

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 7 July 2011

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PRESCRIBED MOTOR VEHICLES) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (10:32)**: 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. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (10:32)**: I move:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to provide that government business has precedence over Private Members Business Bills and Private Members Business Other Motions on Thursday 7 July and that any private members' business set down for that day be set down for consideration on Thursday 28 July.

The **Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:33)**: I will make some comments in relation to this procedure. What this procedure does is take private members' time out for one day of sitting, which happens to be today. The nonsense of this is that last night the house got up at 6 o'clock. The house could have easily sat through until later in the evening and dealt with the speeches in reply to the estimates committees and not denied the house the private members' day today. It was only for the convenience of the government that it suspended the house last night at 6 o'clock and then is going to use its numbers to take away private members' time today.

I simply make the point to the house that we got up at 6 o'clock last night. We could have easily sat through until 10, 11 or midnight and finished the debate so that private members could have continued today, or got the debate to the point where private members could be held this morning and then the debate completed this afternoon. The opposition was always in agreement that the debate would be completed this week—that was never in question—but it is unfortunate that the private members' time is going to be taken away today when the house got up at 6 o'clock. At the end of the day, we accept that the vote is going to go through, but I make the point to the house that next year I think we can do it better.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on motion:

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

(Continued from 6 July 2011.)

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (10:35): I want to continue my remarks in relation to estimates. I agree with the member for Davenport about doing it better next year. I think it is time, under your stewardship, Madam, while you are the Speaker, and myself as a member of the Standing Orders Committee, that we had a good look at this and updated the whole estimates process. I think we can do this across the house on an apolitical basis, because I think it is time, in every way.

As I was saying last night, cost of living pressures are affecting many of our people in South Australia, and the situation is likely to get worse in the not too distant future as costs increase from 1 July. Once again, it was revealed through estimates that funds allocated to rural and regional South Australia continue to be slashed in all areas: health, agriculture, transport, tourism, and the list goes on and on.

I was interested to hear the response of the Executive Director of Primary Industries and Biosecurity, Dr Donald Plowman, to a question from the shadow minister for agriculture relating to the \$2.7 million decrease in expenses as a result of reduction in research and development activity and service delivery to meet budget savings targets. He said, 'bearing in mind that SARDI is unquestionably the leading research institute in the country'. I commend Dr Plowman on his acknowledgement that SARDI is the leading research institute in Australia, and I agree with him; but given this recognition, why is the Labor government cutting support? How long will SARDI

continue to be the leading research institute in the country if funding is continually reduced, as it has been now for about the last five years?

I note the minister is sitting here, and I will try to make it as easy as I can on him, because he is the best agriculture minister we have had for decades. According to the government's own website:

Agricultural and wine industries contribute more than \$5 billion annually in production value and more than double this in value-adding to South Australia's economy.

Well, as it did in last year's budget, the Labor government has again shown scant regard for the value of agriculture in this state in the 2011-12 budget. As I said in my budget reply speech, as food security becomes more and more of an issue we need to have more money put into agriculture research and development, not less. After all, as the minister would know, every year we have got to grow more food on less land. I have mentioned in this house—for probably five or six years now—that it has been a problem, and all of a sudden the world is waking up, or Australia is. It is now becoming an issue and I think now is the time to strike.

I found the minister for agriculture's explanation about how much of the \$1 million allocated per year for new export programs to drive food and wine sector growth has been allocated to the wine industry very surprising, particularly given the difficulties the industry has been facing over the years with oversupply, low prices, and the high Australian dollar, not to mention the extra difficulties experienced by vignerons this year with late rains causing disease. The minister explained (and I quote):

The exact breakdown is: FoodSA, \$550,000 per annum; the Wine Industry Association, \$250,000 per annum; and then \$200,000 held by PIRSA for investment attraction opportunities.

The fact that the wine industry is being allocated only a measly \$250,000 in funds per year is an insult. As you know, Mr Acting Deputy Speaker, South Australia is home to the most famous wine region in Australia, the Barossa, along with many other iconic wine regions, and this is how the government treats an industry worth so much to the economy. It is atrocious. This week we saw the sacking of the SAFF grain section and the minister's intervention, saying that he had not received an audited account of expenditure of levy moneys entrusted to SAFF for grain research. I heard that comment on radio and instantly made some phone calls, because I know the people who did those reports. I was told that audited accounts—for at least for the last three years—were forwarded.

They were sent, at least, over the last three years, and I personally checked it. The minister said yesterday that he has never received audited accounts of expenditure; apparently they have lost them—apparently; I do not know, sir. What happens now? The expenditure of the levy this year is approximately \$500,000. What happens to the SAGIT proportion of this levy? I have made speeches in this house before because I have been concerned for some years about the expenditure of these levies. I have mentioned it in this house, so it is not all new, and it is not all criticism, because I too was concerned about where this money goes.

I presumed that you, the minister, had the auditor's report and that you would have made comment if anything was wrong. Now we see what has happened here with this dispute. I have never had any problem with SAGIT getting good value for our levy dollars because they are fairly open. I know the people involved, particularly Mr Geoff Thomas, who is a long-term friend of mine. Yes, I was a bit unsure about how SAFF spent its money.

I have no problem paying the Grains Council members their out-of-pocket expenses as board members to attend council meetings. I have no problem with that at all because they do put their hands in their own pocket. I have no problem with assisting with the cost of the grains section executive officer's remuneration, but my concern is: what is the split of that? As you do, too, minister, we want to know what the split is. Various accusations are floating around—and I say accusations—about where the money was going, who was paying what, and why there is a rift now between the two. It is a sad day when you see the board sack the grains section committee because, after all, it did appoint them.

It was a sad day when they went away from the election by the members, because now we select them. The board members took it upon themselves to appoint them, and now we see this. I am no longer a member of SAFF; I probably ought to be, and in fact I am considering rejoining. It is pretty sad day because we need SAFF to be in a strong position—a strong position—with the industry as it is, and this is not good for anybody. It is a sad that the board has sacked the grain section.

Chairman Michael Schaefer commented on the ABC that if we ever needed our sole agriculture body to be strong it is now. I take the minister to task when yesterday, apart from saying that he had never seen the auditor's account, he also said that he 'needed an advisory board'. You said those exact words. I say to the minister: you had one until a few days ago, but you never used it; you never asked it to perform. I can understand the minister saying that he needed a specialist-type board. You could have asked these people to do the specific work you wanted them to do.

I also note that these people have got the sack and that they will no longer be employed by the minister or get any money. The whole board costs the minister basically one salary—\$160,000, I think, so it is pretty sad. It is also sad that the board has not spoken up. It has always been apolitical in its entire 125 years. It is not spoken up, and it has taken the sacking without any comment at all. I am sad about that. I have tried to make some comments to stick up for them because they have been a very good board and served all ministers of all persuasions honestly. They have certainly given good service, and it is sad that this has happened.

I also note that yesterday in the house the minister announced his agribusiness council. I congratulate the 13 who have been nominated; I know most of them, particularly Louisa Rose, Chair of the South Australian Wine Industry Council. Well done! You will certainly get some good value out of her. Why was the President of SAFF not appointed? Is it because of a gender balance? My God, I cannot believe that.

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Well, I just think, particularly with what has happened in the last week, it would have been prudent—

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Well, put another member on there, then. I can understand that, with gender balance, there is an issue, but to exempt the President of SAFF I thought was a bit unusual.

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I do not think that I am on his Christmas card list either, minister, so do not be offended by that. Also, most of them are city dwellers—I know two of them definitely live in the country, but most of them are city dwellers—and how often will they meet? I understand they are going to meet four times a year for two-hour meetings. That is eight hours total, which is not a lot considering what you got out of the advisory board, which was probably 10 times that.

An honourable member: It is a very high level.

Mr VENNING: It is a very high level, yes. And they are all individuals; I know them. I believe you could have left the advisory board in place as an extremely good representative of the primary industries across the state, with the agriculture bureaus as the nominating groups and, of course, you have the final say about who is there. It is the largest group probably in Australia.

I agree that there is some merit in an agribusiness council because we have had them before, but not at the expense of the ABA. After 125 years, this minister thinks the ABA is no longer relevant, which is pretty sad. I think that the first issue an agribusiness council needs to address is the current plight of the wine industry. I do not know what we can do, and I am interested to see what will happen and what this group can do. There are some people on there who are very good corporate thinkers, so let's see what comes from it. The big question for me is: do I think the council will succeed? Well, time will tell; we will see what happens.

I also note that minister Kenyon said on radio that he did not believe that road conditions were responsible for accidents or casualties. I could not believe it. I have driven on the roads—I would rank either second or third in this place in terms of the number of kilometres I do—and some of the road conditions are bad, and they have to be part of the problem. But if the road conditions are bad and somebody is not paying attention then, yes, it is a mixture of both.

When you see the verges of our roads, they are pretty bad. I have trained all my family to put their wheel off the verge. A lot of these accidents happen because drivers, all of a sudden, find that they have driven off the road and the resulting noise of the stones flying underneath the car panics them, and they whip the wheel hard to the right and the car goes straight across the road in front of other traffic or it hits a tree on the other side of the road. That is the classic, standard one-vehicle accident, and it is started by the bad condition of the verge. There can be a drop of up to three or four inches in places where they have not graded the verge, or there has been wet

weather and it has washed out. So, to say that it is not the condition of the roads is quite a ridiculous comment, and I cannot believe that he would say that.

Also, currently, we are discussing school bus contracts, and I am very concerned that it is a cost-cutting thing. We have seen five major bus providers in the Mount Lofty and Gawler region lose their contract in the last few days, and I am very concerned about this. It has been taken over by a large company (I will not name it) that is operating passenger services in the north.

I am very concerned. These particular companies, one in particular, and I will name it, Dunns of Kadina, and another large one in Gawler, between the pair of them, they have over 120 years of service to this community, and they now find themselves out of contract for operating school buses. We all know that these bus contracts were the backbone of these businesses. Some of these businesses will go, and we will be relying on this large company, which, incidentally, is a Victorian-based company, to run all of these services.

What about the service we get from these bus providers? They run our children to sport on Saturday, and they are available for excursions—whether it be private or whatever, they are there and happy to serve. They have been fantastic contributors to local communities. They are there when the hat comes around for donations for various events, and they sponsor all those things.

So, what happens now? We see that these five companies have gone, and I am very concerned about what will happen next. Are we going to go the whole lot? Are they going to go right round? The Barossa will be next. We have three providers in the Barossa, and do you think they are concerned? Of course they would be. This large company, ATC, I think it is—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: ATE—operating out of Victoria. It operates LinkSA and Southlink. They operated in a big way, and here it is squeezing out all these little operators. I would like to see what is the benchmark that is used here. Is it fair, and is it a level playing field? I know these companies would have higher operating costs here in South Australia than ATE would in Victoria. We know why: it is the cost that the government charges that go with that.

I would ask the minister to hold the contracts until we can all have a look at the benchmark. If the benchmark shows that our local operators were not providing an efficient service, I will be the first to admit that, 'Okay, you have done the right thing,' but I think to be penny-pinching in order to squeeze out family companies such as this is quite blatantly wrong. I am happy to have a briefing with the minister, and he can tell us why this has been done.

I also want to discuss, as we have seen in the budget and through estimates, the increased cost of drivers' licences. Can I also say how cross I am that the government has taken away the right to keep the numberplates of historical vehicles. Say you have a 1928 Buick and it has the original number on it, if you want to continue using that number you have to go to auction and buy it; I cannot believe that.

I think the government has misjudged here. There are over 100 clubs in South Australia that are affected by this, and they each have about 80 members on average; work that out—8,000 disaffected people. There are a lot of people here with a fair bit of clout that are pretty annoyed. I agree there are people out there who trade in numberplates, and I am happy for them to be forced to go and buy the plates at an auction.

But, for people who have no other interest than to keep a number on a car that has been there since it was new, I think this is pretty mean. A lot of them cannot afford it and are single car owners—and this does not apply to me—and yet you are going to force them to hand in the numberplate and then go to an auction and buy it back. I think that is pretty rough and, in my time remaining in this place, I am going to say that that is just not just.

A lot of these people are working class people. They are the government's own constituents, and are regularly writing to me saying, 'Well, we only wanted to keep this number.' I was contacted by a man yesterday who owns a 1950 BSA motorbike which has a three-letter numberplate. He wanted to put it back on the motorbike so he could pass it down to his grandchildren, and was told, 'No, you can't have that number, you've got to go and buy it at auction.' It is likely to sell for \$2,000 or \$3,000. Well, that is just out of the question.

So, I ask the Minister for Transport to please have a look at this. I have written to him several times already, and I think it is quite ridiculous. I just want to say that I am very concerned about what this budget delivers for South Australians. It delivers more debt, which is a huge worry

to me. It delivers a higher deficit, and it is a very deceitful budget, because it is conning the people of South Australia.

As in life, you have to pay for what you spend. We are all paying, and we have to pay this money back. We cannot be paying \$1.1 million a day. I remind the members opposite that you are also going to pay with your electorate come March 2014, because people out there are pretty upset. In all my time here I cannot recall so many people coming up and saying, 'Why aren't you getting anything from the government, why don't you get into them, go in harder. We're sick of these people. This can't be allowed to happen. Why are we spending so much money. Why are we spending the money on the Adelaide Oval, and now we are spending it on the Torrens precinct. What about our roads in country South Australia?' It goes on and on. So, it will be interesting to see what happens in March 2014.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (10:53): I wish to make some comments in the debate on the report on the estimates committees. In particular, I want to comment on the two or three estimates committee sessions I attended, in regard to various portfolios. The first was the Treasury portfolio. Obviously, Treasurer Jack Snelling was the minister on duty there. I just want to make some comments in relation to the way estimates committees are structured.

I was involved in three sessions of the estimates committees. During the session with the Treasury department proper, there was a two-hour allocation for the whole of Treasury, which is generally the most wide-ranging session of the estimates committee, because the Treasury portfolio obviously influences every other portfolio. So, there is often more scope to ask wide-ranging questions. Compare that to the one hour that was allocated to the Public Sector Commissioner. If you look at the number of staff, the budget concerned and the importance of the portfolio, it really was a nonsense of an allocation of time.

Where the Treasury portfolio gets just two hours, the Commissioner for Public Employment gets a one-hour allocation. It was an indication of the way the government has manipulated the estimates committees to try to limit the opportunity for the opposition to raise matters that might be of interest to them and the media.

During the Treasury estimates there were a number of issues that are worthy of comment. The first is the issue of the Ernst & Young reports into the new Royal Adelaide Hospital project. The house might recall that during various ministerial statements, questions to parliament or, indeed, media interviews, the Treasurer has indicated that there were two Ernst & Young reports and that his intention was to put 'all' of the Ernst & Young reports onto the Treasury website.

The opposition has received communications and understands that there are at least three Ernst & Young reports relating to the Royal Adelaide Hospital: the two that have been put on the Treasury website and a third report that is less favourable to the government in terms of whether it was value for money for the taxpayer to actually proceed with the Royal Adelaide Hospital project.

So, we quizzed the Treasurer about the existence of this third report from Ernst & Young, and, indeed, other reports from Ernst & Young. The Treasurer went around the answer by saying that the government had received lots of advice from Ernst & Young but could not release that advice because of commercial-in-confidence reasons, but, coincidentally, could release the two reports that the Treasurer claims favour the government's project by way of the level of risk, the valuation of the risk, and therefore put those on the website.

We will keep pursuing this matter through other processes, but it is crystal clear, from the Treasurer's answer, that the government has received more than the two reports. The opposition understands that the other report is less favourable to the government's claim that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital project is value for money.

It is interesting that the Treasurer indicated to the house that he was willing to put 'all' of the reports on the Treasury website and is now using slightly different language, saying that there are reports and other information received from Ernst & Young that they will call advice. Ultimately, it is at the Treasurer's discretion as to what goes on the public website so that the public can analyse it.

This goes to the central question of: is the Royal Adelaide Hospital project value for money? It was interesting that during the Budget and Finance Committee in another place, and also during the estimates committees, the issue arose of: what set of guidelines for public private partnerships did Treasury use to estimate the value of risk attached to the Royal Adelaide Hospital project?

It came out during those processes that if they used the South Australian government's guidelines for public private partnerships then there was a lower value for the risk associated with the project, meaning that there was a lower value to the risk of the government doing it as a traditional own and build project.

The government, for its own reasons, decided to do the comparison based on Infrastructure Australia guidelines, so not the state guidelines but the national guidelines. Quite conveniently, if you believe the government, that then means that the value for risk was higher, which then favoured the government's case for doing a PPP.

So, the government was not prepared to use its own guidelines (the state level guidelines) but went to the federal level guidelines and ultimately got a valuation for risk that was higher than had they used the lower value of risk under the state guidelines. There are some question marks around this whole issue. What was all of the advice received by government; what was the advice received from Ernst & Young; what reports were received from Ernst & Young; and, indeed, what did all of those reports say, not just the two reports that have been released onto the website? Anyone who reads the *Hansard*, I think, can read between the lines: it is crystal clear that there were more than two reports received by the Treasurer with regard to that issue.

This leads me to the issue of ForestrySA and the forward selling of the forests. It became apparent through a radio interview just days before estimates committees that the government has essentially totally ignored the ForestrySA board. Mr Ross, the chairman of the board, was on ABC radio in Mount Gambier the weekend before estimates committees commenced saying that the board really had not been properly consulted by the government, that indeed the board has written to the Treasurer and other members of cabinet expressing their concern about the regional impact statement that was undertaken into the forestry sale by the government, and they were very concerned that the government had chosen to only give the board five days to look at the regional impact statement before the government actually made its decision.

Having announced this some 18 months to two years ago, they then produce a regional impact statement and give the board less than five days to look at it. The board then writes to the government saying that it is a flawed regional impact statement and then the government proceeds to forward sell the harvesting rights of ForestrySA anyway. The real concern, from ForestrySA's viewpoint, as I understand the interview, was that the ForestrySA board was denied the opportunity to develop a business as usual case versus a what the government proposed case and make that comparison and give some advice to the government.

The ForestrySA board, in one form or other, has been around for decades. That a government would ignore all that corporate knowledge about how to run forests and the economic value of forests and forward dividend projections by denying the ForestrySA board an opportunity to make the comparison between the business as usual case and what is being proposed case, I think is telling on the government. It is telling on the government because it is crystal clear now, following the budget and following the estimates committees, that there is actually no economic case, in essence, to sell the forests.

I agree with the Minister for Forests when he told a public meeting in Mount Gambier that now is not the time to sell forests. The reality is that they are selling the forward harvesting rights of ForestrySA to prop up their budget, to pay down some debt and for no other reason. It is not a huge economic reform as such; it is simply a matter of 'We are overspending; our debt levels are too high. We need to sell an asset to pay down the debt,' so ForestrySA is one of those assets that is being sold.

The other asset that is being sold, of course, is the Lotteries Commission. This is an interesting one because last year then treasurer Kevin Foley's budget was a crisis budget. They totally turned their back on the election promises they had made just months earlier. They promised \$2.5 billion dollars of budget cuts and tax increases to try to get their budget out of trouble. When they did that, Kevin Foley as treasurer and then cabinet did not suggest selling the Lotteries Commission.

They did not suggest selling the Lotteries Commission during that budget, even though it was suggested by the Sustainable Budget Commission. It was considered by the cabinet and rejected. This year Treasurer Snelling takes over, and Treasurer Snelling is on the record as opposing the idea of selling out government assets to pay down debt, but having taken over as Treasurer, suddenly that view has changed and he has decided that somehow this has become a risky asset in the last four or five months. Somehow the Lotteries Commission has become a risky

asset to own. I note that the Western Australian government do not think that; they still have theirs in public ownership.

We asked the Treasurer what were the risks. He really cannot give an explanation as to what are the risks associated with the business of the Lotteries Commission and why the government would seek to sell it. The concern that the public are expressing is simply this: our debt is increasing, our expenses are increasing because of the mismanagement of the government, we sell our forests and our Lotteries Commission, what do we sell next time? The next time the state is in trouble, where does the state go?

The reality is that the government needs to develop budget discipline to control its debt levels and its expenditure levels, and you cannot keep selling assets to prop up your budget. That is exactly what this government is doing, and one of the reasons they are doing it as we have been told during the estimates process is to do with the 2014 election when the new Royal Adelaide Hospital is built—a hospital that is going to cost taxpayers \$1.1 million a day for 30 years. My 18-year-old daughter, when she is older than I am, will still be paying for that hospital. It is an enormously long contract. One of the reasons they are doing this, trying to pay down their debt now, is that after the next election \$2.8 billion worth of debt is to come onto the balance sheet because of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, as a result of that, the government are nervous about their AAA credit rating, so they are trying to pay down some debt to preserve their AAA credit rating.

The government really has not explained its reasons behind the selling of those two assets. Part of the reason that our debt has increased to such a level is that the government has been running operating deficits—that is, they are spending more money than they are getting in through taxation. Given that we are the highest taxing state, that is a significant achievement by the government to be spending more money than it is getting in through taxation.

