

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 6 July 2011

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

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

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PRESCRIBED MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (11:02)**: I move:

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

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The **Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (11:03)**: On behalf of the Minister for Transport, I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to provide that government business has precedence over Private Members Business Committees and Subordinate Legislation on Wednesday 6 July and that any private members' business set down for that day be set down for consideration on Wednesday 27 July.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (11:03)**: On behalf of the member for Bright, I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT**: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT**: I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT**: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

The **Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (11:04)**: I move:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committee A and B be agreed to.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (11:04): I am pleased to rise in response to this Appropriation Bill. I did not actually make any comments during the estimates process, but I have annually made comment about the estimates process and what an extraordinary waste of time and money it often is. I do that on the basis that I absolutely accept that the government is the government of the day and that it has the right to set its budget and to carry out its agenda. We, the opposition, have the right to question the government about that, but the

estimates process seems to be designed specifically to prevent that from happening in any sane way.

Numerous public servants are dragged in here, having spent weeks and weeks of valuable time preparing for estimates lest there be a question asked which cannot be answered instantly, when in fact most of the time in estimates ministers simply say to us, 'I don't know and I will bring back a report to the house,' or give us some other off-putting exercise. There is an enormous amount of Public Service time committed to the exercise of estimates only to find that we have very limited amounts of time to investigate what is really going on.

We have ministers giving sometimes quite lengthy addresses to start the estimates for a particular portfolio—and, indeed, sometimes even simply quoting from the budget documents we have read anyway—and then interrupting the flow of questions from the opposition with Dorothy Dixers, which have been prepared in advance to shield the ministers. It was evident in this estimates, for instance, that the new Treasurer wanted a bit of shielding because they had much less time than has been the case. No matter what one may think of former treasurer Foley, he did at least face the music, as it were, in estimates, with no Dorothy Dixers, and allowed the opposition the full time allocation to question him. Such is not the case, sadly, in the current situation.

When I spoke originally on the budget reply, I said that this state budget had delivered more debt, more deficit and more deceit to South Australian families, and nothing discovered during the estimates process has led me to vary from that view. We still have a situation where households in this state are increasingly struggling with the rising cost of living, and it is for that reason that I believe more time should be set aside for the opposition to have appropriate time to scrutinise this government's decisions. People want to know why we are paying so much more in taxes in this state. We are the highest taxed state, and—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No, we're not.

Mrs REDMOND: The minister says, 'No, we're not,' and I am sure he is relying on the report in *The Australian* a few weeks ago, which was based on some figures provided by Queensland, setting us at about the middle. Of course, that was Anna Bligh (the Labor Premier) trying to make her situation seem a little bit better than it perhaps is. If the minister had bothered to read his own budget papers, he would see that indeed his own budget papers show—based on sources which are quite independent—that we are the highest taxed state.

People want to know why they are paying more taxes. They want to know why they are paying more for water bills, motor registration, driver's licences, bus tickets, and even why, if they are speeding at less than 15km/h over the limit, there will be such a massive increase in the amount they have to pay by way of a penalty for that behaviour.

Furthermore, the big question is: if all the taxes are going up—we are the highest taxed state, and we have had these extraordinary revenues, and so on—why are we not in a good economic position? Why are we increasing our debt? Of course, the government was already going to put the debt up to \$7.5 billion; now it has decided it needs to put it to \$8.2 billion, but that is without really paying for anything.

It is the opposition's job to ask these questions, and I must say that I am profoundly disappointed every year to find that the government does not want to answer them. For the government to try to hide behind the estimates process by having these rehearsed Dorothy Dixers is simply unacceptable. Indeed, I was talking to a former Labor MP yesterday who said that estimates used to go until 10 o'clock every night for weeks. Clearly, there has been an increasing move over the years to make the budget more complex and less easy to understand. It changes in its format from time to time so that you cannot find what you found in previous years and compare it.

In one committee even the Minister for Education, who, of course, is spruiking his leadership credentials because he is one of the contenders and talking about how he wants openness, accountability and consultation, even he hid behind Dorothy Dixers in the estimates process.

Furthermore, what we get in this estimates process is a government that cannot even get its own message straight. On 8 April—I can remember the date because it is my birthday—the Premier said, 'Our finances have never been better; our economy has never been better.' He must be living in a different state already!

Mr Williams: This is the man that said Tim Marcus Clark was the best thing that ever happened to South Australia.

Mrs REDMOND: That is right. It is the man who said Tim Marcus Clark was the best thing that ever happened to South Australia. It is also the man who wrote a book about a mirage in the desert, isn't it?

Mr Williams: That's right, the same man.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, I thought it must be the same man, because he said on 8 April, 'Our finances have never been better; our economy has never been better.' As I said, he cannot be living here, the highest taxing state, with the highest unemployment of all the mainland states. Today the HIA has put out a media release—actually it came out on 4 July. It is talking about the fact that new home building levels in 2011 are likely to become the worst in the last decade. So what does the government do? The government decides to phase out the First Home Owner Grant. What the HIA says about that is:

The government's recent decision to phase out assistance for first home buyers can only be described as negligent in light of the circumstances facing the South Australian home building industry.

They are forecasting that the number of dwelling starts in South Australia will fall by 12 per cent in 2010-11, with a further 3 per cent expected in 2011-12. Of course the government has already reduced by some \$60 million the amount it was expecting to get by way of stamp duty and that also is indicative of where our real estate market is going.

This government has no idea of management of the economy. They simply think that if they repeat a mantra often enough, they will have the public believe it. For nine years of this government Kevin Foley got up and said, 'We are good economic managers.' He thought that was all there was to good economic management of the state; not actually managing the budget, but just saying, 'We are good economic managers, we are good economic managers, we are good economic managers,' because on the back of the work done by the Olsen Brown governments of the previous decades they did manage to get the AAA credit rating.

On the very same day that the Premier said—and I cannot help but say it again—'Our finances have never been better; our economy has never been better', on the very same day the Treasurer said, 'We have a very soft economy.' Funny that! You wonder how they can come to the same place and come to such different conclusions. The Premier is at war with plenty of others in his own government, of course. There is so much angst going on over on that side of the house about who is going to lead the government. There is so much angst on that side of the house and they get so upset with us being united and nice on this side of the house.

Even yesterday, we had the Premier being exposed as favouring a bridge to the Convention Centre. You can understand why, because he has had to convince the Convention Centre that of course they want to pay for a bridge across the Torrens—of course they do! They have their budget of \$390 million, or whatever it is, to do the next stage of the upgrade of the Convention Centre. I welcome that; I think it is excellent. It was always planned that there would be a third stage of redevelopment of the Convention Centre and it is a fact that the existing original part is becoming tired and outdated and it does need to be brought into the 21st century.

I welcome all that, but I can imagine the people at the Convention Centre, when it was suggested that they were going to pay for the bridge, because of course remember when we were going to get the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, and it was going to cost to cost \$450 million, 'not a penny more', not a penny more? It happens to be \$85 million more, but as well as adding the \$85 million—not a penny, \$85 million—they also removed the car parking and the footbridge. We all went to briefings from the SMA, we have had various briefings at various times, but those briefings always included a footbridge—always—because they explained that when you have these massive numbers of people having to exit the area you could not possibly put them on to the bit of existing footbridge on the current bridge across King William Street. You have to actually exit them from the area fairly quickly.

I heard some time ago about this proposed bridge. In fact, I mentioned it to Michael Owen when he rang me about the new proposal to put the new building behind the parliament on the plaza, with private apartments and all that sort of stuff. When he asked me about it, I mentioned to him in that conversation that I had been told that, in fact, the Convention Centre was being asked to pay for this new footbridge and as a result, of course, they wanted it to go to the Convention

Centre. Surprising that, don't you think—that they would want the footbridge they are paying \$40 million or so to have to go somewhere near their premises?

Of course, there is the problem that the SMA intends to use the oval, at least in part, as something of a convention centre itself. You can imagine how cheered up the Convention Centre is to think it is paying out of its budget \$40 million to create the new footbridge when, in fact, it is going to deliver people across to the Adelaide Oval, which is going to be running its own conventions.

You can imagine what an attraction it would be for people coming from overseas, for instance, to the historic—well, it will not be anymore—Adelaide Oval and looking across the ground they have seen on television, St Peter's Cathedral, and so on. It would be fairly attractive, and the SMA, no doubt, thinks it is going to be a good way to make some extra money. I am sure that the Convention Centre is thrilled by the idea of \$40 million of its money going to provide the new footbridge. As we know, there are others in the government who do not agree with the Premier on where it should go.

We also continued to have people contradict each other; in fact, minister Koutsantonis said a couple of interesting things during estimates. I asked the Premier about the carbon tax. I did not ask minister Koutsantonis about the carbon tax, but I did ask the Premier, and he was unwilling to say where he stood on the Gillard government's carbon tax. He said that he supported the former Rudd government's emissions trading scheme because he was very close to Kevin—very close to Kevin; not so close to Julia, for some reason.

Members interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: No, but the Minister for Industry and Trade does support a carbon tax: he said so. Of course, he has not spoken with the major employers in this state whose businesses are going to be wiped out—never mind about that. He admitted during estimates that he has never been to Nyrstar in Port Pirie or to OneSteel in Whyalla. I am sure, Madam Speaker, that you would prefer that he had been to OneSteel in Whyalla and that you appreciate the importance of that industry and the likely effects of a carbon tax on it. So, there we have the minister saying one thing and, again, the Premier saying another.

We asked questions in estimates about Tiger Airways and trying to lure them to Adelaide, all the money that was contributed and what departments were involved in contributing to that. However, again, as is usual in the estimates process, the minister did not seem to know the answers to the questions—strangely. The minister did not know the answers to the questions, but we do not actually get answers even if there are public servants there who might know the answers. We just queue them up behind the minister for a bit of moral support or something because they never actually ask them anything. They always say, 'I'll bring back a report to the house,' or they make something up on the spot and give us what they think might be the answer. Maybe my friend—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the Leader of the Opposition has just accused me of misleading the house. She said—

Mrs REDMOND: I said—

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down, Leader of the Opposition. I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: She accused me of making things up on the spot whether they were right or not. I ask her to withdraw that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Leader of the Opposition has strayed very closely there.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The deputy leader just said I do make it up. I ask him to withdraw that, as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: You were quoted in this morning's paper as—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: —saying that we were calling on the shutting down of trade offices in China.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You did.

Mr Williams: You made it up.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You did.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You did.

Mr Williams: We did not.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: There is a recording. You did.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Wait until question time. Check your press releases.

The SPEAKER: Order, minister, also! Those statements were very close to the bone that were made by the opposition. I ask you to be very careful about what you say. You did say 'they' and did not name but be very careful now what you are saying. I will listen very carefully.

Mrs REDMOND: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I will continue, and I will move onto another topic, perhaps, the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Because I am out there a fair bit speaking to them, I know that the public of South Australia are flabbergasted—there is absolutely an audible intake of breath—when I explain to them what this government, for no particular reason—we do not need to build a new hospital and bulldoze a billion dollars worth of infrastructure at the other end of North Terrace—other than they have painted themselves into a corner over this issue, is going to invest in this new hospital. As I said, there is an audible intake and a gasp around the room whenever I explain to people that just to supply the building—no doctors, no nurses, not your medical equipment, a little bit of it, but not all of it—just to provide a functioning building with its air conditioning, and cleaning and maintenance, is going to cost the people of this state \$1.1 million a day for 30 years.

That is a disgrace, that is an absolute outrage, and the people of this state have every right to be flabbergasted that a government, which has already got us into such financial disarray in this state, is so consumed with its own indulgent behaviour that it is going to proceed with this thing in spite of the fact that we could actually rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital on its current site, not only much more cheaply but also much more efficiently in terms of where patients are dealt with, and where medical and dental students and all those things are located.

It would be much better for this state, but this government is too arrogant, too proud and too self-absorbed to learn the lesson and listen to what people are saying and back away from this proposal. We have a Treasurer who says that he does not want to run up a credit card debt for our youngsters to have to pay, and that is precisely what the government is doing. It cannot afford to build the hospital itself, that is why it is a PPP, and, as a result, the child who is 15 now will be paying for it as they turn 50.

In addition to all that, there is going to be \$2 million worth of artwork in the new RAH. For \$1.174 million, we could have kept the Ardrossan, Moonta, Keith and Glenelg community hospitals all funded, and had change. We still would have had eight hundred and something thousand dollars to spend on artwork. But, no, we are going to spend \$2 million on artworks. So, we are going to buy artworks rather than keep the Keith hospital open.

Furthermore, in estimates we discovered that the government changed the PPP guidelines to make costings for the hospital look better. As I pointed out the day after the Treasurer made his big announcement about the PPP signing with SA Health Partnership, the government has only compared, even on its adjusted figures, the cost of building as a PPP at that site with the cost of building as a government build at that site. It has not even bothered to do a comparative cost of what it would cost to rebuild the Royal Adelaide on its current site—which we own; there is a novel idea, something that we own. Every step of the way they adjust things to make themselves look bigger. Under the previous PPP guidelines used by Treasury, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital cost more than a debt-funded build, that is, a government build, but under the new PPP guidelines, guess what? It comes out better as a PPP.

I remember that we asked some questions in here about whether there were any other Ernst & Young reports, and the Treasurer said, 'Absolutely not.' The Treasurer said, 'Ernst & Young reports are out there, they are on the web.' What do you know? We have now found out that they

will not release all of the reports because they only want to put on the web the ones that make them look good and favour their position. Strange that.

At the same time, very alarming figures are being delivered to us about public hospital overcrowding, the crisis that is going on, and that is where this government is fundamentally failing the people of this state. Yes, health is a priority, but not putting money into providing a building unnecessarily at enormous cost to the people of this state for generations to come rather than providing doctors, nurses and equipment to provide the services that people need in our hospitals.

What about the sale of SA Lotteries? As I said at the time, when I did media about the issue, you are selling the goose that laid the golden egg. There are possibly two explanations for that. One is that it is such a good offer. If someone offered me \$2 million for my house in Stirling, as much as I love it, I would sell my house in Stirling because it would be a really good deal. If that were the case with SA Lotteries, yes, I could understand. But that is not the case. The other alternative, of course, is that you need cash, and that is what has happened with this government—they need cash.

Of course, in estimates the Treasurer admitted that, as part of the sale, there would be nothing to stop the buyer putting X-Lotto in our Coles and Woolworths supermarkets and in our pharmacies and coffee shops. So, we could have X-Lotto available everywhere. Well done, boys, these who guys rave on! We could end up like Las Vegas. Remember when we came out with our vision for a new precinct where they want to put this awful hospital? We came out with that vision, and they said, 'It's like a Las Vegas by the Torrens.' Remember that?

Mr Williams: And they're going to have it in every shopping centre.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes. Let's turn to the public sector. It was revealed that the government provides attraction and retention payments to some public servants of up to \$40,000 per public servant in addition to their wages. A public servant could apply for a \$60,000 a year job and then get up to \$40,000 by way of a retention bonus. Their actual salary ends up at \$100,000, but the person outside who is looking at the job thinks it will only pay \$60,000, so they do not apply for it—no strange goings-on there, no absolute advantage given to public servants there.

The Parks Community Centre, remember a year ago we were talking about the Parks Community Centre? I still have this theory that they actually put it in there because they expected that we would win the election and they wanted us to deliver what you might call a sandwich—and we did not.

Members interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: I just said 'a sandwich'. This government just does whatever comes to its mind at the time.

Mr Williams: Makes it up.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes. The state budget, on the basis of its announcement about it, has to be at least \$14 million worse off than the budget papers show because, post budget, the government announced it is funding a rebuild of the Parks Community Centre. So, we have gone from closing it to having a complete rebuild of this same community centre.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Yes. They were going to bulldoze it, but now they are going to upgrade it. Good on them. I think it is a good thing because that community centre is used by some 20,000 people. It provides a whole lot of training for the lifesavers and all those sorts of people. It was the only swimming facility available for the people in that sector of the city. I welcome the decision, but this government's management is just haywire.

In the last few weeks, of course, we have heard a wonderful story. Excuse me, Mr Williams, you will have to give me that highlighter because, if you want a new highlighter, you have to hand in your old highlighter before you can get a new highlighter. Is this a penny-pinching government? If you want a new highlighter, you have to hand in the old one before you can get one. If you want some staples, you can get a row of staples but not a box of staples. I think they are working on the theory that if you look after the pennies the pounds will take care of themselves. Big news, guys: we moved out of pennies and pounds in 1966, and it is time you learnt to run the budget.

The film centre at Glenside is costing \$1 million more than the budget papers show. Furthermore—and I raised this on behalf of the member for Bragg, who handed on the information to me—there is a strong suspicion, and certainly allegations being made, that certain people are being treated more favourably than others in terms of leasing space there. The Premier said on the record that, in fact, they are oversubscribed in terms of people indicating an interest in renting space there, so why you would need to discount it, for instance, is beyond me.

Elsewhere, of course, they are giving more and more money to that, but they have slashed funding to science and innovation and they are failing to promote innovation and entrepreneurship in the small business sector. No doubt others, especially the member for Waite, will be talking about some of those issues when he speaks.

One of the fascinating things said by minister Koutsantonis was this wonderful statement, and I quote, 'It is not the government's job to make businesses succeed.' I did agree with him that the Liberal Party is the party of small business. I did agree with him on that because, clearly, those of us on this side of the chamber have largely come out of private sector enterprises; we are not union hacks or staffers.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: I ran my own business, minister.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Did you?

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, for several years.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: After you left New South Wales Labor?

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, well after. I only belonged to New South Wales Labor for one meeting; it only took me one meeting, minister, to figure out that that was a very dysfunctional party, and that anyone in their right mind would not remain a member of it. It is a party where one cannot follow one's conscience, a party where the faceless union men make the decisions and where people come in and say, 'Well, I hold the proxies for this union and therefore I will decide what the vote will be on this particular issue.' It took me less than hour, minister, attending my first meeting, to decide that the Labor Party was the wrong party for me and for government in any state.

The minister says that it is not the government's job to make businesses succeed; that is what he said during estimates. I have to profoundly disagree, because one of the main functions of government is to provide an environment where businesses can succeed. Businesses have to have the right environment. This government, having created the highest taxing government in the country, is doing exactly the opposite; indeed, we have more businesses leaving this state. We have less than 8 per cent of the population, yet of all the businesses that are moving out of one state to another, 22 per cent of them are from this state—and for some of them it is because it is being forced on them.

Mr Goldsworthy: Bus contracts.

Mrs REDMOND: As the member for Kavel says, bus contracts are a prime example. During the first week of estimates, I think, we were asking where were the bus contracts. We were aware of family businesses that had been in place for 50 years and more, running the school buses around this state, being of value to the community not just in the service they provide for the students and their parents but also in local employment for people, actually providing the drivers and giving a great service around the state. More than a year ago they were supposed to get their contracts renewed; but no, the government had not got around to that, even though the minister said, a year ago, that he recognised it was urgent and needed to be a priority.

We went out and did some media, and said 'Look, it's time for the government to actually do something about this. They said a year ago that it was urgent, but they have done nothing.' So the next week the government comes out and announces the first raft of bus contracts, and more than half of them have gone to an interstate firm, throwing businesses in this state—good, solid, strong family businesses in this state—out of work.

Why would that happen? It would happen because businesses here cannot compete because of their costs—because of the WorkCover levies, the payroll tax, the land tax, because of all those things—the rates of taxation in this state being the highest of any of the states. That means that the businesses here cannot compete with the costs of the interstate businesses, which can come up with a lower figure. We then end up with a situation where those businesses will

close. We literally had people ringing our office in tears, threatening to commit suicide, because of the decisions of this government over that issue, just that single issue. I hate to think what will happen as the next three lots of contract are let.

It is an absolute indictment of this government that it would allow that to happen, and allow our economic situation to get to the point where we are pushing out good, small, family businesses from this state and forcing them into financial ruin. Some of those bus contractors had held back buying new buses (they are probably thanking themselves now for doing that); the government wanted them to provide the new services and the new whizz-bang buses, but would not give them a contract. Some of them were wise enough, it seems, not to go ahead, but others actually went and bought buses, hundreds of thousands of dollars invested, on the basis that the government still wanted to run the buses, still provide the service, right up until it gave them the death knell last week. It is a disgrace, and you should all hang your head in shame.

Labor ministers and small business; they just have no idea. However, he is right about one thing: Liberals do always prefer lower taxes, smaller government and less regulation. The minister's comments in estimates actually underline the fact that this government has no idea not only of small business but also of the impact that every decision it makes has on the economy of this state. There is its original plan for Shared Services—I refuse to call it a reform; the government keeps referring to it as Shared Services reform, but it is anything but a reform.

There is nothing but complaints. Every dealing that anyone has with Shared Services seems to find its way to me as a complaint because it is so woefully inadequate; but worse than that, it was going to save, I think, \$60 million a year. It has now blown out. They have not made anything like the savings they promised, but the original cost has now blown out to something like \$128 million, and they still have not got the so-called reform in place.

The fact is that this government has over the years taken this economy, that was actually beginning to tick along almost reasonably when they came into office, to a deficit. They had the best years for their first seven years until the global financial crisis. And no-one will deny that that must have had an impact, although this government seems to want to argue it both ways and say, 'Well, we weren't affected because we were so good,' but then when anything happens they blame the financial crisis. The fact is they had seven of the best years regardless of the global financial crisis, and yet, instead of having money in the bank, secure positions for small businesses, and a tax regime in this state which would encourage small business, what we have is a massive amount of debt, an unbelievable amount of deficit.

I will close on this, because you will recall, of course, that this government said in the Mid-Year Budget Review on 16 December that we were going to go into the next year with an \$81 million surplus. Instead of that, they have taken it from an \$81 million surplus, in less than six months until the budget was delivered, to a \$263 million deficit. This is a government that is clearly financially incompetent and irresponsible, which should hang its head in shame. Really, I only wish that they had got out of the road and that we could have taken government last year. I know we didn't, and we have still got two years, eight months and about a week to go until the next election and, hopefully, we will get into government so that we can start to put the economy of this state back on track.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:37): I wish to contribute to the debate on the Appropriation Bill. I concur with my leader that the estimates exercise could be a lot better. I think it should be an important exercise, it should be an important part of the democratic process in this state. The government does need to be kept accountable through a process where the opposition and other members of the house can question the government line by line on the budget.

However, the reality is that ministers come into this place and by and large make longwinded opening statements, and then read out the answers. I will come to the opening statements of one of the ministers, the Minister for Water. His opening statements, each and every one of them, were directly read out of the budget papers. The information was already there for everybody to read, but he just put all the highlights and all the targets together into a lengthy 10 minute statement and then took Dorothy Dixier questions from his own side and read extensive answers to those questions.

Consequently, the time for the opposition to ask real questions on the detail of the budget was very, very limited. This is a very poor process and ill serves both the parliament and the people of South Australia, the way the process works under this government. I will not labour the point too

much, but I think it is important for the house to consider it. I doubt whether it will happen under this government, because it will not serve the purposes of this government to stand up to rigorous scrutiny. Hopefully, when there is a change of government in the not too distant future there will be significant changes to the way the accountability to the people of this state is managed through this parliament.

I want to spend a few minutes on each of the estimate committees that I was involved in as a shadow minister. I will first go to the energy committee that was held late last week. There is a new Minister for Energy, and I am very thankful for that, because I had a reasonable dialogue with the Minister for Energy and got quite a bit of information from him. He had a very different attitude towards the estimates committee, towards the process, and was more forthcoming with information than was the previous minister, in the experiences that I have had in questioning him in previous years.

I was a bit disturbed by what I consider as a lack of understanding of the energy scenario in South Australia. The minister is relatively new to this portfolio and hopefully he will get more on top of his portfolio and the ongoing—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: He is apparently the best agricultural minister in the country but I can assure you that he is not yet the best energy minister in this country. One thing that has been disturbing me for a long time about the supply of energy into South Australia, and I am talking principally of electricity at this point, is that we have this incredible reliance on wind power. I will quote from a report that was put out by the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) on 30 June, so it was only last week that the report was put out. I quoted one particular piece from it to the committee, and I will quote the minister's response to that. The AEMO report states:

The methodology for calculating the expected wind farm contribution during peak demand has been revised, with the summer and winter peak contribution now anticipated to be 5% and 3.5% of their installed capacities.

That is, in the summertime if you have an installed capacity of 1,000 megawatts of wind power you can expect to get 5 per cent of that 1,000 megawatts at any particular time.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Fifty megawatts. So, you have an installed capacity of 1,000 megawatts and you can only expect to get at any one time in the summer 50 megawatts and in the winter 35 megawatts.

Mr Goldsworthy: That's efficient.

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes; and they can supply that amount of power 85 per cent of the time. That is the criteria used. So, I am questioning—and I have been questioning the previous minister on this for a number of years and he has chosen not to answer my questions—the reliance that we have in South Australia on wind power.

Wind farms have been built in South Australia not because of anything that this government has done and not because they provide reliable power, they have been built because of the mandatory renewable energy targets that have been set out of Canberra and the fact that South Australia has a very good wind resource.

If you are a New South Wales energy retailer and you are obliged to supply 20 per cent of the power to your customers from renewable sources, which they will be obliged to by 2020, then you have to source it from somewhere and the best place to source it, if you are going to build a wind farm, is South Australia because you get a better return than you would in New South Wales. In fact, in New South Wales instead of having a 5 per cent reliability, or 5 per cent capacity, you might only get 2½ or 3 per cent. That is why they are built in South Australia.

Members will recall that the government spent about \$1 million on a study into what was called the Green Grid; that is, developing a major infrastructure across the Eyre Peninsula to allow wind farms to hook into the grid. The study cost \$1 million and the grid would cost billions of dollars.

I put it to the minister that I do not know that it would be in the best interests of South Australia and that we would need a rule change to the national electricity market for it to happen, in any case. The market has just made a determination on that rule change only within the

last week or two to say that it will not accept the rule change, so if we are going to build that infrastructure then guess who would be paying for it? South Australia.

That is something that I have been asking the previous minister about for a number of years and he was always in denial of it. At least the new minister understands that point, or his officers did, and conceded to it, but what did disturb me is that the new minister suggested that the new expanded Olympic Dam operation might rely on wind power. Five per cent capacity during the summertime and 3.5 per cent during the wintertime: I am not too sure that BHP Billiton is going to spend \$20 billion, or whatever, to drive its mine with a windmill. I do not think that is going to happen, but the minister will get his head around that. What did disturb me, though, was that the minister suggested it was a proposition suggested by Professor Garnaut.

