? It is not a 'nonsense ruling', and I am not 'she'. I hope that clarifies matters for you.

Mrs Redmond: Not at all.

The CHAIR: Not at all? Did you require any further clarification?

Mrs Redmond: Yes, please.

The CHAIR: Upon what? I have explained myself quite thoroughly. What do you not understand?

Mrs Redmond: I don't get your ruling.

The CHAIR: Well, yes. That would appear to be the problem. The member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING: In relation to the question that the member for Chaffey asked, the same would apply in the Barossa particularly in relation to the Tanunda Club, and I am very concerned about these extra costs. That club had been teetering pretty close to the line. In fact, it did close for some time and the community put their hands in their pockets and got it open again. Some members of the community dug very deep to keep that open because it is highly valued.

I am just very concerned what that is going to do to that in relation to the extra costs. It is all very well to levy them. This is a community club run by the community for the community. The profit line is pretty narrow and all the profits that are made therein go to the community. It is not a multinationally-owned company. Is there any way that you are able to single out those that are private, commercial operations versus the genuine community club?

Also, as the member for Chaffey said, in relation to the many cellar doors that we have out there—and there are many variations of them in many different categories—they too are going to feel the pinch because it is pretty poor timing, minister, to be putting extra imposts into the wine industry. You know, as we all know, it is going through pretty shocking financial times, probably the worst I think it has ever had since it was set up here in South Australia 145 years ago.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will just say at the outset that there are 5,941 licensed premises in this state from which we are seeking to recover about \$3.6 million a year, spread across just under 4,000 licensed premises, so even for those licensed premises that are going to be hit the hardest, it is still going to be a very minor fee relative to the profits they make. I appreciate and I am certainly aware of the issues that the member for Schubert raises about certain clubs—and I have had discussions with Cameron Taylor and Clubs SA about clubs in this state—where even a very nominal impost is going to potentially cause hardship, and that is certainly not the intention of what we are trying to achieve here.

I do not know the particular circumstances of the Tanunda Club, whether they have a restricted or unrestricted licence. If they have a restricted licence then they will not have to pay anything so they will be exempt from this. If they have an unrestricted licence, chances are that the fee that they would pay would be nominal but, from what the member for Schubert has said, I would think they would probably have a restricted licence and would be exempt from this fee.

I would be happy to go away and get my officers to check. I do acknowledge that there are even some clubs with unrestricted licences for whom, as well, any sort of impost might cause them particular hardship. I can reassure the member for Schubert about the clubs in his electorate. I need to check the circumstances of the Tanunda Club really to be able to give him specific information.

With regard to producers—cellar doors and so on—they will pay the nominal fee, the lowest fee. We envisage that will be around the \$100 mark, unless of course they are trading after 2am. I do not know if you have any cellar doors that are trading after 2am. I doubt it, but just normal cellar door operations will pay the nominal fee of approximately \$100 a year.

In regard to the houseboats, I would need to come back and check. I do not know what sort of licence is issued by houseboats. I will double-check this for the member for Chaffey, but again I would expect, and I am almost certain, that they would either pay nothing or the nominal fee. I am not aware what sort of licence category houseboats are issued with; I just need to qualify that. I would need to come back and double-check that, but I am certain it would be either no fee or, at best, the nominal fee.

Just to go back to the clubs, we are working very closely with Clubs SA to make sure that the fee structure does not impose any burdens on those smaller clubs which are least able to absorb any sort of impost.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Treasurer, the second reading speech, and the legislation, mentions a different fee structure for major festivals. It raises Clipsal and the Big Day Out, which to my mind then raises festivals such as the Glendi Festival and the Schutzenfest—

An honourable member: The gourmet weekends.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: —and the gourmet weekends. What are the criteria for the new fee on events to kick in, and what is the proposed fee?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: At the moment, the fee for a special event licence is \$39, so big events, multimillion dollar events like the Clipsal, pay \$39 for their special event liquor licence. I

think everyone here would agree that that is a fairly paltry amount for an event of that size and complexity and the compliance effort that has to be made on the part of government to look after them. It is a \$39 fee and, likewise, the Big Day Out, which is again another big event with a big compliance effort on the part of government. Certainly for those big events—such as the Big Day Out, Clipsal, Garden of Unearthly Delights—we would look at increasing the fee somewhat to reflect the real cost to government of compliance of that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, it would be substantially more than \$39. We have not set that yet, but we are talking about events that are big on scale, where the turnover is hundreds of thousands of dollars. I do not think that there is anyone here who would think that \$39 was a sufficient fee for a special event liquor licence for an event like the Big Day Out or Clipsal. For smaller events, such as school fetes and so on, under the regulations the commissioner will have the discretion to continue to charge a reduced fee, and I envisage for those small community events, like fetes and things like that that have a one-off liquor licence, the fee would continue to be \$39.

I should clarify that. At the moment they could be charged \$39, but the commissioner uses his discretion to waive that fee. Those small events pay nothing at all at the moment, and we would envisage that they would continue to pay nothing at all under the powers that the commissioner would have to use his discretion.

For those middle range events, the commissioner would have a look at what compliance effort is needed on the part of government and at the nature of the event, and the commissioner would use his or her discretion accordingly and determine what is a reasonable fee, given the nature of the event and the compliance effort that needs to be put towards the event. Certainly, for those great big events like Clipsal, the Big Day Out and so on, we would be looking at charging a larger fee than \$39.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: What is the current cost of compliance for Clipsal or the Big Day Out? Has someone in government actually done that costing? I assume you have, otherwise on what basis is the commissioner going to make the judgement about what is a fair recovery of cost for that compliance effort? Even though they are paying \$39 now, what is the actual cost of compliance to government? Secondly, you still have not clarified for me at what point one of these events—the Schutzenfest, Glendi—gets roped into the higher fee, or will they not know until they apply? I am wondering if there is going to be a regulated structure, or do they just apply and the commissioner will make up a number and then you cannot appeal it—that is the number, and that is what you are going to pay?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: With regard to the grounds on which the commissioner would make a decision, there would be guidelines that the commissioner would issue which would be available to applicants. An applicant applying for a one-off licence for an event would be able to access these guidelines from the commissioner, so they would have some idea about what sort of fee they would be charged according to the nature of the event so there would be some predictability. It is not just about how the commissioner is feeling on a particular day.

To give members an idea about how big the fee would be, we envisage that for a city pub trading standard, not extended, trading hours, the fee is likely to be about \$700 a year that a normal licensed pub would be charged. For one of these big events—Clipsal 500, Big Day Out—seeking a one-off licence for a particular period of time would be a fraction of that \$700 given the nature of the event, so that is the sort of scale we are looking at. A fraction of \$700 would be the sort of amount that you would expect one of these big events to be charged.

With regard to the commissioner using his discretion, guidelines would be issued which would give event organisers some idea of the size of the fee they would be likely to be charged given the nature of their event.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: How are the rules around the fee going to be restricted? I assume it is only going to be restricted to licensing and inspection costs and not to the policing costs of having police on the beat at 3am—extra police going to the Clipsal 500 or extra police security. It is purely going to be liquor licensing inspecting. Gambling inspecting? No, that is separate again.

Where is the discipline on the office not to say, 'Now that we have this levy that we can cost recover against we will have another 20 or 30 inspectors and what does it matter because it is no cost to government, it is all going to go full cost recovery onto the fee.' How can the industry

have any confidence that once the bureaucrat gets their foot in the door on this levy that it is not simply going to be ramped up on the basis of the whim of the government of the day?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The agency would have no individual discretion about how many inspectors it employs. If they decided to increase the number of inspectors, they would have to go through the normal budget processes and the government would have to make a decision about whether it was worthwhile having the additional inspectors, given that it would result in an increase in the licensing fee.

It is exactly the same as decisions governments make all the time. Agencies come to government and Treasury wanting to increase the number of resources that they have, and governments make decisions about whether to grant them that increase or not. The member for Davenport seems to be implying that what this might mean is that the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner might have discretion about how many officers it employs under this scheme and it would then be able to jack up the licensing fees to increase the cost. That is not the case.

If the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner wanted to increase the number of inspectors, it would have to do that using the normal process. It would have to put in a budget bid, essentially, to do that and to be assessed as part of the budget. The government would then have to make a decision about whether to do that and, as a result, whether to increase the cost of the fee, so the government would be under the normal political pressures about not upping the size of the fee to increase the number of inspectors.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This is my last question on this provision. The Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner did a review, as I understand it, into this particular measure and presented a final report to government. Is it the government's intention to release the final report? If not, why not?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am not sure if the member for Davenport is referring to the 'A Safer Night Out' report that was done. The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner did a report to government about the issue of late-night trading and the social problems. The proposal for annual liquor licensing fees came out of that report, but it was an all-encompassing report. It did not deal just with annual liquor licensing fees, it dealt with mandatory closing, managed taxi ranks, how to deal with the general social issues associated with 24-hour trading, and problems particularly in the West End of the city associated with 24-hour trading. That is what the report was about. I am not sure whether or not the report was released, but I would be happy to get back to the member for Davenport; if it has not been released, I will find out why.

Mrs REDMOND: Minister, I would like to clarify a couple of the things that you have just been canvassing with the member for Davenport, particularly in relation to the liquor licensing commissioner's discretion in terms of the fees payable by organisations that may be holding events. I understand that the minister said that basically there is a \$39 fee on most special event licences at the moment, but I also took it from some of his comments that perhaps that fee is waived.

First of all, can you clarify whether that currently occurs, and if it only occurs upon a request, or whether it is the habit of the liquor licensing commissioner to simply waive that fee if an organisation is holding a one-off event—wine and food events often happen in my electorate. If there is a one-off event like that where someone applies, is it a matter where the organisation applies, pays their fee and the liquor licensing commissioner says it, but if someone is in the know they can ask for a discretionary exercise of the authority of the commissioner to waive that fee? That is the first part of the question.

The second part is in terms of what you said about being able to go onto a website and figure out what the fee will be. What will be the criteria for assessing that? I assume from what you have said that it will be a fee of up to \$700 at the moment, and that would be for the highest level of event, but is it taken to be on the basis of the turnover of an event? On what basis will people be expected to make that assessment? Most of the organisations that I know running those sorts of events are incorporated bodies and not for profit. If they do make any profit, it is extremely minimal, and they then reinvest that, in any event, into their running of the organisation to put on the event next year, or whatever they are going to do.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will correct something that the Leader of the Opposition said, which was that I said it would be up to \$700. I said a fraction of \$700. So, the most that anyone is going to pay is a fraction of \$700, not up to \$700.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: It could be \$699.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Indeed, it could be, but that is certainly not what we envisage. So, even the biggest events with the biggest turnover would pay substantially less than \$700, which is what we envisage will be the—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Indeed, and that is only right because if you are expecting businesses with hotel licences to pay a \$700 fee, it is unfair on those businesses to then have someone set up across the road a big event and only pay a one-off fee of \$39. So, for the purposes of equity, it is reasonable to expect that these big events with turnover in the tens of thousands of dollars to have to pay more than a one-off fee of \$39.

With regard to the waiving of the fee and what happens at the moment, I will get back to the Leader of the Opposition. I do not know whether that is done on the initiative of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner or whether it is done upon application, I would need to check. However, the regulations currently provide for an exemption for a licence which is for charitable purposes. So, under the regulations there is an existing exemption. The \$39 fee is waived if the purpose of the function is a charitable purpose.

Essentially, the first criteria upon which the regulations will be made will be one of risk. So, as I explained to the member for Davenport, what is the risk of non-compliance at a particular event? The commissioner will come up with guidelines that will inform the commissioner and the applicant on the sort of things that are likely to contribute to risk.

The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner is far better informed on what sort of things are likely to be factors regarding risk, but obviously hours of operation is one. If you have a special function that is going to be open until the early hours of the morning there is a far higher risk associated with such a function than a school fete that finishes at 5 o'clock in the afternoon.

So, it would be those sort of things that the commissioner would use as criteria in determining the risk of non-compliance. These matters will also be dealt with in the regulations. The detail of this will be fleshed out in the regulations, which will be done under the bill as well.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

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

RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGET

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) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Members of the house are aware of the internationally-leading position of South Australia in renewable energy generation capacity, particularly with wind power. When the government was elected in 2002 there was not a single wind turbine operating in South Australia. Today, there are 534 operational turbines, with a further 25 turbines to be added by the end of the year. This has not come about by accident, but by choice—billions of dollars of investment in wind energy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In January 2007, we set ourselves the target of having 20 per cent of our electricity generated within the state coming from renewable energy. In pursuing this policy, the government has:

- put in place Australia's most streamlined planning framework for wind investors;
- introduced Australia's first and only payroll tax rebate scheme for wind investors; and
- established RenewablesSA and an investment fund to drive further support, such as opening up pastoral land for wind and solar farm investors.

Last week—and I think this is a very significant announcement for the state—the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) released its draft supply and demand outlook report for 2010-11. The AEMO was established by COAG and works within a broader market governance structure alongside the Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC) and the Australian Energy Regulator (AER), which services the economic regulation and compliance of the energy sector. I want to quote from the report:

The capacity of wind generation in South Australia continues to grow and wind energy has now reached 20 per cent of energy production. There is now 1,150 megawatts of wind-generating capacity in the state. According to the World Wind Energy Association's data, this puts South Australia second behind Denmark in terms of penetration, and the per capita figure of 0.702 kilowatts per person is now higher than any major country in the world.

So, what this means is that, according to the AEMO, if we were to be considered a nation, we would be ranked second in the world. The report identifies factors contributing to this outcome as:

Broad public and political support, and incentives from both the federal energy target and South Australia's Renewable Energy Rebate Scheme.

It also identifies that wind investment is the primary contributor to the decline in greenhouse gas emissions in our state. Importantly, wind has displaced some of the state's imported electricity requirements. Imported electricity is the most carbon intensive in Australia and its reduction is a major achievement.

The report also shows that 72 megawatts of solar generation has also been installed in our state, principally in the form of rooftop solar. The report advises that our installed solar capacity now contributes more energy annually than non-renewable carbon-producing diesel-fired generation.

So, achieving the 20 per cent target three years ahead of our own goal, and nine years ahead of the rest of Australia, is a milestone for our environment and our economy. It also prepares us to succeed in a carbon-constrained world.

The carbon intensity of South Australia's electricity production is already 15 per cent better than the national average and the gap is set to widen as we draw relatively more investment to our renewables sector.

Two years ago, we set ourselves a target of having 33 per cent of our electricity generation come from renewable energy by 2020. Since that target was announced, we have seen 410 megawatts of wind power generation added. The state, with 7.2 per cent of Australia's population, now hosts 54 per cent of Australia's wind farm operating capacity.

The outstanding result of meeting the 20 per cent target nine years ahead of the national goal gives us confidence in our ability to achieve the 33 per cent target. Now, how do other states compare? By comparison in terms of non-hydro capacity per capita, we are generating five times more renewable energy than Victoria and 10 times more than New South Wales. However, we face a number of challenges. Some of these relate to managing the intermittent nature of wind generation, the need for better information about transmission availability, and the effect on investor returns of the current soft market for renewable energy certificates.

Finally, the government is concerned about the impact on future wind investment of a recent judgement handed down by the Environment Resources and Development Court. The court has upheld an appeal against a wind farm on the grounds of its adverse impact on visual amenity. I know that the visual impact argument was dismissed by the court in an earlier appeal of another wind farm proposal. This decision potentially contributes to uncertainty within communities and among wind investors.

A large part of our success in building an international reputation for hosting wind investment has been our commitment to making the regulatory environment as certain as possible. The government will now be considering its options for maintaining that certainty in the light of the court's decisions.

The government will not be departing from our ambitious 33 per cent target. We are greatly encouraged by meeting that 20 per cent target three years ahead of schedule, but, most importantly, only this state has reached the 20 per cent target nine years ahead of what the federal government asked us to do and, as we just said before, five times better than Victoria, 10 times better than New South Wales.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Members, I need to apologise to the member for Morialta. There was a group of the SRC from the Norton Summit Primary School here earlier, but I did not have time to acknowledge them, so could you just pass on that they were very welcome, and we hope they enjoyed their time here.

EATING DISORDER SERVICES

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:09): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Today, I table—and I do that now—'Service Model: South Australian Statewide Specialist Eating Disorder Services—Final Report'. This report recommends a new model of care for treating eating disorders in South Australia. The report was prepared by independent consultant Ms Deidre Mulligan and comes after five months of engagement and extensive consultation with key stakeholders, including a project reference group which comprised clinicians, consumers, carers and non-government organisations. The project reference group has approved the release of the report.

The key recommendation contained in the report is that there needs to be a range of services that is accessible by the community across the state, including people in country areas. The project reference group reviewed current national and international clinical guidelines on the treatment of eating disorders, and these informed the model of care.

At present, acute treatment services are offered by the Women's and Children's Hospital and Ward 4GP at Flinders Medical Centre, with limited outreach into the community. This often results in consumers being extremely unwell before they are able to access services. The proposed model of care acknowledges that early intervention and primary prevention are critical in ensuring that consumers have the maximum chance of recovery. The Southern Mental Health eating disorder consultant specialists and senior staff are positive about the new model of care for the treatment of eating disorders.

Central to the proposed new model of care will be specialist eating disorder clinicians who will be able to provide outreach clinics and will assist primary healthcare providers and mental health staff. These specialists will also be able to provide flexible support to country South Australia by teleconferencing, video conferencing, face-to-face sessions, training, mentoring and support. It is important that consumers with early stage onset eating disorders can access services through a variety of means, including dietitians, GPs, psychologists, child and adolescent mental health services and, of course, specialists.

The report also recommends that beds under clinical management be established in a residential setting and be accessible to people aged 15 years and over. This residential service will be complemented by day program services, as well as a clear pathway to acute inpatient services where medical stabilisation is required. The report notes that the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists treatment guide recommends hospital inpatient treatment only for medical stabilisation.

Consumers who require medical stabilisation will be treated in an acute inpatient setting with input from the specialist eating disorder team. This would enable consumers to receive acute treatment in a public hospital closer to their homes and families. Acute medical stabilisation for consumers aged under 16 years will continue to be provided by the Women's and Children's Hospital.

To expand eating disorder services across the state under the proposed model of care will cost approximately an additional \$1.2 million per annum. SA Health will now establish an implementation committee comprising eating disorder clinicians, consumers, carers and non-government organisations. Over the next 12 months, the implementation committee will determine detailed operations of the new model. In the interim, Ward 4G will remain open but, in the long term, this is not the most therapeutic environment for consumers to receive treatment.

This new model of care will ensure that there is a clearer pathway to access specialist eating disorder services and that such services are available to all South Australians, including

consumers, carers and family members. I am advised that the report will be on the health website in about 20 minutes' time.

LYMPHOEDEMA ASSESSMENT CLINIC

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:13): I seek leave to make another ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The opposition health spokesperson today called a press conference claiming that the government is closing a lymphoedema clinic at Flinders Medical Centre and putting patients thereby at risk. This claim is absolutely wrong.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Laugh! They laugh at their own lies. This is extraordinary.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This is absolutely—

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

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister just said that the opposition is making lies and impugned that we are lying. I believe that is unparliamentary, and I ask him to withdraw and apologise for the imputation.

The SPEAKER: Minister, perhaps you would like to reword your statement.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I withdraw the comment. The claim is wrong. It is untruthful. It is not accurate. This is a private clinic which makes its own decisions about its location. It has not been told by the government or any of our agencies to move. It chose, itself, to find an alternative location. Lymphoedema occurs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Lymphoedema occurs when the lymphatic system does not work properly, which can be a result of a range of things but includes surgery for breast cancer. This results in the long-term swelling of part or parts of the body, particularly the upper arms. I am advised that the team of private allied health staff and the Flinders University researcher who run the clinic have elected to cease the clinic from 1 July so that they can review the demand for their services, which has changed over time from purely breast cancer patients to other patients as well. I understand that the profile of patients with lymphoedema conditions has changed, in part because of the outstanding work undertaken by Professor Neil Piller.

Members in this place should be aware of Professor Piller because I organised for the professor to come into parliament to give a briefing on the research that he was undertaking, the work that he has done. As a result of the work that he is doing, a smaller number of people now need to have services to help lymphoedema because they no longer have their lymph system removed as an automatic part of breast surgery.

Public cancer patients will, of course, continue to receive cancer services in a range of public hospitals in Adelaide and around the state, as is currently the case. Cancer specialists can seek further assistance or advice from a lymphoedema specialist if they believe it is necessary to treat their patients. This is currently the case and will not change. The opposition should learn to check its facts. They are so fast to jump into any issue and make whatever political capital they can choose. They do not care about the impact on the patients or how people are scared. That is what they do: they scare people who are vulnerable. They should be ashamed!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Finniss!

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:16): I bring up the 26th report of the committee.

Report received.

QUESTION TIME

LYMPHOEDEMA ASSESSMENT CLINIC

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question, unsurprisingly, is to the Minister for Health. What plans does the government have to provide lymphoedema assessment services, currently conducted by the lymphoedema clinic at the medical centre at Flinders, now that the government is no longer going to have that service at Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:17): Madam Speaker, the lack of flexibility by the Leader of the Opposition is astonishing to all of us, but today she has really picked very badly.

Members interjecting:

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

Mrs REDMOND: The point of relevance. The minister simply started attacking me rather than answering anything in my question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the Opposition, sit down. There is no point of order at this stage. He has just started to answer his question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear myself speak. Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I said in my ministerial statement just two or three minutes ago, a range of providers of services are available to public patients in our public hospitals and will continue to be provided. Private services which were provided can be obtained by a range of private providers as well, and I understand in a note that was sent to the patients of this particular clinic they were advised of those other services. I understand that Professor Piller is determining where he will run his service in the future, but that is a decision that he has made. It is a private clinic that was placed within the Flinders Medical Centre as a matter of courtesy. He made a decision to move it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The absolute lack of fidelity to truth on the other side, which seeks to exploit vulnerable patients and try to get political capital out of it, just disgusts me, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Frome.

TOUR DOWN UNDER

Mr BROCK (Frome) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house of some of the highlights of the new race routes announced last week for the 2012 Tour Down Under?

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) (14:19): I would like to thank the honourable member for Frome for this question. Of course, his involvement in the race a couple of years ago in terms of his advocacy for the Clare Valley to be included in the Tour Down Under was not only strong but it was also successful and we saw the start in the Clare Valley. Of course, earlier this year Clare was not in the Tour Down Under schedule, and the honourable member has had a number of conversations with me since, and I have some very good news.

I was delighted last week when the Tour Down Under race director, Mike Turtur, announced the race routes for next year's events which will run from 15 to 22 January next year. Each day of the seven-day race is going to be a major event in and of itself. One of the jewels in the crown will be the gruelling finish, this time for the first time at the top of Old Willunga Hill, and it is on the penultimate stage on 21 January, but that is jumping ahead and I will come back to that in a moment.

I am thrilled to see that the race is returning to the Clare Valley which this year had a 'bye', so it is great to see that it is back in the race next year. The Clare Valley is one of the most enthusiastic regions when it comes to the Tour Down Under and, as I said, the member for Frome has been (in what may be an understatement) extremely keen for the race to return to Clare, and I want to thank him for his forceful advocacy.

I can understand why because the benefits to the local community are obvious. Clare Valley locals were not only excited about watching the race when the Tour Down Under was last held in Clare, for the first race start that ended in Tanunda that day as I recall, but they also made hay from the influx of tourists and visitors.

Thousands of people turned up to see the start of the race in the main street of Clare in 2010 and local retailers, wineries, hotels, restaurants, and bed and breakfasts all benefited from the influx of crowds. The people of the Clare Valley prepared for the race for months in advance. I remember driving through the region in the period leading up to the race and seeing giant haystacks next to the roads carrying messages of welcome for the riders and audiences.

This year the race will finish in Clare on the first stage of the Tour Down Under, and that is on day 1, so it is a finish rather than a start, and I have no doubt the people of the region will again go all out to make this an event to remember.

Stage 1 on 17 January next year will be a great town to country race. Significantly, the race will begin in the City of Prospect for the very first time. I know the Mayor of Prospect, David O'Loughlin, is very excited about securing the race start. Again, he has been a forceful advocate. He is already in negotiations with the Mayor of Clare, Alan Aughey, about ways in which the two centres can unite to jointly promote the start and finish of the race day.

Like the celebrations in Clare, Prospect will go all out for their race start. The city has already decided to move its annual Prospect Food and Fashion Event, normally held in November, to the night before the race start on 17 January next year and they will be blocking off the newly upgraded main street of Prospect and holding, in the mayor's words, 'the best party Prospect has ever seen'. The mayor is particularly proud of the main street's \$4 million upgrade—funded with the help of the state government—which has transformed a fairly ordinary arterial road into a village heart.

I might just mention that for the first time ever, the Prospect event will include a professional sprint race on the day before the race start—on the rest day for the Tour Down Under on the Monday. Cyclists from around Australia and locally will be invited to take part in the 200-metre sprint bike race down the main street for cash prizes. This has not been done before at any of our race starts or finishes but, as I understand it, these sprint events are quite common in Europe at the start of pro-tour cycling races.

So, this is all part of the excitement of stage 1 of the race, and, again, I congratulate the member for Frome for his advocacy efforts to re-secure the event for Clare—and without his advocacy it would not have happened.

We are all looking forward once again to the great events that go with the other race starts in Lobethal, Unley—with their big street party the night before which has become an annual party not to be missed—and Norwood and McLaren Vale.

For the first time in the event's 14-year history, cyclists will finish stage 5 on the penultimate day of the race, at the top of Old Willunga Hill, after a challenging Skoda King of the Mountain climb, which Mike Turtur assures me will be a spectacular finish. A new classification process will be used for the first time next year, with each climb given a rating between one and three, determined by the level of difficulty. Category 1 will cover the hardest climbs, Menglers Hill and Old Willunga Hill.

So, the 2012 Tour Down Under will be just as big, eventful, and as exciting as the previous races, and in terms of television coverage, millions of people will again see magnificent South Australian regions in all their summer glory as they shiver through their cold European and North American winters, so there could not be a better promotion for our tourism and wine industries. I am looking forward to making some further announcements—

Ms Chapman: How much for Lance Armstrong this year?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: You want to know about Lance?

Ms Chapman: Yes—how much?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Now that I have detailed that all roads lead to Frome, let me just say that I will be making some announcements about some of the spectacular stars who will be both participating in the 2012 Tour Down Under and also attending.

LYMPHOEDEMA ASSESSMENT CLINIC

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: My question is again for the Minister for Health. Where are the patients suffering from lymphoedema, who were due to have treatment but have had their appointments at the Flinders Medical Centre cancelled, supposed to go for treatment, given that there is no other specialised unit to provide treatment for people in the southern area?

The lymphoedema clinic offers statewide assessment services and treatment for the southern area. It is understood that the closure of the clinic at the Flinders Medical Centre from 1 July will leave people in the southern area without any accessible place for treatment.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has already answered that, but he may wish to add something.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:26): Essentially, what is the lymphoedema clinic? Essentially, there are physiotherapy services and there are physiotherapists available in all of our hospitals, and those services will continue to be provided. This was a private clinic which received—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A private clinic dealing with private patients.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett will stop displaying material in the chamber. Minister, have you finished your response?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The interjection was, 'Why has it got a letterhead which has Flinders Medical Centre on it?' Because, as I said, it's a private clinic which is located by agreement between the—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morphett!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I look forward to the day when the member for Morphett actually gets a question on health in question time. The reality is that this is a private clinic and the reference that—

Mr Williams: You are getting rid of all private services, aren't you, John?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: You hate private services.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The consistency on the other side is astonishing: the Leader of the Opposition is attacking me for allegedly getting rid of services for public patients and the deputy leader is attacking me for allegedly getting rid of services for private patients. They need to be clear about what it is they want.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, I have a letter here which I will perhaps read to the house. It says, 'Date, Re: Temporary Closure of Lymphoedema Unit.' 'Temporary closure,' that's not something they pointed out in their question. 'Dear,' to the person, 'We have received a referral for your patient,' so this is a letter to GPs, primarily. It continues:

Please be informed that as of 1st July 2011 the Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic conducted by Professor Neil Piller will no longer be located in the Flinders Surgical Oncology Clinic, Flinders Medical Centre.

Lymphoedema assessments may recommence in the future once a suitable location can be secured. We recommend that in the meantime all lymphoedema patients are referred to an appropriately qualified therapist for assessment and treatment. Referrals received by the Flinders Surgical Oncology Clinic after July 1st 2011 will not be stored, kept or forwarded.

The following is a list of therapists who are appropriately trained in the recognition, assessment and treatment of lymphoedema and therefore able to offer advice and therapy for your patient. A list of websites is also provided however please be aware that only the—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —National Lymphoedema Practitioner Register (NLPR) assesses the qualifications and continuing education of the therapists they list.

Then they list a range of therapists and their locations: Highgate, Eastwood, Murray Bridge and Pinnaroo, Brighton, Nairne and Glenside.

It gives a range of websites and states, 'If you require further information you may call or email Professor Neil Piller,' and then it gives his number and his email address. His email address is, of course, at Flinders University where he is a researcher. Then the clinic manager is provided, and then it has 'Flinders Medical Centre' and the 'Government of South Australia' because, as I say, it is based within our service.

It is not our service. We don't run this service and we don't control it. In fact, Professor Piller is overseas in Canada, and I understand that he will be back in a few months' time. That is his choice. It is his clinic: it is a private clinic. The government is not responsible for private clinics.

LYMPHOEDEMA ASSESSMENT CLINIC

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: given what the minister just read out, can he please tell us from that list which are the services provided to the southern area for the treatment of people with lymphoedema, which was, after all, the thrust of the question in the first place?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:30): I just read the list out. As I said, the public hospital system looks after public patients, so that includes Flinders Medical Centre.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Leader of the Opposition!

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:30): Can the Minister for Mineral Resources Development advise the house of the changes to the Mining Act and regulations that are about to come into force?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his question, and, yes, I can inform the house. As you may be aware, the amendments to the Mining Act 1971 and the new

Mining Regulations 2011 are due to commence on 1 July and will deliver greater transparency and clarity for everyone involved in the mining industry—even the Leader of the Opposition.

The changes to the act and regulations enhance various tenement approvals and regulatory compliance provisions administered under the Mining Act, ensuring South Australia's legislative framework adopts best practice principles. The act and regulations, coupled with government policies and guidelines, guarantee that landowners and the community will be well informed through more effective and transparent government and industry processes.

These are very important reforms that create a number of initiatives designed to help the mining and agricultural industries work together. Firstly, these reforms introduce a minimum standard of information that a tenement holder must disclose on a notice of entry served upon the landowner.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The changes will also establish the requirement for the holder of a mining tenement to submit a compliance report in relation to the activities undertaken on the tenement and compliance with conditions of the tenement and compliance with the act. Further, it creates the power for the minister to request a tenement holder or applicant to provide information to assess or verify the capabilities of the holder/applicant to be able to comply with the requirements of the act.

There will now be a discretionary power to accept mineral claims greater than the maximum size of 250 hectares. Several of the state's larger mining operations have required over 50 mineral claims be pegged to cover the mine project area, and streamlining this process will save not only money but also time. The mining registrar will have discretionary power to allow for the pegging of mineral claims in some other manner, which will reduce costs to the industry by time spent pegging and maintaining the pegs.

The new notice of entry requirements may appear to increase the burden on industry. However, the majority of mining operators already comply with the proposed amendments.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: She's an expert on mining as well.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order, deputy leader.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am sure this is interesting information, but I am struggling to understand why a member of the house would ask the minister to explain changes which have already gone through the house as amendments to the act.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: We debated this legislation only recently.

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. The minister is answering the question in the manner that he chooses. At this stage I do not see a problem. Minister.

Mr Williams: What is the point of the question?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To educate, to inform.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To educate and inform.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: One day we are spending too much time on mining, the next day not enough time on mining.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Explorers are at high risk—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You did a great job, did you?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Explorers are at high risk of being taken to the appropriate court if they do not fully inform and negotiate with landowners regarding entry to land. Given the majority of landowners affected are represented by members opposite—other than the honourable Speaker—I would have thought they have a great interest in making sure that they are well informed of what is going on. In line with this, the compensation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —provisions for landowners have been enhanced. Landowners can now claim up to \$500 for legal assistance relating to exempt land. Further, the general compensation provisions under the act now give landowners—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —so, I can assume that in the future the deputy leader will not be asking any questions about any policy passed by this house—the right to claim for reasonable costs incurred in connection with any negotiation or dispute relating to access to their land by a mining operator. This government has listened to the legitimate concerns of landowners—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: She would have. She would have spoken. She hasn't stopped.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, there is only one way to stop her from speaking.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Ask her about the leadership.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Many men have tried. This government has listened to the legitimate concerns of landowners, the mineral industry and the community and has implemented reform to assist in the mining industry working with the rest of the community for the best outcome for all South Australians. South Australia is already recognised as arguably the world's best mining jurisdiction due to the outstanding work of this government and PIRSA. These reforms add to our—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —already outstanding record and will see South Australia maintain its climate of certainty within the mining industry, which is benefiting all South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would point out to members that if no member was allowed to ask any question about anything we did not know in this place, nothing would ever get asked. The two previous questions from the opposition were covered in the first answer, in fact, in the statement before question time.

EATING DISORDER UNIT

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister confirm that people who—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Minister for Mineral Resources Development!

Dr McFETRIDGE: —are still at a critical stage of an eating disorder and require hospitalisation will now be treated in general hospital wards rather than at a specialised eating disorder unit?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:37): I would say to the member that, before he starts jumping into yet another issue without checking his facts, the report that I tabled today will be online now and I would encourage him to access that through the SA Health website. As I said in my report, we will work with the sector itself through the implementation stage to refine exactly how these things will be done.

The report recommends that we do this in an incremental way over a period of one to two years. So, in the period until this is implemented, Ward 4G will continue to provide the services. Ward 4G, of course, is a mixed surgical ward anyway, with a number of patients with mental health disorders. That is a matter of fact.

What we will make sure of is that if patients need clinical in-hospital care then they will receive that. One of the recommendations of the Royal College of Psychiatrists is that care should be given as close as possible to where people live, so we will explore how that can be done as well.

EATING DISORDER UNIT

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:38): I have a supplementary question. Why is the minister ignoring advice from clinical specialist Dr Kate Jarvis that the specialised eating disorder unit must maintain the services that it provides at its current location? Who are you listening to?

The SPEAKER: I think that is a question, rather than a supplementary.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:38): Interestingly enough, Kate Jarvis is the head of the Royal College of Psychiatrists and she is not an eating disorder specialist, so far as I am aware.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: She made her comments, just as the member for Morphett did, without having the benefit of reading the report. So, as I said to her in the interview I had this morning, I would recommend that the Royal College of Psychiatrists read the report, because if you read the report, which is now online, it goes through what the Royal College of Psychiatrists' recommendations are about how eating disorder patients should be looked after, and by and large, as I understand it, the report is making recommendations that are absolutely consistent with that college's views about how patients with eating disorders should be looked after.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have, and so that is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —what has been recommended to us. I would say to Kate Jarvis and all the other psychiatrists who have got an interest in this, 'Read the report.' We give an undertaking—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The member for Morphett is indicating that he can count, but, given his place in the leadership ballots over time, obviously he can't count very well. We will work with the sector. There was a review group, which included the clinicians who understood these issues and who supported the principles which are at the heart of the report. I understand that the member

for Morphett is frustrated. He likes to make politics without facts. But I say on this occasion, 'Please, just check the facts.'

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Reynell.

APY LANDS, FOOD SECURITY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can the minister update the house on how the government is addressing food security issues in the APY lands?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Premier in Social Inclusion) (14:40): I would like to thank the member for Reynell, and I acknowledge all her important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —work that she does in advancing the cause of reconciliation. Shortly after I became the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, I visited the APY lands for the first time and heard directly from communities about concerns they had in relation to food generally.