This year they are looking at a \$263 million deficit over the next 12 months. The last year, just completed, it was well over \$400 million. Two years ago there was also another budget deficit. So, for three out of four years, this government has been running a budget deficit, not on its investing side, although there is certainly a deficit there as well. Put the capital works aside for one minute. This is not a debt that is being run up just on the basis of capital works. This is a debt being run up because the government's operating side—that is, its day-to-day operation of the education department, the health department, the environment department, etc.—is running up \$738 million worth of operating deficit.

As the Minister for Forests told a public meeting in Mount Gambier, this is a government that is borrowing money to pay Public Service wages, and he is quite right. So, that \$738 million, about three quarters of a billion dollars, is going onto the debt level. When you are selling the Lotteries Commission for what industry experts say is about \$350 million to \$400 million, what the government is essentially doing is selling the Lotteries Commission to cover its operating losses. That is essentially what it is doing, and I think the public have every right to be concerned about the state of the budget and the need for the sale of those particular assets.

Take out those assets, and there are not too many left. SA Water is still an income-producing asset, but the state slowly but surely is owning less and less income-producing assets and owning more and more assets that actually cost money to be maintained, and that becomes a budget squeeze. You have less and less income coming into the budget but more and more assets that need expenditure to maintain.

The other issue that was interesting that came up during the budget process was the issue of retention allowances and attraction allowances. The Treasurer says that he is going to negotiate another allowance for the Public Service in exchange for his backflip on the annual leave provisions. You might recall that in last year's budget the government said (all of cabinet agreed) that it was important to rein in the Public Service expenditure, so they cancelled the annual leave provision and gave the Public Service two extra days a year leave in exchange. That was the proposal. However, before that could kick in—it was proposed to kick in in the next 12 months—the government reversed that decision, at a cost to the budget of about \$22 million a year.

The government also moved to change long service leave provisions in the Public Service and, because of the change to long service leave provisions, the government now wants to negotiate another allowance—a retention or attraction allowance. The evidence provided in the committees was that these retention/attraction allowances are already in existence. The interesting one was Mr McCann, the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, who has a number of non-

executives who receive these attraction or retention allowances. If you add those allowances to the salaries of those public servants, they actually go into the executive level range of salaries, but they do not have to give up tenure.

The whole idea of having the executive level range was that, if you wanted to get the highest salary, you had to give up your tenure. What is happening in a whole range of departments is that public servants are being put onto these retention and attraction allowances which push them over the executive level salary range, but they do not have to give up tenure.

When we asked the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment who was monitoring this, the answer was that that was up to the chief executives. In his own section, these allowances had gone on for at least three years and had not been reviewed. They are now about to be reviewed, but no-one is reviewing these retention and attraction allowances across the whole of government. The opposition's understanding from sources within the Public Service is that these allowances go on and on in perpetuity, so the benefit is permanent.

The other issue, of course, is that the government has a target of getting more women into the executive level service. If these women are being paid retention/attraction allowances and not progressing into the executive level service, then it is a form of glass ceiling as far as career development is concerned for those particular public servants.

The other point that is obvious from the estimates committees is the total lack of any support to the business community within this budget. Look at what has happened to South Australia over the recent trading period: we had the largest fall in business confidence in May this year; we had the largest fall in housing finance commitments in the last 12 months; South Australia has the highest youth unemployment rate of all states; we had the largest fall in job advertisements of all states in the last 12 months; South Australia had the lowest proportion of exporting businesses of all states; we had the largest fall in quarterly business investment of all states; and we had the worst quarterly performance in state final demand. And the Treasurer would have all these figures at his fingertips.

With that background, the budget was staggering in that there was simply nothing there for business other than more costs through higher taxes. In relation to taxes generally in the state, the government wants to grab an extra \$1.1 billion in taxation over the next four years, and it is going up at twice the rate of inflation.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:13): I also take this opportunity to say a few words on the estimates process. I attended some of the hearings, and the member for Davenport has very correctly picked up on the total lack of understanding, knowledge or ability to assist the business sector, particularly the small business sector in South Australia. I cannot believe that a government that has been there for just over nine years still has absolutely no idea—apart from the minister for primary industries, I might add—about the business sector. If they listened a bit more to minister O'Brien, they might have a bit more knowledge. However, by continuing to crucify small business in South Australia they are digging themselves into a deeper hole. I totally support what has been said about that by other speakers on our side of the house.

It was with interest that I attended the budget estimates hearing with the Minister for Police last Friday. I actually found, in comparison with some hearings, that minister Foley actually took questions, fielded them to his offsiders, whether it be the acting commissioner or whoever, answered everything, said that it was the opposition's opportunity to ask questions, took it all in his stride and capably answered, whereas some other ministers were totally out of their depth and were unable to answer questions or preceded the questioning by extensive long statements about nothing. One was minister Caica, who was accused at one stage of reading out previous ministers' briefing notes.

To turn to one of the issues under minister Caica's jurisdiction, that being marine parks. The discussions over marine parks and estimates were nothing short of pathetic in my view, and this issue is not going away. It just so happens that I have been given a copy of a letter sent out towards the end of last week, and it has fallen off the back of a truck. It is from the Minister for Environment to Mr Justin Phillips, the Extension Officer of the Gulf St Vincent Prawn Fishery. I will read the letter into *Hansard*, but all I can say about this is that it is a classic case of an incompetent minister signing letters written by his department—in this case I suspect by the head of the marine parks branch—with no understanding of the issue, and it is simply another attempt by the bureaucrats to divide and conquer, keep people separate and then put their own versions of things on it. The letter says:

Dear Mr Phillips,

Thank you for your recent letter regarding stakeholder consultation for South Australia's Marine Parks Program.

The provision of 'preliminary' sanctuary zone scenarios to the Marine Park Local Advisory Groups (MPLAG) and peak stakeholders in mid-November 2010 was the commencement of a six-month opportunity for both MPLAGs and peak stakeholders to bring important local and industry specific information. This parallel process was the result of the clear preference expressed by peak stakeholders that they would not be required to share information and advice to government via the MPLAG process.

An opportunity for peak stakeholders to share their views with MPLAGs was identified between the fourth and fifth round of MPLAG meetings (between mid-February and late April 2011).

Talk about bureaucratic nonsense! It continues:

However, most peak stakeholders, including the SA Marine Parks Management Alliance chose not to take up this opportunity at that time.

It was not anticipated or suggested that peak stakeholders would be asked to review or comment on the final community advice coming from MPLAGs. The MPLAG and peak stakeholder processes were always promoted as being parallel processes.

Why? Because they want to divide and conquer. It continues:

It is my understanding that your sector has provided advice to several MPLAGs and that, as a member of the SA Marine Parks Management Alliance, your association's views will be encompassed in that whole of industry submission. Industry advice on the preferred zoning scenarios for the 19 marine parks would be of great value. I thank you for providing advice through both these avenues offered.

That said, what I was expecting from the alliance—

bureaucratic speak—

and other peak stakeholders at this time, in line with what was requested (and has been provided) by the MPLAGs, was peak stakeholder advice on preferred zoning scenarios for the 19 marine parks in line with the 14 marine parks design principles. Such advice may provide different alternatives to those provided by MPLAGs, and it is this advice I would find of greatest value.

Please be assured that the various advice from both MPLAGs and peak stakeholders will be carefully considered when developing the draft management plans with zoning for the 19 marine parks and accompanying impact statements.

I repeat: what a lot of bureaucratic nonsense! It continues:

Importantly, I intend to give priority consideration to zoning scenarios that are competent and balanced in line with the 14 marine parks design principles.

This is nonsense! Minister Caica would never have written this sort of nonsense—he has just merely signed the letter.

The draft marine park management plans and accompanying impact statements are expected to be released for formal statewide consultation later this year, with the final plans not due to be implemented until mid-2012. Your association will have the opportunity to make a fully informed written submission during the public comment period.

I expect there will be further discussions between the Department—

DENR—

and the SA Marine Parks Management Alliance in developing the draft management plans and impact statements, to ensure that any industry-related government commitments can be met.

For further information, please contact Mr Andrew Burnell, Team Leader, Marine Parks—

DENR, blah blah blah—

I thank you for your continued interest in this matter.

Yours sincerely, Paul Caica, Minister for Environment.

What I am saying is that this is an ongoing debacle overseen by minister Caica. He thinks it is going to go away. I can tell you it is not going to go away. Meanwhile, we have decent people who operate in the sea for a living doing things such as what is in the local *Islander* from Kangaroo Island this week, where Mr Graham Walden and crew on his boat *Tasha's Choice* picked up and dragged back to Kingscote wharf, I understand, several kilometres of rope weighing up to 3 tonnes floating around in the water.

I would say to you, Madam Speaker, and I would say to the house, that if the department for environment wants to do something about the marine environment, instead of running around trying to stop everybody doing everything they should get off their backsides and get out and do what the fishing industry is doing for the sea—which is a lot, instead of absolutely nothing, which minister Caica's department is doing. I think it is outrageous—absolutely outrageous! This would have cost the Walden family a small fortune in towing and bringing this rope out of the sea, a marine hazard. They are actually doing something about the environment, not just continuing to talk about it. I rest my case on that.

Let me tell you, I was at a meeting in Myponga on Monday night. It was actually a Lions meeting, but there were people there involved with the marine parks from the community point of view, and their anger is only getting greater. It is not going away, it is getting greater and greater and greater, and their frustrations are leading them to boiling point on this. It is simply not good enough. The minister has allowed this out-of-control department to keep going on this marine parks process. He is not listening. He is totally incompetent on this matter and his department is out of control.

On top of that, they had a \$15,000 stand at the Boat Show, manned for the days that it operated; there were six to eight staff down there all day, every day, promoting the marine parks plan. I actually ran into a few people from my electorate, from the Fleurieu and also some from Kangaroo Island. They went up there and they just walked away shaking their heads.

This is the sort of nonsense that continues to go on—\$15,000 worth of taxpayers' money to promote this flawed marine parks process at the Boat Show! They had an EPA stand there as well, part of it, but I don't think anyone was going to that. The general run-of-the-mill community people there, the fishing people that were there, recreational fishing people that were there, left me in no doubt as to what they thought of the government's absolute waste of money being expended on that Boat Show promotion by minister Caica's out-of-control department.

Let me also turn to the current debacle in relation to the school buses that operate across the state, and the contract services. I think my colleague, the member for Goyder, first alerted us to this some 18 months ago, possibly—18 months, two years ago—and we had meetings with the people who operate the buses—

Mr Griffiths: June last year.

Mr PENGILLY: June last year, thank you—12 months ago. We had meetings and have met with the bus operators, and it is an absolute tragedy what is now happening to small businesses that operate school bus contracts around South Australia. How minister Weatherill can sleep at night while this nonsense goes on, I do not know. If this is an example of what we would get if Mr Weatherill was premier, I shake my head in disbelief. How on earth you can allow small business to be crucified once again, bring in big interstate operators and crawl all over the top of local small operators that are providing local jobs, providing food on the table for families, and providing an honest and good service to local communities that work in tandem with the DECS buses that operate in some places, I do not know.

Christine Rufus, from Rufus Bus & Coach, says, 'It's very disappointing how callously they've treated us.' I quote that from this week's issue of the Victor Harbor *Times*. I also read into *Hansard* the editorial in the Victor Harbor *Times* this week, which states:

School bus decision not fair. The decision made by the state government to hand the school bus contracts over to a Victorian business is unfair, not only because [South Australia] is losing business, but in the way the situation has been handled.

The schools are in a state of confusion and don't know who will be providing their services, and the smaller bus charters themselves were left in the dark for a vast amount of time.

In this period of hard economic times supporting local businesses has never been more important. For the state government to take business away from country towns like this is unthinkable. More explanation needs to be given as to why this decision was made.

I will tell you why in a minute, Madam Speaker. The editorial goes on to say:

Eastern Fleurieu School in Strathalbyn—

in the member for Heysen's electorate—

has just been given a major funding boost in the latest state budget for upgrades to the campus, a reflection that the school is in a positive position for continued growth into the future.

So why then take away from a local business an increased need for its services? Yes, the actual bus service will still remain and children will still be able to access bus routes to and from school but the Victorian company is the one that will benefit from the growth.

This is not about rivalry between states; this is about looking after small family owned businesses that may now close because of this decision. The tender process needs to be reconsidered before more damage is done.

I compliment *The Times* newspaper on that article. They have picked up the issue and run with it. I say to the house and minister Weatherill: have a great big rethink on this matter. You have stuffed it up, you have stuffed it up properly, and what has happened is an embarrassment to the government. It shows that the minister has been totally run over by his bureaucrats and that the Treasurer has had his evil way in crucifying, even further, small business in South Australia.

This mob does not care what they do to ordinary South Australians. They could not care less. We had a good example of that yesterday in the Public Works Committee where there was an absolutely disgraceful exhibition of bullying and arrogance by this Rann Labor government when they tried to ram through \$350 million worth of state government expenditure in just on an hour. They rammed it through. They did not even follow due process.

At the end of a hearing in the Public Works Committee, the witnesses leave and then you resume the meeting to have further discussion and move any motions. Vini Ciccarello, of blessed memory, would never have allowed what happened yesterday to happen. She was fair and not driven by factions. What happened yesterday was outrageous, it was a disgrace, and it is a blight on this government that will not go away.

The poor old taxpayers are picking up the bill for \$350 million worth of expenditure on the Convention Centre, yet that very committee was put in place after they stuffed up the State Bank. The Public Works Committee was reformed to take scrutiny of public expenditure, but it was cut short by this arrogant, self-serving government with union hacks responding to their right faction mates to jam things through.

There has not been proper exposure. You saw what happened on television last night, and I tell you what: it has got a long way to go, Madam Speaker. If the government thinks it is going to get away with this just because it has the numbers, it is not going to get away with it, let me tell you. It is a blight on the government.

Mrs Vlahos interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Taylor pokes her head up. I suggest if she wants to make a comment she gets back to her seat, in her proper place, because she was the architect of the disgraceful conduct yesterday. If she wants to stick her head up, I will knock it off gladly, trust me. It was absolutely outrageous. She has been here two minutes and thinks she knows it all.

Vini Ciccarello, the former member for Norwood, was an exceptionally good chairman, and we had an exceptionally good committee where there was widespread debate; matters were discussed and debated, and it was all taken in the way it should have been taken, and proper scrutiny was taken. We will hear more of that one, Madam Speaker, let me tell you.

I go on to talk about the hearing with the Minister for Families and Communities. If there was ever a minister who was totally out of her depth, it is the Minister for Families and Communities. She has no idea whatsoever. She cannot answer questions without arcing up. She probably gets a bit of encouragement to get arced up, from time to time, I might add. However, she cannot answer questions off the cuff without consulting at every opportunity with her officers around her and her staff and getting something to read out. It was a disgrace. It was several hours of comedy with the Minister for Families and Communities.

If it was not so serious it would have been laughable. This is the government that has sold off housing trust properties everywhere. I heard the minister this morning responding to the Hon. Mr Brokenshire from another place, accusing him of being a cabinet minister in a government that had sold off thousands of houses. The difference was that when the former government did sell off housing trust properties, many of them were turned into community housing places; the money was turned over and put into that. Not this lot. This government would sell its grandmother if necessary.

This government has got itself into an unholy damn mess by over-expenditure and it has no idea how to get out of it. We have a Treasurer now who desperately needs training wheels. I say bring back Kevin Foley; at least you could deal with the fellow; at least he had an understanding of what he was doing. The current Treasurer and the budget he delivered was just a

joke—it was an absolute joke. Our debt is soaring and going back to unbelievable levels. My children and their children and their children's children are going to be paying off this debt.

As the minister for primary industries correctly said, we should not be selling off the forests. It is madness, absolute madness. It will get away with it because it gets about two votes in the South-East at the best of times, and that is at a good election. It will get even less after this lot.

All its allies in the trade union movement come out and talk the talk but they do not walk the walk when it comes time to making tough decisions. There is no clearer example of that than some of the unions based in the city that deal with the Public Service. They come along and piddle in the opposition's ears and tell them sweet nothings and then they go away, and when the crunch comes they side with the government. You know where all the money will come from for the ALP in the next election: it will come from those very unions that stand out on the steps and criticise the government now, but come election time they will all go into a hole and then come out and support the government.

The estimates process, once again, exposed seriously flawed policies of the Rann Labor government and exposed seriously flawed ministers who were incompetent. It also brought to light the absolutely devastating impact this is having on rural and regional South Australia in relation to things like school buses, marine parks and everything else which I have talked about and which I am sure other members will talk about or have talked about.

I am filled with horror at the prospect of another 2½ years of this government. It is absolutely appalling where this state is going to end up. In tandem with this debacle, we have in Canberra a Prime Minister who would not know poop from clay, quite frankly. The only thing that the Prime Minister has in common with Pinocchio is that Pinocchio never told quite as many lies as Prime Minister Gillard—that is about the only difference.

I am concerned about the future of this state and I am concerned about the future of this nation under the Labor Party regime in various states. We are slowly getting rid of them but I do not think South Australia can wait another 2½ years for a change of government. We need a change of government in this state before the people rise up in absolute anger over issues such as marine parks.

Last night I was interested to hear that the federal minister has reversed the ban on the live cattle trade. What an absolutely stupid decision that was, made in haste without thinking through the consequences. Quite clearly, the federal government has been belted around the ears very severely. The next poll will be even worse for the Prime Minister, and I hope the next one is even worse for the state government.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:34): I rise to make my contribution to the Appropriation Bill and the conclusion of estimates. I, too, am dismayed, as is the member for Finniss and other members on this side of the house, at the scant regard that this government has for South Australian businesses and constituents. As a regional member of this state parliament, I find it horrifying that, with a \$9.1 billion infrastructure spend this government has in place, very, very little—only the dregs of that—will make it into regional areas.

We have a government that barely recognises regional areas. I certainly acknowledge the Speaker and her seat of Giles; she will bring some part of relevance of the regions to a government that otherwise has no focus outside Gepps Cross and Glen Osmond, because all this government is concerned about are votes. They look at the seats and they work out whether they will even worry about standing in so-called safer Liberal seats or they will just run people who are in university and do not even know which part of South Australia the seat is.

It is a real issue for democracy in this state and how a state is run when they are only governing for the city, for the urban areas of this state. I reflect on one of my portfolios, agriculture, which has taken a real hit with the gross over-spending of this state. I will go back to the budget that was laid down last year just for a bit of historical reference compared to what has happened with this year's budget.

We saw primary industries out of the agriculture section losing 179 jobs, and this was on top of 100-odd jobs from the year before; and \$80 million worth of cuts coming out of primary industries over four years. We see Rural Solutions South Australia losing \$12 million over four years, and we are still in part of that budget cycle with those cuts out of Rural Solutions. It is interesting, because the government had a problem with its so-called targeted voluntary separation packages within Rural Solutions.

I asked the question about what seemed to me to be 27 people who had been hired but who were not accounted for. One adviser (and I will not use his name; I will protect the adviser because they are doing their best), when I pushed the questioning in estimates about the calculation of the 27 TVSPs, said, 'Well, it was a miscalculation,' and that they needed those staff for the extra work that needed to be done through Rural Solutions.' But then the minister came back in response to another question a couple of minutes later and said, 'No, it wasn't a miscalculation.'

So I am not sure whether or not it was a miscalculation, but what we found out during the estimates process was that 27 targeted people actually were needed to do the vital extension work and program work that Rural Solutions does for primary industries in this state, and the government is in a real hole as to whether or not they need these people. They just seem to pick numbers out and decide, 'Well, we'll cut them out here, we'll cut them out there,' and do not even have a full hand on the programs that are on the way.

We see SARDI's research cutbacks, supposedly to save \$8 million over four years. Out of the budget line this year we see a direct line that says that \$2.7 million is to come out of SARDI research. My understanding is that SARDI owns all these facilities, which includes the facilities at the Minnipa Agriculture Centre, over on Eyre Peninsula, which does great work in dryland farming. We have the Waikerie Inland Aquaculture Centre up in the Riverland, and we have other centres. We have the West Beach marine facility that does great work in the fisheries and aquaculture fields. There is another aquaculture facility down at Mount Gambier. We have the Struan Research Centre, Turretfield and Kybybolite.

I note Flaxley is still listed on the SARDI website, but the dairy herd from Flaxley has been sold off, and we are still awaiting to see the outcome of the sale of that land at Flaxley. What bothers me is that, when I asked the question about what specific programs or what specific scientists would be cut with the \$2.7 million from vital research and development for the agriculture and fisheries and aquaculture sectors of this state, the government and the minister indicated that they would have to come back to me.

That is not good enough because I am sure on this budget line the minister must have said, 'This needs to go in as part of our \$8 million slashing of research and development funding for agriculture.' He would have put it up to the Treasurer, and there it is, but there is no substance to show where these cuts are going to be made. I note that Dr Pauline Mooney, Chief Executive of SARDI, has also expressed her disquiet and disgust at these cuts, and she is certainly concerned, as am I, about where research and development are heading in this state.

I am concerned that with these deeps cuts we may not have a research entity in this state, and that would be a very great shame with the outcomes that have been developed over time in the fields of fisheries, aquaculture and agriculture. I also asked questions on the SARDI research line about where we were with the SARDI-owned facilities that could end up with Adelaide university because the government obviously wants to divest itself of any responsibility of the primary industries of this state.

