

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 March 2012

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:02 and read prayers.

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

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The **Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11:03)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.M. RANKINE**: On the most recent sitting day of parliament (Thursday 15 March), in discussing the powers of the Governor in Executive Council, I referred to offenders Michael Allen Shillabeer and Kevin Kenneth Riley. It has been brought to my attention that neither of these convicted offenders were recommended for release on parole by the Parole Board. The presiding member of the Parole Board was made aware of this and of my intention to correct the record as soon as it was brought to my attention.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW IMPLEMENTATION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 March 2012.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:04): I indicate to the house that I will be the lead speaker on this matter, not that I expect to take a long time and not that I expect there to be a significant number of speakers from this side of the house. I have had the great pleasure of being the shadow minister for energy for a significant time now, and I have been the shadow minister at the time when a number of bills have been introduced and debated in the parliament with regard to moving to a national electricity market and then implementing various stages of the development of the national electricity market.

This is the latest of that long line of legislation to transfer regulatory powers with regard to the production, distribution and sale of energy—it started with electricity but it is now called the energy market because it encompasses both gas and electricity—and to move from a state-based regulatory system to a federal, or national, based regulatory system. When I say 'national based', I remind the house that the national market consists of those markets in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, South Australia and the ACT. Obviously, the Northern Territory and Western Australia are not connected to the eastern seaboard grid, which the rest of the nation is, including, now, Tasmania via Basslink.

The latest tranche of the change of law, in fact, occurred about 12 months ago. We passed the national energy retail law through parliament to establish the legal framework. South Australia is, and has been through this whole process, the lead legislator and, when we passed the law as a law of South Australia, the other states simply then individually passed an application law which basically says that the law in South Australia applies to, say, for instance, Victoria, New South Wales, or whatever. In this case, we now have an implementation law which basically will implement that national retail framework, in particular, what we call the customer framework, wherein the regulatory functions pertinent to the relationship between retailers and customers is transferred to the national regulatory regime.

There is a pair of bills in this process and this is the first of them, the implementation bill. Basically, as I said, this implements the customer framework under the national energy retail law to begin as of 1 July. The bill does a number of other things, including implementing, and then it makes some changes to the act that was passed through the parliament last year. There are several sets of changes to that legislation. One set is a series of amendments which, I guess, it could be argued, are technical arguments because, since we passed the bill last year, almost 12 months ago, the Australian Energy Regulator has identified some areas where it was thought the act could be modified to make it work better and some small anomalies, which we are now

taking the opportunity to sort out. The implementation bill also highlights that there are some aspects of this national retail law which will be unique to South Australia and are not shared by the other jurisdictions.

To the best of my understanding of the changes that have been proposed, we are not actually making changes which will be noticed by anybody in the industry, whether it be a retailer or customer. What we are doing is transitioning those changes from state-based legislation to the federal system but we will also leave in place legislation in South Australia (such as the Electricity Act and the Gas Act) under which we will maintain some state-based regulatory functions, so we need to ensure in this implementation bill that those things are able to occur under the law.

As I said, the relationship is being transferred to a national scheme. To the best of my understanding, there will be little or no change noticed by those customers or retailers. The opposition has liaised with a number of stakeholders in the industry, and we have sought feedback from them. The feedback has generally been supportive of the legislation and the move to shift to this new regulatory regime; the latest was a briefing I had this morning.

I seem to have mislaid the piece of paper I am looking for, so I will have to wing it without it. I had a briefing this morning with Mark Henley. We liaise with a number of groups that represent the customer side of the stakeholder group. Mark Henley put to me a number of issues they had particularly pertaining to disconnections and late payment fees. I was able to assure him that, in my understanding, there was really no change, that these things were being transitioned as they are now in current South Australian law.

I congratulate Kristie in my office (who listens to what I say in this place and supports me greatly) because the piece of paper I mislaid was obviously sitting on my desk upstairs, and it has miraculously arrived. Thank you, Kristie—now I can be much more to the point. One of the issues SACOSS raised with me was that they were desirous of there being a review into this change at some time (they suggested maybe in two years) so that we can be reassured not just that the transition has been smooth but that the outcomes continue to provide for the South Australian community, in particular for those less well off in the community and those who have a real struggle with things like paying utility bills.

I suggest to the minister (and he might even take this on board or it might fall in the lap of a future government) that at some time—maybe in two years' time—a review be undertaken by ESCOSA as to the relative effectiveness of the change to the national system as opposed to the system we have enjoyed in South Australia to date. SACOSS's position is that they believe ESCOSA would be the appropriate body. They spoke quite highly of the role ESCOSA has played and the work it has done to date in South Australia.

They also put to me concerns about disconnections, and I was able to assure them that I was of the understanding that the disconnection regime would not be dissimilar to what has already occurred here in South Australia. They raised an issue—and it is one that is near to my heart because members who have heard me speak in this place before would remember that I raise the issue quite regularly of this parliament passing legislation which, to my mind, puts far too much of the detail in regulation rather than in the act.

I was pleased that the South Australian Council of Social Service (SACOSS) expressed a view with regard to things that impact on energy customers that a lot of the detail is left to the regulation. Indeed, it happens regularly that we do not see exactly what the wording of the regulation is and, therefore, we cannot assess what the likely impact might be until well after the parliament has debated the bill and given the head powers. I agree with the sentiments expressed by SACOSS that, as a parliament, we should redress this and move back to a situation where we put more detail in the act and where regulation-making powers are saved just for those things where you need to make changes on a fairly regular basis and where it would be quite difficult and burdensome to reopen the act and bring it back into the parliament.