Mrs Redmond: Well, that doesn't surprise me.

Mr WILLIAMS: Well, it disturbed me that the minister is listening to the man to be quite honest. Because the minister deferred one of my questions on this matter to one of the officers, the officer indeed acknowledged that the renewable energy certificates (the RECs) that are created from the power generated by these wind farms are not credited here in South Australia. They are actually credited in New South Wales and Victoria, because that is where the green energy is being purchased, and that is a point that the previous minister would never concede.

The strategic plan has been drawn up by this government—and this is listed in the budget as a performance indicator. The criteria it uses is calculated on the basis of the total amount of renewable energy generated divided by the total consumption in South Australia. It does not acknowledge where the renewable energy generated is used. It does not acknowledge where the renewable energy certificates are credited. That is the problem and that is why this government continues with the lie that we are doing so well with renewable energy. The reality is that it is New South Wales and Victoria that are driving investment in renewable energy in South Australia, simply because we have a wind resource.

The minister suggested that he is quite happy with the baseload capacity here in South Australia. I think he has that all wrong. We are far too reliant on wind power and we are far too reliant on peaking power which comes at a significant cost. Major industries in South Australia are now shutting down their operations when power price gets above \$300 per megawatt hour, and that happens on a number of days, particularly during the hot weather, and that is undermining the economic capacity of this state. That is simply because we have failed to invest as a state in baseload generation because we have been chasing this elusive wind power and renewable—

Mr Venning: Mickey mouse.

Mr WILLIAMS: Mickey mouse, as my colleague the member for Schubert says. We do have some serious issues. Another thing that came out in the energy estimates committee was that we have this Residential Energy Efficiency Scheme (REES) where retailers are obliged to gain certain credits by going around to domestic consumers and doing energy audits and changing the way that they use energy in their homes. It is claimed that, over the two years of the REES scheme, there has been a saving of some 456,000 tonnes of CO₂ emissions because of the REES scheme.

The reality is, as it became revealed in the estimates committee, that some 46 per cent and 30 per cent (in the two years that the scheme has been going) of reductions achieved by ceiling insulations were because of the commonwealth pink batt scheme. So, 46 per cent and 30 per cent in each of the two years was achieved by the commonwealth pink batt scheme. A further 33 per cent and 58 per cent in those same years of those CO₂ reductions were achieved by changing from incandescent light bulbs to energy-saving light bulbs.

Again, the change from incandescent light bulbs to energy-saving light bulbs is something which was mandated by the commonwealth government. It is not something that occurred because we had these energy audits and because anything this government has done. It was mandated—incandescent light bulbs are illegal in Australia. To claim hundreds of thousands of tonnes of benefit from something which had nothing to do with this state government, I think is outrageous.

I also pointed out to the minister that, whilst we have been wasting—and it turns out from the recent debate in the place—hundreds of millions of dollars promoting small-scale PV rooftop generators, we should have been promoting new technologies like the BlueGen technology which is almost ready for commercial release. In fact, I think you can buy them now where you use natural gas to provide hot water, central heating for the home and electricity, getting an efficiency

rating of something like 85 per cent of the energy in the natural gas. It has an incredible efficiency rating when we compare it to generating electricity and then transmitting it to the homes, and it provides what we call embedded electricity generation which will reduce our requirements to continue to pour millions of dollars into our distribution networks. There are technologies that actually work and actually give benefits to the community, rather than the technology that this government has linked up with, such as the rooftop PV cells, which have imposed a public cost, and only provide a private benefit.

The Victorian government actually has 30 of them installed in public housing in Melbourne now, and is trialling them, and they have actually been used in Japan for a few years. It is new, cutting-edge technology, and I think it is a very, very exciting technology, and one that we need to get on board with.

Madam Speaker, I note on the clock that time is getting away from me, so I had better move on. I had the pleasure of again having a new minister in the minerals portfolio area, and that was also an interesting estimates committee. There were a couple of things that came out of that particular estimates committee. I suggested that the government had been caught out over-hyping the mining industry, and the growth in the mining industry. I think I did point out that there are fewer people employed in the industry today than what there were in 1985, and I—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No, you didn't.

Mr WILLIAMS: I didn't? Well, I make the point now. I did use the example of Nick Bianco having been quoted in the paper last week, saying that he believed the hype that the mining industry was going to provide huge economic benefits for business here in South Australia. He thought that that was one of the things that caught him out.

I also pointed out that the City of Whyalla had developed an industrial site and were struggling to sell parts of that estate—in fact, they were discounting them. The minister said, 'The truth is that Whyalla is booming.' I am not too sure that that is exactly what the people in Whyalla are saying.

While we are talking about Whyalla; I raised the issue of Deepak Fertilisers. Again, the new minister was lauding this as a fantastic project for South Australia, and defending the decision that an explosives plant had to be built at Point Lowly. I remember suggesting that it might not be the most appropriate site, given that other projects were probably going to be built in that vicinity. The minister was at pains on radio a couple of weeks ago lauding this project. It turns out, Madam Speaker, that the minister has never met with the company. He is out there selling their proposal and their project, but he has never met with the company, and I found that out through an FOI request to his office.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister says it is inappropriate, but a company that he had met with (Central Petroleum and Allied Resources) made an announcement early last week to the Stock Exchange that they were proposing a mining venture in the Far North of South Australia—in fact, straddling the South Australia/Northern Territory border. The minister suggested, on radio, that this was a very exciting project, and said it was comparable with Roxby Downs and a 'game changer' for South Australia. I question, Madam Speaker, whether a minister of the Crown should be out there pumping up such a proposal, when the proponents were going to the market seeking capital. I really question the sensibility of that and, to be quite honest, I thought it was something that a minister of the Crown should not be doing.

So on one hand, the minister is saying that he could not meet with Deepak Fertilisers because he was going to be the authorising minister, and yet he was out there and had met with another company which had a proposal on the table and was, in fact, going to the market seeking funds; and he is out there, spruiking what a wonderful project that would be.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I know where the Pedirka Basin is. So, I do question the double standards by the minister. But the icing on the cake for the minister was when I asked him about carbon tax. He said he supports carbon tax; notwithstanding, he eventually admitted that he does not know the details of what has been proposed, but he did admit that he has met with neither Nyrstar or OneSteel in the north of the state—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, the member for MacKillop—sit down.

Mr WILLIAMS: It's alright.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sit down.

The Hon. M.J. Wright: It's in the rules; you sit down when there is a point of order. You know the rules.

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The member for MacKillop is implying things he did not mention, and he is putting words into my mouth which are not true. He is doing it again; I have met with OneSteel.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop needs to be very careful about how he is phrasing his comments.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, from my recollection, when I put to the minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —'Have you been to Port Pirie and met with Nyrstar, have you been to Whyalla and met with OneSteel?' the answer to both questions, to the best of my memory, was no.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: I would ask the member for MacKillop to provide supporting evidence of that.

Mr WILLIAMS: I will check the *Hansard*. Let me say, for the minister's benefit, that I withdraw the comment in regard to OneSteel—but I did ask the question—just for the sake of moving on. The minister did definitely say that he did not meet with Nyrstar, has not been to Port Pirie and met with Nyrstar, but he supports a carbon tax. That is the reality. This is the Minister for Industry and Trade, this is the Minister for Mineral Resources Development, this is the minister who is saying that we have a target of getting a \$4 billion minerals production industry in this state by 2014, and he has never met with one of the biggest mineral producers in this state.

Nyrstar at Port Pirie is the biggest single trade lead smelter in the world and he has not met with them, yet he is supporting Julia Gillard's carbon tax. That is the problem that this state is facing. Not only is the government's budget going down the gurgler but the very businesses, the very industries that are driving the economy of this state, are being ignored. They are being ignored because these ministers just do not care. This minister just does not care. If he cared, he would have been out there to meet Nyrstar. He would have been up there talking to Glenn Poynter, and he would understand the problems and he would be arguing their case in the cabinet. That is why he is a minister. That is the job of the minister—to argue the case in his cabinet. This minister just does not care.

Unfortunately, I have run out of time to speak about the water and River Murray portfolios, but suffice to say that I could be making very similar comments about the minister in that portfolio as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (11:57): I would like to discuss the two estimates committees I sat on and, in particular, the contrast in the two leadership contenders, Mr Snelling and Mr Weatherill. I first sat with Mr Snelling, as the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education on the Tuesday of the estimates process, but unfortunately, as I arrived, I was informed by his chief of staff (Mr Louca) that there had been a change in the arrangements for questions and that TAFE questions would need to be asked towards the end of the estimates process, rather than during the two hours I had allocated for employment, training and further education because there had been a split in the ministerial responsibilities.

I agreed that I would hang off for the TAFE questions for the last half hour, but it was only an hour before Mr Snelling had to move in to take questions on WorkCover in the other chamber, even though the industrial relations minister was being questioned in that chamber. I can

understand why he was not given the responsibility of WorkCover: they wanted somebody who could actually handle that position, so I can understand why Mr Snelling was given that process.

So, I had to ask him questions about TAFE earlier than anticipated, and Mr Snelling then returned for the last 20 minutes or so of the hearing. I was not made aware of these changes, but we did establish that the Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education was in fact the sixth minister in seven years to have that responsibility under this government.

It is interesting to look at the history of the ministers who have moved into this position. On average, each minister has had one year and four months in this position. It appears to me that the Premier has been using this position to train his own ministers, as opposed to providing jobs and training for South Australians.

We have had record youth unemployment. Time and time again the youth unemployment figures come out and South Australia is the worst in the country. If you look at the way the government has treated the training portfolio you can see that there is very little long-term commitment to having a training minister who can get in there, be hands on, understand how training works and deliver some results. We are seeing some very poor youth unemployment figures, in particular, under the management of this government.

Mr Snelling had no Dorothy Dixers: it was a very quick opening commentary and I had two hours with both ministers (Mr Kenyon and Mr Snelling) asking questions without interruption from the other side. I appreciated that because it is the role of estimates to be able to question ministers about their portfolios. Because it is a committee process it is an opportunity for members who have questions arising from the budget about portfolios to be able to ask those questions. Good ministers enable you to pull the bow and ask questions that might have a segue to a line in the budget. Dorothy Dixers, when they are asked, often pull the bow and pull a segue because they are never about figures; they are generally about statements in the budget.

However, if you compare that to the left's leadership contender in South Australia—Mr Weatherill—it seemed as though he had seen Mr Rann's performance the night before where the Premier lined up literally dozens of Dorothy Dixers to stop the Leader of the Opposition and others asking serious questions about portfolios. Mr Weatherill used that same approach. I have not done a word count but my guess is that more than a third, perhaps up to a half of the time, was spent with pre-prepared questions and pre-prepared answers for the Minister for Education. I think political commentators out there will probably compare the performance of Mr Snelling and Mr Weatherill and how they handled their very important portfolios through the management of Dorothy Dixers.

If you want some idea as to how the government uses the Dorothy Dix process to manage the estimates process for its own benefit, you only need to look at the master of the Dorothy Dixer, minister Gail Gago. I represented the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place on consumer affairs, and when I arrived I was offered a reduction in the time from 45 minutes to half if I agreed to no opening statement and no Dorothy Dixers. I was offered 22½ minutes, a free run at the Minister for Consumer Affairs, but I declined because I really did not think that she would have the audacity to use half the time for an opening statement and Dorothy Dixers to block the opposition asking serious questions about the consumer affairs portfolio—but she did. Every question had a written answer that the minister read out in reply.

Just like Mr Weatherill—he had orchestrated a number of written answers and written questions. I even managed to negotiate a longer period on the new SACE in the estimates process. Generally non-government education—that is the independent Catholic schools—and SACE are allocated 30 minutes. I was able to negotiate the first session of the morning, a longer session on SACE, because this is the first year of the new SACE and there are many questions that need to be asked.

I tried to get some answers about the new SACE through the FOI process but I was quickly advised that the SACE Board is exempt from the FOI process. It was important for me, as a member of parliament representing the interests of many of those students who are going through the SACE process for the very first time, to ask as many questions as I could because I had been blocked from that access through the FOI process.

There was some objection to how difficult and detailed my questioning was, but I have a series of commitments from the minister for answers to come back that could not be answered by either the Chief Executive of SACE or the minister, and I look forward to getting those. It is also

interesting that the minister said that there will be a review of the research project. The research project was very controversial, and any parent with a child studying year 12 and any teachers that are out there teaching year 12 will understand that it is controversial.

We have to go back to the history of how we ended up with the new SACE. If you recall, when a national curriculum was a federal Liberal government idea, it was criticised by the then Labor education minister here in South Australia as not making one iota of difference to education in South Australia. They then proceeded to spend \$100 million developing the new SACE here in South Australia, and then a Labor government was elected that believed in a national curriculum also.

Now we are seeing South Australia moving to a national curriculum after spending all this money developing a new SACE for South Australia and putting thousands of year 12 students through an untried system that the minister has admitted is going through a review. My guess is that next year's year 12 SACE will be different from that of this year because of the experience of this year, but my question is: what about those students who are doing SACE this year?

Year 12 is a very important year. We know, because of this government's poor commitment to education, and science and maths in particular, that in 2000, 44 per cent of South Australian students who were doing year 12 received a pass mark at ATAR level in maths, chemistry and physics; that in 2003, when that had slipped to 39 per cent, the government said in its strategic plan that it wanted to lift that figure by 15 per cent to 45 per cent by 2010; and that here we are in 2011 and only 37 per cent of students in South Australia are getting a pass mark in year 12 for their ATAR in chemistry, physics and maths.

This is at a time when the Premier is on record as saying that he wants to deliver 100,000 new jobs here in South Australia—in fact, he promised that during the election campaign—and he said that those jobs would be in the areas of defence, mining and engineering. Guess what? You need maths, physics and chemistry for those areas in South Australia, but we have fewer students coming out of our education system with those qualifications.

What did the government say it was going to do? It was going to set up a new Teach SA program here in South Australia. I pulled down the tender documents earlier in the year and, according to those, that process was supposed to start last Friday, 1 July, yet the minister was not able to tell me, two days before the start date, whether the tender had been let and who the contractor was; of course, it has not started on 1 July as planned. We are not even sure whether the original \$8 million-odd is still available or when the tender is going to be let. So, that is another test Mr Weatherill has failed. We know how important maths and science are for our students here in South Australia—

The CHAIR: Member for Unley, can I remind you that you have consistently referred to members by their names, rather than as minister or by their electorate, so could you refrain from calling them by their names. It is not the practice in this house.

Mr PISONI: Certainly. The Minister for Education has failed in his first test of arresting the downturn in maths and science in South Australia. As a matter of fact, he dismissed it by saying that we cannot help student choices. Students need guidance: they get guidance from their parents, they get guidance from their teachers, and they should be getting guidance from their education minister, as well. The Premier has identified that maths and science based employment is the key for South Australia's future, and yet the minister is failing to deliver those results in the school system.

If we look at fees and charges in the budget for those two portfolio areas, in the education portfolio we are seeing an extra \$25 million being collected over the forward estimates over four years in school fees in South Australia. In TAFE fees, we are seeing a shocking \$53.9 million being collected in extra TAFE fees.

The parliamentary library has done some research work for me. We have already identified that, in South Australia, we have the highest TAFE fees in the nation. So interested were other states that, when that story about South Australia being the state with the worst TAFE fees came out last year, the parliamentary library was approached by the Queensland government to try to get those figures so they could get their own comparisons. Those comparisons told us that Queensland was at the lower end. Of course, Queensland is a boom state for employment and a boom state for the economy.

Here in South Australia, we have kept the brakes on training, we have kept the brakes on self-development, we have kept the brakes on employment, by having high state government taxes and charges on all of our businesses here and, now, of course, the highest fees for TAFE. Do not forget our shocking WorkCover rates here in South Australia, compared to other states. This all, of course, affects the employment figures.

The Premier, again, made the claim and the promise during the election campaign that there would be 100,000 new jobs and there would be 100,000 new training positions. During the estimates process, we have established that they are, in fact, double dipping. They are double counting. They are counting apprentices as employment positions and they are counting apprentices, in those numbers, as training positions.

So, we are seeing an overlap of employment and training positions in that 100,000. It does not mean that we are going to see 200,000 people being trained or employed: we are going to see an overlap of some degree in that area. Do not forget that training happens in the employment process. It is not just in the apprenticeship system, but in other areas, whether it be retail, catering or other areas where there is an overlap of employment and training.

Another issue raised with the minister was where I was accused of being bitten by a union as a young boy when I raised the question as to why it is that SA Unions are notified of businesses that take on children for work experience. I mean, work experience is a part of the PLP—the Personal Learning Plan—and it is part of the new SACE. Work experience has been around in schools for a very long time.

When I was an employer, we were strong supporters of the work experience program. We would have several work experience students coming into the workshop over the year and we met some bright young kids. Some of them went on to move into the trade, doing apprenticeships, and others realised that perhaps it was not really for them. So, work experience for students is a very worthwhile process because it enables them to define what it is they want out of their education, where their next step is and where they want to go.

I was shocked to hear that the minister thought that was fine and dandy, even though it is a fact that WorkSafe SA does not have to be notified. The Employee Ombudsman is not notified, Business SA is not notified—only SA Unions. I did not get an answer to the question as to what happens if the box is left blank, if the employer does not tick yes or no for SA Unions to be notified of their premises being available for work experience. I was not given an answer as to what would happen and whether SA Unions would, in fact, still be notified.

My guess is that it is a little scheme that was concocted quite some years ago to help the trade union movement increase its membership by identifying businesses where they might find members. I certainly experienced that when I was running my business. We had several occasions when unions insisted on meeting up with my employees, after there may have been a bit of publicity about the business. Whether it be a new contract that we got, a new advertising campaign or some other publicity, inevitably we would get the CFMEU—in the old days, it was the furnishing trade union but in recent years it was the CFMEU—demanding to speak to my employees. I gave them access but, to the best of my knowledge, they did not manage to sign up a single member because my staff understood the relationship they had with their employer and they did not want the interference of a third party.

Here we have the education department assisting what is a private organisation. It is an industrial organisation that represents people for a fee—it is no different from Business SA, no different from a lawyer, no different from an interior designer who presents a fee for service—yet the education department is complicit in giving them market details that are not available to even Business SA, for example. That is an area that concerns me and makes me wonder how many small businesses have refused to participate in the very valuable work experience program for fear of getting a knock on the door from the trade union movement.

My colleague the member for Goyder also raised the issue of the management of the school bus operations in the budget. We learned that a Queensland provider had knocked out a dozen or so local contractors who had been not just providing reliable bus services but were also very loyal to the government and were continuing to provide those bus services. They upgraded their buses while the government was still going through the tendering process, but five years after they promised to upgrade buses with seatbelts and air conditioning they were still going through that process. They were very concerned about the safety of their students, and they did all the right things only to be shafted when it came time for those contracts to be let.

It appears to us, on this side of the house, that any community benefit of having a local contractor with community history who is involved in the local footy club and in other community events within the school and who had an established routine outside the bus services to service the community with their buses for other purposes, was not a consideration. They were totally and completely shafted by the government; it was interested only in the dollars and cents, the hard financial model which will, in turn, see spin-off effects in the regional communities that were disadvantaged. That, of course, is of great concern to my colleagues in rural seats, whether they be in the Riverland, on Eyre Peninsula, in the Barossa Valley or down in the South-East. They are all very concerned.

I also need to raise the debacle of the Adelaide High School expansion. If members recall, in the lead-up to the election the Liberal Party did a lot of research and, due to the good work of the then Liberal candidate for the seat of Adelaide, identified that many people in the inner northern suburbs who wanted to use public education were locked out of Adelaide High School. We decided that we would bite the bullet and take advantage of the former Clipsal site purchased by the government at Bowden for a TOD. Of course, if you read about TODs, or visit TODs, you would know that a school is a very integral part of making a TOD work because they bring mass into the area. We announced we would build a multi-level school on a small footprint in the Bowden area.

It obviously polled extremely well because, a couple of weeks before the election, the government announced that it was going to expand Adelaide High School. It also promised that it would expand Adelaide High School without encroaching on the Parklands, yet four of the five options presented to the governing council for the extension of Adelaide High School encroached on the Parklands; the one that did not involved the destruction of a heritage building. Here we have a government that will say anything when it is pushed up against the wall and then not deliver on its promises.

It is a similar situation to what we saw in Marryatville, where we saw the government trying to push the easy option of a new building in front of the beautiful main building and shortening the length of the oval because it was a cheaper, easier and best value for dollar option, ignoring the other options of removing some 30-year-old temporary buildings and placing a building there, or renovating and extending some of the other buildings on the site. I was at the briefing, and the reason it did not want to do that was that it would involve making those buildings disability compliant, and it did not want to spend that money. This is what this government has come to.

It is all about what they can present in the media, what they can present in the lead-up to an election. It is not about caring for the little people. They are not interested—not interested—in those with disabilities, not interested in those who are struggling in school; they are only interested in presenting the smoke and mirrors that they need to hang on to government or to win the 24-hour media cycle. Madam Speaker, we had some difficulty with the clock starting, and you have been very generous with your time, and I thank you for the opportunity.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (12:20): It has been a very interesting estimates period. I am one who believes that the discipline of estimates is actually good for both sides of the house. I say that for two reasons. Firstly, it forces departments to drag all the skeletons out of the closet, dust them off, and present them to the minister. It forces ministers to engage with their departments and go over all the contentious issues of the year past and the year ahead and, if you like, have a spring clean, and then come into the parliament with their people very focused on dealing with any questions that the opposition may have.

It is a very good discipline for government, but equally it is a very good discipline for opposition, because it means we must pick up the budget papers, we must go through them and scrutinise them, we must engage with stakeholders, and we must come in, having identified the weak spots in the government's financial planning, past and proposed, and pluck the eyes out of it. And, boy, can I tell you, in this particular budget estimates cycle there has been plenty to pluck. I want to start with chicken in chief, the Minister for Industry and Trade.

He has been out there with some outrageous spin. He has slashed the department down to the bone. He has carved people up and thrown them out the window, and he has sacked so many people there is hardly anybody left in the department. He has thrown himself up for budget cuts. He has seen his department—this is the supposed champion of his department—whither on the vine.

People wanting to invest in this state are ringing, and no one is answering the phone. Then he has the temerity to put out some media late last night claiming that he is doing a fantastic job on exports. Let me tell you what a fantastic job the Minister for Industry and Trade is doing on exports.

Back in 2001-02 exports were \$9.1 billion. His announcement last night, champion of the crusade, is that exports have now hit \$11 billion. What a remarkable achievement over the course of nine years, barely keeping pace with inflation.

Of course, he conveniently forgot to mention that his premier and his government had promised the people of South Australia, in their notorious and glossy State Strategic Plan, that they would treble exports to \$25 billion by 2014. Well, it is 2011 and he has hit \$11 billion. It is going to be a spectacular result over the next three years to see it zoom from \$11 billion up to \$25 billion. The fact is this government and this minister are failing on exports. Under the previous Liberal government, in 2001-02, South Australia's exports were \$9.1 billion, as I said, and our share was 7.5 per cent of the national export market; but, under Labor that has slipped to 4.5 per cent of the national exports market, and his crowing about it.

He goes on with more misinformation. He has made the outrageous claim that the opposition have an official policy that says we will close our trade offices in India and China. He says we have an official promulgated policy—it is out there—posted up somewhere that we will close our trade offices in India and China. Well, here's the rub, Madam Speaker: if he is wrong with that claim, if that claim is untrue, if it is an accidental untruth, or, even worse, if it is a deliberate untruth, the message really is that everything else he said is also untrue. So, I challenge him to show us the official policy of the Liberal Party that says we will close our trade offices in China and India, as he has suggested. If he cannot show us the official policy document, then it is untrue, and he should apologise.

Not only is it untrue, I draw his attention, as I did in estimates, to a discussion paper that I have produced on behalf of the opposition which points the way forward on our future trade engagements with China. It is out there for public debate and I would be delighted to receive a submission from the minister, if he has the time. I would love to see if he has anything intelligent to say about our trade with China, because we are still waiting to hear what his policy is.

Apparently, he has a couple of people working on it, they are still beavering away, but once again the opposition said in the agenda, 'We have been out there for ages now.' They are probably out there now plagiarising our work so that they can reinvent it as their own. But what does it say? It says that we should enhance and bolster our trade functions in China so that we can do better, because we are not doing very well.

That makes a particular point. The reason that we are seeing a small lift in the last 12 months in our trade performance, and it is happening across the nation, is that our farmers have had a bumper year because the drought has ended, and there is some result coming from grains. We are also seeing record minerals exports, but of course all of that is negotiated by the national government. All of that is dealt with by Austrade.

All of those contracts are managed by major international corporations directly with their customers in overseas destinations. I doubt very much if the South Australian government has anything whatsoever to do with negotiating those sales contracts. The wheat and minerals go up and down, under national control and under commercial control, with very little input from the state government.

What the state government's job is is to make sure that our wine producers are exporting. The state government's job is to make sure that our manufacturers are exporting. The state government's job is to make sure that small to medium enterprises in this state are exporting. What are the results there? Very poor indeed.

In fact, wine, which is overall for South Australia one of our most significant exports, when it comes to China ranks very lowly. By overwhelming numbers our biggest export to China from South Australia is minerals. It is the manufacturers that need the minister's help. It is our food producers, particularly processed food producers, that need the minister's help. It is the service industries that need the minister's help. They are not getting it.

What we have heard today from the minister is nothing but utter and absolute spin. From a government that was off funding trade fairs in Puglia, off on farragoes all around the world; that was its trade priority, while our trade to China and India (our biggest trading partners) needed support.

We have been critical of some aspects of the way the government is doing business in China and India. For example, we have asked questions about why the head of our trade office in India, Mr A.K. Tareen, is getting paid \$340,000 a year. Not a bad job if you can get it; more than

the Premier, I believe; more than half of the budget, as we heard during estimates, used to fund our office in India.

So, we are certainly asking questions about whether the government is doing the right thing in China and India. To suggest that we do not need representation there is simply silly and the minister is just carrying on with a whole load of nonsense, and he knows it.

Of course it does not end there. During estimates he was not able to answer questions about Tiger Airlines. He seemed completely unaware that the government had made a pitch and offered \$10 million to attract Tiger's base here: 165 jobs, \$10 million, \$83,333 a job. Not a bad pitch. That was really good value for money, was it not?