The government is quite happy to take all the kudos, and you would have thought they made it rain to get the 10.4 million tonnes of grain that contributed about \$3.5 billion to the economy of this state, but I do not think that this Labor government with its spin can even go that far. The government is quite happy to take the results of the sector that provides the most income of any single sector in this state—still well ahead of mining, which is still going through a major exploration phase, before the potential mining boom.

I would also like to talk about commercial fishing and aquaculture, where we see that more cost recovery will happen as the government claws away at the good businesspeople of this state, making a good income and building their businesses. These people rely on some of the research I was talking about previously. There is the biosecurity cost recovery, where the government introduced Property Identification Codes, but they have not been game enough to introduce their biosecurity levy because I think they will have a fight.

I think they will recover something like \$8 million through that levy, which was to be introduced this year but has been put off by 12 months. The government is saying that it wants to go out and consult. Well, that might be a first. I can assure you that industry does not take kindly to being hit time and again for different fees and charges, and there will be a strong debate around that budgetary measure when the legislation is introduced. I believe it has to come in under amendments to the Livestock Act.

While I am talking about issues I am responsible for, I want to talk about the forward sale of forests. The government has still not been game to give us the actual number, but I note that the shadow treasurer (the member for Davenport) identified a \$682 million hole in the budget where he thinks (and I think he is pretty right) the number they may get for the forward sale of forests comes in. The government has a real issue. Gunns has just sold some forestry assets in the South-East—

Mr Pengilly: Given them away.

Mr PEDERICK: —given them away, says the member for Finniss. They went for something like under 40 per cent of their value, so you have to wonder what is happening here. It has been indicated to me that potential forestry buyers are swarming over the South-East looking to pick up a bargain. Someone has picked up Gunns' assets, and someone can see the potential of picking up 111 years of forward rotations of timber—three rotations—and getting a bargain out of it. I am still stunned by how this government thinks, as it has indicated, that it can put certain controls in some contract agreements to guarantee that that timber will be sawn in the South-East of this state, as well as timber that comes out of Victoria on ForestrySA plantation land.

The government is trying to believe its own spin by saying, 'If the forestry plantation expands, then our mills will be fine.' There is no guarantee of that. There is no guarantee that the forests will expand, because the government has not been spending the money that it has budgeted for as far as expansion of the forestry estate. If there is no confidence in the industry and the mills go before we see the expansion (because obviously timber is a long-term asset and takes a long time—about 37 years—to get to full growth) how is there any guarantee that any mills will be in place?

I will go through the *Hansard* because I find it quite interesting. I asked a question regarding industry development and referred to the South Australian Forestry Industry Strategy through engagement with forest industry stakeholders. On the subject of engagement with forest industry stakeholders, we learn from the Treasurer's response to a question in Estimates A on 29 June 2011 that certain information about the forward sale proposal was not shared with ForestrySA as it was considered to be commercial in confidence. My question to the minister was:

...does the government not trust its own board to treat such information with absolute confidentiality?

The minister responded:

I expect to receive the South Australian Forest Industry Strategy within a fortnight. My understanding is that it has been developed with wide engagement with forestry industry stakeholders. I have just been advised that some 428 copies of the draft strategy were distributed. There were 21 media interviews and articles, which obviously would have gone to other individuals and businesses with an interest in the industry. There were seven stakeholder forums involving more than 100 people, and 21 submissions were received. I have been advised that I will receive the final strategy within the fortnight, and it is then my intention to consult further on the key recommendations.

Then I responded:

You have not answered the question, minister. Regarding the forward sale of the three rotations, certain information was not shared with the ForestrySA board, and I am wondering whether the government does not trust its own board to keep things in confidence.

The minister replied:

Member for Hammond, you referred to a dot point that referred to the forest industry strategy and engagement with forestry industry stakeholders, and I have answered the question.

I responded:

I do not think you have but it sounds as though that it is all we are going to get. It sounds like the ForestrySA board is out in the wind. How can the government explain its decision not to share the detailed financial information and modelling of the forward sale proposal of three rotations of forestry in the South-East with the ForestrySA board?

The minister responded—I found this quite amazing and I hope the house takes note:

That is not a budget line within my portfolio area. It is one that sits squarely within the budget responsibilities of the Treasurer and I thought the Treasurer made himself available through this process to answer any questions on the forward sale.

Here we have the Minister for Forests, essentially, saying he is not responsible for ForestrySA. I do not think the minister knows the wood from the trees! I responded:

Surely, minister, referring to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, page 199, Program 4: Forestry Policy, as far as forestry policy, I would have thought the ForestrySA board would have something to do with the Minister for Forests.

Then the minister said:

They do—

So he has had a revelation—

in the sense that it manages and advises within the policy settings. The policy settings are in the process of being determined, in large part by the round table. Once they are determined, they will inform the management practices of ForestrySA and the advice that will be given to me.

I responded:

A policy decision of forward selling three rotations of forest, you do not think that is a policy decision that ForestrySA should be involved with?

The answer was:

It is a policy decision that is made by government.

I further responded:

Obviously, as the Minister for Forests, you are right in the thick of the forest, I would think with regard to this matter, and I would have thought it would be appropriate that ForestrySA's opinion was sought on the advisability of the forward sale. I am advised that their opinion was not sought before the decision to sell was announced. Can you clarify that one way or the other, minister?

The minister's final response on that line of questioning was:

I have made the comment that it is not a budget line for which I have responsibility. It falls squarely within the Treasurer's ambit of responsibilities. He has given evidence and I think these issues may have been canvassed. If they were not, that was a decision the opposition made at the time. We are talking about my budget lines, areas over which I ultimately have responsibility, and that is not one of them.

So, that shows the depth that ministers will go to to dodge answering questions in estimates. We saw it right through the program. There are issues we have where ministers will not take responsibility for their portfolio areas.

Just on the issue of the forward sale of forests, I know that the ForestrySA board is ropeable about not being consulted or acknowledged in the whole process of going ahead with the forward sale. I would have thought they would have been the prime group to consult on this issue.

The member for Finnis gave a very good summing up of the marine parks debacle in this state. I certainly questioned the Minister for Fisheries and went through a detailed address of how well fisheries are managed under the Fisheries Management Act. I asked a question around, 'Do you actually acknowledge that you manage them and will the department of environment be taking over management with their planned marine parks that they want to instil on the people of this state?' He did indicate that yes, he was still going to be in charge and the environment minister will not be.

Well, I hope they get it sorted out because it is certainly clear in my head that the environment minister, who says he is a keen fisherman, wants to stuff everyone else's fishing capabilities up by imposing these marine parks on the best-managed fishery in the world. The minister for fisheries—and it is not often I agree with him but I do on this one—has actually indicated in this house that they are the best-managed fisheries in the world. Why do we need this whole debacle where we will see people in tinnies going six or seven kilometres offshore to get outside a marine park zone, and then we will be sending the search parties out to find them? Sadly, we may lose people because of this.

Just quickly, I too am concerned with issues around school bus contracts. We have seen LinkSA come in with its parent company from Queensland. They are taking over family-run bus operations right throughout South Australia. From what I have heard, some of these operations have buses that are being fitted out as I speak, ready to go on with what they thought were continuing contracts. But no, alas, these people with the local knowledge, who have put money into communities and regional communities for decades, are being overlooked for someone coming in over the top of them. I hope this government does not go looking in a few years time and say, 'Hang on, we need some buses for tourist outlets,' or 'We need some buses for education,' and find out they have sent all these people broke and they have left the state to find their wealth somewhere else.

We see the same issue with the government's regard for country health. I note that the Keith hospital debacle still has not been dealt with. The Keith hospital is 100 kilometres south of where I live at Coomandook. It is a vital hospital on the Dukes Highway, connecting to the Riddoch

Highway. It is just a shame that this government does not recognise what goes on in regional areas, and that includes the regional road network that needs hundreds of millions of dollars of upgrades to get back on track.

Just finally, I just hope it is not the irrigators of this state who have to take the hit for the \$228 million that the commonwealth has pledged for the desal plant because the Minister for Water cannot work out who has to quantify for that water to come from the commonwealth, to look like we are drawing less water off the Murray.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (11:54): After seeing what the Labor government has done so far by adopting Liberal policies and visions for the future of South Australia, I am slightly hesitant to hand over any more ideas. If you look at the track record, the vision is adopted, distorted and left to the taxpayer to rescue.

Let us first look at what happened with the desalination plant concept. The desal plant was brought up by the Liberal Party as part of a holistic plan to secure our water for the future. The Liberal plan also included stormwater and storage. All through the drought, one of the worst in the state's history, the desal was talked down by the Labor government, and they sat on their hands and told people to pray for rain. Then, surprise, surprise, after a few alterations, a desal became the government's only water security plan.

They unnecessarily doubled the size of the desalination plant, paid a premium to rush it through to fit their political agenda, and they have had a lot of safety issues and even deaths associated with the project. We now have an over-budget, over-time desal plant that has to run even if we do not need the water. We also do not have any new storage for the water so, in theory, if it keeps raining, we could be sending our most expensive water ever out to sea.

It is important to note that, since the announcement of the desalination plant, water bills in South Australia have increased by 16 per cent, 21 per cent, 25 per cent, and now, this year, 40 per cent. Water is an essential item and a cost that cannot be avoided, especially as the supply cost is very high and the smallest amount of use is at the highest price. My electorate office is constantly receiving letters regarding the price of water and electricity every day from angry people who cannot afford these price rises.

The Liberals had a great plan to bring football to the city. The Labor government said the home of football was at AAMI Stadium and talked down the idea of a purpose-built city stadium. After seeing how popular the purpose-built stadium was, the government decided it had better do something and cobbled together the Adelaide Oval idea. As we can see, this idea is still being developed as more and more issues arise.

First, it was \$450 million and not a penny more, then the deputy premier decided to generously offer taxpayers' money to pay for the \$85 million SACA debt, even though SACA was sure they could pay for it themselves. Then it was \$535 million, plus \$40 million for a bridge that can be hidden in the figure for the Convention Centre, and no provision has been made for parking, other than on the Parklands and in the streets of North Adelaide. We also know now that, even five rows from the back of the new stadium stand, people get wet. The new building requires extra toilets and a media centre to be added for AFL football to be filmed, and now the lights have to be lifted due to the roof line. When will the expenses ever end?

Besides the costs, which are increasing every week, the government is trying to take control of the whole area away from the Adelaide City Council and give it to the privately-owned commercial business SMA. These are the Parklands owned by the people of South Australia and held in trust by the Adelaide City Council. They are also nationally heritage listed, which does not seem to matter at all.

This brings me to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This time the government came up with the idea of the Marjorie Jackson-Nelson hospital on the contaminated rail yards first. The Liberal Party then investigated the advantage of using the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is collocated with the University of Adelaide's medical school, the Hanson Research Centre and the IMVS. We also looked at making use of the award-winning burns unit, the recently upgraded emergency area, the therapeutic Botanic Garden surroundings, and the space available on the existing site.

The Liberal plan was to cost \$1 billion. The government plan was to cost \$1.7 billion. This went to \$1.8 billion and now is up to \$2.7 billion before they have even started. This is a poorly-located hospital, being at a major intersection of North Terrace, West Terrace and Port Road. Every ambulance that enters will hold up traffic in all directions, causing gridlock. There are also

questions over whether emergency helicopters can land, as the hospital is in a flight path. This is also a poor use of prime riverfront land.

The Adelaide High School is another cobbled together policy on the run to try to counter the popularity of the Liberal policy to build a public high school at the Bowden Urban Village, formerly the Gerard Industries Clipsal site. In a last-ditch attempt to get votes in the marginal seats, \$60 million was offered to build on four different high schools, including Adelaide High School. The promise was that it would expand the area to Prospect and Walkerville, it would not encroach on the Parklands, and it would add an extra 250 students. Currently, by the benchmarks, Adelaide High School is already 200 students over capacity.

When I questioned the minister, both at the governing council meeting and in estimates, he maintained that it will expand by 250 students but would not confirm whether that means they are adding space for 450 students, to account for the 200 they are already over plus an extra 250 students, or whether it just an extra 50 places, to account for the 200 they are already over plus 50 more. He also cannot confirm any expansion of the zone, so we still do not know whether students from Walkerville, Prospect, Fitzroy and Medindie can even access the school.

Out of the five plans that were put forward to the governing council (of which I am a member), four encroached on the Parklands and one had heritage implications. The second of our two choices was chosen and it almost entirely covers the Parklands, so it is completely unsuitable and does not account for the 400 or more people who, every year, try to get into Adelaide High School, let alone the expected 3,500 extra residents who are expected to move into the Bowden Urban Village, as well as the increase in population of the city expected under the government's 30-year plan.

This brings me to the Convention Centre. Yesterday in the Public Works Committee it was confirmed that the Labor government approached the Convention Centre regarding an expansion almost six months after the Liberal Party had released its policy paper on redeveloping the centre. That is just another example of Labor following Liberal's initiatives. Let us hope that they do not mess this one up and go over budget and over time, as they have with every other project.

The last comments I want to make are regarding business. Having been in business for 16½ years, I think the last 1½ to two years have been the worst economic market for small business that I have ever seen. In my own electorate, on Prospect Road about 12 to 13 businesses have gone under in the last six months; some have moved because they are not doing any trade in the area, but most of them have actually closed.

The cost of rent is one of the high costs, which can also be attributed to the high cost of land tax. This state is very uncompetitive with its land taxes, payroll taxes, and all the red tape involved in running a business. We have a national wage rate so it is no cheaper to employ staff, yet our overheads are higher, and the population is lower so turnover is lower. Why would anyone start a business in Adelaide? We really need to look at what we can do to help businesses survive.

I note that the minister, in one of the estimates committees, was trying to tell me that BECs are the same as Business SA. Again, having been a member of Business SA for several years and having also used the facilities of the Business Enterprise Centres, that is like saying that TAFE is the same as a university. Yes, they both provide tertiary education, so, yes, BECs and Business SA are both available to small business. However, for a very small business it is a lot easier, psychologically, to ring the BECs. They are less formidable, you do not have to pay a \$400 plus fee to be a member, you can just go in off the street and you can call at any time. The service is not the same as Business SA and, whilst Business SA is a fantastic group, I think the BECs provide an essential service and should have state funding reinstated.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:03): I want to quickly talk about what I have been involved with over the last week; in fact, my second estimates. There were a couple of highlights for me—or lowlights, whichever way you like to look at it—and one in particular was with regard to health. In examining the health budget, it is obvious that it is a huge portfolio. It is probably one of the most important areas for policymakers and constituents alike, without a doubt, and that is becoming obvious.

One part of the health budget that particularly interests me relates to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. I have spoken about this scheme many times in this place because it is hugely important to people in my electorate and in regional South Australia more broadly, and I do not think there is any more glaring example of this government's neglect of the regions than its neglect

of this particular scheme. I am very disappointed that this government has been unable to make significant levels of funding available for the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS).

Unfortunately, there has been no increase in funding for this particular scheme since 2001, i.e., the life of this government. Do you know, Madam Speaker, that patients who need to travel to Adelaide to seek specialist help for medical issues are reimbursed just \$30 a day for their accommodation? Now, I do not know of anywhere you can stay in Adelaide for just \$30 a day; in fact, the most basic room costs about \$90 a day, and more.

These levels of funding continue at a really rather low rate, and that is despite having a health budget of roughly \$4.7 billion, according to the health minister, and the overruns that occur in health. I will argue that it demonstrates to me that the government has many priorities wrong in its health budget and, in fact, has lost control of its health budget in many ways. I implore the health minister and the government to reassess the health needs of regional South Australia and acknowledge the importance of the PAT Scheme and make some long overdue changes to it.

Country health services more generally, I believe, need to be a priority of federal and state governments. Capital works and upgrades in regional South Australia are very welcome, and we are seeing some of those in both Ceduna and Port Lincoln; but it is critical that we have the doctors and nurses to provide front-line services in these areas. We desperately need a practical scheme with which to attract GPs and other health professionals into the country, to attract them there, to encourage them to set up practice, do business, raise a family and stay; it is doable. I am sure there is a constructive way to do this. I think it just needs some lateral thinking from the government.

Next on the list is education. I am going to stick with the big issues this particular day. I was disappointed and somewhat surprised by some of the answers provided by the Minister for Education in response to a question I asked in the estimates process. The minister very kindly visited EP quite recently, and he quite rightly pointed out that \$4 million had been granted to the Cleve Area School. I am sure that they, and myself, are very grateful for that. But I did ask the Minister for Education a question about capital investment generally, particularly capital works from high schools.

My question focused on a \$60 million grant in capital works funding, which went to a number of city high schools between them. I asked whether these schools had capital works submissions lodged at the time of the funding announcement. Unfortunately, I did not believe the minister provided a satisfactory answer, because he was not aware and he was not in the portfolio at the time. He also made a curious remark about the election trumping any such submission. I believe a great many schools that had lodged submissions would be disappointed with his answer, and the uncertainties surrounding the process unfortunately has not been explained sufficiently.

In my electorate of Flinders there are a great many schools which are crying out for upgrades of this nature, so the minister needs to reassure them that the proper processes are in place and that they are not denied funding because of an election pledge trumping the proper funding procedure. I will continue to talk with the minister about a couple of projects in particular that he is aware of in the seat of Flinders.

As a number of my colleagues have done previously, I would like to talk about primary industries, agriculture, food and fisheries and their importance to the state's economy and the neglect that they have been shown in the state budget. The estimates process revealed some disappointing details, unfortunately, about the cuts to the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI)—this is cuts to research and development (R&D), to research expenditure. It is incredibly short-sighted.

The government only yesterday was spruiking the value of our exports in the last financial year, and a big part of that came from primary production and a record state crop. One of the reasons we have been able to achieve such production figures is because R&D in this state in the past has been good, expenditure into that area has been appropriate, and the results have been extraordinary. We have seen that out in the field in increased yields, better farming and aquaculture techniques and developments in fishing.

These developments cannot take place unless appropriate research is done, with extension of that research into the public domain. Some of the cuts are hugely disappointing because they will severely compromise the ability of the research to be done and extended. It is such an important industry to this state's economic prosperity, as was highlighted by the government only yesterday.

Part of the PIRSA brief is to be in charge of biosecurity. We have had some negotiations with the minister and his department about the two quarantine stations that are permanently in place, one in Ceduna, in the electorate of Flinders, and the other at Yamba. After considerable lobbying and effort by myself and a number of my colleagues, we have been able to ensure that the nightshift at both Yamba and Ceduna remain in place. We could not see for the life of us how the saving of 3½ full-time equivalents would, in any way, enhance our quarantine and fruit fly free status in this state.

I understand that Biosecurity SA is now considering a possible shift of the operations carried out at Ceduna to the South Australian-Western Australian border. It is looking at a joint operation with the Western Australian Department of Agriculture and Food. This sounds all very good (and I understand that investigations are ongoing), but I can say that this is causing a great deal of angst amongst the staff at Ceduna. I believe there are a number of issues that have not been given appropriate consideration in terms of shifting the current operations out to the border. I think the answers provided in relation to these issues do not give any certainty to those people who are operating at Ceduna.

Unfortunately, the minister's non-committal answers regarding these arrangements warrant greater scrutiny and, certainly, we as an opposition will be endeavouring to get some straight answers about this situation. As I said before, what price do we put on protection? I have talked already today about attracting professional staff into the regions and keeping there. The difficulty with placing a quarantine station on the border, at the Border Village, will always be attracting and retaining staff.

In fact, I visited the Border Village (the electorate of Flinders extends right out to the Western Australian border) some months ago with my wife and a couple of friends, and it became very evident that people are out there for a short time only. It does nothing to satisfy those who are currently working on the quarantine station in Ceduna—people who have their family life in place in Ceduna and who have kids at school and family members who are working—and enjoy the convenience of living in a regional service centre, with all of the services required by families.

I will now touch briefly on mining. It is interesting to note the overblown rhetoric on mining in this state. This could not be highlighted better than by the fact that, as I understand it, there are now fewer people employed in mining in South Australia than there were in 1985. I believe that Eyre Peninsula could well contribute significantly to this state's potential mining future but, unfortunately, until we have a government that can actually deliver, instead of merely spruiking the mining boom that is yet to occur, that potential remains locked away.

The former treasurer, Kevin Foley, once described opening statements as gratuitous and boring, and I think that says a great deal about the quality of this government, because what I saw last week was that many ministers opted to make lengthy opening statements. Unfortunately, the most glaring example for me was when the Minister for Mineral Resources Development said, 'I will try to be brief in my opening statement,' and then proceeded to speak for 20 minutes.

That particular minister is also the Minister for Small Business, and he said during estimates, 'It is not the government's job to make businesses succeed.' That is true; I agree with him, but this was said in the context of the removal of funding for Business Enterprise Centres (BECs). It is my belief that it is the role of government to provide a framework in which businesses can thrive and I think these comments reveal, unfortunately, that this government does not really care about whether or not small businesses succeed.