In that briefing I was given some interesting figures. In their estimation—we may have been talking about energy customers in general, but it might apply directly to electricity customers—between 0.3 and 0.4 per cent of those customers find themselves on some sort of hardship program. We have a hardship program here within South Australia and that will be transitioned into the new regime.

He also made the point that about 25 per cent of customers struggle to pay their bills and, from the latest information I had, that is about 200,000 of about 700,000 electricity customers in South Australia who are concession holders. It fits within that ballpark. Whenever we make these

changes, we have to be very sensitive to the needs of clients and what impact it may well have. I put a question on notice to the minister—and he may make some statement with regard to it in his summing up—which is about the disconnections during extreme hot weather and the inability to pay in the short term. SACOSS was concerned about the impact of that. The minister might explain if he foresees any changes to the regime with regard to disconnections during extreme hot weather and if there is provision in the new regime to protect customers. As we all know, it is one thing for a retailer to seek a disconnection for non-payment of an account but I think we all agree that doing that in the middle of a heatwave is unconscionable.

They asked about late payment of fees, and I was able to give them the information that there are clauses in this bill which ensure that late payment of fees cannot be used as a fining system but only to recover payment costs. They also expressed some concerns about the ongoing level of service standards and they have pointed out that the service standards that customers enjoyed in South Australia were better than in other jurisdictions, and this is in the case where a customer might ring up to complain about an element of their service or to seek redress for some part of the service they expect as a client of an energy retailer. My reading of the legislation is that that is covered off as well, so I passed on that information.

I do not wish to take too much time of the house. The opposition is supporting this legislation. We were in government when this process to establish the national electricity market began and we have been supportive of it all the way through. We think it has helped and supported the delivery of energy, in particular, electricity and gas (particularly electricity) here in South Australia.

We think that the move to the national market reflects the modern world. It has benefited South Australia. There are still plenty of things I think we need to repair and fix up. I am aware that a number of reviews are going on currently as to the way the market operates and with regard to the current rules under which the market operates, and I guess there will be changes as we go forward. Once implemented, the National Energy Retail Law will basically finalise the transition from the state-based regulatory regime to the national-based regime.

The government is retaining price control for electricity here in South Australia. I am not convinced that that is necessary. All the reports I have seen into the competitive nature of the retail market in electricity suggest that Victoria has the most competitive market in the world and that South Australia has the second most competitive market in the world. The very nature of that competitive market means that the continuation of price control here in South Australia is probably no more than a nonsense. I am sure that it is only to service a political end—so that the government can say that it still maintains price control to protect the citizens of the state. The reality is that competition delivers a better control on prices than does the price setting that ESCOSA makes.

One of the other things I am quite pleased about that will come out of this transition is that, as customers' contracts are transitioned to the licensed retailers under the new regime, there has been a move to encourage customers here in South Australia to go on to a market contract, as opposed to a default contract. Through the transition under the new licensing regime, any customers who remain on a default contract will remain on that only as a temporary measure, and the retailer will be obliged to contact those customers and assist them to move to some sort of market contract, which should indeed benefit the customers. I think there is a saving of at least several percent in the annual cost of electricity for people who are on a market contract. That is just one of the little things which I think will be improved by the change. I think I have made enough comments about this bill, and I commend it to the house.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (11:23): As the shadow minister has just said, this is all about transferring powers from a state-based to a national-based system. All except the Northern Territorians and the Western Australians will be involved in this, because they are not connected. Of course, the question comes to mind as to why not. I know that it is a long way across the Nullabor Plain, but I would have thought that the Territory could have been connected, say, through Queensland. Of course, they probably do not have a huge consumer base at the end of it, but it would be nice to know that we had a true national system.

Madam Speaker, as you know, we passed the national law legal framework here in this house a year ago. This is a follow-up, as we know. It is an implementation law outlining the retail framework to the national regulatory regime and the customer framework as from 1 July this year. We therefore need to change our state laws to facilitate this, and we are assured that the consumer will not notice any difference.

I want to raise now the solar part of this. I am most concerned about what has happened to the eligibility for the solar feed-in tariff scheme. Many of my constituents put in an approved system, as did a lot of people right across the state. It was really taken up very strongly, and it was signed off; that is, it was an approved ETSA installation, in many cases. The trouble is that now they have gone back on that approval and advised that it is up to the customer (my constituents) to fix it at their own expense; that is, install a new meter and arrange and pay for an electrician to transfer the connection of the solar panels to that meter. I have a letter from a constituent (in fact, I have several letters), and I will quote part of one, without any names or addresses:

As per the letter from ETSA this transfer will be at our cost for the new meter and to also arrange an electrician to transfer the connection of the solar panels over to the new meter.

We have also been advised by ETSA in their letter that our [feed-in tariff] payments have been temporarily suspended until our solar PV system has been connected to the alternative connection point.

Our biggest disappointment in regards to this matter is ETSA approved our current installation and have since gone back on our approval and are now advising us that [this] is up to us to fix it at our own expense when we have already paid out a large amount for the installation as it is.

I then sought a copy of the letter written by ETSA Utilities to the constituent:

...the NMI which you requested to have your solar PV system connected to does not pass the test which excludes systems where the generation of electricity is for the dominant purpose of making a profit.

We appreciate that you may have chosen this connection point under advice from your solar installer with the full intent of reducing the overall energy costs you presently incur from this and other connection points or properties you are responsible for rather than for making a profit.

I know we had this debate a year ago, but I still have a lot of difficulty with this. What is wrong with making a profit? After all, these people have spent a lot of money (in some instances), so are they not entitled to get a return on that investment? That is where I have the greatest difficulty. We have changed the rules. We have moved the goalpost after the match has started. A lot of people borrowed money to install solar cells.