I was similarly concerned, and I instructed my department to get to work with communities on a policy framework and a way forward that would address these issues—issues like the cost of food, the access to food and the supply of food. We did that, and we released in December of last year the APY Lands Food Security Strategic Plan.

The plan committed over \$800,000 of new money and has a number of elements: it encourages local fresh food production; it has a focus on educating and improving community awareness in relation to diet and nutrition; and, finally, it seeks to bring together all levels of bureaucracy on the lands that are currently—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Madam Speaker?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Sorry.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I could not hear myself, I'm sorry. Since I—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: When you're ready. You ready?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Since I launched the plan, I am pleased to report that there have been a number of significant achievements. The Arid Lands Garden/Horticulture Project is well underway at Watarru, and further beds have been approved at Sandy Bore and Kalka. The work on this project has been done by locals, and Aboriginal contractors have been employed, which, obviously, is contributing to local employment and skill development in the community.

Secondly, the Red Cross will shortly commence a new school holiday cooking and nutrition program, and the community development officer will also be working on the lands as part of that program. At a strategic policy level, I have established a cross-government action team, appropriately named APY-EAT, which is responsible and accountable for implementation of the plan, the pursuit of new initiatives, and the evaluation of results. That group has met three times—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I've got all day.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: The group looks at money management issues, consumer protection, healthy food and nutrition for vulnerable children, community store management and freight issues.

We know that service delivery in remote communities is always going to be incredibly difficult, and we must be flexible with our response to all issues—but, in particular, food security issues—as situations change. For instance, at the time that the food strategy was prepared, the Mai Wiru Regional Stores Council was deliberately included as a critical element in that plan.

We now know that it is negotiating with the federal government as to its future, and that will cause us to revisit the plan, but it has been proposed by some, including Mai Wiru, that the answer to the issue of food on the lands is for the government to provide a subsidy. That is not my view, that is not this government's view, because we need to find a solution that is sustainable, which is why we are taking a community development approach to this issue. We do not want to perpetuate a—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —welfare mentality.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Madam Speaker, while there is much work to be done on the lands in relation to a number of issues, I am very confident about the future.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You are shouting it. Members must understand that a lot of the comments that are made are picked up by the microphones, and one day the media are going to pick up some of the things that are said, if you are not very careful.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett.

PALM LODGE MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:45): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the government confirm that it will close the mental health facility Palm Lodge, and when will this closure occur?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:45): Absolutely, Madam Speaker. I am happy to give the detail that the member asked. The Palm Lodge building was built in the mid-1950s as a motel in Adelaide and has been used as a mental healthcare facility since the 1970s under various models of operation and management. It is a 20-bed facility in poor condition and is no longer suitable to deliver supported accommodation services. The occupancy rate of Palm Lodge has been around 50 per cent or less over the past two years, and currently there is just one resident there.

In line with the Social Inclusion Board's recommendations, the government has developed supported accommodation, which has resulted in a significant increase in supported housing availability for people with a mental illness—in fact, I think it is 260 houses we are building in South

Australia through funding provided by the commonwealth government's stimulus package for mental health consumers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Much of that will be in supported accommodation. There are 57 new supported accommodation houses being built across metropolitan Adelaide, as well as 20 new supported accommodation units that are part of the Glenside campus redevelopment. These new houses and units are being completed between May and December 2011. As I said, there are 262 social houses allocated to mental health use under the commonwealth government's Nation Building package. So that is 300-and-something extra units that are available. That will replace and add substantially to the accommodation that is inadequately provided at Palm Lodge.

Over 200 of these 262 houses have been tenanted by mental health consumers. In addition, there will be another 80 supported accommodation places available through the government's success in obtaining commonwealth subacute funding. Consumers who may have gone to Palm Lodge previously are now able to receive care in community rehabilitation centres and intermediate care centres.

Residents of the new supported accommodation will receive regular support from mental health clinicians as well as community services provided by non-government organisation support workers to help with their individual needs. The clinical and nonclinical staff of Palm Lodge will be offered similar positions in the health system or elsewhere.

In answer to the question, it is expected that Palm Lodge will close in the next two months once all the residents—and as I say there is only one left—are placed in accommodation that suits their needs. The future use of the site for other mental health services is under consideration. This is old stock. We are now moving to put people into better, purpose-built accommodation. We have done it slowly to take into account the interests of the individuals and their families, and I think it is a very good outcome for mental health in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: My statement before about comments being picked up by microphones applies to both sides of the house. The member for Morphett.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That was not an invitation to talk.

PALM LODGE MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:48): Thank you, Madam Speaker; I could not hear above all the ambient noise. My question is to the Minister for Health. As the government has just confirmed that it will close the 20-bed mental health facility at Palm Lodge, why is the government employing seven staff to accommodate just one patient at the facility that is about to close?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:49): So swift on his feet; he is a kind of really agile performer, the member for Morphett. As I said, we are closing this thing down slowly. Clearly, we need to have a range of services provided, even if there is only one patient there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We are working sensitively to try and make the adjustments, because these are people who obviously have a whole range of needs. The outcome—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The outcome for mental health consumers will be vastly improved, and we will get through that process over the next couple of months. I would like to know the opposition's policy, of course, on this and other areas. What would they do? How would they deal

with these clients? Would they kick them out into the street? Would they close them down and sack the staff? Maybe they can tell us what they would do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport.

ADELAIDE ZOO BOARD

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:50): My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the government has three public servants appointed to the Adelaide Zoo board, including Rodney Hobbs from Treasury and Finance, how is it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Acclamation from both sides of the house, I notice. I wonder why.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I am sure that the government has some interest in this question. I will ask it again. Given that the government has three public servants appointed to the Adelaide Zoo board, including Rodney Hobbs from Treasury and Finance, how is it that the zoo was able to increase debt to unsustainable levels; and did Mr Hobbs and other representatives of the government ever raise concerns about the zoo's finance with the Treasurer and, if not, what was their purpose in being on the board?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, were you able to hear that question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will ask it again for the Treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Less noise, please.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Given that the government has three public servants appointed to the Adelaide Zoo board, including Rodney Hobbs from Treasury and Finance, how is it that the zoo was able to increase debt to unsustainable levels; and did Mr Hobbs or the other government representatives ever raise concerns about the zoo's finance with the Treasurer and, if not, what was their purpose of being on the board?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:51): I know that Mr Hobbs is a beloved figure for members of this chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I need to check the history of the government representatives. I know the government has been entitled to have representatives on the board. I need to check the history of the government's representation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will investigate and I will be asking questions. I will be asking some serious questions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Indeed! The government expects the best of our public servants who serve on boards representing the government, and if there have been some inadequacies—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —then I will take the appropriate action.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: But we have two new representatives on the board: a new official from Treasury, who is representing the government on the board, and Dr Susan Close from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. They have specifically been appointed to the board only very recently and I am looking forward to them discharging their duties well.

The SPEAKER: I imagine Mr Hobbs is very busy looking at our global allowances. It is amazing how much passion the man can inspire from both sides of the house. It is good to see members from both sides are united on an issue. The member for Bragg.

CHILD'S DEATH

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:53): My question is for the Minister for Families and Communities. Why was the minister able to make a statement to the media and the parliament on 9 June regarding the five-year-old boy who tragically died in the housing trust home on Wednesday 8 June, but the minister now says that she cannot comment on her department's involvement with that boy and his family?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:54): I refer the member for Bragg to the statement that I made on that particular day, and—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I said that I had received some initial information from the agencies under my control and that I was seeking further information, that I had asked for a detailed assessment of the processes undertaken and whether the actions taken were appropriate considering the information they had. I said I was keen to identify if there were any gaps in how this family was dealt with, or whether there are any difficulties in the protocols for handling such cases and, if there are, we will fix them. That is what I said on 9 June, and what I have said consistently since that time—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —is exactly the same: the details in relation to this case, I have been told that if I talk about them I could interfere with the case that is before the courts currently. This matter will come under intense scrutiny internally, through the Department for Families and Communities. It will, I am sure, come under the intense scrutiny of the Coroner, once the court case is finished, and it will come under the intense scrutiny of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Taylor.

SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Health. Have the non-government organisation tenders for supported accommodation assistance under the government's mental health reforms been announced?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (14:56): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. As part of the Stepping Up report

reforms, a new level of care, being supported accommodation which I referred to in answer to another question, was recommended. Supported accommodation aims to help people with mental illness return to the community by providing housing, community mental health team input, and non-government organisation (NGO) support. I am delighted to announce that the state government has secured contracts with three NGOs to provide support services to the value of \$11.4 million over three years to people with mental illness.

The three NGOs—Life without Barriers, Mind, and Neami—each have extensive experience providing rehabilitation support to mental health consumers. These organisations will work one-on-one with 77 mental health consumers by visiting them in their homes and providing non-clinical support 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The community mental health teams will continue to provide clinical support, but the NGOs will complement that work by helping consumers integrate into the community, assisting them with shopping, cooking, cleaning, seeking work and the like.

The state government has also allocated \$20.5 million to provide the individual and cluster housing for this program, and I am pleased to say that there were originally 73 supported accommodation places planned but, due to national rental assistance scheme funding from the commonwealth, those 73 places have been increased to 77.

Initial start-up services with consumers commenced in May this year, and the first consumers moved in to new accommodation in early June this year. In addition, it was recently announced that further accommodation packages will become available through the state successfully gaining COAG subacute funding. While many of the supported accommodation places are out in the community, there will be 20 places with 24-hour NGO support at the new Glenside campus. These places are presently nearing construction completion and 20 consumers, many transferring from Glenside Hospital, have been allocated places there.

I would also like to take this opportunity to announce some further good news about the Glenside Hospital redevelopment. The design of the new mental health and substance abuse facility has won a high commendation and been shortlisted for overall winner in the Design and Health, International Academy Awards 2011, Future Health Project. The winner will be announced in the United States on 9 July 2011, and I congratulate Adelaide architects, Swanbury Penglase, and global health designers, MAAP Medical Architecture, on a design that creates a peaceful and therapeutic environment within a village configuration, using sustainable design techniques to provide the delivery of 21st century mental health and substance abuse treatment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Bragg.

CHILD'S DEATH

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:59): My question again is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Did the minister receive legal advice not to answer any questions about the conduct of her department in respect of the death of the five-year-old boy in a housing trust property from the Attorney-General, the Crown Solicitor's Office, the former attorney-general (whom she is speaking with now), the solicitor representing her in the defamation case, or another lawyer?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:00): I have been keen to be as open and transparent about this issue as I possibly can. I have not in any way tried to hide that the family concerned in this tragic event were tenants of the South Australian housing trust and that there had been some contact with Families SA. What I am advised is that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: What I am advised is that I need to be incredibly cautious about the public statements I make—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —about involvement with this family while the matter is before the court. That is the advice I have received.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Regardless of the outcome of the trial and the review process that will be undertaken by the Coroner and the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee, this government continues to look for ways—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —to improve services for vulnerable families. Let me tell you some of the things we have done in relation to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: You don't want to hear that?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, stop shouting across the floor! Member for Bragg, behave. Member for Stuart, do you have a point of order?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I rise on a point of order: 98. The minister is not addressing the substance of the question. The question was not about whether she got the advice, but where it came from.

The SPEAKER: Sit down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood, behave!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As I have said on a number of occasions, ministers can choose to answer a question how they wish. The minister has given a full explanation. Have you finished your answer, minister?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am happy to tell the opposition that we have a crown solicitor outposted in the Department for Families and Communities, and the advice that I have received is that I need to be very cautious about what I say publicly because it is likely—

Ms Chapman: Yesterday you wouldn't give an answer.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: You didn't ask that question yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman: Yes I did.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No you didn't.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The empty vessel makes the most noise, doesn't it? A long time waiting—you are going to be sitting there waiting a long time.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They don't like it when she's quiet. The only time she's been quiet of recent times is when she was asked to support her leader after the post-election period.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: All this noise from the person who lost the election for them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will get back to her answer. I think you have answered it very well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, supplementary.

CHILD'S DEATH

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): Can the minister please clarify whether she is saying that she got the advice on which she is relying from the outposted solicitor who works for the Department for Families and Communities?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood will behave, and the member for Bragg will behave!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That was not a supplementary question, it was a new question. However, minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (15:03): Madam Speaker, it was the same question and I answered it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

LYMPHOEDEMA ASSESSMENT CLINIC

Ms FOX (Bright) (15:04): Is the Minister for Health aware of Professor Piller's views about the closure of the Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic at the Flinders Medical Centre?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Health, I hope you heard that question. I only heard half of it myself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (15:04): The question was, am I aware of Professor Neil Piller's views about the closure of the lymphoedema clinic at the Flinders Medical Centre? As it happens, I now am. I have just been handed a media statement put out by the Flinders Surgical Oncology Clinic Pty Ltd and it goes thus:

The Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic based at Flinders Medical Centre is privately operated and led by Flinders University Professor Neil Piller on a voluntary basis.

The clinic is not funded by SA Health.

The clinic provides an assessment service for people with lymphoedema, developing treatment and management plans which can be implemented by therapists based in the community in liaison with GPs.

'The Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic will be relocating from its current location. As a result the clinic will need to close for approximately 6 months effective from 1 July 2011,' Professor Piller said.

'All existing patients of the clinic have been contacted about the closure and have been provided with contact details for several South Australian lymphoedema therapists.'

'I am completely supportive of the relocation and temporary closure of the clinic.'

Professor Piller is currently overseas and intends to continue with the Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic as soon as a new location is determined.

Professor Piller will continue to undertake lymphoedema research during the relocation.

There is a post office box in Melrose Park, SA, and at the bottom it says, 'Flinders Surgical Oncology Clinic Pty Ltd', and the ACN number. Incidentally, the member for Morphett asked me

why we had seven staff working at Palm Lodge: I am advised that at any one time there is one staff member on duty.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Will the minister confirm that the new western grandstand at the Adelaide Oval partially blocks the north-west light tower and that this will compromise the televising of AFL football matches and as a result at least that tower and potentially all four towers will have to be raised?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:06): I certainly cannot confirm that because my role has not been to design the new stadium. Many people might think it is a good idea that it is not my role. I will happily try to get an answer from the people who are responsible for such things. What I can say is that whatever occurs at Adelaide Oval we will not go down the path of retractable lights that don't work. We think they are up there with one-way expressways as bad ideas.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Water. What was the legal bill for South Australia in conducting the High Court challenge on the River Murray? When the minister was recently asked this question on radio in Adelaide he said he did not know the cost at that stage but would be finding out.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for his question. He is correct, I will be finding out. It has not been determined yet. Presumably, there are certain things with respect to legal cases that need to be worked out but I will tell you this: the result that we got made things worthwhile.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If members want to have a discussion like this they can go outside and stop interrupting question time. Member for Croydon.

ROAD SAFETY STRATEGY

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (15:08): Can the Minister for Road Safety inform the house about the progress in developing the South Australian Road Safety Strategy 2020, Towards Zero Together, particularly as it relates to pedestrians and cyclists?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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) (15:08): I thank the member for Croydon for his question. Some people unkindly suggest that his greatest contribution to road safety is to ride a bike—but I don't agree with that; I think that's uncalled for. I am pleased to report to the house that the period for public comment on the draft strategy closed on 10 June 2011 and there have been a total of 171 submissions from individuals and organisations from a wide cross-section of our community. This, of course, indicates the intense community interest in road safety issues and I would like to thank all who have made a contribution and provided the Road Safety Advisory Council with their valuable feedback.

Submissions were received from many interested groups, including the Centre for Automotive Safety Research, the Motor Trade Association, the RAA, the South Australian Farmers Federation, the Heart Foundation, the SA Group Institute for Engineers Australia, the Council on the Ageing, the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia, Walking SA and the Adelaide Bicycle User Group.

Submissions have also been received from community road safety groups in the Adelaide Hills and the South-East. Local government submissions have come from the City of Marion, the Kingston District Council and the District Council of Grant. In this place, I am pleased to say that a submission has been received from the honourable member for Fisher, Dr Bob Such, who, as we all know, has a deep interest in making our roads safer.

The draft strategy reflects the most common plea heard from South Australians who attended the community forums across the state last year—a plea urging everyone to have greater respect for each other every time we share the road. I inform the house that all submissions received will be reviewed for input into the final strategy. In addition, specific road safety actions will now be developed and outlined as part of a detailed action plan following the wide-ranging responses received during the public consultation period. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition admitted that they have no policy at all, so it comes as no real surprise that the opposition did not make a submission on road safety.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order, Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Kavel has been making assertions about himself by way of a visual display, and I think it is out of order.

The SPEAKER: I would hope the member for Kavel has not been doing that. I have not observed it, but, if you are, member for Kavel, I would ask you to restrain from doing so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Does the minister stand by his comments on television news last night, and I quote, 'We are one of the lowest taxing states in the country for small business,' given that page 44 of Budget Paper 3 highlights the Commonwealth Grants Commission assessment that South Australia has the highest tax effort of any state?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (15:11): I refer to that publication of note, *The Australian*. *The Australian*—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: *The Australian* has South Australia as one of the lowest taxed jurisdictions in the nation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What I was saying yesterday on television was that the Leader of the Opposition went to a small business and said, 'It's the government's fault that power prices are going up,' but refused to mention, or failed to mention—and electricity prices—that she supported the privatisation of our electricity assets. That's the point I was making. I would refer members—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: the Leader of the Opposition was not even in the parliament when the electricity assets were privatised.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am not sure what point of order that was. However, minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a matter of record that John Olsen's candidate in the seat of Heysen supported the privatisation of our electricity assets. Did you not?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I stand by it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop and the Minister for Mineral Resources will be quiet.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Croydon will behave also.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE LONDON

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:14): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on the recent agreement concluded between BHP Billiton and University College London?

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) (15:14): I am pleased to inform the house about this. People will be aware that University College London has, of course, been around for nearly 200 years in Britain, and its first overseas campus is in Adelaide because of what is happening on the resources front, and it has a strong emphasis and offers masters degrees in energy and resources. Santos put up \$10 million and the state government \$10 million.

Members of the house would be aware of the government's commitment to increasing the flow of international students to our state and creating an international profile for Adelaide as a university city. People would have seen the stories this morning about Laureate University and Kaplan.

The state government has worked to boost South Australia's international higher education credentials by attracting some of the world's finest educational institutions to our state. Our efforts have paid off in many ways, including through the significant economic dividend which has seen international education become our second largest overall export in 2009-10, bringing \$1.05 billion into the South Australian economy.

This area was so neglected by the Liberals when they were in power. We did pitifully in terms of overseas students. We have seen a massive increase in overseas students since this government was elected and working with the universities.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Norwood, you are warned!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Today, I would like to report to the house of a further significant outcome from our University City program. A new agreement has recently been concluded by BHP Billiton and University College London that focuses on energy and resources, two of South Australia's major growth areas and two of University College London's areas of internationally recognised expertise.

The agreement supports an International Energy Policy Institute in Adelaide and an Institute for Sustainable Resources in London. According to UCL:

The two new institutes will drive research into the complex economic, legal, environmental, technological and cultural issues faced by the resources sector and provide a framework within which expertise from the northern and southern hemispheres can be shared and innovative responses developed.

Under the terms of the agreement, BHP Billiton Sustainable Communities, a charity established by the company as part of its community investment program, will provide University College London with \$US10 million over a five-year period to establish both institutes and fund academic research,

fellowships and scholarships, as well as the appointment of a new Chair in Sustainable Global Resources and a Chair in International Energy Policy.

In South Australia, BHP Billiton's contribution will include: funding for a new Chair in Energy Policy based in Adelaide; four postdoctoral research fellowships; seven PhD research scholarships over five years; and 16 masters of science scholarships over five years.

UCL is an exceptional global university, which I am told has been ranked fourth in the world in the annual Times Higher Education World University Rankings and top of the most recent ranking of the UK Research Council awards. So, if you think about world universities, No. 1, I think, was Harvard, No. 2 was Cambridge, No. 3 was Yale, No. 4 was University College London and then we get down to Oxford.

This, of course, would not be a eureka moment for the member for Unley because he probably thinks that he wants to continue his campaign against this, but BHP Billiton is a lot smarter than the member for Unley.

In 2006, the state government invited UCL to establish a campus in South Australia and signed an agreement in 2008 that led to the establishment of the UCL School of Energy and Resources in Adelaide—as I said before, UCL's first overseas campus.

The UCL-BHP Billiton agreement follows another recent agreement concluded by UCL. A six-year, \$3.1 million agreement funded largely by Santos and energy giant Korea Gas Corporation will engage UCL's School of Energy and Resources to educate future Korean energy leaders. This additional agreement will see 18 students from the Korean Ministry of Knowledge Economy and KOGAS undertake two-year Masters of Science in Energy and Resources degrees in Adelaide. So, congratulations to Santos and BHP Billiton for recognising this as something that is an outstanding asset, and a unique one for Australia, located in Adelaide.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

LYMPHOEDEMA ASSESSMENT CLINIC

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:19): The Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic at the Flinders Medical Centre has been forced from its current location. The minister read out a press release from the Flinders Surgical Oncology Unit at Flinders Medical Centre written by spin doctors—not real doctors, spin doctors—who claim that the professor in charge of this assessment clinic, Professor Neil Piller, is supporting the move.

Professor Piller is in Toronto at the moment presenting a paper on lymphoedema. He is a world authority on lymphoedema. I cannot speak to Professor Piller at the moment. I have put a call into him. I am expecting a call back. I would like to get his firsthand view on this, not the spin doctors' point of view from Flinders Medical Centre. I have just spoken to his staff who I believe genuinely believe that Dr Piller has been forced into this position.

He may not have jumped up and down and said, 'We're not going to go. We're not going to go.' This is an absolute outrage, because he has been forced to go. Many academics are forced into these positions because they have research grants and they have research programs in jeopardy. They are forced to accept a fait accompli. There is no way that I will believe for one second that Professor Neil Piller is supporting this move away from Flinders Medical Centre.

The Flinders Medical Centre website (which I have downloaded) talks about the Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic. It talks about how people can be referred from the Flinders Medical Centre. A general practitioner can refer them. The website states that internal referrals from medical officers are also accepted. It also talks about the location of the assessment clinic: it is on the ground floor of the car park building at the Flinders Medical Centre. The website states that 'clinical trials may be held in ward areas'. It is hand in glove.

The Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic is hand in glove with the Flinders Medical Centre, and also with Flinders University. The private patients who go there are forced to go there. Why? Because there is no public service that is at this level. Sure, some therapists are out there who do assist in the treatment of lymphoedema. Let us not forget that lymphoedema affects 300,000 Australians. I do not know the figure in South Australia.

With respect to third stage lymphoedema, we would all be familiar with those graphic pictures of people with elephantitis, because that is what lymphoedema is in its extreme. A chap from Broken Hill told me today that he could not get his pants on because his legs were that fat and

that swollen because of lymphoedema. He came down from Broken Hill. He has been travelling for over 20 years to visit Professor Piller and his therapist. He is now able to have a normal life. He told me today that he would be in a wheelchair if it was not for this assessment clinic.

This assessment clinic may be a private clinic working in a public hospital, but it is providing excellent services to South Australians who do not have the facilities in a public hospital. I do not believe for one moment that Professor Piller is supporting a move away from that facility. Why would he when there are referrals from medical officers from Flinders Medical Centre being accepted? Trials are being done in the wards of Flinders Medical Centre. It goes hand in glove.

This is not something that the opposition is making up. I have spoken to the staff, I have spoken to the patients. I believe them. I don't believe the spin doctors from the media unit at the Flinders Medical Centre. I am waiting to speak to Professor Piller, and I will be very, very surprised—as will his staff, as will his patients—if he is supporting this move in any way whatsoever.

For the government to say that this is a private decision by a private doctor is in theory right, but what precipitated it? That is the question. It is the lack of support from this government for an essential service, a world-class service, being delivered by world-class physicians and also being supported by excellent staff.

This is the fourth report with respect to the eating disorder unit at 4G. We had reports in 2007, 2009, 2010 and now we have 2011, and all those reports talk about a statewide eating disorder unit. But, apart from the latest report, every other report talks about keeping the eating disorder patients (who in many cases are young women) away from severely mentally ill patients, and I congratulate the government on reversing that stupid decision about putting them in Margaret Tobin.

The report talks about having a specialist eating disorder unit in the hospital, not some community placement out there. That may be possible later on, but you need a specialist eating disorder unit in the hospital, and 4G has been providing that. One of the recommendations was that the number of beds in 4G be expanded. If there are other patients in there (and I believe there are), well, move them out. Make 4G a specialist unit. Respect that and respect the Lymphoedema Assessment Clinic.

PHOTOGRAPHIC FILM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24): Today my remarks will reflect on the demise of photographic film and the rise of new technologies. Over the past 12 months or so, buying film has become more difficult, and now my local, the Clovercrest Photo Shop across the road from the Florey electorate office, has closed, a victim of competition from the big stores that so many small businesses cannot sustain and new technology. Photo terminals have popped up in chain stores and led to changes in customer habits and turnover volume.

My love of photography came early in life and fills much space in my office and home. Many here will know that I have been taking large numbers of photos for my entire parliamentary life, chronicling the history of my duties in my electorate and the state, my party and, of course, this place. For 12 of those 14 years, Sue and Kevin Henderson have sold me cameras, film and batteries and developed and reprinted all my photographs. They are wonderful people for whom nothing was too much trouble, and they will be missed by many in the Modbury area.

They diversified their business into framing, scrapbooking and much more, but it was too hard to compete with the big chains who can provide photos now for 10¢ a copy. Prior to Sue and Kevin, I used Kodak and then Smith's after a rebadging of the store at Tea Tree Plaza, and I owe much to Stephen Burgess, now a friend through the Port Adelaide Caledonian Society, and then, following on from Stephen, Christine Jeffries, now a mum at Good Shepherd Lutheran School not far from our office. She looked after me prior to me switching to the Clovercrest Photo Shop. Interestingly, the Tea Tree Plaza Smith's outlet closed some years ago, when digital cameras first came onto the market.

In a previous life, I had much to do with a video library and watched Beta versus VHS. Despite those in the know saying that Beta was a much better format, it soon vanished—yet another example of how new technologies leave devastation in their wake.

It reminds me also of how things can work in reverse. Thank goodness cinemas still exist, although many now are in multiscreen complexes but, as we will see, the sale of DVDs through stores is having a harsh impact on video libraries, and they too may soon be a victim. Books, of

course, are facing the same sort of period of change, and I for one am confident that my inclination will always be for hard copy—again, a habit my staff can attest to—with archiving being one of my favourite undertakings.

But, back to film and cameras, the Eastman Kodak Company marketed the world's first flexible roll of film in 1888. At the turn of the 21st century, shutterbugs around the world were buying close to a billion rolls of film a year; this year, it will be reduced to a mere 20 million rolls. It is thought, based on these figures, that film will have all but disappeared by the end of the decade. I myself fully embraced the lure of instant gratification last month and finally switched to using my digital camera full-time.

Due to film photography's long history of widespread use, there are now around one trillion pictures on photographic film or photographic paper in the world, enough to cover an area of around 10,000 square kilometres or about half the size of Wales, which is where the guru in IT and photography in the Florey electorate office—my wizard, Wendy Herbert—hails from.

Kodak remains the world's biggest film manufacturer, with Japan's Fuji close behind, but the consumer and professional films they make have dwindled to a precious few dozen film stocks in a handful of formats, becoming one more factor in the mammoth drop-off in film processing. Sadly, there are so many digital images taken every day, especially with the new mobile media, that will never be developed or even downloaded into an album, and much will be missed through the loss of sharing of images, and quality will always be another factor.

With the film market shrinking by more than 20 per cent annually, most signs point downhill, but ironically it is film's newest fans—not unlike music aficionados who swear by vinyl records—who are being drawn together by the rise of the internet. The technology that enabled the demise of film is actually helping to keep it relevant with specific types of users. It is prized by advanced amateur photographers and a smattering of professionals who specialise in nature, travel, scientific, documentary, museum, fine art and forensic photography—those who still want to be photographers rather than computer technicians.

Regardless of the type of photography used, there can be no doubt about the power of the image, both still and moving. After the turn of the 20th century and the birth of photos, postcards were in huge supply. Suffragettes used images on postcards as a powerful campaign tool in their fight to win the right to vote, and we are fortunate to have some of their images currently on display here in Centre Hall.

Of course, it was the powerful images of the cruel treatment of Australian cattle in Indonesian abattoirs that caused a massive public outcry resulting in a review of the live cattle industry. Although no-one condones animal cruelty, and we all recognise there must be reforms made in this industry, my heart goes out to all involved who have been affected. I have long been a supporter of Australian food producers and manufacturers, and I have recently produced an updated Australian products guide which was distributed to Florey residents.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Florey, and I understand you are going through a real grieving process about the loss of your film camera.

Ms BEDFORD: I am.

The SPEAKER: I hope this is part of your grieving process. The member for Flinders.

MORTLOCK SHIELD FOOTBALL CARNIVAL

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:29): I rise today to talk about a community event. It is a good news story and what I would like to talk about is an event that has become an institution on Eyre Peninsula: the annual Mortlock Shield Football Carnival.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr TRELOAR: It is obviously well known around the state. It is held in Port Lincoln every June long weekend. The first carnival was held way back in 1936, and it has been played continually now for some 75 years. In fact, my maternal grandfather played in that first carnival 75 years ago in 1936. The carnival was not held every year until after the war years but, as I said, it has become such an institution around the Eyre Peninsula that that particular weekend is not known by us as the Queen's Birthday holiday weekend or even the June long weekend, but rather it is known universally across the peninsula as the Mortlock Shield weekend or simply as Mortlock.

It is a competition where all the football leagues from across EP come together and compete for a shield that was donated originally by Mr W. Mortlock, a local identity and landowner. There has been expansion and consolidation of sporting clubs on Eyre Peninsula over the years as there has been right throughout regional South Australia. However, I can tell you that the teams and associations that competed in this year's carnival just two weeks ago were the leagues from Port Lincoln, Great Flinders, Eastern Eyre, Mid West and Far West. We were pleased to have along this year Kangaroo Island, who have been represented in the past and have rejoined the competition this year. They have made a commitment for another three years, so that is terrific.

Leagues that have come and gone in the past include Streaky Bay, Kimba, County Jervois, Le Hunte, Lincoln Districts, Lincoln City, Central Eyre and even, Madam Speaker, Whyalla had a representative team there for some time. There is no doubt that the success of the carnival is due to spectators coming from all over Eyre Peninsula. I understand that it is the longest-running carnival of its type in South Australia, and what it does is reflect the importance of sport generally, but football in particular, to country communities. Football generally goes hand-in-hand with netball throughout the countryside and results in an excellent family day out, often culminating with tea at the clubrooms.

The rapid rise in popularity of Australian Rules football has always intrigued me. From those early days in Victoria in the 1850s, we had league teams here in Adelaide by 1870, and invariably one of the first social events that the early settlers undertook was to form local football clubs. Many of our local clubs on Eyre Peninsula have already or are about to celebrate their centenary. Indeed, the football league that I have had close involvement with over the years, Great Flinders, is celebrating its centenary this year and we did so with a recent game against old rivals Port Lincoln at the Cummins Oval. Unfortunately for us, Lincoln won convincingly.

Interleague games on the Eyre Peninsula began way back in 1909 prior to the Mortlock Shield but it was a precursor, a forerunner, to the Mortlock Shield. A team from the district surrounding the Cummins township, which was in those days very much undergoing early settlement, ventured all the way to Lincoln on the train. They wore black and white and played two games against the Port Lincoln Football League.

They were known as the Mallee Whackers which you can take as you like, I guess, but in those days I understand it was in reference to the amount of time spent clearing the Mallee scrub to bring that land into production. Once again, I had a predecessor, an ancestor, playing in that team. In fact, my great-grandfather played in that team. They played two games against Port Lincoln, won both games and had a great weekend in the big smoke.

Many good footballers have come from Eyre Peninsula. Many have gone on to play VFL, South Australian National Football League and AFL and a lot of those had their first opportunity at the next level of the game playing in that Mortlock Shield weekend which is often well attended by spotters from the various league clubs and, without naming them all, we have had good representation over the years in football at the highest level. Congratulations to the Mortlock Shield on 75 years and we look forward to a long future ahead of us.

COUNTRY AMBULANCE STATIONS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:35): I am talking about country ambulance stations today, but I might just carry on with the subject that the member for Flinders was talking about. It was my great pleasure on Saturday afternoon to head out to the footy in Melrose to see BMW, which is Booleroo-Melrose-Wilmington, play Jamestown-Peterborough. The member for Stuart was out at the game as well. I was the only one there with a Willunga footy club stubby holder, but I was supporting BMW for the day because that is the team of the local member and we were in Melrose. Always safest to stick with the locals. Unfortunately, BMW went down, but Jamestown-Peterborough has a pretty good team this year.

It was a really high level of football and I concur with the member for Flinders' comments that country football, and indeed netball, really are the focal point of the community. People come in each Saturday afternoon from the farms and outlying areas around the towns and contribute and play footy. It is a bit of a pity that we have seen the population drain that we have out of country areas. Booleroo, Melrose and Wilmington were once rivals and then over the years they have had to merge as there have been fewer and fewer players out there.

I was in the Lower Flinders Ranges area to open two ambulance stations on Sunday. The first one was at Booleroo Centre. It is a purpose-built facility for those great ambulance volunteers who do so much work in the region and we were really pleased that the Booleroo Centre

ambulance service put in \$300,000 towards the new ambulance station. The total cost was \$1.1 million and the state government contributed the rest.

It was fantastic just to be able to say thank you to the volunteers, who not only are there when patients need to be transferred or when there is a crash scene or something else to attend, but they are also there for training, every Tuesday night in Booleroo Centre's case. At Orreroo it is a similar story: every Monday night the volunteers there, who are fewer in number than they would like to be, do their training. The local ambulance service there put in \$230,000 towards the \$1.1 million cost of their new ambulance station.

It is fantastic to see that these great professional volunteers now have professional surroundings in which to train and work out of. I am sure that will be a drawcard for more volunteers to come into the ambulance service. As I have said, they could do with more numbers, and we are hoping that a recruitment drive in the area will mean that they are soon joined by some rookie volunteers who will be trained up.

That part of the world is looking particularly good at the moment after a good start to the season, and it was good to see so many crops going in and growing well. It is one part of the state we have not got to yet on our tour around South Australia on the Grain Handling Select Committee, but we have heard from farmers from those regions who have come into meetings at Crystal Brook and into Clare. I think that is a very important select committee in terms of listening to what people have got to say in the regions and making sure that the mistakes of last season are not repeated again next season and in seasons into the future.

At the football the member for Stuart was kind enough to introduce me to a few people and mentioned my role as parliamentary secretary for health. I heard some good feedback from people. One particular man, a farmer who was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis in 1999, wanted to thank the government. He is on to his second gopher. He said he thought was lucky to get the first one, but when they replaced the one that had worn out he was delighted.

Sometimes it is just good to get out and listen to people and hear those good stories about how the decisions made in this place or in government departments really do affect people. In this gentleman's case it has given him mobility to get around on his farm for a lot more years than perhaps he would have otherwise had. He has had a local welder weld a frame onto it and he has an electric crane on the back of his ute, so he can lift it on and off with the crane. He was at the footy really enjoying himself.

We also climbed Mount Remarkable and walked through Alligator Gorge, and I want to pay tribute to the people from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources for the upkeep of both those tracks. Our national parks are something to be really proud of.