There was no apology for the funding cuts to the BECs, and this just shows the attitude of a Labor government towards small business. It is the backbone of this state's economy—we say that time and time again to no avail. I firmly believe that the hurdles and the regulations that small businesses are confronted with in this state is making it more and more difficult for small business to do business and to succeed. That framework needs to be a good framework; it needs to be an essential framework in which businesses can function efficiently and effectively in order to do well and thrive.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (12:17): I am pleased to make a contribution to the debate in relation to the Appropriation Bill. I had the pleasure of being involved in seven committees in total, and having responsibility, if you like, for four of the committees in relation to the opposition: State/Local Government Relations, Volunteers, Emergency Services and Road Safety. I would like to make some remarks, as other members have done, concerning the estimates committees' process.

I think we do need to look at some modifications in the process. This business of having to sign in and out when the members comprising the committees change is somewhat archaic. I know a lot of what we do here is based on tradition, and tradition is an important part of the institution of parliament; however, I think we could look at streamlining the process concerning some of the procedural matters of the estimates committees.

Speaking in relation to the committees for which I was responsible, the first one we actually dealt with was State/Local Government Relations. Our line of questions to the newly-appointed minister, Hon. Russell Wortley, mainly focused on the Burnside council investigation. I have to say that it was somewhat disappointing that the minister refused to answer any of the questions that we put to him concerning the Burnside council investigation.

The minister said the reason for this was that he was going to make a ministerial statement in the parliament, which we all know was made yesterday in the other place. I understand that the minister is newly appointed and has only been in the job for about a week or so, but he sat in that chamber for the entire time the previous minister (minister Gago) had responsibility for the Burnside council investigation, so I would have thought—

Mr Pengilly: Three ministers back.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, well they had four ministers in about four months for State/Local Government Relations, which I think says a fair bit about the current state of the government. Putting that to one side, the current Minister for State/Local Government Relations sat in the other place for the entirety of the parliamentary process, if you like, concerning the Burnside council investigation that had been grossly mismanaged by the previous minister, the Hon. Gago.

So, we did not get any answers to the questions that we put forward. However, fast forward a week or so, and the minister has made a statement in the other place yesterday saying that they are going to scrap the Burnside council investigation and subsequent report. This matter could not have been more mismanaged if the government had put its mind to it; if it tried any harder the process could not be more mismanaged.

We have a bill of close to \$2 million and what do we have for our money? Nothing. The inquiry is ceasing. The report is going to be buried forever. The FOI restrictions are not going to be lifted. So, we have this shroud of secrecy still encompassing this whole Burnside council investigation matter.

It is a staggering waste of taxpayers' and ratepayers' money. As I said, the estimated cost is, I think, well above \$1.5 million, nearing \$2 million. The minister said in his statement yesterday that it is in the public interest for the inquiry not to proceed. I make this point, that I would like to know on what basis the minister makes that statement, given the fact that it is in direct contradiction to the Supreme Court judgement that was handed down only a week or so ago. I am happy to quote to the house from that judgement. It is in two parts of that judgement, and I will read both of them out for the benefit of the house. He says:

It is in the public interest that Mr MacPherson complete his inquiry and report to the minister as soon as practicable on matters within the scope of the terms of reference as limited by the court.

Then in another paragraph he states:

Mr MacPherson should now complete his inquiry and report to the minister as soon as practicable.

We had a radio interview about an hour or so ago and the minister says that I am selectively quoting from the judgement. I am quoting some extremely pertinent points, I think, the actual points that go to the heart of the minister's statement that are in absolute contradiction to that judgement. The minister might like to wax lyrical and spin it the way he wants to, however, the fact of the matter is that his statement is in direct contradiction to the Supreme Court judgement.

Furthermore, I understand that the newly elected Burnside council has sought a report. The minister says, 'We want to put it all behind us. We've got a newly elected Burnside council, you know, let's just move on.' It is my understanding that the newly elected Burnside council has called for a report.

Another point to make in relation to this is that the minister also states that it is too difficult to go back and re-work the report, in terms of the revised terms of reference. We know that a number of weeks ago—I have the judgement here; it was 27 May—it was deemed that there were some invalid sections within the terms of reference. The minister is saying that it is too difficult to go

back and untangle the report in relation to the revised terms of reference but, again, that statement just does not make any sense.

How can the minister know that they are the facts of the matter when he has not spoken to Mr MacPherson himself and asked the question, 'Mr MacPherson, you are the investigator; you wrote the report. Is it too difficult to rework the report?' The minister has not asked that question, so how can he make the statement that he thinks it is too difficult to untangle the report and present a revised report? It just does not make any sense.

There are a lot of questions the minister has to answer. I know he was on the radio this morning waxing lyrical, gilding the lily, if you like, spinning it the way they want to spin it, but there has been a lot of money spent on this. The government is trying to avoid bad news. There is a shroud of secrecy around this report in terms of not lifting the FOI restrictions. The judgement recommends, as I stated, that the matter should proceed, and we want it to proceed.

I will move on to the next committee in which I was involved and that was volunteers. We all know what an outstanding contribution our volunteers make to the wellbeing of South Australia and the nation. Our questions went to the Volunteers Day Concert that was held a number of weeks ago, and there is bipartisan support for the Volunteers Day Concert—there is no doubt about that.

However, the minister acknowledges that a section of one performance at the concert really was inappropriate, and we highlighted that fact in the estimates committee. It was really the language that the performer was using that was completely inappropriate and the minister acknowledges that, and I am pleased that she does. There is another consequence of this, however. I know that the Governor and Mrs Scarce were present and, unfortunately, the Governor has been drawn into this by a letter a person who was attending the concert sent to him highlighting their disquiet—distress, if you like—in relation to the performance of that entertainer. It is an unfortunate consequence, I think, that the Governor has been drawn into this issue.

The minister did try to explain the process that took place in vetting the performances, and I think that everybody involved—the Office for Volunteers, the minister's office—has learnt a very good lesson that perhaps more scrutiny and a more rigorous approach is to be taken in the future so that we do not get a repeat of this. As I left the concert, a number of people, including some local government mayors I know, spoke to me about how inappropriate that performance unfortunately was. The minister will not agree with me on this point, but I think it did sour the afternoon to some extent.

The next committee I attended was on emergency services and, obviously, the semi-recently appointed Minister for Emergency Services took questions. He was in pretty fine form as usual. I am talking about minister Foley. It was his usual performance in estimates committees. I thought he was not quite as on his game, if I can use that description, in the afternoon compared to the morning when we had police, but that might have been because there was no media presence in the afternoon.

I know the minister does like playing to the media, and he was putting on a fair performance in the morning, but he seemed to quieten down in the afternoon somewhat. Notwithstanding that, he was his usual bluffing self, but we got through it. We had two hours of unfettered questions. I will say that there was no opening statement, from memory, and no Dorothy Dixers. We just flowed through questions from the opposition. One thing that did stand out was a—

Mr Sibbons: Was the Toy Run.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: We actually got some good media on that on the TV news that night, but that was in the police estimates, member for Mitchell. That was in the morning when we did have the media, so it paid off for us. It did not go so well for Kevin. Channel 7 ran a pretty good coverage of it, so it did not work out so well for the minister. That was in the morning, not in the afternoon when I had the main responsibility for emergency services.

I am digressing slightly. The point I was getting to in relation to emergency services is that in last year's estimate there was going to be a \$9 million cut out of the SAFECOM budget in relation to employees—\$9 million cut out of FTEs in SAFECOM. What has come to light is that this current minister has actually cut it another \$2 million, so it is my understanding that, at the end of the 2012-13 year, there will be a total cut of \$11 million out of the SAFECOM human resources budget line. We will be watching that very closely.

The CFS Volunteers Association (CFSVA) called for a significant increase in funding for support for brigades and front-line volunteers, who go out morning, noon and night, rain, hail or shine to provide a service for our community to keep our communities safe and secure. The CFSVA requested a significant increase in funding for training and brigade support. Unfortunately, that was not provided in this budget. A mere \$400,000 in this budget was provided to the CFS, and I think about \$100,000 to the SES, which is completely inadequate to meet the training needs.

We saw an article in *The Advertiser* just this week highlighting the fact that the number of volunteers in the CFS is falling. It has fallen by some 400. I hope the minister is being provided with advice. If he is not, I hope he is seeking this advice to ensure that he understands that the support for our volunteers within the CFS is vitally important. If you do not provide an adequate satisfactory level of training for our CFS volunteers, then you will see some of them obviously become disenchanted and look to leave the service. So, it is a two-way street. We want these people to volunteer. We are very keen on these people volunteering their time for the safety and security of the community but, on the other hand, it is the government's responsibility to satisfactorily support them through their training needs.

I want to get on to road safety concerning some trouble that the Minister for Road Safety has got himself into in relation to what he is not admitting. He was refusing—even though he did a slight backflip yesterday and tried to give himself a bit of wriggle room in coming out in the media yesterday afternoon—in the estimates committee to admit that certain road conditions can contribute to a crash.

Some radio media yesterday morning I think highlighted the fact that the minister is dead wrong in relation to the statements he made. I have a transcript of the radio interview with Ms Angela Bentley, a lawyer, who I understand takes cases concerning road crash injuries to motorists. I will read the opening statement by Ian Henschke, who is obviously the journalist on 891 from 9 o'clock onwards:

Angela Bentley, she's a lawyer who's successfully sued the department of transport because of the condition of the roads in this state...you've had 30 years' experience in this area. When you hear a road safety minister basically putting the bulk of the onus back on to the driver, what do you think?

This is Ms Bentley's response:

I was actually horrified when I heard this when Matt and Dave hit the airwaves at 6 o'clock this morning...with due respect to Tom Kenyon, I don't think he understands anything about road safety, and he's the minister for it.

There you have it. We have a lawyer who has successfully prosecuted DTEI for injuries caused to motorists as a direct result of road conditions. This person has had 30 years' experience, as the transcript states. On the other hand, we have a minister who I believe is dead wrong when he says that certain road conditions do not contribute to road crashes—it is like the poor old beleaguered Minister for State/Local Government Relations—it is in direct contradiction to the advice he has received from the government's own Thinker in Residence, Professor Fred Wegman, an expert in road safety.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (12:37): I rise to speak on the budget bill and indicate to the house that, during the course of the estimates committees, I represented the opposition in the areas of families and communities, justice, the Attorney-General's Department and, of course, women.

In relation to justice and law and order, which now have such a minuscule percentage of the overall budget in South Australia—ever diminishing—it remains a concern that our superior courts were described by a recent retiring judge as the worst in Australia and that there is nothing forthcoming either in the budget or by the Attorney-General during the estimates that would give us any hope.

However, the Chief Justice told us that \$500,000 to \$750,000 would be sufficient to undertake a business case for the development of purpose-built facilities for superior courts in the state. I hope that future attorneys-general take note and that members of cabinet appreciate the significance of that, given the importance of funding that jurisdiction so as to be effective.

The area of women was responded to in estimates by the minister for women, minister Gago. There is a vast variety of competence and capacity in any cabinet, and I suppose one would have to say that she is not necessarily the sharpest pencil in the pack; she is probably closest to the Minister for Families and Communities, both of whom are at a level of incompetence, which I propose to outline.

As to women, the minister failed to respond on probably the most important issues: women's employment, the protection of women in domestic violence circumstances, the services and facilities for women in both mental health and the eating disorders unit (which is under review in South Australia), to name a few. Questions were put to the minister for women about which she had no knowledge, no support, no consultation or no answer. That is an embarrassing situation, given that over half the population in South Australia is represented by her portfolio, and the performance we received in estimates was a disgrace.

I now move to the hurt, hungry and homeless, who would have wept upon reading this year's budget in respect of Families and Communities. If the minister were present during cabinet meetings to sign off on this budget, she must have been either silent or ignored (if she said anything) regarding the plight of those people in South Australia. The aspect of concessions, as we move into an era unprecedented in the increase in costs of services in this state, was monumentally underprovided for in this budget.

If we look at the provision of services for the disabled, the aged, and child protection, even where announcements were made, there was a monumental continued failure by this minister in providing some relief to these important areas in this year's budget. In covering some of these, the area of housing, and in particular public housing, which is under the direct responsibility of minister Rankine, this year for the first time, along with other government instrumentalities, did not show up in any particularised form as the SA housing trust in the budget papers. That has been wiped off the map, and we now have only a summary within SA Housing, continuing a practice of concealment, lack of transparency and lack of accountability therefore in the budget process.

The minister continued during estimates to tell us of all the extra housing, extra support in tenancy areas in rental allowances, and the increase in maintenance of housing that her government had undertaken. The one statistic I remind the house of is that, in the seven years from 2003 to 2010, supported by the data from the institute of welfare, that is, the national body that covers these areas, we have 5,371 fewer tenable houses in this state. We will no doubt wait until we get the housing trust report later in the year, as we do not have that information now in the budget, to identify whether or not it that has deteriorated further.

What we heard repeatedly during the Dorothy Dixier questioning of the Minister for Housing during estimates was the figure of hundreds of millions of dollars via federal initiatives she has spent in this state on public housing and the hundreds of different houses she has enhanced as public stock availability. The announcements are cherry picked regarding housing developments, but the one statistic I ask the people of South Australia to remember is that, under this government, in seven years alone there has been a reduction in the overall number of public houses of 5,371. It is a very telling statistic, and one that will never be answered by the minister, who just wants to come into the house and tell us of a few houses or proposals—10, perhaps 100 or so—that have been in the pipeline and of which she is proud. There are a number of aspects of housing to which I would like to refer, but time does not permit today.

The Parks sell-off, announced in last year's budget, caused unprecedented public outrage and rebellion against such action regarding that public facility. It was proposed that it would recover \$17 million on the capital sale of the property. This year, after receiving a report from Monsignor Cappelletti on a review of that property on behalf of the government, we saw the Premier announce through his press release on 2 May that he had received the report; a budget comes and goes and there is no provision in the budget (notwithstanding that the Premier had this report on 2 May, according to his press statement) as to what will happen with the Parks.

After the budget was announced, we received a notice of a further announcement and that is that the government, having read the report from Monsignor Cappelletti, was going to 'accept his vision' (to use the Premier's words) and that it was going to sell off only \$10 million worth of property and it was going to make it into a sports hub. The government has failed to answer—whether it be the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, the Minister for Families and Communities (who currently owns this property) or the Premier—why there has not been one cent of funding in this year's budget to even provide for that service.

Let me place on the record that I will strongly object to any of this \$10 million—that is, the proceeds of the sale of this property—being used for anything else but welfare services. If that goes to help support a library service which will still accommodate a facility for welfare services, then I can live with that. I would be happy to support it, because part of the recommended model is that the local council chips in a piece of land next to this precinct and that some capital funds be applied to the building of a library complex on it.

Some of these have great merit. I am sure all the sports facilities that have been announced will be welcomed by parents and consumers of those services. That is great, but it should not be coming out of the welfare budget. The extra \$15 million deficit in this program needs to come from somewhere other than the much-needed and under-resourced area of Families and Communities. I will continue to maintain that position.

We have, of course, minister Rankine's other area of responsibility, ageing. I want to refer to that for a moment. The ageing portfolio is one which deals with the distribution of grants for a number of ageing projects, but also policy matters. The minister answered some questions on Dr Alexandre Kalache, one of the Thinkers in Residence. She confirmed that, in this last budget, \$100,000 has been used to pay for Dr Kalache (as she describes it) to look into the question of the engagement of older people and ensure that we have age-friendly communities and that these are used in line with the design of community that is age friendly—all admirable.

Let me say this: we currently have ministers who go overseas; we have policy units in her department which spend multimillions of dollars looking at these issues; we have the Commissioner for Social Inclusion who has his multimillion dollar unit in the Premier's department; and we have areas in the universities which are dealing with these issues. I just read in the Adelaide University publication today of a project being undertaken there—a very good one, it seems—on the social isolation of aged people in our community. The article states:

Professor Andrew Beer and a team of researchers have been awarded \$348,151 by the Australian Research Council to look at the most effective programs to combat social isolation in an ageing society where divorce, lower marriage rates and reduced fertility are contributing to a critical health issue...

Why is the minister approving \$100,000 for someone to come from overseas to tell us something we already know? We have a national expert here at our own university already undertaking the research. How many people do we have to have and how many hundreds of thousands of dollars do we have to spend? It is just a complete abuse of the process of the allocation of moneys in a priority area when we have people waiting in line for wheelchairs and when we have over 20,000 people waiting for a housing trust facility, etc.

It is unacceptable that the minister can come in and in one breath advocate for the cutting of financial counsellors in her department, as well as in the outdoor field. In addition, she has failed in the estimates committees to satisfy, in my view, why it is necessary to do that and how she expects the NGO sector to be able to pick up that responsibility with minimal and totally inadequate funding to do it.

How is it that she can say that disability clients of Disability SA now have to pay a fee to the Public Trustee to have their meagre funds managed, all for minor savings over periods of time, and yet she can spend \$100,000 a year to bring just one person from overseas when we have an army of people in our own state who are not only undertaking the study but who are charged with the jurisdiction to do so?

It is just unconscionable that that sort of funding is introduced when we are asking people who have no means whatsoever to make provision for these services. Just today we have heard again about the rerun of the issue that was raised last year on the review of tenancy in Housing Trust homes. The absolutely imbecilic lack of priority in the decision making of how we help people in our community who are in need of services is mind blowing.

I therefore say that this level of incompetence by the minister is directly related to her incapacity to understand what is a priority and what is not. We are in a three-year electric car trial by Families and Communities, which is participating in some national program. That is a cost to the department, yet why isn't some other department doing this? Why is this not dealt with within climate change or transport, or something? Here we have Families and Communities money being used when we have people desperate for services.

While I am talking about people desperate for services, I specifically relate to those with a disability. We have welcomed the government's continuation of the program to empty Strathmont, which is the last of the residential facilities based on the very old style model of providing for people with significant disabilities who require 24/7 care. Slowly and progressively, the residents have been transferred. I am disappointed that the government has not moved the balance of 60-odd, but at least they are prepared to move half. What we have wanted from the government is a commitment that the proceeds of the Strathmont centre, just like the Parks Community Centre, is secure and will be applied to the projects necessary to reaccommodate and provide services for our most disabled in the community. That is all we have asked, and we have had no commitment.

Additionally, during estimates the minister told us of the program which is called the Young Persons in Residential Aged Care Program which started back in 2006 which prioritised, we were told at the time, the relocation of people under the age of 65 who are living in aged-care facilities because there was no other disability service available for them. Sometimes these people are victims of motor vehicle accidents and there is no facility close to their residence and there is nothing suitable for them. They end up in an aged-care facility but might be 40 or 50 years of age. Obviously, that is not acceptable. There are some unique circumstances where families in a particular location or community have supported them and we welcome that.

However, at that time there were at least 50 people living in those circumstances. We have a situation where that number has not diminished in seven years, and we heard during estimates that the minister had provided some support packages to some people and the homes they were living in because they did not have adequate access to a separate facility as their parents or spouses aged, for example, and were unable to continue looking after them. We found that, in seven years, of the number of those young people living in aged care facilities, only 27 in all that time have actually been relocated to a specific disability service.

I, probably like many members here in this parliament, have members of family who are caring for children who are disabled. I am a legal guardian of a woman in her mid-30s who is living in a non-government facility in South Australia. Her mother is in aged care. She is not a blood relative. Through the accidents of history, we take on some of these responsibilities and I provide her guardianship.

I have a cousin in his mid-40s who lives on Kangaroo Island, the youngest of four siblings. A tragedy at the time of his birth has rendered him unable to walk or, in fact, to communicate verbally. He is living with aged parents, my aunt and uncle, who clearly are in that cohort in the community who have not reached crisis point (probably, largely, as a result of the generosity of people in the community to support them and provide respite and assistance) but nevertheless are worried about his future when they are no longer able to provide the service of 24-hour care, and they are desperate for some support from the government.

Various projects and reviews have been undertaken to support alternate models for people to even make a contribution to the capital acquisition of properties, but they just seem not to have been responded to by this government in progressing what will be a catastrophic disaster if we do not provide adequate services for these people.

The other thing that really concerned me, on hearing the minister's evidence to the committee, was that of those young people living in aged-care services—and I am sure the parliament will be shocked to hear this—there are four people with disabilities who are under the age of 30. This is a totally unacceptable living environment for them.

How can there be a situation where a minister can pay \$100,000 to bring in an apparent expert from overseas under a Thinkers in Residence program when we have an army of them here to do it already? She can allocate \$100,000 to do that and other pet projects of the government can be pursued (including the Premier's now Adelaide Studio, the ex-film hub, at the Glenside Hospital site) and yet they ignore the plight of children who are stuck in environments that are totally unacceptable just because they have a disability.

This government does not care. There are people left in critical situations in homes in the care of disability where the capacity to manage the crisis culminates in a Coroner's report. Most recently, we heard of the acquittal of a woman who was apparently found not to have sufficient mental capacity when she killed her adult son who was severely disabled.

We read about these tragedies in the newspapers. We read these Coroner's reports. I read these judgements, and every year we end up with a situation where the government says, 'We are spending more money. We are doing more for these people.' I do not hear that: I hear a very distressed cohort in the community who are struggling against the odds, who have inadequate provision and who have a heartless government and useless minister to advocate for them.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (12:57): I rise briefly, given the time, to respond in part to a comment the member for Flinders made about the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme. I remind him and other members that in the 2011-12 budget there is a \$719 million investment in country health in South Australia. That is an 89.3 per cent increase on the last budget under the Liberal government back in 2001-02.