At this point in time, I declare that my family has installed solar panels, but by a pure stroke of luck we have them on a single meter and this does not apply to us. I feel for those people whose cells are connected through the wrong meter. The cost to buy another meter and have the connection altered is a sizeable amount of money. So, I have a lot of difficulty with that. I think the government (state or federal) cannot change the rules after people have made a sizeable investment.

Having solar panels at home and being in view of the wind turbines, I know which works and which does not. The solar cells work every day (during daylight hours), even on a dull day the thing is purring away nicely. We ought to be encouraging all of our constituents to install solar panels and to make a profit, otherwise why would you spend the money? Why would you spend thousands of dollars if you are not going to get some return on that? Wind turbines are costing the state millions. They are not the answer, because on a windy day they do not work and on a hot day they turn them off, which is exactly when we need the power.

This is all about protecting the future requirement of power generation in this state. After what happened in Queensland last week, we know that people are really starting to feel the cost of living and one of the biggest costs to our constituents today is the cost of electricity. A lot of our older folk, our pensioners, are turning off their air conditioners because they cannot afford the power bill. The power bill has certainly gone through the roof. So, at this moment, when we discuss a matter like this with regulations of state, I think we have to at least allow our people to have affordable electricity so they can live in some comfort and not be having to sweat it out at home with a wet towel over their head because they cannot afford to turn on the air conditioner.

That is what is happening in my electorate and some members opposite would certainly know about this, so why do you not encourage people to install solar cells and encourage them to make a profit so they get some money back? If they know they can make a profit, they will install them in the first place. They will go to the bank, get a loan to buy the cells and over, say, 10 years, they will get their money back. I cannot understand the logic in that because, in the meantime, until we get new technology that gives us a base load of power, these work. I think that we should be encouraging it more and more.

I am strongly opposed to any more wind turbines, but I am not opposed to individuals having a wind turbine. In fact, if it was worthwhile, I would consider putting a wind turbine on my own house because we always used to have them. In my first 30 years of my life, we lived with a

wind turbine—a 32-volt power generator. We get used to that. I would be happy to do it again if it was worthwhile. They will not be obtrusive, we will not be putting them up across the skyline and it will be at my cost. I would have to look after it—there would be no cost to the state to look after it—and I would pull it down at my cost when it is worn out.

What worries me about the huge wind turbines is they are extremely high cost to run, there is a high cost to put them there and they are high maintenance—and we have all paid for that—and what happens when their life is finished? Who is going to remove them? Who is going to restore the site to that pristine condition, usually across the nicest skyline that we have on a high spot? My opposition to these wind farms has been quite obvious. I still say that, if wind farms were the answer, why do we not put them across Mount Lofty? Nobody has given me the answer to that. If it is good enough to put them at Keyneton, if it is good enough to put them on the Hummocks, it is good enough to put them on Mount Lofty. We know why. It is obviously because of the visual impact. Well, why is the visual impact any worse here at Mount Lofty than it is, say, at the northern Hummocks or at pristine Keyneton—the beautiful rolling hills of Keyneton in the Barossa Valley—which I certainly hope does not happen.

Anyway, without any further ado, I know we are supporting the bill. The damage to this was done probably a year ago, but it does not make it right and I still believe that something should be done for those who have put their photovoltaic generators on under the existing situation where they were approved. If they have to be changed, I believe they should be changed at zero cost to the constituent. In fact, I believe that the government or the regulator or ETSA should at least help pay for the extra installation to keep them approved. I know that I am probably speaking to deaf ears but I will keep doing so at every opportunity I can get. These people, I believe, have been dealt a difficult hand. A lot of them are working-class people. They have borrowed the money to put up these things because they think they are doing it for the environment and also doing it for their own pocket and they are now finding that their investment will not be revenue positive. In fact, they will never get their money back because they cannot make a profit out of it.

With that, I commend the shadow minister for his work on this matter. Yes, I agree that, at this point in time, we bring the state into line with the rest of the country and are passing these laws and regulations so we now have a national grid. I think this is where we are all moving to. I have no problem with that but, when you hurt the little people, that is what concerns me. I support the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (11:34): I always love following the member for Schubert. He is, without a doubt, one of my favourite Liberal members and a man of great integrity. I think he is the longest-serving member on the opposition benches.

Mr Venning: Bob Such is the only one.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Opposition benches, not Independent benches. I remember the day when then premier Olsen walked into the parliament to announce the privatisation of ETSA. The member for Schubert said to me afterwards in quiet reflection that he never thought he would be here doing this. I listened with interest to his remarks now about electricity, but he has always acted in the best interests of his constituents.

Mr Venning: I don't think so; it was a long time ago, Tom.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It was a long time ago but I remember it distinctly. I would like to thank members for their remarks about the bill. To save some time, and for expediency, I will answer some of the questions on the bill coming up: the National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) (Implementation) Amendment Bill that the shadow minister foreshadowed in the house. He talked about: how would customers be protected from being disconnected on extreme heat days?

The National Energy Customer Framework envisaged in the bill coming up allows for a prohibition on disconnections during an extreme weather event only where the jurisdiction in which the customer is located has defined the meaning of 'extreme weather event' in a local instrument. In the proposed legislation coming up, South Australia will define extreme weather events in a local instrument, and the definition will be the same as the current definition of an extreme heat day used by the Essential Services Commission of South Australia in its Energy Retail Code, so there will be no change.

Just to give members some security about what that is, 'extreme heat day' means any day where the forecast for the Adelaide metropolitan area issued by the Bureau of Meteorology at 4pm Central Standard Time indicates that the following day is the third day in a sequence of three days where the average minimum and maximum temperature for each day equals or exceeds 28° Celsius. I hope that allays any concerns that the honourable member may have. I thank the honourable member for his remarks.