I went to Quorn, which is in the member for Giles's seat; a great town and really good to see so many tourist activities happening there. It is, along with Hawker, the gateway to the Northern Flinders Ranges. I might mention to the Speaker that there is a great pair of lizard-skin cowboy boots, made in Mexico and a fair few years old, in the Northern Emporium, one of those great stores that you find in regional South Australia. It is a beautiful store, where they not only serve good tea and coffee and Devonshire teas but they also have a range of old clothing, women's hats and men's boots and the like. I wish they had been bigger than size 10 (and I did try to get into them but they would not fit), but you might look good in those cowboy boots, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you member for Mawson. The mind boggles.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:40): It has long been recognised that the Premier has a penchant for celebrity. He loves to use taxpayers' money to fund his personal indulgences. His personal relationship with Lance Armstrong has been a huge cost to South Australian taxpayers, and we are still unsure about exactly how much this has cost us. The Thinkers in Residence program is another example of where the Premier has preferred to listen to those from outside South Australia rather than tap into the enormous expertise of those living within our state—maybe it is because he was not born here, maybe it is because he was not raised here, or maybe, more pertinently, it is because he does not plan on living here much longer and he is trying to increase his network of contacts interstate and overseas. Whatever the reason, South Australia is missing out.

His policy of neglecting South Australians is now infecting the entire Labor government. In recent days, we have learnt that the contract for the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval will be given to an interstate architecture firm. This government has also outsourced the Riverside redevelopment project to an interstate firm. South Australia has some of the largest architectural firms in the country; in fact, Hassell, Woodhead and Woods Bagot are all headquartered here in South Australia. These make up three of the largest architectural firms in Australia, and they bid on a large range of projects here, interstate and overseas. It seems incredible to me that South Australian firms can win much larger contracts interstate and overseas but that this government sees fit to award our iconic projects here in South Australia to interstate firms.

The contract for the Royal Adelaide Hospital was written in such a way that virtually makes it impossible for South Australian firms to submit a tender on this project. Yesterday, the Minister for Health in this house told us, incredibly, of the state government's decision to train future nurses for this state's health system not here in South Australia but, indeed, in Vietnam. This is simply unbelievable considering the extremely high youth unemployment rate we have here in South Australia. Then only last week we heard again from the health minister that he had outsourced all new advertising work to a Western Australian advertising firm called 303 Advertising.

Until about 12 months ago, all South Australian government television commercials had to be quoted by at least three production companies based here in South Australia. This is no longer the case. The latest WorkCover ads have been produced interstate. This is millions of dollars that have been removed from our economy, from our advertising industry and from creating employment here in South Australia. The state government is the largest individual client in the state's advertising sector. Previous work done by South Australian firms on government projects has won national awards, yet the health minister and this government are still willing to turn their back on our talented advertising community.

Unlike other states, we do not have a large publicly listed corporate sector. It is therefore more important here in South Australia that our government procurement does not undermine the business sector, it does not undermine our economy, and it does not undermine our jobs. This recent decision to send health department advertising work and architecture work out of South Australia is a huge blow to this sector and the wider South Australian economy. Firstly, it sends state government money to an interstate economy. Secondly, it reduces employment in these important sectors here and makes people think, 'Should I be actually going into this sector?' It creates a perception that to get a decent job in architecture or in advertising you need to move to an interstate firm. Thirdly, it sends a message to people aspiring to work in this sector, as I have just outlined. Fourthly, it sends a terrible message to the wider business community that our own government does not back South Australian business.

It is time for this government to back South Australia. It is time for this government to use its considerable procurement power to build this state and support our business sector. The previous treasurer called South Australians a bunch of whingers. There is an obvious disdain within the current government towards the business community in South Australia. There was absolutely nothing for them whatsoever in the budget handed down the week before last. It is time for change. It is time for them to stand up for business in South Australia and time to stand up for jobs. If this government does not want to back South Australians, why do they want to represent them in this parliament?

WOHLSTADT, MR M.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:45): On 1 June *The Advertiser* ran a story regarding the termination of the employment of the Town of Gawler's Director of Planning, Mr Michael Wohlstadt. The overall tone of the story was essentially that Mr Wohlstadt was a humble public servant who was the innocent victim of crossfire between the Town of Gawler and the state government.

Having worked alongside Mr Wohlstadt for some years and having been involved in the DPA processes that gave rise to the conflict between the Town of Gawler and the state government, I am in a good position to provide this house with some insight into this matter. I understand that Mr Wohlstadt has commenced or is about to commence legal action against the council alleging wrongful dismissal. Accordingly, I do not intend to address the issue of whether the dismissal was wrong or unlawful as that is the proper domain of the appropriate tribunal.

The whole affair raises three serious issues: firstly, the transparency and accountability of council decision-making; secondly, comparisons with the Peter Beare v Light Regional Council matter and the crisis at the City of Burnside last year in relation to governance structures; and,

thirdly, the accuracy of statements made to this parliament (albeit in the other place) by Mr Wohlstadt through a citizen's right of reply.

I can assure the house that Mr Wohlstadt is no shrinking violet and certainly no humble public servant. Mr Wohlstadt has always enjoyed playing politics so it is a gross distortion to suggest Mr Wohlstadt's role as director of planning was only to follow council instructions. I am saddened to say that in the court of public opinion Mr Wohlstadt's dismissal has been overwhelmingly well received. There are a few aggrieved by the council's decision, but the vast majority who have contacted my office have supported the council's action. I say 'sad' because Mr Wohlstadt is a very competent planner. However, his actions are not highly regarded by the community at large nor by his peers in the region.

Mr Wohlstadt advised the Legislative Council in his citizen's reply that at all times he followed council instructions and that he had not approached other landowners to invest in the council legal action against a former minister. Those statements are, at best, debatable, and, in all likelihood, inaccurate.

Additionally, there is evidence to suggest that Mr Wohlstadt went legal opinion shopping until he obtained the opinion that met his cause. There is also evidence that he withheld information from both the CEO and the council regarding the scope and extent of the legal advice obtained. I mention these two matters because there are a few local supporters of Mr Wohlstadt who have suggested that both the CEO and the council should accept full responsibility for the legal action. At one level this is correct and true; however, both the CEO and the council based their decision on advice provided to them. If the advice is skewed, so is the council decision.

Returning to the first point, the community will never know in its entirety what advice was given to council as it was provided behind closed doors. While it is appropriate for councils to consider matters in confidence from time to time, it does lead to a lack of transparency and accountability in decision-making. We do not know what was taken into account to arrive at this decision and who voted which way.

The meeting regulations can and should be amended to maximise transparency and accountability. I intend to hold discussions with both the minister for local government and the LGA to explore how this could be achieved. What this case has in common with the Peter Beare v Light Regional Council matter and Burnside council fiasco is that existing governance arrangements—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: My understanding is that the Peter Beare matter is before the court and therefore the member's speech may well influence what is before the court. My understanding is that the Peter Beare matter is not a matter that has been concluded by the court.

Mr PICCOLO: I will not be touching on that legal issue either, or the legal action.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Light, just hold on for a moment. The member for Davenport must have information that we are certainly not aware of here. I am not sure if you are aware of that information, but I suggest you be very, very careful about what you say.

Mr PICCOLO: Yes, Madam Speaker. What I suggest is that, given what has been said in the public domain, what this case has in common with both the Light Regional Council matter, which has been reported, plus the Burnside council matter, governance arrangements only work when reasonable people act reasonably. The governance structures are not robust enough to avoid bad decision making when very strong personalities are involved. This deficiency needs to be addressed.

The whole drama that is under consideration—this current drama regarding the Gawler council—will cost the Gawler ratepayers up to \$500,000, and it has also tarnished the reputation of a local family company who have been good corporate citizens within the region.

Time expired.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET 2011) BILL

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 11.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Treasurer, you mentioned that there is going to be an annual fee charged. Is it the intention to set the annual fee but charge it on a three or five-yearly basis so that the administration only has to send out an invoice once every three or five years, or is it the intention to charge and send out an invoice every year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In answer to the member for Davenport's question, I would expect it would be charged annually, but I will check with the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner and find out if that is how it expects it will do it. If it is not an annual fee, if it is not to be charged annually, then I will get back to the member and let him know.

I would ask that clauses 11 through to 17 be deferred and taken into consideration after clause 18.

Consideration of clauses 11 to 17 deferred.

Clause 18.

Mrs REDMOND: I move:

Page 9, lines 14 to 37 and page 10, lines 1 to 32 [clause 18, inserted section 189A]—

Delete inserted section 189A

We had a fair discussion in our party room about this, but really this amendment does not, we think, become a money bill. Indeed, we took advice about whether this was a money bill and reached the conclusion that it was not a money bill. The intention of the amendment as moved is to delete section 189A.

Clause 18 adds into the bill a provision as to costs generally, which is section 189, but then adds in 189A, 189B and so on, down through to 189E, I think is the last one. If you go through those, effectively there are a number of provisions in the existing act which are then repeated in the various parts of sections 189C, 189D and 189E, so that for the most part those are not really new, they are just repeating what is already in the legislation.

Sections 189A and 189B are really the crux of the matter. Section 189A is the section which reduces the court's discretion to award costs against police. The other part, section 189B, is basically the court enforcement fee. That section proposes to increase the court enforcement fee for cases where a defendant is found guilty. At the moment it is \$25, and the proposal of 189B is to increase that to \$100. The government says that will raise an extra \$13.4 million over the next three years and will continue to meet the costs of prosecuting in this state.

We are not objecting to that. If I can make it clear that of all the sections in there, the new 189 is replacing, I think, 189(1) as it is at the moment. The new section 189B is the court enforcement provision which is increasing the fee from \$25 to \$100, and we are not objecting to that. Sections 189C, 189D and 189E are simply repeating the equivalent provisions in the existing legislation. Our objection is simply to section 189A. Now, why do we object to that? Section 189A(1), in brief, provides:

If, in proceedings for an offence prosecuted by a police officer—

- (a) the Court dismisses the proceedings; or
- (b) the proceedings are withdrawn.

the Court may only make an order for costs in favour of the defendant if the Court is satisfied that...the order should be made.

The effect of it is that, if a person is prosecuted by the police in this state and is entirely successful, that person will not necessarily get their costs paid. It has been a fundamental principle of justice in this state over more years than any of us in this place have ever been here, that, if you go to court and you win, be it in a civil case or a criminal case, you will get your costs paid. They will not always be the whole of your costs, they will be costs according to the scale, and so on, but you will get at least a contribution, and it is significant that you are able to get your costs paid if you are in the right.

What this does is tantamount to creating a police state because it allows the police, without fear of any penalty whatsoever, on the slightest whim, to take a matter to court and put the person who is accused to the bother, the time, the cost and the inevitable stress of defending themselves against a police prosecution. Of course, they do not have usually all the wherewithal of the police, but they may well engage legal assistance at considerable expense; and no matter that they win

their case entirely, no matter that they are found absolutely innocent, they are not necessarily going to get their costs.

That is fundamentally objectionable, and it is for that reason that we are seeking to remove that provision from this particular piece of legislation. As we say, we have taken advice. It is not a money bill, and we are not persuaded that it is appropriate for this government to try to sneak this radical change into the rights of the individuals in this state into this legislation.

It is for those reasons that I am moving, on behalf of the opposition, that we delete new section 189A (and that is the amendment standing in my name) from this legislation. We consider that it is entirely inappropriate. In my reply to the budget I asked the question as to whether the Attorney-General was going to nail his colours to the mast over this, because I can tell the Attorney-General that there is a great deal of angst in the legal community about the idea that people can be dragged into court on the whim of the police, and, no matter how successful they are in defending themselves, the police are not going to be up for any of the costs of this matter.

I have a couple of questions that I want to ask the minister in relation to the clause of the bill as it stands, so I wonder whether it is appropriate for me just to conclude my remarks on my amendment, have the vote on that and then move onto my questions, or whether you would prefer me to ask my questions of the minister on the bill as it stands at the moment?

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Thompson): It will be simpler if we deal with the amendment and then proceed to questions on the whole clause.

Mrs REDMOND: In that case, I will just conclude my remarks on the amendment. I might just indicate briefly where I am going to have concerns, amongst other things, because one of the things that this proposal seems to do is simply take money out of one pocket and put it into another. I say this because a considerable number of people who are represented in our courts in matters which are being prosecuted by the police are indeed there on the basis that they have obtained legal aid.

To obtain legal aid in this state in this day and age is pretty difficult. When I was in practice many years ago it used to be the case that you could get legal aid over a range of issues. These days, almost exclusively, you will get legal aid only for criminal matters, and, if you do get that legal aid, you will have to get it by showing that you are virtually unable in any other way to get your own legal representation. So, it is really the people who are the most vulnerable in the state who do get legal aid, and I used to do a lot of that sort of work. There are a lot of people who are out there who need to be represented by legal aid in order to have any representation should their matter go to court.

What would normally happen at the moment is that a person goes to court and they are represented by legal aid—they may have had to make some small contribution to their legal costs, but usually only a very nominal amount. They go to court, they are represented by a solicitor from the Legal Services Commission, and that person then, if they are successful, applies for costs, and those costs are awarded by the court, and the money then has to be paid to the Legal Aid lawyer, who of course is in receipt of that on behalf of the Legal Services Commission.

The effect of that, it seems to me, is taking money out of one pocket, that is, the police, who have lost the matter, and paying it to the solicitor for the Legal Services Commission. That seems to me to be pretty much taking it out of one pocket of the government and putting it into the other. But there is a question to be asked about the fact that the government says that they are going to save \$1.6 million—and I think it is \$1.6 million per year—by this measure.

One of the questions which I think must inevitably arise is whether that is a gross figure, as it were, a figure just on the extra people beyond the Legal Services Commission, or whether that is a figure that relates to people including the Legal Services Commission clients, because, as I say, a lot of the money that transfers, transfers from one pocket to the other of the government.

One of the other interesting factors here is whether it diminishes the police accountability in this state. Our view of the matter is that it does significantly reduce police accountability, because it means that the police are going to be able to take a prosecution without any fear that, no matter how much it costs the person defending themselves, they will be able to continue to prosecute regardless of the likely prospects of success, and regardless of what that pursuit may do.

I know that there are people in this state who have been pursued in legal prosecutions who have literally had to lose their house because of the costs of defending themselves. In fact, Tom Easling springs to mind in that regard.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: He didn't lose his house.

Mrs REDMOND: He didn't quite lose his house. It cost him \$2 million in costs, though, because of a prosecution by the state against him, which was ultimately unsuccessful on every single count. That was not, I think, a police prosecution but, nevertheless, there is certainly ample evidence that many people spend a considerable amount of money defending themselves.

As I say, they are not necessarily going to get back all of their money in going through the normal processes and getting costs awarded in the normal way, because they will only get costs awarded according to the scale. Nevertheless, it is significantly impeding the access to justice in this state if people have the possibility that they will face considerable financial penalty, with no recompense from the government, no matter how innocent they may be ultimately be shown to be.

I also think there is probably less incentive to finalise a case where, perhaps, costs could be used—you know, there is cooperation that no costs will be sought if there is an early resolution of the matter and so on. It may even be that there could be an increase in civil actions against SAPOL from lawyers seeking costs.

But, in any event, I do take the view, and the entire parliamentary side of the Liberal Party takes the view, that it is inappropriate, fundamentally wrong, and entirely unjustifiable for this government to say that it is going to achieve a saving of \$1.6 million a year and put it through as a budget measure, when what they are really doing is so heavily impeding the rights of the citizens of this state to have what people everywhere, I think, in modern, civilized communities anyway, should expect, and that is the right to recover at least their scale costs in the matter of a police prosecution, should they manage to show themselves to be innocent, or even not guilty. For those reasons, I move the amendment in my name which involves the deletion of the inserted section 189A into the bill.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The government is opposed to the amendment. It is interesting to hear the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I cannot agree with them. What this bill effectively does is just make consistent for summary offences what already applies to higher criminal offences that are heard in the District and Supreme Courts. As the member for Davenport would know, with Mr Easling, if you are acquitted in a criminal matter that is heard in the District or Supreme Court, you are not entitled to recover costs. The effect of the bill is to make consistent with summary offences what already happens with those higher indictable offences.

If the Leader of the Opposition thinks it is such an injustice that people who are acquitted of an offence in a court have to bear their own costs, then perhaps the Liberal Party at the next election might be taking a policy that people acquitted in the District or Supreme Court of an offence be entitled to recover their costs against the Crown. It would be a very courageous policy, I have to say, and I would be very pleased to see the Leader of the Opposition have the courage of her strongly held convictions and take such a policy to the electorate and let the electorate decide.

For the time being, until a Redmond government is elected and until the Leader of the Opposition has her way and those people who lose their cases in the Supreme or District Court or are acquitted of an offence can recover their costs, the government believes that it makes sense for there to be consistency and that if you are acquitted of a summary offence in the Magistrates Court then the same principle should apply as if you were acquitted of an indictable offence in the District or Supreme Court.

I must say that if you have to appear on a charge in a higher court, the costs which you have to bear and which this parliament expects you to bear on your own, regardless of whether you are acquitted or found guilty, are much higher, one would normally expect, than if you were charged with a summary offence where the costs you are likely to have to bear are going to be much lower.

The government does not agree with the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. We think this is a sensible measure. It will enable scarce resources to be put into policing, into police officers, into doing the job that police officers have to do in detecting criminal offences and bringing criminals to justice, rather than having to pay out costs awarded against them in the Magistrates Court. We think this is quite sensible and we do not agree with the opposition's amendment.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: As the committee knows, I am not legally qualified and I have not had a lot to do with the courts, as luck would have it, but it just seems to me that the Treasurer's contribution does need to be answered in this context. The existing system where costs are

awarded has been in place for many years. No government up until the Snelling budget has sought to change that provision, not in the Foley crisis budget of last year—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It wasn't introduced in last year's budget, I don't think. It might have been a Sustainable Budget Commission issue.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So it was a savings measure in last year's budget. Right. For the previous eight years of the Rann government this almighty principle that is now being argued apparently was not such an injustice. It has only become an unfair system in the government's mind in the last budget or, if you take the Treasurer at his word, in the budget last year. It just seems to me that the system has worked pretty well and the only reason the government is doing this is for a cost measure, a savings measure, and not looking at it as a justice measure.

The interesting thing about it is the Treasurer says that the \$1.6 million will go back to police. That is not my understanding of the budget savings measures. My understanding of the budget savings measures is ultimately that they are exactly that, they are budget savings, so the money is not spent and any savings go back into general revenue and could end up anywhere. The police budget is not being increased by \$1.6 million a year because they are saving that money out of their prosecutions. My understanding of the budget savings measures is that, if the police do make this \$1.6 million worth of savings, it will ultimately go back into the general revenue pool as part of the Treasurer's savings task to try to bring the budget back into surplus. I do not think the Treasurer's argument is necessarily true on that basis.

I also support the Leader of the Opposition's position that this particular measure is hardly a true budget measure. It is attached to the budget bill. There is a trap or technique, which is a better word, used by treasurers to tag non-budgetary measures to budget bills, because there is a protocol that exists, of course, that the government gets its budget. So, if you attach a non-budget measure to a budget bill you try to sneak it in on the back of the budget bill. That is exactly what this is. This is not about a tax or a levy or a licence fee. It is about a saving that might be made if we change the justice system. That, quite rightly, should be debated separately from the budget, and that is why the leader has taken the position she has, and that is why the Liberal Party is supporting that position.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: My answer to the member for Davenport about why this has suddenly become an issue, why this has not been an issue for eight years of the Labor government, simply is this: in 2002-03 costs awarded against police for these sorts of matters amounted to \$461,072.36; in 2009-10, that has risen to just under \$3 million (\$2,933,639.57). The police are having costs awarded against them on such an increasing scale that I would much rather that money be spent on policing than be awarded against police by magistrates. The issue is that the Magistrates Court has such a wide discretion that on even relatively trivial technicalities the police are finding that they are having costs awarded against them and on an increasing scale. So, it is simply because the cost has, over the time of the government, increased roughly sixfold that this has now become an issue.

Mrs REDMOND: All that the Treasurer has said simply indicates that the police are not being successful in their prosecutions; hence they are trying to find an easy way out of having to face the consequences of taking unjustifiable matters to court or not prosecuting them appropriately. That should not be the way justice is administered in this state. That is the reason we are moving this amendment—that is simply the wrong way to go at it. As the member for Davenport said, we should be about the delivery of justice, and how can it be just to say that because the police are becoming increasingly inefficient at managing their own prosecutions and succeeding in their own prosecutions, and the court is therefore awarding more and more costs against them because they are becoming increasingly inept, why then should we change the system that has been in place for so long to allow those who have been forced into court by those very police to not recover their costs? That simply makes no sense and is unjustifiable.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, it is not, because, in the Leader of the Opposition's words, 'the police are inept' whatsoever, and I think those words will come back to haunt her. The fact is that the successful prosecution rate is about 80 per cent and it has remained at 80 per cent and it has not changed significantly. What is driving this increasing cost is the increasing tendency of the Magistrates Court to award costs on relatively minor grounds. That is what has driven the increase

in costs, not, as the Leader of the Opposition alleges, because the police are in any way inept. The successful prosecution rate—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I would be very careful if I were the member for Norwood, because the Leader of the Opposition has really just scored an own goal. The simple fact is that the successful prosecution rate is about 80 per cent and it has remained consistent over that time. That is not what is driving the increase in costs being awarded against the police whatsoever.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Piccolo): Is this your last round?

Mrs REDMOND: Mr Acting Chairman, I did not call a point of order before when the Treasurer got a second chance, but we are technically dealing with my amendment, so I actually get the last word on my amendment.

The ACTING CHAIR: Go ahead then.

Mrs REDMOND: I absolutely accept the 20 per cent figure. If that is what the Treasurer says is the rate, then that's fine. Then what the increase reflects is the increased cost to the innocent people out there who are taken to court. Whether they are part of the 20 per cent or some other figure, it is an increased cost to them. Generally, the court does not award all of the costs, but if the award of the costs for the 20 per cent of police prosecutions that are unsuccessful has gone up to \$3 million, that is because it costs so much more for the individual to go to court. And that is yet more evidence as to why this is an unjustifiable thing because the individuals involved are, therefore, having to pay a much higher figure as the years go by to defend themselves against prosecutions by the police.

The committee divided on the amendment:

AYES (17)

Brock, G.G.
Goldsworthy, M.R.
Pederick, A.S.
Redmond, I.M. (teller)
Treloar, P.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Evans, I.F.
Griffiths, S.P.
Pengilly, M.
Sanderson, R.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Williams, M.R.

Gardner, J.A.W.
Marshall, S.S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Such, R.B.
Venning, I.H.

NOES (22)

Bedford, F.E.
Caica, P.
Hill, J.D.
Koutsantonis, A.
Portolesi, G.
Rau, J.R.
Thompson, M.G.
Wright, M.J.

Bignell, L.W.
Conlon, P.F.
Kenyon, T.R.
O'Brien, M.F.
Rankine, J.M.
Sibbons, A.L.
Vlahos, L.A.

Breuer, L.R.
Geraghty, R.K.
Key, S.W.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rann, M.D.
Snelling, J.J. (teller)
Weatherill, J.W.

Majority of 5 for the noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mrs REDMOND: I have a question for the Treasurer. As I mentioned when I was speaking on the proposed amendment, a number of police prosecutions are undertaken against people who are funded by the Legal Services Commission. Can he provide any information on the extent to which the savings that will be made by the police in not having to pay the prosecution costs in an unsuccessful prosecution will in turn then be visited as extra costs to be borne by the Legal Services Commission because they will not recover the costs that they would otherwise have done in that event?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We do not have any exact figures. We will have to wait until the legislation is in operation and we will have a better idea about what effect it might have on the Legal Services Commission. We will work closely with them. However, I am advised that the

general practice is that the Legal Services Commission do not make claims for costs in these cases. If they are successful in an acquittal, they generally do not make an application for costs. So, we do not expect that this is going to have much of an impact on the Legal Services Commission. However, we will monitor the situation and liaise closely with the Legal Services Commission in case it does.

Mrs REDMOND: Prosecutions are from time to time conducted by other departmental officers—control officers or authorised officers of various sorts. Why is it that police are singled out by this provision? What is it about the principle of police prosecutions that the government has decided is different from the prosecutions conducted by other departmental officers?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Essentially, because this is a budget measure that is targeted at reducing expenses to the police. It is so that the police can prioritise their resources towards detecting criminal activity rather than on having to pay out costs in these sorts of situations.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: There are two things that I want explained. The Treasurer said earlier that the current cost is \$3 million a year. How is the saving only \$1.6 million? If you are taking away costs then surely the saving must be \$3 million? Secondly, is the Treasurer saying that the police are going to save this and spend it in other areas and therefore it is not part of the savings task, it is not part of the \$1.6 million a year contribution to the savings task?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The saving is based on the 2008-09 figure of costs awarded against police, so the saving may be greater than the \$1.6 million which is indicated in the budget. With regard to the second part of the member for Davenport's question, if this saving was not found by this measure it would have to be found by some other measure in SAPOL and inevitably that would mean that the police would have less resources to detect criminal activity and bring criminals to justice.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Earlier, the Treasurer used figures of about \$300,000 or \$400,000 at one point and now the costs have climbed to about \$3 million, and he is saying that there is an 80 per cent success rate of police prosecutions. What is the number of prosecutions where the costs were at the lower figure and what is the number of prosecutions now?

While your adviser is getting that information you might be able to answer this one for me, just so that I can explain this to my constituents. I assume that if someone gets a speeding fine and wishes to contest it that, if they are lucky enough to have it overturned, under this provision they are not able to claim costs, whereas previously if the magistrate was so convinced they were able to claim costs.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will answer the second part of the member for Davenport's question first. Yes, the member for Davenport is correct, if you elect to be prosecuted and not pay the expiation then it is the same as any other prosecution, and if you are acquitted of that prosecution then, yes, under this provision you would not be entitled to recover costs.

As far as the figures are concerned, we have the figures available for two years, and, for the other years, I am more than happy to get back to the member for Davenport. For the year 2008-09, the total number of cases was 63,255; for 2009-10, the total number of cases was 57,618. You wanted to know how many of those had costs awarded against them?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The number of prosecutions in each case and how many had costs awarded against them.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In 2008-09, in 1 per cent of the 63,255 cases the court awarded costs against the police. In 2009-10, of the 57,618 cases 2 per cent of cases had costs awarded against the police. That is for those two years.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Sorry, was it about 2 per cent of 63,000? So, 10 per cent of 63,000 is 6,300. We are talking about 2,000—not even that. You are talking about 1,200 cases.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Over two years, yes.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: What is the average cost awarded against? Can you tell me the average cost. I want the answer on the average cost. Let me explain it this way, Treasurer: what you are saying to every speeding motorist is that, if you want to contest your expiation notice, which, at the lowest level is now \$252, you have the great opportunity to go to court and incur more costs and, even if you win, you are not going to get your costs back.

It is going to cost you more to go to court and take the risk of having court costs than it will the fine. The reality is that I have dealt with the police Expiation Notice Branch with disputes, and they are not always as fair as I think they can be. I want to know: if you have got 63,000 and 2 per cent of those have costs awarded against them, 10 per cent of it is 6,300, so 2 per cent of it is around 1,200; and 1,200 into \$3 million will give you the average cost, and that is going to be more than your \$252 traffic fine.

The point I make is that, when he stands up and talks about what happens in other criminal matters, the Treasurer is talking about serious criminal matters. We just make the point that this is going to impact on ordinary, everyday South Australians, and hundreds of thousands of them, because how are they going to really contest a speeding fine if it is going to cost them more to take the chance in the court than the speeding fine itself?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: For the benefit of the member for Davenport with regard to his earlier question, for the year 2005-06, there were 502 files in which costs were awarded against the police and which represented 0.7 per cent of the total files. The total amount was \$747,054. The average, which the member for Davenport is interested in, is \$1,488.15. For 2006-07, there were 456 files and it was in 0.62 of a per cent of the files where costs were awarded against the police. The total amount of money was \$876,341.33. The average cost per file was \$1,921.80.

In 2007-08 there were 548 files, and in 0.76 of a per cent of the files, costs were awarded against the police. This represented a cost of \$1,161,551.05. The average cost per file was \$2,119.61. In 2008-09, there were 755 files. In 1.06 per cent of files, costs were awarded against police. It came to a total of \$1,660,351 and the average cost per file was \$2,199.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I have had a little bit of experience in these matters. Mr Treasurer, the bottom line, in my view, is that this is designed to discourage people from exercising their legal right, in a society which is still somewhat democratic, to contest a matter. What you are seeking to do is to make it even more difficult for someone to challenge a system.

We heard Justice Hora talking about penalising lawyers who delayed matters. Well, the Crown can delay matters too; that is one of their tactics, so that they inflict additional costs on someone who is challenging a matter in court. So, the bottom line (and I would like you to respond to this) is that this is designed to reduce and restrict the rights of a citizen so that the currently partially level playing field, in terms of court procedures and outcomes, is made even more uneven than the current situation.

That is why the Law Society and others are extremely concerned about this matter. It seems part of a process where we seem to be moving more and more to an authoritarian-type state, which is completely contrary to the principles that have been established over a long period of time, and which have always been referred to as British justice. I would like you to respond to the accusation that this is simply about trying to deter people from exercising a right in a system which is already geared against them.

It is difficult and costly now for someone to challenge the system, particularly when, for example, during a court case, the police will threaten to bring expensive witnesses to put additional costs on a person if they lose the case. My reading of this is that it is another step towards whittling away the rights of citizens, which have been won at great cost over a long period of time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is designed to do one thing, and that is to allow police to spend more money doing what the South Australian public expect them to do, and that is to detect criminal offences and bring criminals to justice. At the moment, there is a cost pressure in South Australia Police because, contrary to the assertions of the Leader of the Opposition, who says it is because the police are inept, the police are more frequently having costs awarded against them than has previously been the case and are having higher costs awarded against them as well.

The latest figure I have, which I think was 2009-10, states that cost pressure in the police was about \$3 million, whereas in the past it has been but a fraction of that. I would much rather the police have that \$3 million to spend on doing what the South Australian public expect them to do, and that is to detect criminal offences and to bring criminals to justice. That is why the government is bringing this bill to the parliament and seeking to do this.

It is consistent with what happens in the higher courts, in the District Court and the Supreme Court. If you are acquitted of an offence, you are not entitled, normally, to a recovery of costs. If you are acquitted, you have to bear your own costs. It simply makes consistent for summary offences what exists for indictable offences in the higher courts. It enables the police to

concentrate their resources on doing what they do best and that is bringing criminals to justice and keeping our communities safe.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The fact that something exists in another level of the court system does not mean that that is correct either. I do not see why we should extend a principle that is questionable in a higher court to a lower court. Just from my own experience, mine was a relatively minor traffic matter—I do not generally regard speeding generally as a minor issue, but I do when I believe you are falsely accused—that cost me something like \$14,000 in the Magistrates Court for the lawyer. If I had been speeding, I would have paid the \$300, because \$300 beats \$14,000 anytime.

So, what are people going to do? The system is designed to discourage people from appealing, and the police say that quite openly to people who are thinking about challenging, because the way the system operates at the moment—just using expiation cases—you do not get the expiation notice until something like seven months after the alleged offence, after the time you have to decide whether or not you are going to contest it in court. So, you have a system that is geared against the citizen from day one.

Then, to cap matters off, if it is an expiable offence, if you pay it no-one knows about it so judges and others can pay it in secret and no-one knows, whereas if you lose in the Magistrates Court you get a conviction because it is a criminal matter. So, not only do you get the lawyer's costs—in my case, \$14,000—you get a conviction, you get court costs and you get the penalty as well. If you think that is a system of fairness and justice, then I would question the values that this government asserts, because the system is anything but fair.

I would be less concerned about this if the government was prepared to look at measures that helped avoid people going to court through a process that was less costly like they have in New South Wales, where disputed expiations can be considered by an independent panel. Victoria is setting up a commissioner to look at some of these matters. I would be less concerned if there were cheaper alternatives where people could have their grievance heard without having to go to court. But the answer from the police is, 'You take us to court.' Nothing comes out of their pocket; they don't care how long the court case drags on. They don't care.

In my case, I think there were about 11 visits to the court. The police officer took leave so that he could go to Europe for a funeral. There is no concern about the costs imposed on the person challenging the system. So I just repeat that I would be happier if you were advocating a cheaper option where issues could be dealt with without having to go through the costly and time-consuming business of taking the matter to court.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: This is my final contribution on this point, and I also want to support the member for Fisher in his comments. I personally have not had the experience of going to court to defend an expiation notice, but I have certainly had lots of expiation notices that I have taken up on behalf of constituents. I will just give you one example.

I had a gentleman come to see me who had not had an offence in over 40 years, and he got picked up for speeding going through a red light camera at a crossing. He was not picked up for going through a red light; he was picked up for speeding through the crossing. As luck would have it, when you get a red light camera and you write to the Expiation Notice Branch and ask for the photos, you get two photos, one second apart.

It just so happens in this case that on the first photo, the back wheel of the car was on the white line. On the second photo, the back wheel of the car had not reached the other white line, so you could actually reference how far he had travelled, or not travelled, in one second. He went down to measure from the white line to the white line, and it worked out that even if he had travelled between the two white lines (which the photos clearly showed he had not), the most he could have been doing was 64. He was booked at 68, even though he had not travelled that distance. It was physically impossible for that photo to be accurate.

We wrote to the Expiation Notice Branch saying, 'Hey, withdraw it.' We offered to go down there and measure it with them, and the answer we got back was, 'Bad luck, take your chances in court.' I just make the point that the member for Fisher makes: not only are the fines increasing but the Expiation Notice Branch knows that if they say this to the taxpayer a lot of them will not take a day off to sit around in a court. One issue is the cost, and the other issue now is that you are going to get hit with costs as well. Where is the pressure on the Expiation Notice Branch to look at each issue on its merits? I mean no disrespect, but I have had some experience.

I know of another guy who was picked up by a speed camera on Main North Road or Lower North East Road, and when he sourced all the information from the Expiation Notice Branch the camera was in two different locations, according to the documentation. The camera was in two different locations—well, that is physically impossible. The Expiation Notice Branch said to this guy, who ran a small business, 'Go to court.' I support the principle outlined by the member for Fisher, that is, to me the system is even going to be more weighted against the average citizen in this particular case. You write to the commissioner on those matters, and ultimately the commissioner refers it to the Expiation Notice Branch, and that is where you get your response.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I might just point to one provision that is in this section and that is 189A(2)(b), which provides that 'where there was a failure to take appropriate steps to investigate a matter coming to, or within the knowledge of the prosecution' the court is given some discretion to award costs in the circumstances. So there is a provision there that in those circumstances, if something has come to the attention of the prosecution, the court has the discretion to impose costs. I point out—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The simple fact is that in the 1970s the road toll peaked and 372 people lost their lives in circumstances where the traffic volumes were about a third of what they are today. The road toll now sits at just over the 100 mark. A few years ago we managed to get under 100. Without a doubt—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am not saying that speed cameras are the only reason, but without a doubt—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There are members on the opposite side who came to me when I was road safety minister asking me to have speed cameras installed on school crossings in their electorates. It is all nice and convenient for you to say, 'Aren't speed cameras terrible?' but the simple fact is that when it is convenient for the opposition, and they have an issue in their electorate, they are the first ones coming to say, 'Please put a speed camera in this location.' You cannot have it both ways. The simple fact is that speed cameras have undoubtedly saved hundreds upon hundreds of lives. We would not be able to have the speed camera system if every single incidence of speeding had to go before a court and be prosecuted. It would put an enormous drain on the resources of the government and South Australian taxpayers. The system of expiation is not something that was invented by this government; it is something that has been around for a very long time. I have great esteem for the member for Fisher, but on this matter I could not disagree with him more profoundly.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The issue is that this will make it harder for people to contest matters in court. If the Treasurer is worried about the cost on the police force out of a budget of nearly \$700 million, reform the system so that people are not forced to go to court as a last resort to try to clear their name. Reform the expiation system. The government does not want to do that. You do not get the full expiation notice at the time of the offence. I am trying to get it changed so that they get it at least within seven days. In my case, I got the expiation notice seven months after the alleged offence.