What we are trying to do with country health in South Australia is to spend more money in the regions so that people do not have to come to Adelaide as often for treatment, only for very specialised treatment. I was in Ceduna, in the electorate of the member for Flinders, earlier in the year to inspect the first stage of the \$36 million hospital redevelopment there—\$36 million is a massive investment.

Also in the electorate of Flinders, the commonwealth—who we are working really well with to get money spent in South Australia—contributed \$39 million to the Port Lincoln Hospital. I would just like to reconfirm that the South Australian government is committed to country health in South Australia and will continue to be so.

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) (12:59): I move:

That the remainder of the bill be agreed to.

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) (12:59): In English, I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I would just like to draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of a group of young students from St Monica's Parish School, who are guests of the member for Bright. I am not sure what year levels you are, but I think that you are primary school level. Welcome, and I hope that you enjoy your time here.

MARINE PARKS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Presented a petition signed by 241 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to halt the introduction of marine park exclusion zones until the Select Committee on Marine Parks in South Australia has reported and all other studies are completed.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

SURPLUS EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (7 October 2010) (Estimates Committee A).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries):

Treasurer

Department/Agency	Position Title	Classification	TEC Cost
Department of Treasury and Finance	ICT Security and Risk Manager	ASO7-4	\$104,898
	Consultant	ASO5-4	\$32,441
	ICT Program Manager	ASO7-4	\$104,898
	Sales Advisor	ASO4-3	\$68,046
	Senior Project Officer, Communications	ASO4-3	\$68,046
	Senior Payroll Officer	ASO3-3	\$69,385
	Applications and Infrastructure Manager	ASO7-4	\$100,313
	Administration Officer	ASO3-3	\$48,813
	Senior Policy Officer	ASO7-4	\$104,898

Department/Agency	Position Title	Classification	TEC Cost
	Manager, Business Services	ASO7-4	\$100,313
		Total	\$802,051

Minister for Defence Industries

Department/Agency	Position Title	Classification	TEC Cost
Defence SA	Manager Business Development, Technology Park Adelaide	ASO-7	\$88,788
		Total	\$88,788

WATER PRICING

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (11 October 2010) (Estimates Committee B).

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

1. The cost per kilolitre of water produced at the Adelaide desalination plant will be in the order of \$2.80 per kilolitre.

It is not possible for me to comment on the cost of water from the plant proposed by BHP Billiton. As far as I am aware, BHP Billiton has not finalised its planning for any plant it may build and the cost of water produced by any plant it builds will be influenced by the size of the plant, its location and the level of desalination required to meet the company's need.

ROYAL ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Last month I informed members of the financial challenges faced by the Royal Zoological Society. The society is an incorporated body that runs the Adelaide and Monarto zoos in South Australia. The society itself is run by a board comprised of elected members, as well as up to three members nominated by the Governor, which has been a longstanding provision in the society's constitution.

The government provides an allocation of \$3.126 million each year to the society to assist in running the zoos. This operational funding recognises their importance to the public of South Australia and their considerable tourism value. As previously indicated, I was advised earlier this year that the society was having difficulty managing its cash flow and that it had a substantial debt. The society sought assistance from the government with its cash flow position.

Subsequent to the resignation from the board of the two existing Governor's nominees earlier in the year, two more senior government officers—one from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) and the other from the Department of Treasury and Finance—were nominated to the board to assist the society in the short term to deal with its financial challenges while greater clarity was sought.

The government responded to the zoo board's request for assistance with cash flow by bringing forward \$1 million from the society's allocation in 2011-12. At the same time, the government conducted an independent review into the current state of the society's finances to determine if further action might be required. This review suggested that the society's financial difficulties were more substantial than previously recognised and recommended the provision of a further \$1 million to give stability to the society's financial position and consideration of the long-term position of the zoos.

As circumstances are involved, and as foreshadowed in my statement of 21 June, I advise that a government working group has been established with the agreement of the society's board to work with the society in respect of its current financial challenges and the future sustainability of the zoos.

The working group comprises senior officers from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Crown Solicitor's Office. The working group will report to the Chief Executive of DENR and the Under Treasurer, and will assess

the critical issues which led to the zoo's financial difficulties and develop a framework that will aim to restore and maintain an appropriate financial base at the zoos.

This will include examining appropriate government contributions and putting in place mechanisms to avoid these circumstances arising again. It will also consider appropriate governance arrangements for the society's board. Given that the zoo has accepted the government's offer to play a more active role in helping them to deal with the zoo's financial difficulties, the most recently appointed Governor's nominees to the board have now resigned their positions, so that they can serve on the working group. This is in line with good governance principles.

I have been advised by the president of the society that he and his chief executive have entered into discussions with Westpac Banking Corporation about the debt facility that the society has with Westpac. The society's debt with Westpac is a matter for the bank and the society, and the government trusts that they will reach a suitable arrangement that will allow the society to move to a sustainable position. The government's commitment to working with the society for the long term sustainability of the Adelaide and Monarto zoos remains strong.

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (14:05): I bring up the 75th report of the committee, entitled Franchises (Supplementary Report).

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:06): I bring up the 407th report of the committee, entitled Northfield Correctional Facilities Infrastructure Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mrs VLAHOS: I bring up the 408th report of the committee, entitled South Para Dam Flood Mitigation Remedial Works.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mrs VLAHOS: I bring up the 409th report of the committee, entitled New Glen Osmond Metropolitan Fire Station.

Report received and ordered to be published.

The SPEAKER (14:07): Members, I have examined the *Hansard* transcript from yesterday's Public Works Committee meeting, which is now available publicly if it is required. I am satisfied that the matters raised were procedural and that they need to be dealt with by the committee itself, and not by me or the house. The question asked yesterday of the member for Taylor—while I am reluctant normally to allow members other than ministers to be asked questions—again was of a procedural nature and so was in order.

QUESTION TIME

TAXI VOUCHERS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:08): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Why has the government withdrawn taxi voucher funding for renal dialysis patients who cannot afford to pay for the necessary three taxi trips to dialysis centres each week and have no other transport available? My office has been contacted by dialysis patients who have been advised that the government is withdrawing taxi voucher funding from 1 August. These people have told me that they will die without the dialysis.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (14:08): Even as Acting Minister for Health, I know enough to check any story that comes from the member for Morphett, because, of course, he has form. In fact, I have been given some advice on this and I am sure we will be able to give him more. But, do remember the approach of the member for Morphett, because he told the member for Light once—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He said he doesn't care whether he gets them wrong, he will get one right one day.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That's what he said, and he has form, and he uses the vulnerable—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, point of order.

Mr Pengilly: Relevance.

Mr WILLIAMS: Absolutely it is. It's standing order 98, and it's about relevance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, so your point of order is relevance, I presume?

Mr WILLIAMS: That's right, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I would draw the minister back to the point of the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I do point out that there isn't actually a standing order that goes to relevance, but then again neither does the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Can I say, if they want good behaviour, maybe they shouldn't interject quite as much.

I have got to say that the statements today from the member from Morphett follow from his statements in this house yesterday about a poor boy waiting 24 hours to be admitted to hospital. We checked that story and, of course, it was one hour and 20 minutes. I regret that anyone waits one hour and 20 minutes, but to say 24 hours is just absolutely disgraceful. On this occasion, what I am told, and I will get further information—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morphett!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, you are a disgrace, I agree. On this occasion I am advised—

Mr VENNING: Madam Speaker, point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr VENNING: Standing order 125, offensive words against a member.

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, I appreciate what you are saying, but if we start singling out 'disgrace', I must have heard that word a thousand times in this place. Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I just make the point that if he doesn't want people to say things about him he shouldn't interject in a disorderly fashion, and any interjections, of course, are out of order.

I was briefly advised before I came into this place about one of the matters the shadow minister has raised. It was a question of a woman who, as I understand it, was offered taxi vouchers three times a fortnight and had agreed to drive herself three times a fortnight. Those taxi rides, as I understand it, amount to some \$600 in taxi fares because she comes from far out.

I am told that, in fact, it was the result of an agreement, but if the woman doesn't want to do that in the future there are many options available, and she simply needs to have discussions with

the relevant health authorities, and I am happy to provide further information. I point out that I am the acting minister, but I will stress that the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Are you still here? If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has a question for me, I would relish taking it. Please, just wait your turn. What I will say is that—

Mr Williams: You covered yourself in glory yesterday, Patrick.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I covered you in something. Are you done now? I look forward to your question. This is a serious matter, and I wish the opposition would stop their interjections.

An honourable member: A bit rich.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And it's funny. Apparently, it's funny. Anything from Whetstone today? No, I didn't think so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No matter what he says he won't tell the truth about it later.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I did? I point out we take our health services extremely seriously. I am told the information on this matter, just as yesterday, is not as suggested by the opposition member—and hasn't he got form? Can I say this: we do take very seriously the services offered for dialysis patients, as we do with all patients, and the most vulnerable in our community are not assisted by being used by the member for Morphett for political purposes.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (14:13): My question is to the Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Can the minister advise the house of the current levels of employment in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Premier with South Australia's Strategic Plan, Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:14): I thank the member for Reynell for her question. I am very pleased to advise the house that the employment statistics released this morning by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that more South Australians have jobs than ever before, according to today's figures. There are 825,200 South Australians now in work. This is the seventh consecutive month when the number of South Australians in jobs has grown.

Since the March 2010 election, 18,600 jobs have been created in South Australia. This means that since 2002 a record 134,000 jobs have been created. Significantly, the state's headline unemployment rate has dropped by 0.3 per cent to 5.1 per cent in June. These figures, along with a record all-time-high participation rate in trend terms of 63.8 per cent, show that South Australians have the confidence to find jobs they want, with an extra 1,900 people gaining employment in the last month alone. Along with the drop in the headline unemployment rate of 5.1 per cent, the third lowest nationally—not two as I might previously have suggested—South Australia's youth unemployment rate also dropped by 6.8 percentage points to 20 per cent in June.

There are more jobs in our state than ever before, coupled with record investment in training, to ensure that South Australians have the skills they need to take advantage of the jobs of the future. The state government is investing \$194 million in the Skills for All reform agenda, which is setting out a blueprint for the modernising and renewing of the vocational education and training

(VET) system, aimed at significantly increasing the state's skill levels to lift workforce participation and increase productivity.

We have also committed to continuing our massive infrastructure build, with an investment of more than \$9 billion. As well, the value of major developments in South Australia stands at a record \$80 billion, with almost half generated in the minerals and resources sector.

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I would 'Hear, hear!' myself, but I can't. The June employment figures show growth in total employment in South Australia of 19.4 per cent since 2002, more than double the figure of only 8.4 per cent during the term of the last Liberal government. An even greater contrast is that full-time employment has grown by 17.9 per cent under the Rann government, compared to just 1.3 per cent during the term of the previous Liberal government. I am sure the sounds of silence from the lemon-sucking member for Unley this month will be deafening.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: I ask for that to be withdrawn. I do not think that is very parliamentary.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think the minister should withdraw that.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Ma'am, I withdraw and apologise for being uncharitable.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

TAXI VOUCHERS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:17): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, what is the budget saving to the government of the withdrawal of taxi voucher allocations to renal dialysis patients, and how many patients are affected?

Members interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: They ooh and aah over there—this is a very serious issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (14:17): Again, I stress that the person who Mr McFetridge, the member for Morphett—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Are you done there?

An honourable member: More than one.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There is more than one, is there? Do you count them the same way you count interconnectors or the way you count wharves?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There are a range of options available in our health service for those who need dialysis. The person in question, and others, simply need to talk to their clinical provider. The options do include paying for taxi fares. They include in some circumstances actually moving dialysis machines closer to where the person is. There are a range of options. There is no budget.

I assure the member for Morphett that this year's health budget, like the one before and like every health budget we have had since coming to government, has more money than it did before. If they want to compare our health budget with ones of the previous government, you will see an absolutely dramatic—and I think the Treasurer could help me with this—increase in funding for health. We fund health seriously, we take it seriously. Everyone knows, when it comes to health and public health, there is one party committed to it, and that is the Labor Party of Australia—always has been, always will be. Again, I stress that there are a range of services available. I am happy for—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You can ask another question in a moment, member for Morphett. The issue that has been raised with me—and we will provide more information—is not the case of a cut to this person, but is a case, as I understand it, of the person themselves wanting to change earlier arrangements. She can do that, and all she needs to do is talk to her clinical provider about those services.

PORT AUGUSTA SERVICE DELIVERY

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can the minister advise what work is occurring in the Port Augusta area as part of the government's response to the Lew Owens report?

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) (14:20): I would like to thank the member for Taylor for her question on this very important matter. I am very pleased to announce this afternoon that the state government has, in conjunction with the commonwealth and the Port Augusta City Council, agreed on a new governance model for service delivery in Port Augusta. This new governance model addresses one of the key recommendations in Lew Owens' report, entitled 'Report on observations of service delivery issues at Port Augusta', and forms an integral part of our work—the state government's work—under the National Urban and Regional Strategy.

What this means is that for the first time the three tiers of government will be sitting around the table with the community to negotiate and discuss ongoing service delivery issues. Up until this point, the Port Augusta community has been—and I accept this—frustrated by what has essentially been a merry-go-round of service delivery. We know that this is certainly not assisting all of us in closing the gap of Aboriginal disadvantage.

Lew Owens told us in his report that a lack of money was not necessarily the problem. In fact, he said that there are a great deal of good programs and services being delivered in Port Augusta, but what he did find was that we were all wanting when it came to coordination. He said that we essentially needed to get our act together, and that is what we are doing with this new service delivery model.

I would like to thank Mr Owens on behalf of all of us in this place for the work that he did in a voluntary capacity. One of the other recommendations that he made was that the Aboriginal community must have a voice in determining priorities. Of course, the services need to be accessible and they need to be tailored to that particular community.

I am very pleased to announce the appointment of two community advocates for this initiative: Mr Paul Case, who is very well known to all of us in this place, and Ms Kerry Colbung, who is very highly regarded. They, like Mr Owens, will work in a voluntary capacity to independently drive the work that needs to be done and hold all of us—the state government, the federal government, the Port Augusta City Council—to account.

I was very pleased last week to visit Port Augusta, and I met with mayor Joy Baluch to discuss this initiative, and she confirmed to me her support for this approach. She was apparently quoted on ABC saying—

Ms Chapman: A great lady.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Yes, a great lady. They quoted her—it was reported, and I am not sure if it was a direct quote—that she saw this initiative was an important step in the right direction. Last week, I was also very pleased to open a community forum, where the community had the opportunity to sit down and decide how it wanted interface with this initiative. They have

taken up the opportunity, drawn a line in the sand in relation to their frustrations with the past—and I accept that.

I am very pleased to hear that the commonwealth will give these community members (I think might be 21) an opportunity to participate in the leadership program to assist them in developing their skills as well as contribute to the wider community in Port Augusta. There is no question that our most important partner in this work is the Port Augusta community. I am committed to working very hard, working with members opposite, working with the member for Stuart, on getting some serious progress in Port Augusta. I commend the initiative.

TAXI VOUCHERS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:24): I will try again. My question is to the Deputy Premier. Did the government conduct an assessment of the cost impact on families of the withdrawal of taxi voucher funding to renal dialysis patients at the same time as introducing public parking fees in hospitals?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (14:24): Again, the member for Morphett asserts something in his question. I would be very careful before I accepted it; in fact, I will check thoroughly because it is inconsistent with the advice I have been given, that is, that there has been a budget savings on taxis.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We will take that on board but, again—

Mr Pisoni: Concerning the parking, the parking fees are there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I do not understand why the member for Morphett is so reluctant to ask the actual Minister for Health questions.

Dr McFetridge: You don't get an answer, mate.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Oh well, you can have another one of those. I will check all of the information provided by the member for Morphett. I will check it thoroughly, but I will say this: I take everything that the member for Morphett says with a grain of salt.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Florey will be heard in silence.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:25): She hopes. My question is to the Minister for Education. Could the minister outline how the state government is helping Aboriginal students in transition from the school environment to further education and the workforce?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development, Minister for Science and Information Economy) (14:25): Can I thank the honourable member for her question and also acknowledge her powerful advocacy not only on behalf of young people in relation to their education but for her broader commitment to reconciliation with Aboriginal Australia.

To support the achievement of the Closing the Gap targets, the state government recognises that there is a need to do things differently if we are to lift Aboriginal retention rates and make sure that they gain access to better career opportunities. There have been significant efforts in recent years by all school sectors and, in particular, by the SACE Board—the Senior Secondary Certificate, and the changes that we have made at that level—working in close collaboration with universities, to encourage more Aboriginal young people to complete their SACE and to seriously look to further study, whether that be at TAFE or university.

There has been a clear strategy for Aboriginal education aimed at working with schools to increase the number of students who stay on at year 10 to complete their SACE, and we are seeking to bridge that gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal SACE completion. The number of Aboriginal students completing the SACE has more than doubled in the past decade, from 69 in

2001 to 167 in 2010. That represents about 78.4 per cent of the Aboriginal students who were considered as potential completers.

So, when we do get young Aboriginal students into the state's TAFE system, we have a very good chance of them completing their SACE. This is the highest figure ever for South Australia, and it represents, I think, an exciting opportunity for the future, when we imagine all these young Aboriginal people going into higher education courses, getting those qualifications and taking their rightful place in the leadership of our community. This indicates that we have made substantial progress in school retention rates and SACE completion, but there are significant gaps that still remain between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people, and I remain committed to narrowing that gap.

I want to speak about a range of strategies which we have adopted and which have helped us get those results. One of them is the Keeping Them on Track initiative, which provides guidelines for teachers, parents and guardians on how to help students to engage with their SACE and transition from school into effective pathways. Another initiative is the South Australian Aboriginal Sports Training Academy, which has expanded from two schools in 2005 to 11 schools in 2011. Finally, the Growing Your Future program is run through the Northern Region Workabout Centre and provides years 8 to 11 students from across the region with the opportunity to study units towards a Certificate II in Horticulture, specialising in landscaping, while teaching them valuable skills in the transition from school to work.

We know that for many young people imagining themselves being successful is a very important part of being successful. We know that the road to achieving anything in life can be bumpy, and many of these young Aboriginal people have not had members of their family who have completed that journey, so mentors are absolutely crucial, and support along the way is absolutely crucial. We understand that, and that is why our programs are focusing on the special needs of Aboriginal young people. The programs also help Aboriginal people to see the employment pathway they are working towards and be able to give them experience and a taste of that work, so they can see what the goal is at the end of their training.

This week, students have undertaken their final lessons in the program I mentioned before. Some students will go on to complete certificate II next term. The program has been so successful that a new group of students will engage in Growing Your Future from next term. This program, and the others engaged in by the various agencies that are working together in this endeavour, are ones to be proud of. There is much more work to be done, but we have made a very important start.

LABOR GOVERNMENT PROMISES

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Which Labor promise should be believed: is it that there will be maximum four-hour waiting times for all patients presenting to public hospital emergency departments, or is it that there will not be a carbon tax, or is it that the Adelaide Oval upgrade will cost \$450 million and not a penny more, or is it the new Royal Adelaide Hospital will cost only \$1.7 billion? What can be believed from Labor?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley: More infrastructure than you've ever seen.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (14:30): What can be believed from the Labor Party and from me is, I would say, everything I say and we say, because we are genuine people setting the agenda in the state, building the infrastructure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: In fact, I would hold up in comparison our honesty with the comments of one of your backbenchers just in the last 24 hours who claims he did not say something that was plainly caught on the record. If you want to talk about telling the truth, we can talk about that all day. Can I say, if a member—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: This has no relevance to the question. In fact, I believe—

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, sit down. We do not need an opinion from you. Sit down. Your point of order was relevance. The question was very broad-ranging and I think the minister can answer it as he chooses.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There is certainly a difference between an estimate given, a good intention fully stated, and a deliberate lie. Let me give you an example of a deliberate lie: 'We will not sell ETSA. Full stop. Full stop. Full stop.' That is a deliberate lie. An estimate that later has to be corrected is regrettable, but it is not a deliberate lie.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: When a person says, 'I didn't say that; I didn't say that' and the public record shows they did, well, I've got to say that looks like a deliberate lie, too. If you want to talk to us about honesty—any day of the week, kids.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That's enough.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, from both sides of the chamber! The member for Mount Gambier.

MOUNT GAMBIER HARNESS RACING CLUB

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister inform the house about the action taken by the state government to assist harness racing in Mount Gambier?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs, Minister Assisting the Premier with South Australia's Strategic Plan, Minister Assisting the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education) (14:33): Happily, I can, and I know the member for Mount Gambier is a very keen advocate on behalf of the harness racing club down at Mount Gambier and, as a result of that advocacy, we were able to find \$100,000 to provide to them to wire in their digital video network.

Now they are able to broadcast digitally into the Sky network every race. Previously they had to have a van there that cost them about \$7,000 a race. With \$30,000 from the club and \$100,000 from the state government, they will be able to provide that footage to Sky and it will save them having to raise \$7,000 before a person has even walked in the gate. Through our decision to reallocate SATAB wagering tax returns to the three codes, the state government has also ensured a further ongoing revenue stream—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: —for the racing industry with an estimated \$8 million expected to be injected into the racing codes in 2011-12.