As I said in the second reading explanation, this bill forms part of the government's package of legislation to implement a national framework for regulating retailers and distributors who sell and supply energy and gas to customers. The National Energy Customer Framework is an important component of national energy reforms, to which this government is committed.

I thank all honourable members. I understand that we are going into committee because there are amendments which attempt to exclude generators. There are a number of regional generators, in terms of photovoltaic cells, where multiple meters are on a farm. I am guessing what the member is trying to do—for which I have some sympathy—and I would like the member to indicate whether I am right or wrong. Where some farmers have put photovoltaic cells on places that are more prominent in terms of the sun and on meters that are further away from the house, they are getting some grief from ETSA about it being a profit-generating scheme rather than what it was intended for.

I understand the concerns that a lot of regional members have about this. I share some of those concerns, but I do not think there is one blanket tool that can fix this. We want to have legitimate photovoltaic generation for those people who genuinely want to conserve electricity and reduce greenhouse emissions. What we do not want to see—and what we want to try to stamp out—is profiteering. What is my definition of profiteering? It is people attaching photovoltaic cells on meters out in the middle of nowhere generating electricity for which there is no use; for example, somewhere in a field.

The Farmers Federation has approached me about this. There are some sheds that farmers use maybe once or twice a year. When they use those sheds, they generate a lot of electricity because they use a lot of heavy machinery. I have a lot of sympathy for that argument. What I do not have sympathy for is placing field generators (in terms of photovoltaic cells) out in the middle of nowhere just to generate revenue. That is the difference.

I know that some people do not want to understand this, but we are trying to protect other consumers. I note that the shadow minister is on the record as saying that renewable energy is increasing the cost of electricity for all South Australians; however, I note with interest his amendments here today and look forward to hearing his explanation for these amendments in committee.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Mr WILLIAMS: Can I first apologise to the house, Mr Chairman. As I think I said in my opening remarks, there are two bills to implement what we are doing today; I was speaking to the National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) (Implementation) Amendment Bill when, in fact, we are debating the Statutes Amendment (National Energy Retail Law Implementation) Bill. They are similarly named.

The CHAIR: So we are dealing with item 5 in the *Notice Paper*, is that right?

Mr WILLIAMS: Yes. But I just want to make the point that I was confused; I hope I did not confuse anybody else in the house. I am sure that, as they were listening to my contribution, some of them may have been a bit confused, but I am surprised that nobody jumped up and pointed out the error of my ways.

Clauses 1 to 13 passed.

New clause 13A.

Mr WILLIAMS: I move:

Page 6, after line 22—Insert:

13A—Amendment of section 36AC—Interpretation

Section 36AC—after its present contents (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:

- (2) For the purposes of the definition of *excluded generator*, if there are 2 or more meters for measuring the consumption of electricity on 1 site, in assessing the purpose of the installation of a generator on the site to determine whether or not the generator is an excluded generator, the operator of the distribution network must take into account the electricity consumption of the site as a whole (despite the fact that, for example, most or all of the electricity consumption on the site is recorded by a different meter from the meter to which the generator is connected).

I am proposing two amendments to the Electricity Act under this statutes amendment bill, principally because there a number of anomalies arising from the implementation of the latest changes to the feed-in tariff scheme. Let me say from the outset that I note the minister said I had been on the public record suggesting that renewable energy has increased the cost of electricity to South Australian consumers; that is absolutely correct.

The feed-in tariff has increased the price of electricity to South Australian consumers. The feed-in tariff is paid for by all electricity consumers. The cost of the scheme is not paid for out of the generosity of the government, nor is not paid for out of Treasury; it is paid for by every electricity consumer in South Australia. Every time they get their bill, a component of that bill pays for this scheme.

Notwithstanding that, I think it is beholden on this parliament to ensure that the scheme operates in a fair and equitable way. There is nothing worse than having a scheme, albeit costly, that is both more costly on some individuals and grossly unfair to some individuals. I think the minister understands the situation. He spoke briefly about it in his summing up at the second reading stage and he said exactly right.

In the farming community, historically, there was a separate rate charged for rural power. Quite often in a farm situation you have the homestead and a series of sheds, maybe including a shearing shed, nearby. Quite often, there is one meter box and a number of meters in it: a meter for the domestic supply and a meter for the rural supply, because they used to be charged at a different rate. Now they are charged at the same rate. The tariff is the same and it would be no problem to consolidate all those services to the one meter, except that it would come at a cost to the consumer, so they have not done it.

What has happened in a number of situations where people under those circumstances have chosen to install a rooftop photovoltaic generator is that their supplier has come out to the farmhouse ready to put a system on the roof and they have said to the client, 'I don't know why you are putting these on the roof there, because you have that great big tree there shading the house that your grandfather planted 100 years ago to shade the house because he wanted to save on energy costs in 100 years' time, so you would not have to run the air conditioner all the time.' That means—

Members interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I take the point. I do want the house to understand that the grandfathers of farmers were very smart people and very forward looking; they knew what was coming. The reality is that it is very common for farmhouses to have extensive trees planted around them to try to shade them. They are often not in a coastal situation, where most of our urban communities are, and they do not enjoy the afternoon sea breeze, so they have extensive plantings of shady trees around them.

That is the reality, and the installers of the solar panel systems in many cases said to the farmers, 'Let's do this a little differently. Instead of putting the panels on the house there, let's go over and put them on the shed down in the yard where you haven't gone to the trouble of planting trees and the shed gets the full glare of the sun all day long.' That is exactly what has happened. I suspect one of my colleagues has made the same decision. The unfortunate consequence of this is that the solar system is then connected through the rural power meter.