Where are your witnesses? You find out when you get the notice seven months later that the police officer is claiming that he was 120 metres from where I understood he pulled me over. If you are worried about the cost on the police department, reform the system so people are not forced to go to court to try to clear their name. In my case there was no photo, no camera, and the officer said at half a kilometre approximately he could tell what speed I was doing. I defy anyone in here to be able to do that. No photograph, three dodgy certificates presented to the court—three dodgy certificates all different—whiteout on them, handwritten additions on the certificates and the court accepts it.

What is your bill going to do in that case? The magistrate will say it has been investigated properly, but has it followed procedures which are fair and followed due process of reasonableness and so on? Your provisions here under section 189A provide no protection or guarantee that the person taking legal action through the court will get a fair hearing and be dealt with fairly at all.

If you are concerned about the cost of the police department then reform the system so that, when people are issued with an expiation or any other type of penalty provision, it is fair, it is

open, it is transparent, they get the information up-front, and they can make a considered judgement about whether to contest it in court, not months after the closing date for deciding on whether or not you go to court.

You have to decide within 28 days whether to go to court. You get the information six months after that. That is ridiculous, and that is the system we have currently, and the police oppose giving full details at the time. The traffic police at the front line do not, they think it is a good idea, but you cannot get that detail until the police decide to give it to you, and they only give it to you if you go to court, and often that is seven months later.

Mrs REDMOND: The minister indicated that the number of prosecutions has increased but the proportion, according to him, has stayed the same, in terms of 80 per cent of police prosecutions being successful and 20 per cent being unsuccessful. It seems to me that, if it is not an increasing percentage of police prosecutions that are unsuccessful, the explanation for the massive cost increase is either because it is costing a lot more for the individual to go to court and, therefore, more costs are awarded or, as the minister asserts, the magistrates are actually awarding costs more readily.

I understand that to be the statement of the minister and the Treasurer, that the motivation for bringing this in is because the government perceives that magistrates are awarding the costs more readily in favour of a successful defendant in the court and, therefore, this is an attempt by the government to interfere with that process by means of a claimed budgetary measure. We do not accept that it is a budgetary measure.

I just want to clarify that that is the minister's position, that the government is seeking to address what it sees as an untoward magistracy in awarding these costs too readily in favour of successful defendants and that is the ill the government seeks to address in bringing in this measure.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The issue is that magistrates are willing to award costs too readily above the scale. That is what is driving the increase in costs which police are finding when they are having costs awarded against them. It is not necessarily that they are too readily awarding costs per se, but they are too readily awarding costs over the scale and that is what is driving the costs. The Leader of the Opposition asserts there is some sort of principle here. It is not the government that is doing this; if the legislation is passed it is the parliament and the parliament is perfectly within its rights to do so.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The Treasurer gave us some figures earlier about the number of prosecutions and the average costs. You may not have them now but, in between houses, given that you are doing this on the basis that magistrates are awarding costs above the scale, can the police officers, through you, advise us of the split between those costs that have been awarded on the basis of the scale costs and those that have been awarded above scale costs so that we can see the trend?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I do not have that information to hand, of course. It might be a bit hard to dig up what that information is. It is not information a record of which is necessarily kept, but I will have my officers or the officers of SAPOL see what they can find out and if there is information to be found we will provide it to the opposition.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I make two points: the government's whole assertion is that magistrates are awarding costs above the scale rate. I ask for the evidence of that because you must have had the evidence, Treasurer, because your own advice to this house is that this was announced 12 months ago, so you have had 12 months to collect the evidence and you would not have made the decision based on no evidence. The police, somewhere, must have sent you a minute saying, 'Here is the evidence to our claim.' So, we want to see the evidence to the claim.

The second point I make is that in your contribution you tried to paint the opposition as somehow being anti road safety. I want to correct the record: it is a nonsense to suggest that the opposition is anti road safety in that it criticises the procedures used by the Expiation Notice Branch.

As the member for Fisher quite rightly outlined in his argument and as I have outlined in mine, we are not criticising the expiation notice per se. We are criticising the process that follows, once someone receives an expiation notice. How then does the process deal with it? That is what we are critical of and that is not about a road safety measure. It is an administrative measure that is

meant to be treating citizens fairly. It is that issue that we are arguing, not whether road safety is in question. Naturally, we are in favour of road safety.

I also make the point to the Treasurer that, of course, the big killer in South Australia is not motor vehicle accidents, although they are significant. The big killer, of course, relates to the 1,200 people a year who die of smoking. For every one who dies on the road, 12 die of smoking.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: With regard to evidence, I will cite some examples of costs that have been awarded against the police that go above the scale. This is not precisely the information the member for Davenport is seeking, but he is seeking the basis upon which we are seeking this measure from the parliament, so I will cite some examples.

Benjamin Craig Hirst was awarded costs in the amount of \$90,683.64 by Mr Harris SM in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 6 September 2007. He had been charged with a number of offences, including indecent assault and indecent exposure. Henry Arkell was awarded costs in the amount of \$73,957 by Ms Tracey SM in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 17 December 2009. He had been charged with historic sexual offences. Lilya Flaks was awarded costs in the amount of \$54,606.17 by Mr Ackland SM in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 24 November 2009 on charges of theft and unlawful possession of paintings. Antonio Leo was awarded costs in the amount of \$26,496.75 by Mr Grasso SM in the Adelaide Magistrates Court on 27 June 2007.

These are examples of the sort of costs that we are seeing being awarded against the police way and above the scale of costs. It does not take too many of those sorts of costs being awarded against police to get the sort of cost figures that I am talking about. These, admittedly, are anecdotal, or a number of examples and not the precise figures, but this is the basis upon which the government is proceeding in this bill.

Mrs REDMOND: Further to the Treasurer's statement he just made, I take it that the Treasurer can confirm, though, that those people each managed to get an acquittal on the charges, and none of them received any more in costs, and possibly even received less in costs, than their bill for costs from the people who represented them in defending those matters.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Leader of the Opposition does not have to get narky. I did not say that these were not costs that they had not incurred. I am simply pointing out examples, given the member for Davenport's questions on the basis for which the government is proceeding, of where costs are awarded against the police and the sorts of costs that police are expected to bear way and above the scale of costs in the Magistrates Court and the basis upon which the government is proceeding with this bill.

Ms CHAPMAN: The question I have relates to the basis of this recommendation which, as I understand it from the second reading explanation, emanates from the Sustainable Budget Commission. In fact, it is detailed in the leaked sustainable budget report which is now in the public arena and which, therefore, of course, came under consideration by the group that was appointed, including Monsignor Cappelletti, who was a member of that commission.

The minister to some degree has identified, by examples of cases where there were quite substantial costs orders against the police, exactly why we have in the law a presumption, but still a discretion in the trial officer—usually a magistrate in this instance—where police are involved in the prosecution of offences. Essentially, unless a felony is committed where there is permission given for the prosecution of serious cases, some immunity for the Crown, whatever the officer is, whether it is a police officer or a prosecutor from the DPP's office, or the old Crown as we used to call it, there is a public good in ensuring that very serious offences are prosecuted, if there is reasonable evidence, and there should not be a fear in the prosecuting officer of an order for costs against them, and that is longstanding.

One of the reasons you have a capacity for the magistrate in these instances to make an order for costs is when someone is put to an extraordinary expense through no fault of their own. Sometimes they contribute to that cost and that is often reflected in an order that is made by the magistrate where they do not enjoy an order that is fully recovering their costs at scale.

In the information provided by the Treasurer in the last few minutes, there seems to be a suggestion that these orders for payments of \$90,000, \$73,000 and \$54,000, those large costs orders, in some way are above a scale that is ordinarily paid in a Magistrates Court.

An honourable member: They are not the norm.

Ms CHAPMAN: They are not the norm in the run-of-the-mill minor cases that might be dealt with in a Magistrates Court, that is true. These are quite serious offences that presumably have at least got to some committal stage, given the numbers of awards of payment that are in here as costs orders. Obviously, there are a lot of smaller cases where the orders would be much inferior.

Quite a bit of time, since I have been listening to the questioning, has related to orders that would be made relating to road traffic offences where an expiation notice is issued in circumstances which, for whatever reason, ultimately, when challenged, are unjustifiable and perhaps should have been known by the prosecuting officer at the time as being unreliable and therefore a costs order is made against them.

Quite a few questions have been asked about road traffic offences. The member for Davenport, the member for Fisher and the Leader of the Opposition have quite clearly pointed out the position from this side of the house. We support road traffic initiatives that provide for safety on our roads. We support an expiable offence process as being one which avoids all the costs of litigation in the first instance and gives people an option, but we are fundamental in the commitment that it has to be done properly.

One of the most important aspects of a costs order, either way; that is, against the prosecution or against the defendant or a bit of both, is that it is an instrument of discipline to ensure that there is some level of transparency and accountability by either the prosecuting officer, whether that is a police officer or not, or the defendant or their representative. So, we give that power to a magistrate to be able, at their discretion (they do not have to) on an application for costs, to grant that.

I find it unbelievable that someone, especially someone like the Commissioner for Social Inclusion, would be a party to this recommendation, to be quite honest, in recommending it as a cost-cutting exercise to the government. It does seem, in the absence of any other information coming to us, that this has actually emanated from the police department, which has been put under pressure by the government to come up with some ideas about how it can cut its budget so that it can comply with a directive from Treasury.

We can talk about the merits of that or otherwise, but the fact is that the police department has been given a job to do. It has come up with a list of ways that it could cut costs. It is up to the executive of the government, and for the Treasurer in particular in that cabinet, to be able to say, 'Well, we have to also identify what is important for the whole social fabric of ensuring that our court system is one that can be measured, can be tested, can be accountable and have some instrument of discipline.'

I know, not only from the short time that I have been in this parliament but also from the 20 years before when I was in courtrooms, how situations can be abused in litigation, as well as the extraordinary cost, not to mention the time off work, the personal expense and the destruction to people in having to go through litigation. If there is one instrument which helps to be able to manage that, it is the instrument of someone facing the risk that they will have to pay the costs of the other side—or at least part thereof—if they have taken proceedings or maintained or perpetuated those proceedings which have been malicious, which may have been just simply reckless but which have been trivial.

We have instruments in our legal proceedings, including costs orders, as a way to manage that. In the nine years that I have been in here, I have repeatedly come into this parliament to argue when the government has said, 'Let's have a no-cost jurisdiction,' which is where each party pays their own costs, unless there are exceptional circumstances. I paraphrase that, but that is a sort of 'no-cost' jurisdiction.

It seems to be that the Labor Party has a real penchant for this type of exercise, yet we see in the courts that exercise no-cost jurisdictions probably the greatest abuse of process by litigants where that applies. Each and every time it has been raised, each and every time this government has tried to introduce tribunal-type determinations, no-cost legislation, I have opposed it, and we have argued that many times.

I would have thought that, by now, the government would appreciate the significance of having a costs-order process which keeps people on their toes, and, in this instance, the Police Department. I find it unbelievable that the minister (the Treasurer in this instance) would use a historical sexual offence charge for which a costs order was made of some \$73,900 (presuming in that case that there had been an unsuccessful prosecution of someone accused of a historical

sexual offence), when we had debated in this parliament the importance of there being the opportunity to prosecute old sexual offence cases, and I think it was pre-1982.

This was something that was championed by the former attorney-general, and we raised in the debates at the time the significance of whether there would be many successful cases on that because of the difficulty in being able to prosecute cases where the witnesses might have moved interstate, died, or whatever, or even the alleged defendant or abuser in those circumstances, and how it was going to be difficult to prosecute those cases.

But what we would have at least expected is that, if they did prosecute them, they would have a good case and that they would be able to resist any order for costs against them if they failed in being able to demonstrate to the magistrate that they had acted in a manner which was proper in all the circumstances and which they should resist on their submissions through their council an order for costs against them.

I just find it incomprehensible that, when it comes to using excuses or case studies of where the police are trying to get out of paying costs orders where there are serious offences and high costs orders are made, they are using that as the explanation to try to save, whatever it is, a million dollars a year for this initiative.

I would say to the Treasurer that I think that we need to have some explanation, if there is any, as to whether this was entirely a proposal from the Police Department to the Sustainable Budget Commission, or whether, in fact, there is any other explanation—any other party who was knocking on the door of government to say, 'Change the costs order jurisdiction in the Magistrates Court for non-felony offences.'

I have never heard of it. Nobody has come knocking on my door in the time I have been here in the parliament, and I have covered legal matters both in principle and as the speaker in the lower house. In nine years, not one party has come to me to say that this is an area in which there has been some abuse to the public or the public are abusing this power to which they should not be entitled and putting an unreasonable financial burden on the Crown. If there is someone, I would like to hear who it is.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The point of those cases that I cited was this: if any of those cases had been heard in the District or Supreme Court and an acquittal was found, those costs could not have been awarded because, in the Supreme and District Courts, you cannot be awarded costs in the event of an acquittal. The purpose of this bill is simply to make consistent the summary offences heard in the Magistrates Court with what already happens in the Supreme and District Courts.

The member for Bragg has come in rather late into the debate; if she had perhaps joined the debate a little earlier, she would have heard me say this several times to other members who were here at the beginning. In regard to how the proposal came about, I was not Treasurer at the time, but the Sustainable Budget Commission sent out requests to various agencies for proposals for savings measures, and this is a proposed savings measure that SA Police put forward to the Sustainable Budget Commission. The Sustainable Budget Commission accepted it and included it in its final report to the government.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Thompson): The question is that clause 18 stand as printed. Those in favour say aye and those against say no. The ayes have it. We now return to—

Mr Marshall: No!

The ACTING CHAIR: You are too late.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR: I did. He said yes, and then I went back and asked—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR: No, then I asked for the noes as well. I will do it again, just in case I was asleep. Those in favour say aye, against say no. The ayes have it.

Clause passed.

Clause 11.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes, in answer to the member for Davenport's question: you are charged every year.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Treasurer, why would you do it that way? The government is strapped for cash, and it has brought in tax increases and budget saving measures, so what it has decided to do is hit every pub and club with a new fee, ranging from \$100 to \$700, depending on the type of hotel or club, including, of course, some extra fees for late-night venues, because the government needs more money. To make sure we spend the money on administration, the bureaucrats and the Treasurer have designed it so that we have to send a bill out every year. Why would you not send out a three-year bill? Why would you not give an option to pay two or three years in advance?

I know it will not save the business any money, but it will save the bureaucrats time. They are developing a system where there is going to be an annual invoice, an annual envelope and annual administration. It does not need to be that. You can buy a 10-year driver's licence. The hotels do not change too much; they basically stay in the same venue. It just seems to me that you are setting up a bureaucratically clumsy system by charging it every year and not having the vision to do it in multiple years. I will leave that for the government, but I am glad you clarified that for me because I think it is a poorly thought-out system, if that is the way it is going to be implemented.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Of all the things to get excited about, whether it is paid annually or every three or five years—I am a bit stunned that the member for Davenport would feel such passion on whether a bill is paid annually or every three or five years but, nonetheless, whatever floats your boat. Annual fees are generally charged annually; that is the nature of them. Apart from the driver's licence exception, I am not really that familiar with fees that are paid anything other than annually.

I am sure that, if we expected pubs and clubs to fork out three or five years in advance, I would be getting complaints from the opposition that this was a terrible impost and 'Why can't we break them down into more frequent but smaller payments?' In terms of the costs and so on, the costs of doing it will be fairly minimal, whether it is three years, five years or one year. I do not think it will make too much difference to the cost of administering it. I pointed out that the bill will be able to be paid online, so I think that that will also have the effect of reducing the cost of collecting the revenue.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 15 passed.

Clause 16.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: For those who have just entered the debate, we have actually dealt with some later clauses first because some of the advisers were not available, so we are now going back to some earlier clauses in the bill. There are four elements of this bill. There is liquor licensing, the prosecution matter which we have just dealt with, annual leave and the First Home Owner Grant, which we did this morning. There are four elements and this is the last element. This element deals with the annual leave provisions.

This is the Treasurer's Christmas present under the tree provision. This is the provision that reinstates for the public servants who were so affected the 17½ per cent holiday loading. The opposition position on this is very simple.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: You've got a position, have you?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Absolutely. We've had a position on all of these elements, Treasurer.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: I am waiting to hear it.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We just voted against the last one and we moved amendments trying to delete the other one. I am sure you have picked them up. The reality is that last year the opposition did not oppose you taking it out because it was a budget measure and we are not going to oppose you putting it back in as a budget measure. We are going to comment, though, that the government seems to have no consistent strategy in dealing with the Public Service.

Last year, the then treasurer came in and said he was going to streamline the costs of the Public Service and reduce the cost of the Public Service and this was a prudent measure and people in private enterprise did not get this outrageous condition. There were all sorts of claims about good economic management by the former treasurer. Those claims were so valid that the union movement took on the then treasurer, made it known publicly that they were going to get rid of that treasurer and, ultimately, the treasurer changed.

Let us have no crocodile tears from the current Treasurer saying that in preparing the budget all of a sudden he realised that, by taking away the 17½ per cent loading for the public servants so affected and giving them two days extra leave a year, that was going to take cash out of their pockets and affect Christmas presents under the tree. Well, give me a break, Madam Acting Chair! This is nothing other than a survival strategy by treasurer Snelling that treasurer Foley was not prepared to make. Treasurer Foley was not prepared to back down, treasurer Snelling is, and it is simply a message to the PSA that they are firmly in charge of this treasurer, unlike the previous treasurer, who was prepared to stand up to them. At the end of the day, the opposition are not going to stop this measure being reintroduced. We accept the fact, as we did last year, that it is part of the budget, it is part of managing the Public Service, so it will go through both houses and the Public Service will have their condition reinstated.

The Treasurer has, of course, then gone on to flag that he will try to recoup this \$22 million cost a year in other areas. The Treasurer might like to outline to the house what other savings provisions, what new savings provisions, are now going to be required from various departments to find this saving of \$22 million a year; or are they simply going to give up on that saving measure and accept the fact that they are going to have fewer savings than treasurer Foley first outlined last year?

As part of this measure, the Treasurer is talking about giving an extra allowance to the Public Service. That is something like a retention allowance to attach to the Public Service, in part as a repayment, if you like, or a counterbalancing item for the long service leave provisions which the former treasurer has cut and this Treasurer is, at this stage at least, holding onto, and which are subject to a High Court case. I am just wondering whether the Treasurer can explain to the house what the extra provision is he is actually talking about.

He has been in the media saying that there is money in the budget for this extra provision to counterbalance the long service leave. I am just wondering what exactly we are talking about, because there already are retention allowances and attraction allowances paid. If they are already getting retention allowances, attraction allowances, long service leave allowances and annual leave allowances, then what other allowance is not covered by those four items? Do we need to pay the Public Service, given that last year the government's position was we had to reduce the cost of the Public Service and now the Treasurer is not only reinstating this cost, but is talking about introducing a brand-new cost?

In responding I would like the Treasurer to explain what is this new allowance he is negotiating with the Public Service Association? What is it meant to cover that is not already covered, other than a repayment for some of the long service leave lost? I will be surprised if there is not an element of their service that is not already covered by some form of allowance, whether it is their actual salary, their annual leave loading—that is now of course being reinstated—their current long service leave, their bereavement leave, their sick leave, their carer's leave, or any of the other industrial conditions that have been negotiated through the EB process and negotiations with various governments over many, many years.

So I am interested in that particular issue. Also, I will just make the point that it seems to me that this is nothing more than a backdown by the Treasurer. The PSA and Janet Giles through the union movement have made it crystal clear that on the cuts to Public Service entitlements they essentially blame two people: they blame former treasurer Foley and current premier Rann, and they are going to continue their industrial action until they get rid of both.

I think the Treasurer's colleagues thought that he had done a deal, that when he gave them the annual leave provision back there had been a negotiated settlement with the Public Service Association that they would lose 400 jobs as a result in part for the saving of this particular measure and then that would be the end of the industrial action. It would be back to paradise, but the reality is that that deal did not last. The union movement now has the sniff of blood because they have had one win. The former treasurer is not going to be treasurer and, if the rumours are right, the former treasurer may not even be in the parliament all that much longer, and now they are after the Premier. It will be interesting to see where it goes because they have made it crystal clear that they blame two people.

Here is the issue: what is the member for Cheltenham doing behind the scenes? We know that the member for Cheltenham tried to get closer to the union movement over the WorkCover changes in cabinet. We know that the left wing of the Labor Party was angry with the right wing of the Labor Party over the WorkCover changes. Remember last year when there were protests after

protests by the union movement? We had members of the left wing of the Labor Party sneaking out into the protests saying, 'Don't blame me, it was that awful right wing of the party.'

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: There were members of the Liberal Party out there, too.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Of course there were members of the Liberal Party out there. The government was cutting workers' entitlements.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: You've got to be consistent.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Let me explain this to the Treasurer. It is something that the previous Liberal government never did to state public servants. Certainly, we reduced numbers, but we never came in by legislation and changed their entitlements.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Do you support this or not?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We are letting it through, Treasurer. Just as we let you take it out, we will let you put it back in. It is part of the budget. The reality is that the Liberal government's past at state level did not take away workers' entitlements by legislation. It did not do it, so of course we were going to go out there and say, 'Don't blame the Liberal Party, we never did this when we were in government. This is your own mob that did it.'

The big question in the Labor Party is this: what is the member for Cheltenham doing behind the scenes in relation to this issue? He is already out there speaking to the teachers union and the media saying, 'Please don't protest over this because we can talk.' The message from the member for Cheltenham is pretty clear, that the—

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order. I am exhausted from listening to the member. I am not sure how you are relating this to the bill, but we are going to be here all night if you do not come back to bill.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am happy to be here all night, member for Torrens. I know the Labor Party likes to knock off at six. I have been here lots of nights very late, and I have spoken for a very long time and very late into the night, as the member for Lee might remember, on a particular bill. It was five hours 28 minutes in response to his four hours 23 minutes, if I recall.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Thompson): Order, member for Davenport!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It comes back to this point, now that I have been so tactically interrupted by the member for Torrens. The reason the member for Cheltenham wants to talk to the union movement over annual leave, which is part of this bill, and other conditions, is that the member for Cheltenham is out there undermining the Premier as fast as he can go by saying to the union movement, 'Mike Rann couldn't give a stuff about you. He doesn't care about you. He is taking away your entitlements. But don't worry, Jay from Cheltenham is going to listen to the union movement,' and that is the real issue with this bill. The Liberal Party is supporting the reinstatement of these particular provisions; it is part of the budget measure and we look forward to its speedy passage through the upper house.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The member for Davenport gave a wide-ranging speech which covered far more ground than what is strictly in the bill, but there is no doubt that on this issue the opposition has the political equivalent of bipolar disorder. On one hand, it is saying, 'This is a terrible measure, you should never have done it,' and on the other hand it is saying, 'Treasurer Snelling is doing the bidding of the unions. He will do whatever the unions tell him.'

You cannot have it both ways. At some point the opposition is going to have to come up with a consistent position rather than just picking and choosing the issues and trying to get the greatest political expediency that it can at any particular time. Either it thinks the government should have proceeded with this measure (which as I said, was going to hit hardest the lowest paid public sector workers) and opposes the government not proceeding with it, or it opposed it from the very beginning and now supports what the government is doing. The opposition cannot have it both ways.

A very interesting point is the question of tenure, where opposition members seem to be having a very difficult time making up their mind. They ring *The Advertiser* and say, 'We are going to have a position on this. We are going to be able to give you our position today. We will give you our position today.' Then during question time they send a message, 'We are going to tell you our position. We will tell you what it is in the next half-hour.' Then the half-hour passes, 'We are having some difficulty coming up with a position. We will tell you what it is in a couple of days.'

This is an absolutely hopeless opposition which cannot make up its mind on these issues, an opposition that on the question of tenure is at complete sixes and sevens, that does not know what it is going to do. It is an opposition that is completely hopeless and unable to come to any considered position of policy. You only had to listen to the 6,000 words of drivel from the Leader of the Opposition yesterday morning in the Appropriation Bill debate. It went for 2,000 words longer than the budget speech itself, but was there a single policy position in 6,000 words?

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Yes, there was!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, not a single position. This is an opposition in complete—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, Madam Acting Chair. I would hate the Treasurer to mislead the house. The Treasurer knows full well that the Leader of the Opposition in her budget reply outlined the opposition's policy on the police prosecution issue we have just been debating for two or three hours. He knows that and he misleads the house. I would hate for him to mislead the house and for me to have to come in and move a motion on him because he knows that if he continues down that line he is misleading.

The ACTING CHAIR: Member for Davenport, points of order are points of order, not speeches.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The simple fact is that the Leader of the Opposition had no new policy positions to point out in 6,000 words—2,000 words longer than the budget speech itself.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I know the Leader of the Opposition is the creation of Evans Inc. in the Adelaide Hills, and I know what a bitter disappointment she has proven to be to the Evans clan. They thought she was the great white hope and how disappointing she has turned out to be. So, I can appreciate that the member for Davenport is somewhat sensitive about these issues. Nonetheless, on this provision the government listened to what we were told, not only by the unions but also by people talking to Labor MPs in their electorates. We were convinced by the argument that this measure was going to have a disproportionate effect on lower paid public sector workers and on that basis we have decided not to proceed with it.

Clause passed.

Clause 17 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (17:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank honourable members and the opposition for their support for the bill, apart from one amendment that they made. I thank officers for the preparation of the bill.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WOHLSTADT, MR M.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (17:51): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr PICCOLO: Earlier today I spoke about a matter relating to the Gawler council and members opposite and some members on my own side raised a matter, and I probably gave a bit of a puzzled look as to what was happening. The matter, which refers to the Light Regional Council, was actually referring to the dismissal of their CEO, which is a separate matter to what is in the courts at the moment. So, just to clarify, the comments I was making and the parallels I was trying to draw were in relation to the dismissal of two individuals and not the matters that are before the court at the moment.

ADELAIDE ZOO BOARD

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (17:52): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: During question time I raised a question about a Treasury officer being on the zoo board. The Treasurer has advised me that the Treasury officer has recently been appointed to the zoo board. Mr Hobbs had previously been appointed by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources onto the zoo board, and then after that had been elected by the membership in his own right to the zoo board. So, I wish to correct the record so that Mr Hobbs is not unduly criticised for that issue. I think it is only fair that I correct the record, because the information given to me was that he was representing, at that time, the Department of Treasury and Finance. I just correct the record for the house.

[Sitting suspended from 17:54 to 19:30]

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 June 2011.)

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (19:31): I am pleased to take this opportunity to speak on the budget that we received a bit less than two weeks ago. Certainly, from the opposition side of the chamber, there have been many very good speeches about a lot of detail and, I think it is fair to say, a lot of disappointment in this budget, particularly on behalf of families.

More importantly, I am willing to say that one of the realities about all budgets is that there is never enough money. It does not matter whether it is a government of a state, a nation or a household, there is never enough money. So, the majority of our arguments in this place are about priorities. They are about priorities of how to spend the money that is available.

How you raise that money and whether you should be raising more or less is an issue, but the majority of what we talk about in here is really to do with priorities of how to spend what is available. Again, as I am sure people are becoming very familiar with, my priorities are in the country, they are in the outback, they are in Stuart, and then more broadly throughout the rest of rural and remote South Australia.

I would like to highlight a couple of good things in the budget. No government is completely good or completely bad and there are some good things in the budget. As an active CFS volunteer member, I am very pleased to see some money in this year's budget, an increase of \$25 million over four years, for firefighting and the CFS. I think that is a real positive.

I am also very pleased to see money for the medical heating and cooling (electricity) rebate, which I think is very important. I congratulate the government on following the Leader of the Opposition's announcement quite a few weeks ago that that would be Liberal Party policy. So, I think that is tremendous as well.

I also congratulate the government on what the government has called the Office of Public Integrity, which the opposition, under our leader Isobel Redmond, calls an ICAC (independent commission against corruption). Let us hope they both achieve the same thing. Let us hope they both do what every fair-minded person would want, which is to ensure that everybody, every agency, every thing under the government's control operating in this state operates effectively, independently and fairly, without corruption.

When I mentioned priorities before, my priorities are things like roads. I am disappointed that there is not more money for outback roads. I note that there is some additional money for roads, particularly starting in Kangaroo Island, which is terrific. But the outback dirt roads, primarily Strzelecki track, Oodnadatta track, Birdsville track and some of the main dirt roads that connect them, are very, very important to this state.

Yorkeys Crossing is such an important infrastructure opportunity for this state, and I really do fear what I see as the government and BHP trying to stare each other down in a game of chicken. We all need it. It has got to happen. Yorkeys Crossing is a bypass of Port Augusta (temporarily, I just hope), but what we really need are two lanes going each way across the gulf through the middle of Port Augusta. But we have a bypass for now, just sealing the existing Yorkeys Crossing to take the heat out of traffic congestion in Port Augusta and also allowing the heavy transport that will be required for the development of Olympic Dam by BHP when that happens.

I know that is not a fait accompli, but I am confident that will come about. However, I see the state government saying, 'Look, we're going to hold off and not fund it because BHP will need it, and so we'll get their money' and BHP saying, 'Well, it's not our problem. We're going to bring this wonderful big project to the state. It's the state government's—and also the federal government's, by the way—responsibility, so we'll get them to fund it.'

In the meantime, while they are staring each other down, waiting and waiting, playing this game of sort of dare-devil chicken, the people of Port Augusta are suffering, and also, very importantly, heavy freight movements across our whole nation are suffering. From Sydney to Perth, from Adelaide to Darwin, all traffic goes across one bridge each way across the top of the gulf at Port Augusta; and, when it rains, the currently dirt road around Port Augusta is impassable, with only about five or six mils of rain. So, it is a very, very serious issue for our nation, but I am disappointed that there is no money for that in our budget.

Everyone knows about health services. I will not go into great detail here, but one of the simplest, easiest and least expensive opportunities that this government has to contribute to health services in country South Australia would be to put more money into PATS (Patient Assistance Transport Scheme). It is crying out for more money so that rural and outback people can get to specialists in Adelaide. It is not expensive. Just a few million dollars would make an enormous difference to people's lives.

With respect to shared services, well, the member for Kavel referred to it a day or so ago as 'shared shambles'. That is just taking jobs away from rural/regional centres, and it is not saving the money that the government says. More money is going to be poured into that, and that is a great shame.

I mention country remote education and small schools' grants. People who remember the speech I made last year know how terribly, terribly disappointed I was—and still am—that the government took away the small schools' grants last year and has missed the opportunity to reinstate that. I and other members of the opposition met with the Isolated Children's Parents' Association (ICPA) representatives today, and one of their responsibilities is trying to help kids who are involved in School of the Air.

They desperately need an upgrade to the electronic communication platform, Centra, which the kids use. Roughly 45 families and 68 students throughout outback South Australia, and some fringe outer country areas, are suffering. They are having a hard time because they cannot learn. Consequently, the future of these kids is being affected by the fact that there is not enough money to go into this.

Special education is very, very important, as well as the issue of people with disabilities in general in country areas. Every person in this house would really have a good feeling for how hard it would be for anyone with a disability. There are some programs that provide support but never enough. But I can tell members that it is so much harder for anyone in the country who has a disability to get by and just to get around and live the sort of life that every South Australian deserves.

With respect to funding for police, I have called many times for extra funding for after-hours services. I am not saying that we need more police roaming all over the country, but in Port Augusta, particularly, we do not have enough police and enough resources for after-hours policing to look after people.

Aboriginal Affairs: very interestingly, in a budget context, Lew Owens, through his report for the government very recently—I think it was August last year—said that there is enough money going into Aboriginal Affairs services. So, here is a golden opportunity for the government in the government's budget to do something effective and say, 'Actually it does not need any money.' In fact, we could even possibly save some more money to provide services to Aboriginal people and Aboriginal communities—two very important ones in the electorate of Stuart being Davenport and Nepabunna. So, a bit of rearrangement, potentially even a budget saving with better organisation, would help Aboriginal people in the electorate that I represent.

Regional Development Australia and Outback Communities Authority: again, last year in the budget, money was withdrawn from the RDAs. It is really shameful stuff given that the state government allowed them to do a complete redevelopment of themselves on the promise and the expectation that they would have local, state and federal government money. The government let them twist themselves inside out to reinvent themselves, realign themselves, get themselves all organised to perform in a three-tiered funding model from every level of government, and then after

they finished that said, 'By the way, we are going to take our funding away.' So, I am dreadfully disappointed that the state government has decided not to reverse that decision.

I will just touch on that and pick up on a very insightful point made by the member for Goyder when he spoke: not once in the Treasurer's budget speech did he mention small business. I do not care if you live in the city, I do not care if you live in the country, I do not care if you live in the Outback. In South Australia, small business is the heart of our economy. A lot of other things contribute, and we need BHP, we need Roxby Downs, we need all sorts of other businesses from minute to gigantic, but small business always is, and always will be, the heart of our economy in South Australia and our major employer.

Small business is not about small business people making money and living high on the hog. Small business must be successful so that small business can employ South Australians, because the most important thing that we can do here in the parliament is help people with jobs, and give them every opportunity they can possibly have to have as much employment opportunity as possible, and that will happen through small business.

Dingo control, invasive weed and pest control are very important issues for South Australia but no extra funding in this budget. Also, the shameful, sad situation where the government is going to sell 111 years of forward rotations of the forestry off-take in the South-East of our state. As the Leader of the Opposition quite rightly said, 'You are going to sell 111 years—the next 111 years, three or four generations, probably four generations—of our lifetime for the same value as 15 years of current income.' Why on earth would you do that? Nobody would do that in their own private business unless they were in a very desperate situation, and I find that dreadfully sad. Obviously, the South-East is not in Stuart but I can tell you that the people of Stuart are very angry about that decision.

I think some of these decisions come about because the government undervalues a lot of what goes on in rural and remote South Australia. As I said before, it comes back to priorities—never enough money—it is about your priorities. Where are you going to spend your scarce money? For example, the government does not value country hospitals nearly enough. The government understands very well, and I have said it in here quite openly, that minister Hill has a very tough portfolio.

It is not easy, but do you know what? Minister Hill and the government value hospitals purely by the value of the health services they provide, and that is incredibly important but it is not nearly enough. They sustain small communities. If you do not have a hospital you will not retain families with kids, and you will not retain ageing people who need the health services. No hospital, no aged care, no pharmacy, and it rolls on from there.

Country hospitals employ 30, 40, 50 people. So, the value of the health service is not nearly enough to South Australia when you look at that hospital, and I think it is undervalued. I think that the value of small communities in general is not fully understood. If we do not have small communities with people who can live and work, and, very importantly, find jobs in small communities in South Australia, we will not have the people then who support the incredibly important agriculture, fishing, mining, wine—all these other things that we have going on in country South Australia, without which the state cannot survive. The state will not survive without those industries which operate in country South Australia. If you do not have the small towns to provide a workforce, you will not have those industries, and we cannot live without them. Even the most city-centric focused person in this chamber must understand how important to our state those industries are.

One of the things that concerns me most about this budget is where we are going with debt. We are heading towards an unsustainable level of debt for our state. I have heard all the analogies from the Treasurer in the media saying, 'Oh, well, the average family on an income of this equates to a mortgage of that, and surely that's all sustainable.' And do you know what—he is right. He is 100 per cent right, so long as you pay your debt off. So long as you take out your home loan over 20 years, 30 years or whatever it takes, and you pay it off, you get rid of it, and you work it down. So long as you do not die with that debt and leave it to your heirs. That is where we are heading at the moment.