I can also say that, during my trip down to the South-East, we visited the Kongorong Sportsmen's Club and I have to say that the member for Mount Gambier is somewhat of a rock star at the Kongorong Sportsmen's Club. The kids all know him as 'Pegs'; the school was out, the school was there, and their love of Pegs is second only to their love of all the chocolate biscuits and cake in the area, which was wolfed down very quickly. It was a great afternoon. We gave \$45,000 to Kongorong, to the sportsmen's club, and also managed to visit the South Gambier Netball Club and get a cheque to them for \$40,000 for the rebuilding of a clubhouse facility down there. There is advocacy everywhere, all over the place by the member for Mount Gambier, and as

a result we have been able to go down and present some cheques. It was a great day and I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his hospitality on the day.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:35): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Now that the federal government is not going to use private hospitals to clear public hospital elective surgery waiting lists, will the state government continue to fund the use of private contractors to perform elective surgery and, if so, what is the state budget impact?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure) (14:35): I thank the member. He is determined not to ask the Acting Minister for Health. I have been seeking to get across this portfolio this week. I am not as fully across it as I would like. I am happy to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I mean, getting criticised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for not being across something! Goodness me! When will they learn? When will they learn that election by hissy fit is a mistake? I am happy to understand the details of that question and get an informed answer for the member for Morphett.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DISABILITY FUNDING

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Disability. Can the minister explain to the house how the Rann government is providing employment opportunities for South Australians with a disability?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:36): I thank the member for Torrens for her question and her ongoing advocacy for South Australians with a disability. We have a Strategic Plan target to grow participation for people with disabilities, and we very proudly advocate across government to increase opportunities for—

Mr Pisoni: Have a look at DFEEST. Seven they've got.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pisoni: Down from 80-odd.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: One of the best ways of achieving this is to encourage the growth of the Australian Disability Enterprises. These commercial businesses run by non-government disability support services provide work opportunities for more than 3,000 South Australians with a disability. They operate across a wide range of industries, covering printing, metal fabrication, packaging, recycling and landscaping.

Locally, South Australia is served by some outstanding services, including Bedford, Minda Incorporated, the Royal Society for the Blind, Phoenix and Orana. In 2009-10 the Department for Families and Communities purchased services amounting to approximately \$500,000 across providers such as these.

In March 2011, a selective request for quotation was released, seeking a supplier to print and distribute Housing SA's *Customer Chat* newsletter. I am delighted that Post Haste, a division of Phoenix Society, was recommended to deliver these services for up to three years. Their success in winning work for people with a disability has continued. Last month Post Haste was also given the contract to print Disability Services' *infoLink* magazine.

I am pleased to advise that policies are in place mandating business units within DFC to approach appropriate Australian Disability Enterprises directly for goods and services valued below \$11,000. The policy also requires business units to approach at least one Australian Disability Enterprise for goods and services valued between \$11,000 and \$110,000.

An intranet page has been set up to provide staff with detailed information on the services that these enterprises can provide. The success of these partnerships also includes the pairing of International Linen Services and Minda for the delivery of linen to Disability Services; the promotion of the Bedford Group's Balyana Conference Centre; and the employment of Adelaide Property and Gardens, a division of Bedford, to provide horticultural services for Housing SA through a public request for tender. It is also pleasing that some of the large kitchens operated by my department now buy RSPCA accredited eggs from Bedford's Compass Farm.

The ability of Australian Disability Enterprises to deliver benefits is not limited to the public sector. As you know, Madam Speaker, I recently had the pleasure of visiting Phoenix's Whyalla operations with you and, as well as sharing a great lunch with the employees, I saw firsthand some of the many exciting ventures they are involved with. At the time, their industrial embroidery machines were working around the clock preparing uniforms for a mining company. With about 45 Australian Disability Enterprises outlets in our state, I encourage members to visit their local Australian Disability Enterprise and get involved in promoting this great cause to other local businesses.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:40): My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with his Minister for State/Local Government Relations who said on radio today that the \$1.5 million Burnside council inquiry was 'a waste of taxpayers' money'?

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) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Burnside council saga goes back some time, as members would probably recall, and we had a dysfunctional council. The dysfunctional council was the subject of great concern and ultimately was the cause of the first exercise, as far as I am aware, of the powers under section 272 of the Local Government Act. There was an appointment of an investigator, the former auditor-general, and he conducted what could only be described as a very thorough investigation, and that investigation canvassed a number of matters and went for a bit of time because he did not want to leave any stone unturned.

Throughout the time that his investigation was going on, none of the people who subsequently went to the Supreme Court indicated that they had a problem with the terms of reference or anything else; that occurred after they received a confidential copy of the report for the purposes of them commenting on that confidential copy and, for reasons best known to some people, that was then distributed, and we have what has since unfolded in the Supreme Court.

The good news is—and the member for Kavel will probably feel better about this. The good news is this: first of all, there has been an election, and the good burghers of Burnside have gone down and voted—of course, they do it by post, but you know it's a metaphorical thing. They voted, and all of the people who were the subject of complaint and concern are no longer there—all of them gone. And—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: And the other really interesting thing about it is that the government, having made the commitment last year to look into the question of a public integrity commission and having announced in November last year a model for public consultation (that consultation going until 25 March this year)—and I note that some of the critics of that whole process did not bother to put in a submission, including—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —yes, it's true—including Dr Allan Perry from the University of Adelaide, who suddenly has become a critical of a document and a policy of which he is yet to become aware because we have not finished it, and including the opposition, in particular Mr Wade, who is constantly on the radio complaining about it, but of course he has not seen it either because it is not finished. But the process inasmuch as that refers to local government has been largely informed and substantially informed by all of the lessons we have learned out of Burnside. So, there we are. I think we have a great solution. We have all of the councillors, who were the subject—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —of concern, and we have a great new reform coming with a public integrity commission which will address all of the issues of concern.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

GEOHERMAL ENERGY

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SIBBONS: —thank you, Madam Speaker; rowdy lot, aren't they—Mineral Resources Development. Can the minister advise the chamber on how the government is supporting the development of geothermal energy in the state?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services) (14:45): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I want to thank the member for Mitchell for this important question. As members of this house are aware, this government has been a keen supporter of the development of geothermal energy. South Australia was the first state to introduce a regulatory framework specifically tailored to the rapidly developing geothermal industry.

I am pleased to advise that our state continues to lead by example in supporting the development of geothermal energy. The government recognises the outstanding potential of this emerging technology, and since 2005 has supported the sector with targeted grants totalling \$4.39 million for precompetitive research co-funded by industry and research institutions.

These research initiatives have been focused on addressing critical challenges to the commercialisation of geothermal energy in South Australia. Grants awarded so far include:

- a series of tied grants for 14 studies into geothermal research through 2005-09;
- a series of Plan for Accelerated Exploration (PACE) grants totalling almost \$1.1 million offered for 12 projects between 2005 and 2010; and
- a grant of \$560,000 from the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund to help develop the transmission infrastructure for Australia's first one megawatt engineered geothermal system power plant from Geodynamics' Habanero geothermal site to Innamincka. This power plant is expected to be the first of its kind in Australia.

In 2009-10, the state government also provided a two-year grant—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I am glad you think this is funny—of \$1.6 million to underpin the start-up of a South Australian Centre for Geothermal Energy Research at the University of Adelaide.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The centre is now up and running under the capable leadership of its director, Dr Martin Hand. I am pleased to announce today that a further \$2 million worth of funding has been made available to boost priority geothermal research at the South Australian Centre for Geothermal Energy Research for the next three years.

Thanks to the financial and regulatory support by this government, South Australia is now a world leader in geothermal energy. The fact that South Australian geothermal licences have grown from three in 2004 to 238 as of May 2011 is evidence of this.

South Australia has also attracted 87 per cent of all investment in Australian geothermal energy exploration projects between 2002 and 2010. I am advised that this is \$582 million of the

total \$670 million available. South Australia is home to three of the most advanced geothermal projects in Australia: Geodynamics in the Cooper Basin; Petrathem in the northern Flinders Ranges; and Panax Geothermal in the Otway Basin.

Furthermore, South Australia's geothermal projects are being recognised internationally as amongst the most important geothermal projects in the world. These outcomes confirm the geothermal industry's perception that South Australia is the preferred destination to explore emissions-free renewable geothermal energy resources. It is a reputation—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —yes, and the Fraser Institute ranks us No. 1 in the world—this government will continue to pursue, and I hope that the member for Chaffey understood all of that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:49): My question is, again, to the Attorney-General. Given that the Full Court of the Supreme Court considered that it was in the public interest for the Burnside council inquiry to be completed, will the Attorney-General explain why the government has chosen to abandon the inquiry, and is it because the government interest is more important than public interest?

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) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for that question. First of all, let's be clear on this: my understanding of what the Supreme Court said was that it would be, from their point of view, useful for a completed report to be released. It didn't say the government should go ahead and complete it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Secondly, with all due respect to the Supreme Court, it is not the Supreme Court's business to be telling the government whether to complete an administrative exercise or not. They have in their possession copies of the draft report, and they have made orders in respect of those copies—not the government; they, the Supreme Court—have made orders in respect of the release of that, and they have said the report should not be released.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: I am interested in the answer, having had some involvement, and I can't hear with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition constantly interjecting.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And the member for Unley interjects, while I am complaining about interjections—who, I point out, is not sucking lemons at present.

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, minister. The members on my left need to realise that they are asking the ministers the questions; they don't need to be answering themselves, otherwise we won't bother with question time. Attorney.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: So, the Supreme Court has suppressed the report: that is their decision. We do not intend to go on and spend more time and money on a report—

Mr Pisoni: That you've mucked up.

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —into a group of councillors who are no longer members of the council, and—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Do you want to hear the rest of the answer or not?

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Do you want to hear the rest of the answer? We do not intend to spend time or money on the preparation of a report in relation to councillors who are no longer members of council and in relation to whom no remedy by the council would be of any use because they are not members of the council. And, as I tried to explain to you before, the whole experience of the Burnside council is a matter that has been taken into account in relation to the public integrity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It has been taken into account in relation to the preparation of the public integrity review which all of you had the opportunity to contribute to but didn't and, in due course, you will be seeing the finished product.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HERITAGE FUND

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:52): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. How is the state government assisting owners of state heritage places with ongoing conservation of these important and unique places?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:53): I thank the member for Ashford for her very important question. Since 2002, funding has been allocated to the SA Heritage Fund Grants program to assist private and local government owners of state heritage places with the provision of support for ongoing conservation measures. These annual grants, totalling \$250,000, are offered for the conservation of state heritage places which are entered in the South Australian Heritage Register, or places located within a state heritage area. I know that the recipients of those grants are very thankful for the money that is provided.

The grants are provided on a matching basis, with owners matching the money provided from the SA Heritage Fund, either dollar-for-dollar or through in-kind work. There are currently about 6,000 state heritage places eligible to apply for this program including places within state heritage areas. There are two categories of grants available: one offering grants of up to \$10,000 and the other offering grants of up to \$25,000.

Applications for grants for the 2011-12 financial year closed at the end of February 2011, and a total of 83 applications were received. Applicants included private individuals, corporate bodies, church bodies, local councils and community organisations. The applications were assessed by an independent panel comprising a member of the SA Heritage Council, the Register Committee, and an architect from Department of Environment and Natural Resources. The South Australian Heritage Council then endorsed the panel's recommendation.

I am pleased to announce that a total of 31 applicants qualified for a South Australian Heritage Fund grant this year, with the successful proposals including: verandah repairs at the Beehive Corner; termite repair and treatment, and salt damp treatment at the Burra Railway Station; replacing roofing materials for the National Trust museum at the former Mount Gambier courthouse; external and internal works to preserve the Two Wells Public Library; restoration and preservation of stonework at the former coach-house at Mitchell House; repair and painting of facades at the former Peterborough YMCA hostel; replacing gutters, fascia and eaves, and connecting new downpipes at the former Norwood Wesleyan Methodist Church; repointing the outside walls of the Wallaroo Police Station and dwelling; and repairs to the concrete frame, and bird proofing at the Greek Orthodox Church and belltower located in Franklin Street, Adelaide.

The SA Heritage Fund Grants provide critical support to individuals and organisations who share the government's commitment to preserving significant heritage sites for the benefit of future generations of South Australians, and I commend all applicants for their passion and commitment to the cause.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (14:55): My question is again to the Attorney-General. Given that the estimated cost of the Burnside council inquiry was initially set at \$250,000, who

approved the additional funding of \$1.25 million for work that the government is now throwing away?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker: the suggestion that the government is now throwing it away is argument and he is not allowed to do that. I know he is—well, he seems new.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I would ask the member to withdraw the last part of his question. It is sufficient to say 'who approved the additional \$1.25 million'.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: I can change the last part of the sentence, if you like, to 'is now abandoning'.

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) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his question. The period that he is speaking of actually pre-dates my tenure in the job.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General will answer the question, not the opposition.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: So I don't know the answer to that question; however, I can find out.

KINSHIP CARERS

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Can the minister inform the house about what the Rann government is doing to support relative and kinship carers in South Australia?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:57): I thank the member for Light for his question and I appreciate his ongoing interest in supporting some of the most vulnerable young people in our communities, and their families. Since coming to power we have made child protection a key priority and ensured that taking care of our most vulnerable children and young people is everyone's responsibility. We have also seen Families SA funding grow to almost \$300 million, compared to just \$90 million in 2001-02.

Recently, I had the opportunity to meet with some people who have taken the courageous step of caring for a child from within their family who was unable to remain with their birth parents. Some were grandparents, some were aunts, but all had an amazing commitment and love for the young ones in their care. In South Australia we have nearly 800 family and kinship carers, almost 460 more than we did in 2005. This is good news and means that more children will have stable placements with family.

The Rann government has gone to great lengths to support these connections, which is why I am pleased that vulnerable children and families are a key focus of this year's state budget. In addition to the budget announcements, I can advise the house that \$1.6 million will be allocated in this financial year to the Families SA Relative and Carer program to employ 15 more support workers. This program supports more than 2,600 carers and children right across the state.

The support workers in this program have played an important role in increasing the number of relative and kinship carers and, ultimately, the number of young people who can continue to live with family. This additional support will help them connect with and support more families who have been thinking about caring for a young person, and with those families who have suddenly found themselves as carers.

I also recently launched a DVD promoting the role of relative and kinship care. The *Family for Life* DVD was developed to give families and relatives a better understanding of the positive role they can play in the care and support of children in their care, as well as being an important tool in training carers and staff.

In South Australia, we only take children from their birth parents when it is no longer safe for them to stay there, but this does not make it any easier or less heartbreaking for those involved. Research shows that most children who maintain links with their birth family and relatives are much better off than those who do not. These connections are even more important if the birth family is Aboriginal or has particular religious, cultural or spiritual beliefs.

Of course, just because a child is with a family does not make it any less challenging. In fact, caring for children who are related can present additional challenges, such as relationships with the birth parents and other family dynamics. As presented in the DVD, issues around relative carers not expecting to have to take on the role of carer until the need arose can be particularly challenging. This is really a life-changing situation.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VISITOR AND TRAVEL CENTRE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Will the minister confirm that there were at least two tenderers for the privatised South Australian Visitor and Travel Centre whose proposals were for a street-level facility, complete with disability access, and can he further confirm that at least one of those tenderers was the RAA?

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) (15:01): I do not think it is appropriate for me to give answers here if I am not absolutely certain of them, so I will tell you what I do know. I do know of reports, allegedly from the RAA, that they were a tenderer and an unsuccessful one; whether that is true or not I do not know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The second question is: do I know what floor they or the other people that I may or may not know about have their places? No, I don't.

INDUSTRY AND INDIGENOUS SKILLS CENTRE PROGRAM

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (15:02): Can the Treasurer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —inform the house about funding to regional South Australian training providers for infrastructure improvements?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation) (15:02): The Industry and Indigenous Skills Centre Program provides capital infrastructure funding for training and skills centred development through two program funding streams: the Industry Skills Centres and VET Infrastructure for Indigenous People. The Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations funds the national program on a financial year basis to the value of \$11 million, with industry contributions for some of the applications.

The primary purpose is to fund minor capital costs incurred in building, refurbishing or expanding existing facilities to deliver accredited vocational education and training. The funds can also be used to purchase mobile training units and other capital training resources that directly lead to the delivery of identified industry/community VET skills and training requirements. Applicants are expected to be not-for-profit incorporated industry or community organisations, and funding is approved on a nationally competitive basis through independent state evaluation and prioritisation panels.

One of the main objectives of the program is to improve employment opportunities and the ability to deliver effective employment-related training. The program supports the goals of the Skills for All reforms, particularly in raising the skill levels of South Australians and increasing employment participation. Applicants are evaluated, endorsed and prioritised at state level against national and state identified needs for skills through independent state evaluation and prioritisation panels.

I am pleased to say today that, of the funds available nationally, South Australia has secured just over \$1.5 million. There have been three successful bids from our state. The Construction Industry Training Centre has won funding of just under \$550,000. This will be used to help with the purchase of training equipment to meet skills demands in the specific areas of construction, mining and defence. The Kalka Community Aboriginal Corporation has won just over

\$500,000 to build a skills training centre to help meet the increasing demand for training in Kalka and other APY land communities.

This new skill centre will give people living in one of our state's most remote regions access to broader training options in environmental management, mining and community development. The Career Employment Group, based in Whyalla, has won funding of just over \$460,000 to deliver critical skills through the provision of a mobile simulation facility. This facility will provide light and heavy transport operation and learner driver training through an industry standard and industry utilised program.

To the successful organisations, we congratulate you. You will be bringing state-of-the-art facilities to regional South Australia, and you will be creating opportunities for students across our state to develop their skills. This investment in infrastructure complements the state government's Skills for All reforms, which aim to increase skill levels, lift workforce participation, and provide economic benefit to the state. We will be giving people the opportunity to increase their knowledge and skills, we will be getting them work ready and, ultimately, getting them into jobs.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VISITOR AND TRAVEL CENTRE

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:06): My question is for the Minister for Tourism. When the minister was briefed—perhaps I should ask 'if' the minister was briefed—on winning the tender for the privatised—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order. You are not allowed to make a little speech when you ask a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, minister. Member for Unley, can you finish your question, please?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: Freudian slip, Madam Speaker. When the minister was briefed on the winning tender for the privatised, relocated South Australian Visitor and Travel Centre was he informed that the centre would be moving into a basement with no disability access, and how did such a location meet government tender requirements?

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) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for his question. The question presupposes that at some point in time I was given a detailed briefing about the outcome of the tender. That is not the case, unless, of course, in terms of any briefing, one is talking about the period after the tender was agreed to.

Mr Pisoni: Any time, any time at all, we'll take either one, John.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I have explained to the house before, the order of events is roughly this: on a particular day (I think it might have been a Wednesday or Thursday a couple of weeks ago) there was a story to the effect that there was a relationship between the successful tenderer and the chairman of the board. I asked, at that point, to be provided with the appropriate documentation considered by the CE in relation to that tender.

A day or so later, a bundle of documents arrived in my office and they were immediately forwarded on to the Auditor-General, accompanied by a letter from me saying, 'Here's the material that has been given to me about this matter. I ask you to look into it from the point of view of probity.' That is the sequence of events as far as my involvement in the matter is concerned.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

GREEK DIASPORA

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:09): Today I would like to speak about a dinner I attended in Adelaide last Thursday evening to celebrate the 9th International Conference on Greek Research:

Ageing in the Migrant Diaspora. It was attended by myself and Isobel Redmond, the Leader of the Opposition. I was really pleased to hear about the history of and the reasons for the conference. As somebody who enjoys the multicultural South Australia that we live in, I was very proud to be part of such an event. These conferences are held at Flinders University and hosted by the Modern Greek section of the Department of Language Studies and the Southgate Institute for Health, Society and Equity, all based at Flinders University. It has a focus on Ancient Greek philosophy and Greek literature, language, society and culture.

The Ageing component of the conference focused on the ageing experience for the first-generation migrants, in terms of access to services for those from culturally and linguistically diverse and non-English-speaking backgrounds, both in Australia and overseas.

The event consisted of a conference over four days, which included free public lectures, social events, and the dinner which the Leader of the Opposition and I attended. There was also a 'meet the locals' day for delegates, exploring the SA countryside and wineries, for those who wanted to see more of South Australia.

The biennial conference on Greek research hosted by the Flinders University attracts learned contributions from scholars and postgraduate students from around the world. This year's focus on ageing and the migrant diaspora aimed at providing a platform for international dialogue and healthy ageing among the Hellenic diaspora, and the wider aim of a cross-cultural understanding of migrant ageing communities.

The study of modern Greek language and culture offered through the Modern Greek section allows students to enter into an understanding of the importance of the Greek Hellenic tradition for European intellectual development—a cultural intellectual continuity of at least 3,000 years. It is amazing how many words in the English language have derived from Greek.

Modern Greek Studies focusing on language and culture, based at Flinders University, offers major degrees, as well as electives at Flinders University and through cross-institutional enrolment at Adelaide University, the University of South Australia and Charles Darwin University.

The conference enhances Adelaide's reputation as the Athens of the South; it is appropriate and a compliment for South Australia that the Modern Greek section of the Department of Language Studies should have established Adelaide as its home city.