One of the other things that have happened in rural Australia over recent years is that the wool industry has been in the doldrums for the last 20 years. Shearing sheds, which would have been a hive of industry on the average farm right up until the early 1990s, quite often lie relatively idle these days and there is very little electricity consumed in those sheds; that changes from time to time depending on what is happening on the farm.

We have the situation where a farmer who has put his solar panels on the shearing shed roof, or a machinery shed roof and it runs through his rural power meter, in a number of cases has

been excluded because part of the legislation has an excluded generator clause, which says that you will be excluded if the prominent use is to feed electricity back into the grid.

That definition has been taken, as I understand it, in negotiations between the government and ETSA on how that would be applied. Those negotiations occurred on 30 September last year, the very last day that the feed-in scheme was available for people to become approved. The criterion was set that there was a minimum usage at that meter of 400 kilowatt hours per year, which is not a huge amount of electricity. However, the anomaly has now arisen where one farmer who does not use his shearing shed and uses, maybe, a light occasionally when he is in the shed of an evening and might use 250 kilowatt hours per year misses out. He does not qualify for the feed-in tariff—he misses out. His neighbour down the road with the exact same circumstances but for one reason or another maybe has a beer fridge in the back corner of the shed—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: —yes—and consumes more than 400 kilowatt hours of electricity per year qualifies. Mr Chairman, 400 kilowatt hours is not very much. It is about the amount of energy which would be consumed by one 60 or 75 watt light bulb in a year; so, it is only a small amount of electricity. You might have a third scenario whereby the shed and the house were established more recently and actually operate through one meter, and the usage through that meter, obviously, including the house, is over the 400 kilowatt hours per year threshold and they qualify. So we have a number of farming families who in good faith have spent in some cases tens of thousands of dollars and who find themselves excluded from the feed-in tariff.

Another clause in the bill seeks to prevent people from using the feed-in tariff simply as a money-making exercise under the Electricity Act, and that clause says that, notwithstanding how much electricity your system generates, you can only be paid the feed-in tariff for up to the maximum of 45 kilowatt hours per day, and, if you generate more than that, you do not get paid the feed-in tariff for that in any case. I would argue that that should be enough to stop those who have used the feed-in tariff system simply as a money-making exercise.

Might I also make the point—and I think that I expressed this at the time we debated the last lot of changes to the feed-in tariff—that I think it is a nonsense to say that anyone out there has not put in their system without the intent of feeding electricity back into the grid. If that was the case it makes a nonsense of having the feed-in tariff. Why have a feed-in tariff if there is no expectation that electricity is going to be fed back into the grid?

What I have proposed in new clause 13A is a provision which adds to the definition of 'excluded generator' and, in fact, picks up on the point that I have made about you having a supply on one site which has been fed through two separate meters. What I am suggesting by this amendment is that, for judging whether there has been 400 kilowatt hours a day, you amalgamate the usage through the two or more meters at that site. I am sure that in 100 per cent of the cases that would mean that those people who find themselves excluded under the circumstances that I have described would, indeed, not be excluded and they would be treated in the same way as their neighbours who for one reason or another are treated differently.

I commend this amendment to the house. I will talk to the other amendment in a moment, but these two amendments, I believe, would resolve over 90 per cent of the issues that have arisen from the implementation of the feed-in scheme as amended mid last year and as applied from 1 July 2011. I commend the amendment to the committee.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I speak in support of the amendment of the member for MacKillop and deputy opposition leader. It is interesting because, as a regional MP also, I have been contacted by people concerned by this, and I know that other members have also been contacted. I have a rather interesting scenario to put to the minister, and I am grateful for the fact that he understands the concerns that we have had. In his brief contribution to the second reading he said that many comments had come back to him about this and that he understands the issue.

The chap who came to me, though, has a bit of a different scenario. He has sheds on his property but no farmhouses. So, no-one actually resides in those. He has had \$100,000 worth of tools stolen in the last 10 years. Because nobody is on the property permanently, these scurrilous devils who go around and spot the properties that are remote go in and have stolen all these things. He wants to put up big lights that will illuminate the whole place every night, but he does not want to be responsible for the electricity cost of doing that unless he knows he can put in the photovoltaic cells to have some level of compensation for his costs.

That is his scenario, which is slightly different from what the member for MacKillop is talking about, but just another example of what is out there in regional areas with people who want to protect their property. He is not doing it as a money-making concern, but just wants to ensure safety and to reduce theft from his property. Other members would have other examples like that too. The challenge is to ensure that the regulations cover the absolute majority of people so that you give fairness and equity to those who have invested large sums. I declare that I have 20 photovoltaic cells on my roof, and I am very happy with the rate of return.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Twenty?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Only 20, not like the member for Schubert, who probably has a lot more than that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: We did so on the basis of actually helping the environment, minister—purely that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: He doesn't believe in climate change!

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, he does. You are putting words into the member's mouth now, minister—that is just it. We had a good chat yesterday in our portfolio meetings about these amendments proposed by the member for MacKillop. I asked a question, which he does not support if there is any reluctance from the minister to accept the amendment, if there can be some form of averaging where, if there are multiple meters on a property you can look at an averaging situation to ensure that, when the average is above the 400-kilowatt hours per year per consumption per meter, these people who have spent a lot of money have a chance to get some level of return on their investment.

Mr PEDERICK: I rise to support the comments by the member for Goyder and our deputy leader, the member for MacKillop. In a lot of ways what has happened with the solar panel rebate scheme has been farcical. There has been no clear direction for anyone out there buying photovoltaic cells and no clear direction from industry. We have seen some players on the industry side of the market go broke, but we have also seen some interesting factors with regard to the cost of photovoltaic cells. With the previous scheme that finished on 1 October 2011, when the 44¢ rebate scheme ran out, a five-kilowatt system could cost close to \$20,000. Now you can buy the same system for about \$7,500 under the 16¢ rebate, which is applicable at the moment. It is interesting how, with market forces and the change of value, somehow photovoltaic cells are worth a lot less than they were. I find that an interesting point of view.