The picture is grim, but it is grimmer than we know if we concentrate on the net operating position—and this comes directly from the general government sector budget estimates tables—that the government claims we will be in; so, surplus versus deficit. The 2007-08 budget said that at the end of this financial year (30 June, just a few days away) we would have a surplus of

\$278 million. In 2008-09, they said we would have a surplus of \$434 million. In 2009-10, they said we would have a surplus of \$78 million. In 2010-11, they said we would have a deficit of \$389 million. So, the same point in time, 30 June, which is just around the corner. But, over time, as we get closer and closer, we realise how bad this is.

Nine months ago we were told that, in a few days' time, we would have a deficit of \$389 million. Now we are told we are going to have a deficit of \$427 million. The budget came out on 16 June and we are now told that, at the end of June this year, we will have a \$427 million deficit. But, for the same point in time, 30 June 2011 (which is a few days away), in the 2007-08 budget, we were told that we would have a surplus of \$278 million.

The closer the time gets, the more the reality comes into focus, and the reality is getting worse and worse. We now know that, at the end of this financial year, our estimate is that we will have a \$427 million deficit. Do you know what is really scary about that, Madam Speaker? The fact that, at this point in time, the Treasurer is also telling us that, in four years' time, at the end of the current budget estimates period, we are going to have a state debt of \$8.2 billion.

Now, just going back to the numbers I gave you before. We have gone from a prediction of a \$278 million surplus at the end of this financial year—just four or five years ago—to now knowing that it is going to be a \$427 million deficit. So now, looking four years out, we are told that there is going to be an \$8.2 billion debt for our state. What will it really be when we get there? Four years down the track, almost to the day, I am sure we will all be taking about this, and I guarantee this house that we will be facing a lot more than \$8.2 billion, and that is the very, very scary part about what is going on here.

We have a grim picture, but the reality is much worse. As the Leader of the Opposition quite rightly said in her budget reply speech, \$8.2 billion on the books—\$8.2 billion state debt at the end of the four-year period—but when you put in the WorkCover deficit, the hospital, the oval and you wrap up all the other things that the government tries to hide away and not put in as the actual public sector debt figure, we are actually much closer today to \$24 billion dollars of state debt in four years' time. This figure of \$24 billion is an extraordinary number for a state like ours. It is incredibly scary, particularly given that we know that, when we get there in four years' time, it will be much worse.

This is all in the context, of course, of growing GST revenue. The government has said and the Treasurer has said that GST that the federal government collects from all of us and then hands back to the states is actually reducing, but the reality is, as the shadow treasurer (the member for Davenport) has highlighted, GST revenue is actually growing. GST revenue is not shrinking. GST revenue is actually growing through this period. There are no excuses for what is going on here at the moment.

Obviously, in opposition I am hopeful and I work very hard every day to ensure that in 2014 we swap from a Labor to a Liberal government but, whether or not that happens, one of my greatest concerns is that as we look over the next few years the South Australian taxpayer, the South Australian infant, and the South Australian pensioner are going to be stuck with some dreadful things that this government is going to leave behind. We are going to be stuck with all that debt that we know about, but we are also going to be locked into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

We are going to be locked into paying \$1.1 million every day for 30 years. We cannot get out of it. Once the health minister and the Premier sign that off, there is no going backwards. We are locked into it. We are going to be locked into the Adelaide Oval. We are going to be locked into a high cost of living, increases in water prices and increases in electricity prices. A very real example is \$11 a kilolitre for water that you cannot even drink. In half a dozen of the small communities in my electorate of Stuart, out on the Barrier Highway, that is what this government is doing: locking us into gigantic spending programs that we will not be able to get out of, locking us into high taxes. Taxes will go up more than double the inflation rate through the next budget. It is dreadfully scary stuff.

I would just like to finish by talking about one of my very genuinely heartfelt theories: you do not have social success, and you cannot address social issues if you do not have a strong economy, and you will not have a strong economy if you do not address social issues. They go together. You will be successful in both; you will be unsuccessful in both. As I said, with regard to priorities, we can all argue about where the money should be spent. We might have different ideas on either side of the chamber here, but if we do not have a strong economy we cannot address the social issues, and I fear that our economy is not going to be strong.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I understand we have a group of people here from the Lions Club of Rostrevor. Welcome to them and we hope you enjoy your time here. It is nice to see you here.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (19:53): I rise to support the Appropriation Bill and to commend the Treasurer for what has been a good budget in a time of considerable difficulties. I know that every member on this side would have liked to have been able to bring down a different budget, a more generous budget in which we could have given more to a number of people in the community who we know are finding times difficult, but I also know that the world is hurting.

We saw on our television sets just a couple of days ago riots on the streets of Greece as a result of the budget they have had to bring down in Greece curtailing public expenditure. Thanks to the wisdom of the Rudd-Swan and then the Gillard-Swan governments and the work of the Rann-Foley administration, in Australia and in South Australia we have not felt the effects of the global financial crisis in anything like the way people have in Greece, in the US and in the UK.

In the UK, the Cameron government has withdrawn much of the heating subsidies so that old people are likely to die in the next winter because of the lack of heating. In the UK every year people die because of the lack of heating—people also die in the UK because of the lack of cooling. This can only be exacerbated by the measures taken by the Cameron government in response to the global financial crisis. Fortunately, we are not facing those problems here in Australia but we are facing tight budgets in which difficult decisions have to be made, and people will feel that the government is not as generous as it can be. However, my view is that we are focusing expenditure on the areas of most critical need.

When I look at the last budget brought down by the Olsen government I can see considerable changes in the values that have been demonstrated by the Rann government through successive budgets. When I was first elected by far the biggest issue in my community was hospitals. When I undertook a community survey, the hospital issue was so far No. 1 that it was also Nos 2, 3 and 4. The next issue of concern to my community was way down the scale compared with its concern about hospitals.

At my last survey their concern about hospitals had considerably reduced. We do not have people on waiting lists for two and three years any more, as we did at the end of the time of the Brown-Olsen regime. We do not have people waiting for hours and hours in emergency departments. I agree that people wait in emergency departments, but there is nothing like the sort of waits that were reported during—

Mr Pengilly: Three hours the other night at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Ms THOMPSON: —the Brown-Olsen government. 'Three hours' the member for Finniss interjects, at the Royal Adelaide. One of the things that amazes me about members opposite is their lack of corporate memory. In fact, I had thought that I would urge all the new members elected last year to go back and have a look at some of the *Hansard* from the estimates during the days of the Brown-Olsen government—and, indeed, I do. There are very few members opposite who were there during those days and know what was happening. All we ever hear is that it was due to the State Bank. However, the priorities exhibited by that government were very different, as can be demonstrated from the fact that, in the 2001-02 budget (the last budget of the Olsen government), 24.7 per cent of the budget was devoted to health. This year, 29.5 per cent of the budget is devoted to health.

We know that the health budget is a real issue in Australia. Australia has the best health system in the world; Canada is close but, otherwise, we have the best health system in the world. It does not come out of nowhere, but it is clearly the priority for people of Australia that when you are sick you should be able to be looked after; you should not die on the streets, as people in the US do because they have no access to a healthcare system. You should not have a situation, as they have in the US, when the Obama government tried to introduce some basic public health scheme, that they had riots in the streets, saying that this is not right.

Public health has become a major priority for this government. Of all the things that are important to our community, one of the most important is the knowledge that people can have their healthcare needs attended to. They would like a lot of other things, they would like concessions for

water and electricity, but a basic security for them is to know that they can have their healthcare needs attended to. The situation now is that health is clearly the priority of this government.

As I said, the proportion of the budget that has been devoted to health has increased from 24.7 per cent to 29.5 per cent. That is a 4.8 per cent increase, not in the growth of how much expenditure is going to health but in the proportion of the budget that is going to health. Of course, that has meant that money has had to be saved in other areas, but it is also a significant fact that the other area of major growth in the budget during the time of the Labor administration is social security and welfare.

In the last budget of the Olsen government 4.7 per cent of the budget went to social security and welfare. Now 7.2 per cent goes to that area, an increase of 2.5 per cent in the proportion of the budget that goes to looking after the most vulnerable in our community. It is that area that I want to use my time to speak about tonight.

In the families area, the record of the Rann government is exceptional. When the Rann government was elected in 2002 the Liberals barely cast an eye over the issue of child protection. They left behind a barely functioning alternative care system, under-resourced, understaffed and buried within the former department of human services. Since coming to power, the Rann government has shone a spotlight on child protection, raising awareness of the issues and making it a priority to protect our children in the whole community. The Layton Review, the single biggest review of child protection in the state's history, and its findings identified areas requiring urgent action and increased resources, and the Rann government listened.

In the last eight years we have undertaken a massive amount of reform in this area. The Guardian for Children was appointed and so was the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee to examine serious cases of harm and recommend ways to prevent this. The Rann government has almost trebled the total of annual funding for Families SA. Following the handing down of the 2011-12 budget the total funding is now almost \$300 million. This means this year an additional \$69.1 million will be invested over the next four years in the state's child protection system.

In South Australia children are only ever removed from their birth parents when it is no longer safe for them to stay there. This is obviously a traumatic and heartbreaking experience for anyone involved. That is why in this budget more than \$50 million will be spent to support the growing need for alternative accommodation. This includes \$41.7 million to meet the home-based, residential and emergency care costs of children in alternative care, as well as \$8.4 million for six new residential care homes which will help us to provide a stable, secure and homely environment for children in state care and will help us achieve the goal of having no children in motel-style accommodation.

A particularly important feature of the new style of residential accommodation is it enables children from one family to be kept together. One of the tragedies of the system that was operating under the Liberal government is that children from one family—where there was a critical need, so that the children could no longer stay with a parent or relative—were broken up, just adding to the absolute trauma that children experience when they cannot be cared for by their parents.

We are also working to support families so that children do not need to be removed from them and we have identified an \$19 million boost to funding to ensure more intensive programs for families at risk, to help parents and children deal with their challenges.

Another area of critical need left by the former Liberal government was housing. During the period of the Liberal government, South Australia's public housing system suffered to the tune of 11,000 houses being sold in eight years. I really urge new members to look at the record of public housing for the previous Liberal government and not have this collective memory loss that we hear in this house nearly every day.

At the moment we are in the middle of the biggest social housing construction program in 20 years as we build over 1,360 new houses and refurbish more than 500 others through the Nation Building Economic Stimulus Plan. More than 1,000 of these houses are now complete and the remainder are due to be ready by the middle of 2012. This is thanks to a partnership with the commonwealth. The previous Howard Liberal government did not even have a minister for housing, let alone provide funding to the state for public housing.

Another successful partnership between the state and the commonwealth is the National Rental Affordability Scheme. This will provide 3,800 new private rental properties in South Australia

that must be rented at least 20 per cent below market rates. This was funded with \$100 million from the state government, plus additional funding from the commonwealth.

Housing SA is also partnering with community organisations to build 500 new affordable rental properties through the Affordable Housing Innovations Fund. This fund was created from the revenue that was received as we helped 1,000 public housing tenants to buy their own home with HomeStart's equity start loan. Yes, we sold houses. We mainly sold them to tenants so that they could own their own homes. In relation to the funding for the new Affordable Housing Innovations Fund, \$60 million came from the sale of homes to housing trust tenants and \$60 million came from community organisations.

HomeStart has been a really successful innovation, having since 1989 helped around 60,000 South Australians to buy a home. Many of these people could not get finance from a bank, but HomeStart is able to organise flexible funding arrangements and repayment arrangements so that they can own their own home.

South Australia was the first state to introduce a requirement for 15 per cent affordable housing in significant new developments. This has achieved more than 2,200 commitments from 25 developers to date, and another 2,000 commitments are under negotiation. Congratulations to previous ministers for housing—Key and Weatherill—as well as the current Minister for Housing for having the foresight, first, to implement this scheme, and then, secondly, the determination to make sure it works.

The government is also ensuring that affordable houses are bought by those who need them most. In 2007, the state government launched the Property Locator website, which gives low and middle income buyers exclusive access to affordable homes at a fixed price before they are placed on the open market. More than 1,200 properties have been listed on this site so far.

Disability: yes, there is still need in disability areas, but also yes, yes, yes, the Rann government has done more for people with disabilities than any previous government in this state's history. As part of the 2011-12 state budget, the Rann government will increase the disability services budget by an extra \$37.5 million over four years. This comes on top of other key disability announcements, including \$10.8 million over four years for disability equipment and \$7.7 million over four years to relocate 32 of the remaining 63 Strathmont residents into community living.

This funding will be used to address key spending priorities in the disability portfolio and will include: accommodation support; community support, such as therapy services; community access, including day options; and respite. This is new money and comes on top of last year's commitment to deliver a further \$70.9 million over four years for disability services. As the only government in Australia that provides a meaningful unmet need register, we will be able to deliver this funding where it is needed the most.

Since coming to office, the Rann government has increased state disability funding by 93 per cent, from \$135.4 million in the 2002-03 budget to \$261.3 million in 2009-10. Around 20,145 people receive disability support services in South Australia. This is an increase of over 5,000 new clients since the Rann government came to office in 2002.

South Australia provides services to 36.6 per cent of the estimated disability population, the highest proportion nationally and well over the national average of 23 per cent. As members may have recently noticed, part of this funding has been announced to deliver over \$1.5 million over four years to Novita Children's Services to deliver therapy and family support services. Novita Chief Executive Glenn Rappensberg said it was 'a great result for the children and their families we serve and a much needed boost to support our charitable cause'.

Disability equipment: this \$10.8 million initiative over four years will support both children and adults. It will purchase 600 pieces of equipment or home modifications each year for South Australians with a disability. Based on current levels of demand, this measure is expected to significantly improve management of the waiting list for the foreseeable future. It comes on top of the government's \$17.5 million election commitment for disability equipment, with that \$17.5 million being spent over four years.

It is worth noting that the Liberals made no commitment to fund disability equipment during the last election campaign. The best they could do was an uncoded superschool for children with autism and \$2.5 billion a year for unmet demand—\$2.5 million is quite considerably less than \$17.5 million over four years.

Average supply times during 2010-11, from the figures for 31 March, included: all item types supplied in 4.3 days; customised manual wheelchairs, average supply time 40 days; and powered wheelchairs, 51 days. It is important to note that these customised wheelchairs are made by hand to suit the particular needs of an individual. In 2009-10, there were 6,097 items of equipment and 451 home modifications to South Australians with a disability were made. This compares with 1,393 new items of equipment and home modifications in 2001-02—6,097 plus 451 is an awful lot more than 1,393 and indicates dramatically why people are finding it tight in some other areas of the budget.

Yes, the budget has grown in every area and, yes, we are looking at the expenditure of every single dollar, let alone every single hundred thousand dollars, to make sure that the bulk of resources in this state goes to ensuring that people have a good, safe healthcare system, to ensuring that all children have the chance to a good, sound education system and, most importantly, to ensuring that the most vulnerable in our community, that is, children whose parents are not able to care for them and people with disabilities, have their needs met and are well cared for by the government of South Australia.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (20:13): I will probably bring a different side to the debate on the budget, as I will give recognition to both what is bad and good in the budget we have before us. For far too long now this state has been living beyond its means and reliant on selling its capital base so that it can remain viable. Our forebears up to the 1980s built this great state and its businesses and infrastructure.

The rot set in under the Bannon government in the 1980s, with the collapse of the government-owned State Bank. This was brought about by pure mismanagement in a reasonably stable financial climate. Bannon was then followed by the John Olsen-led government in 1996. This government introduced a policy of corporatising and privatising state-owned businesses and services. Through these actions we saw the sale of ETSA and the TAB. The TAB was sold for about what it would return to the government in one year.

Some said at the time that the ETSA sale would be convenient as the price of electricity would go up and, if it was in private hands, the government would not be blamed. Guess what? The price has gone up and the government has still received the blame but no longer the profits. Just imagine how much easier it would be to formulate a budget today if the government were still receiving these massive profits.

It saddens me that this present Labor government is about to repeat the folly of the Olsen-led Liberal government by forward selling the harvesting rights of the state-owned forests in the South-East of South Australia and western Victoria for up to 105 years. I will repeat what the champion of the Labor movement, former premier Don Dunstan, said to the 1998 Whitlam lecture series:

Why do we have to have a fire sale of community owned assets, including assets which are revenue producing? It is only for ideological and irrational reasons that this is put forward.

He then went on to say about the timber industry:

The state sector has remained throughout the driving force in providing a timber resource to this state, and providing a use of a non-indigenous timber already of considerable benefit to communities elsewhere in Australia. The whole enterprise had provided a cheap timber resource which has been a factor in keeping housing costs down. The state forestry enterprise is on the Olsen government's privatisation list. The whole pine forestry enterprise and the pine resource of this nation would not exist if the matter had been left to the enterprise of the private sector.

I am sure that Don Dunstan would be quite upset with the proposed sale of forestry by this Labor government.

I believe that we have to have a very serious look at the way our government carries out its business. We have a very dedicated Public Service workforce whose rights and conditions must be protected. At the same time, I must say that the growth in our Public Service is unsustainable. We now have one public servant to every 19 residents in this state. The total wage bill for our state government public servants last year was \$6.697 billion or \$4,084 for every man, woman and child in this state. We must concentrate more on the delivery of our core services such as education, health, police, social welfare, transport and environmental protection. It will take a government with a lot of intestinal fortitude to make the changes necessary, but the longer it takes the greater the pain and disruption will be.

I congratulate the government on bringing in a form of ICAC. I feel sure that, once we have this proper ICAC in place, the people of this state will have a lot more surety that our government

and our police are answerable to an independent authority. I commend the government on the extra resources made to the most vulnerable in our society. I am sure that people with disabilities and their carer's lives will be made a lot easier with the extra funds for resources and equipment that have been made available to them.

The extra funding being made available for the housing of children from dysfunctional families is a great initiative, and I think we must realise that if we can help these young people now it may cost us a lot less in the future, as I am sure that these children will be a lot better citizens if cared for in a proper way now.

I am also pleased to see the extra funds that have been made available for fire suppression and control, which should make it a lot safer for our residents, particularly in regional areas. Road safety is always of a great concern to us in the country, and it is pleasing to see that there will be extra funds made available for safety measures such as shoulder treatments and sealing on our rural roads.

Our farmers are rightfully aggrieved with this budget. I fully understand the reductions in drought funding and locust control but I cannot understand how we can further reduce the funding to both SARDI and PIRSA. We must remember that agriculture is by far the largest contributor to the South Australian economy, and much of this has come about from the excellent work done by our researchers and extension officers. With cuts to both PIRSA and SARDI, one wonders how much longer they can operate in a worthwhile manner.

I cannot support the proposal to not allow people who have been prosecuted by the police and then found not guilty to recover their costs. I feel this would be a complete injustice to those people.

On the local scene, the people of Mount Gambier certainly thank the government for the allocation of \$300,000 to the BMX Club which is holding the national finals in April 2012. This club has the best quality course in Australia and has done all of this off its own back, with tremendous support from the council and local businesses in Mount Gambier. I recently attended an event at the BMX Club and it was tremendous to see hundreds of families enjoying themselves and so many fit and healthy young people competing in a safe and family-friendly environment.

We were also pleased to gain approximately \$1 million in funding for traffic lights on the corner of Jubilee Highway and Pick Avenue. This corner has been a major concern, with many accidents occurring over a long time. The state government has also been successful in gaining from the federal government \$3.5 million for a new ambulance station, and a further \$26.7 million for health initiatives in Mount Gambier. The present ambulance station is completely inadequate and poorly located, and the staff and the community have been calling for a new station over many years. There is no doubt that they will be pleased that there is some light at the end of the tunnel at last.

Dental services at the hospital are to be increased from six to 10 chairs, which is a great initiative. Two extensive reports have been done on the Mount Gambier Hospital's Accident and Emergency Department and the surgery department, and it is great to see that part of this \$26.7 million is to be spent on these areas to implement the major recommendations of both these reports.

At last, our oncology and mental health services are to be brought up to a more adequate level, and many of our residents will be able to receive treatment in Mount Gambier instead of having to travel to Adelaide at a time when it is very trying for these patients and their families. I believe that once the mental health projects are implemented—such as, community-based intermediate care services, the digital tele-health network project, the mental-health subacute health services and acute care beds, all to be implemented over the next couple of years—it will be much easier for us to attract mental health care workers, particularly psychiatrists.

Overall, I thank the government for what it has provided to us, but I must say that I am disappointed that we have a deficit budget which relies on the sale of major assets to come back into surplus in the future.

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (20:23):

One day Henny Penny was picking up corn in the cornyard when—whack!—something hit her upon the head. 'Goodness gracious me!' said Henny Penny, 'the skys a-going to fall: I must go and tell the king.'

There are similarities between this story and the story members opposite are telling South Australians about this budget. The sky is not falling, even though we face tough economic times. The global financial crisis is still having an impact on state government revenues, export and private investment. There are many in the community doing it tough right now; in particular, single pensioners and low income families are feeling the pinch.

As a government, we are doing the best we can to give financial support where it is most needed. This is a responsible budget. It is also a budget that delivers for people of my electorate of Mitchell. Spending is modest, but it is directed towards those who need it most—those who need care, equipment and facilities—and I congratulate the Treasurer for that. As a person who knows only too well the human impact of job losses in the suburbs around Mitchell, particularly from the closure of Mitsubishi, I am very pleased about the continuing emphasis by this government on getting people into work and giving them employment opportunities for the future.

Since the Rann government came to office in 2002, more than 130,000 new jobs have been created, with more than 80,000 new positions being full-time. This has been achieved through a number of different means. We have been investing in crucial infrastructure, winning all-important defence contracts and tapping into the expansion of mining exploration within the state. One such infrastructure investment particularly close to my own heart is the \$125 million the government is budgeting for a new Sustainable Industries Education Centre at Tonsley Park.

This centre is being established to give young South Australians the skills they need to get into the workforce. It will offer training in such trades as plumbing, carpentry, surveying, bricklaying, building and electrical. I have spoken before about how vital it is that there is a permanent fix found to the traffic woes of commuters using the Oaklands Crossing where Diagonal and Morphett roads traverse the Noarlunga rail line. The Premier, transport and infrastructure minister Conlon, Treasurer Snelling and planning minister Rau all know from my form my feelings on this one, and the state government recognises the need for grade separation here.

I am very pleased that this budget commits funds to plan for a complete solution to a long-term problem, greatly improving traffic flow through the intersection and area, including improved access to the new SA Aquatic and Leisure Centre, Marion Shopping Centre and the adjacent GP Plus clinic. Speaking of the new Marion GP Plus, it is wonderful to have such an accessible and broad-ranging healthcare service in Mitchell. As well as being able to treat minor injuries and illness, the centre offers mental health counselling, physio, podiatry, dental and children's health services.

Of course, many residents in Mitchell rely on the health services provided by nearby Flinders Medical Centre, too, so it is great to see the government investing \$163 million to upgrade the south's main hospital. This revamp will be complete by mid-2012. It includes a new maternity wing, a new cardiac ward, a new emergency department and a new day surgery. Other health investments that will bring positives for my electorate include a \$36 million boost for BreastScreen SA, which has a clinic at Marion.

This includes an extra \$17 million to buy digital mammography equipment, which will mean more people can be screened more quickly and in more detail, giving better health outcomes. Many of my constituents also attend the nearby Repatriation General Hospital at Daw Park which specialises in health care for older people and the veteran community. I am pleased that this government is investing money through the new acute care beds at the Repat which will also soon feature a new 120-bed teaching and aged care rehabilitation facility thanks to a collaboration with the not-for-profit aged-care group ACH, Flinders University and the federal government.

We all know that pensioners are amongst those with the greatest financial challenges in our communities, which is why it is important that the state government lends a hand through concessions towards necessities such as energy and water. Maximum water concessions will rise from 20 per cent to 25 per cent of the total bill, while a new medical heating and cooling rebate will provide for a doubling of energy concessions for people living with conditions and disorders affected by hot and cold weather, up from a maximum of \$158 to \$316. This will assist people with such conditions as MS, Parkinson's disease or spinal cord injuries, for example, who often need to run a heater or an air conditioner more often than the rest of us. I said at the start of this speech that throughout this budget the government is proud to be giving financial help where it is most needed.

Another major area of investment is funding for disability services. This will include \$37.5 million to help people with disabilities and their carers; \$10.8 million to buy more disability

equipment and to cut waiting lists; and \$8 million to improve disability access for public transport. This budget will also deliver an extra \$69 million in support of another vulnerable group, children entering state care, particularly directing funds to assist with reconnecting children in care with their families. Money also will be used to reduce the time children spend in alternative care so that they do not have to stay in motel accommodation.

In the area of education, the children of Mitchell also will benefit from the government's budget plan of preschool relocation. Under this program, stand-alone preschools will be relocated on school sites. This will make the school drop-off and pick-up regime much easier for parents who have children of different ages, while also making the transition from preschool to school less confronting for little ones.

It will also allow schools to better plan the whole of a child's early years of education. A well-rounded education requires access to local sporting facilities, and the government has recently opened Australia's premier aquatic facility at Marion. The Australian age swimming championships held recently were an enormous success, and we can now look forward to seeing the likes of Michael Klim, Stephanie Rice, Eamon Sullivan and Libby Trickett at the Australian short-course titles at the centre in July. The centre has also helped South Australia secure the 2012 World Life Saving Championships, the 2012 World Junior Diving Championships, the Australian Masters Games and the Australian University Games. It is a great example of the economic benefits of subscribing to the 'if you build it, they will come' philosophy.

This is a budget of responsibility and well-targeted measures. It supports those who most need it, while keeping our economy strong and our financial position secure into the future. This budget builds vital infrastructure and creates jobs, and it delivers the transport and healthcare system we need in the 21st century.

In the remaining time I will talk about the past. If the international economy was so buoyant when this government came to power in 2002, why did the last three budgets delivered by those opposite contain operating deficits of \$800 million? The first three budgets that Kevin Foley delivered had an operating surplus of \$1 billion. That did not happen just by accident.

It is good to see that the member for Waite finally admitted to the house yesterday that there was a dramatic change in the international and national economic climate in 2008. For some time, it seemed that those opposite were determined to believe that the tough decisions made by the Rann government in last year's budget were due entirely to events within the control of the South Australian government.

The third budget of Kevin Foley delivered an operating surplus of over \$200 million, as did the fourth and the fifth. I note from the member for Waite's comments yesterday that he is confused about the difference between net lending and net operating balance, believing the former to be a \$263 million deficit in the current budget and the latter to be \$1.2 billion in deficit.

I can inform the honourable member that if he refers to page 2 of the budget overview he will be relieved to find the net operating balance is only a deficit of \$263 million compared with deficits of \$330 million, \$297 million and \$174 million delivered by members opposite in their last three budgets.

During what the member for Waite himself calls buoyant times, this government has been able to deliver such a strong result during such difficult times because of the difficult and strong decisions made by the former treasurer Kevin Foley and this government in the 2011-11 budget. Kevin Foley protected a AAA balance sheet during the biggest economic disruption in 75 years.

South Australia has pulled through the GFC without going into recession. During 2008-09, when the GFC started to hit, our economy grew by 2.1 per cent. In 2009-10, as the effects on our exports and other industries intensified, our growth was still 1.5 per cent. In fact, apart from Western Australia, South Australia has been the only jurisdiction that did not record a fall in GSP per capita during the GFC. This is due in no small part to the considered and steady hand that the former treasurer, along with the rest of government, had in formulating its response to the greatest financial disruption in 75 years.

Prior to the GFC, the United States, the United Kingdom and Japan were three of South Australia's largest merchandise export destinations. In the two years leading up to the GFC they each imported more of our goods than China. In 2009, each of these economies contracted: the United States by 2.6 per cent, the UK by 4.9 per cent and Japan by 5.2 per cent.

In the two years since to June 2010, exports to these struggling economies have decreased by 89 per cent, 28 per cent and 83 per cent respectively. This should help members to qualify the impact of the GFC on the South Australian economy. Faced with this level of economic downturn, the government and the former treasurer acted decisively to maintain support for the community wherever it could, while retaining the state's AAA credit rating and keeping the budget strong.

I look forward to watching our state continue to grow, as the budget measures we have before us come to fruition.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (20:38): I would also like to speak on the budget handed down by the government, and the Appropriation Bill. First, let me congratulate the new Treasurer, the Hon. Jack Snelling, for bringing down his first budget. Bringing a budget down is not an easy task, trying to do the best with funds available and to be able to please everybody in the state. It has been very interesting to hear members from both sides of the chamber and their views on this budget. I will also give my view, as I see it as a country member, on the budget.

While my main focus is on the electorate of Frome, I am also very concerned with regard to other parts of this great state, particularly regional South Australia. We all understand that any government, and in any case any responsible person or company, needs to adjust their budget according to the opportunity for income.

This state has been promoting the many opportunities for the resource commodities and the great additional opportunities with the awarded opportunities for the defence industries and renewable energy projects. As has been mentioned earlier tonight, this state has been very fortunate with the opportunities we have had so far. As the previous treasurer has stated, we had the global financial crisis and the loss of expected revenue from the GST share from the commonwealth government.

However, this GST is now increasing, and we are on the up. This state has had the best years of the exploration for mineral resources, and we are looking forward to the next 10 years; and, hopefully, we can grab the opportunity and reduce the debt and increase our infrastructure spending in the regional areas of South Australia. As we are all aware, Australia and, indeed, South Australia escaped the worst of the crisis, and while our state received a great share of the commonwealth stimulus package moneys, we seem to have missed the boat with long-term planning.

We had, with the pause that was created in activities as a result of the above issue, an opportunity to look at getting people ready for the time when the resumption of activities occurs within the resource sector. This state appears not to have grasped the opportunity fully, with cuts to adult education and this opportunity now being slashed—and also the reduction of TAFE subjects being taught in the regional areas, which is not the right direction we should be going in as a state.

We have people looking to be skilled or retrained, and here we have this opportunity not being taken to the fullest advantage. How are these people able to get the required training to be able to apply for positions within the resource sectors—which, I might add, are all in the top end of regional South Australia—when the opportunity arises. This is being made harder with the reductions of opportunities in regional South Australia with large infrastructure improvements being made to teaching facilities in metropolitan Adelaide.

Unemployed people in the regions are finding it hard. Unemployed people in the regions are really struggling, and if they have the opportunity for retraining they have to come to Adelaide. Some of those people cannot afford to come to Adelaide, not only in terms of the cost of petrol but also with respect to the cost of accommodation at the different locations.

We have also sent a very clear message to business opportunities within the regional areas by eliminating or making uncertain funding for Regional Development Australia after 2013. This does not send a very good, positive image out to the commercial industries or the resource opportunities. We need Regional Development Australia to be able to grasp the opportunities there. Local councils are very, very supportive of growth opportunities, but they cannot do it by themselves. They are also struggling.

We should be increasing the activities of these sectors in Regional Development Australia to encourage activities and opportunities both on this side and also on the west side of Spencer Gulf. There are many opportunities within regional South Australia, but the message being sent to

potential business partners is not very encouraging. One of the things that the member for Mitchell just indicated was: build it and they will come. I agree.

I think that is a great philosophy, but here we have the emerging resource opportunity in the north and they do not have anywhere to export their opportunities. Their minerals will be going straight up on the Adelaide to Darwin railway and being loaded at Darwin. We have Port Adelaide and Outer Harbor, but there is a lot coming down there to get to the overseas markets. The member for Mitchell has a great philosophy: build it and they will come. Build the infrastructure and they will use it. We will then reap the opportunities with the royalties, the charges and so forth, and it creates employment opportunities.

Another issue I want to bring up relates to school buses. The country school buses have been an issue for many, many years, and, as members will be very well aware, I endeavoured to get a select committee to investigate the operation of the school buses in country areas last year. That was not successful.

However, with respect to some schools, the students live a large distance away, and bearing in mind some of these parents of these Eyre Peninsula students are not very well off at all. They are struggling. Some of them do not even have a car. I will just use one example, the Lochiel to Snowtown bus. It had 10 people on it. It came down to nine, therefore the bus was eliminated. The Snowtown Area School took it upon itself to lease a bus for three years to be able to maintain those students coming in. If those students did not come in from Lochiel School to Snowtown, they would have gone to Balaklava or somewhere else, and that would have had a domino effect on the Snowtown Area School, forcing potential for closure. As the member for Stuart has indicated, schools are a very important part of the community. They are the lifeline, as are hospitals. That is something that the government needs to look at. Just because we go one below the qualifying number of 10, then we should continue to do that. We are here not only for the metropolitan area but also to qualify and assist regional students.

The electorate of Frome, as with other electorates, has a proud wine industry which not only provides export earnings for the state but is also very active in promoting tourism activities not only for people within this state but also interstate and overseas visitors. It was interesting to see in recent statements by the Minister for Tourism that the Clare region was one of the regions in the state experiencing more international tourists. This may have been as a result of running the 2010 Tour Down Under. This event gave Clare and the region great international exposure, and I am very grateful, after a lot of lobbying, that the finishing leg of the first stage of the 2012 Tour Down Under has been returned to the Clare region. The reason I am saying that is that exposure is very important. We cannot have and do not have all the money within South Australia—we need to get people from overseas and interstate.

However, despite the greater exposure with increasing tourism, the state of our regional roads leaves people with a very disappointing image of our state, and that applies not only to people living in the regions but also to the many visitors. Can you imagine somebody coming in and they go on the Northern Expressway—they are going to Clare—and, all of a sudden, they get into the back areas and the roads are very bad. The first impression is a lasting impression. They will go away and they may not come back. The amount of money included in this budget for regional roads is appreciated; however, it is far too little.

As I have mentioned previously, the state of our regional roads can be attributed to many years of successive governments not placing enough emphasis on maintaining them. We are now experiencing this loss of maintenance and infrastructure repairs to accommodate today's vehicles and lifestyles. Some of these roads were built at the end of the 1950s and 1960s—60 years ago—and lots of these roads are in their original condition. The motor car and vehicles have changed dramatically but, no matter who has been in government, we have not kept pace for many years. There are numerous roads in my electorate, in particular, the Port Broughton to Bute and the Bute to Kulpara roads; this last road being in the electorate of the member for Goyder. However, roads do not know any electoral boundaries, and I will be fighting very hard, as will the member for Goyder, to get both those roads upgraded in the next budget or the budget after that.

Also the Gladstone to Yacka road and then the road to Clare are utilised by many travellers with caravans and, again, these are tourists. These roads are not only becoming very dangerous but they are a bad image for our state. Just recently, I was in the main street of Bute and the road there is falling apart. DTEI has indicated that it is a low priority. I questioned that with the Minister for Infrastructure and, to his credit, we had a meeting, and I would hope that this road will not only be patched but it will be repaired to an acceptable standard.

During my regional visits as Chair of the select committee on grain for the parliament, the issues of roads has been brought up continually at all meetings, together with the standard of rail infrastructure, in particular in the Mallee area. There are trains that have speed restrictions and load restrictions, and that does not do well for moving grain by rail. Country people are, and always appear to have been, perceived as second cousins, and this affects the lifestyle and the confidence of extra activities in the regions.

Recently, the opposition stated at a meeting in Clare that the government would close a further 17 country hospitals and, whilst the Minister for Health has stated that this is not the case, I certainly will be asking for clarification from the minister. Statements like that do not build any confidence in regional South Australia. We cannot afford to lose any more of our hospitals, or any of the services in our current hospitals.

I have been communicating with the Minister for Health regarding increasing the payment for the authorised country people who require medical or specialist attention in Adelaide through the PAT Scheme. I have been talking to the minister for the last 18 months. This system has been the same for over 10 years at the same cost: 16¢ per kilometre, \$30 per night for accommodation, and you then have to pay the first \$30 out of your own pocket. That is an absolute disgrace for the less fortunate people in our regional areas. This system has been the same for 10 years—I will just repeat that: 10 years—and in the meantime the cost of living, the cost of fuel and the cost of accommodation have risen dramatically. Again, regional South Australia has been asked to pay for services that are readily available in metropolitan Adelaide.