YUDUM

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:13): I rise today to talk about a wonderful film premiere I attended on Tuesday night at Tandanya, as part of the NAIDOC Week celebrations. The film is called *Yudum*, and it is a film that I recommend to all members in this place, and to any other South Australians. The film was written by Aaron Stuart.

Aaron was born in Port Augusta in 1968, and his family lived on the Davenport reserve. There had been many infant deaths on the reserve, and because Aaron was very ill as a baby, his parents placed him in the adjacent Umeewarra Mission Children's Home. His mother took him back to the reserve when he was four years old. Aaron went on to become a member of the South Australia Police, and served with SAPOL for 18 years, before joining Centacare Catholic Family Services in the Diocese of Port Pirie in 2008.

Aaron has written a lot of stories, and has a collection of books with the stories of Yudum. When it was decided that Aaron would turn one of these stories into a film, the people of Oodnadatta were very pleased to hear that and, in fact, insisted that the film be shot in Oodnadatta—which, when you have a budget of \$20,000 to make a film and you are reliant on the federal government's suicide prevention program, and the generosity of the Catholic Diocese of Port Pirie, and other private funding to make the film, it was a very tight budget.

So, the filmmaker and two stars of the movie (who were taken up from Adelaide) arrived at Oodnadatta on the Monday to hold a community meeting to work out who would be in this movie. The idea was that members of the community would be part of the film; however, when they turned up to their first meeting on the Monday, there was no-one there. Obviously, it is pretty hard to make a film when you do not have anyone there to participate.

But, they got around it and eventually the people all came from far and wide. They were asked, 'Say these lines,' and told, 'Do this particular thing,' and the movie was shot inside a week—which is pretty remarkable, for anyone who has had anything to do with making a movie or documentary. Then the film was brought back to Adelaide and edited.

It is a delightful film that tells the story of a young Aboriginal man growing up not knowing who his parents were and, without wanting to give away the plot, it goes through his falling in love, getting married, having children, splitting up and getting back together again. As I said at the outset, it is a film that I would thoroughly recommend. There are a lot of people who need to be thanked for the great work that has gone into this.

I would particularly like to mention Terry Cleary, who is the statewide program manager for the Anangu Arts and Culture Aboriginal Corporation based at Tandanya. I met Terry a few weeks ago when I was opening an art exhibition at Tony Bond's art gallery out on Magill Road—the Papunya Tula exhibition. I ran into Terry that evening, and he told me about the film and said that they wanted to go back up and have the world premiere of this film in Oodnadatta where there is a small outdoor screen but, having spent the \$20,000 on making this remarkable movie, they did not have any funds at all to actually be able to put on some food and get some transport to take people from the surrounding areas into Oodnadatta.

I asked Terry to send me an email with the brief, and I then passed it on to minister Hill the next day and, within about 24 hours, the department had found \$1,000 to enable the world premiere to happen. Having been to the one at Tandanya, it was a wonderful experience, and the stars of the show and the director of the show—Terry's son—were all there, but apparently the one in Oodnadatta was fantastic because every time one of the locals came onto the big screen everyone just broke into raucous laughter, and it was a really fun night and a great celebration for the people of Oodnadatta.

Terry, I might say, also stars in the movie in the role of the Catholic priest, and he did say that it was hard to find someone to play that role once they had arrived in Oodnadatta. I congratulate Terry and Aaron and everyone else involved in the film.

POINT LOWLY DESALINATION PLANT

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:17): I rise to speak today about the proposed BHP desalination plant at Point Lowly. There has been much discussion, particularly over the last few days, regarding BHP's plan to deposit saline discharge into the Spencer Gulf, off Point Lowly. In my maiden speech, I made a commitment to represent the constituents of Flinders without fear or favour. Overwhelmingly, what I am hearing from the residents of Eyre Peninsula is that they have very grave concerns about the impact that the outflow from this plant could have on the ecology of the gulf and the existing businesses that operate in that gulf.

It has been interesting to watch the BHP proposal to expand Olympic Dam unfold over the last few years. BHP has recently modified the proposed outflow from the desal plant essentially to address concerns raised in the public consultation period. More recently, we have received notice that the prawn fishing industry had undertaken its own scientific review of BHP's supplementary EIS. That report has raised legitimate questions about the potential impact on prawn stocks in the gulf.

There are 42 prawn fishing licences in South Australia, and 39 of these boats fish in Spencer Gulf. The remaining three are on the West Coast. The prawn fishery has been operating for many years as a well-maintained fishery—world's best, even, as are all the fisheries here in South Australia. There is yet another report to be made public in the near future, and that is to come from the South Australian Research and Development Institute (SARDI). I believe that this report will provide yet another comprehensive critique of the proposal and I look forward to reading it. I understand we are still waiting for the government to make this report public.

Ultimately my role in this place is to represent the views of my constituents, and I would like to put on the record that overwhelmingly those constituents are of the opinion that this is not an appropriate site to discharge into the gulf.

BHP has done an enormous amount of work on this and has deemed Point Lowly the best location in terms of what is best for the environment. Equally, the prawn fishing industry has raised significant concerns about the environmental impact this project could have on prawn stocks. As the local member, I am mindful of the importance of the seafood industry to the Eyre Peninsula and to the state generally. BHP is also mindful of its environmental obligations, and it needs to get it absolutely right when it comes to the gulf.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:20): Yesterday I spoke to the house about the importance of community involvement in reducing domestic violence and the need to recognise that domestic

violence is not just something that happens in a home between family members and that should be left there; it is something that the whole community is affected by and can in turn influence the way in which domestic violence, which is a vicious form of bullying, is accepted or not accepted in the community.

I indicated that I have hopes that South Australia will lead Australia, and indeed the world, in reducing domestic violence because of the effective action it is taking in relation to bullying. I cited a study by Professor Donna Cross from Edith Cowan University, which showed that South Australia has the lowest rate of all forms of bullying across Australia (22 per cent compared to 27 per cent) and the lowest rate of covert bullying in state schools in the nation (11 per cent compared to 17 per cent).

South Australia, I believe, was also the first state to introduce bullying specifically as an issue in the workplace, through actions taken through the health and safety legislation and in the standardisation of health and safety legislation across Australia. The preservation of the South Australian provisions in relation to bullying was an important issue.

I would like to address today the fact that this lowest rate of bullying in South Australia has not just come about by accident. The promising results in South Australian schools are the result of consistent action led by the Rann government. Professor Cross says that she believes that one of the reasons that South Australian schools have the lowest level of bullying is the collaborative actions undertaken by the Coalition to Decrease Bullying, Harassment and Violence in South Australian Schools. This is chaired by Janine Harvey, the Assistant Director of Child and Student Wellbeing in DECS, and its membership includes national and international experts (Professors Rigby and Slee and Drs Spears and Yoneyama), together with representatives from the three schooling sectors and a representative from the South Australian schools.

Professor Cross is of the opinion that the work that this group is doing to provide active support to schools is enabling our schools to deal better with this problem. It is very important to mention that bullying in schools does not just come about because of the schools. It happens in the community and is brought into schools, and with modern technology is taken more rapidly from schools out into the community.

Some of the actions that have been taken by the Rann government include the introduction of primary counsellors into our primary schools. My recollection is that the gradual introduction was one of the first initiatives of the Rann government where primary school counsellors were introduced to schools in disadvantaged areas. Since the Rann government has come to power, the number of attendance counsellors has also increased. It is now 24 compared with, according to my recollection, six in 2002.

We have regional support services that support teacher behaviour consultants in schools. We have child and student wellbeing policy advisers, and there is a special initiative to enable country schools to access funds to enable programs to be accessed by teachers in country schools. We have established a range of training packages for leaders in schools, teachers and SSOs working in schools. One of the programs we have initiated—and it is particularly appreciated in my schools—is the SMART program which provides training in understanding the impact of abuse on students. I commend these initiatives to the house.

ONE AND ALL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:26): The completion of the sail training vessel *One and All* in 1987 was the fulfilment of a long-term dream. A dedicated team of volunteers worked for many years to construct a purpose-built sail training vessel in South Australia that could operate youth development programs. The ship's keel was laid in 1982. Initial funding came from public subscriptions and a Community Employment Project Grant. In 1985, proceeds from the charter agreement with the First Fleet Re-Enactment Company, the South Australian government and corporate sponsors were used to complete the ship, assist with the cost to take part in the re-enactment and bring the ship home to operate in its key role of sail training for youth development.

The ship was commissioned on 5 April 1987. She sailed halfway around the world on her maiden voyage, joining the First Fleet Re-Enactment just outside of Rio de Janeiro. She returned to Australia with the fleet, arriving in South Australia on 1 April 1988. Since the *One and All's* return to South Australia in 1988, she has continuously fulfilled her purpose-built role, that of a sail training vessel for youth development programs.

The Sailing Ship Trust of South Australia (the trust) was formed on 20 September 1989 and incorporated on 27 October 1994. The trust was formed for the sole purpose of retaining the sail training vessel *One and All* for the people of the state of South Australia. The trust is the public custodian of the ship and ensures her maintenance and safe operation. In line with the initial intent of the ship, the trust predominantly runs the *One and All* as a sail training vessel for youth development programs.

I had the privilege of serving on the trust board for a number of years along with Chairman, Rod Lindquist. Prior to that, it was a former member of the other place the Hon. Martin Cameron. Other members were Scott MacKenzie, Harry Wierda, Alec Mathieson, Bob Dabrowski, Tess McGrath, Duncan Welch, Lisa Jesse, Graham Ingerson and Commander John Parkin. Indeed, the foundation president of the *One and All*, Sir James Hardy, said of this ship:

The reason for building *One & All* was to provide the community with a vessel for sail training and to provide a unique youth development program for South Australia. Working as a team on a ship under all conditions makes better people out of all of us and that can only have long term benefits for the rest of the community. The building of the *One & All* was a labour of love for all of us and the last twenty years has provided our youth with a unique environment from which to learn the skills of life.

During my term as a member of the trust board, I had the opportunity to sail on the *One and All* in the Sydney to Hobart race in 1994—a most enjoyable but terrifying experience. Nevertheless, the most important job of this ship has been for the youth of South Australia. The education department and other youth programs have joined with the use of this ship over decades now and, therefore, it made me very sad recently to hear that, as of last Friday 1 July 2011, all of the staff and the crew have been sacked, the government having taken over the control of the ship some years before (that is, the current government) to find that it had been in a financially impecunious state in its management. I do not know the detail of that. Very significant sums of money have been put in by the government in the last few years to maintain its survey qualifications and general maintenance. However, there seems to be a general acknowledgment by the government that something has gone wrong.

But its decision to sack the crew and to put out for tender on 5 July this week for its operation and management as a request for proposal invitation really is very concerning, because this also confirms to me that the government has abandoned its commitment to youth training programs in this state. The document that is now published on the website for the management tender includes:

...to establish a charter party agreement for a minimum term of five years.

It clearly states in the objectives:

...a primary objective is that it generate revenue sufficient to sustain the vessel's operation as a minimum and, if possible, return a financial benefit to the operator.

The government wants to make a profit out of a vessel that had been put together by volunteers with hard work and commitment to the youth of South Australia. The government now wants to try to make a profit out of it. It has already hopelessly failed with the *Falie*, which is now attached to a mooring at Port Adelaide—still—and falling into disrepair.

That was a disastrous venture. Now it wants to take over something and usurp what has been an admirable objective for the trust. I am very, very concerned about the future of this for South Australia, particularly the youth, and I ask: where is the Minister for Youth on this issue and what will she do about it?

30-YEAR PLAN FOR GREATER ADELAIDE

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:31): On 17 February 2010 the previous minister for urban development and planning (Hon. Paul Holloway) launched a final report of the 30-year plan. Since that date the plan has generated and received a great deal of commentary, both positive and negative.

The 30-year plan will have a significant presence in my own electorate of Light. The areas of Playford Alive, Angle Vale, Munno Para West, Munno Para Downs, southern Gawler, Gawler East, Concordia and Roseworthy are all within my electorate. At the moment there are a number of ministerial and local council DPAs to give effect to parts of these developments.

In terms of the Roseworthy development, there is both a residential component and employment lands—some of it is designed to be put onstream between now and 15 years, and a

second portion between 15 and 30 years. I recently led a tour of the electorate for a range of community, business and education leaders and local media.

The purpose of the tour of the electorate was to give the 30-year plan greater context. It will usher in some significant changes for the electorate. The changes do not have to be negative. In fact, the plan has created a sense of renewal in many sections of the community, but the plan needs to be implemented carefully and have proper regard for the needs of the relevant communities and the people.

Done well they will add to the financial sustainability of local government and the communities in the area they serve; done poorly we will burden future generations with huge infrastructure costs. I have spoken on a number of occasions in this place about the various elements of the 30-year plan. Today I wish to highlight the proposed Roseworthy development and place on record the issues that I believe need to be addressed if the development is to proceed.

I have previously raised concerns about the general DPA process, as well as other DPAs. I am happy to say that these concerns have been addressed in the current process underway in my electorate. I am aware that the Light Regional Council has established a government structure to ensure transparency and accountability of the structure planning and DPA process for Roseworthy.

I am satisfied that the council has endeavoured to make the process as transparent and accountable as possible. My concerns lie in two areas: first, the provision of Just-in-Time infrastructure; and, secondly, the provision of Just-in-Time employment. Infrastructure will require major investment by the developer or developers and appropriate support from state and local government.

Accordingly, both state and local government will need to know the extent of the infrastructure required to ensure that the future budgets cater for it. In particular, it is my view that both public transport and road transport need to be fully planned and budgeted for before any DPA is authorised to enable the development to go ahead. The proposed train and complementary transport services need to be agreed to before the development gets the green light. Equally, agreement needs to be reached on the location and construction of the north-eastern connector for Gawler to ensure that east-west traffic generated by the Roseworthy development does not engulf Gawler.

For communities to be sustainable, they require a level of local employment opportunities. In my view, any residential DPA for Roseworthy must be simultaneously complemented by an Employment Lands DPA. People will need jobs locally. The investment process that leads to employment is generally longer than a residential DPA, so an Employment Lands DPA must be central to any structural planning for the Roseworthy development. It cannot be an add-on or an afterthought.

A central factor of the 30-year-plan is to ensure that we have appropriate zoned and serviced land that would accommodate whatever growth we have over the next 29 years. It is imperative that we get right the first steps we take in the development of Roseworthy. Time and reflection should not be sacrificed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LAND HOLDING ENTITIES AND TAX AVOIDANCE SCHEMES) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: We agree with the minister.

Motion carried.

ELECTRICAL PRODUCTS (ENERGY PRODUCTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 March 2011.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:37): I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. The Electrical Products (Energy Products) Amendment Bill will amend and rename the Electrical Products Act 2000 and amend the Gas Act 1997. The bill will introduce minimum energy performance standards and labelling for gas

products. Minimum energy performance standards are already used for electrical products. This bill will ensure that similar standards will now apply to gas products.

The bill arises from the decision of the Ministerial Council for Energy to bring the existing industry sponsored gas labelling scheme into a consistent regulatory framework. The bill will extend the Electrical Products Act 2000 to cover gas products, both natural gas and LPG, and in the future other energy products, such as solar, will also be included. It renames the act the Energy Products (Safety and Efficiency) Act.

The bill extends the Governor's proclamation powers to energy products rather than simply electricity products and allows the Governor to declare a certification body to certify energy products as opposed to electrical products. The bill enables the technical regulator to issue public warnings on unsafe products and installation practices.

Under the new Electricity Products Act 2000, authorised persons will be renamed authorised officers, and the information-gathering powers of authorised officers have been extended to bring them into line with other acts such as the Electricity Act 1996. The extended powers include the ability of authorised officers to stop and inspect a vehicle (that means break into, if necessary) if it is suspected that products contravening the act have been loaded onto that vehicle. The authorised officer would need a warrant issued by a magistrate to perform that action. The bill also provides authorised officers with the power to seize products pursuant to a seizure order and have them tested.

The bill modifies the privilege against self-incrimination, and I will ask the minister about that clause in committee. The government alleges that the existing self-incrimination privilege has been used by traders to avoid answering questions. It is proposed that the privilege will be modified with respect to safety issues. It will be retained for natural persons including directors of a body corporate but removed for bodies corporate. The bill also provides a grandfathering period to enable traders to clear existing stocks. This will remain at six months as already in the Electricity Products Act 2000.

I conclude my remarks there and indicate that the opposition will be supporting the passage of the bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:42): I, too, rise on the opposition's side to support the Electrical Products (Energy Products) Amendment Bill. I note that this bill will introduce minimum energy performance standards and labelling for gas products. I note this is already used in relation to electrical products and, when this bill is enacted, it will ensure that similar standards will apply to gas products.

I would like to give an overview of an issue with gas appliances, especially for people who live in the country. I do not think a place like Coomandook is that far from the big smoke, being about 130 or 140 kilometres from the centre of Adelaide. I went through the process of installing a gas heater at the farm when my father was living there. He was about 86 and I was living down the road in a rented farmhouse. I could tell he was struggling to deal with loading wood into the combustion heater so I said, 'I'm going to fix it, Dad; I'll fix it right up. We will get a gas heater and away we'll go.'

I think it was at Ultimate Heating in Adelaide where I found a good gas heater. We organised it and had it installed, once I found a plumber who would come out from Murray Bridge to help put the flue kit and everything in. Then we hooked it up to the normal outside household gas bottles that weigh about 85 kilos. What we did not know at the time was how much gas this monster would eat.

The Hon. M.F. O'Brien: Put it back on the wood fire.

Mr PEDERICK: Having moved back to the farm in the last 2½ years, I find it very tempting to get the chainsaw out, not just for the wood. The exercise would not hurt either; it is just finding the time. We had twin bottles hooked up outside the lounge room where the gas heater was installed and we found that we would get through one of them in about a fortnight.

Apart from being 86 and a little infirm at the time, as he still is but a little bit older at 91, my dad could not move the bottles. With me being involved in here, it was difficult to be around all the time to shift the bottles. So, I thought I would go through the process of putting in one of those gas bullets that you see at the service stations. That is a difficult exercise to arrange.

You get hold of the gas companies and, for a start, none of them would entertain the idea. I found out what the issue was, and I congratulate Tony Henika from Origin, who finally came on board with me. He said, 'Well, your problem is, Adrian, you're not on a gas delivery route.' For some reason Coomandook may as well be at Birdsville, because the route coming down from the city turns off at Tailem Bend and heads out the Mallee Highway, and the South-East gas delivery route only comes to Coonalpyn, so I am in the black hole. It was an interesting exercise.

I said to Tony Henika, 'Listen, Tony, you tell me how it's going to work. I know that means money,' and it did. Anyway, Tony came up with a gas price per litre so that we could have gas delivered. It is a hell of a lot more than you would pay for gas delivered in the trunk network in the city, but it is probably comparable with the price of buying bottles and hooking them up. You have to have an audit every year. You have to have a safe work ticket, which is fine. I think that is about \$150. Origin found me a little bullet that holds about a tonne of gas legally, and we got that delivered. Then I had to get my fencing contractor to put in all the barriers so you cannot back into it, and I had some old railway iron posts that did the job admirably.

As you can imagine, by now the costs are starting to mount and the chainsaw is looking a lot more attractive, but it does not end there. We got that all worked out, and it was great to have the gas supply for my dad who was living at the farm at the time. We see that copper prices have gone through the roof now, but then we had to plumb the copper into the house from the big tank, which we did. I am not going to tell the house how much it cost me in the end, but I can say that the whole project was a few thousand dollars, which was a few more than I imagined.

What I am getting at is that it will be very helpful, with a bill like this, for people to know the approximate energy use for an appliance so that they can fully evaluate what they need to do when fitting any gas appliances, whether it be combustion heaters, water heaters, or gas stoves, which I believe are certainly better to cook on than electrical stoves. It will certainly help consumers make value decisions when installing gas. Even though it did hurt the hip pocket a bit, it is nice to get up in the morning, hit a button and everything lights up in front of you.

Mr Williams: What are you talking about now?

Mr PEDERICK: I am talking about gas, Mitch. Before we digress, I will leave it there.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:49): I have listened with keen interest, and I think dad got off quite lightly. I would not have even given him the chainsaw; I would have just sharpened the axe for him. It was a dutiful son looking after his dad, and it is wonderful that he lights up the way that he does in the morning. With those remarks, we will conclude the debate and get onto an examination of the various clauses.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

Mr WILLIAMS: I do not think the committee will take a long. I just want to take the opportunity to raise an issue, which I raise from time to time when bills are going through this committee, with regard to the general powers of authorised officers.

We continually get what I can only describe as draconian powers given to a whole range of authorised officers performing a whole range of functions under a significant amount of the statute law of the state. We are continually given the excuse that, 'This is just a standard set of powers, and we have it in this act and we have in that act, and it won't cause a problem.' From my experience—and I have been here for a few years now, but it is not aeons—we have, in a creeping fashion, given more and more powers to authorised officers.

I do not have a problem, per se, with authorised officers having adequate powers to perform their functions. What I do recognise, though, is that every time we give another power to an authorised officer we are impeding or impinging upon the rights of citizens. In this particular case, I really do ask the minister: how serious are the issues with regard to administering the existing legislation, and what grave ills does he experience—and I say 'experience', not expect? I want to know what experiences and what ills we are trying to rectify with this legislation.