Of course, they were unsuccessful in that and then claimed that they pitched for a second base. He was unable to tell us exactly, across the whole of government, how much has been spent on that. We heard that it was \$2.25 million from his portfolio and another \$900,000 from tourism: \$3.15 million. I suspect there is money from other portfolios that has flowed into that Tiger bid. We are still waiting for answers.

In last year's budget papers they claimed to have attracted up to 120 new jobs, but he was unable to tell us exactly how many jobs had been attracted, exactly how many aircraft had been attracted and what the benefits of the taxpayers' spending of that \$3.2 billion or so had achieved. So, it was a very poor effort from the minister.

Of course, we had secret loan agreements with Bianco. We all have our thoughts with the Bianco family and the company at this difficult time, but why sign secret loan agreements? Why not bring them to the Industries Development Committee? Then we had revealed during estimates that the government has given money to a whole stack of companies—a whole stack of them, in secret, behind closed doors. Secret loan and grant agreements that no-one has seen because these things are not being brought to the Industries Development Committee or any other proper process for scrutiny, which can be easily done; commercial in confidence is required. The government is out there dishing out money in secret and not telling anyone about it.

If the minister wants to have an account of how things are in the economy in South Australia at the moment, having touted the righteousness of Business SA during estimates and telling us that they defer to Business SA, he should do so. He should go and talk to Peter Vaughan, who has been out there as CEO of Business SA just this week saying that things are about as bad as he has seen. He should go and talk to our retailers and exporters, get out there with industry. We know that he has not been to Nyrstar, as the minister for minerals. He is not visiting other companies either. He needs to get out more, get out of the factional back rooms and get out and visit the companies that look to him for leadership. Industry and trade, I have to say, were very disappointing. This is an area where there has been disinvestment and windback from this government, and we will pay a price and we are paying that price.

I want to move on to defence. This is another area of high priority for this state, and it has enjoyed largely bipartisan support. I have publicly, and I do so again, given the current government some credit for building on the good work of the previous Liberal government and maintaining the momentum on defence. There have been a lot of good things done. We did not oppose the Osborne ship-lift redevelopment and common-user facility, and many other of the initiatives that the government has proposed, because we could see they were good for the state—and we are a party that always puts the people of South Australia first, not petty politics, unlike the current government when they were in opposition who would rip anything down if there was a political point to be scored.

I must say that the government needs to do more on shipbuilding. There have been problems with the air warfare destroyer project. The Collins submarine maintenance is on a watch list, and the big challenge before us is the SEA 1000 12 submarine build which is to follow, and there is a real danger that if the federal Labor government dillydallies any longer with the submarine build, there could be a gap between the Collins and the new capability which would see the workforce in South Australia dismissed and then have to be rehired years later when we work up to create a new shipbuilding facility to manufacture the new submarines.

Of course, this is also the case with other ships the government plans to build. It is a quarter of a trillion dollars over 30 years—not 20 years, as the Premier said in one of his media releases. I suggest he check his facts before he goes out with a media release and check with Business SA, in particular, about whether it is 20 years or 30 years.

But a quarter of a trillion dollars is a nation-building investment. If the Snowy Mountains scheme at around \$8 billion was a nation-building undertaking that required a national approach, why do we not have a national approach on the issue of naval shipbuilding? We cannot afford to let a federal government go off and write cheques over the next 30 years for a quarter of a million dollars to oversee shipbuilders to buy ships off the shelf when we can build them here and see it generate the jobs and the economic activity we so need.

For that reason, I say that naval shipbuilding should be a matter that goes to the Council of Australian Governments (COAG). I think the states need to be around the table before decisions are made about how this quarter of a million dollars is spent. It is too much money for defence, DMO and the federal government alone to simply decide they will buy off the shelf—they will buy this, they will buy that—to meet a defence capability. Primary though that is, it is also a decision that affects the manufacturing, employment and shipbuilding capabilities, certainly in WA, South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales but also I suspect in every other state and territory. It is simply too big to be left without the states around the table, and I think South Australia should champion that move.

We also heard during the estimates period of the government's disinvestment in science and innovation. This is something that concerns me extraordinarily. In 2009-10, the government spent \$31.3 million on science and innovation, but in 2011-12 that has been slashed to \$20 million: no wonder the science and research community has been irate with Labor, both state and federal. We have seen cuts to SARDI, we have seen cuts to Bio Innovation SA, we have seen cuts to and, in fact, the winding up of the Playford Capital organisation, Innovate SA and other entities that were there to stimulate innovation and creativity within the economy.

This portfolio of science and innovation, in our view, is linked to industry and trade and economic performance; that is why we have those two portfolios grouped together under the one shadow minister. The government has a different approach: it has science and innovation grouped off with the education minister and not industry and trade. I think that is a strategic mistake. The way forward for manufacturing in this state is through transformation based around science and innovation. We cannot go on producing me-too products—T-shirts, footwear, the sorts of manufacturers and businesses that have closed through competition from emerging economies.

We must go forward with smart products which require a high degree of intellectual input and which are based around cutting-edge science and technology in new areas, and manufacturers must transform their businesses to embrace that value proposition. That is the way we can compete with China and India—because we have a smart, innovative workforce; not on cutting wages and not on cutting cost factors of production, but by being smart.

The number of people employed in science and innovation has decreased, and I want to particularly mention Bio Innovation SA, a creation of the former Liberal government kept alive by this government but suffering a death of a thousand cuts. The momentum in energy that once existed for the Thebarton Bioscience Precinct appears to have diminished and faded within this government, with land proposed for sale and with the energy and thrust in growing that precinct and attracting biotech companies to it apparently having vanished.

More alarmingly, in my view, funding support for the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics may well be at risk. During estimates, the government could not commit to any funding strategy beyond 2012 in anything other than generalised terms. The fact is that that plant functional genomics centre is an example of what we should be doing and, as the minister who helped champion it when we were in government, can I say that we need to see more of that from this government.

I would rather see money being spent on attracting science centres of excellence here, from which genuine business opportunities can be generated, than to see money thrown away on some of the very expensive farragoes this government has chosen to pursue. Let me remind the house that, as a consequence of this earlier investment in biotechnology, we were able to attract Terra Rossa Capital here—a private venture vehicle for biotech start-ups—using private funding from the NTAA based out of Canberra but all linked off a commitment from state government to grow biotechnology.

All that is at risk if this government continues to disinvest from science and innovation at the very time, looking around the world at global structural change, when smart countries like Australia should be reorganising themselves around that very valued proposition—being smart, being scientific and being involved in high technology.

That, of course, leads me to Playford Capital, which the government announced last year that it would be winding up and which it has reiterated this year that it is to close. The Reid report upon which that decision was based is still being kept secret wrongly, and the government is unable to explain why, at the very least, it did not consider selling Playford Capital as a going concern so that at least the capability would be retained; instead, it is to be decommissioned.

All this is bad news for the state economy because we are going into difficult times. I just say, coming out of estimates, that the government is at a precipice: it can go forward and fall over the cliff to its death, or it can go forward, actually show leadership for this state and leave it in better shape than when it took over. It is not too late. I am sure that either way the government is facing execution in March 2014, but it would be awfully nice if they did not leave us with another State Bank wreckage or something like it.

I have to say that the failures I see in this budget, coming out of estimates, suggest to me there is no plan, and there is no vision. Yes, they are building some things, but quietly to the side the economy is struggling, and it is the areas of industry and trade, commerce, defence, science and innovation which must be the engine room for the future of this economy. If you do not water it, it will not flower. I see a picture of money being stripped out of these three portfolios, particularly industry and trade, and science and innovation, and redirected into other areas. That is a strategic mistake and it must be corrected.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:40): The budget provides an opportunity to scrutinise the finances of the state. Every government prepares a framework to deliver its priority areas of expenditure while still maintaining services necessary to care for the needs of South Australians. This has always been so. Governments of every persuasion have delivered budgets and they always generate much discussion. This is part of the democratic process, a welcome feature and one to be encouraged.

Political allegiances aside, parliament delivers a system of democracy that is controlled by people for people. People interested in the political process become groups or formalise into parties interested in similar policies or ideals. From time to time, smaller parties or individuals are elected, and we see much of this these days. Even so, the two-party system is a strength and has delivered stability and, one could argue, reasonable and steady progress federally and in each state and territory of the country.

No government makes laws or adopts policies to deliberately aggravate electors because it is to the wider public, those who rely on elected members to represent their rights, that we are all answerable. What parliamentarians have always tried to do, some more successfully than others, is listen to the needs of the community and then communicate and progress those views and positions within the structures in place to deliver outcomes.

Parliament is the mother of all committees and anyone who has worked on a committee of any kind will know that adversarial politics exists at all levels of society, and they will also appreciate that many people choose, for whatever reason, not to become involved and in some cases would rather criticise than be part of the solution of whatever matter is under consideration. Nevertheless, we all usually want to end up in the same place. The debate is only about how we get there.

This government's priorities have always been the issues most mentioned whenever I am out and about: to have a place to live, a job to maintain yourself and your family, and to have access to the best possible education and health care. In Florey, our area is mostly residential, with employment being found in strong retail representation and a little light industrial. We do, however, have many aged-care facilities, schools and the Modbury Hospital, which has traditionally been a focus. In addition, we now have a co-located GP Plus Super Clinic to address the needs of a growing ageing population.

With the service hubs for state departments like Housing SA and Families and Communities, and a large Centrelink office and a local council office and depot, we have many healthcare professionals and public servants employed in our area. We are all probably related to a public servant and I am sure appreciate their work and no longer subscribe to the theory that it is a cushy job for life.

In my remarks today, I would like to concentrate on the services being delivered by this budget through the Modbury Hospital and other areas. Modbury Hospital deals with about 36,000 people a year, both patients and visitors. The hospital employs about 850 staff who work in a dedicated manner, striving to ensure a safe, clean and caring environment that puts patients'

needs first. Modbury Hospital has a thriving volunteer group across a range of areas. The Modbury Hospital Foundation, which manages the fundraising hospital kiosk, has 120 volunteers. It is to this self-contained community that people in the north-eastern suburbs will often go first when they are ill, need an operation, or have a need for acute care.

South Australia has a health system working hard to meet the community's demands. I acknowledge the healthcare professionals for all they do. Occasionally I hear people complain and use the term 'Third World'. I truly believe, however, that unless you have experienced a poor health system it is not possible to appreciate what we have here. Everyone wants the health system to be the best it can be. Unfortunately, some people have adverse outcomes when they are ill, but—and this is an important qualification—much more often than not people receive the treatment they require to recover or the support they need at the time of a loved one's end of life.

One of my own immediate family members recently faced a severe health crisis and, I am grateful to be able to say, received life-saving treatment at the Royal Adelaide Hospital ICU and is now being assisted during recovery to, I hope, full health. The stresses on family are immense whenever someone is ill, and this is why the government is aware that it must do all it can to assist. There are competing priorities to deliver core services, and so there is much debate in my area at the moment about introducing parking fees in line with other hospital sites in this state. As some sites have existing commercial rates in place and others do not charge anything, there is logic in standardising car parking arrangements at all nine metropolitan public hospitals in Adelaide.

However, I believe that Modbury Hospital presents a special set of circumstances, as the entire central region of Modbury, including the hospital, Westfield Tea Tree Plaza, the TAFE site, and the O-Bahn park-and-ride facility, already has parking problems due to lack of planning and vision. Implementing parking controls within the Modbury Hospital parking area is not expected to adversely affect traffic flows into and out of the facility; rather, increasing numbers of drivers may opt to park in surrounding streets, and local residents will be affected by congestion in this area even more than they already are.

Information to hand indicates that, under parking plans for Modbury Hospital, there will actually be a decrease in the number of spaces available for parking. Parking on the site is already at a premium for staff, with spots reserved for doctors, public parking areas and disabled bays. Therefore, until a multi-level, purpose-built facility of some kind is developed to address the parking needs of the Modbury region, the overwhelming message I am receiving is that car parking fees at the hospital should be put on hold. I will continue to work with the appropriate authorities to ensure that this message is heard and, hopefully, acted upon as quickly as possible.

Another welcome budget measure addressing parking in some way is the provision for additional parking at the O-Bahn park-and-ride. The current facility is at capacity, with commuters being forced to park on private property, including Westfield Tea Tree Plaza, which has resulted in many residents being issued with fines. Extra car parking will assist current regular O-Bahn commuters and make provision for additional growth in a public transport system that is strongly supported by this government.

In education, I work closely with local schools and will always continue to have a strong interest in making it possible for young people to have dreams for their futures and careers and to achieve those careers and dreams. All my siblings and their partners are teachers, as is my daughter-in-law, so I always know firsthand exactly what is going on in the broader education sector from them and, closer to home, through committed governing councils and parents in my electorate.

The above examples are among local issues that this year's budget addresses. More broadly, I know that the Premier is focused on making sure that there are jobs for people who are looking for work and on improving infrastructure and services of this state. The Treasurer and ministers share his determination in delivering on the policies taken to the last election and also with an eye to the future prosperity of the state.

In conjunction with the member for Newland, there will be a public forum shortly in my area when the Treasurer will be on hand to discuss some or as many as possible of the budget initiatives. I hope residents will take the opportunity to participate. We all have a say in how the state progresses. Democracy is not something that happens once every four years; it is something that happens every day, with people phoning or visiting offices for services, schools for their children's education, hospitals for health services, and even calling their local MPs for assistance in

a matter that may be of concern to them. We can all be part of the endeavours and the solutions that will keep this state is strong.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:48): I also rise to make a contribution to the estimates process, and I do so on the basis of confirming that I had the great pleasure of sitting in on all five days for a variety of periods on each of those days. It continues a tradition that I have had, regrettably, from this side of the chamber since being elected in 2006 to having been involved in every day that estimates has sat. I am subjected to it just about as much as some of the Labor members opposite who are sitting there also.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. The member for Florey was certainly in Estimates Committee B every time I was there.

Ms Bedford: And working hard and paying attention.

Mr GRIFFITHS: And working hard. It is a process that many have a level of frustration with. It creates an opportunity for an approach in which you can try to get information on a calm basis, ask questions sensibly, get a good answer, pose supplementary questions and get all the information you seek; or, indeed, take the confrontational opportunity that it presents, when there can be a lot of yelling and screaming and potential walk-outs—which has occurred in the past in this chamber, I think, probably about three or four years ago. It is a necessary process.

The people of South Australia, in providing the funds available to government for its services and infrastructure, surely have an expectation of a high level of scrutiny, and that is where the estimates process provides the greatest level of corporate knowledge about where that \$16 billion is going that exists within public servants, ministers, government backbenchers, opposition shadow ministers and opposition backbenchers at the one time.

It is a chance for all members of parliament to pose questions either through direct representation on the committee or through someone who does that. I know I had conversations with the Independent members in the chamber saying, 'If you have issues you want brought up, please bring them to me so that I can pose them on your behalf,' because no matter where you come from—

Mr Piccolo interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, but unfortunately I did not get any from them. No matter where you come from, there are issues where the budget will have an impact on people, and that is a direct result of the fact that government services are so wide and varied.

I wish to reflect on some of the questions that were posed, the issues that arose, and the answers that were given during the approximately 10.5 hours of direct questioning responsibility that I had as part of those five days. I do so from the viewpoint that I respect the efforts made by the chairs, too. They had a hard job. It is not always an easy one. The Hon. Michael Wright was chair of Estimates Committee B during the times that I was there, and I commend him for his attitude towards it. Ms Chloe Fox, the member for Bright, was the chair of Estimates Committee A. Chloe brings a different perspective to it, there is no doubt about that, but those in here certainly respect what she brings to it.

I was surprised when I asked questions of minister Conlon about some performance issues in public transport. While he might not have got the focus of my question, one point that I took out of it was that, in train passenger numbers for public transport options, the estimated result for the 2010-11 financial year is that we were down by 1.2 million people. I am willing to recognise that the disruption to services on the Gawler and Seaford lines because of the electrification that is occurring there would have transferred a vast number of people onto bus options—I do respect that.

Mrs Vlahos interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Temporarily, while those near \$600 million projects, funded predominantly from federal government sources, are being undertaken. I recognise that, but I cannot necessarily respect that 1.2 million people were suddenly transferred onto buses who would have normally gone on trains. I would be interested to get some more detail on that and we will see what we can find out because all political parties come from a position of the need to support public transport, to make sure that we get the maximum number of people on it, and to provide a safe option for people when they are on public transport.

There has been a lot of media recently about concerns from people who have felt either intimidated or have been attacked in some way on public transport. I know that there are 79 transit officers and there is an intention to employ a few more. I do not adhere to the proposal from the Victorian government of the employment of some 980 security officers, who will be carrying guns, for its public transport network. I would hope that our society is a bit better than that, so that level of security support within the public transport is not necessary. Victoria has made a decision to do that based on what it has seen. In South Australia, I hope it does not get to that.

It is a busy role for the nearly 80 transit officers we have in the South Australian system to make sure that we have confidence in our public transport users and the options provided, and we need that. We want people not to be turned off in any possible way. We want them to consider public transport as their first option for transport, so let us make that happen. I asked questions also about the tram breakdowns. There has been quite a few of those. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND BULLYING

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (12:54): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Earlier this year I advised the house that Mr Bill Cossey AM, a former chief executive of the Courts Administration Authority and former acting chief executive of the Department of Education and Children's Services, would undertake an independent review of the circumstances of a violent incident at a northern suburbs school. As members would recall, that particular incident involved a savage attack on a student that had been filmed by another student and then posted to the internet in a manner calculated to cause further distress to the victim. The assailant in this case was immediately suspended and has subsequently been excluded by the school. The incident was also reported to the police and led to the assailant being charged with assault causing harm.

The seriousness of this incident prompted questions about the application of anti-bullying policies in this case and the effectiveness of incident management procedures, particularly the reporting relationships between schools, the education department and police. These matters were the focus of Mr Cossey's review.

I can advise the house that Mr Cossey has handed down his report and I have today released the report and the government's response to its findings. The report makes 14 recommendations which provide for:

- strengthened procedures where incidents of violence occur, both to ensure parents are involved at an early stage and that there is proper reporting to and involvement of police;
- a strengthened role for the existing Coalition to Decrease Bullying, Harassment and Violence in South Australian Schools; and
- raising the profile of bullying policies in schools and monitoring bullying behaviour.

I can advise the house that the government supports each of the recommendations made in the report, with a series of changes to be made between now and the start of the next school year. A copy of the report and of the government's response to the report will be available on the education department's website.

Mr Cossey also identified a further six broader policy issues for further consideration, including an improved approach to handling parent complaints. In respect of this particular issue, I can advise the house that we will introduce a new approach to responding to parents' concerns, which will include clearer guidance for parents about processes, dedicated support for parents during the grievance process, a complaints resolution unit and a panel process for review of decisions. This will ensure that parents have greater confidence that their concerns will be fairly addressed.

Although there is clearly more work to be done, particularly in light of the rapid growth in social media and its use in bullying behaviours, the report has also indicated that existing anti-

bullying measures are having a positive effect. Research evidence reviewed by Mr Cossey indicated that Australian schools are amongst the safest in the world and that the incidence of bullying in South Australian schools is lower than in schools interstate. The review processes also identified examples where relations between schools and police were strong and responsive and helped build a school environment focused on the prevention of incidents.

I am advised that the student who was assaulted in the incident that prompted Mr Cossey's review has positively re-engaged with school and has achieved well in both maths and English. That he has done so is a credit to him and his family.

When bullying and violence are brought into our schools, our schools have an obligation to deal decisively and assertively with them, for the benefit of the students involved and to ensure community confidence in our schools is maintained. By acting on Mr Cossey's recommendations, the government will continue to work with our schools to help change the attitudes that fuel bullying behaviours, teach students that bullying and aggression are not acceptable behaviours and support every student to focus on their learning.

[Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00]

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (PARENTAGE) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MOTOR VEHICLES (THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ELECTRICITY (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I draw members' attention to the presence in the gallery today of a group of students from Cummins Area School. They are guests of the member for Flinders, of course, but my near neighbours as well. We welcome you and hope you enjoy your time here today.

KING, HON. L.J.

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) (14:03): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Leonard James King, AC QC former member of the House of Assembly, former attorney-general and former chief justice, places on record its appreciation of his meritorious public service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Like so many South Australians, I was saddened to learn late last month of the passing of Len King, who died on 23 June aged 86. Len King made an outstanding and enduring contribution to South Australia as a brilliant lawyer and barrister, as attorney-general during a period of profound social and legislative reform, and as a Supreme Court judge, held in the highest esteem, who went on to serve our state as chief justice.

As I noted in a tribute delivered at last week's state funeral held at St Ignatius Church at Norwood, Len King was, by any measure of a civilised society, an outstanding man whose unquestioned gifts of intellect, insight and empathy were complemented by a lifelong commitment to social justice and jurisprudence. He is remembered by all who knew him as a thoroughly decent, fair and compassionate man whose integrity played a profound role in our state's legislative and judicial evolution.

Leonard King was born on May Day, 1 May 1925, and he spent his formative years as an only child in the inner suburban precinct of Norwood. He was educated initially by the Sisters of St Joseph at their school on Beulah Road and then at the Marist Brothers school that preceded the present day St Ignatius College.

His academic potential was immediately obvious to the brothers, who understood that young Len would be forced to prematurely leave school to financially help his family through the

Great Depression, and therefore they allowed him to sit and pass his leaving certificate at age 14. This was two years younger than the average age to complete what became matriculation level.

It was during his childhood that Len also developed the passions that were to remain constant throughout his life. He would often visit Victoria Park Racecourse to watch the racehorses train and run. He nurtured a great interest in sport, particularly his beloved team the Norwood Redlegs. He remained steadfast in his faith, with the parish priests of St Ignatius providing Len with his first pushbike, which enabled him to regularly serve mass.

Upon leaving school, Len was employed as a clerk with the Shell Oil Company, but even though his was a protected occupation, upon reaching age Len enlisted in the Royal Australian Air Force. He served as a wireless radio telegraph operator and spent a great deal of his wartime service in New Guinea.

Following the war, the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme, which was introduced by prime minister Ben Chifley, enabled Len, like many other servicemen who would never have been able to afford a university education, to pursue his lifelong dream to study law.

The late Supreme Court Justice Michael White used to enjoy recounting the tale of the morning in 1946 when, as he made his way to the University of Adelaide campus, he was approached by a quietly spoken young man, whom he later came to know as Len King. The young man politely inquired, 'Can you please tell me where the law school is?'

It was during his university days, when he returned to live with his parents in Norwood, that Len King joined the East Norwood sub-branch of the Australian Labor Party. Among his contemporaries around that time, at law school as well as in grassroots politics, was Don Dunstan. Len had first developed an awareness of politics when his father, a former ALP branch president at Carrieton in our state's Mid North, used to take him to hear the debates that took place in the Speaker's Ring on a Sunday afternoon at Botanic Park.

As was recounted at last Friday's funeral service, Len's father was a man of limited education but of keen intellect. He was an avid follower of politics, and so Len's commitment to social justice and the labour movement was formed at home and was reaffirmed by his and his family's experiences during the Depression.

Len recalled years later that, upon being discharged from the Air Force, he had a further conviction that people should be actively involved in politics. He said, 'I felt that we live in a democracy and it only works if people really get involved.' Having begun as a legal practitioner in Whyalla and Port Augusta, Len returned to Adelaide and soon established a reputation as one of the city's outstanding legal minds.

In addition to his flourishing practice, Len King also served as a member of the state's Law Reform Committee, and in the late 1960s was appointed by Don Dunstan as Counsel Assisting the royal commission into South Australia's archaic liquor licensing laws. It was in that capacity that Len helped to bring about the end of the infamous 6 o'clock swill.

It was several years later, with a state election looming that the ALP appeared set to win, that Len was at Don's home one Sunday morning and was asked by the premier in waiting if he would consider standing for election and, if successful, to serve as the state's attorney-general.

As a man with a thriving legal practice, a family of five children to provide for, and no direct experience in politics, Len advised that he would need a couple of days to talk over the offer with his wife Sheila and even with his older children. When he next spoke to Don he said, simply, 'The answer's yes. You've jogged my conscience.'

Len later explained that he owed his law career to the Labor Party, in particular to Chifley's training scheme that enabled a young working-class boy from Norwood to attend university. He also stipulated, during a conversation with Don Dunstan, that he only wanted to serve two terms in parliament. It confirmed Len's view that, while politics was a strong calling, the law remained his great professional love.

Len, of course, was a terrific member for the seat of Coles, the eastern suburbs electorate with a high proportion of Catholic voters that became Morialta after the 1998 redistribution. He doorknocked tirelessly to meet and listen to as many constituents as possible. He joined local associations, went to local RSL meetings and worshipped at local churches, rather than in his own parish.

In his maiden parliamentary speech in this place Len King outlined the values that were to define his political career. He spoke about the need to fix the state's grossly unfair electoral system, the importance of public education and social welfare, the urgent need for consumer protection laws, the vulnerability of our aged and of our Aboriginal people, and his strong opposition to capital punishment and the ongoing war in Vietnam. He concluded that address by saying:

I hope that when I come to make my last speech in this house, I shall be able to claim that my efforts in public life have advanced, and not hindered, our community's grasp and understanding of the infinite value of every man and woman.

The fact that upon leaving politics to assume a place on the Supreme Court bench Len King was described by Don Dunstan as 'the greatest attorney-general in South Australian history' confirmed that he was true to his words of his maiden speech.

During his two terms as attorney-general, Len King also served as minister for social welfare, minister for Aboriginal affairs, minister for community welfare and minister for prices and consumer affairs. Indeed, it was his trailblazing raft of consumer protection legislation that Len himself considered to be his major political achievement.

When he came to office, Australia had virtually no consumer rights legislation. It was a testament to Len's preparedness to tackle this issue on behalf of everyday consumers and his commitment to preparing legislation, often tailor-made for specific industries, that many of his measures were adopted by other Australian states, even those with Liberal governments.

When Gough Whitlam's government took office in 1972, then attorney-general Lionel Murphy devoted an entire section of his new Trade Practices Act to consumer protection. Don Dunstan was to describe these consumer laws as 'one of the greatest achievements of the Dunstan government'.

Len King also oversaw the revision of South Australia's Social Welfare Act to become Community Welfare, and when the commonwealth took over responsibility for Aboriginal affairs, he amalgamated the remnants of the state's Aboriginal affairs department with the welfare portfolio.