With regard to the amendment the member for MacKillop has put up, it is a very real amendment and should be agreed to by the committee. As has already been stated, there could have been a shed—whether a shearing shed, an implement shed or large hay shed—that was in a far better position to have an array of photovoltaic cells to catch the northern aspect so power could be put back into the grid but also used on the property as well. I note that perhaps the only way people with shearing sheds or implement sheds with photovoltaic cells on the roof can qualify is to put in a beer fridge or, as a lot of shearing sheds have, a fridge for vaccines and other gear that has to be kept cold for their sheep husbandry actions. They have to make sure something is in there generating power.

It seems odd that you have to be using that power before you even qualify, while obviously somewhere on the property you will have a house that will be using lots of power but may not have been the best site to put the photovoltaic cells on its roof. I fully commend the motion. It has been very confusing for everyone involved. I know I have thought about putting photovoltaic cells on the roof of my place, but during the debate things were moving around and I was not sure where it was going to land, so I have not made the investment. I commend people who have made the investment, but there are a lot of people right throughout the rural areas who look like they are missing out on the ability to get the rebate. I think this is a sensible amendment so that these people can get some payback for the quite large investment they have made. I support the amendment.

Mr VENNING: I would like to speak briefly to the amendment. I support this; it is exactly what I talked about earlier, and it covers the concern I raised, except that I am concerned about where it says 'on one site' and would like someone to clarify that. I was not present in the party room yesterday when it should have been clarified—whether or not it was I do not know—but the

question I have, and the shadow minister may want to tell me when he is on his feet in a moment, is: is that just for one owner, one title? What happens if you have two houses?

The member for Mount Gambier and I were having a discussion about this a moment ago, doing a mathematical on this one. If there are two houses together on separate meters—such as with an outhouse or a cottage, usually a workingman's cottage—and on the one title, is that included in this? I hope it is, otherwise you will see people running the proverbial extension cord across the yard from the shed to the other user.

Just to clarify it, the minister was aghast a moment ago that our family has a rather large solar array. Yes, we do, and I did declare that. I am a born-again climate change person—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Seriously, as a family we made the decision—against my son's judgement—to spend the money because we thought we should do the right thing for the environment. That is what it was for, that was the first consideration. The second consideration was power security, to make sure that we always had power. Of course, when we did this we also planned to have a full set of batteries and a wind turbine as well as a diesel generator, so we would have all the bases covered. We have not gone there yet; we were to fit our own wind turbine about now, but with this legislation hanging around it was totally counterproductive. I am all for personal wind turbines, absolutely; but I am not for wind turbines across our beautiful horizons.

That is what it was all about, and all I can say is that it works. Go down there on a cloudy day and the thing is humming away. It is the answer. Of course, we still need base power at night because it does not answer the question at night, and hopefully that is when the little wind generator might just keep things ticking over. But, again, in the end we should be encouraged to put in the batteries because then there is power security. I can see big problems in the future. We do not want to see power cords across the yard from the shed to the house, because that is what you are asking people to do—run the power cord across the yard so that they can get the cheaper power into the house. That is not on.

Many years ago we had some instances like this when we nearly electrocuted someone—in fact, it was me—so we now have no visible powerlines on the farm at all. They are all underground, where they ought to be, because when you are mucking around with augers, etc., it is so easy to have an accident. I did that one day, and I nearly was not here. I was pushing an auger around the yard and pushed it onto the powerline above me. Luckily, I pushed it onto the earth wire first and then pushed it onto the active one; if it had been the other way around, I would not be standing here today.

In a matter of five days, those powerlines were gone, underground as they ought to be, particularly in areas where you are moving things like that around the yard. We have signs up—and thanks go to ETSA for printing those little signs—saying 'Please look up'. How many instances have we had like that? I lost a good friend who stood up on top of a stock crate, loading stock under a powerline, and he is no longer with us. However, that is digressing. With that one qualification about what is one site, I support the amendment.

Mr PEGLER: I have a question regarding a property where if, at the moment, there are two houses and one of those houses does not use a lot of power but it has the cells on it, there is a great advantage in that the power that is generated there returns to the owner of the property a lot more money than if the cells were on, say, the main house that uses the most power. I wonder if this amendment is going to affect those properties or not.

Mr WILLIAMS: Before I go to the question I want to point out that I only filed these amendments this morning because we only had them drafted yesterday. It is probably unfair to expect the minister to give a full response now. I am sure there will be opportunity to do that in the other place so I will not blame the minister if he is somewhat dismissive of the amendments at this stage. They will obviously go through the process in the other place and it will give the minister a bit more time to be fully briefed on these amendments. I meant to make that point clear earlier.

With regard to the question from the member for Mount Gambier (and I think a similar question was posed by the member for Schubert), the point of the amendment is to ensure that on a property where there are two meters—and essentially it was where there was a shed and a home and the owner was encouraged to put the cells on the shed because it was obviously going to capture more sunlight and be more effective—you could combine the meters.

Depending on the circumstances as to whether it was a house and a cottage, the member said that it was not really the intention that this would allow the combination of those two meters and, again, it would depend on the circumstances: if the house was lived in it would not make any difference because it would go over the 400 kilowatt hours per year threshold; if the house was used as a weekender it would go over that as well. It would only be if the cottage or the second house on the property was not being lived in and did not have any electricity consumption, did not have a fridge running in or a freezer or something like that, that the question would even arise.

I must admit that in drafting this amendment it was not my intention to pick up that particular circumstance. It was a circumstance where there were two meters because of the historic context of there being two rates of power supplied generally for a farm business and you had two meters: one for the farm business and one for the domestic residence. Quite often the two meters were in the same meter box, as I said.