I am also very passionate about regional hospitals and health services. Whilst I am very appreciative of the \$12.5 million for the new GP Plus facility in Port Pirie, again this has been in the previous budgets, and I am only hoping that the start date will be 2010, to be completed by 2013. It has been in budgets previously, and I want it to be up and running. At the same time, there is an issue with the diagnostic mammogram machine at our regional health service. It has been out of action for 12 months, and we have to wait because of all the service and the contract for the whole of the state on the medical side of things. Again, the minister knows about this, and I am very confident that he will take it on board.

We also appreciate that the cost of energy needs to keep pace with inflation and operating costs; however, as mentioned before, there are people out there with certain medical conditions who require constant cooling at the same temperature. I had the privilege of sponsoring a forum on the medical cooling facility, and the member for Ashford was there, as were the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC and also the member for Bragg. The forum highlighted these conditions and the fact that these people need to have their air conditioners operating at a constant temperature at all times, 24 hours a day. I am glad that the government has increased the concessions for those medically approved people; however, I stress that they need to keep those rebates in line with rising power costs. Do not leave it as it is today; it will not do anybody any good.

I realise that any government or private industry has to economise and look for the best practices. However, some of these moves may cause some concern for the elderly, and one of those is the elimination of the provision of registration vehicle stickers for vehicles. This may be a small cost saving, but it is causing concern for lots of people out there—especially the elderly. They are concerned they may overlook the renewal date and then, if they are driving an unregistered vehicle, they will not see it, they will forget about it, and then they will be liable for prosecution.

As the member for Mount Gambier indicated, the forward selling rotations of forests is not the way to go; we are selling our assets—the assets of our future generations. It is similar to the sale of the ETSA facilities by the Olsen government. Again, you can see what has happened now: the cost of power has risen dramatically. I think that is a retrospective move, but it is a decision that the other side has made.

Another area of concern, which happened years ago, was the relocation of various services in government departments to Adelaide that became Shared Services. There were to be massive savings by relocating to a central location, but this has not proven to be successful. I understand that a further allocation has been made towards Shared Services to further embed the new operation. The funds that have been allocated in this year and previous years to try to make it work could have been better utilised in providing funding towards extra services, equipment to country hospitals and also improving the road infrastructure in the regions. However, on a positive note, I am thankful to the Minister for Health for last year approving the four renal dialysis machines at the Port Pirie Regional Health Service. These units have been gratefully appreciated by the patients who now do not have to travel three times per week to Port Augusta.

Mr Venning: And you got the credit.

Mr BROCK: And I did get the credit, because I fought very hard in my previous role, also. Just last week at my listening post at Port Broughton, I had one of these patients come up to me and say how grateful they were that they did not have to travel to Port Augusta.

Mr Pengilly: That's one vote.

Mr BROCK: It's one vote. There were two, because it was a husband and wife; I always do it in twos. However, let's get serious. That was dominating the lives of these people; it was ruining their home life. Now they only have to go to Port Pirie, and it has changed their whole lifestyle.

Mr Venning: Rob Kerin helped.

Mr BROCK: Rob Kerin helped; yes, all right, if we can give Rob the credit. If we have to reduce expenditure for whatever reason, then we must ensure that the 'must have' items are maintained, and the 'like to have' items may have to be deferred or reduced to ensure that the items required for our day-to-day existence are maintained and improved.

We can increase income by increasing taxes and the like, which has happened in this budget and previous budgets. This move certainly does not encourage confidence or any increased activities by businesses, and it has been mentioned that small businesses are the backbone of the business community in South Australia and in the general communities.

Just before I close, that is why I think the Adelaide Oval, whilst it will be great for the metropolitan people and the followers of football, is a thing that could have been a 'nice to have'. I believe that that could have been deferred. That \$500 million could have been deferred and utilised on expenditure in rural areas.

Again, we understand the need to balance budgets. However, we need to ensure that we do it in a responsible manner and, whilst people may elect to state that this is a reasonable way to achieve the savings, it is again the less fortunate who are bearing those cuts. The Treasurer may be saying that this is a reasonable family budget. It was very well presented. However, the people who have contributed to this with increasing costs are the people living in the country.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (20:57): I can say that one could actually be forgiven, after listening to the opposition, for thinking that nothing good came out of this budget, and nothing could be further from the truth.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Sorry; I am deaf. I would like to congratulate the Treasurer on his first budget, which he brought down about two weeks ago now. I would agree that the Treasurer would have had quite a number of sleepless nights when drawing up this budget, given the narrowness of the state's revenue base and the decline in revenue estimates from the GST and property-based taxes. It is always difficult to find the right balance when drafting a budget, but I do think that the Treasurer has actually done a very good job under challenging circumstances.

This budget, though, ensures that South Australia's economy remains strong, our financial position remains secure and we continue to be supportive of those most in need, and that is exceptionally important. As has already been mentioned, the heating and cooling concession which has been introduced for those who suffer from chronic medical conditions which require them to maintain their body temperature within a narrow range to maintain their quality of life, I think is an exceptionally good initiative.

I, along with others, have been lobbying the Minister for Disabilities for some time to introduce this initiative. The concessions will greatly assist low and fixed-income earners who need additional heating and cooling. I have quite a number of people in my electorate, and I am sure other members do as well, who suffer from multiple sclerosis, paraplegia, quadriplegia—particularly given that I have a number of facilities to house people with those difficulties—and a number of other illnesses who find that even a mildly hot or cool day actually severely impacts on the quality of their life, so this will make a great difference to them.

The budget sees a number of proposals that directly impact on my electorate of Torrens, such as the improvement to the Klemzig O-Bahn Interchange, something I have discussed on a number of occasions with the Minister for Transport for a long time. It is going to greatly enhance service to my constituents. With greater urban infill and the Light's View development at Northgate

occurring within my electorate, the improvements at the Klemzig Interchange are much needed and certainly will be much appreciated by my constituents—and even those who are not my constituents but who use the Klemzig Interchange.

I am also very pleased with some planned changes to bus services which are scheduled through the Klemzig Interchange. Hopefully, having spent many early mornings down there viewing what happens, I do believe—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: —the changes that are going to occur will alleviate a number of the queues. I am really quite pleased if the member for Davenport is telling me that he likes to pop down to my electorate and catch the O-Bahn into the city.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I am happy to meet you down there and we will catch the bus together. Health has always been a priority of this Labor government and the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will be the jewel in the crown of our state's health system. The RAH is one of three public hospitals (along with the Modbury Hospital and the Women's and Children's Hospital) that my constituents rely on. It is pleasing to see ongoing investment in the Modbury Hospital with a \$46 million investment in an upgraded emergency department and 36 new inpatient rooms which will improve patient care at the hospital. I must say that I really am very excited about the new Royal Adelaide Hospital that we are going to build because I think it is a wonderful thing for our state and for the people of South Australia. Once it is built and up and running, I think people will really appreciate what has been given to them.

Another health initiative that I am very pleased about is the building of the Hillcrest satellite of the Modbury GP Plus Clinic at the Gilles Plains Campus at Gilles Crescent at Hillcrest, which is to be opened early next year. The Modbury GP Plus Clinic facilities, both at Modbury and Hillcrest—and I use the term 'Hillcrest' because it is actually physically located in Hillcrest but those of us who are local refer to it as part of the Gilles Plains Campus—are going to assist in reducing the demands placed on our public hospital emergency departments by providing nursing and midwifery services, treatments for minor injuries and illness, child health, and dental services.

I go around there at least once a week to see how the construction of the building is going and, as it is part of my Gilles Plains Community Campus, I am extremely excited about it because there is a long story about how that came about, and I am extremely honoured and pleased to have been part of it. The Gilles Plains Campus site will support chronic disease management services and also deliver health services to disadvantaged sectors of the community.

Another pleasing aspect of the budget is the increased funding for disability services which will assist in meeting the growth in demand for these services. There is additional money to help people with disabilities and their carers, as well as \$10.8 million to buy more disability equipment to help reduce waiting lists, and the \$8 million to improve disability access for public transport is greatly welcomed.

I have a number of services for the disabled in my community. My community is quite focused on such services and I know that it is very welcoming of those decisions. As we know, 32 current residents of Strathmont Centre will be relocated into community living. This will leave about 31 residents living at the centre. A sum of \$396,000 over four years has been set aside for sustainment works, and will be spent on the remaining residential villas and site infrastructure, which is necessary and also welcomed. I am keenly awaiting the release of the business case that will determine the future of the site. I am told this will be with us shortly.

I might just say, occasionally Strathmont is raised, sometimes by members of one of the houses of this place, and not necessarily, I think, in a productive way. I have in my 16 or 17 years in this chamber visited Strathmont exceptionally regularly, with a friend who had a daughter residing there, but also because I take a great interest in the services that are provided. While there are some things that certainly we are doing differently now than were done in the past, I do not think the way it is portrayed at times is quite correct. We are most excited about having former residents of Strathmont move down into community living. It has worked exceptionally well and they are extremely happy, as are their families.

The \$19.32 million funding to BreastScreen SA to provide additional resources and support digital mammogram screening is an initiative that is also to be congratulated. Breast cancer is the most common cancer among Australian women, accounting for 27 per cent of all cancer diagnoses

in 2007. One in 11 women will suffer from breast cancer before the age of 75, so I think these statistics clearly show the need for this program.

Education is always dear to my heart and I am very pleased with the ongoing commitment to funding of infrastructure in our schools. Klemzig Primary School sees \$3 million allocated this year towards the \$7.05 redevelopment of the integrated special learning unit, which is the hearing-impaired unit. Klemzig Primary and Centre for Hearing Impaired are totally integrated to provide a bilingual, bicultural program for deaf and hearing-impaired students learning both Auslan and English.

It is actually a really interesting school to visit. I have a brother-in-law who has been deaf from birth, so I find it a wonderful thing to see children in a playground who may be hearing or who may be partially deaf or completely deaf integrating in the schoolyard and communicating with each other exceptionally effectively. Those who are hearing, because they have learnt Auslan—which is the language of the Deaf—communicate just as we do verbally, and so there is that total integration.

The school is exceptionally proactive in ensuring that the deaf or partially deaf children have every opportunity that is available to them, and it also gives the hearing children a different perception of dealing with people who are a little bit different from them. They do not notice the difference at all. It is really well worth a visit and if any member would like to see how that school functions, I would be more than happy to take them for a visit. I just cannot recommend it highly enough.

One of the things about that school is that they have a choir, the Deaf choir. They sign the songs; it really is a unique experience. They often perform at school music festivals. In fact, the Queen of Sweden, Queen Silvia, visited the school some years ago to see the bilingual, bicultural program. I must say that one of the treats when visiting the school is to see not just the signing choir but the integration with the children and what a positive effect it has on the whole of the school community. Some of those children might not have a hearing impairment themselves but a sibling or one or sometimes two of their parents has a hearing impairment. They may have two deaf parents but they need to be able to speak and also communicate with their family. We all know with children with any kind of disability that, if we do not intervene very early in their life, it sets their learning back many, many years. I am very proud of the school.

Another initiative that is worth mentioning is the establishment of the network of children's centres that will integrate health, education, family and community services. Of the 34 planned centres, 23 are up and running, and one of those is in my electorate of Torrens at the Gilles Plains campus, which is where the Gilles Plains Primary School is and which is also where the spoke of the GP Plus centre will be. That is an initiative that I started pursuing some years ago, writing to the federal government and the state government. Finally, our Minister for Families and Communities picked up on an initiative and so this whole program came together. Even I am amazed at how—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: I am amazed at how we have just put this whole thing together. It is just really extraordinary. I am talking about the Gilles Plains campus.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes; he knows. You have to be persistent. I have worked out one thing in life: just be persistent, drive everyone mad and eventually—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: So quickly, you have put it together.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes. Eventually, they give up, might be one way of putting it, just to get rid of me, but I am very proud of it. At that site, we have had a coordinator appointed just recently and her role is going to be to liaise with the local community. She will bring together the care and education, health and family services, so that will all be rolled out together. As I said, I am exceptionally pleased about that.

It is also fantastic to see investment in our schools. Whilst the federal opposition has been critical of the federal Labor government's Building the Education Revolution program, I can honestly say that it has certainly been extremely well received in my electorate. The program was the biggest investment in our schools in decades, and in my own community I am yet to hear any local criticism of that program.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Catch a bus to Blackwood on Sunday and I will fill you in.

Mrs GERAGHTY: You can take me there for a ride, yes. My schools have had money invested in them that they were crying out for many, many years ago. What we as a state government have done is invested in them, like the money we have put into the Klemzig school and a number of others. These school halls have been the icing on the cake.

The \$12 million boost to the Home and Community Care program is another welcome initiative. It is certainly going to assist older South Australians who live in their homes—and we do try to keep older people in their homes—and it will certainly assist people with disabilities who live independently. HACC, which is a joint initiative of the federal and state governments, supports more than 95,000 people in South Australia who receive services such as domestic home help and nursing and allied health care like physiotherapy, podiatry, home-delivered meals, personal care and also social support, which is exceptionally important. Again, this is a service providing help to those who most need it.

Another important focus of this government is the spending of an extra \$69.1 million over the next four years to support child welfare in South Australia. The \$8.4 million investment in six new residential care homes will help provide a more stable, secure and homely environment for children in state care. We know that that is incredibly important. These new homes will focus on keeping sibling groups together while working towards reuniting them with their parents. Where it is appropriate, ultimately where possible it really is best to reunite children who are in state care with their families; but, sadly and regrettably, that is not always possible.

I again congratulate the Treasurer on his framing of this year's budget. It provides a responsible mix of economic restraint, while focusing importantly on the services for those who most need it. I am exceptionally pleased that my electorate has greatly benefited from a number of the initiatives that he has set down for us.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (21:16): Our leader and shadow treasurer have put on the record our view of the budget in detail and alluded to copious financial figures. The only thing I can really find that is in tune with this government is the space shuttle program—because they are both coming to an end. I have added it up, and I reckon we have 14 or 15 members on the other side who are either in the transit lounge or in the captain's club waiting to go—and what a mess they are going to leave in this state! There is only one thing worse than this government, and that is the Greens; let me tell you, they both should disappear.

It has been an interesting transition from treasurer Foley to Treasurer Snelling; it has been a most interesting experience. I commented a week or two ago, and it has been commented on since—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I will come to you in a minute, Robyn. We had the seemingly benign appearance of Treasurer Snelling, coming in to do his first budget, and there was a picture of him with his family—he has a lovely family. However, let me just say this attempt at a new version of Shylock from the SDA has failed pitifully. He has absolutely no idea.

I really do not know for the life of me how you can go to school, have a year or two at university, go into a union, come in here at the age of 24, never have any real-life experience and become the Treasurer of the state. It is a singular failing of the Labor Party that it is filled up with union hacks and going nowhere. Very few have life experience, but one of the main ones with life experience is the minister for primary industries. He has at least run a business and knows something about business, and he gets pooh-poohed by his own side all the time, which is a travesty of justice. At least he has some idea.

Then we have the bizarre appearance on radio of the member for Mawson earlier this week doing another latter-day version of, 'Et tu, Brute,' sticking it right up the current Premier. This is after the Premier stepped in and bailed him out at last election by announcing the Southern Expressway, by announcing the McLaren Vale overpass, by doing this, that and everything else, and on top of that, he has gone to live in Port Willunga. I ask you—it is ridiculous.

I found the member for Fisher's contribution a little bit interesting this afternoon. With the 300-odd pages in the *Government Gazette* of government charges that are going up, the enormous increase in water and the effect of all these increases on the average family, I think it is a bit rich for the government to sit here and say what a wonderful job they are doing for government members.

Why I mention the member for Fisher is because he picked up on local government and rates, and I almost equate the two. What has happened is that the government and local councils,

bless them—and I am a great defender of local government, they do a mighty job—are being starved of additional funding from state and federal government. However, what they are doing in tandem with the government is putting things up to the extent that the average family on a fixed income is staring right down the barrel.

While local government puts up its rates—CPI and anything up to 11 or 12 per cent—they have no idea of the ratepayer's ability to pay and, likewise, the government has no idea of the family's ability to pay. They simply cannot afford another \$750 a year on average that each household in South Australia is going to pay. It is decidedly unfair. They simply cannot handle it.

If you wonder why numbers are down at the AFL football—and given that my belief is that the Crows and Port ought to play each other for the rest of the year so that one of them can win the odd game—the fact is that families simply cannot afford to go to sport. They simply cannot afford to go. They are pinned to the wall by increasing costs, and we have these ongoing debacles.

I am also being given information that in the department of environment, the national parks are scheduling a 6 to 8 per cent increase in their park entrance fees on 1 April next year—way above CPI. My personal view is that the department of environment should do what they have done in the new governments interstate: they have put it in with primary industries. Get rid of the department and put it in with primary industries. I think that would be a good move.

I heard earlier the member for Reynell, I think, talking about housing and what a fantastic job the state government is doing about housing. Well, it is a bit rich for her to stand up there and talk about that when the government have got rid of 12,000 houses.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: We have not.

Mr PENGILLY: I am just about to pay you a platitude actually, minister, so just wait a minute.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I seek protection from this vicious attack. I was about to say to the minister, before she interrupted, but I have actually had a great deal of assistance from this minister in finding housing in my electorate for people, both down on the South Coast and on Kangaroo Island. I want to put on the record my great concern—and the minister would not be aware of it, and I would not expect her to be in a department of that size—that her department and other agencies are sending people out into the country from the city, particularly to Victor Harbor and Kangaroo Island (more so on the Island) where there just is not the housing nor the support services.

Unfortunately, those people are disadvantaged families in our community, and we always have them. The minister and I know that; we have talked about it. However, disadvantaged families and families who simply cannot cope with life are being sent across to Kangaroo Island where there are no support services, there is no public transport, not enough to assist them, and they are getting themselves—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order.

Mr Williams: What number?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Yes, 303.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Sibbons): Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: You used it yesterday. There is a 303. Look it up.

Mr Williams: No, there is not.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: There is. The member for Finnis has made the assertion that the government has got rid of 12,000 public houses. That is not true. In fact, 11,000 public houses were sold under the previous Liberal government. I suggest he withdraw that comment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Minister, there is no point of order. Member for Finnis, continue please.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you very much for your protection.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: As long as it is on the record.

Mr PENGILLY: Perhaps not 12,000; perhaps more like 14,000. I am not sure. Anyway, there are a lot of them gone. Minister, the reality is that some of the people in your department are sending more and more families out into the bush where there are not the support services.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I am sorry, but when I have education authorities, when I have police come to me raising these issues, there is something wrong, Jennifer. I did say that I paid you credit for assisting me on many occasions, but I am also placing well and truly—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Oh, shut up!

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Okay, I have made my point on that. I am concerned and other authorities are concerned because it is increasing problems across my electorate, and it should stop. Quite simply, if these people cannot find accommodation, cannot find the facilities they need in the metropolitan area, there is little or nothing to be gained from pushing them out into rural areas across the state where we do not have the support mechanisms.

In the last 24 hours, we have learned that the \$24 million debt at the zoo cannot be paid, so the government has had to step in. Once again, all of a sudden, the government can find \$2 million to assist the zoo when it could not for months and months find anything to assist Minlaton, the hospitals on Yorke Peninsula or at Keith, or whatever.

Mr Williams: Keith.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, I just said Keith. You can have your turn in a minute.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Well, have another turn. It could not find money but, overnight, it can find—

Mr Williams: Can we get the zoo to take over the Keith Hospital? They'd run it.

Mr PENGILLY: The reality is that the zoo is an integral part of South Australian culture. It is a wonderful zoo. We were most supportive of the panda enclosure and the other buildings that had to be done there. I was on the Public Works Committee at the time. However, in my view, the government has failed. The shadow treasurer (the member for Davenport) raised it today. The government has failed again. Their people on the board of the zoo have failed them, just like their people on the State Bank board failed them all those years ago, in the early 1990s.

Much has been said. I listened with interest to the member for Torrens and I nodded my head in agreement with much of what she had to say. However, this government has absolutely no idea what is happening to small business. It has no idea. Only today I learned of a major enterprise down in Victor Harbor that is closing in the next week or two because just one of the many costs that they have to bear is land tax. They are up for \$98,000 in land tax, and it is beyond them to pay.

The economy is declining, Australians are going overseas in droves and the incoming tourism industry is staggering at the moment. I know of businesses in my electorate that are talking downturns to the extent of 30 per cent in international visitation. While we are on the subject, the government has gutted the SATC, the very government agency—small as it is—that should be out there doing all it can to bring people into the state. It is a big employer in the tourism industry, an enormous employer in the state, particularly in rural and regional areas. The government has gutted the SATC and, once again, we go down hill—no experience in business.

I have raised the issue of police resources in my electorate with the media, and I have raised it in this place. The state government talks about the number of additional police resources it has, but the reality is that it is bringing them in from areas close to Adelaide, putting them into the city on Friday and Saturday nights, and they are reducing the numbers available for patrol out in other regional areas. That is what is going on. The government is robbing Peter to pay Paul.

There is an increasing rate of petty crime in areas of my electorate which concerns me greatly. We do not have a lot of crime down our way, either on the Fleurieu or on the island, but the petty crime rate is lifting, and an analysis of that will be done. It is a major worry to me that the police are not getting the resources they need.

We are spending a fortune on this marine parks program, about which I have spoken on countless occasions, probably much to the interest of the minister, I am sure. The reality is that we are still spending a fortune on that and, at the risk of repeating myself, I am told that park prices are going up 6 to 8 per cent. We are still spending \$500,000 on sterilising koalas on Kangaroo Island.

On that topic alone, there has been absolutely no research done since the 2007 fires which burnt out a third of the island, including enormous amounts of koala habitat. There has been no research done whatsoever into how many got cooked in those fires, yet we are still pouring money into sterilising koalas. These are simple things.

I am very pleased that the government has found in its budget some money for roads in my electorate but, more particularly, \$2 million into Kangaroo Island roads. It has picked up on the Liberals' promise last year before the election when we promised \$2.5 million a year over four years on an ongoing basis to do something about the roads and the government has announced that it is putting in \$2 million. I welcome that, and I welcomed that in the local press.

That was not enough for the Minister for Transport. The Minister for Transport had to have his fun and games and he got his beavers up there beavering away in his office, so he rings up and they put in the local paper that Pengilly has written 147 letters to the Minister for Transport but not mentioned Kangaroo Island roads. I have news for the minister. We have counted up 20 speeches that I have made in this place since 2006 particularly on Kangaroo Island roads, and we have not finished yet: we have not even got to the last 12 months. So, when the Minister for Transport wants to play little ducks and drakes—this is more government expenditure—and send a press release by courier to the island to announce that, he should get his staff to look and see how many times I have talked about it in the parliament, because the local people know.

We have what is called in our policies a Royalty for Regions. It is a wonderful idea, I support it in its entirety and it should be brought into play as soon as we get into government, hopefully in 2014.

I am pleased to see more money being put into fire protection by the environment minister. I think that is a good move and am pleased about that. However, what really worries me is that we are running out of volunteers. In the early 1990s we had 17,000 CFS volunteers. We are now down to under 11,000. It is a major concern that the bush is getting duded and people are leaving to work elsewhere and the volunteer ethic is dribbling away very slowly.

What I note, and it is very evident on the South Coast in the Victor Harbor, Port Elliot and Middleton area, is that most of my volunteers and service club people are what we would call senior citizens. They do an absolutely fantastic job but they are ageing and the younger people who are coming through are simply not picking up on the volunteer ethic like they used to. They are involved in sports clubs, but they have families that are struggling and they have to work. We have increasing numbers who are working away two weeks on and two weeks off, and it is putting pressure on everything.

I listened to the member for Reynell about an hour ago talking about the government's priorities and the priority of health, and she talked about 29.4 per cent, I think, of the state budget going into health. It is no secret that the minister himself has said that, the way we are going in this state, before very long, in a few short years, health is going to take all of the state budget. The whole lot will be taken just by the health budget. This is a major concern. I am very lucky that I have wonderful health facilities in my electorate. We have two hospitals—the South Coast hospital at Victor and the Kangaroo Island hospital at Kingscote.

Mr Gardner: They have got some tremendous staff.

Mr PENGILLY: The reality is that we have wonderful health facilities, wonderful people serving those facilities and wonderful doctors across the regional areas. In my electorate, I am particularly grateful that I have such wonderful medical practices across the electorate—at Kingscote, Yankalilla, Victor Harbor, Port Elliot, the Middleton area and also wider afield at Mount Compass. So, I am very lucky. But we cannot take our eye off the ball.

In closing, let me also indicate that I am delighted that the Tour Down Under is coming back for a stage and finishing in Victor Harbor. It is a wonderful event, and it was highly successful and popular last time, and it will be highly successful and popular again. I look forward to seeing that next January. Likewise, I support the government in its push for a surfing competition at Vivonne Bay in November; it is a good step forward. I only hope that there is some surf; that is the major worry.

What does worry me is that there is a group that is trying to destroy the concept of the surf carnival. They do not want it to happen. I go back to my initial comments about the Greens, which I made at the start of this address. There is a group of people in this state, it does not matter where they are, they want to stop everything. They want to pull everything up, everything sacred, everything has to be protected. This surfing competition will be fantastic. It will be properly run and it will be an asset to the island and to South Australia, as indeed are the surfing competitions already being run at places such as Waitpinga and around at Boomer Beach and other areas. I support the bill, with reservations.

[Sitting extended beyond 22:00 on motion of Hon. J.M. Rankine]

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (21:37): I want to take this opportunity to outline for the house the budget for the Department for Families and Communities for 2011-12. I will give a very brief summary of that and then dispel some of the nonsense and rot that has been—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —spoken in this house over recent days. The overall increase in the budget for the Department for Families and Communities is in the vicinity of \$149 million over the next four years. This an amazing—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —outcome in light of the tight financial straits we find ourselves in and an indication of—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Well, that's right. The member for MacKillop would consider providing funding for people with a disability and families struggling and children needing care and protection a waste of money, so I hope Hansard has that on the record.

Their disability budget will be increased by \$56 million over the next four years, and this money comes on top of an additional \$17.9 million in last year's budget. It will address key spending priorities, including accommodation support, therapy services, day options and respite. Some examples of that are therapy for children attending Novita services, a family support program for children at Novita and, importantly, a grant of \$40,000 for Tutti Kids; \$10.8 million over four years for the equipment program and home modifications, and I will go into some detail about that in a moment; and, very importantly, \$7.7 million to relocate 32 of the remaining 63 residents of Strathmont.

The Families SA budget has an extra \$69.1 million over the next four years. This is money for alternative care, providing residential care facilities, two new facilities for children, so that we do not actually have children in inappropriate emergency care. There is also nearly \$19 million for a reunification program and support for parents to assist them make the changes they need to be able to keep their children at home with them safely.

Mr VENNING: I rise on a point of order. I believe the minister in making this speech should be making it from her ministerial spot rather than the duty minister, where she is.

The SPEAKER: Under normal circumstances that may apply but standing order No. 64 states that the Speaker may determine where a member stands when they speak and I am quite comfortable with the minister speaking from that seat, but thank you for bringing that to my attention.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am sure if I was at my spot as opposed to being the duty minister the member would be complaining about that as well, but never mind.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: In relation to concessions for financially disadvantaged people in our community, there is \$23.9 million over four years; a medical heating and cooling rebate of \$1.8 million over the next four years, which will double the energy concession for people who have eligible medical conditions; and an increase in the water rate concession that will take the concession from a minimum of 20 per cent of an account to 25 per cent.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: In dollar terms I think that is about a 55 per cent increase. So, that is a substantial increase and will benefit approximately 186,000 people every year here in South Australia.

I want to address some of the assertions that have been made during this debate. The shadow minister for families and communities has made the assertion that this government has totally dismissed the non-government sector. I think the member needs to have a serious look at the partnership between the state government and the non-government sector. In fact, we issue contracts worth something like \$400 million a year to non-government organisations and they take up about 50 per cent of the disability funding. So, rather than dismissing the non-government sector they are, in fact, very valuable partners in all areas of the work that we do in our community.

The member for Bragg made a comment along the lines that the member for Port Adelaide had been consigned to the dustbin of history. I bet that after the 2010 election there were many Liberals who were thinking that would be a good place for the member for Bragg after her performance. She made comments—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What performance was that?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Her lack of support for the leadership.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The member for Croydon should not be interjecting on the minister during her contribution, particularly from the Leader of the Opposition's seat.

The SPEAKER: Order! We do not need you to discuss this. Thank you, member for Davenport. The member for Croydon will note that and I will uphold that point of order. You will stop disturbing the minister, who is making a very serious speech. It does remind me of old times when we used to regularly have Wednesday night sittings. It is quite an interesting night. It is interesting to see it from the chair rather than from the other side. Minister, I will try to protect you from now on.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They are always frightened when the member for Bragg remains silent. She was very silent when she was asked whether she would continue to support the Leader of the Opposition, but that is by the bye. It helped lose the election for them, if I remember. She made some reference to privatisation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —in her address.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order. The minister keeps using the word 'she'. It is 'the member for Bragg'.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold that point of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The member for Bragg happens to be a female and we generally refer to them as 'she'. Do you want me to refer to her as 'it'?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members on my left will stop provoking the minister and behave themselves and if not they can go back to the bar. Minister?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will support that totally if you go. Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The member for Bragg—'it'—referred to privatisation. A *7.30 Report* article from 2000—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, ma'am.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr PENGILLY: The minister is quite ridiculously reflecting on another member.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. Sit down and behave.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: 'It' referred to the *7.30 Report* article from 2000, which confirmed that the Liberals planned to sell the lotteries. This followed the Liberal's privatisation of ETSA, SGIC, the State Bank, the Adelaide Casino, the TAB, South Australian Ports, Modbury Hospital, etc.

Mr Pengilly: Is this the best you can do?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The member for Bragg claimed 'more money is being spent with more and more demand but less and less services being provided'. Since coming into office the Rann government has increased state disability funding by 93 per cent. Around 20,145 people receive disability support services in South Australia. This is an increase of over 5,000 new clients since coming to office and compares with Western Australia, which has a budget of in excess of \$152 million more than South Australia and gets 4,000 fewer clients.

As of 31 May, 346 people are yet to have their needs fully assessed in relation to equipment. That said, this financial year no-one of the highest priority has been waitlisted, and we are well placed to exceed supplying 5,000 pieces of equipment and 700 home modifications this financial year. Since coming into government we have spent an unprecedented \$50.5 million on disability equipment.

The government is also increasing the annual funding for equipment services by \$2.6 million in 2011-12; and, due to our commitment, the 2011-12 direct spending on equipment, repairs and home modifications for adults and children will total \$9.3 million. This is 95 per cent more than 2002-03. In 2001-02, under the Liberal government 1,393 new items of equipment and home modification were provided.

In 2010-11, more than 5,000 equipment items and 600 home modifications are expected to be provided. Home and community services have increased by 99 per cent since 2002. More people are receiving more services than ever before. Similarly, the number of people receiving HACC services is increasing. In 2009-10 it was 95,600, and this is increasing to a target of 99,500 in 2011-12. The number of ACAT assessments has decreased, but this is due to changes in commonwealth legislation, which has reduced the number of assessments that are required. If a person is changing from low care to high care, for example, they no longer require an assessment.

In relation to the Public Trustee, the 2010-11 budget included a savings initiative to transfer responsibility for disability client trust management from the Department for Families and Communities (DFC) to the Public Trustee. It is inappropriate for DFC as a service provider to also manage people's funds. That is appropriately the role of the Public Trustee or an appropriate third party. These changes are coming into place. A decision has been deferred until 1 July 2012 to allow people to properly plan for a transition and whether they engage with the Public Trustee, another third party, another organisation, or whether family and friends actually undertake that work.

In relation to concessions, the member for Bragg said something along the lines that utility service concessions are not even a pinch on what the increased costs are going to be. Since coming to office, the government has provided and significantly raised concessions for eligible seniors and other low and fixed-income people. Every concession in this state, as I understand it (and I am happy to be corrected), was introduced by a Labor government with one exception, the Emergency Services Levy. The Liberals introduced a tax and were forced to introduce a

concession on that tax by the Independents in this place. We have announced a significant boost to concessions for something like over 200,000 South Australians and we have, for the first time, indexed concessions on energy, water, emergency services and sewerage by 5 per cent each year until 2012-13.

The cost of rising utilities and the impact this has had on those doing it financially tough has not been underestimated by our government. In 2011-12, we have committed a further \$22.1 million to further increase water concessions from 20 to 25 per cent of the total annual water bill on top of last year's increases and, as I said, we have also introduced the energy, heating and cooling concession, which will effectively double the current energy concession for eligible South Australians.

I want to briefly conclude in relation to housing. The member for Bragg mentioned a \$30 increase given to single pensioners that is now being included in housing trust rents. Let me make it really, really clear: South Australia provides more public housing per capita than any other state in Australia. South Australia provides a subsidy of more than \$200 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, it is not your speech. Would you please be quiet!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey will behave as well.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: South Australia provides more public housing per capita than any other state in Australia. Housing SA provides a subsidy of more than \$200 million every year to public housing tenants. No tenant pays more than 25 per cent of their income in rent. The Liberals sold more than 11,000 houses in eight years—and I hope the member for Finniss is listening to this: the Liberals sold more than 11,000 houses in eight years.

Since we have been in government, we have sold about a quarter of that. In no year has the highest—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —number of house sales reached the lowest number that the Liberals sold in a year. Labor has also been at the forefront of the stimulus package, building 1,368 new houses and refurbishing 503 others—and the Liberals voted against this stimulus package. Labor created the Property Locator website so low and middle income buyers can get on to the property ladder and build a future. We have created the equity start loan, which has helped around 1,200 public housing tenants buy a home.

Money from 1,000 of the sales was placed in an affordable housing innovation fund which, amongst other things, is supporting 500 new affordable houses in partnerships with non-government organisations. Labor created the National Rental Affordability Scheme federally, and the South Australian government has committed to funding 3,800 new affordable rental properties in South Australia. The Liberals were too busy selling public housing to come up with any innovative new ideas. Out of interest, I would like to know: what are the Liberal's policies on housing?

Many things went down under the previous Liberal government, including its credibility. And who was the state director of the Liberal Party for most of the previous Liberal government? The member for Bragg. Where was the member for Bragg? On the record—

An honourable member: No she wasn't!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —speaking against her own trashing of public—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order.

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

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I do not want to unduly interrupt the minister, because I know that would be out of order, Madam Speaker, but the minister previously took a point of order correcting the member for Finniss on an error of fact that the minister alleged. So, in fairness, I should correct the minister, because I know she is not one to want to deliberately mislead the house. The member for Bragg has never been the state director of the South Australian Liberal Party—

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: —as claimed by the minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you for your correction.

The SPEAKER: You are acknowledging that correction, are you?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Where has she been on the record speaking against her own party, trashing public housing here in South Australia? I venture to say: nowhere. She only squawks when there might be something in it for her. That is a fact.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order. Madam Speaker, you have already corrected the minister: it is not 'she'; it is the 'member for Bragg'. Members should not be called by their names; it is the member for Bragg.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The member for Bragg squawks when there might be something in it for her.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: That's what the member for Bragg calls a social conscience. And I think it was fair and reasonable for *The Advertiser* to pose the question today: what do the Liberals stand for in this state? I do not know.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: I think it is standing order 303. The minister has now used 17 valuable minutes of the house's time, and what the people of South Australia really want to know is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will sit down. That was a frivolous point of order. You will behave. You did not quote me a standing order number.

Mr Williams: 303!

The SPEAKER: You were making a point yourself, so I think it is even both ways now. Minister, you have three minutes left.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I do think it was reasonable of *The Advertiser* to ask today what the Liberals stand for in South Australia, because I do not know.

Mr Williams: You don't know nothing.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop, I suggest you go outside and cool down for a while.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is late, I know; however, this behaviour is not acceptable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Finniss will not turn his back to the Speaker and stand in the way of another speaker. The member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (21:56): I too congratulate the Hon. Jack Snelling on delivering his first budget.