He also set up a committee to recommend on the complete overhaul and revision of criminal and penal law, a review headed by Dame Roma Mitchell, herself one of South Australia's foremost legal figures. He was a driving force behind the revamp of our court system to introduce a third tier, the District Court, to bring about a more efficient disposal of case loads and, therefore, a more effective system of justice.

Taking up a position on the Supreme Court bench when he stood down from politics, Len King then turned his reformist mind to the daily running of our court system and introduced the Courts Administration Authority to achieve that outcome. He was also renowned throughout the legal fraternity for his ability to deliver extempore judgements, effectively off-the-cuff judgements, in even the most challenging cases.

A brilliant technical lawyer, this skill underscored his capacity to synthesise complex legal arguments and deliver learned reasons on the basis of notes he would jot in a notebook as cases unfolded. He also used his daily walks to and from work across Victoria Park to distil thoughts that resonated far beyond South Australia. Indeed, local lawyers appearing before our High Court would be told by eminent minds such as Justice Michael Kirby, 'You are from South Australia. Please tell me what Justice King had to say on this matter.'

As a lawyer and a judge, Len King was as scrupulous as he was cerebral. As attorney-general, he was a pioneer as well as a pragmatist. As a husband and father, as his daughter Sue and son Michael so movingly eulogised at last week's funeral, he was as loving as he was inspiring. As they noted, despite all he achieved and the great esteem in which he was held, one of Len's greatest pleasures in life was simply spending time with his wife Sheila whom he devotedly cared for throughout her lengthy illness until her death in 2004.

In his final years, despite having suffered a stroke, Len remained a keen student of current events, politics and the Catholic Church. He maintained his insatiable appetite for reading and knowledge, with a special interest in the church's international weekly newspaper, *The Tablet*. His family knew the risks of turning up to visit Len without being fully across the big issues of the day, whether it be carbon pricing or refugee policy. Daily news and daily politics were a very important part of his life until the end.

On behalf of all members of the house, on behalf of the people of South Australia, I extend my deep gratitude for the outstanding and enduring contribution that Len King made to our state. I also extend my condolences to his children, Sue, Michael, Cathie, Joe and Jim, to his extended family and his many friends, colleagues and admirers.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): I rise to second the motion. Len King was an extraordinary South Australian. He achieved more in his lifetime than most would dream possible. He served in the RAAF in World War II, became a member of parliament and a minister of the Crown, and eventually retired as chief justice of the Supreme Court. It would be worth noting if he had achieved just one of these successes but to achieve all three plus much more is a considerable feat.

It is interesting to me that not too long ago we did a condolence motion in this place for Kym Bonython, and I remember making a similar comment about his diverse and extraordinary achievements. Perhaps it came from being born into that time after the ravages of World War I, growing up through the hardship of the Great Depression, and then facing the tough prospect of involvement in World War II all before you were out of your teens. Indeed, social commentator and author Hugh Mackay concluded in his book *Generations* that that generation was the happiest and most satisfied with their lives in spite of, or perhaps because of, the difficulties they faced early on.

Len King was one of the most respected legal minds this state has ever seen. He was also a dedicated family man, and he always knew where his priorities lay. I noted in the eulogy book at the funeral that he was born on 1 May 1925 into a world recovering from the devastation of war. He grew up in the Great Depression and times were tough. In 1943, at the age of 18, he went to war serving both in Australia and New Guinea with the RAAF for three years. He started that when he was just 18. When he returned, he attended Adelaide University and studied law.

He had come from quite an ordinary working-class background, and it was only through the special arrangements made for the resettlement and retraining of servicemen that enabled him to study law. He was admitted to practice in 1950 and, by 1967, prior to entering parliament, Len was made a QC. A pre-eminent legislative reformist, Len was the South Australian attorney-general and member for Coles (which, as the Premier said, is now Morialta) from 1970 to 1975. He had the distinction of being only the second man to enter cabinet with no prior parliamentary experience. Indeed, at the state funeral held to commemorate Len's life, his daughter Sue explained that Don Dunstan had specifically approached him to enter the parliament in order to be Don Dunstan's attorney-general.

In his maiden speech, Len spoke of the great value he placed on humanity but also flagged several critical issues he planned to address as a parliamentarian and as a minister. Prophetically, these issues are still highly relevant on the political agenda today: education, business, aged care, law reform and others. His great sense of justice was evident in that very first speech to the parliament on 15 July 1970, when he said:

Human dignity in society is protected by the rule of law. Respect for the law, like respect for conscience, is vital to the well-being of society.

That says, succinctly and well, why we should all respect and uphold the rule of law.

In his time as attorney-general, Len King was instrumental in implementing significant legal and social reform. Don Dunstan, as the Premier has said, described him as 'the greatest attorney-general this state has seen'. He restructured the justice system by separating magistrates from the Public Service and created the Courts Administration Authority, effectively giving the judiciary independence over their own administration. Len was also a strong advocate for the abolition of the death penalty, saying:

When the state, as a deliberate act of policy, lays aside its power to punish by inflicting death, it demonstrates in a practical and striking way its conviction of the value of human life.

He also drafted legislation to decriminalise homosexuality and liberalise drinking laws. Len was not one to mince his words. As attorney-general, he once famously criticised the then governor of the day, Sir Mark Oliphant, saying that, in his view, the views of the magistrates are:

...greatly preferred to the views of...others, however distinguished, who have no knowledge of the facts of a particular case.

After those somewhat terse comments directed at the governor, Len went on to be sworn in by Sir Mark Oliphant as a judge of the Supreme Court. Len was elevated to the Supreme Court bench following his retirement from politics in 1975 and named chief justice just three years later, in 1978. After an illustrious career, he retired from the bench in April 1995, just two days before his 70th birthday. At that time, he was rightly flooded with well-wishers from both the political realm and the legal fraternity.

As the Premier also mentioned, Len always liked to walk to and from work. Indeed, it was always walking outside the courts that I had occasion to converse with him, as I never appeared before him. One imagines Len on his walks pondering the complexities of the working day that lay before him. However, his interests outside work were wide and varied, too.

A regular churchgoer, Len attended the same church in Norwood for virtually his whole life—St Ignatius. He married there, his children were baptised there and, last Friday, his funeral was held there. He was also an avid tennis player, and many of the longest lasting friendships of his life, and that of his family, revolved around the tennis regulars, some of whom were present at the funeral last Friday. Len also loved the races and was a passionate supporter of the Norwood Football Club. Indeed, I am sure he would be pleased to see the success of his mighty Redlegs, currently at No. 2 on the ladder.

Above all, Len was a family man. He loved nothing more than spending time with his family. When he retired from politics—a career (and I would have to agree with his statement) he said took more time but less intellectual capacity than the law—he was looking forward to having more time with his kids. I know that he was very proud of his family, and he loved his wife Sheila dearly; sadly, she passed away some seven years ago. I offer my sincere condolences to his five children, Susan, Michael, Josephine, Catherine and James, and their partners, and the grandchildren.

Len passed away peacefully on Thursday 23 June, aged 86. In his maiden speech to the parliament, he said:

I express the hope that when I come to make my last speech in this house I shall be able to claim, in that speech, that my efforts in public life have advanced and not hindered our community's grasp and understanding of the infinite value of every man and woman and of the essential equality of all human beings and that my efforts in public life have assisted translation of these great principles into the laws by which the community is governed.

I am sure members from both sides of the house will agree in saying that Len certainly achieved that aim and much more. His legacy will live on in the South Australian parliament and in the legal heritage of this state. He was a truly great South Australian. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (14:24): I rise today to join in celebrating the illustrious career and life of the Hon. Len King—a man whom I am sure will be warmly remembered and sorely missed as a former parliamentary colleague, a great jurist and, more importantly, a staunch friend and loving family man. He serves as an inspiration to me personally as the current Attorney-General of the state as I follow in his footsteps towards making, hopefully, a more positive impact on the community.

The role of the attorney-general in contemporary Australia is a different and somewhat complex one. In South Australia the attorney-general is a member of cabinet, and so is bound and constrained by cabinet rules in exactly the same way as any other cabinet minister. This much is clear. What is less clear is the curious amalgam of common law, statutory obligations and custom residing in the office. In reality, it seems that the nature and extent of these responsibilities are primarily a function of the personality and views of each individual attorney. There is, however, clearly an ever-present tension between these two roles.

In some circumstances this could become quite awkward. Former federal attorney-general, the Hon. Daryl Williams QC, attempted to resolve this dilemma by essentially vacating the field. For example, he seems to have been unimpressed by the Shawcross principle. I did not agree with many of his views during his tenure and perhaps members would not be surprised to know that I still do not agree with them.

That is not to say that I would like to take things as far as another former federal attorney, the Hon. Bob Ellicott, but I have taken the time to read Len King's words about the role and importance of an attorney-general at a state level, and they have been very instructive and very

helpful to me in my role. I agree with everything he has had to say and I commend anybody who has the opportunity to read them.

Len was born in 1925 and educated at the Marist Brothers School in Norwood. He started, as people have already heard today, from very humble beginnings. He remained in school until the age of 14, at which time he achieved a leaving certificate, which was the standard of education at the time. As the Premier said, he went on then to work for the Shell company, then to be in the Air Force, spending time in New Guinea. Upon leaving the RAAF in 1946 he went on to continue his education, studying law at Adelaide University.

It was during these later years of education that his passion and talent for the law came to be recognised by those around him. From 1952 until 1957 he practised law in his own account, establishing a successful and growing practice, a practice which continued to grow to the point of him requiring the service of a partner. In 1967 he took silk, being appointed a Queen's Counsel and serving with distinction in this important and ancient role.

We know of the Hon. Len King as a man of exceptional ability who excelled in his professional life as a barrister and, as we have heard, later as a parliamentarian, then cabinet minister, judge and chief justice. As attorney-general from 1970 until 1975, he established a reputation of being a reformist in the government of Don Dunstan. He also held a number of other portfolios, including social welfare and Aboriginal affairs, and prices and consumer affairs.

I have taken the opportunity to read the Hon. Len King's maiden speech and I think some of the remarks he made in that speech bear repetition, not simply because of the inspiration that one derives from reading them, but also because of the timeless nature of the message that he brought to the parliament even then in his maiden speech. First of all, in relation to the question of electoral fairness, he said:

At the heart of all governments is the constitution under which government is carried on. The two principles to which I have referred must be reflected in the constitution of a state if that constitution is to be worthy of a society based on freedom and justice. No constitution can be said to meet this norm unless it ensures, so far as laws make this possible, that all citizens have an equal voice in deciding the government of the state.

Further on he said:

An understanding of the worth of each individual human being leads to an appreciation of the importance of education and of the state's role in education. Education enables the child to develop his faculties and to realise his full potential as a human being....The state must undertake the task of ensuring that the greatest possible education is available to each child....Class sizes—

remember when this was, 1970—

in the school are generally too large and equipment and facilities are in many cases not wholly adequate.

He then went on to talk about the importance of commonwealth support for state educational institutions. Later in his speech he said:

...a major objective of government is to restore and enhance the dignity and rights of the ordinary citizen living in a modern, commercial society. The nature and organisation of the economy places the ordinary citizen at a severe disadvantage in his business dealings. In almost all his business dealings, the citizen deals with large organisations which are in many cases immensely powerful and in virtually all cases well equipped with the knowledge and machinery to protect their own interests. A proper regard for the dignity of the individual citizen demands an overhaul of the law and to restore justice in the citizen's business dealings.

On the topic of Vietnam he goes on to state:

I have stressed as the theme of this speech the intrinsic value of human beings and of human life. How ghastly an affront to this idea is offered by the conflict in which Australian troops are currently engaged in Vietnam.

He then moves on to talk about capital punishment, in similar language, talking about the dignity and rights of human beings. He then moves on to another topic with a similar theme:

No person can fail to be moved by the sight of so many young lives being ruined by criminal behaviour and antisocial attitudes. The prevention of juvenile delinquency and the rehabilitation of offenders will be a primary consideration in the administration of this department. Steps will be taken as soon as possible to implement improvements in the machinery for dealing with juvenile offenders.

Another current, contemporary issue. He then goes on to say:

There is a special group, however, for which, by reason of my portfolio of Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, I have a special concern and responsibility, and that is those of our citizens who are members of the Aboriginal race. It is a regrettable fact of history that human worth and dignity has not always been enhanced by the attitude of the white people of Australia towards their Aboriginal fellow countrymen. All too often the Aborigines have been

exploited by white men and at other times they have been over-protected. The policy of my administration will be the recognition of the intrinsic worth and dignity of the Aboriginal citizens as well as the white citizens of this community. My policies will be signed to give the Aborigines the maximum opportunity to assume responsibility for their own lives.

That is just a range of the comments made by this remarkable man in his maiden speech here in this parliament. As has been remarked upon already, however, he told Peter Donovan in November 2004, as part of the Don Dunstan Library Collection, that he regarded his greatest contribution to be in the realm of consumer legislation.

This occurred at a time when there was virtually no consumer legislation to speak of anywhere in Australia. He was very much a pathfinder in that regard. For me, as Attorney-General and, more broadly, for anyone who strives to serve the public, I think we all hope to have such a profound and positive impact on the community, the law and the protection that it offers to South Australians.

After leaving his role as attorney-general, the Hon. Len King was appointed, of course, to the Supreme Court of South Australia, where he was able to apply his tremendous talent and skill for the law. Fittingly, in 1978, he was appointed the chief justice of the court, a position which he held until his retirement from the bench in 1995.

It has already been remarked upon by others that he had a particular talent for delivering extempore judgements. I was speaking to one of the people at the funeral last week who told me an anecdote where, after a particularly complex appeal, the Full Bench had retired to the anteroom and the chief justice said, 'Well, I think we should go in and deliver our judgement.' One of them said, 'Look, I want to think about it a bit more, I might not agree with you,' and he said, 'Well that's alright; we'll be going out in five minutes, you've got plenty of time'—and out they went and he gave the decision straight off the top of his head. It happened over and over again, where this remarkable man was able to pull together complex cases and deliver judgements in a speedy and well-respected fashion. He was also a remarkable administrator of the Supreme Court.

Of course, outside of the law and outside of politics he was also a man who had a great many friends and who was greatly devoted to his family. Speaking personally, I had the great privilege of coming to know the King family in the late 1970s when I was at university. At that stage, I do not think I had ever met anybody who was a lawyer, let alone somebody who was a judge. To have the opportunity of being invited to the home in Alexandra Avenue and watch people play tennis (because I cannot play tennis), have a chop or sausage and talk to people who were absolutely completely down to earth and welcoming was a remarkable revelation to me. That really, I think, is the important thing I would like to say about Len as a person—that airs and graces, or being high and mighty, were certainly not part of his repertoire. He was an extremely down to earth, easy to engage person.

He leaves behind a legacy of community spirit, maintaining a strong connection to the people of this state throughout his career, and the community as a whole is all the better for his years of service. His legacy is certainly an example that all of us should strive to live up to. I would particularly like to extend my condolences to Sue, Michael, Cathie, Jo, James and the rest of the family.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:36): The Hon. Len King QC, Companion of the Order of Australia, brought incredible skill, legal insight and knowledge to South Australia's social services sector during his time as minister for community welfare in the Dunstan Labor government. I am told that Len's father lost almost everything during the Depression—his friends and neighbours even more—and from this experience Len learnt and never forgot how suddenly a person's life could change, how quickly you could go from having everything to next to nothing, and how important it was to help those in need. This spurred his passion for justice. It also gave him a sense of compassion and a commitment to protect the most vulnerable in our community.

Among his great ministerial achievements, Len proposed and drove the organisation of the department of community welfare. This included establishing regional offices and community welfare centres where people in need could go and receive face-to-face support from social workers in relation to matters, including foster care, adoption and relief payments, a model which still exists and works effectively 40 years on.

Len was also master of collaboration and understood the value of government working closely with local councils and community organisations to coordinate work to best connect with the disadvantaged. Len King was responsible for major reform in the way young offenders were dealt with in South Australia. The juvenile courts legislation paved the way for juvenile panels, which could deal with first offenders without having to go to court, and a fuller assessment of circumstances and behaviour of children before their committal by a court. He also ensured the juvenile court was presided over by a judge of District Court rank.

Len was ahead of his time in understanding the need to protect the community but also rehabilitate young offenders and help them turn their lives around. Len also acknowledged education as a key to opportunity and a better life. This underpinned his commitment to public education. He never forgot how lucky he was to have the chance to attend university and study law through what was then the Commonwealth Reconstruction Training Scheme. Being grateful and never taking anything for granted were the qualities he strove hardest to instil in his children, Sue, Michael, Cathie, Jo and Jim.

While I never had the privilege of working with Len King, I have been lucky enough to work alongside Cathie and Jo, who both carry their father's fierce sense of social justice and commitment to improving the lives of the disadvantaged. When they were teenagers, Len often reminded his kids, 'In your life, you are a lot luckier than most people.' Len King lived by this principle, and South Australia is a better place because he did. I express my deepest condolences to both Cathie and Jo and the King family at this time.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:39): The Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Premier and minister Rankine have outlined Len King's great history, so I will not repeat their words. As a long-time workers' rights advocate, I will address my contribution to that area of Len King's great work. Some years ago, in researching the area of workers compensation legislation in South Australia, I was heartened to read of the ALP's role in the development in this area and also of Len King's role as attorney-general in the Dunstan government. He was instrumental in developing groundbreaking workers compensation legislation in the early 1970s.

The Dunstan government's track record on workers compensation is second to none, certainly for that era. That is in keeping with Labor's commitment to greater social and economic equality for working people. In 1971, the Dunstan government introduced an entirely new act that enhanced the compensation for significantly broadening the definition of injury and disease, boosted weekly payments from 75 per cent to 85 per cent of average weekly earnings, raised death payments up to 33.3 per cent, increased the total that could be paid by 25 per cent and transferred responsibility for the resolution of claims disputes from the District Court to the Industrial Court.

In 1973, amending legislation lifted weekly payments to 100 per cent of workers' average weekly earnings while, in 1979, the title of law was changed from the Workmen's Compensation Act to the gender inclusive Workers Compensation Act. I should mention also that, in 1978, the government established the Byrne committee. This was the report that formed the basis of the WorkCover scheme in 1986.

As with the WorkCover legislation that we have had before us, the 1971 act was a highly contested instance of law reform. It was the start of the modernisation of workers compensation law in South Australia, after decades of stagnation under the Playford government. Not surprisingly, it attracted widespread opposition from the conservatives, particularly in the Legislative Council. All told, more than 120 amendments were put forward by the opposition. The main focal points of attack were the long-overdue improvements in workers' entitlements put forward by Labor and the proposal to transfer jurisdictional responsibility for the handling of claims disputes to the Industrial Court.

Then, as now, Labor did not have a majority in the council. That emboldened the opposition to attempt to block key aspects of the Labor reform agenda, which inevitably led to a conference of two houses. Len King, in conjunction with the minister for labour and industry, Dave McKee, and the talented workers compensation lawyer Terry McRae, were among the members who took part in that conference. Negotiations over disputed provisions of the bill went down to the wire. In the end, however, Labor—thank goodness—prevailed. While a number of concessions were made, the fundamental reforms regarding the broadening of eligibility, increases in compensation payments and the resolution of disputed claims remained unscathed.

With his extensive legal experience and acumen, Len King played an important role in supporting the complex and protracted negotiations that took place at that conference, thereby ensuring that Labor's commitment to the South Australian community at the 1970 election concerning workers compensation was delivered.

This was a great achievement for Labor and the state's working people. It was an achievement that illustrates what can be done when Labor has politicians of the calibre of Len King. My condolences to the family, particularly Cathie and Sue, both of whom I have worked with. Vale Len King.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (14:43): I join in the debate on the Premier's motion and support it today, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition and ably contributed to by other members of the parliament. I too express my condolence to the family of Len King. His brilliance and his contribution to South Australia have been ably presented, both in the law and in this parliament.

He had, indeed, an outstanding working career and what would some, I think, describe as a privilege of being able to contribute to this parliament, to the executive and to the judiciary, which comprise the three arms of governance in South Australia. He did them not only extremely well, as has been espoused, but in a respectful manner to each of the other arms in that democratic system.

I just wish to mention one other attribute. It is less outstanding and less brilliant, but it is my most recent memory of Mr King QC. There are some older memories, of course, such as a few dust-ups in here between Len King QC and other members—Robin Millhouse QC was one who springs to mind—and if anyone wants to read those *Hansards* they will be entertained, enlightened and educated. Couple that with his judgements, both as a member of the Supreme Court and ultimately as chief justice of the Supreme Court, is it a wonder that the Attorney's comments will be warmly received by everyone here today.

My most recent memory is of His Honour (as we continued to call him) on the racetrack. I think others have briefly outlined his contribution to the racing industry by being a perpetual punter and contributor in that way, and that was a healthy contribution, and I am sure the industry appreciated it. The late Len King joined with my late husband and my late father, who were also lovers of the racetrack. I cannot actually think of three more different men, in every attribute, but I will say that they loved it, and they loved it passionately. Each one of them had different talents in that regard, and I have to say that on the occasions that His Honour proffered advice or a tip—and it was not often; it usually had to be extracted—it was usually completely unreliable and not highly sought after! But he had a great time, and he made a great contribution to the social fabric of sport and racing in this state. Vale Len King.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (14:46): Solicitor Kevin Ward said of Len King:

He walks to work usually and walks home, likes the races and has a modest bet, is a great Norwood supporter in the footy and is a regular churchgoer.

Len King was born in 1925, grew up during the Great Depression, served three years with the RAAF in the Second World War, and attended law school from 1946, where he was a few years older than his classmates. He joined the ALP the same year. He was admitted to the bar in 1950.

The political world in which Len King was active was one in which not every adult Australian citizen living in South Australia could vote for the Legislative Council, one in which some electorates had 3,000 voters and others, such as Hindmarsh, had 30,000, and one in which one party ruled from 1933 to 1965, often polling much, much less than a majority of what we would now call the two-party preferred vote. Electoral injustice was an issue that would win a generation of young people to the ALP.

In 1969 the Liberal and Country League government, led by Steele Hall, decided to compromise on electoral reform and allow a redistribution of electorates in which, while not conceding the principle of one vote one value, the tolerance of the disparate number of voters per electorate was diminished so that, for instance, the new eastern suburbs seat of Coles had 17,000 voters and the far north-east seat of Frome 8,300. For the 1970 general election many new seats were created in the metropolitan area and one of those was Coles, which was roughly the current state districts of Morialta and Hartley combined. Len King represented the ALP before the commission drawing the electoral boundaries of the House of Assembly on Steele Hall's new principles.

He had taken silk three years earlier and was the shadow attorney-general but not yet in parliament. He was preselected by Labor for Coles and went on to win it with 8,802 votes to 6,898 for the Liberals and 450 for the DLP. Labor won the election, Don Dunstan became premier again, Len King became attorney-general and minister for community welfare, and those in the LCL aligned with upper house leader Ren De Garis blamed Steele Hall.

In his maiden speech Len King told parliament that his electorate was a developing area. He spoke about the importance of state parliaments, the rights of the unborn, capital punishment, the Vietnam War, conscientious objection to compulsory military service, consumer protection, retirement villages, community welfare and Aboriginal people. He said:

Notwithstanding that great national issues in our federal system are decided at the political centre of the commonwealth, many of the issues that most directly and fundamentally affect the quality of life of our people are decided at the state level.

He spoke about 'the intrinsic value of each human life, the corollary principle being the essential equality of all human beings', and he continued:

I make the point that in the last parliament the sense of the paramount value of human life suffered a severe wound at the hands of this parliament. It withdrew the protection of the law from the life of the unborn child in many circumstances.

At a time when the expression 'cold as charity' was common, he told parliament:

It is as important that those who seek assistance are treated with the respect due to citizens of the community who have fallen upon misfortune as it is to see that their material needs are met adequately.

In 1972, he told a meeting in Sydney that maintaining law and order was more important to a party of change than to a conservative party. As attorney-general, Len King would appear in court personally on behalf of the state, and in 1975 he took off for London to appear before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, then the final court of appeal on some matters. He travelled with his personal secretary, Greg Crafter.

From 1972, he was in charge of ALP efforts to get eligible South Australians to enrol for the Legislative Council. One political commentator claimed that his efforts could lead to Labor winning two more Legislative Council spots at the 1973 election. This was before the 1975 reforms that saw the Legislative Council elected by a proportional representation on a single statewide electorate and from the same electoral roll as the House of Assembly. The LCL candidate for Coles needed a 6 per cent swing to unseat Len King at the 1973 general election, but that was never a possibility. He continued as attorney-general and minister for community welfare in the Dunstan decade and the advance of what conservatives at the time called the 'permissive society': sex shops, R-rated movies, acceptance of pornography.

On one occasion, without a cabinet decision, he used his status as attorney-general to apply to the courts to try to stop the risqué stage play, *Oh Calcutta!* In an article in a law journal many years later, when he was a judge, he expressed the opinion that the political rules had changed in a way that would probably prevent an attorney-general making such an application without the concurrence of cabinet. Of another stage play, *Stud*, staged at Elizabeth's Shedley Theatre, he said, 'A prosecution can at times only excite interest in something that would pass unnoticed.' He told one newspaper:

My own personal convictions as to the morality of pornography did not affect the judgement I had to make as a minister within a pluralistic society such as ours.

He sought to remove capital punishment from the statute book, but the LCL-controlled upper house blocked his path. In 1974, he canvassed spent convictions legislation for offenders who had gone straight, but that had to wait until 2009 and the member for Fisher. He also canvassed the need for statutory protection of privacy, something the former member for Hartley, Terry Groom, took up in 1990 only to be defeated by the power of the media corporations.

In 1974, he announced that he would not contest the general election due in 1976. This cleared the way for the Dunstan government to appoint him to the Supreme Court in 1975 and for Des Corcoran, embattled in the seat of Millicent, to move to the city and stand for Coles. On the eve of the 1975 deadlock election, the Dunstan government appointed Len King to the Supreme Court, and in 1978 it appointed him chief justice as successor to John Bray. Liberal Movement leader Robin Millhouse attacked the 1975 appointment of Len King, which is interesting in light of the Tonkin government appointing him to the same court in 1982 in order to create a by-election, which they hoped they would win but did not. LCL leader Bruce Eastick said:

The appointment is in extremely bad taste, coming as it does on the eve of an election which Mr King will not contest.