I particularly draw the committee's attention to what will become new section 11—General powers of authorised officers, subsection (7), which will remove the right of a person to remain silent. If a person who believes they might be incriminating themselves is forced to provide information, the caveat is that:

...if the person is a natural person, the information or document so given or produced will not be admissible in evidence against the person in proceedings for an offence...

Notwithstanding that, if that particular piece of information cannot be admissible in the proceedings against the person, the person still may incriminate themselves, and we are removing one of the fundamental tenets of living in a free and open democratic society. We do this, I think, far too regularly. I continue to argue against it. It is not the sort of power that our police enjoy when they are investigating criminal matters, but we give these powers to authorised officers in a whole range of statute law. I ask the minister: on what basis is it deemed necessary that we incorporate this power for authorised officers under this piece of legislation?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: I thank the member for MacKillop for the question. I have just been informed by my officer that there was an instance in Victoria quite recently where a gas device did not meet specification and, as a result, two children died from carbon monoxide poisoning. I must admit the instances are rare, but when they do occur they are of significant consequence, and for that reason we believe that the powers contained within the bill are required. They would be used infrequently but, when required to be used, there would be a compelling reason, such as the death of two children by virtue of carbon monoxide poisoning.

Mr WILLIAMS: Minister, are you telling the house that, if the Victorian authorised officers—I am not sure whether they have authorised officers in Victoria—or their equivalent had had these powers, the deaths of these two children would have been prevented?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: No; the intent of the clause is to allow the investigating officer (the regulator) to compel the supplier of the equipment to indicate, most importantly, where similar devices have been installed so they can be removed and also to advise where the uninstalled devices are stored (whether in a warehouse or, in some instances, in the boot of a car). This sets out to ensure that, once a defect is noted—and hopefully it is not as a result of a tragic accident—and as soon as a device is found to be faulty, there is power to compel the installer or the seller to inform officers of other installations.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am not going to hold the committee any longer. The minister has given an explanation which, to my mind, is totally inadequate in making the case for having these powers in this legislation. I cannot, for the life of me, imagine a situation where there has been a tragedy and a person who has the knowledge of where a risk may arise in other circumstances, through similar equipment, would withhold that information. I cannot, for the life of me, imagine that we would need this power to extract that relevant information.

Having said that, I think this is a classic case of using a sledgehammer to crack open an acorn. What disturbs me is that this will now be used as an example to say, 'It is in this piece of legislation, therefore, we can justify putting it into another piece of legislation,' and so it flows on. I think it is an outrage that, as a parliament, we have accepted that we should be investing these powers in authorised officers.

I repeat: we do not give these powers to police officers, who go through considerable training, who are investigating criminal matters, and who still manage to get convictions. It is my suspicion that the reason that we are being asked by the bureaucracy to give these powers is not about saving lives but it is about getting much easier convictions after the fact. I think the parliament should question that, and certainly, for as long as I am in this place, I will continue to question it.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: The official has advised me—and the official runs a team of eight auditors who are responsible for checking on the quality of electrical installations and gas installations—that it is his experience that if able, people will claim privilege, that there is a general reluctance to expose a scale of inappropriate installation or inadequate equipment. That is the officer's experience, and if we look to New South Wales in particular, in terms of the installation of the ceiling batts, we can see what shoddy workmanship and inexperience can bring in its wake. The last thing that we want is a couple of deaths to prove that this particular section in the bill is required.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (16 to 21), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Energy, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (16:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION (RIGHT TO RECORD CERTAIN CONVERSATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DE FACTO RELATIONSHIPS) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ELECTRONIC TRANSACTIONS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May 2011.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:05): It is with pleasure that I indicate to the house that the opposition has considered this bill, and we will be supporting it. The bill was introduced in this house by the Attorney-General on 4 May 2011. As outlined by the Attorney's second reading contribution, it purports to update the Commercial Arbitration and Industrial Referral Agreements Act 1986 to reflect amendments in 2006 to the United Nations Commission on International Trade, the UNICITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration. The Standing Committee of Attorneys-General (SCAG) met in April 2009 and noted that the UNICITRAL Model Law on International Commercial Arbitration could form the basis of a uniform domestic arbitration in Australia.

In May 2010, SCAG agreed to a draft model law based on the UNICITRAL model but adapted for domestic application. As we understand it, it includes elements of the commonwealth act, such as the maintenance of confidentiality (section 27E(1)) and issues of costs and awarding of interest (section 33B). Our understanding is that this model bill has already been adopted in the New South Wales and Tasmanian parliaments and, as I have indicated, it is one which we support.

I should disclose that I am a registered arbitrator and in doing so indicate that I do not think there is any conflict of interest in my speaking on this matter. It is not a qualification that I have utilised very heavily because I decided to come to parliament not long after obtaining that qualification in Tasmania. I will say that arbitration as a means of mitigating against expensive court litigation generally has been favourably received around Australia and has offered an alternative for litigants to the court process, largely to minimise cost and time.

Unfortunately, some of our courts are under enormous stress in undertaking litigation and determinations through the court process, and therefore litigants or potential litigants have been facing months, if not years, of delay. It is important that we offer that relief where disputes have arisen. In this circumstance, I think that all members would appreciate, just as we have moved for corporate registration at a national level, for the very same reason it is important. We have companies and businesses Australia-wide which do operate and practise their businesses or professions across jurisdictions that are state jurisdictions, and it is important to have some uniformity in this area.

This is the method which the Attorney on South Australia's behalf at the SCAG meeting has signed up to as the means to implement it, by the model bill being introduced to each of the jurisdictions, and accordingly I indicate that we will support the bill. I should also indicate that the Hon. Stephen Wade in another place has consulted with a number of different bodies that we consider would have some say on this matter, including the Law Society of South Australia, the Australian Centre for International Commercial Arbitration, the Institute of Arbitrators and Mediators Australia, and others.

I will say that the Law Society has not expressed any concern or suggested any amendments. Mr Ian Nosworthy of Nosworthy Partners, someone whom I overlapped for a time in legal practice and someone who has been recognised in the mediation and arbitration world of some experience and capacity, had this to say:

I have been involved in the arbitral community in Australia, and particularly in South Australia for many years, and I confirm that that community welcomes the introduction of the *Commercial Arbitration Bill 2011*. There is a need for a uniform arbitration regime in Australia and, to the extent that it harmonises with our international arbitration regime, that will ultimately be to the benefit of us all.

Mr Nosworthy is an Adelaide-based board member of ACICA and a past president of the AIMA.

Certainly, we have appreciated his indication of endorsement. Mr Nosworthy, of course, continues in his work in this field to the aid of potentially warring parties. Probably the most recent occasion that I am familiar with to do with his involvement, which I think has assisted to progress the matter, was the mediation of a number of different local government councils over the stormwater project for the Brown Hill and Keswick Creek project, which has had some notoriety in the press due to the different views taken by Mitcham, West Torrens and other relevant councils.

Because it covers a flood area and potential water harvesting, some of that is seen in a damaged and detrimental way and others have seen it as a positive and potential opportunity way. We have councils like the Adelaide City Council that would have the opportunity to harvest a significant amount of water out of that. My local council of Burnside has an opportunity to harvest and aggregate water into the bottom end of the Glenside hospital site and channel that water under Greenhill Road into the South Parklands, if such a project were to have some momentum and to advance. We have the areas in Unley and West Torrens where often every year they get flooded and, of course, there is a flood mitigation opportunity there.

When we have circumstances like this, it is important to be able to bring in an arbitrator to determine the matter or a mediator to help assist in the resolution of the matter. One of Mr Nosworthy's recent cases was to assist in that regard. I, and other members of the parliamentary party, certainly have appreciated his advice and recommendation in this regard. With those few words, I indicate our support and I will not be asking the house to go into committee.

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) (16:14): I place on record my appreciation of the contribution from the honourable member for Bragg and say what a delight it is that in this chamber we have the honourable member dealing with these matters and what a contrast it is to another place where things go on interminably, where amendments are moved endlessly, where the simplest of things become intricate, complex and—

Mr Pederick: Come on, John. There's an air of love this afternoon. Let's go.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, you know, John Paul Young didn't always get it wrong. I am quite serious when I say this, because, even in conferences where the two houses have attempted to resolve their differences, I have felt that the member for Bragg quickly understands the issues, comprehends the issues. She does not necessarily agree with me—often does not—and is quite firm in saying so, I might add, but does not appear to have a problem understanding what is being said, and that is tremendously gratifying to me. Can I just say that the other day—

Ms Chapman: Ping-pong balls!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I was just going to go there. The other day when we were explaining about balloons and ping-pong balls, I looked across the other side and the member for Schubert had a huge question mark written on his face. The member for Kavel stirred himself to emit a question mark. There were question marks, and then the member for Bragg, sitting there nodding—'I've got it. I know what you're talking about.' I think that afterwards she gathered the member for Schubert and a few others together and explained to them what was going on, and I think they were probably grateful for that elucidation by the member for Bragg.

I am quite genuine in saying that it is marvellous to be able to have things in here which are dealt with on their merits. Even though no-one is tougher in this place than the member for Bragg when she is offended or unhappy about something, she is equally generous and courteous in terms of agreement, and she is an ornament to the parliament in that respect. I thank her very much for her cooperation in relation to this matter.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (16:17): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:20): I could not pass the opportunity to make a contribution at this time. A number of us will be going off to enjoy the school holidays. My children are way past school age but I will be enjoying them nonetheless. I will be castrating a few cattle next week, and other things, which will be an interesting task. The purpose of me speaking today is to place on the record one area of concern that I have post the budget process.

Shortly prior to the budget being announced this year, I attended a Public Works meeting for the consideration of a project by the Metropolitan Fire Service to redevelop an existing Metropolitan Fire Service operation on Portrush Road in my electorate. It is something which I have championed for some time: firstly, that it be retained, in light of a new facility being built in Norwood a number of years before, with the prospect that the station at Glen Osmond might be forfeited in some way and lost.

I had taken up with the minister and others, the need to ensure that we maintained a Metropolitan Fire Service profile in the electorate, and adjacent to the major South-Eastern Freeway, and also to service people who are resident in the Waite area, and, as we move up the hill, in addition to Bragg, obviously into Heysen and the like. So, it was very important that we maintained a Metropolitan Fire Service right next to the major arterial road leaving Adelaide to the east.

I was pleased that the matter had progressed into a Public Works consideration, that is, it had been announced late last year and had progressed that far. The reason that I was particularly pleased was because I had not seen it in the previous year's budget as a capital works.

Normally a project of more than \$4 million—as this one was to be—not only needs Public Works approval but is usually sufficiently important to be announced in a budget. As pleased as I was that this project had advanced, what I did learn was that it was a project that was utilising funds for smaller projects that had been announced in the previous budget. When we have a list of capital works projects, they are identified, but there is also an amount of money used at the end of these lists of projects for most portfolios for other projects.

They usually relate to smaller projects for which, often, the minister subsequently provides a list. They might only be for a few hundred thousand dollars, sometimes they might be up to a million dollars, so it was very unusual that most of a portion of other project's money should actually be allocated to one major project that had not been identified in last year's budget.

As the local member, I am not complaining, but why is it that halfway through the financial year a decision is made for other projects money—which I assume had been earmarked for smaller projects—to be given to this one major project? I am grateful for it, but I ask the question, what other projects have missed out? Have there been other smaller projects—I am not saying they are any more worthy—for which there would have been a reasonable expectation of having that money that they would otherwise have been eligible for?

If I could have some reassurance that the minister had not in any way, or if the department had not in any way, cut off the expectation of other people who were looking for smaller MFS projects—for example, to buy a vehicle or replace some equipment in an existing station—then I would feel much relieved. I look forward to the minister giving some reassurance on that, as I do not feel that has been done.

I will report to the house in due course as we progress the Public Works report, which I note has been tabled today. I will be very happy to speak on it and support the worthy project that will progress as soon as public works approval is complete.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:25): I rise to finish a griever, which I was halfway through in yesterday's griever session, on the imminent release of the Murray-Darling Basin draft plan. To carry on with what I was saying, and where I left off, South Australia needs to be represented as one for the best outcome for every South Australian. At the moment, unfortunately, I see a media approach to the release of the plan, and it is dividing every water user and every sector and group of people who rely on water within the Murray-Darling Basin.

Of late, we see the media portraying the interests of the environment against the interests of food and fibre production, and we see a perception that the environment is against the communities that rely on the river and on the economies that the river helps to generate. The communities are driven, essentially, by food production and tourism. Those two industries are extremely important not only to local economies but to South Australia's economy as one.

The vision we in South Australia have to portray to the rest of the basin states is that we have a united approach and that we will work together for an outcome that will benefit everyone here in South Australia. The vision I have for balanced reform is that the water that needs to be put back into the environment and into the river systems has to come from somewhere. At the moment, we are looking at a very large system with a lot of inefficiencies, a lot of leakage and a lot of evaporation, and I think that is what needs to be addressed.

The federal government, particularly the previous federal water minister, was fixated on taking the water away from communities and taking the water away from food producers and just leaving the environment to go along as it once did many hundreds of years ago. That is not what the outcome needs to be.

We need to look at fixing up the leaks. The Murray-Darling Basin is, essentially, a leaky bucket and along the system we have leaks, we have inefficient delivery systems and we have inefficient farm practices along the way. The federal government has a very large bucket of money; some of that money is to spend on infrastructure upgrades, and some of that money is to spend on strategic water buyback.

What I would like to see with this new reform is a win-win for everybody and, to achieve that, we need to fix up what we have. We need to look at the strategic buyback. That approach enables farmers who are of an age that they want to get out, and people who are cash-strapped and who need to underpin their businesses with some money, to sell some of their water licences and continue with the business they have been in for many years or for many generations, in most cases.

Again, we need to look at an audit of where those savings can be made. We need to look at where we can measure at the point of extraction. We need a unified, strategic metering process. I re-emphasise that you cannot manage what you do not meter; if you do not know how much water you are using, how can you manage what you have?

Again, we look at the infrastructure money that needs to be spent. Nearly \$6 billion of infrastructure money can be spent on improving the infrastructure and the delivery via the open earthen channels. In many cases, it is not viable to put the big channels into pipes, but there are a lot of those secondary channels that could be putting water into pipes. They would not have the evaporation loss and the seepage loss, and it would be a more efficient way to get water to the gate and onto the farm. We look at on-farm efficiencies. We look at the schemes that the federal government has in place to help support the transformation from open delivery on farm to sealed delivery on farm.

South Australia is a working example of what can be achieved. What we have achieved over 40 years is remarkable, and I urge the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to adopt some of those practices that not only South Australia but many other regions have adopted. However, there are areas that need to look at the big picture, and that is using water more wisely and efficiently. South Australia must work as one. Every South Australian will benefit in the long term with some short-term reform.

PARLIAMENTARY FRIENDS OF THE HELLENIC REPUBLIC

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (16:31): I rise this afternoon to talk about an exciting event that happened in the Torrens Room at lunchtime today when, for the first time, a group of people from both the upper and lower houses of the South Australian parliament formed the South Australian Parliamentary Friends of the Hellenic Republic. This is a group of concerned South Australian

parliamentarians who wish to encourage the development of friendly relations between the two great nations that I have mentioned before and the peoples of those countries.

We aim to enhance interactions between the South Australian and Greek communities through discussions, and also through the governments of the two bodies, and the broader communities in Australia and Greece. We also aim to provide hosting and good delegation hosting between the two nations, and we want to discuss cultural linkages and opportunities between the State of South Australia and the nation of Greece.

The friendship group is a multipartisan project, with the Greens' Hon. Tammy Franks MLC attending. Martin Hamilton-Smith and I were elected as co-conveners. Minister Tom Koutsantonis, the member for West Torrens, was elected as group secretary. I look forward to working with those three people to further the project over the coming months.

As we discussed today, we are looking towards the Parthenon marbles, and aged-care facilities for people of Greek heritage in South Australia and the issues that they currently face. We also discussed broader cultural connections between the two nations and establishing relationships with other parliamentary friendship groups with the Hellenic Republic throughout Australia, including the federal parliament group.

In closing, I thank the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker for facilitating the establishment of this group today and the some 20 members of parliament who made the time to attend the lunchtime gathering and who support this important multicultural initiative.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VISITOR AND TRAVEL CENTRE

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Urban Development, Planning and the City of Adelaide, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Food Marketing) (16:33): I wish to make a brief ministerial statement. In answer to a question today regarding the question of tenders for the tourism licence, I have seen a copy of the rush from *Hansard* which says:

I do know of reports, allegedly from the RAA, that they were a tenderer, and an unsuccessful one; whether that is true or not I do not know.

I wish to make it clear to the house that, lest the word 'allegedly' be misconceived, I do know of a report from the RAA, because they wrote stating that they had been a tenderer, and an unsuccessful one. My answer was intended to convey that I had been told that they were a tenderer, by them, but I do not know from examination of the tender documents whether that is the case or not.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

SCHOOL VIOLENCE AND BULLYING

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (16:35): I had not finished talking about the issue of bullying, so I am sure the house will be pleased to hear some more about this important issue, because it is incumbent on every one of us to take a role in the community, particularly in our schools, to see this evil practice stamped out.

It is my contention that bullying in schools leads to violence in relationships, and violence in relationships is something that is damaging to all members concerned in that relationship. It puts strain on the family around them as well as the immediate participants. It should be remembered that domestic violence is also a cause of harm to animals and is therefore quite a comprehensive evil in our society. Many millions of days and many millions of dollars are lost in productivity through domestic violence each year. Our hospitals treat too many people as a result of domestic violence, and it generally undermines the wellbeing and relationships in our community.

This week, the Minister for Education released a report by an eminent South Australian, Bill Cossey, entitled 'Review of procedures and processes in Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) related to bullying and violence in schools'. This report again reinforces the fact that, while bullying is a problem in all schools in all communities, South Australia is, in fact, doing very well and that, given this good starting basis, we have every opportunity to continually refine our policies and procedures and our understanding of bullying and the damage it does not only to those who are bullied but also to those who do the bullying.

It is most rare, I think, that people who act as bullies, people who perpetrate domestic violence, are happy, healthy participants in our community. The member for Little Para, through his

experience as a police officer, would have seen too much of the damage caused by domestic violence in our community.

Some of the interesting and important messages from the Cossey report include the fact that the community, fortunately, is increasing its level of concern about bullying and violence. What was tolerated in the past is no longer tolerated, and we can only be pleased about that; but that means that our school staff, teachers, volunteers and visitors to schools, as well as the support structures in the education department, are having to retrain and re-evaluate the way they have handled situations in the past.

Another factor which makes bullying more complex is the increased number of students with disabilities in schools. About 10 per cent of students in South Australian state schools are identified as having a disability, and quite frequently that is a disability in terms of communication. We know that children who suffer from Aspergers and autism behave differently in a perfectly reasonable situation. Staff need to be very skilled not only in handling that situation themselves but also in guiding other students how to behave respectfully towards children with a disability. In the section trying to define the dimension of the problem, Mr Cossey states:

Whilst the number of critical incidents reported in DECS schools each year is a small proportion of the number of students (in 2010 there were 1,974 incidents reported as critical against a total DECS school population of approximately 165,000 students), the community needs assurance that everything possible is being done by DECS to minimise this number. Again, this is consistent with what DECS and its schools aim to achieve.

In the section 'South Australia is not alone', Mr Cossey notes, 'Education systems throughout Australia and across the world are faced with similar problems and challenges,' and he emphasises again that:

...international evidence strongly indicates that Australian and South Australian schools are amongst the safest in the world.

There has been some speculation as to whether the incidence of bullying and related violence is on the increase and whether it is higher in DECS schools than in interstate schools. Enquiries made of researchers during this review revealed that the research to date suggests that, overall, bullying in schools is not increasing and may even be slightly in decline although, as discussed [elsewhere] there is an apparent shift towards more cyber bullying. Research also indicates that cyber bullying and face to face bullying are not mutually exclusive activities

He concludes this section by saying:

However, there is no doubt that any level of bullying is too high and the community's tolerance of it is decreasing.

The fact that the community is feeling differently in terms of bullying and general fighting at schools—which was certainly part of what I saw as a child at school, and what my brothers talked about—is no longer tolerated is a sign, I hope, that Australians are not tolerating bullying and violence of any sort and that that will translate into peace and harmony in our homes.

In respect of the fairly new area of cyber bullying, Professor Donna Cross from Queensland said, 'Academic research already conducted in Australia is still progressing,' but so far it indicates that:

- Although the overall incidence of bullying is not increasing, cyber bullying is increasing whereas face to face bullying is in decline;
- More than 80% of students who have been bullied or who have initiated bullying activities have been involved in both face to face and cyber bullying;
- Face to face bullying starts in the early years of primary school and peaks at the point of transition to secondary school before declining whereas cyber bullying continues to increase through secondary school.

There is more and more vital material in the work of Professor Donna Cross and in the report of Mr Bill Cossey. I am pleased that the education department and the minister are responding to this and looking at ways of continually updating already excellent policies.

At 16:43 the house adjourned until Tuesday 26 July 2011 at 11:00.