Mr Williams: Why? It was an awful budget.

Mr VENNING: I didn't say it was good. I said 'delivering': very careful choice of words. People expect that what politicians say is generally just rhetoric. I want to make some observations tonight that I think people will not just pass off as rhetoric. Now more than ever before, the decisions made by the Rann Labor government are seriously hurting and affecting everyday South Australians. Why else would they be so low in the polls? This budget is my 23rd and is yet another Labor document where the Rann Labor government cuts expenditure to vital areas and increases taxes yet again.

It is another Labor budget where one-third of South Australia misses out. Country South Australia does not rate in this Labor budget and has not since 2002. We were already the highest taxed state in South Australia. Now, after this budget, the situation has become worse. You, Madam, are the only government member representing a country area. I wonder what you think about what is happening in country South Australia because, not only do you drive on your own roads and look at your own facilities in the north around Whyalla, you also drive on some of ours as well, so I do often wonder what you think as the only member of the Labor party living outside Adelaide.

The cost of living in South Australia is Labor's legacy. We are now paying extra for the privilege of living in South Australia versus the other states, and it is becoming very obvious. This budget, Labor's 10th, turns an \$81 million surplus last December into a \$263 million deficit now. The huge over-employment in the Public Service is but one of the reasons for our economic malaise. Over 12,000 extra positions were not budgeted for, and that does not include the nurses and policeman and other essential public servants. You just wonder how that could happen. Now you have the problem of trying to downscale them, and it is very difficult to put them out. You have employed them, totally out of control.

The Treasurer said the other day after the budget, 'I think the community will understand that times are tight.' Well, the only reason that times are tight for the government is because of its own financial mismanagement—wastage, blowouts—and it will continue to get worse once they sell off our income-producing forests in the South-East and the Lotteries Commission. What a ridiculous thing to do: two cash cows looking after the future of our state and they are both going to be sold.

It is a budget for now and not for the future, certainly not past March 2014. It really is a budget that is all about maintaining the AAA credit rating—Standard & Poor's. The criteria for Standard & Poor's to make a judgment should stand a fair bit of scrutiny in relation to what a credit rating is. When you see the debt of this government, the intended debt, and when you see the essentials that are required for this, apparently the government pays for this credit rating—the shadow treasurer nods. You pay for the credit rating and then Standard & Poor's stand in judgment.

I wonder how, without the sale of the forests and the lotteries, our credit rating would have stood. If that is the reason, it is a pretty sad day for South Australia. I will be having a very good look at Standard & Poor's. I think it needs to come under scrutiny, as does the media in this place, about the debt we are running and what is actually happening.

Times are tight for many South Australian households and families, as the cost of living continues to rise, but there does not appear to be any relief for the hip pocket at all from the Labor government. You cannot fool all the people all the time. If you listen to some of the speeches tonight, particularly from the member for Mitchell—I could not believe that he and I were living in the same state. You would not believe the rose-coloured glasses the member for Mitchell must have on. I think you need to travel outside of Gepps Cross and have a look and, likewise, the member for Torrens. I could not believe the rhetoric that was coming from over there.

The people of South Australia are waking up. No wonder Mr Bignell spoke out the other day. I could not believe it. I was driving along in the car (on 639) when I heard the member for Mawson being interviewed. He was there talking away and he said those words and I thought, 'That can't be right.' Anyway, the man's got courage. He is fighting for his survival because he is in a marginal seat, and I can understand that. In the end, well, we will see what happens.

But South Australians are waking up. The rising cost of living through increased taxes is demonstrating to all South Australians that the Labor government does not care. There is a huge cost for businesses operating in South Australia. As one of my colleagues said earlier, very few of them, apart from the Minister for Primary Industries who knows a bit about business, have ever run

a business. The cost of operating a business in South Australia is as high as anywhere in Australia and 22 per cent of the Australian business transfers interstate are from South Australia. These are facts from the Bureau of Statistics: 22 per cent of all the transfers are out of South Australia. Who can blame them? The big problem is that we have people going overseas but, worse for us, is that head offices are moving out of South Australia and going interstate.

We are being compared to other states every day, especially with land tax and investment housing. Why would you want to be in investment housing? I have some of these. Why would you be in investment housing here in Adelaide when you have to pay land tax to the point that you do? Your profit is all going in land tax. Why do you want the hassle, when you can go to Sydney and other places where the land tax is either nothing or minimal. We are losing. The people of South Australia who rely on rental housing are the losers. Most of these people would be supporters of the government, so that is—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a lot of noise. It is very hard to hear the member for Schubert, who is very passionate.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VENNING: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The minister was right alongside me here. Can I make the point that a lot of the constituents of members on the other side rent their houses. Just consider the landlord who owns that place, who has to maintain it, and now you are seeing the levels of land tax that that person has to pay. Can you understand it when you see the 'For sale' sign go up and he has moved interstate? The problem then is: who wants to buy it? There are a lot of land rentals on the market and nobody is buying them. Believe me, that is what is happening. It is a pretty sad state of affairs.

Fifty-one per cent of South Australians did not want this government elected last March in 2010. Now, only 16 months later, this figure has certainly escalated. People have switched off this government and we know why. You can spin the matters of state importance so that people are unaware of the grave condition of the state economy, but you can only spin it so far. Now, even with a bloated public relations outfit in the Premier's department, the spin is falling on deaf ears. People have switched off, because they can see firsthand the huge cost that they all now have to meet. Rises to taxes, charges and utilities will cost the average household about \$750 per year. You tell that to working class families who are battling with school fees, battling with their power bills and everything else. You tell them; \$750 has got to come from somewhere. They will remember this in March 2014.

That \$750 comes with no improvement in services, and that is what people are feeling. Families will hurt because of this. They do not want to hear spin from the Treasurer and family man. I pay credit for that; I thought the picture of the family was quite appropriate and I congratulate him on being a great family man, but it does not make it a good budget. The Treasurer claims to understand the impact that the rise in cost of living expenses is having on the average South Australian family. Well, I very much doubt that.

What about those on fixed incomes—the elderly, the retirees, the pensioners? How will they go finding the cash for all these extra costs? Just tell them. A lot of them—I would say more than half—are your constituents. People who have voted Labor all their lives are now feeling the pinch. Some of the increases in this year's budget include water bills, which have almost trebled, and gas and electricity prices have doubled. The cost of renewing a driver's licence has increased by 32 per cent—32 per cent! The first homeowners' payment has been abolished. What will that do to the housing market?

Speeding fines are to rise by 29 per cent. For example, the speeding fine for travelling at 58 km/h in a 50 kilometre zone will increase from \$196 to \$252. Why would you do that? Because that is the area where the revenue is raised, when people inadvertently slip in a 60/50. That is where the revenue is; they want to maximise it, so they up that bit. I have no problem with raising the fine over 110—no problem at all—because when you are doing that you know, but they are abusing people who do not happen to see the 50 sign on a major road. I think that is an abuse. That is harvesting the driver and it is proof again—proof positive—that this really is about revenue raising and has little to do with road safety.

There is the introduction of more fixed speed cameras to raise even more revenue, \$24 million more in expiation fees. They really are now leaning on these cameras to balance their

budget. Tax increases will deliver this government an extra \$1.1 billion in tax revenue over the forward estimates. Madam Speaker, where has the money gone? Where is the money going? At the current rate, the interest bill that the government pays on its debt is approaching \$2 million per day. Imagine what could be done for regional and rural South Australia if every day a different community was given \$2 million to work on a project in their area.

What do we get for the increases in tax revenue? We get a new Royal Adelaide Hospital, built on the rail yards. We were promised it would cost \$1.7 billion, going into the election, when it knew, and it has now been revealed, that it will cost not \$2.8 but \$3.2 billion. That is a cost of \$1.1 million a day for 30 years. I cannot believe this could happen. If you and I, Madam Speaker, say, had planned to build a house in Adelaide today and we had budgeted for a figure of \$400,000 and we got it quoted and it came back at \$800,000, what would we do? What would the average person do? What would you do? You would say, 'I can't afford this. I'm backing off.' I would say no thanks and back off, and that is exactly what you should do. This is a figure that we cannot afford. I wonder how many of you on the backbench over there had a say in this matter. Who gave the permission to continue at this hugely escalated cost? You do not know, do you?

Mr Sibbons interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Member for Mitchell, did you have a say in that?

Mr Sibbons: The sky is falling, isn't it?

Mr VENNING: Member for Mitchell, was your voice heard in that opinion? Did you get a vote in it?

Mr Sibbons: The sky is falling, isn't it?

Mr VENNING: I am asking you directly: did you have any input into that decision?

An honourable member: It's not question time.

Mr VENNING: Well, you interjected, and I am asking you. I do not think they did. I think that the Premier, the Treasurer and minister Conlon would have had to make that decision, with no consultation with any of the others. I believe that you should have said, 'It's too expensive, so the state cannot afford that at this time.' I am not asking you to shelve the project but to pull back and say, 'We can't afford it at this time,' or at least seek wider contracts to try to get the price pruned.

I wonder how many people actually tendered for it. The trouble is that you do not have a large tender pool anymore, and that is part of the problem. We do not have it because most of them are from interstate. The cost of their coming over here is expensive and they rip us off—they really rip us off. I firmly believe that at this point in time you should have said, 'At that price, we cannot afford it. The answer is no. We will give the current Royal Adelaide a minor spruce up,' and then planned it for another day.

I throw out that challenge because we really cannot afford it. Whatever the price was, are you just going to keep saying yes, yes, yes? A lot of you people are going to personally pay the price for this. When we are broke in 2014 you are going to pay a big, big personal price. It is going to get worse than the State Bank because we do not have the capacity to pay it back. We do not have the asset set to sell to pay the bill. I do not know how you are going to pay this debt off in the next 10 years, if this continues.

Labor did it in 1993 with the State Bank debt, and I was here. I was in this house when it happened and the members of the government were in denial, just like you are tonight. They were in total denial and, all of a sudden, the sky did fall in, member for Mitchell. The sky fell in all right and look what happened: only 10 of you were left—10 of you made it back here. The only thing I regret is that the Liberal Party did not form the opposition. We could have formed the opposition and had all the cars and all the perks of office. I was sitting on this side of the house actually, in government, because there were so many of us. That is one of those things you will read about in my book one day, Madam Speaker.

We had enough to form the opposition, but that can happen again. Seriously, that can happen again when you are into that much debt. I believe that the outcome this time will be worse than the State Bank debt, and what for? To build a hospital we do not need because the existing hospital could have been upgraded with a huge reduction in the cost. Our current Royal Adelaide has a wonderful reputation, in a wonderful setting offering a great service. Yes, I believe the plan that we had was sustainable and achievable.

I also think that to spend \$535 million on upgrading Adelaide Oval is wrong at this time. I know some of my ex-colleagues do not agree with us, but I do not believe that it is what the majority of South Australians want at this time because, again, we cannot afford it. What is \$535 million on a sports stadium going to do for the economy of South Australia? What is it really going to do?

We have accepted this decision on this side of the house. We have gone along with it now because it has gone too far, but why not bring in the codes two years earlier? Why wait four years? Bring them in in two years' time and put the footbridge there. I agree that that would make a big difference. Give the place a coat of paint, upgrade the food outlets and the loos and then see what happens. If it works, if it is a goer, then spend the rest. Our two local teams need to get their act together, really lift their standards and make the competition worth supporting, and that is the biggest reason: it has little to do with the facilities. I just think that \$535 million is a huge amount of money, and I do not think it is justified at this time. I am sad to see that the ambience of the Adelaide Oval will be totally destroyed.

I do not make any speech on the budget without mentioning the Barossa. There is not a mention, not a sign, in the budget of anything to do with the Barossa hospital—nothing. What chance do we have now with these huge expenses on the new Royal Adelaide on the rail yard and the oval? What chance have we got of getting anything? Even though the government's own business case states that we need a new hospital, it is totally ignoring its own report. I do not think we can see anything inside 25 years. This hospital was on the top of the list when I was on the Public Works Committee right back in 2003. That is when it was on top of the list, and that was not bad, and very little has been spent ever since—very little. So, what are you going to do? Are you just going to keep on going with a hospital in a growth area like that? Nothing at all.

The question I now want answered is: will the Labor government spend the money needed to bring the existing hospitals—the hospital at Tanunda and the one at Angaston—up to standard? If you will not build us a new one, are you going to fix up the old ones, the two of them? The community has agreed to close two and have one, which I think is very commendable. It is a brave decision, as the member for the Barossa, because you know the parochialism between those two towns. If you are not going to build us a new hospital, I challenge the government to fix up the old ones. I am amazed that the Department of Health has not gone through there and put an order on it. I am also very concerned about the sale of the Lotteries, and the sale of the forests particularly, because I believe it is going to affect our economy in a very big way.

I will not continue on, but all I can say is that country people in South Australia have no joy in this. Yes, I did enjoy the contributions of the member for Frome and the member for Mount Gambier—country members—this afternoon. Look, there is no joy in this, and this government is so blatantly ignoring South Australians. I hope you, Madam Speaker, representing country South Australia, have a strong voice in the cabinet because it is not working for us; I certainly hope it works for you. I am very concerned that this budget just does not go where it needs to go. One-third of South Australians live outside of Adelaide. You would not think so looking at this budget.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (22:17): In this budget we see a \$263 million deficit in 2010-11 and South Australia's debt rising to \$8.2 billion over the course of the forward estimates. Of course, the \$263 million deficit that we see in 2010-11 was initially projected to be a surplus. The last series of budgets and Mid-Year Budget Reviews all suggested that in that financial year there would be a surplus coming. Now that we have the figures in, the reality is that it is a \$263 million deficit.

When the budget papers suggest that the debt of South Australia is going to rise to \$8.2 billion over the course of the forward estimates, I would like to think of that as a best guess. I fear what may come and what that will mean for the people of South Australia and, in the years ahead, for my children and future generations.

The Treasurer talked about how South Australians cannot afford to run up debt, effectively running up the credit card so that our children will have to pay it off, yet he has delivered his first budget, eloquently as it may have been, that, in reading it, delivers nothing but debt and deficit and a massive credit card bill for our future generations to pay and look after.

Of course, financial liabilities go beyond the \$8.2 billion of debt. Once you include the WorkCover liabilities and the government institutions, which do not show up in the books on that \$8.2 billion, financial liabilities for South Australia are up to \$20 billion by 2014. That is an

extraordinary figure for a state like South Australia. That is an extraordinary figure for a state with a bit over 1.5 million people and the opportunities for prosperity that do not match up to those interstate where governments have been able to deliver better budgets.

The other concerning thing about this government is that we all know that the way to encourage business investment, better jobs and economic growth is to take every opportunity to reduce taxes and to make for a better business environment so that they can create jobs, create wealth for our state. Yet, over the forward estimates we see \$1.1 billion worth of extra taxes. More than double the rate of inflation is our tax take increasing. This will have direct effects and indirect effects of the cost of living for people in South Australia.

I was interested today to read on the Punch website an article by Frank Zumbo, who is the Associate Professor in the School of Business Law and Taxation at the University of New South Wales. Frank Zumbo made the point that:

With survey after survey revealing how much financial stress that Australian families are being put under, it's time that all governments—

and I think this is particularly true for the government here in South Australia—

...start doing something about the escalating cost of living. What can be done? Well, two things stand out. First, Governments need to make sure that they don't increase taxes and charges and where possible they should actually be reducing taxes. The harsh reality is that struggling Aussie families are being bombarded by hikes in Federal taxes and fees and now face the prospect of new taxes...

That is just at a federal level. At a state level, this budget has delivered a whole raft, pages and pages, as in the regulations of increased fees, charges and taxes. We have compulsory third-party insurance up 2.7 per cent and motor vehicle registration up 4.3 per cent. A 10-year driver's licence renewal is going to cost 32.1 per cent more in 2011-12 than it did last year.

Public transport multitrips are up \$47 over the course of a year. Of course, we know that occasionally, unfortunately, people pay that voluntary tax of a speeding fine for going 55 km/h in a 50 km/h zone. If they do, as many families will find that one driver in the family does over the course of the next year, they will be paying an extra \$56 for the privilege.

All of these in and of themselves do not necessarily sound that scary but, of course, they all add up. They are all on top of those federal taxes, and I am not done with the state taxes yet. Water bills are up 40 per cent this year and, of course, we know that they are another 40 per cent next year and they have just been increasing year on year. I will be talking a bit more about that before the end of this contribution.

Sewerage bills are up 11.8 per cent; the average electricity bill is up \$120 over the year; gas bills are up 5 per cent nearly; the emergency services levy is up; the NRM levy is up; the Save the River Murray Levy is up. Council rates are up an average of 12.3 per cent and, of course, there are other fees. All of those are just to have the basic running of the house. As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out in her speech, we are talking about the average costs for South Australian households being \$750, and that is only assuming that you have one person, one car, one speeding fine and all of those flow-ons. For many households it will be much more.

There are other costs. Say you leave the house. For example, you might want to go to the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre or any other of our public hospitals where we are now going to be faced with the prospect of people having to pay commercial rates for parking. These decisions by the government that have increased the cost of living are actually have some fairly serious impacts on South Australians who deserve better.

I want to read into *Hansard* a letter that was sent to me by one of my constituents which illustrates the point particularly in relation to Hampstead, but bear in mind that it comes on top of all of those other increases in rates, taxes, fees, charges and everything else that goes along. I will name the constituent because she said yesterday that she would be happy for me to do so. Her letter states:

My name is Ms. Maxine Lane and I live [at an address in Paradise]. Sadly I am a sufferer of cancer and had to have my Left Kidney removed and leaving my right kidney working only at about 5%, because of all this I need to be on Peritoneal Dialysis on a daily basis for 10 hours. Because of this condition and the use of peritoneal fluid which contains 2½% Glucose I have put on 10 kgs. Of weight. My specialist has told me to have a specialised exercise program which I have started at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre. We have now been advised that in the near future we will be charged for parking my car, which is the only way to get to the centre from my suburb, I need to go to the centre twice a week for 2 hours. I just cannot afford this cost as I am on an Age Pensioner living by myself with the help of a carer. I also need to visit the R.A.H. and Q.E.H. on a regular basis both for my Cancer and

Dialysis, and I also now believe that they too are to charge for parking. Could you please try to reverse the decision for this big grab for cash at the expense of the people that can least afford this extra cost. If this does happen I will have to cut my treatments which will probably lead to my demise.

Maxine Lane pays \$100 for a six-week session of being involved in that exercise therapy program at Hampstead. For two hours a session twice a week, let's say that her car park is there for 2½ hours. Now, \$2 an hour does not sound like much to members of parliament or ministers on ministerial salaries but, for a pensioner who is going to be faced with an extra \$12 a week there on top of her \$100 for her six-week rehabilitation and therapy sessions, that adds to an extraordinary impost on her quality of life, and her inability potentially to pay that comes at serious detriment to her health and future prospects. It is a tragic situation that the government is leaving us with in South Australia.

Other fees and charges are up. Driver's licence renewals are up 32 per cent and, as expected in this budget, the government wants to reap in an extra \$29.5 million. Of course, as I said before, those are largely just expenses in the home. It is now going to be harder to get the home because this government has now ripped out the state contribution to the First Home Owner Grant, which will reduce the opportunity for first home buyers to get financial assistance when buying their first house.

Those are all things the government is directly doing to people that reflects the cost of living. However, people's cost of living is not just affected by government-direct charges and imposts on them; it is affected by the federal government, the state government, by council and, of course, by the cost of goods and services. The cost of doing business in South Australia comes into it as well because, when businesses see increased costs and imposts, they have to pass that on, in many cases to their consumers. In many cases, where their consumers are unable to meet those increased costs, they have to potentially consider reducing their staffing, which has another flow-on effect on jobs.

The member for Finniss and other members listed businesses in their electorates that have indicated that they may have to shut shop altogether or move their investments interstate. Or, in the case that was put by the Leader of the Opposition, one of the small entrepreneurs in her area is moving his entire portfolio to the Northern Territory where there is a sensible land tax regime. The cost of doing business in South Australia has been significantly affected by this government and by this budget.

Earlier in the week, the member for Heysen, the Leader of the Opposition, Isobel Redmond, was kind enough to come out to my electorate to meet with Rob Mignone at the Adelaide Towel Service, a business which Rob runs with his brother Angelo and their wives. Angelo wrote to me on Facebook on the weekend asking me to look into his case. He pointed out that their water bill had increased so dramatically that it was sincerely affecting their capacity to do the business that they do. Adelaide Towel Service employs about 10 people. They collect, wash, dry, hand-fold and then return the towels to 300 hairdressers around Adelaide. They provide a vital service, and it is important that it be done safely so that the health standards of those hairdressers are met. They do not really have the opportunity to reduce their water consumption on health grounds, so their water is an inelastic quantity.

Their water bill due 29 June 2010 was \$2,014.95 for the quarter. For 28 June 2011, it had gone from \$2,014.95 up to \$3,224.20, more than \$1,200 more for the quarter or \$5,000 more for the year, and this is just the start of the rises. This is before the water rise that will take place on 1 July and before the other 40 per cent water rise that will take place on 1 July next year. We have calculated that their annual water bill is going to go from about \$8,000 a year to over \$20,000 a year.

On top of all the other costs of doing business, on top of the incredible payroll tax and land tax and the other costs of doing business imposed by this state government, as well as other areas that are going up, this is the sort of thing that is really affecting this business. As Rob Mignone said on Channel 10 last night, it is the sort of thing that makes him and his brother shake their head and wonder what the hell they are going to do. If this sort of business shuts down, it will have a drastic effect on their employees and on our local economy and, quite frankly, we cannot afford it. They are being squeezed from every angle, particularly by this government and particularly by these water charges.

When asked about it by a journalist yesterday in the corridors of Parliament House, the Minister for Small Business said that South Australia was, in fact, the lowest taxed state for small

business. He was asked about it in the chamber today. How on earth does this happen, given that his own budget papers include the findings that South Australia is taxed the highest?

We have seen on the record for the last couple of years that every time they do the analysis of the highest taxing states in South Australia—business taxes, payroll tax, land tax, all of those taxes that affect businesses and have flow-on effects for everyone else—South Australia is, in fact, the highest taxed. Our small business minister is living in a different state if he thinks that our state is the lowest taxing for small business in Australia.

That is not the story that small businesses tell, and it is certainly not the story told by the analysis that is, indeed, in the budget papers. Another tax that clearly affects businesses and has that flow-on effect for everyone else is payroll tax. Since this government came in, the payroll tax take has increased by 75 per cent—that is extraordinary—and property taxes have increased by over \$1 billion, by 141 per cent. It is one thing to see figures on a piece of paper, but these have real effects on people.

Roslyn Jean Gabriel of Athelstone has contacted me on a number of occasions. She has had to pay a whole year's land tax on two properties that she sold in a year. Land tax is incredible in the way that it is collected. Panayiotis Iannou, of Athelstone also, whom I have had a bit to do with, gave me an example that his land tax bill has increased from \$1,500 to over \$15,000 in the last three years.

Given that in South Australia an overwhelming majority of our small businesses are operating out of rented premises, the land tax bill of their landlords are naturally passed on in rent to those small businesses and, to survive, they have to pass those costs on to their clients. It is not just small businesses—the shops and the tenants operating at the corner store: it is also engineering firms and others.

We have seen an extraordinary spate of significant government infrastructure projects in the last couple of years going to interstate firms that are competing on an uneven playing field with South Australian firms, which are priced out of the market because those interstate firms have much better tax regimes in their states and therefore can afford to underquote local South Australian contractors. It is an absolute disgrace. Taxes on insurance have gone up 74 per cent over the life of this government, and motor vehicle tax is up 57 per cent over the life of this government. As the cost of business goes up, we all pay more and there are fewer jobs.

As the Leader of the Opposition pointed out in her speech, the Dun and Bradstreet report came out recently showing that, of all the businesses in Australia that are moving interstate, 22 per cent of them are moving out of South Australia. Given that we have fewer than 7 per cent of the nation's businesses, for 22 per cent of businesses to be moving interstate coming from South Australia is an extraordinary result and demonstrates the lack of confidence that businesses in South Australia have in this government.

This morning on the radio I noted discussion about the problems besetting the Adelaide Zoo and the need for the government to step in and help the Adelaide Zoo meet its financial obligations. I should declare that, as a life member of the zoo, I have something of an interest in its future success if my investment in life membership is to bear future opportunities to visit the zoo.

Peter Vaughan from Business SA and the business consultant Ian Smith both pointed out that in South Australia the business environment is not capable of supporting the sort of corporate donations to zoos as happens interstate and in comparable overseas zoos when something like the pandas come along. It is an indictment on this government that we are not doing more to create the sort of environment for business to be able to deliver those sorts of things.

We have to remember that the state government taxes and charges do not exist in isolation, but the federal government's carbon and mining taxes are coming in and council rates are going up. My constituents in Campbelltown are very concerned because the Campbelltown council, in order to meet its increased costs, largely due to the state government's taxes, has had to introduce rating by tenancy, which a number of other councils have already done.

This means that many local businesses that are accommodated in blocks of shops, for example, had dramatic increases in their council rates because they are now charged the minimum council rate, which is something over \$700, rather than a proportion of the whole building's council rates. For example, for a group of six units, the council rate has jumped from about \$1,800, which it was previously (so they each paid \$300) to about \$4,300 now, and each of them pays the minimum

potential rate of \$700. The Campbelltown council has brought in that increase in order to raise \$329,380 extra.

Do you know what the difference is between the Campbelltown council and the state government? The council is doing this because they need to, but the council actually is interested in the feedback from its constituents. I note in the *East Torrens Messenger* that came out today that council staff will be preparing a report that looks at the impact of the budget if the tenancy rate is introduced over a three-year period. That council listens to people, and that is something that is quite different from the government in this place.

The opposition is interested in how things such as the state budget affect individuals and businesses. Isobel Redmond, the Leader of the Opposition, listens to businesses, but on the government benches, all we see in its ministers are the arrogant, the ineffectual and the hammer—and they can work out which ones are which. The point is that governments and parliaments should be listening. We have two ears and one mouth each, and it is important to use them in that proportion.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pengilly): Order! There is too much noise in the house.

Mr GARDNER: It will be interesting to see what the government does under its new leadership regime, whether it moves to that 'consult and decide' approach. I am seriously sceptical because I do not think they are up to it. The new broom in Treasury is just like the old one, except one or two policy differences and a gentler temperament. This government is not listening to the community. It is taxing the life out of South Australia and it is putting up the cost of living for all South Australians.

Time expired.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Hammond will come to order. The member for Flinders.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (22:37): I rise at the end of this rather long day to make a contribution to this debate. I understand that we need to finish this debate by tomorrow evening because we cannot go on to the estimates until that has happened, so I will try to keep my comments succinct. But I would like to put on the record my observations of what I believe to be another quintessential Labor budget from what seems to be a divided, deceitful and downright dreadful Labor government.

We have a new Treasurer in the Hon. Jack Snelling. It is quite obvious that the ghost of the former treasurer haunts this budget. His legacy will be one of debt and deficit and, unfortunately, that is the story of this budget. The pretty pictures on the budget papers are, I believe, part of a charm offensive intended to present a change of style from a new Treasurer, but the budget itself does not paint a pretty picture of South Australia's economic situation.

Sadly, after a decade in power, this budget has delivered more debt and more deficit and, once again, is distinctly dismissive of South Australian families in both the city and country alike. The rising cost of living as a result of this budget and previous budgets will hurt individuals and families right across this great state.

As has been mentioned many times already in this debate, water bills, motor registration, driver's licence renewals, transport tickets and compulsory third-party premiums are up, and a whole raft of government charges and fees have gone with this budget. Interestingly, I have discovered that administrative charges are disproportionately high. One political commentator noted last week that up to 85 per cent of his water bill was for administration charges; just 15 per cent of it was for the cost of water.

All of these increases will hurt people and these rises, combined with increased state taxes and charges, will cost the average household a staggering \$750 a year for no improvement in the services they receive. It is unbelievable and will have a massive impact on all families, particularly—and I note that the member for Schubert mentioned this—those on low fixed incomes—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRELOAR: —those on pensions and disability incomes, low fixed income earners who have no room to move and no room to absorb these increased costs and charges. I believe this demonstrates how tired, arrogant and out of touch this government is, and it shows that it has no understanding of the financial realities for families and individuals and, indeed, businesses, and quite rightly South Australians have stopped listening, as the member for Mawson so succinctly put it the other day. Although I notice that the Minister for Education has been out listening today, and it must have been so because it was on the news and they said that he was out listening, so I take it to be fact.

This budget does nothing to ease the cost of living pressures for families and it does nothing to instil confidence in South Australian businesses. One of the most damning indictments, I believe, on this government to come out of the budget is the fact that an \$81 million surplus has somehow been turned into a \$263 million deficit. The budget papers themselves reveal that debt will rise from a current \$4.5 billion to \$8.2 billion within three years (2014). That will be this government's legacy, one of debt and deficit, and I fear its financial mismanagement will be the burden of our children.

It is a very bland and disappointing budget in many ways, not least of which are the disappointing increased taxes and charges, cementing our place as the highest taxed state in the nation. This high taxing government is driving South Australian businesses and workers interstate. Sadly, that is another indictment on this government's decade in power.

This government's taxes are up more than double the rate of inflation over the next four years. That is a staggering \$1.1 billion in extra taxed revenue, and South Australians will feel the full impact of that on their household budgets and the bottom line of their businesses. Unfortunately, this is a government addicted to taxing and overspending. It does not have a revenue problem, it has a spending problem.

In the last nine budgets Labor has gone over budget by a total of \$3.5 billion. This is since 2002-03. For ordinary business people and households I believe this sort of reckless overspending is no way to operate a state budget. This sort of economic vandalism is why the state finds itself in such huge debt and running a budget deficit in 2011-12. It is also why the interest bill that the government has to pay on its debt is fast approaching a massive \$2 million a day. That is \$2 million a day of taxpayers' money that cannot and will not be spent on country health services, education, police or road infrastructure.

I would like to place on the record just a few budget-related points for my own electorate of Flinders and, indeed, regional South Australia generally. I have spoken on a number of occasions in this place about the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, or PATS as it is commonly known in country South Australia. PATS is a scheme which provides reimbursement for country patients to travel to Adelaide to receive specialist care that they need to access in the city when it is unavailable to them at the place they live.

It is a critically important scheme and I would argue that it is desperately underfunded. The number of constituents who come to me and indicate their concern about the level of funding that goes into this scheme is quite extraordinary. I would guess that there is barely a family living in regional South Australia that has not had to access this scheme at some point, and, as I said, it is desperately underfunded. As I understand it, there has been no increase in funding to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme since 2001—that is the life of this current Rann government. Perhaps this scheme would receive significant levels of funding if the government were not weighing us down with a \$3.2 billion Royal Adelaide Hospital. It would seem that we are going to have a new hospital, but we cannot get to it.

Country health services are critical for communities on Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast. The Port Lincoln Hospital redevelopment is welcomed. It has a budget of \$33.25 million but only \$4.96 million of that is budgeted for 2011-12, with an expected completion date somewhere in mid-2016. Will they be able to deliver this on time and on budget? Only time will tell.

The hospital needs doctors and nurses to provide the services as well, and, as I have said before, the challenge for this state government is to provide those services to fill a new building. I wonder whether the project in Port Lincoln will experience the delays that the Ceduna Hospital did.

I would like to talk about regional development funding just briefly. There has been a removal of roughly \$4.1 million in regional development funding by 30 June 2013. It is a disgraceful decision as the Regional Development Association is there to support small businesses right across regional South Australia. That money is being pulled. The member for Chaffey spoke of the underspend in 2010-11 of the Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund. That is unforgivable.

They are asleep at the wheel when it comes to making investments in our regions. The fact that they seem to have a different regional development minister each year seems to me to indicate that there is no continuity or strategic approach to regional development. Goodness knows how many ministers for regional development we have had in the last 10 years. I also think that this lack of interest in meaningful regional development feeds into the reality that this government does not acknowledge the contribution to the state's economy that the regions make.

The capital expenditure into agriculture has been halved from \$10 million to \$5 million in this budget. PIRSA as a department is losing out each year. The investment priorities in primary industries are inadequate, yet primary industries are one of the drivers of the state's economy. This government loves to spruik the benefits of record harvests, etc., yet in the last budget and in this budget PIRSA has lost out. SARDI also has suffered a \$2.7 million decrease in research funding. This is incredibly short-sighted.

I refer to a newspaper article that talks about the agriculture, food and fisheries budget, which has been cut from \$216 million to \$181 million in 2011-12. The Agriculture, Food and Wine program has dropped by \$4.3 million—extraordinarily short-sighted, pulling investment from industries that actually generate wealth for this state. Are we shutting up shop?

It seems that there is inadequate funding into the small business program. Businesses are fleeing interstate. I want to mention education and schools' funding. In my own electorate, the Cleve Area School has welcomed the announcement of funding over four years to construct new learning centres. I certainly welcome any investment into our schools, but there are countless other schools in the electorate of Flinders—and the Minister for Education is aware of a number of these—that are crying out for similar project expenditure to get their facilities up to speed.

Tourism is a critical industry on Eyre Peninsula. Unfortunately, tourism has been targeted with program efficiencies. I see this as basically spin for cuts to regional tourism and the removal of regional tourism employees—a ridiculous move, a penny-pinching move. A number of meetings have been held across the regions to try to address this severe cut in funding and severe lack of confidence that this government puts into tourism. Once again, talking the talk but not walking the walk.

CFS volunteers are crucial to Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast in terms of front-line bushfire fighting. When fires do occur—and, unfortunately and tragically they do and will continue to do so—the volunteers in their budget submission were seeking \$2.8 million per annum for training and to ensure that they are properly resourced. It is not a big ask for unpaid volunteers who are front-line bushfire fighters. Unfortunately, the government has committed only \$2.1 million over four years. It is an obvious shortfall in what was requested and is simply inadequate.

We had a delegation in Parliament House today from the Isolated Children's Parents' Association (the School of the Air in old language). The School of the Air is an Australian icon. Almost all of the recipients of the School of the Air here in South Australia are using the Centra program and experiencing difficulties with service delivery, and their children are suffering because of it. This has been going on for 10 years, and I find it extraordinary that this has not been addressed and has not been fixed. It is obviously an IT issue, a service delivery issue, and it should not be that hard. These are children who are missing out on a quality education because of lack of service delivery.

This is a cash-strapped government. Its budget cuts have extended to the point where I am hearing stories of school cleaners having to be out of the school grounds by 6pm so as not to incur penalty rates. What that means is that they need to start their daily cleaning early in the afternoon. The cleaners are cleaning while class is on and while school is still in. They are cleaning around teachers, around students, and in some places (through no fault of their own) they are not able to complete the work adequately.

I believe, essentially, that governments should provide the framework within which business can thrive, but unfortunately this government, it seems to me, has become self-fulfilling. It has lost its focus and it is neglecting the needs of all South Australians. The member for Mount

Gambier mentioned today—and I was not aware of this, but I took note of it—that now, here in South Australia, there is one public servant for every 19 residents.

I am wondering where the commitment to Eyre Peninsula's water security is. It is an issue I have raised in this place a number of times. It is an issue that the previous member for Flinders, my predecessor, raised a number of times. There was a commitment, I understand, in 2002 by this government to build a desalination plant on Eyre Peninsula. That still has not happened, and there is certainly no indication in this budget that it is any closer.

Nothing has been done to shore up our water security. SA Water has a debt of \$1.7 billion which, incidentally, is not included in the debt figure quoted in the budget papers in the forward estimates. The member for Frome talked about the centralisation of services, and I can tell you that Shared Services has been an unmitigated disaster. There have been no cost savings and, in fact, the costs of delivering that service have actually increased and often the service delivery has fallen short of being adequate.