Dean Clayton QC, now Judge Clayton, said of Justice King:

He has the ability to grasp the most difficult factual situation, to analyse what's important and what's not, cut through the camouflage and go right to the heart of the matter and come out with a good decision.

According to Dean Clayton, Justice King's judgements were never overturned by the High Court. Indeed, when my son Johnno, who is now at law school, brought his recent torts assignment to me to look at, it featured a Len King judgement appeal to the High Court. The months-long battle between the then attorney-general Chris Sumner and chief justice King that led to the creation of the Courts Administration Authority is still legendary.

Len King retired from the Supreme Court in 1995 with a reputation for running a tight ship, having shortened the waiting list by making the civil courts sit in January, swift delivery of judgements, and being firm but fair and polite. Firm, fair and polite, one cannot ask for much more in a judge. I offer my condolences to Sue, Michael, Cathie, Jo and James. Rest eternal grant unto him O Lord and let light perpetual shine upon him.

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) (14:55): I rise to express my most sincere condolences for His Honour Mr King, a man committed, without question, to the protection and enhancement of civil liberties and social justice, a great Labor reformer, a great South Australian.

His strong connection and commitment to the eastern suburbs and community is still remembered very strongly and very fondly by many of my constituents. I am often reminded, in particular by members of the Italian community, of the high regard and respect that they had for him and his commitment to improving their living conditions and rights.

While many in this place—although the Attorney-General did talk at some length—have risen to talk of the reform he made in his capacity as attorney-general and minister for prices and consumer affairs, I want to talk briefly this afternoon about his brief time as minister for Aboriginal affairs. He was minister for Aboriginal affairs between 1970 and 1972.

Members must remember that this was a period of significant change when it came to Aboriginal affairs. In 1967, we had the referendum, marking the beginning of a very important period for Aboriginal Australians, and Mr King, a senior minister, brought incredible status to this portfolio.

Mr King's legal prowess, his capacity to act as a powerful advocate, ensured that real advances were made when it came to Aboriginal South Australians. He set the tone for his agenda in his maiden speech, and the Attorney has touched on this but I think it is worth repeating, and we must remember that this was 40 years ago. He said in his maiden speech:

The policy of my administration will be the recognition of the intrinsic worth and dignity of the Aboriginal citizens...my policies will be designed to give the Aborigines the maximum opportunity to assume responsibility for their own lives. They must have the same opportunities as white men to make their own decisions as to the way in which their lives will be led, to exercise the full rights of citizenship and to assume the corresponding responsibilities. Human dignity and self respect and pride in one's race and culture are qualities to be encouraged among all our citizens, not the least among our indigenous citizens.

In 2004, John Summers of Flinders University wrote about the policy dilemma that faced Mr King: how to enable Aboriginal people to retain their heritage and maintain a separate cultural identity, and at the same time provide the educational opportunities necessary to take an equal place in the wider community, issues that we still grapple with today.

Greg Crafter, the former member for Norwood and highly respected senior government minister, worked for Mr King in the 1970s and reflects on him as the minister that laid the foundation stones for the Aboriginal land rights movement in South Australia. Specifically, in Greg's view, he says that Mr King opened the dialogue with Aboriginal people through meeting and working with communities on the APY lands. In his view, this dialogue was integral—and of course it was—to the development of the APY land rights legislation of 1981, the first legislation that recognised land rights for Aboriginal South Australians.

I have to say that his work in restructuring the community welfare portfolio had a significant impact on improving people's lives and his support to democratise the upper house ensured, for

the first time, that all Aboriginal South Australians had the opportunity to participate in the election of upper house representatives.

There is no question that Mr King was a great reformer alongside Don Dunstan. He was a man of great integrity and enormous commitment to social justice and civil liberties. I extend my most sincere condolences to Mr King's family, to Cathie in particular, and know that his legacy in this place and in the community will never be forgotten.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, thank you for that. Obviously, Len King was a truly great South Australian. He has left an incredible legacy behind him for the benefit of this state. What a wonderful place this would be if we could all leave that legacy behind us when we leave this earth. He was a wonderful man for his family who must be extremely proud of him and proud of his memory. My sincere sympathy to all of you, particularly to Cathie who I have had the pleasure to work with and know for many years.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 15:00 to 15:10]

EATING DISORDER UNIT

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 206 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to provide a dedicated medical team and facilities at Flinders Medical Centre to deal with eating disorders that is separate from general psychiatric facilities.

MOUNT LOFTY BOTANIC GARDEN

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 4,000 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to ensure recurrent government funding is provided for adequate horticultural staffing of the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Rules made under the following Acts—

District Court—

Civil Rules—Amendment 17

Criminal and Miscellaneous—Amendment 10

Magistrates—Civil Rules—Amendment 37

Supreme Court—

Civil Rules—Amendment 16

Criminal Appeal Rules—Amendment 4

Criminal Rules—Amendment 28

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

Regulations made under the following Act—

Road Traffic—

Mass and Loading Requirements—Proof

Miscellaneous—Apparatus Approved

Road Rules Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—

Crashes

Dangerous Goods

Vehicle Standards—Dictionary

Local Council By-Laws—

City of Port Lincoln—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties

No. 2—Moveable Signs

No. 3—Roads

No. 4—Local Government Land
No. 5—Dogs
Wattle Range Council—No. 4—Local Government Land

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

Regulations made under the following Act—
Health Services Charitable Gifts—General

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas Long term—Hahndorf, Mount Barker and Nairne
Rates and Land Tax Remission—Remission of Water Rates

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

Regulations made under the following Act—
Natural Resources Management—General—Transitional Provision

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

Regulations made under the following Act—
Fisheries Management—
Fees—
Division 1-4
Schedule 1 Part 1
Schedule 1 Part 3

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

Emergency Services Funding—
Declaration of Levy and Area and Land Use Factors—Notice 2011
Declaration of Levy for Vehicles and Vessels—Notice 2011
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Emergency Services Funding—Remissions Land 2011
Parliamentary Superannuation—Additional Contributions
Southern State Superannuation—Parliamentary Superannuation

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

Flinders University—
Annual Report 2010
Statute 1.2—University Colours and Insignia
Statute 2.3—The Vice-Chancellor
Statute 2.7—The Registrar
Statute 4.1—The Council
Statute 4.3—The Faculties
Statute 6.1—Admission
Statute 6.2—Enrolment of Students
Statute 6.4—Student Conduct
Statute 7.9—Academic Dress

AGRIBUSINESS COUNCIL

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:15): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: I am pleased to announce that I have appointed a new Agribusiness Council to act as a high-level conduit between the state government and industry to ensure the sustainable growth of South Australian agriculture. The establishment of the Agribusiness Council follows a review of industry development boards and the Premier's Food

Council last year. I would like to acknowledge past and present members of the Advisory Board of Agriculture, who performed a valuable role over many years. I thank them sincerely for their efforts.

It was my view the missing ingredient in advice coming to the government was high-level expertise from major players in the agribusiness sector. Growers and producers are well-represented on the various industry boards and the ABA, but there was no forum to bring farmers together with other significant players in the value chain. Utilising the broad expertise, networks and advice of industry representatives will not only improve strategic discussions, but also identify further domestic and international opportunities. It will assist in ensuring the sustainable economic development of this state.

Primary production, food manufacturing and the various agribusiness support sectors are pivotal to our economy, with the state's gross food revenue contributing an estimated \$12.4 billion last financial year. Predictions of a 70 per cent increase in global demand for food by 2050 present an opportunity for our food industry to increase the supply to our interstate and international markets.

The new Agribusiness Council has attracted keen interest from high-calibre people, which represents a vote of confidence in the state's agribusiness sector. I am delighted that some of South Australia's leading rural business and industry leaders have come forward to serve on the council, which will hold its first meeting at Parliament House in early September. The members are:

- Catherine Barnett, Chief Executive, Food SA;
- Mike Brooks, Deputy Vice-Chancellor of Research, University of Adelaide;
- Glenn Cooper, Chairman and Marketing Director, Coopers;
- Rob Gordon, President, South-East Asia, Viterra;
- Malcolm Jackman, CEO, Elders;
- Rob Kerin, consultant and former premier;
- Peter Michell, Managing Director of Michell Wool;
- Richard Murdoch, Chairman, Advisory Board for Agriculture;
- Malcolm Pridham, State Manager, NAB Agribusiness;
- Louisa Rose, Chair, South Australian Wine Industry Council;
- Darren Thomas, Chief Executive, T&R Pastoral;
- Simon Venus, Partner, Piper Alderman; and
- Carol Vincent, CEO of the South Australian Farmers Federation.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister Assisting the Premier in Social Inclusion) (15:18): I bring up the 2009-10 annual report of the committee.

Report received.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:19): I bring up the 27th report of the committee.

Report received.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:19): I bring up the 57th report of the committee, entitled Invasive Species Inquiry ('It's not over until the cat lady sings').

Report received and ordered to be published.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I bring up the 58th report of the committee, entitled Bushfire Inquiry.

Report received and ordered to be published.

QUESTION TIME

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VISITOR AND TRAVEL CENTRE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Will the minister advise why the street level King William Street Visitor and Travel Centre was transferred to the basement of a Grenfell Street building before that building was made accessible for those with prams, walking frames or disabilities and while the government is still paying rent at the King William Street site?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:21): The question about the disability access, which is a matter that has been on the radio this morning, is something that does concern me. In fact, this morning on the way to parliament I took a walk down and had a look at the visitor centre itself in order to make sure for myself what the position was in relation to the access. I am talking about the new premises. At one level the premises appear to be very good; that level, of course, is when you are actually in the premises.

Mr Williams: The basement level?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I am going to lead you through them bit by bit, so you do not miss anything. We will start in the basement. The basement is actually very well appointed, very well set out and does an excellent job of displaying South Australian tourism opportunities. However, I am disappointed that there appears to be a period of time between the closing of the old premises and the present time, and I gather for some weeks to come, where proper disability access is not available in the new premises. I am disappointed about that.

I have, in fact, made it clear to the commission that that is the case, and I have requested not only that I be provided with further particulars about this, but also that an independent assessor be engaged to confirm that the proposals for disability access which have been arranged or contemplated by the licensee do in fact meet Australian standards.

KRUSE, MR E.G. (TOM)

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:23): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the funeral arrangements for Tom Kruse, the legend of the outback?

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) (15:23): Madam Speaker, it was with great sadness that we learned of the passing of Tom Kruse last week at the age of 96. I am sure that I speak for all members of the house in saying so. I asked the state government's protocol department to offer their assistance to the Kruse family in relation to the arrangements for tomorrow's funeral. The funeral will be held at 2.30pm tomorrow at the Panasonic Pavilion at the Morphettville Racecourse. It is expected that more than 600 people will attend the service, and the public are welcome to join the commemorations for this outback legend.

Tom was an absolute icon of our state. When you think about the story of South Australia and the people who helped shape the outback, Tom Kruse's name comes up time and time again. Tom was the sort of character you could not invent, travelling across the harsh terrain in his Leyland Badger delivering mail, fuel, supplies and even medicine along the Birdsville Track. His trips would take a fortnight, and he would regularly have to deal with floods and breakdowns as he carried out his work to help ease the isolation of living in the outback.

Tom's legendary work became famous thanks to the 1954 documentary *Back of Beyond* and, as a result, Tom became a national icon. He was awarded an MBE in 1955 and later inducted into the National Transport Hall of Fame, named an outback legend by *Australian Geographic* and nominated as a South Australian icon by the National Trust.

Even though he retired to Adelaide in 1984, his links and passion for the outback remained strong. He went on to do several re-enactments of his mail run, helping to raise money for that other outback icon, the Royal Flying Doctor Service. I look forward to attending tomorrow's funeral, as I know will other members of this house, to celebrate the life of a man whose own story helps tell the story of the development of South Australia and the spirit which built this great state.

The government has agreed to allocate time for a condolence motion for Tom Kruse because a number of members, including me, as I said, will be attending the funeral tomorrow. A condolence motion will be held on the following day of sitting to enable those members to participate. I want to thank the honourable member for Stuart for his assistance the other day.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VISITOR AND TRAVEL CENTRE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:26): My question is again to the Minister for Tourism. Why is the taxpayer paying for the disability compliance requirements for the privatised South Australian Visitor and Travel Centre, and what is the cost?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:27): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I have been seeking information about that this morning and, when I have some, I will be better informed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop! The member for Ashford.

RIVERBANK PRECINCT

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:27): My question is directed to the Premier. Premier, can you update the house on the government's vision for the Adelaide Riverbank precinct?

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) (15:27): I thank the honourable member for her question. Our riverbank is home to our halls to culture and education, the Adelaide Oval, Australia's first integrated cultural centre in the Adelaide Festival Centre, our Convention Centre, hotels and hospitality, the Casino, and even our metro rail station, as well as Elder Park and other stunning natural features. We need to see the riverbank as a legacy for Adelaide's next generation, in the same way as the previous generation saw Linear Park. It was one of the first ambitious concepts to think holistically. However, for too long we have had a city which has turned its back on the river, and now we are making the river the centre, the focus point of our city.

Last week, I asked the Capital City Committee to examine options for the future of the Thebarton police barracks site on Port Road and the Old Adelaide Gaol. The Thebarton police barracks, established in 1917 and expanded until the 1950s, are still used today by the South Australian police, including the mounted police. The Old Adelaide Gaol was built in 1840 and remained an operational facility until 1988, and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources manages the museum and tourist attraction.

Apparently, there are views about re-opening Adelaide Gaol, but I am advised by the minister for corrections that it would not be appropriate to modern-day conditions; however, it is a very historic building. Together, these two sites cover an overall area of approximately nine hectares. I have also asked the Capital City Committee to draw up options for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, keeping in mind heritage-listed buildings, as well as returning a sizeable part of the area currently occupied by the Royal Adelaide Hospital to Parklands or to the Botanic Gardens.

The Minister for Health and I, and the Deputy Premier, had a meeting down at the Royal Adelaide Hospital site with Tim Horton and others just a week ago. Our aim for this site is to deliver even more green space to city workers and residents for the future. The site is currently compromised by buildings at the end of their design life and infrastructure that itself was developed over successive periods without thinking about its special location.

Riverbank is just a keystone to a wider setting. Like the Torrens, Riverbank does not stop at a bridge. It will be the state's biggest ever building site and, when complete, will revitalise the city centre. We are beginning the process of master planning from Hindmarsh—and that is why we extended the tram down there—the Bowden site, all the way down to Hackney Road.

Just on the bridge, let me say this clearly so that it cannot be misinterpreted. I know there has been great excitement about a bridge that never was and a bridge that never will be, going

direct apparently from the oval to the Convention Centre. I read the front page of *The Advertiser*. Let me make it very clear—because I heard what the Leader of the Opposition said this morning, and I will not insist on someone informing the house correctly so I am going to—I do not favour a bridge going over the Torrens to the Convention Centre, and never have, and have never expressed such a view, and neither does the Minister for Infrastructure. So, I hope that is clear and understood, but I understand that there are days when it is quiet, that things have to fill spaces.

Let me explain for the benefit of those opposite—who I know would be the last to criticise the planning of vital infrastructure being subject to proper scrutiny—as all members know, a Riverbank Reference Group has been convened to work on a coordinated master plan for the whole Torrens riverbank precinct. The reference group comprises representatives from the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure, the SA Tourism Commission, the Integrated Design Commission, Adelaide City Council, Adelaide Festival Centre Trust, Arts SA and SkyCity Casino. They are quite rightly looking—

Mr Pisoni: What about Health?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On the bridge between the oval and the Convention Centre?

Mr Pisoni: You have a hospital in there, don't forget. So, don't forget Department of Health.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: What about the Zoo? What are those creatures called? They quite rightly are looking to ensure that the footbridge is positioned correctly for maximum benefit for the whole precinct. That is what you would expect any government to ensure is widely considered, before the final design plans are drawn up, let alone approved.

Since the master plan for the precinct is still under development, no decision—no decision, no decision—on the location of the proposed footbridge has yet been made. Our vision for a riverbank precinct master plan is to extend the lens of today's architects, landscape architects, planners, engineers and urban designers from Adelaide's most innovative mixed-use community at Bowden Urban Village to Adelaide's Botanic Gardens at Hackney Road.

The master plan will further enhance the developments we have already supported including the upgrade of Adelaide Oval, the extension of the Adelaide Convention Centre and construction of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. It will be done in close consultation with the Integrated Design Commission. It comes at a time when Adelaide is rapidly evolving into a city with an enormous future. The riverbank is one of the most under-utilised visual identities of South Australia, and seeing it reach its potential as a cultural and social hub has always been high on this government's agenda.

Our vision will strengthen our position as Australia's most liveable city. It will provide a long-term vision for the future and serve as a roadmap for decision-makers to inform more targeted and intelligent investment. These developments will change the face of Adelaide. Metropolitan Adelaide is situated on the Torrens. Where once it supported the Kurna people, it can now sustain us all, and that is what the people of South Australia expect. We are going to do it properly. I think that, when a source in the upper house is described as 'reliable', then you know how much substance that story had.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VISITOR AND TRAVEL CENTRE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:35): Again, my question is to the Minister for Tourism.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley: I am disappointed in the standard of questions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: And I am disappointed in the lack of answers, but I persevere, Kevin, I persevere. My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Why didn't and doesn't the minister defend

his own policy decisions in the media regarding the relocation and privatisation of the South Australian Visitor and Travel Centre, instead of sending out Tourism CEO, Ian Darbyshire, to defend the minister's policy decisions?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:35): There is an act of parliament that establishes the tourist commission. I think it is called the tourist commission act; is that right, Premier?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It was conceived in brilliance.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It was, as the Premier has mentioned, conceived in brilliance, though not by me.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Who was it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think a very prominent former minister for tourism.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What, during the Arnold government?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Mike Rann.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Mike Rann. Anyway, that is the framework. Now, if you read that, it has a board and the board are like a board of directors and they set policy. They then have a fellow—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Do you want to hear the answer or not? I am explaining to you a complex act of parliament. I am trying to reduce it down to bite-size pieces, right? The next bit is, they have a person who is the chief executive. That person administers the day-to-day aspects of running the commission. They set the policy for the commission. Now, I do not think the board decides whether the pies and pasties are going to come from Vilis or from—

An honourable member: Balfours.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —Balfours. I do not think they work on that level. I think that is something that is done somewhere else. I do not think they actually sit down as a board and negotiate contracts with people or about people; that is done by the chief executive, right? So, if the honourable member is asking, 'Why is the chief executive talking about this?' the answer to the question is, the chief executive is the person who does the job. The chief executive is the one who does the job.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I have explained earlier on in this place, I have asked for information about this particular process. When I have—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Would you prefer that I actually got in and gave them directions, assuming I have the power to do so, before I even know about something? Just give them random directions? I mean, really. So, I am trying to actually find out what the facts are. When I find out what the facts are, if there is anything that I am obliged to do, or a responsible person in my position should do, I will do it.

COAL TO FUEL PROPOSAL

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:38): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Can the minister explain the relationship between Central Petroleum Limited's coal to fuel proposal and the proposed deep sea port facility at Point Lowly?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (15:39): I thank the member for his question. It is a very good question and very important in terms of this state and its very bright future. Of course, the minister for mineral resources was on the radio just recently talking about the very important coal to fuel proposal from this company. It is a massive, massive project—I think they have spent something like \$100 million on exploration already—with potentially \$7.5 billion worth of investment.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Mitch thinks it's highly speculative.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mitch thinks that, but I will come back to that. I happened to be in the car listening to the Minister for Mineral Resources Development talking about this project, and of course the member for MacKillop rang in. The member for MacKillop, who is desperate to get in quick and undermine and talk down anything good for the state, decided he had better ring in and say something.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: When you are done, thank you. But he did achieve one thing that he has never done before, in my experience: he made me laugh out loud. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, he of the three votes, rang in in an attempt to talk down the state, to argue that, because the progress of the government's proposal for a deep-sea facility at Point Lowly was too slow, this project would be in jeopardy.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, I can read what you said if you like. He rang in and said, 'Patrick Conlon,' that's me, incidentally, 'has been talking about a port facility at Point Lowly near Whyalla for about four years.' He did say something that didn't make me laugh. He said:

...the consortium who've got the tick of approval to be the preferred bidder on that project sat and waited for about two years for Patrick Conlon to get back and respond to their proposal...

That, of course, is either deliberate dishonesty or he is so uninformed that he should not be the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, or in any position. I invite him, upon the conclusion of question time, to ring Vince Tremaine, the leader of the proponents, and discuss this with him, get it right, and then do the decent thing and actually clear up the totally misleading statement he made.

His proposal was that, because we had been slow on this project, it was not going to go ahead. That was his proposal, and that is what made me laugh out loud. Can I say that the proposal is for a deep-sea facility for the bulk export of minerals, particularly iron ore, over there. The proponents have been working on this. Apparently, they would have done better because they offered \$2 million at the last election. That \$2 million would pay for the study. I had discussions with Vince Tremaine today; Vince Tremaine is currently paying for that, but it would have been a great use of taxpayers' money.

We go further. They are proceeding as quickly as is reasonable in the circumstances. But I can say that, regardless of the speed of their proposal, it will have no bearing on this very important project because—can I explain to the member for MacKillop, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—we have no proposal for a deep-sea facility at Point Lowly to export fuels. Anyone who has ever been there would know immediately why we have no proposal.

Madam Speaker, you would know, as the local member, why we have no proposal for a deep-sea facility for exporting fuels at Point Lowly; the mineral resources minister knows why: because there is already one there! We've already got one! In the immortal words of the French knights in the *Holy Grail*, 'We already got one.' He is so desperate to talk down the state that he gets on the radio and makes an utter fool of himself.

In fact, we have had a number of proponents of the potential export of liquids talk to us—myself and the Premier—and in this case we have talked to proponents about very large prospects of the export of CNG out of shale gas being proved up in the Cooper Basin. This is the approach of the opposition. This is the person who would be the deputy premier of the state. We know that the Leader of the Opposition has said privately that she has no intention of doing anything in terms of policy; she is going to sit and just wait until she wins the next election. That is what she said.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Now they are getting angry. This fellow is going to go out and say anything—no research, no work, nothing, he is just going to go out and say anything that he

thinks will help the cause. I say this to them: please continue this approach, please keep the current Leader of the Opposition and the current deputy. Please keep this approach because what we are doing in this state is setting the agenda. We are building the infrastructure, we are building the state, and you think you are going to win by running out and making up stories. I must point out that it is the same bloke who said that we did not need an interconnector for electricity from New South Wales because we already had one—which of course we do not. He is a very confused man.

I note in the other place that the Hon. Mr Ridgway, when we were talking about the riverfront precinct, got up and said, with shock and horror, that we would consider a proposal for a commercial office building in the riverfront precinct. Now, can I just point out to this one that, when he wanders up North Terrace, that big thing called the riverfront centre is an office building. Okay? We have already got one.

Madam Speaker, please, keep this approach going, because we will continue to set the agenda, we will continue to build infrastructure, we will continue to lead a resources boom. Can I say: what a great result for the Minister for Mineral Resources Development today—an enormous increase in exports to China and India, which, of course, were immediately talked down by the opposition. Well, you keep your approach, we will keep ours, and we will see you on the Ides of March 2014. We will see on the Ides of March and, let me tell you, beware the Ides of March!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop! You can continue the discussion outside the chamber. It is question time.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the Minister for Transport also!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition.

TIGER AIRWAYS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:46): My question is to the Treasurer. What was the total cost to the taxpayers across all government departments of attracting Tiger Airways to establish a base in Adelaide? Budget estimates was told on 4 July that the departments of trade and economic development and tourism gave \$3.15 million to Tiger Airways, but the government's original pitch to attract Tiger Airways entitled 'Case for Adelaide: Tiger Airways' offered \$10 million, comprising \$7 million in the support package and \$3 million of additional money from the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (15:47): Madam Speaker, I can see the member for Waite's little heart dying, because this is his question; it got taken off him, and he is so upset—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —he is so upset, but I will give the answer as if he had asked it. No deal worth \$10 million was ever agreed to for Tiger Airways. Of course—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Details aren't important, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Oh, the little heart is breaking again. 'That was my question. It should've been my question!'

An honourable member: She took it off you, Martin.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: She took it off him. That's okay. He had all day in estimates; but I'm with you, brother. \$2.25 million was provided—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What did you say? Speak English?

Mr Whetstone: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do speak English, and if you are making a reference to my Greek heritage, I am proud—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —of my Greek heritage, and I will not take offence from someone like you. Perhaps you should go back to the Riverland and speak to people there of Greek heritage and see what you say about them. It is an outrageous attack.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, \$2.25 million was provided to Tiger—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: \$2.25 million was provided to Tiger on the basis that it would establish its second base in Adelaide. The money was paid in two instalments: \$1.7 million in April 2009 and \$550,000 in February 2010. This arrangement required Tiger to have a minimum of two planes based in Adelaide, increasing to four planes in a designated period. Tiger wrote to me on 21 June stating its intention to reduce this number to one plane from August 2011. Tiger then asked for a variation of the contract to allow for this arrangement. That offer was declined by the government.

The process of recouping the money through the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA), has commenced. As I said in estimates the day before yesterday, the government will be pursuing Tiger. Indeed, in my negotiations with Tiger, they accepted that they are in breach. There is no question of their breach; they accept it. Now SAFA—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm getting to that. They will pay the money back. SAFA is pursuing them to pay the money back. All payments were made by the South Australian Tourism Commission to Tiger on behalf of the airline attraction fund, a joint initiative of the Adelaide Airport authority, DTED and the SATC. An eight-year agreement was prepared in February 2009, being an annual performance-based incentive agreement to be paid in arrears at 30 June each year to Tiger for having multiple daily flights and multiple source locations. The maximum payable in any given year was to be \$500,000.

These payments were made for services rendered, so there is no clawback required in those areas, but the \$2.25 million that was agreed to in the contract will be clawed back and the taxpayer has been protected.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EXPORTS

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (15:50): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources Development.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBBONS: Can the minister please inform the house on how South Australian exports are faring in the current economic climate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (15:50): I thank the honourable member for his question. I also note his

keen interest in exports. I am pleased to report to the house that in the 12 months to May 2011, the value of South Australia's overseas goods exports totalled \$11 billion; the highest figure in this state's history, an increase of 38 per cent on the previous 12 months.

I understand that whenever our exports go up, a little part of the members opposite dies inside, but South Australia, again, has the second highest growth rate in the nation, just 2 per cent behind Western Australia. Our state dramatically outclassed the national average by 12 percentage points.