Sometimes, for convenience at the time of installation, they might be a couple of hundred metres apart, where the meter is physically in the shed. That is the anomaly that we are trying to cure. To be quite honest to the member for Mount Gambier, I have not been approached by anybody in circumstances where they had two houses on the property and they put the cells on one house which had not historically been utilising at least 400 kilowatt hours per year, so that was not my intent.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have a great deal of sympathy for farmers in this situation. When my little girl was in hospital we became quite close friends with two other rural families (one from Broken Hill and one from the Mid North of the state) who had babies in a similar situation, and they had both encountered these same problems. I have a great deal of sympathy for them and I know firsthand some of the examples that members are talking about.

I have given undertakings to the Farmers Federation to personally take up a lot of these issues with ETSA. However, I will point something out to members, especially to the member for Schubert—probably one of the most comfortable members of this house. I say that generously—good luck to him, and so he should—he has worked very hard and deserves everything he has earned. I am in no way denigrating the member for Schubert; I have a great deal of respect for him.

However, this scheme was set up as a net scheme; that is, it was designed to be linked to your power bills. It is linked to household use of electricity. What that means is that you put the photovoltaic cells on the roof; it is linked to your power bills and it is there to offset the high cost of electricity and, if you generate more than use, you get a rebate which goes towards the infrastructure.

It is not designed as a profit-making instrument. I know that a lot of people say, 'Well, why not? We're doing the right thing by the community. We're not using fossil fuels. We're not emitting carbon into the atmosphere. Why can't we just put on these solar panels and get the full rebate?' It is because they are subsidised by your neighbours.

The member for MacKillop quite rightly says that a lot of these farmers have a historical incidence where there are two meters. I accept that. Absolutely, he is right. He is right that a lot of homesteads are built around very large shaded areas, because in rural communities air conditioning is a relatively new concept in the last 40 or 50 years, so they did their best to make do in a very hot landscape. They planted a lot of trees around the homesteads, so it is very difficult to get good sunlight for the photovoltaic cells.

When farmers did the right thing economically—because, let us face it, 44¢ per kilowatt hour is not bad; it is a very good return on investment—they put it in the place with the best aspect. That is in conflict with the intention of the bill. The bill was designed to allow residential users to offset their household consumption. What do we do in residential areas in metropolitan Adelaide where, through no fault of anyone's, they are not north facing, or you live in on one of the communities that the opposition represents where there are a lot more trees and there is a lot more shade over houses? What do we do in those cases?

Do we allow people to move them or centralise them in a park somewhere else to get a greater return? There are always going to be issues around photovoltaic cells, but while they involve subsidies from your neighbours—paradoxically, when the member for MacKillop is not in here arguing for greater subsidy to increase power costs on his neighbours: he is out there saying, 'Vote for me, because renewable energy increases your power costs, and cost of living is a big issue.' So, we have these two opposing arguments from the opposition: one saying that the poor

old farmer cannot get the full subsidy and the other argument saying, 'You're paying more for your electricity because of photovoltaic cells.' Which one is it?

I say that with all due respect for the member for MacKillop, because he is actually trying to do the right thing by his constituents here, as there are some very unfair circumstances. However, I say to the member for MacKillop that the best way to go about that is not by changing a net system to a gross system. What that will mean is that people who have photovoltaic cells under the circumstances that he is talking about will go from a net system, where they get the difference back on their power bills, to a gross system, so it is just generating electricity and it is not linked to power consumption.

I know there are anomalies. I know that there are individual circumstances that are unfair, and I accept that. I am working with ETSA on a case-by-case basis to try to fix it. Let us face it: if your house is surrounded by trees, you live in a rural or remote community and you have put your cells on the shed 500 metres from the homestead, where you have two meters, it is unfair that you do not get the subsidy. I accept that, and we have to work with ETSA to try to remedy that, but this is not the solution. The member for MacKillop has very good intentions but a very blunt axe. This needs a scalpel.

In terms of what the member for Goyder talked about, where people in rural and remote communities have properties with large sheds and lots of equipment, and they want to use lighting, I understand that. It is a big security risk. I know in a lot of rural communities, especially where the partner works great distances away from the homestead and the house is near the road, people get quite concerned at night, and lighting can be a good thing or a bad thing.

I have a lot of sympathy for that argument. However, again, photovoltaic cells are not a security measure: they are a measure to try to help generate an industry to help reduce the impact of fossil fuels on our climate. So, what we did was to kickstart an industry. We initially only wanted the feed-in tariff to apply for five years. Members opposite moved amendments in the upper house to have the feed-in tariffs apply until the year 2028, I am advised, but they go out and argue that the feed-in tariffs increase power prices. So, you move the amendments to increase the period you can have for feed-in tariffs but then argue that renewable energy increases power costs.

I am dealing with the politics of energy, which is fine—the opposition is entitled to have its view on energy—and then I am dealing with mums and dads who have gone out and done the right thing and put photovoltaic cells on their roofs to take advantage, quite rightly, of a very generous scheme. And why wouldn't they? So they should. I do not begrudge anyone and I do not accuse any of them of pushing up our power prices. They have done the right thing by trying to limit their impact on the climate.

South Australia elected to implement the feed-in scheme on a net basis. That is, a consumer only received a feed-in tariff on its system regeneration after offsetting their household needs. There is another solution for regional communities; it is not this. I would ask regional communities for a little bit of patience.

I have given an undertaking to the Farmers Federation that they give me every single case that they have of people who have bought into the scheme before the cut-off and have had issues with ETSA. I have given them my word that I will undertake to deal with all those personally with ETSA. I am not saying that I can solve all of them, I am not saying there will be a happy answer to all of them, but I will do my best.