DTEI needs to address a \$200 million backlog in the state's road infrastructure maintenance work. How critical is this? Our road network is essential to the movement of population and freight around this state—absolutely critical—and yet the government has allowed this backlog to build up.

Although it does not appear in the budget papers (and nor it should), I am considering the economic impact of marine parks. The minister and the government have indicated that they want no more than a 5 per cent economic impact as a result of the imposition of sanctuary zones, and many people are telling me that they believe this has already occurred through the fall in coastal land values and the fall in value of fishing licences and boats, so the impact of this is already being felt.

Mining royalties are down by \$6 million, but they are expected to rise in 2011-12 to almost \$42 million, and that is encouraging. I do believe we are on the cusp of a mining boom. This state has yet to realise the full potential of a mineral resources boom, and Eyre Peninsula will be a key part of the state's mining future. I truly believe that, but it is critical that we have the infrastructure in place to capitalise on what could be just a window of opportunity. What is needed is not in this budget. It is not in the forward estimates. It is, in fact, critical investment in infrastructure.

What is in this budget for the most vulnerable in our communities—the seniors and the pensioners? There is very little. The government has tried to portray this as a budget helping families but the pretty pictures do not match the harsh reality of a budget and a financial legacy which will in fact hurt families. It will hurt older people and ultimately hurt the most vulnerable in our society, and I believe this budget ultimately will hurt the government.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (22:55): I rise today to speak to the Appropriation Bill 2011. I would just like to reflect on issues that are affecting rural South Australia, especially out of the reckless spending of this state Labor government. We have a state Labor government spending \$9.1 billion on infrastructure and 99.9 per cent of that will be in urban areas. We see the \$1.8 billion desalination plant that will be coupled to over \$400 million worth of pipes—a desalination plant that only needed to be half the size—and had it been built when we had the policy in 2007, probably at least \$1 billion would have been saved.

We also have the new Royal Adelaide Hospital which is going to cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$2.8 billion, when we were told before the election by Labor that it would only be \$1.7 billion. Then it went up to \$1.8 billion virtually immediately and then—surprise surprise—we see it heading north towards \$2.8 billion. This will be a hospital that will cost all of us \$11 billion just to operate for 30 years. It will cost \$1.1 million per day for 30 years.

We also see major rail upgrades in the city costing billions of dollars and, yes, some of these are needed, but I look around my rural electorate of Hammond and I look around the state at infrastructure that is sadly lacking, such as railway infrastructure. I agree with the member for Frome's comments about the infrastructure in the Mallee, that I was well aware of and which we were also reminded of on our grain handling select committee, about how slowly trains have to operate on our Mallee rail lines out towards Pinnaroo.

This is the case right throughout the state, and I know that the member for Flinders is well aware of the shortcomings of the rail in his electorate, of the narrow gauge lines up there, and that there are vast areas and vast amounts of rail that need upgrading. I look at the country roads in this

state and note that there is about \$54 million put aside for road maintenance. It is still about \$200 million behind what needs to be spent.

I reflect on issues like the \$80 million—and a lot of that is federal money—being spent on overtaking lanes and rest stops on the Dukes Highway. I know I have mentioned this several times in here: why do the state and federal governments not just get on with the job of duplicating the Dukes Highway so that we do not get so many of these horror smashes on these roads? I am told it will cost \$5 million per kilometre but it is still less than \$1 billion to do the 191 kilometres to the Victorian border, and I just wonder how many lives that would save.

Speaking of lives, I came across the tragic accident on the Riddoch Highway near Padthaway several hours afterwards, and what a sad loss to the family from Keith losing all those children and losing the father of two of those children and a husband. My sympathies certainly go out to that family. I am certainly not aware of what the issue was there, but there should be more money spent on rural roads so that people travelling these distances, as we do to our country electorates—and I know the Speaker does to her electorate of Giles—have better roads so that we can get around this state and go about our business safely.

I reflect on how everything is focused on the city and about the cuts that happened with the agriculture section of the primary industries budget last year, where we saw 179 jobs targeted. We saw \$80 million in cuts targeted over four years—\$20 million a year. I want to reflect on the jobs that were cut. Good friends of mine were targeted with these so-called targeted voluntary separation packages. I think you can take the word 'voluntary' out.

It is interesting to see that PIRSA would send along its representative to attend the farewells, and then off they go. It is interesting that I have not seen the Chief Executive, Geoff Knight, at any of those farewells. He was probably the one loading the gun for these targeted packages. I will reflect on what has happened and the decline in the budget for agriculture in this state.

I look back to 2009-10 where it was \$285,648,000. Then we get to the 2010-11 budget and it was \$225,607,000. Then we find out the estimated result is quite a bit lower for 2010-11 at \$216,337,000. To make matters worse we get to 2011-12 and it decreases to \$181,746,000. It is approximately \$104,000 less than was allocated to agriculture in the primary industries budget from 2009-10. It just goes to show how this government has no vision for the regions: no vision for one of the major wealth producers of this state.

Yes, we do have mining getting on its feet in this state, but it is only getting on its feet especially in comparison to Western Australia. We have a long way to go—a long way to go to come anywhere near anything like Western Australia produces, and I doubt we will ever get that far. I applaud all the exploration that companies are doing around the Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula. I know that the Terramin mine is well operational at Strathalbyn. I know with the Australian Zircon mine at Mindarie there are some new owners looking at whether to fire that up again.

People need to understand that agriculture is also a core supplier of funds to Treasury and of employment in this state. The Premier came into this place and carried on about the record harvest, the \$3.4 billion harvest, as if he had produced it. He probably does not know what a wheat stalk looks like.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: That was a wheat stalk.

Mr PEDERICK: A wheat stalk. Yes, that was the only stalk. It is just incredible to come in here and take credit for the rain when farmers are losing services and there are cuts to the budget. I note some of the cuts that are happening: the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI) cuts, a \$2.7 million decrease in research spending; a \$4.1 million decrease in service expenses with SARDI; and we see a \$12 million decrease in biosecurity funding.

What commitment does this government have for agriculture? Absolutely zero. We have an agriculture minister who announced in the Riverland that he was the best agriculture spokesman in the country. If he is that damned good, tell him—

An honourable member: In the world!

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, in the world.

An honourable member: In the history of the world!

Mr PEDERICK: If he is that good, send him up to Indonesia and get him to fix the live cattle trade. That would be the go. Send him up there. Perhaps he needs to get out there and he can direct Joe Ludwig, the federal minister, and get that mess sorted out.

People need to be aware—and now I have digressed a little bit—that there are two sides to the story of the live cattle trade. They were horrendous images that we saw on the news on *Four Corners* the other week, horrendous images, and I know for a fact that cattle do not need to be killed that way. If people look at the other side of the industry, at the industry players, the big companies that are managing their stock appropriately, and the abattoirs that are killing appropriately, they would see that the trade is being run effectively; and yes, the cowboys need to be cut out and there needs to be the proper regulation and it needs to be sorted out.

People need to be aware in this place that there are at least 700 Aboriginal stockmen's jobs at risk. Some of them are losing their jobs already. State-of-the-art live cattle boats are still being built and this is affecting the whole of the north.

Mr Williams: It will affect the south too.

Mr PEDERICK: It is affecting the south already, because it is affecting the price of cattle. I do not think any of these northern cattle have come down, but the markets already know that there is the threat of all these hundreds of thousands of cattle that cannot be shipped out. People carry on about the live trade. The live trade—live sheep and live cattle—have supported farmers in this country for many, many years.

Some elements say, 'Oh, we can just kill everything here and send the meat up there.' Well, I can assure you that not too many Indonesians out in the poorer areas have fridges. They just do not have refrigeration, so you cannot keep the meat. Unless all these do-gooders are going to start building power stations and sending refrigeration up there, it is just not going to happen.

I just want to make one final comment about the live cattle trade, because I am being egged on a bit here, and that is that these people in Indonesia will not go hungry. They will import stock from countries that potentially have foot-and-mouth. They could come down through other countries like India and come into Indonesia, and if foot-and-mouth gets there it is only a short way down the archipelago to New Guinea—and I tell you what, Australia is only a short mosquito flight from New Guinea.

I will just indicate to the house what I understand is the protocol for clearing up a foot-and-mouth outbreak in the north of this country. The protocol, from what I understand, is to poison every waterhole in the north—every waterhole! That will not just kill all the cattle; it will kill all the crocs, all the kangaroos, all the native animals. So people need to reflect on that and they need to perhaps do a little bit of research before they go straight out and bag the live cattle trade. People do need to have a look and see what goes on. That is the protocol.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There seems to be an outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease here!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond has the floor.

Mr PEDERICK: I am a shy, retiring operator. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am concerned about another couple of things that are going on in this state. It looks like the federal review about broomrape control is not going to recommend that broomrape can be eradicated. Now, look over at the other side: this is a state government that got in by the former member for Hammond signing away so that they would get his vote; but they agreed to eradicate broomrape. This government agreed to eradicate broomrape as part of that compact. Here we are; it is in the compact. Here we are 10 years later and there has been—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: —there has been \$45 million invested by state and federal governments—about \$1.9 million annually by the state government, \$2.6 million by the federal government—and yet here we see what looks like the federal government pulling out because, if they say it cannot be eradicated, the federal funding will have gone out of the broomrape eradication program.

I ask the government: will it step up and bring that funding up to the \$4½ million per year? That is what needs to happen. We will have a major problem if broomrape escapes the area that it is in at the minute, in the Murray Mallee, and spreads out across this state and throughout the country. It has the potential to decimate our dryland agriculture, but also our horticulture, in this country—not just in this state, but in this country. People need to be well aware of that.

I want to speak about forestry and this government's shortsightedness with the forward sale they are planning for the three rotations of forestry in the South-East. It is interesting to note that, on this side, the shadow treasurer has found a \$682 million hole in the budget which looks like about the amount that the government will potentially get for the forward sale. It will be a fire sale.

There have been some calculations made that the state could recoup over \$4 billion over 111 years but it is a state government that is very short-sighted. They get the SACA vote in one night. Surprise, surprise! The next day there is a re-announcement that the forward sale is going ahead because there was a bit of confusion between who was announcing what and whether it was going to happen and we have had these different announcements since 2008.

We even have a Treasurer who gave conflicting comments in answers to separate questions in this place on whether the ACIL Tasman study that was done was a cost benefit study. You only need to talk to the people in the South-East. They know darn well what will happen. The member for MacKillop told the house about a Victorian company that is going against its code of conduct and practices in sending logs offshore in containers. You can get containers to Asia for \$500 and less. It is pretty competitive to get empty boxes back to Asia because there are plenty of full ones coming this way.

Is this government prepared to sacrifice the whole economy of the South-East? I think they are. They are that shortsighted that they cannot see outside the bright lights of Glen Osmond and Gepps Cross. They cannot see past the bitumen and the concrete of the edifices that they are going to build as monuments—

Mr Williams: To their stupidity.

Mr PEDERICK: —to their stupidity. I agree with the member for MacKillop. Government members are saying that they are not into privatisation. Not only are they selling off the forward rotations and the forward generations of many people in the South-East in this state, they are also selling off SA Lotteries because there is a risk. What is the risk? People are going to give up gambling? I do not think so. Whether you like gambling or not, people love a punt. There is supposedly a risk. I think about \$86 million that is contributed to the state's economy is going to be slashed. That is another privatisation by a party and a Premier who actually made a pledge that he would not privatise assets. So, it has gone directly against their ethos on—

Mr Williams: They have no ethos.

Mr PEDERICK: —yes—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Torrens!

Mr PEDERICK: —what they were going to do. I just want to talk about biosecurity in regards to this budget. We have a government committed to what they call cost recovery. They have quite happily put a property identification code in by regulation that will drag in about \$240,000 to the government, but the biosecurity levy, which has to come in by legislation, has been deferred by 12 months. This government must be fearful of whether that legislation will get through the house. I think that will contribute something like \$8 million if they manage to get it through. It is interesting that it has been put off by 12 months.

I want to talk briefly about the Murray Bridge police station, which has had its funding deferred by 18 months before it is completed. I appreciate that we are getting something done in the electorate but, here again, so that the Treasurer can push the money aside, as they have done right throughout the budget, with hundreds of millions of dollars, they will just offset projects around the state. Here we go again—the Mallee will take the hit by not building the Murray Bridge police station for another 18 months. What we see is a short-sighted budget, one where the government does not reflect on the prosperity of this state and what people and producers can do for this state.

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (23:16): I would like to make a small contribution to this debate. In opening, I congratulate the new Treasurer on his first budget, which I am sure will be the first of many budgets that he will be delivering in this institution. I would like to also congratulate all the

speakers who made a contribution to this debate. In particular, I congratulate the member for Mitchell on his well-balanced speech; mine will be shorter because I do not wish to repeat all the things he has said, but I concur with all of his comments.

I would like to provide some context to the comments because I think it is useful to provide some balance to what has been said here today, particularly by those opposite. I will put on the public record of this place some comments that are in the editorial of today's *Advertiser*.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: It's a very interesting editorial.

Mr PICCOLO: They are very interesting editorials.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Very good reading.

Mr PICCOLO: Very good reading. I would just like to quote from it because it contrasts very strongly—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Just read the whole thing into the record.

Mr PICCOLO: No, I do not think I want to read the whole thing; I do not want to take up too much time.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: I will move on if people stop interjecting.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: I cannot answer that unless I am listening. These are the comments I would like to put onto the public record in this place because I think they are clearly relevant to provide a balanced perspective of the budget. In talking about Ms Redmond's response to the budget, the editorial states, 'Ms Redmond failed spectacularly to take—'

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order. As members well know, when we are speaking on a bill we have to actually speak to the bill. This is the Appropriation Bill. I do not know what the editorial of *The Advertiser* has to do with the Appropriation Bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, that is enough of your point of order. As this is the Appropriation Bill and the debate is fairly widespread, I will listen carefully to what the member for Light says, and if I think he is out of order I will pull him into line.

Mr PICCOLO: Madam Speaker, members opposite have reflected on this government's performance over the last 10 years. Now, the last 10 years is not this year's budget. They have made a whole range of reflections on this government's performance over the last 10 years, so it is quite appropriate for me to provide some balance and contrast to what has been said.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: They've even referred to the State Bank.

Mr PICCOLO: In fact, that is right—they have even referred to the State Bank. I would just like to put on the record what was said. I appreciate that the member has given me a second opportunity to put this quote in *Hansard* in case he misses it the first time. It states:

Ms Redmond failed spectacularly to take the fight to the Government in a speech which made only one mention of significant policy issue in eight pages of *Hansard*.

The Leader of the Opposition set the tone for the rest of the debate for the opposition. What was said there was all true of all the other debates from the other side. It is great to see that all the members followed their leader.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order. Madam Speaker, I appreciate that the editor of *The Advertiser* may not have a close understanding of the standing orders of this house, but the reality is that the opposition has been judicious in addressing the matter before the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —and we have been addressing judiciously the matter of the Appropriation Bill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —and this, Madam Speaker, has nothing to do with the appropriation.

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, I presume your point of order is relevance. However, as I said before, I will listen carefully to the member.

Mr PICCOLO: All the other members opposite actually reflected on our members' contributions today as well, so I am doing the same. I am happy to use up my 20 minutes. How long I speak is up to you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: How badly did she fail?

Mr PICCOLO: How badly did she fail?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICCOLO: The editorial reads:

Ms Redmond failed spectacularly to take the fight to the Government in a speech which made only one mention of a significant policy issue in eight pages of Hansard.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I believe it is out of order for members to read their speeches and I understand that the member is actually reading.

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, you can sit down. I have no idea whether the member was reading from anything because I could not hear a word because of the noise coming from both sides of the house. Sit down.

Mr WILLIAMS: In your determination on whether he was reading, I suggest you ask him to put the piece of paper on the table and see if he can continue his remarks because I doubt whether he can.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Madam Speaker, with all the hubbub, I didn't quite hear how much Ms Redmond failed. I missed that. Could the member for Light repeat it?

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Treasurer. You have made your point. Thank you.

Mr PICCOLO: I could quote it again, if you want me to: 'spectacularly'. However, I move on to read the next quote because I do not want to misquote the editorial:

Ms Redmond—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. You just remarked that you couldn't tell whether the member was actually reading or not. He has just confirmed to the house that he is reading which I believe is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, members have always referred to copious notes in their comments in these speeches. I consider they are copious notes, and he is quoting from something that he may previously have read. They are copious notes he is referring to.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, he confirmed to the house that he is actually reading. I know that the member is incapable of original thought—

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. The member is referring to his notes.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: I did a fairly good job last time, mate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member still has 16 minutes to go.

Mr PICCOLO: Madam Speaker, can you chuck him out?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will now behave.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Goyder, you are not in your seat.

Mr PICCOLO: The editorial goes on:

Ms Redmond has pioneered a 'no target' strategy, which can only be viewed as uninspiring to say the least.

Again, she set the tone for the rest of the speeches we have heard in the last couple of days. I go on:

In the background, the building blocks of significant achievements are being laid; the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, the Royal Adelaide Hospital—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I want to remind the member that somebody suggested that his car is in a disabled car park out the back.

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down. Member for MacKillop, if you continue to make remarks like that, I will ask you to leave the chamber.

Mr PICCOLO: The editorial continues:

The Opposition does not serve itself well to ignore this and totally fail to develop its own narrative for voters. The performance of the Opposition is also a total disservice to the people of South Australia and the Westminster system which demands that the fight be taken up to the incumbent...The only message to be had from the election was that the Liberal Party must work harder to earn the respect and the votes of the public—

which they haven't done yet—

...for any South Australian—

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: That is what the poll said about the last election with me, too. I am still here. Sorry, I am still here.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: Is that right? It reads:

For any South Australian who was asked what the Liberal Party stands for in this state, the only possible answer today would be 'I don't know'.

All of us can say the same. None of us know what the Liberal Party stands for.

Ms BEDFORD: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICCOLO: Now, what has this government done? It—

Members interjecting:

Mr PICCOLO: I am happy to do that.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey, are you trying to make a point of order?

Ms BEDFORD: There are any number, but 142 seems to be—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: I want to talk later tonight. I do not want to be here until two in the morning. It would be really nice if people could settle down.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Be quiet. It is ridiculous.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is getting ridiculous now. Member for Light, get on with it.

Mr PICCOLO: In contrast to that editorial which reflected on the Liberal Party's performance, this is what we as a government have achieved. In terms of public education, we have delivered the biggest infrastructure spend for decades. For example, the new John Hartley

School in my electorate, the Mark Oliphant College, the 12 million-dollar investment in Gawler High School, the redevelopment of Roseworthy Primary School, and four children's centres. This is the biggest investment in public education—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I really think that the member needs to be prevented from actually doing himself a disservice when he says, 'we delivered' when referring to federal programs, which are actually funded by the long-suffering taxpayers of this country. Debt.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: It is called debt.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. We do not need a debate in your point of order. The member will sit down.

Mr PICCOLO: Like I said, the John Hartley School in my electorate, the Mark Oliphant College, the Gawler High School redevelopment, the Roseworthy Primary School complete redevelopment, four children's centres. We have invested enormously in public education. We then come to public health in the region. We have invested immensely in the Lyell McEwin Hospital, which serves my electorate. We have invested in the GP Plus centres—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PICCOLO: —and we have also extended services to Gawler for oncology, etc. We then come to public transport: the rail electrification and the station upgrades which service my electorate. We are also going to have the introduction of a metro bus system in Gawler from 25 July, the first time Gawler will have a metro service in addition to the train, which we have delivered. Let us contrast the investment that we are making in public transport with what the Liberal Party policy was on transport for Gawler.

Mrs Vlahos: That would be very interesting.

Mr PICCOLO: That would be interesting. Their policy at the last election for providing an extension of public transport to Gawler was to start a community bus. That was their policy. That was their whole policy on public transport for my electorate. They wanted to start a community bus. Talk about an original idea. That is an original idea that the Liberal Party had, isn't it?

We have invested millions of dollars in our metro-ticketed bus service which will start on 24 July. But we did more. We also initiated public transport in Angle Vale. Contrast that with what the Liberal Party did. When they were in government, they ran a service which closed down in six months. That is what they did.

Mrs Vlahos: That's right.

Mr PICCOLO: Do you remember that? They did that. We have extended public transport to Angle Vale. We have extended bus services and greater services to Peachey Belt and Munno Para West. This is the huge investment that this government has made in public transport not only in the state but particularly in my electorate. I am proud of the investment that we have made in my electorate.

We go to transport again. This government this year is investing \$500,000 to plan for the south-east connector road for Gawler to provide the infrastructure for the growth of Gawler. The Liberals were talking about it 20 years ago, I can remember. Never was anything done. We are investing there. Also, we are investing tens of thousands and millions of dollars in road improvements around the electorate.

Then we move to our investment in jobs and training. We are committed to creating 100,000 jobs and 100,000 training positions, which is, again, one of the biggest investments over the next six years to provide the foundation for this state. We have made the biggest ever investment in water security in this state.

What do these investments reflect? They reflect a major investment in infrastructure in this state. They reflect a major investment in the future wellbeing of this state. They reflect a major investment in the future of our young people in this state and they provide an important economic stimulus for our state. This government is building the capacity for the future of this state to grow and to provide a prosperous state for our young people.

Mr Treloar: You need to get out and look.

Mr PICCOLO: I do go around in my electorate and look, don't worry. In addition to that, we have a whole range of road safety measures throughout my electorate—road sealing programs, for example, and road shoulder sealing programs, to make our roads safer. There is the Hamley Bridge Road and the main Light to Gawler-Redbanks road, for example. Closer to home but not in my electorate is the Kapunda-Greenock road. Again on road safety, the government will be installing point to point safety cameras along the Northern Expressway, which are important to keep families safe on our roads.

I contrast that to the reckless indifference which the opposition has shown to road safety when they talk about road safety and they say it is okay to creep and it is okay to speed on our roads.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Who said that?

Mr PICCOLO: Ivan Venning said that today.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: He did not.

Mr PICCOLO: Yes, he did. He said if you get caught speeding over 50 km/h it is an abuse of process. That is what he said. You should read what he said. In fact, he has said it before. In addition, this government is ensuring the delivery of a range of services to the regions in my area.

I will just summarise, and I will not go into any more detail because, as I said, the member for Mitchell covered most of what I wanted to say in his speech. We are building the foundation for growth of this state in the future. The Treasurer delivered a very balanced budget, one that showed care and concern for the most vulnerable in our community. We have increased the concessions for a whole range of programs to support those people who are most vulnerable.

Madam Speaker, contrast our budget, our vision and our philosophy with what *The Advertiser* editorial said about the Liberal Party response.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Let's hear it.

Mr PICCOLO: Do you want to hear it? This is what the editorial in the paper said today.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: They won't like it.

Mr PICCOLO: They won't like it? In case they missed it the first time, this is comment about the response of the leader, which they all followed dutifully. It says:

Ms Redmond failed spectacularly to take the fight to the Government in a speech which made only one mention of significant policy issue in eight pages of Hansard.

She set the tone for all the other speeches we have heard from the opposition today and yesterday. It goes on:

For any South Australian who was asked what the Liberal Party stands for in this state, the only possible answer today would be 'I don't know.'

They don't know, we don't know, and the Liberal Party doesn't know. I commend the budget to the house.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (23:34): Members might want to look at my contribution to the Statutes Amendment (Budget 2011) Bill to look at my more formal response to the budget. I was lucky enough that the Treasurer brought on that bill straight after the Leader of the Opposition's speech, and I was lucky enough to have unlimited time, so I took my opportunity to deliver my response to the budget as part of the response to the Statutes Amendment (Budget 2011) Bill.

Ms Bedford: Clever; double dipping.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Florey says, 'Clever.' In actual fact, it was not my doing; it was the Treasurer's own will, with the agreement of the whip, who wanted to design it that way. I just happened to be next in line to speak. Anyway, as luck would have it, that is what happened. For those who really want to see my response, they should go to that particular debate, but I do get 20 minutes to make a contribution.

I have deliberately left myself to last so that I can respond to some of the contributions from members opposite. I note that the member for Light took great joy in reading today's editorial. We all know that there will be good editorials and not so good editorials for all sorts of parties over time. We look forward to reading editorials about the change in Labor leadership in due course, because

we know that one thing is for sure, and that is that we could run out today and pick up lots of media articles in the last week about how bitterly divided this government is. It is hard to tell, Madam Speaker—

Mr PICCOLO: Point of order, Madam Speaker: I am not sure how this reflects on the budget appropriation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down.

Mr Piccolo: Excuse me!

The SPEAKER: Order! No point of order; sit down.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You could have a competition nationwide about which group is more divided, the federal Labor Party or the state Labor Party, because they are tearing each other apart. And here he is! The leadership hopeful is here, the Treasurer. It will be interesting to see whether he can get the numbers over his colleague the member for Cheltenham (Minister for Education), who, even today, was out there saying, 'Let's have discipline and unity.'

When his factional colleague the member for Mawson is out calling for the Premier's head, why would a contender stand up in front of the TV cameras and say to his colleagues, 'We need unity and discipline?' Well, there is only one reason they would do that and that is that the member for Cheltenham wants the story to keep running in the media that there is Labor Party division about the leadership.

To come back to the member for Light's reading of the editorial, I just want to make the point that I find this line humorous because, if you look at what Isobel Redmond has put out there in the public arena during her time, it has been quite a significant policy framework. There is the issue of the ICAC, which the government is playing catch-up on in relation to its announcement. The government spent a couple of years saying that you could not possibly have an ICAC because it would cost \$35 million or \$40 million. When we announced Isobel Redmond's initiative of an ICAC of a lesser amount, the government said, 'Oh, we can't possibly! You can't do an ICAC for that amount.' Now the government is announcing an office of public integrity which, frankly, for this government is laughable, of around \$4 million. They have simply followed Isobel Redmond's lead on that issue.

Isobel Redmond as leader went out with a different view about the hospital, and the public, by majority vote statewide, voted for that vision. There was the issue of the oval—a different policy indeed on the oval. She announced some time ago the reversal of public funding for the community hospitals, something this government will not do. She announced the medical heating and cooling concessions, something this government again followed. She took an opposite view on the prosecution costs matter in this budget, something she addressed in her speech. She had a significantly different stormwater policy from this government, and this government followed Isobel Redmond's policies on land tax and payroll tax in the last two budgets.

The Editor of *The Advertiser* can write what he wishes, but the reality is that Isobel Redmond has a very proud record of putting policy out there for the South Australian public to consider, and this government has followed her lead on a whole range of issues—on land tax, the ICAC and payroll tax. Even on the riverbank issue, it was Isobel Redmond talking about setting up an authority on that matter. So, have your fun with your editorial, but I will just say to the member for Light: editorials come and go. What goes around comes around and we look forward to having some debate about some editorials that will come.

Let us talk about Labor's vision that is not in the budget, because the member for Light paints Labor as a party of some vision. Let us go through it. Where is the tunnel on Grange Road and Port Road that was promised, the six-kilometre tunnel? I cannot see it in the budget. It was a promise that came and went.

Then there was the underpass near my electorate, the Sturt Road/South Road underpass. It was front page at the 2006 election that this was going to be delivered. It is simply not there. Then there was the front page, at the 2007 budget, that the government was going to build new prisons. It is not there. That vision has gone. Then there was the vision in the next year's budget: 'We are going to duplicate Mount Bold Reservoir.' That has gone. This government has followed on the vision, not led the vision.

So, the member for Light can have his fun but I just make that point to the house. Even in his insipid contribution, where he has to come in here and quote from the paper, he talks about the Liberal Party 20 years ago, talks about the bypass road around Gawler. Well, 20 years ago it was the Bannon government in government and they were not talking about it. The member ought to get his facts right.

The reality is that the member for Light is nothing but a puppet of the leadership. He will snuggle up, because he changed factions; he got a bit upset, he did not get the right job and he was trying to swap factions. Which faction this way; which faction that way? Who will he vote for? It is pretty obvious who he will vote for. He will vote for whoever is going to give him a job. That is where he is going.

I want to touch on a couple of other contributions, because during the debate we had a couple of people who came in and tried to give some history lessons. I want to correct a couple of things for the record, and this is no disrespect to those people who mentioned these particular issues. I want to walk through the ETSA sale because some people are saying that the forest sale by the Labor government is the same as the electricity sale by the previous Liberal government. I want to tell you about the differences, Madam Speaker, and I want to tell you about the similarities.

Mr Piccolo interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will tell the member about that as well, if he wants. I will tell him about the differences and the similarities between the forest sale and the ETSA sale. The difference is simply this: the government is selling the forests because it has committed itself to too much government expenditure. It is expending too much money. The debt is increasing and it needs to sell, as minister O'Brien said, its forestry assets to reduce its debt to keep its AAA credit rating. I am quoting the minister in saying that. I do not know whether the member for Light is going to dispute the minister, but that is what the minister said.

The difference with the ETSA sale is that the losses racked up under the Bannon government were essentially through poor investment results. I remember the stories about South African goat farms. I remember the stories about making losses in New Zealand forests. Do we remember the plywood cars? Do you remember scrimber, and they were going to make plywood cars, and every time I go to Melbourne I walk past 333 Collins Street just to introduce a South Australian who once lost a lot of money on it thanks to the former Bannon government.

The difference is simply this: the Bannon government racked up debts through its incompetence on the investment through Tim Marcus-Clark and the State Bank. According to the now Premier, Tim Marcus-Clark was a genius and we were lucky to have him. The State Bank debt was racked up largely through lost investments. The debt this government is racking up is through its own decisions. That is one of the key differences.

The similarities are this: the reason for the asset sales is because of the high debt levels racked up by Labor governments. The reason that they racked them up were different but the similarity is that they are both Labor governments. Let us talk about privatisation of the electricity sale for a minute. The state budget in 1993 was around \$8 billion. The debt level was \$11 billion. The parliament took a decision—and the Labor Party opposed it, of course—about leasing out the electricity assets, and it paid off the debt. In those years—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Sorry?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It significantly paid off the debt.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It significantly paid off the debt, leasing the electricity assets, and we always said that we would do that. If my memory serves me right, about \$700 million a year in interest was being paid in that time. I was the police minister at the time, and I think that the budget for the police at that time was around \$400 million. So, there was a significant cost burden in interest payments.

The reality is that, for those who say that the electricity assets should not have been sold and lament that fact, they have never been able to explain to the public or to the parliament how they were going to maintain that level of debt, maintain that level of interest payment, pay for all the capital upgrades that were required, enter a competitive market (forced on the states by the Keating government through the national electricity market through the Hilmer reforms) and regain the AAA credit rating.

That has never been explained, and the reason that they are not going to explain it is that they did not have a policy to do that. They were in opposition, and the editorial that the member for Light just read out could easily have been read back to that group at that time such is the nature of opposition. And then, ever since that time, the government could have reinvested in the electricity market any time it wanted.

The member for West Torrens makes some noises as to suggest 'as if they would'. Exactly right. You are not going to because you are not going to risk taxpayers' money in a competitive market. Their stance on privatisation is a fraud. They say that they do not support privatisation, and now they are selling 111 years of forward rotations of the forests. Well, if that's not privatisation, I do not know what is.

They are going to sell the Lotteries Commission so that the licence is run by the private operator. If that is not privatisation, what is? They say that they do not support the privatisation—they claim it is privatisation—as in relation to SA Water; and, when the contract came up for renewal, did they bring it back under government control? Did any of them argue to bring it back under government control? Of course, not. They left it under private control because it was a good deal for the taxpayer.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You were too gutless to bring it back under government control. You did not have the courage of your conviction. And then, when we had the public transport contract up for renewal, and the member for Mitchell at the time moved an amendment to bring it back under government control, every single one of the members opposite, including the member for Light, sat on the side of the house voting against the government taking it over. You voted for the continued privatisation of that particular contract.

So, let us not have any crocodile tears by this particular government that somehow they are anti-privatisation. Their privatisation policy is a fake and a fraud. It has been exposed by their own decision-making over the years, and I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the house.

Some of the members have raised the BER projects, and somehow they say that was a good expenditure of money. I just want to give one example of the BER project in my electorate, at the Coromandel Valley Primary School. How can it be that it took the state government, through this BER program funded by the federal government, longer to build the basketball stadium at the Coromandel Valley Primary School than it did to build the new \$125 million aquatic centre at Marion. How can that be?

How can your capital works procurement be so bad that it takes longer to build a less than full-sized basketball court at Coromandel Valley Primary School than it does to build the \$125 million aquatic centre at Marion? Not only did it take longer, but they have built the basketball stadiums (and I am glad that the minister for sport is here, because he should be outraged), all these school sports stadiums (most of them, at least), one or two metres short of full size and they cannot be used for community competition. Why would you go out and spend \$10 million, \$20 million or \$30 million dollars building all these school sports stadiums and not make them the appropriate size for competition? It was an inefficient use of taxpayers' money, Madam Speaker, and could have been used a lot better.

The other issue I want to just comment on very quickly, Madam Speaker, for the member for Light's benefit, is the issue that, when he talks about oppositions and policies, the government, when in opposition, never actually explained how they were going to reduce the debt if ETSA assets were not leased and the GST was not brought in, because the government, of course, opposed both of those measures.

If you took today's budget and took out the GST receipts and put back in the old wholesale sales tax receipts, and you left the State Bank debt where it was, I know all the cabinet ministers over there know it would be virtually impossible to run the budget anywhere near like it is in this particular budget.

They have raised some interesting points. The reality is that the budget will get through both houses. Isobel Redmond has put out, during her time as leader, a significant policy package. And it is not unusual for opposition to spend the early years in a new term in opposition internally reviewing their various policies, talking to various lobby groups to hear what they say and then, at the timing of their choosing—depending on the policy—make the various announcements. There is absolutely nothing new with that at all.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It will take—for the member for West Torrens' benefit—as long as it takes, and each policy will be different; who cares what you think? The reality is—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It will take as long as it takes; simple as that. So, the reality is that the government, through the member for Light, really has not made any significant contribution. I must congratulate the government, though, on at least making a contribution this year. As you might remember last year, Madam Speaker, they were a bit embarrassed.

They stood up in the party room and applauded the then treasurer for a great budget, but when it came to the public forum—where they actually had to stand up and defend it—not one member last year spoke in this particular section of the Appropriation Bill, to the great embarrassment of then treasurer Foley. So, we do congratulate the government on at least having the courtesy to come in behind the new Treasurer and saying some words of support, and we look forward to the grievance stage of the debate.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (23:53): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the house to sit beyond midnight.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members not being present:

The SPEAKER: As there is not a majority present, the motion is lost.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Second reading debate resumed.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (23:57): I thank members for their contribution to the second reading debate of the budget bill.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, Madam Speaker: I understand that the Minister for Families and Communities took a photo which is out of standing orders. I ask that the attendants collect and destroy the photo.

The SPEAKER: I did not see that, but I will talk to the Minister for Families and Communities afterwards. The Treasurer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (23:57): I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (23:58): By leave, I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that all honourable members of the Legislative Council holding commissions as ministers during the period for the examination of estimates be permitted to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (23:58): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (23:58): I would just like to make the point that I am extremely disappointed that I had a discussion with the Opposition Whip just prior to calling for the suspension of the house, and the opposition, as far as he advised me, agreed to go beyond 12 o'clock so that we could continue the grievance debate. Sadly, they all disappeared and I

presume they have gone home. Unfortunately I guess that means we will be staying after six tomorrow evening to finish the grievance debate. We did try to accommodate them. They agreed and failed to keep their part of the agreement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, do you seek to adjourn the debate?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No; I was just seeking your clarification, Madam Speaker. I understand that it is improper to take photographs of members in this chamber. Is it improper to take a photograph of empty seats?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Any photographs taken in this chamber need the permission of the Speaker.

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

At 00:00 the house adjourned to Thursday 23 June 2011 at 10:30.