I think it is important to note that these results have come despite the high Australian dollar, which has consistently been above parity. Combine this with poor economic conditions around the world, in particular in Europe, and there is no doubting that our exporters are doing a fantastic job. The total value of South Australian exports continues to be supported by growth in the value of wheat, metal ores and refined copper. Compared to the same time last year, wheat is up more than \$1 billion, a 251 per cent increase.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Congratulations to South Australia's farmers. Metal ores and scrap metal are up \$706 million, a 59 per cent increase, and copper is up \$673 million, a 110 per cent increase. The increase in our metal exports is thanks to this government's approach of backing the mining industry. We have grown from four mines to 16 in the life of this government and we have more than 30 projects in the pipeline.

The opposition is constantly saying, 'When are we going to see the benefits of mining investment?' As much as it pains them to hear this, a record level of exports is thanks to the rapidly increasing mining exports. Our farmers must also be congratulated for a record—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —10.2 million tonne grain harvest, which is reaping its rewards in the export market. Furthermore, the latest figures also justify our targeted—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The members on my left will be quiet. I cannot hear the minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —export programs in India and China. In the year to May 2011, exports to China were up \$980 million, an 85 per cent increase on last year. Exports to India were also up \$299 million, a 63 per cent increase on the previous year.

To the member for Waite's credit, he accepts that China and India are key markets. However, he has questioned our strategy. He has questioned why we have both special envoys and trade offices in India and China and whether this approach is necessary. My answer to the member for Waite is that there are 1.3 billion reasons why we take this approach.

This government continues to be active in assisting South Australian businesses to access trade opportunities in emerging overseas markets. I am confident that, with our \$1 million Gateway Business Program that assists emerging exporters and our new \$1 million two-year export partnership with Business SA, our exporters will have a fantastic support in entering the global market. This government looks forward to continued export growth as the state keeps moving ahead at a rate of knots.

TIGER AIRWAYS

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:55): My question is to the Treasurer, although I expect he will pass it to the Minister for Industry and Trade. Now that Tiger Airways is to abandon Adelaide as a base, has the government reached a firm agreement with Tiger Airways which will guarantee that all of the taxpayer funding will be paid back, including the \$900,000 paid to Tourism? Is the airline in a position to argue that the job and aircraft targets agreed to in the secret agreement between the government and the airline were met?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (15:56): It is so secret I am talking about it in parliament. I am glad that he finally got a question on this. It is impressive she gave you the scraps.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is impressive she gave you the scraps. But the truth is this: as I said in my previous answer, Tiger Airways admit that they are in breach of the contract conditions. They came to see—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We did have an agreement.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We have an agreement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government entered into an agreement with Tiger—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: She is now an expert on aviation attraction as well. It is impressive. The expertise does not end.

The SPEAKER: Minister, back to the question.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is an interesting point. The former minister for industry and trade says that we were criticised for not getting the \$10 million deal that they are now saying we entered into in secret, so it seems to me that they are a bit confused about their policy. The truth is that we did enter into an agreement with Tiger. I have detailed those conditions. Those conditions were in a signed contract. Tiger are in breach. They will pay the money back. SAFA is chasing them.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:57): My question is to the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide. Can the minister inform the house about the release of the designs for Adelaide's redeveloped Convention Centre?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (15:57): I thank the honourable member very much for her question. Yes, last week the government was able to unveil the plans for the new Convention Centre, which is a \$350 million redevelopment in two stages. The first stage involves the construction of a new building to the west of the existing building, which will come into contact at its western margin with the Morphett Street Bridge, and then subsequently there will be a second phase of the development when the existing plenary building is demolished and a new building replaces it.

These developments are a crucial element of the government's vision for rejuvenating the riverbank precinct and will obviously become part of the postcard landscape of the city of Adelaide for years to come. The plans not only include very significant and impressive new buildings but will also provide for different ways of access through and about the river precinct—that is, through North Terrace to the riverbank itself, a new frontage onto the Morphett Street Bridge so that there will be now a—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I seek your ruling on the question of whether the minister is addressing a matter before a committee of the parliament. The Public Works Committee has heard evidence this morning on the project to which the minister is referring.

The committee is yet to report and complete its work, and I seek your guidance on whether the question is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, you would be aware of the implications of that question. I would hope that your response would be—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, Madam Speaker, you might be able to assist me because I have a question which you might be able to assist me with. My understanding is that if the committee has basically discharged its function, it is perfectly reasonable for me to go down this path. I do understand that, at some point in the committee meeting, certain members put their hands over their faces and said, 'We're not here, we're not here, we're not here,' and a vote was taken whilst they were standing there pretending not to be there. Does the fact that they say they are not there render them not there? That is actually a relevant question, because my understanding is if you are in the room—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —and the *Hansard*—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Madam Speaker, it is a bit like, 'There's no-one here but us chickens.' If you are actually on the *Hansard* saying, 'Hey, I'm not here, I'm not here!'—

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am seeking your decision on the point of order I have raised. It is not a question for debate. It is a question of the Public Works Committee having to report to the house on the project, which has not yet occurred, so it is before the committee.

The SPEAKER: I understand there was some controversy about that meeting this morning. I am not sure of the full circumstances of it; I have heard varying rumours. I think until that matter is clarified for me we will defer that question until a later time. I will go to the next question. Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, Madam Chair: I think the *Hansard* will show that the Deputy Premier claims to have quoted from the *Hansard*, which is yet not public, and is privileged to the committee. I would ask you to look at that during the break and give a ruling.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Davenport. I will look at the *Hansard*, but I don't think—I didn't hear the Attorney-General say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have said that I will look further into this matter, because I understand there are some issues relating to the committee meeting this morning, and I will follow them up and report back to the house. Leader of the Opposition.

CARBON TAX

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (16:02): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Trade. Has the minister been briefed about the details of the federal carbon tax being announced this Sunday, given that he admitted during estimates that he supports this tax?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (16:02): I suppose the reverse of that argument is: she has not seen the details yet and yet opposes it. So, Madam Speaker, my point is this: the dinosaurs opposite me that believe that the climate is not warming bury their heads in the sand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order: the minister is debating. The question was: has he received a briefing on the federal carbon tax, which is going to be announced on Sunday?

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I refer the minister back to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, I have searched the Liberal Party website in search of their climate change policy, and I have searched their views on—

Mrs REDMOND: Madam Speaker, same point of order: it is a matter of debate. The minister is referring to what is on other websites. We have asked a question about whether he has received a briefing on the federal carbon tax. It is a straightforward question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I uphold that point of order. Minister, back to the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, I believe climate change is real. We need to act as a responsible nation—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order, Madam Speaker: again, the minister is debating the question, rather than answering—

The SPEAKER: No, I don't agree with that; you can sit down now. He is answering the question as he chooses to do. This a lead-up to whether he has been briefed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, I believe climate change is real. I believe that we need to act as a responsible nation to reduce our carbon emissions. In principle, Madam Speaker, we believe in a price on carbon. We are working behind the scenes with the federal government, led by our Premier, in negotiations about our important strategic industries.

We will not be premature, we will not come out and attack something before it is announced. We are there arguing the case for South Australia, but I will say this: this government supports a price on carbon, and we will work with the commonwealth to make sure that the impacts of that carbon tax are not felt as harshly as they may be by Nyrstar and OneSteel. The Premier has met with Nyrstar. He meets with companies across South Australia and is negotiating on behalf of the government in relation to a price on carbon. The real question is: what is the opposition going to do? What is their policy on climate change?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not one press release since the election on climate change—not one!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CARBON TAX

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (16:05): As a supplementary, will the minister guarantee that none of the 7,000 jobs at OneSteel and Nyrstar will be affected because of the carbon price on Sunday?

The SPEAKER: I rule that as not a supplementary; it is a question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (16:05): Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the greatest challenge facing humanity is climate change, and the opposition offers no alternatives, offers no policies. They offer us no vision. They bury their head in the sand. They are dinosaurs. They have no vision, they have no policy, they have no plans.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition.

CARBON TAX

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (16:06): Thank you, Madam Speaker. My question is again to the Minister for Industry and Trade. Will the minister now visit with and meet with and talk with Nyrstar at Port Pirie, given that he hasn't yet visited that business?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (16:06): This government is led by the Premier. He is the one who is negotiating—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Unlike the opposition, which is led by no-one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, you are warned!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I got more than three votes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier leads this government and leads it well. He is the one who is always standing up for South Australia. He is the one who stopped a national nuclear waste depository in this state. He is out there arguing the case for South Australia, and I think that on Sunday, when the plans are announced, members opposite will be eating their words.

COMMUNITY EDUCATION TRAINING INITIATIVE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (16:07): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Can the minister advise the house of programs to improve literacy and numeracy in the community?

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, Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (16:07): I thank the honourable member for her question and note her keen interest in this area. More than 2,000 adult South Australians will have the opportunity to improve their literacy and numeracy skills through the state government's \$3.9 million community education training initiative. The Adult Community Education Grants program provides funding to support South Australian adults experiencing low levels of literacy and numeracy to participate in learning, training and jobs.

I am particularly pleased at the applications received for the second round of the Adult Community Education Foundation Skills Grants program. The funding provided under this stream of adult community education funding will see 2,086 training places offered by community-based, not-for-profit training providers at over 50 sites across the state. This funding will provide accredited training, in partnership with TAFE SA, so that participants can further improve their skills to access higher levels of training and gain employment.

The extra \$2.175 million for this round of the Adult Community Education Foundation Skills Grants program is playing an important role in delivering on the state government's job strategy commitment and brings the total for foundation skills grants funding to more than \$3.9 million since the program began last year.

We know that people with limited literacy and numeracy face barriers to gaining jobs and further education opportunities. This additional investment provided by the Rann Labor government to the Foundation Skills Grants program builds on the existing Adult Community Education program. It offers real opportunities for disadvantaged South Australians to secure sustainable employment.

The Skills for All reforms, announced in February, provide additional support to the adult community education sector in delivering foundation skills programs to South Australians so that they can access training and find work. The successful applicants in the latest round include: the Tailem Bend Community Centre, the Christie Downs Community House, the City of Port Adelaide Enfield at Kilburn, and UnitingCare Wesley at Port Augusta.

A record 130,000 new jobs have been created in South Australia since the Rann government came into office in 2002, and the training provided across the state as part of adult community education will help deliver on the state government's Skills for All job strategy which commits to creating 100,000 new jobs and 100,000 additional training places over the next six years.

ELLIS, MR B.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:10): Will the Premier repudiate comments made earlier this week by his speechwriter, Bob Ellis, regarding sexual misconduct, and will the Premier undertake that he will no longer engage Mr Ellis to write those speeches?

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) (16:10): I regard with repugnance the views expressed in that article on the ABC website about women, just as I view with repugnance the views expressed by Cory Bernardi about race, ethnicity and faith, and just as I view with repugnance the views expressed by the Leader of the Opposition after her meeting with the President of Cyprus.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Supplementary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Leader of the Opposition, quite audibly to our side, just called the Premier a liar. That is unparliamentary and I ask her to withdraw it and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Did the Leader of the Opposition call the Premier a liar? I ask her to withdraw that remark if she did.

Mrs REDMOND: I didn't call him a liar, no.

An honourable member: You did!

Mrs REDMOND: No, I didn't. I said he was a lying so-and-so.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that remark also.

Mrs REDMOND: I withdraw and apologise, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Bragg, you have a supplementary question, I understand.

ELLIS, MR B.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:11): My supplementary is: will you undertake not to use Mr Ellis for future speeches?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is not a supplementary question; it is the same question again.

Mr Pisoni: But there was no answer.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is still not a supplementary question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (16:12): I am very happy to take responsibilities for speeches that I make. The ABC has to take responsibilities for what it publishes.

SCHOOL TEACHING AND LEARNING PORTAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:12): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister advise the house on how teaching and learning is being modernised in the public schooling sector?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (16:12): I thank the honourable member for her question. The government is investing \$7.8 million into a new web-based learning portal that will give every teacher, principal, preschool director and student their own personal homepage and log-in to access this new and revolutionary learning technology. Schools have been making the progression from blackboards and chalk to interactive whiteboards and laptops, replacing books. Frankly, the classrooms of today are almost unrecognisable to those of us who were at school not so long ago.

The school portal is an online learning tool that allows students and teachers to better connect. It allows students to log onto their own homepage, email teachers about their school work and submit assignments online, view YouTube videos about teachers demonstrating maths equations, keep track of their school calendar online, post and receive messages about schoolwork through online forums, and access information about other school activities and school sports, like training times and bulletins from the coach.

Teachers will be able to take the roll class by class so that student attendance can be monitored in real time, use Moodle (the online student management tool) to track student performance assignment by assignment, view their teaching schedules to track what class they have and the students in the class, and upload YouTube clips to complement their teaching.

Schools are in a unique position where teachers are instructing students who have grown up with this technology at their fingertips. The school portal embraces the way technology-literate students learn, and this technology is the next progressive step in the way students and teachers interact. Frankly, if we do not have this engaging online environment within school, we are competing with students who are doing this outside of school, and school will become an increasingly tired option in comparison so we have to have these offerings.

Teacher training is important and the new school portal replaces the ageing EdSuite Services and will be introduced into schools and preschools over the next 12 months, with the assistance of that training. Video tutorials and other resources will be uploaded online to help teachers use and get the most out of the school.

All indications show that teachers know how to use a web browser and, therefore, the transition to the new system should be quick and smooth. DECS will offer further support to teachers and principals online on how to best utilise the new system, as well as to facilitate an in-school mentoring system to link teachers who are well adapted to using the system, and helping those who might need a bit of extra help.

Student online safety is a key component of the school learning portal and teachers will be able to monitor the online forums, and schools and preschools will filter internet content that is not age appropriate. Our brand-new schools are fitted with Wi-Fi and computers throughout and have been built with future technology like the school portal in mind. The school portal is an exciting step forward in the way teachers teach and the way students interact. We have heard a lot about the perils of cyber safety, but the truth is there is also an enormous world of opportunity to revolutionise our schooling system, our education system, through online resources. It is something that our young people are literate in, and it is something that our system needs to respond effectively to.

ELLIS, MR B.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:15): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for the Status of Women in the House of Assembly. Does the minister support the use of taxpayers' money to engage the services of Mr Bob Ellis to write the Premier's speeches given that Mr Ellis said earlier this week, and I quote:

Why are deeds long common at office Christmas parties used by women to ruin good men's careers?...Are men too harshly treated for what men have always done, trying it on, attempting foreplay, rolling bedroom eyes and murmuring lewdly...should they be ruined for this?

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) (16:16): I will answer the question. I have yet to see—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —one member on that side of the house condemn Cory Bernardi for his racist comments, his attacks on Islamic people. If you have got an issue to raise, raise it with the ABC.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (16:16): My question is to the member for Taylor as chair of the Public Works Committee. Why, as the presiding officer of the Public Works Committee, did she attempt to force the Public Works Committee to a vote on the \$394 million Convention Centre project after only 65 minutes of questioning?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: the phrase 'attempt to force them to a vote' is plainly comment. It is argument.

The SPEAKER: I think you need to modify your question, member for Waite. I am listening. It is normally not practice for questions to be asked of members apart from ministers—however, standing order 96, if it relates to business that the member is responsible for. I will listen to your question, but be very careful of your wording of the question.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Indeed—standing order 96. Why, as the presiding officer of the Public Works Committee, did she attempt to ensure that the Public Works Committee voted on the \$394 million Convention Centre project after only 65 minutes of questioning, with witnesses still present in open forum, without allowing any debate on the evidence, and without the agreement of all members present to so proceed?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (16:18): If the member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs VLAHOS: —who was in the room at the time—I indicated that I was foreshadowing that we would be moving to write a draft report. We then had some more questions, we then put the motion to members from the Liberal Party who were still present in the room at the time of the vote. They had not exited the room. I have many people who could concur with my—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Having asked the question, no matter how angry he is, it is not open for him to argue with the answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Taylor.

Mrs VLAHOS: Two people may think they were not in the room. I am sure the record will show that three votes were in the affirmative, two votes were not exercised, the motion was passed that we write a draft report. It is not finalised. We will move in the normal procedure that the Public Works Committee does, and we will move forward.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already noted earlier in the day that there seems to be some controversy about this, and I want to look at this. Thank you, member for Taylor, for answering that question, but we will not have more questions on this until later, until I have been able to look at the information, look at the *Hansard*, and come back to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SPECIAL OLYMPICS

Ms FOX (Bright) (16:19): My question is to the Minister for Disability. Can the Minister for Disability give details on the seven South Australians who represented Australia as part of the Special Olympics team in Athens?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (16:19): On 15 June, the Premier, the minister for recreation and sport and I co-hosted a special farewell to the South Australian contingent of the Australian Special Olympics team. I was pleased that the member for Reynell was able to join us, the member for Mitchell was there, and the member for Bragg was present. The gathering at Parliament House was a wonderful opportunity to wish the team all the very best before they travelled to Athens to take in the world summer games from 25 June to 4 July. I can say that the excitement of those young people in the room was palpable.

The Special Olympics is endorsed by the International Olympic Committee and hosts one international competition every four years. However, 3.1 million athletes participate in 33,000 events annually. To be eligible to participate in the Special Olympics, athletes must be over eight years of age and have a permanent intellectual disability or limited cognitive development. Athletes compete with fellow athletes of similar abilities.

Whilst I am sure they have had a lot of fun, I am in no doubt that the competition was intense, with 7,500 people from 185 countries lining up to compete in 22 sports in Athens this year. Seven South Australians made it to the national team and have been successful in winning four gold medals. Every one of South Australia's seven athletes won a medal.

Daniel Tsatsaronis competed in bowling. He won gold in the mixed team, bronze in the doubles and came seventh in the singles. Krystal Petherick was also involved in bowling. She won gold in the singles and doubles and silver in the women's team. Rebecca Sargent and Jasmine Crewsdon won gold as part of the women's basketball team, and James Maxwell, Brad Kinross and Wayne Kinross all took silver in the men's basketball.

I would like to congratulate these young people whose achievement is quite extraordinary, and I want to recognise their dedication, determination and commitment. I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the families, friends, coaches and fundraisers who have gone out of their way to support these athletes which has allowed them to excel. I am sure members present will agree that the team has done all South Australians proud, and I look forward to celebrating their success when they make it back to Adelaide.

COAL TO FUEL PROPOSAL

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:22): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr WILLIAMS: Today, in question time, the Minister for Infrastructure made several allegations against myself, claiming, firstly, that I got it wrong with regard to a liquids berth at Point Lowly. For the record, I had a briefing from Central Petroleum and Allied Resource last week.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order. The personal explanation is not an opportunity to canvass the issue at length: it is an opportunity to say exactly what I said and where I got it wrong, not to canvass it at length. It has never been allowed for that.

Mr WILLIAMS: That is exactly what I am doing.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, it's not.

Mr WILLIAMS: That is exactly what I am doing.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will listen to your explanation.

Mr WILLIAMS: I specifically asked the company if the liquids berth at Point Lowly—

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

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I see the Leader of the Opposition is angry again. Anger may be an energy, but it's not a policy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He needs to say what I have said that is wrong and make a brief explanation as to why it is wrong. I point out that if he wants to say I was wrong he can always take a privilege matter, if he has the ticker for it.

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold that point of order. Get to your point very quickly.

Mr WILLIAMS: In another matter, the minister said that I got it wrong in saying that he took two years to assess a proposal from the consortium wishing to build a port at Point Bonython. Might I say that the record shows that *The Advertiser* on 24 March—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: this is an argument. This is not a personal explanation.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am presenting the facts.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Tell us what the facts are.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am about to. If you give me time, I will tell you. The record shows that *The Advertiser*, on 24 March 2009—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: how does he seek to rely on *The Advertiser* for a factual explanation?

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, minister.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is actually explaining that last point; I listened carefully to it.

Mr WILLIAMS: It said:

Gulf port study lodged: The Spencer Gulf Port Link Consortium has lodged a feasibility study with the state government for its Port Bonython export proposal.

The record also shows that on 16 May 2011, a bit over two years later, the minister put out a press release saying, 'Agreement paves the way for exciting next step at Port Bonython.'

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order. That is plainly an argument from an embarrassed buffoon.

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, minister.

Mr WILLIAMS: It is on the record: I am right and you are wrong!

The SPEAKER: Order, member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. It is not open for him to say I am wrong unless he does so by substantive motion. He is allowed to do a personal explanation. If he wants a matter of privilege I suggest the buffoon screw his courage to the sticking place and do it.

Members interjecting:

An honourable member: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Thank you members! There will be no more discussion on this point. No; I am not even going to take the point of order. The house will note grievances.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If there is any more of this carry-on I will close the parliament down. The minister will leave the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is a house of parliament, not a zoo. The house will note grievances.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

OAKLANDS PARK RAILWAY CROSSING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (16:26): I wish the Minister for Transport had stayed, because 28 June 2011 was the first anniversary of a letter I had written to the Minister for Transport regarding the Oaklands railway crossing/Diagonal Road/Morphett Road intersection. I wrote to the minister on 28 June 2010. That letter was acknowledged on 15 July 2010, but we had no further indication of any work being done on that letter. We phoned the minister's office on 5 January, and they said they would call back. We phoned again on 8 March this year; they said they would call back and get into it as soon as possible. We phoned again on 3 May this year and they were following it up.

We still have not received a response to my letter regarding the Oaklands railway crossing/Diagonal Road/Morphett Road intersection, which is a major traffic hazard in my electorate. In fact, it is on the boundary of my electorate, the Minister for Transport's electorate and the member for Mitchell's electorate. If any member—or anyone listening, or reading *Hansard*—wants to see what it is like, they can go to my website and look at the video on there and see how congested and dangerous that intersection is.

I have been driving that intersection for many years now, between Glenelg and my veterinary practice at Happy Valley, and since 2002 as the local member. About 27 or 28 years ago proposals were put in place to upgrade that intersection because they knew it was going to be a looming bottleneck. Even 27 years ago they were talking about grade separation down there. We have had further talks and discussions, we have had numerous plans put in about grade separation there, because that is the real answer to that problem.

As members would see on the video on my website, that intersection combines Diagonal Road traffic, Morphett Road traffic, now the new aquatic centre traffic, the medical centre traffic, and the very large Westfield shopping centre traffic—all that traffic coming in together and trying to get across at the Diagonal Road train crossing. What the government has done there is a real patch-up. The planning has fallen aside, and we can see that from this year's budget, where the money that was in previous budgets to improve that intersection (although it was not grade separation) has been removed and more planning will be done. Another couple of million dollars will be spent on planning at that intersection.

What we saw were plans to change the intersection of Diagonal Road, Morphett Road and Prunus Avenue, creating a 'triangular-about', as someone described it, at that area. That was not going to solve the problems. All we have seen so far is the government spending a lot of money on moving the railway station towards the crossing and putting in a bus interchange there. None of this has in any way improved the situation; it has made it worse, far worse. What we are looking for from the government is not more delays. We know it has to be done. It can only be done once, but it must be done properly. What we have seen in the past have been patch-ups. It has not been good enough.

Unfortunately, when the Liberal government was in we did not have the money to do anything serious there. This government prides itself on looking forward. Well, they should be looking forward to what is going to happen to that intersection, because it is going to get busier and busier and busier. The intersection of Dunrobin and Diagonal roads has been a perennial problem. The pedestrian crossing that is just before the intersection creates a further bank-up of traffic. If you go there now, at half past four at night, you will see traffic lined up on both sides of the intersection, down Diagonal Road and Morphett Road, trying to get around Prunus Avenue and, of course, off and onto Dunrobin Road.

The need is to act now, not to delay. I will be interested to read what the minister has to say when he replies to my letter, dated 28 June 2010. It will be nice to get a briefing on what they are intending to do at that intersection. It has not been good enough. We are seeing further delays;

it is not good enough. Once again, I tell people to go and have a look at my website, have a look at the video on my website, and you will see how busy that intersection is. It is a disaster. It is a disaster waiting to happen, and we are very lucky that there have not been serious accidents there involving fatalities.

It has not happened yet, but with the way traffic is nowadays, with pressures on people to get from A to B, I am sure that the intersection is going to be the cause of increased angst and driver concern. The minister and the government need to answer my letter and also get on with doing something about the intersection, not just more and more and more planning.

LIONS CLUB OF GAWLER

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (16:31): Last Saturday night, I had the pleasure to MC the handover dinner for the Lions Club of Gawler. As members would be aware, during June and July most service clubs hold their handover functions to install their presidents and board members for the forthcoming year. I note in today's paper that Ray Brussow is the new president of the Gawler Lions Club and Chris Edmunds is the new president of the Gawler Rotary Club.

Accordingly, I think it is an appropriate time to draw to the attention of this house the great work performed by the local service clubs and their members. Firstly, I should mention that I am a member of the Lions Club of Gawler. Having said that, what I am about to say about my own service club is certainly true of all the service clubs in my community. My town is well served by service clubs. In addition to the Lions Club of Gawler and the Gawler Rotary Club, which I have already mentioned, we also have the Kiwanis Club, the Apex Club, the Zonta Club, the Rotary Club of Gawler Light, the View Club, and also the Country Women's Association.

The service clubs of Gawler devote a lot their time, skills and endeavour to community service. This service takes many roles, but two key roles stand out. Firstly, they fundraise for community projects and support other charities; and, secondly, they take direct action by rolling up their sleeves and undertaking a number of projects, from establishing local parks to helping the elderly clean up their backyards. Despite a rapidly ageing profile and diminishing membership, service club members are very effective in raising funds. For example, my Lions club raises over \$15,000 a year from running a weekly market at the Gawler Railway Station. This activity, however, requires a commitment of over 515 volunteer hours.

Service clubs are always active and involved in major events around the town. They often raise funds at these major events. Service club members are often at the gates of the Gawler Show, for example, or other major events, where they staff car parks, for fundraising. Additionally, they run barbecues and food vans. Apart from providing a valuable service, these occasions are also used to raised funds for various community projects.

Fundraising events range from major events to the minor, but they all have one thing in common: volunteers giving their time and skills tirelessly and without reward. Their contribution enriches our communities both economically and socially. Service clubs do great things, particularly when they band together and work together to organise some really awesome activities in the town.

One example of this in my community is the RSL garden in Pioneer Park in Gawler. This project, which was led by the Rotary Club of Gawler and supported by other clubs, paid for the construction of a garden where the RSL can have its various services throughout the year. This project represents a great partnership between the service clubs of Gawler, the Town of Gawler and also the state government, with the state government providing 50 per cent of the funds required for the project, while the council managed the project itself.

Our service clubs need new members if they are to survive in the long term. I would call on all members of our community, irrespective of their age, to consider joining a local service club. Membership of a service club not only gives you an opportunity to serve but also an opportunity to learn and form great friendships.

As we look across our communities you will find the effort of a service club member in every corner of the community. There is no greater activity than to serve. I wish to acknowledge and pay tribute to all service club members, in particular those in my local community. I would also like to wish all incoming presidents and their boards the best for the coming year.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:36): With the imminent release of the guide to the draft Murray-Darling Basin Plan to be released within weeks, players are positioning themselves. The Murray-Darling Basin Plan's water reform to date has been based on the 2007 Water Act and the establishment of a Murray-Darling Basin Authority in 2008.

Its primary role was to develop a basin plan, and that basin plan was to put the Murray-Darling Basin in its entirety back into a viable state, a state of sustainable environment, sustainable food production and fibre production, but also to keep vibrant communities that rely on the rivers and the catchments for the long term.

The authority took over responsibility for all functions of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission in December 2008, and through a consultation program, travelling the communities along the basin, came out with the guide to the proposed basin plan in October 2010.

Once that plan was released it was met with outrage and concern because that plan's foundation was based on the 2007 Water Act. That plan outraged not only the communities, environmentalists and food and fibre producers, it outraged everybody because there was uncertainty. There were numbers put out there but they were all uncertain. What were they based on? That was the question. No-one really gave a direct answer.

Along the way we have seen the resignations of the chairman, the CEO and board members. We have now seen the appointment of a new CEO and board members. The Windsor report, which has come along and analysed and consulted with all of the communities along the basin, has come out with a much more balanced argument.

The Murray-Darling Basin Authority really did mislead, within the consultation process, the stakeholders in the lead-up to the guide. There was \$38 million spent on the release of that first guide. That is \$38 million of taxpayers' money wasted through bad government consultation, bad decision-making and a bad PR exercise with the release of that plan.

Again, the unbalanced approach was based on the Water Act and the badly handled consultation process followed the release of that guide and it left people outraged and with an uncertainty of where their future lay.

We now look at where we are headed. Within the next couple of weeks (two to three weeks) we are going to see volume No. 2 of that basin guide plan come out. What I have seen to date is that we need to have all vested interests working together. It is about the environmental sector, the food and fibre producers and the communities working together for an outcome that will benefit everybody.

We all know that we have to have a healthy, sustainable river in a way that we can have all the people who rely on the river, who grow food and fibre on the river, but also all the people who come up to the basin as tourists, as the support mechanism that keeps the economies vibrant right along the basin.

I have a plea to the media. The media have been very divisive right from the word go. They have taken opinions from the environmental sector, they have taken opinions from the irrigators, and they have also taken opinions from the communities, and they have pitched one against the other, and that has been basically one of the most destructive mechanisms with the introduction of the draft plan.

While the media have been destructive in coming out and pitching those commodities, all those river users against one another, it is division—and, as we all know, division is death. Again, as this plan is about to be released, it must be that we show a united approach. Every South Australian must be united in getting an outcome for the upcoming draft plan. We have to work together to gain an outcome that will benefit everybody. Not everybody is going to be happy, not everybody is going to be a winner, but there has to be a balanced outcome. In doing that, I have a strategic approach that I think we all need to look at and perhaps in some way accept that looking along the river we have a solution.

Time expired.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (16:40): Just recently, the Onkaparinga Collaborative Approach to the Prevention of Domestic Violence (OCA) launched its Mythbuster stickers project. I

was very pleased to be one of those who participated in that launch. This has been a community based project, exploring people's ideas of what is behind domestic violence and why, despite all the tragedy it brings to our community, it still exists so much today.

I have been asked to put on the record some of the comments that I made during that launch. I told the story of how in 2006, as part of my parliamentary study leave, I attended a centre for violence research at the University of New York, and this was at the suggestion of some of the members of Onkaparinga Collaborative Approach to the Prevention of Domestic Violence who were aware of some innovative research there. This was quite an interesting experience for me. I had never been to New York before. I really did not know how to get around. I made my way by train and went up to the 12th floor of a very tall building with a central atrium, and I was really feeling quite trepidatious about what I was going to encounter.

I expected that I was going to be meeting two or three people. I went into a room to be greeted by about a dozen people who told me that they had come together because they had never met anyone from the first place in the world to legislate for restorative justice. I did not know that was us, but it was, when we legislated for restorative justice as part of our youth justice system. I acknowledged that New Zealand implemented the practice before we did, but I was assured that we legislated first.

I was also told by the researchers in this centre that they had great hope that Australia, and South Australia in particular, might be the first place in the world to make domestic violence truly a community issue. They pointed to the effectiveness of community education campaigns in Australia. They knew about the Grim Reaper campaign, they knew about our seat belts campaign, and they knew about our campaign to reduce smoking and were aware that, through a public campaign with television advertising and activity at all sorts of levels including sporting clubs, etc., Australia has been very successful in reducing the amount of smoking to one of the lowest rates in the world.

This institute considered that we also had the opportunity to lead the world in getting rid of domestic violence, which is a blight on the economy, our health system, but more importantly on individuals who are not only bashed but who lose their confidence and their ability to build strong relationships through their early experience of violence.

I am pleased now to be able to say that, in fact, there is a good chance that we will lead the world. The action taken by the Onkaparinga Collaborative Approach to the Prevention of Domestic Violence has brought many bodies in the community together, both government and non-government, to look at how we can work not only to effectively support and protect those who have been involved in domestic violence but also to prevent it.

There has been a history of public artworks and campaigns at the grassroots level to raise awareness of domestic violence. While the south might lead South Australia, I am very encouraged by the fact that Professor Donna Cross, from the Edith Cowan University, in a recent study of bullying found that South Australia has the lowest rate of all forms of bullying across Australia (22 per cent compared with 27 per cent), and the lowest rate of covert bullying in state schools in the nation (11 per cent compared with 17 per cent).

I hope that in a few years' time, a colleague will be able to visit the University of New York and be greeted by people who are admiring the fact that, through the legislative framework and community action, South Australia leads the world in preventing domestic violence.

YUDUM

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:46): I rise today to tell the house about a movie premiere I attended last night at Tandanya. It was the Adelaide premiere of *Yudum*. The world premiere was held in Oodnadatta just recently, but the Adelaide premiere was last night, and it was a pleasure to see the member for Mawson there as well. This movie was produced by Aaron Stuart—a constituent of mine from Port Augusta—and also by Terry Cleary, and it was directed and edited by Nicholas Cleary. The two lead actors in the movie were Jermain Hampton, who played Yudum, and Gemma Theatre-Riley, who played Mary; both did an excellent job. Most of the other actors came primarily from the Oodnadatta area.

It is important to point out that, with regard to payment, this was essentially an amateur production; however, with regard to its quality, it was an excellent production. Some of the other Oodnadatta actors included Ronnie Finn, Anna Lennon, Desmond Dodd, Ronald Lennon, and Audrey Hull. I would also like to point out that Renée Ellis—another well-known person from

Port Augusta—played a small part as well. Sound design was by Josh Williams, and the soundtrack was composed by Seth Dodd. This really was a tremendous event, but it would not have been possible without the support of Centacare, a very generous contribution from the Cleary family and also, I understand, the federal government, so I thank all those organisations.

I was told by Dr Peter Munn of Centacare last night that the movie was made for approximately \$20,000 in cash. There were lots and lots of other in-kind donations and in-kind contributions, but it was an absolutely remarkable movie for that sort of money. It explored issues of relationships, family pressures, personal responsibility, trust, drugs, violence, suicide, family strength, and community values. The story was told through the two leads, the two Aboriginal actors, sharing very much an Aboriginal story of their lives—coming together, getting married, having a family, splitting up and coming back together.

While it was a story of Aboriginal people in an Aboriginal setting in outback South Australia, I think it is also important to point out that the issues that were explored, and the challenges that were dealt with, could equally apply to many non-Aboriginal families and communities as well. It is worth pointing out that some of the real positives that gave strength to the central character, Yudum, came from some very positive Aboriginal cultural themes. Certainly non-Aboriginal people could learn a lot from some of those themes as well.

While it explored some very difficult topics, I have to say it was a pleasure to watch. It was not easy and comfortable to watch all the way through, but it was not gruesome, it was not violent per se. It was actually quite uplifting and it really did have the attention of the Tandanya theatre, which was packed. The sound was beautiful, the soundtrack work that was put to the story was tremendous. The colour and the lighting, as all people who have visited outback South Australia would know, was really stunning, and I think the fact that non-professional actors, in fact people who had not even participated before in any way in drama or on the stage, did such a marvellous job is a tribute to them.

The whole movie was set around the stories of Aaron Stuart, a proud Aboriginal man from Port Augusta. It does him enormous credit, and I would like to sincerely congratulate and compliment everybody who had anything to do with this movie with regard to financial support all the way through to an Oodnadatta person who may have had a very small role in the movie. They all did an absolutely wonderful job and I encourage all members of parliament to look at this movie when they have the opportunity.

NAIDOC AWARDS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:51): It was my honour last evening to be present at the 2011 Premier's NAIDOC Awards in the Lyrics Room at the Adelaide Festival Theatre in the presence of the Premier; the Lieutenant-Governor and Chairman of the Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, Hieu Van Le; the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Grace Portolesi, who also acted as MC; the Leader of the Opposition, Isobel Redmond; former premier of South Australia Lynn Arnold; my parliamentary colleague Terry Stephens; distinguished members from the South Australian Council of Elders; Commissioners for Aboriginal Engagement Khatija Thomas and Klynton Wanganeen; patrons, ambassadors and members of Aboriginal organisations and the wider South Australian Aboriginal community.

The Premier acknowledged, as the Speaker does here each week, that we meet on the traditional lands of the Kurna people and that their deep spiritual relationship with the country is respected and acknowledged. The Premier reminded all present that it will be 40 years next week since the Aboriginal flag was officially flown for the first time in Australia, a landmark occasion that took place right here in Adelaide. It was in July 1971 that the black, red and yellow flag was hoisted above Victoria Square, now also known as Tarndanyangga, on the occasion of National Aborigines Day. I am aware also that the same flag was flown for the first time at the Adelaide Town Hall at the insistence of Monica Whitman, who was also present last night.

The flying of the flag was a moment of long overdue recognition of Aboriginal people and Aboriginal culture. The year 1971 was an important one for historic firsts: Neville Bonner became the first Indigenous Australian to take a seat in our federal parliament, and Evonne Goolagong became the first Aboriginal woman to be named Australian of the Year.

Monday's official flag-raising ceremony in Victoria Square is an integral event amid this week's many and varied NAIDOC activities to celebrate the history, culture and achievements of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. On Friday I will join the annual NAIDOC march

through the city to the family fun day at Elder Park, and Saturday night's NAIDOC Ball will be the finale to a week of events throughout Adelaide, regional South Australia and across the nation.

All these events will carry this year's theme, 'Change: The Next Step is Ours'. We must all take responsibility to help meet the challenges confronting Aboriginal people, especially those in remote communities. We must all do whatever we can to help bring about the changes needed to close the gap in opportunities, in knowledge and in understanding and assist wherever possible the changes that will provide for real choice, to better enable Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to take their chosen path through better access to education and employment. In the state's mining industry we see a fine example of closing the gap, with OZ Minerals winning the inaugural Premier's Award for Social Inclusion for best delivering tangible social dividends to the wider South Australian community at its Prominent Hill operation near Coober Pedy.

Aboriginal people themselves continue to work for change, working with all levels of government through various means: the Aboriginal Advisory Council, chaired by Parry Agius; the Office of the Commissioner of Aboriginal Engagement, which provides an independent public voice for Aboriginal people and whose commissioners are Khatija Thomas and Klynton Wanganeen; groups like ANTaR, the Journey of Healing, and Reconciliation SA co-chaired most ably by Peter Buckskin and Robyn Layton.

For 54 years, NAIDOC Week has seen the contribution of outstanding individuals recognised. All three nominees for the Premier's award this year, Kevin Richardson, Lester-Irabinna Rigney and Vince Coulthard, have made a significant contributions, and Vince Coulthard won the award.

Last night we also had the Premier and minister, assisted by Shirley Peisley, present 12 Aboriginal women with the Gladys Elphick Centenary Medal. They were: Ms Annette Groat, Ms Liz Tongerie, Polly Sumner, Ms Katrina Power—who made a fantastic speech—Ms April Lawrie Smith, Ms Natascha Champion, Ms Sharron Williams, Ms Sharon Clarke, Ms Rosemary Wanganeen, Ms Muriel VanderByl—who also made a fantastic speech and was a very hard act to follow—Ms June McInerney and Ms Bev Frahm. The medal winners will also be added to the Aboriginal Women's Honour Roll which was announced earlier this year as part of the Centenary of International Women's Day celebrations.

At the Lord Mayor's morning tea earlier this week NAIDOC Awards were presented to: Person of the Year, Chris Koolmatrie; Person of the Year, Paul Tanner; Young Female of the Year, Naomi Parrott; Young Male of the Year, Delahay Miller; Female Elder of the Year, Christine Wilson; Male Elder of the Year, Murray George; Scholar of the Year, Kudnarto Joy Watson; Trainee of the Year, Tarita Chester; Sportsperson of the Year, Ajay Nguyen; and the Event of the Year was the South-East Aboriginal Focus Groups, which included the making of a traditional bark canoe and the DVD *Moggy's Yuki*.

The NAIDOC Week celebrations, as I said, will continue until Saturday night. I urge all members who are able to, to take part in the march on Friday and go down to Elder Park and have a good look at what is happening. I see the member for Morphett nodding. He has been there many, many times. He is fluent in Pitjantjatjara, and I am sure he will insist, as well, that we all take part in as many activities as possible.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (16:57): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the independent inquiry into the Burnside council made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Russell Wortley.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:58): Another one of the groups where I had questioning responsibility was urban development and planning. That was an interesting one with the Deputy Premier and the minister. It covered things like the West Beach Trust and the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority. We did have some interesting questions there because of my previous role, having been an executive member of the Cemeteries Association of South Australia. Importantly, we talked about planning matters. There was some good dialogue about the chief executives group and what they do to ensure that challenges in the way are actually met and what

happens there and, importantly, we all agreed that planning is one of the most basic things that has to be right. There has to be the forum around it in which developers or any person who has a proposal knows what the rules are and that the flexibility exists to change those rules where appropriate, and that there are concerns about the time frames taken for that.

That time frame delay has been frustrating members of parliament for many years and people in local government for many years. Even for a ministerial DPA, the target that the department sets for itself was some 11 months but its achievement was 17 months—for a ministerial DPA to go through. For local government ones or ones driven by private developers who put up developer-funded DPAs, the time delay is rather long. I posed a question on behalf of the member for Flinders about a development at Port Lincoln which is deferred residential 2, where the property owner there is seriously asking, 'What is going on?'

I am told by Mr Nightingale, chief executive of that department, that he has asked local governments to prioritise their top three DPA reviews, and that is going to come through and will be the emphasis of what the minister's department will do. I would encourage the minister to ensure that that works quickly and smoothly to give some confidence to the industry.

Another area I questioned was the southern suburbs, which has only a relatively small economic profile of about \$360,000, I think. While I gave due deference to the member for Morphett and his questioning of the Minister for Health about very important health matters, which have only one hour for each of the \$1 billion involved in health, it overflowed by some 13 minutes or so and, when the changeover occurred, it left me with only 12 minutes to talk about southern suburbs.

The south is a very important part of metropolitan Adelaide. We all know that it has had challenges, and it has had some resources put into it which, hopefully, are ensuring, as much as possible, that business growth is going to occur and that economic opportunity will exist for the residents of the south. I hope that the Office for the Southern Suburbs (and it seems strange to me that it is located in the CBD office area) works smoothly and gives chances for those good people of southern Adelaide.

As to education, the member for Unley (David Pisoni) allowed me to come in to ask questions about school bus contracts, which are of particular interest to me. I had the opportunity of estimates with minister Conlon for three hours on the Wednesday morning and then went to the meeting with the Bus and Coach Association—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well, yes, it was a nice way to spend three hours. We did not have an argument, and we got some good info out. The Bus and Coach Association really has some grave concerns, and they relate to the benchmark figure that has been set by the Department of Education and Children's Services for the cost of services. In the first round of contracts that have gone out, of those 45 some 20 have been let to one company, which was not a pre-existing supplier; the others, as I understand it, have gone to pre-existing suppliers, and there is a tolerance figure of some 5 per cent to recognise that they are, in the main, smaller family companies.

There is a great level of concern from the Bus and Coach Association about the benchmark. They tell me that in discussions with DECS staff over the last 10 years, the concerns have been acknowledged to some degree. There has been a review, and that has been audited—again, by an independent group—but, again, the BCA comes back to me constantly about the need for it to be reviewed, and it asked two staff members from DECS who were at the meeting last Wednesday if there was a chance to seek support from the minister for the contract process to be delayed until the benchmark had been reviewed so that there was acceptance within the industry of it. I am hopeful that that has occurred. I asked questions of minister Weatherill the next day about that but, as I understand it, the Bus and Coach Association is still very worried about the future.

The northern suburbs was another area about which I asked questions, and it was pleasing to recognise the attendance in the chamber of Hon. Lea Stevens, who is the Executive Director of Northern Connections. The Hon. Lea Stevens has taken on that role in the last few months, and I commend her for the commitment she will bring. There is no doubt that, as the former member for Little Para, her heart is very much in the north, and if anybody is able to ensure that there is an opportunity to overcome the challenges that face those people, with some endemic concerns that have gone through multiple generations, the Hon. Lea Stevens will lead the way.

Let's hope that there are some great outcomes because it is important that we get more people in the workforce to replace our baby boomer generation at retirement. There are great chances that are going to occur in the north, and there is no doubt that it is one of our prominent growth areas—and the member for Little Para nods in agreement. Let's ensure that for younger kids, kids at school, and all through the age profiles, there is the mentoring and the support that gives them a chance in the future.

Small business was another area on which I asked questions. The minister was not necessarily surprised when I had a preliminary focus on Business Enterprise Centre funding, as it had been an area of questions I posed to him in last year's estimates session. The house would be aware that BEC funding closed from a state government perspective on 30 June. I am certainly aware that local government support for BECs in some areas is now being reviewed because that was contingent upon state government support. My greater concern is not just that local governments are reviewing what they are going to do but what the federal government—which has a three-year funding agreement in place which runs out, I believe, at the end of March 2012—is going to do because the BEC network has some 70,000 contacts per year, be it personal, telephone or email.

It is these small business operators who are actually screaming out for more support. They are, indeed, the fulcrum around which the economy of South Australia operates. As the minister quoted in his opening comment, we have 138,000 small businesses, representing 96 per cent of business operations in South Australia. In the main, these are quite small. They work very hard in the job they do, they need support and for them, a lot of times, an opportunity to contact the Business Enterprise Centre network and get free and impartial advice makes a difference to the success of their business. The minister has put focus on a program of \$1 million over two years with Business SA. I hope that Business SA ensures that the services it provides go out to all business operators across regional and suburban South Australia because it is important that we get it right.

Gambling was another area I asked questions on on behalf of the Hon. Terry Stephens.

The Hon. M.J. Wright: You asked a lot of questions.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I did, and the honourable member provided a great forum for us to ask questions too. With gambling, I asked questions about the inspectors in gambling facilities and the timing of those, and some questions about the removal of the cap on the trading of gaming machine licences and the impact that is going to have on getting rid of the last 730 or so of the 3,000 machines that are required to be removed, as per laws passed by this house and this parliament in, I think, 2004. There has been no trading for some time. The cap removal comes into place from 1 July. I certainly hope that it allows those numbers to go and gives some surety to the industry too.

With respect to government enterprises, the questions focused on Service SA operations and registration. I know I have had a lot of contact from people in the community concerned about the removal of the six and nine-month renewal options for their registration. Also, I have had some suggestions from the community about a direct debit opportunity to allow for monthly payment from their bank accounts for their vehicle registrations, just as a cash flow opportunity for people, instead of paying one large sum for a 12-month registration or a smaller sum for the three-month registration, but we know that comes at an additional cost.

The minister did have some correspondence from me and she has replied to that indicating that some investigations are occurring on the direct debit system, but she certainly expressed some concerns, during estimates sessions, about the practicalities of how that might work. We hope that there is some thought there.

I think there is a bit more acceptance of the removal of registration stickers. It will be interesting to see how that works, though, from 1 July. I certainly hope that every South Australian driver and car owner out there ensures that they have their car registered and third-party insurance in place because, if they do not and they have an accident, there are going to be some grave consequences of that.

The next area is regional development. I questioned the reason for an underspend in the Riverland Futures of \$4 million in the 2010-11 financial year and \$1 million for the Upper Spencer Gulf Enterprise Zone for the 2010-11 financial year. The assurance was certainly given that those funds are going to be carried forward. They need to be, too, because they are very important

programs and it is important that those funds are expended in total within the original time frame which is, I think, four or five years.

I also asked a lot of questions about Regional Development Australia. Members in this chamber would be aware that funding for the RDAs closes as of 30 June 2013. The RDAs are the prime economic opportunity drivers within regional areas. There are eight of them. The withdrawal of the funding is at a cost of about \$4.1 million to the budget. Certainly, every report that I have ever read from an RDA talks in glowing terms about the number of jobs they have created and about the economic development that has occurred within their region that they have been prime drivers of. It seems to me that a \$4.1 million investment in regional South Australia returns itself at least 100 times over, so that must be a good equation to determine it and they are worthy of support.

These are good people. I posed the question to the minister. These are good people who have worked for a lot of time in economic development in the regions. Indeed, their skills will be lost unless there is some surety of contract. It will finish before two years when the money runs out because, unless those people have been given a commitment and because they all have bills to pay themselves, they will start looking for other opportunities.

I give minister Gago the recognition that, on this one, I took some hope from her, but, similarly, I took some hope when minister O'Brien held that portfolio last year in estimates. I think there is a great desire amongst those ministers to ensure that it continues. The great challenge for them is to ensure they can put the argument up to the Treasurer to get the money to come forward in a couple of years' time, preferably even before that, because it is important that it continues.

Rec and sport was an interesting one. It is not my shadow portfolio area but I asked questions on behalf of the Hon. Terry Stephens, and I appreciated the assistance of the Hon. Michael Wright, a couple of suggestions about Adelaide Oval questions that helped the cause immensely. The focus of that was on the South Australian Sports Institute, the review of funding arrangements there and the taking away of funding support from seven sports areas. It is interesting that one of those is tennis.

I know that the minister talks about the fact that tennis actually has the ability to fund its elite development operations itself, but the fact that a young South Australian, Luke Saville, from Cobdogla near Barmera, is the most recent Wimbledon boy's tennis champion really does show that there are some great sporting opportunities happening in South Australia. So while these difficult decisions are made by government, I hope that sporting opportunities are not lost.

There will be questions about the sports hub that will be developed at the aquatic centre, and there was a commitment given about the Port Augusta sporting facility that both parties went to the state election on, confirming support of \$5 million. While the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing has approval to carry that forward into the 2011-12 financial year, he is unsure beyond that, so let us just hope that we can get the money from the feds—from memory, I think that project was about \$13 million—because it is important that it goes through.

It was also interesting that the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing had not had a briefing in any form from the Stadium Management Authority about the Adelaide Oval development. I was rather surprised at that. He is relatively new to the portfolio, and his excuse was that the Minister for Infrastructure was responsible for it. I said that yes, that minister will build it, but then it is a sporting facility and, presumably, the minister for rec and sport would have some involvement in it. I would have thought he would have liked to have seen the business plan on that.

Transport was the main focus on the first day, and we talked about regional roads flooding from the December and January flooding incidents and the need for local government to get support—I think they have something like \$38 million liability in road damages. Adelaide Oval was discussed, and the Land Management Corporation. Only 4.3 per cent of the available land for the development within the 30-year growth plan is actually controlled by the LMC; the majority of it rests in private hands. That is interesting to see; it is a bit of a change. I presumed that the LMC had a far greater ownership of land within that area. Indeed, in the forward estimates it recognises a reduction of returns back to Treasury from LMC operations as their accessible land is fully developed and purchased by people.

Within the Premier's area of economic development I was frustrated that there was no recognition of what the impact would be of the removal of funding for business enterprise centres and Regional Development Australia. I asked if that were a question that he posed to the Economic Development Board, and it was not. That is rather disappointing.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member's time has expired. Member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (17:13): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I know you had cause to call me to order during the estimates committee, but that is only because—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is because you were a little feisty, member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I am very passionate about my portfolios, and always have been over the years. I have had a number of portfolios and I have always tried to do the best I can with the limited resources we have in opposition. In estimates it always amazes me that we have the minister come along, with hundreds of hours of work put in by their officers for months beforehand, and we still cannot get all the answers we want.

The David and Goliath battle that goes on between government and opposition is politics, I suppose. The estimates process is one that, while it has been described as everything from a near death experience to an absolute waste of time, does serve the purpose of at least being able to question and re-question—with quite a bit of flexibility—the minister who is in the chair for that day. In my case the main one, obviously, was my major portfolio of health.

The budget for health this year is a little bit over \$4.6 billion. I had 4½ hours to do that, and thanks to the member for Goyder we were able to extend by an extra 15 minutes into Southern Suburbs. So we had 4¾ hours for \$4.6 billion to \$4.7 billion; a billion dollars an hour. It is really something that you need a number of days to do thoroughly. I have probably twice as many questions that will go on notice as I was able to ask during that brief period of the sitting of the committee.

The other portfolio I was involved in was veterans affairs, which was only half an hour with the Treasurer and Minister for Veterans' Affairs. It is always a bipartisan approach to this committee. There were a couple of issues—on rent for veterans organisations at the Torrens Parade Ground and their not having their rent put up, and I was concerned about veterans having to pay for car parking at the Repat but, of course, that overflowed into the health portfolio.

I was on the road safety estimates committee with the member for Kavel, and I was astonished to hear the minister say that, according to him, drivers are responsible for 100 per cent of road accidents. We did have to point out to him that, while driver behaviour has significant input, road design, the condition of roads and equipment failure are also significant causes. I think that he will learn from the people who were having input on the airwaves today that he should show a little bit more humility and listen to other people's points of view.

The other portfolio in the estimates committee I sat in on was Aboriginal affairs, which has been another area of deep interest to me. I am not the shadow minister anymore; the Hon. Terry Stephens in the other place is. This year, though, the new member for Norwood, Steven Marshall, is on the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. He is very passionate about Aboriginal affairs, so I was more than happy to ask him if he wanted to run this estimates committee and give him the opportunity to show what he can do. He did so exceptionally well with the assistance of another up-and-coming member in this place, the member for Stuart. Between them, they did a great job and were able to get some information of use on that portfolio for all South Australians and not just the opposition.

I will spend most of the 16 minutes left to me talking about the major portfolio of health, mental health and substance abuse, and I will need every moment, just as I needed every moment of the 4½ hours I had in the estimate committee. I could have used 4½ days, not 4½ hours, to question the minister. Because of the pressure everybody is under, you do get a bit testy, you do get a bit frustrated, you do get a bit annoyed, and sometimes you might overlook a point you wanted to make, and there is one I certainly want to clear up right from the word go, that is, the Premier's pledge card. We knew that it was better hospitals, more beds, but what we needed to clear up was the number of beds this government has delivered for South Australia.

In a question on notice to the minister, I asked about the number of public acute hospital beds from 1994-95 to 2008-09. As per the table in his answer, he has given them to me. In 2001-02, there were 2,601 metropolitan hospital beds, and in 2008-09 there were 2,819, so there was an increase of over 200. There were 1,962 country hospital beds in 2001-02; in 2008-09, there were 1,819, which is a significant decrease. When you add those up, the total hospital beds in 2001-02 were 4,563; in 2009-10 (because we had an update from the minister during estimates) there were 4,628—that is 65 more beds. It is nothing to crow about.

I should have perhaps been quicker on my feet on the day to point out to the minister that, while there are over 200 more beds in the city, when you put the whole of the state together—and we should consider the whole of the state, as the health department needs to, not citycentric positions—there are 65 more beds. The minister did comment in estimates that there was a reduction of over 400 acute beds in the country during the Liberal's time in government. To give him his due, and I will be fair this time—he is not always as fair as he might be, in my opinion—he did admit that a number of those beds were converted to aged-care beds. It will be interesting to add those up.

I do not have the figures on those, but I would be very certain that when you add up the number of acute beds in country hospitals that were converted to aged-care beds that there would be a very small reduction in those, but when you add up the numbers that the minister gave us when we were asking about acute care beds in hospitals, there is a significant reduction in numbers between when the Liberals left and 2008-09. The minister was not able to give us the 2009-10 figures for country beds, but certainly there had been a 10-bed reduction between 2008-09 and 2009-10 in the city.

We need more hospital beds. We know that. We know the new hospital has 700 acute beds and then another 100 dialysis chairs, oncology chairs and day surgery chairs. The minister is being a bit tricky about it by saying that we have 800 beds. It is not; it is 700 acute beds. We know that. The current Royal Adelaide Hospital has 662 acute beds.

When you look at the dashboards, the inpatient dashboards—and I will talk about dashboards a bit more in a moment—which show the demand on our inpatient beds, you will see that in many cases, with 662 available beds, it is well over 700 beds that are being occupied.

At one stage (I think it was two weeks ago), Dr Peter Sharley, the AMA President, said that there were 735 acute beds with inpatients in that hospital. How can they do that? It is because the hospital had over 800 beds. Many of those beds have been shut down and not funded. The hospital is only funded for 662 beds. So, when you are running over 700 patients you have to drag that money and fund those beds from somewhere, so hospitals overrun their budgets.

The government is going to have to think carefully about where it is putting the money and where it is putting the beds. We know that every day in South Australia there are 500 South Australians from near and far, from rural and regional areas, who are in our city hospitals. They are there for obvious reasons. You cannot have a heart transplant in every hospital. That is just not going to happen.

What you do need to have are acute facilities, tertiary hospitals and facilities where country people can come to have their treatment, but then, at the first possible moment, they should be able to go home. If you do not have beds in the country then they cannot go home to their families and they cannot go home to their communities. It is not just about building that edifice down the road.

Talking about mathematics, the minister was a bit harsh in some of the comments he made about me being able to count. The minister should look at what he said about the capital spend. In 2005-06, it was \$362.1 million. In 2011-12, it is \$497.8 million, an increase of \$135.7 million. The minister said that was a 267 per cent increase. I do not think so. It is a 37.5 per cent increase.

In the budget overruns, the minister said that the budget was \$4.7 billion and that it had overspent by \$100 million. The minister said that was a quarter of a per cent. It is 2.13 per cent, minister. So, you cannot go out saying that you are as perfect as you wish to be if you are talking like that.

We did get some real figures though out of the minister. It took a while. It took a bit of dragging and a bit of persuasion for the minister to finally admit that the cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the cost that has been put on the books of the Treasury in 2016, is \$2.8 billion.

We know that when you go out to—I was going to say Biancos, but there is a South Australian company that has done a lot of good for this state but is having problems now—the hardware store and buy all of your bricks and mortar to build your house, that is only part of the problem, that is only part of the cost. The \$1.8 billion that they have been talking about for building that hospital down there, that is part of the cost.

You then have borrow the money and you have to pay interest on that money. If you cannot pay that interest back straightaway, or it is not being paid back straightaway, it is

capitalised. That is what is going to happen, \$670 million-odd is going to be capitalised, the interest is going to be capitalised. So, when you add on that and some other costs, the total cost that is going on the ledger in 2016 is \$2.8 billion. It is a \$2.8 billion hospital.

When you look at the repayments for that 700-bed hospital, those repayments are not locked in, there is nothing fixed about it. If the base interest rate, and I am no economist, I am no accountant, and I think that is the one set by the Reserve Bank, if that moves then we could be paying a lot more. We could be paying up to \$500 million a year in repayments for that hospital. The average, they say, is 370 or 380; it is a significant amount of money. It is \$1.1 million a day. If interest rates go up, and we are paying \$500 million a year, it is about \$1.5 million a day we would be paying for that hospital. Sure, we have a product in return, but go down the road and look at what we have already.

This was the other issue that the minister was being very tricky about. We asked him: what was the asset value of the Royal Adelaide Hospital as it stands at the corner of Frome Road and North Terrace? They were very tricky about it. He tried to say it was going to be a liability. If it is a liability, minister, why have you put so much money into it in the last few years? Why did you move to renal transplant unit there from The Queen Elizabeth Hospital? Why are you doing that if it is a liability? It is an asset to this state; it has been for many years. There are world-class facilities there already now. It is an asset. It is a billion-dollar asset. There is an opportunity cost in you bulldozing that and moving down the road. So, that asset is going to come off the books when you move down the road. You are going to write off \$1 billion.

I asked about some of the equipment in the Royal Adelaide Hospital as it is now and what is happening down the road at the new one. Some of it—computer screens were an example. Computer terminals were going down the road, but there is a lot of it that we understand is going to be given the flick; it is going to be turfed out. We will be watching very carefully what the transition plans are between the current site at Frome Road-North Terrace down to the rail yards site. If there is any wastage, if there is any equipment that is dumped in the rubbish, then we will be very loud and vocal about making sure that does not happen, because it should never happen.

Having said that, we should remember that in 2016—we are working very hard on this, and we should not be arrogant—the future premier, Isobel Redmond, will be cutting the ribbon on it and, if I have the opportunity to be the health minister, I will make sure that the equipment that is down at the Royal Adelaide Hospital now is not going to be dumped, that it is going to be used to the best of its ability. That may not be at the rail yards but it may be going out into the country or it may be re-used somewhere else to the very best of our ability.

It is very important that we do make sure that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is going to be value for money because we know that the minister said in March 2010 just before the election that it was \$1.7 billion (he told Leon Byner that) when he knew, because the Auditor-General said so because cabinet signed off in November 2009, it was \$1.8 billion. They were not telling the truth then, and we know now that the actual cost is \$2.8 billion.

The non-clinical support contract with Spotless: it will be interesting to watch that, because non-clinical support is everything from the catering, cleaning, cooking, security guards to the helpdesk. That is a flexible arrangement. There will be some costs going up over the years. We will watch that very carefully.

The big announcement on the day was that the government was going to be open and honest about the pressure on our emergency departments. After months of me showing and embarrassing the minister in here every day with the emergency department dashboards and the inpatient dashboards showing the capacity and the pressure on our hospitals, the minister came out and said that this was world first. What he has put up on the health website is the emergency department (ED) dashboards for each hospital. I encourage people to go on there and have a look.

It is a traffic light system. It does not tell you this on the website; it gives it in a roundabout sort of way. It does not tell you honestly that the green is when the capacity is less than 80 per cent, amber is 80 to 95 per cent, red is 95 to 125 per cent, and white is 125 per cent capacity. They are bursting at the seams. Any day you go on there—today, the women's and kids' was at white again. The women's and kids' is on white most of the time, and most of the other hospitals are on red or white a lot of the time. Those hospitals are bursting at the seams.

The minister has another new column on there, compared with the ones I was getting about average waiting times, and they are in a matter of minutes. When you actually go and look at the capacity plans for our hospitals—not the current situation as it is today at this moment on the

dashboards—you can see the way the hospital is planning their potential admissions. You read, for example, last Wednesday 29 June at 3.31pm, the Royal Adelaide Hospital ED occupancy was 75, there were 27 patients waiting more than four hours, there were 11 patients waiting more than eight hours, there were nine patients waiting greater than 12 hours, and the average length of stay (ALOS) in hours in the emergency department was 50.1 hours.

In the Women's and Children's Hospital today, there is one poor little kid who has been waiting more than 24 hours for a bed.

Mr Pederick: Shame!

Dr McFETRIDGE: It is an absolute shame, and we are not seeing the truth from the government. If people are going to look at the ED information on the Health website, go into the glossary and go into Frequently Asked Questions, and if you do not understand that, go to my website and you can download the users guide for the dashboards; it is all there.

You need to understand it so that the government can be embarrassed by the fact that it is just in denial. This minister has been in denial for months and months. He keeps trying to deflect to the fact that they are extending some hospitals, sure, and that is a good thing, but it will not be happening until 2014 or 2016, and we saw delays at Noarlunga and at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

It is a real travesty that South Australian taxpayers are not getting the value for money in health that they should. We are spending more and more. How is this government clawing back its overruns? It is introducing car parking. The veterans down at the Repat are going to be paying for car parking. They can get it back if they go through a convoluted process of filling out forms—which nobody wants to see—but other people will need to pay. There will be a lot more said about car parking over the next few weeks and months.

This government is not doing what it promised to do. It is not delivering a better health service for South Australia. The ED dashboards on the website will not deliver one more doctor, one more nurse or one more bed, but they look pretty. The dashboards are quite confusing if you have no idea what you are talking about, so go and read the FAQs and the glossary, and go to my website and have a look at the users guide, to see what is going on in our hospitals.

I challenge the minister to do what the Western Australian government is doing, and that is not just one page as he said on ABC radio in an attempt to belittle what I was saying. A range of information is provided on the Western Australian Health website, and that is what we will be doing. It is not expensive, and it is easily done. The website can be maintained and managed by less than half an FTE and, each day, you can update the ED daily activity—attendances, admissions, ambulance attendances and ambulance diversions. It could also include ambulance ramping.

Every hospital in Western Australia, both country and city, lists its occupancy every day, and that is the sort of information that South Australians deserve. They do not want to know how many are in various streams within the hospital; they want to know whether they can be admitted into a hospital, how many beds are available, and what the minister is doing about ambulance ramping and overcrowding in emergency departments, and what he is doing to fix this health system.

The minister has done none of that, and he is in complete denial. He cannot continue to divert through Crisis Management 101, which is 'Deny, deny, deny. Deflect, deflect deflect.' We have had enough of the denials and the deflections, and the more you look at the health budget, you will see that he was tricky in his answers, and you will see that it is time for this minister to go. We know that he has told cabinet he will be retiring in 2014; it is time for him to go now and give the job to somebody else who can do it. I cannot wait until 2014, and, if I am the health minister, by heck, I am going to do a much better job than he has done.

MEMBER'S REMARKS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:33): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr WHETSTONE: In question time today, I responded to minister Koutsantonis. The minister made a statement which I could not hear. The minister stated, 'What did you say?' I responded, 'Yes' to his inquiry, 'What did you say?' I was clearly asking him to repeat his statement, and not the language used.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is that the extent of your statement?

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes, it is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay, right; thank you for that. Member for Fisher.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right, does anybody have an official point of order of any sort whatsoever, or just general squeaking?

Mrs Geraghty: Well, we will read the *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Read the *Hansard*; okay. Member for Fisher, apologies.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Debate resumed.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (17:34): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I had the privilege of not attending estimates. I have read nearly everything that went on and, a lot of it does not impress me at all—especially the foul language and other inappropriate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I will not repeat it. But, I think it is time—and I have been saying this for a long, long time—the process that is called estimates needs to be reformed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Point of order: the member for Fisher has said there was foul language. I was at estimates every day, popping in and out or listening to all of them as a member of committee. In defence of other members, I do not recall foul language.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not quite sure what the point of order is there, member for Torrens, but I may also reflect upon your—

An honourable member: I heard the minister for environment swear once.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I did chair a number of these extraordinary sessions. There is a lot you could say about estimates, but I do not think there was much foul language used.

An honourable member: There was some.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Was there some? I missed that.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: There was.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oh, just the ministers.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I will not repeat it, but I am confident there were at least two occasions.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is true that someone used the word 'dope'; but they may have been talking about university cigarettes.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No, someone used stronger language than that. Someone reminded me today that someone else had used even more foul language, which was picked up and later edited out. I do not want to dwell on that too much. The point I want to make is that it is time that the estimates process was reformed and revised. It costs hundreds of thousands of dollars for public servants to produce material in the event that a possible question may emerge related to that information.

It is the most inefficient, ridiculous process that one could imagine. You have hundreds of public servants preparing for something that may not eventuate. I think it is time that the process was revised and reformed. Maybe we could have more questions on notice or people submitting the questions, or else all the material prepared by the public servants for answering could be given to the parliament—something as radical as that.

I think what we need to ask is, what is the benefit of estimates for the community? By and large we know how the game is played: the government and the opposition want to get a good press release out; they want to get one headline, a good one for the government and one negative

from the opposition about the government. That is basically what it is about, but in terms of assisting in our role as legislators and representatives of the people, I do not think estimates reflects well on any of us and I think it is time it was changed.

In passing I draw members' attention to an article in the recent edition of *The Parliamentarian*, where the Speaker of the Queensland parliament reflects on what our role is. He says, and I agree with him, 'Our role is to be legislators and representatives, but what we have become is largely social workers and ombudsmen'—and 'ombudswomen', I guess.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a Danish term, that actually does not need to be gender specific.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: That is the first point I want to make. In not being here for estimates, I was out amongst the community and I must say there is a lot of angst out there and concern about increasing costs being imposed on the community. This is not just in country areas, where I spent most of last week, but it is throughout the state. In fact, it is getting to a point where I do not know how people on a basic income can make ends meet. I just do not understand how some of them get by.

What has happened as a result of this latest budget—and it has been highlighted through the estimates committees—is that taxes and charges are going up, by more than CPI in a lot of cases. I will not get into the issue specifically of impact on motorists, because I hope to deal with that later in the week, but that is just one area where the cost increases have become quite significant. What is probably equally as bad is the fact that a lot of these measures come into the category of being draconian.

We have had an indication—and this was touched on through the police estimates, where the minister said it is not his bill (I am sure he is happy not to have it)—that the government is about to impose a vehicle defect system involving a fine. The person who gets the fine for a defect then has to go to Regency after it has been repaired and get it cleared; and I can tell you when you go to Regency they will find another fault. You have to go out and get it fixed and then you have to pay a release fee.

That will hurt not just country people, but I think it will hurt them very harshly. What the police have been telling me—the police who do the real policing—is that they are not motor mechanics. It is not their job at a police station to be checking vehicles for mechanical faults and making sure they have been fixed. What you will have is a draconian system. In fact, many people have said to me that they are thinking of not staying in South Australia because it is getting to a point where they feel oppressed and it is going over the top.

The Premier said earlier this year and last year that his government would be out there listening to the people. I do not see any great evidence of that, and I do not see enough evidence of the opposition really pushing the government hard. I know the argument is, 'Don't go too early because you have an election, and it is a few years away,' but, in looking at estimates, I notice that many of the questions were fairly meek and mild and not really punchy enough. People say to me, 'Why weren't you there?' I do not automatically get on estimates, and I would have to rock up and try to wangle a question if I could.

For example, the health budget is \$4 billion, as we heard the member for Morphett say. Why are we not seeing more effort in terms of trying to reduce ill health and people becoming ill? We cannot sustain that sort of cost in the long term; it is \$4 billion now, but what is it going to be in a few years? It is going to be even more.

On my recent trip up north, people in DECS told me that children in the Port Augusta area who have problems with their eardrums cannot get their ears checked until possibly November because there is not enough capability in the system for them to be checked out by the health system. That is appalling. We are not a Third World country. Why is there not more emphasis on trying to improve health so that we do not end up with a budget bigger than \$4 billion?

In regard to the police, I thought a question that could have been asked of the police minister was: where are the 4,400 police? They are largely invisible. Where are they? We are told that there are more than ever before, but I do not see any evidence of more police out and about; whether they are camouflaged, I do not know, but I have not seen them. I was quite surprised by a figure that was given that, out of the 400 plus police recruited from the UK, over 140 have left. That shows there is some problem, and I think the initial problem was that the police recruited from the UK, who might have had a substantive promotional position in the UK, were basically made to start

from scratch again here. The former minister can correct me if I am wrong, but I think that was part of the problem.

We see a trend in terms of increasing costs for the public, and we are seeing it now with the removal of the registration disc. What we will find is that numerous people will be caught, and the government is already budgeting for an increase in revenue from that; likewise from the defect notice procedure when that comes into play.

In terms of infrastructure, I have been travelling on some of the roads in this state. I have spoken to the member for Frome, because I was in his electorate, and he tells me that, hopefully, there are plans in the not too distant future to improve the section of road between Clare and Yakka, but there is no decent road verge. Coming back on Monday night, it was raining and there were big grain trucks on the road (which have every right to be on the road), but if you have to go onto the edge of the road there is nowhere to go because there is no road verge.

Some country roads are very variable in their quality, and I have raised before the Murray Bridge to Loxton Road, which is a recipe for trouble. A lot more money needs to be spent on some of these basic things. I have acknowledged before that the government has done a great job on the edges, the curves, and so on, on the old Princes Highway through the Hills, from Wasleys through to Callington, but it needs to be repeated in a lot of places throughout the state.

Another issue I picked up on was the petty harassment of people in small business by bureaucracy. I spoke to the leaseholder or owner of the North Blinman Hotel, who was warned that he would get a \$1,200 fine because his liquor licence was just inside from the main entrance and not close to the front door. That is ridiculous, petty nonsense. How many people go into licensed premises to read the liquor licence and need it right by the front door? The hotelier running the Austral Hotel in Quorn told me that she had been warned because a lot of people had gone to the hotel after the Quorn races, which is not surprising—they want to go there for a drink.

More and more draconian impositions are being applied in this state without common sense. In Quorn, people were telling me about the police officer who was there, I think, until recently, and he was one of those country police officers who showed common sense. An old lady had a numberplate that was in need of repair or replacement and he said to her, 'Love, you need to get that fixed. If the city police come up, you will be in trouble.' That is old-style policing and what you need to do in a country town if you are a country police officer because you live in the town, your children live in the town, and they go to the local school. We want a return to more of the old-style policing, where people were often given a warning rather than this heavy, draconian, money-raising exercise—tax collecting—using the police force to do that.

In regard to other issues, this did not come up in detail during estimates but I am now aware that the government has decided that it will not seek to have the independent inquiry into Burnside council vetted and then released. It has also maintained a suppression order in relation to not allowing freedom of information requests to be granted in terms of that inquiry. What is going to happen—and the people already feel this—is that South Australia will be the secret state where things are suppressed.

I have not read the judgement of the Full Court, I will be interested to read that, but one could reasonably argue that Ken MacPherson (for whom I have the greatest respect) would not have highlighted issues if there was not some concern about the behaviour of individuals. If he went too far and if the report continues to be suppressed, I think there is still an obligation to make sure that people—if they did wrong, if they behaved inappropriately—are held and brought to account. The way the ministerial statement reads, it sounds as though, 'Look, it is all too difficult. We will walk away from it. We have spent over a million dollars. Let's move on.'

All that will do is leave things under a cloud; it will create a suspicion and people will believe that the whole thing relating to what may or may not have happened at Burnside council is smelly. That is just not acceptable. I have argued for years in here that the Auditor-General should have oversight over councils. That has been opposed or resisted. If we had that system in place, this saga at Burnside would never have eventuated, in my view. When Ken MacPherson was auditor-general, he indicated to me that he did not have the power to investigate wrongdoing in councils where it related to inappropriate practices, and I raised with him instances where people in councils have got away with blue murder. I mentioned when I was on a council at the time (and I have said this before), where the outgoing CEO was given a Holden Berliner as a going away present. That was suppressed under staff confidential items, and a whole lot of other funny business went on as well.

Until and unless the Auditor-General has oversight, you will never be able to get to the bottom of these things. You are not going to have people accountable and they are going to continue to do the sort of things that almost certainly went on in relation to Burnside council where, it would appear, some people did act inappropriately, if not illegally. I think it is incumbent on the government not only to indicate that they are going to move on or work with the LGA, but also they need to make sure that the people, if they did wrong, are brought to account.

As I say, I have the greatest respect for Ken MacPherson. He is a man of great integrity, and it is highly unlikely that he would have made any recommendations if he did not believe that there was some substance to them and that they were not worth investigating. I am sure he was compelled in his report to say things which now, unfortunately, have been suppressed because the people under investigation took legal action and managed to convince the Full Court to suppress that report.

So, that matter was not, obviously, fully canvassed in estimates because the minister, the Hon. Russell Wortley, only released his ministerial statement today. The fact that that report is being suppressed and will continue to be suppressed, and any person seeking information under the Freedom of Information Act will be denied, I think, just adds further suspicion in the public mind and raises their concerns even higher. It makes the case for an ICAC even more compelling.

One of the other issues I come back to—and I understand the opposition is opposing it or has agreed to oppose it in the upper house, along with others—is the outrageous suggestion that people who win in a Magistrates Court will either get no costs awarded or get low costs. Now, that is outrageous.

What concerns me more than probably the issue itself is the fact that it was suggested by the police department—that really concerns me. So, for the sake of probably \$2 million at most, out of a budget of \$700 million, the police have argued and the government has rolled over and said, 'Let us take away people's rights for consideration of costs in the Magistrates Court.' In other words, let us make the system even less just than it is now and make the pursuit of justice more expensive and more difficult. Let us deter people from even questioning anything in the system.

We know that the government—and I hope they have second thoughts about this—is not even prepared to have a system in relation to some of the speed detection, where there is integrity in the system. They are not prepared to even consider that. The public is starting to get even more concerned about those aspects than some of the financial implications of what the government is doing.

Now, an issue close to the parliament—I would not say close to my heart—is this issue of the bridge over the River Torrens. I personally find it hard to believe that you need a pedestrian bridge there when you have got a good bridge already on King William Road. It would only add 500 metres or so to your walk, coming from the football, back to catch a train or whatever you want to do in the city. It may be 500 metres. I doubt whether it would be a kilometre.

So, the government wants to spend \$40 million on a bridge and yet, we are going to have extensive parking, presumably near the oval, in the Parklands area. Now, why would the people parking there, after the football, want to leave their car there? We know that football is generally played in wet weather, but it may be sunny for the cricket. Why would the people who park over there then walk over this side on this gold-plated bridge? Why would they walk across this side and then have to walk back again afterwards? I do not think that is going to happen.

I come back to my original suggestion, which I have been trying to get the minister to consider, which is to run the tram down past the oval, preferably out to North Adelaide and even further out. That would not only reinvigorate the city and North Adelaide, but people could park out in the northern area and catch the tram in, as well as people from the south and people joining the tram in the city catching it to the oval.

So, as I say, it is time for estimates to be reworked. It needs more than a little makeover. I think it needs fundamental and drastic surgery to turn it into something that is productive and of benefit to the people of South Australia, rather than the costly ritual which it is now. May that reform happen sooner rather than later.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (17:55): I rise tonight to contribute to the Appropriation Bill, and I, too, will make comment in relation to the whole estimates session debate. I have sat through about 50 hours of them in my time here—probably more than that, probably more like 500 actually.

Mr Pederick: A fair few, Ivan.

Mr VENNING: A fair few, but I am amazed that we all agree that we need to do something about changing the way we do it, and the shocking waste of money, but that we never seem to achieve it. When governments become oppositions and oppositions become governments, all of a sudden the rules change.

I find it incongruous that we have members of the other house involved in this chamber as ministers, but we cannot use members of that place on the crossbenches to listen or participate in the exchange in the house in relation to the investigation, and I always find it little unusual that it is a House of Assembly investigation, but we allow ministers from the other place to participate. I think that is rather strange. By the same token, we are unable to use the shadow ministers in that place, and I find that strange to the point of being a little ridiculous.

If we can use ministers from the other place, why can we not use the shadows from that place? The Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Terry Stephens and the Hon. Rob Lucas would love to come down and participate in estimates, but of course they cannot. Irrespective of that, I offer my services to the house as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, with the current Speaker (Hon. Lyn Breuer) to look at this and again attempt to bring some sanity to the situation so that we do not bring all these departmental people in here at great cost, some of whom have spent weeks preparing.

We should be able to do away with all that, and I think the answer lies somewhere in putting the questions in writing so that the departmental people only have to address the questions that are asked; they do not have to spend hours and hours preparing for questions that might be asked. I think we could have a session where it is all in writing, as in questions on notice, the difference being that they would have to deliver the answers in a given period and in bulk, all at once, so that when we had the sessions we would actually get all those questions put up at once and on time.

Returning to estimates, I find the information revealed from the past five days of estimates hearings to be far from surprising, and it demonstrates what South Australians, and we on this side of the house, have been saying ad nauseam; that is, the Labor government is expert in economic mismanagement, waste, inefficiencies and blowouts. The clock is ticking, and every day under this government state debt is increasing to the degree of being quite alarming exponentially. As someone who has been around here a while, I have seen many members come and go from this place. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (OFFENCES RELATING TO INSTRUCTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Thursday 7 July 2011 at 10:30.