As for the member for MacKillop's solution, I give him credit that he is not expecting an answer today. My initial reaction is to oppose the amendments, but I will look at them between houses. I will give my undertaking to the committee that I will look at them between the houses, but it seems to completely disconnect the principle of linking this to household consumption.

The important thing about energy consumption, before it becomes a profit-making scheme, is that we link it to use. It is very important that we link it to use. I know what you are saying about the meters being separate—I understand that—but maybe a solution here is that the feed-in tariff is very generous, much more generous than people would get now. The cost of doing business is, perhaps, changing their meter. I am not sure of the exact cost of changing over the meter. I know it is substantial; they are not cheap.

Mr Griffiths: \$600 for a three-phase and—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: \$600; so we are talking about someone who has put—and this is an estimate, so do not hold me to it—a five-kilowatt system with 20 panels on their house, and they would be making a fair bit of return.

Mr Griffiths: 20 panels is 3.8 kilowatts.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Depending on the size—

Mr Griffiths: Most of them are 190.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, say you have 250, the premium solar panels. You have changed to 250 kilowatt solar panels with a five-kilowatt inverter. Unless you are running 15 plasma TVs nonstop and some sort of illegal activity involving hydroponics, I suspect you are not going to be using all of it, and you would be making a nice return, comfortable with paying off the returns. I would say that the \$600 to change meters is not a bad investment to maintain the subsidy until 2028.

I know in your heart of hearts you probably think, 'Yeah, I probably would,' but maybe some people cannot afford it. So, I undertake to all members of the committee that if you have constituents who have invested in solar panels and bought an inverter and are having difficulties with ETSA, refer them to me and I will deal with ETSA on a case-by-case basis. I ask members not to support the amendment, but I will consider the amendments and enter into negotiations with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition between houses.

Mr WILLIAMS: I think I am having a bad morning. I told my colleagues that we would get through these bills in a matter of minutes this morning, and we have been here nearly an hour and a half. I apologise to my colleagues. Notwithstanding that, I want to do justice to this particular matter. I totally agree with the minister: I am saying that this feed-in scheme has driven up the price of electricity. That is irrefutable. I still make the point that this is about equity. This is about everybody who has gone out in good faith being treated identically. The minister has not refuted the comment I make, because he cannot, that the criteria with regard to the 400-kilowatt hour usage in the last year was established on 30 September last year, which was the last day. Many people had already committed themselves and, if they were going to go into establishing this, were obliged to commit themselves before they knew that criteria. So they went in in good faith.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: The government made it public well in advance of that.

Mr WILLIAMS: But you had not made the criteria. The minister says that the government made it public. Let me just come back to that, because there was one press release issued by the then premier on 31 October, the year before, 2010. If the minister wants a history lesson on this I can give it to him. When the feed-in scheme was started, the government announced that when we got to installed capacity of 10 megawatts there would be a review. That target was hit in May of 2009. The review was not announced until, I think it was, 29 or 30 October 2009. It was supposed to be concluded by the end of 2009.

The industry expected that it would be the subject of debate in the ensuing election campaign running up to 14 March 2010 but there was not one mention of it. The first mention of a response to that review was on 31 August 2010 and the premier, amongst other things, said, 'Yes, we will do something to stop people using the installation of solar panels as a money-making exercise,' and the press release, amongst other things, had a statement to that effect in it. The next thing that the installers and community knew about it was on 30 September when then minister O'Brien announced the criteria, which were established that day.

So, I do not accept the argument that the community was made aware of it. People were given, in my opinion, very little forewarning and they went out in good faith. This is where the problem has arisen, because I believe these people have gone out in good faith. I do not think they have gone out with the intention of ripping off the system. They have gone out in good faith, and this is why I have moved the amendment.

I think there were getting towards 100,000 applications across South Australia to install solar panels and I understand this probably impacts on less than 1,000, so we are talking about less than 1 per cent, or about 1 per cent. That is my understanding. So the impact is not going to be huge. The minister has already said he has given an undertaking that he will work one on one, and some of them I am sure he will get across the line. I suspect there will be a significant number that will not get across the line. I wonder what the actual impact would be on the whole scheme as far as the cost to other electricity users. I am making the assumption that it would be quite minimal.

Given that people acted in good faith and on the best knowledge they could ascertain at the time, I think they deserve a break, to be quite honest, and that is what this is about.

Let me also make it quite clear that in the photovoltaic or solar panel industry, you have to have an understanding of how these machines work if you are going to make an argument about it being a net scheme or a gross scheme. Basically, my understanding is that if you have a solar panel sitting on your roof with the average pitch of a roof and the direction they are facing, the panels will give a fairly good output for four or five hours a day—that's about it—maybe from 1 o'clock in the afternoon to 4.30 or 5.30. Their efficiency drops off quite rapidly when the incidence of the sun's rays falling on them becomes acute. I did see one the other day on a large tracking frame that tracks the sun. This was a farmer who has obviously got it all right, and I am sure his panels work at maximum efficiency for most of the daylight hours. However, he is still subject to the cap that I mentioned earlier—he can only be paid the feed-in tariff on 45 kilowatt hours per day—so that captures him.

I would argue that the reality is that, in the average household, during the time of the day when the cells are producing electricity there is very little activity in the house. As we know, a significant number of houses these days have both people living in a two-person household working in the workforce and maybe the only thing that happens during the day is that the fridge or the freezer might cycle in for short periods.

In effect, most of the electricity that is generated by a large number of the solar panels that are on people's roofs is fed straight back into the grid. Their electricity usage is at a different time of the day—by and large, it is after 5.30 in the evening. When you look at the graph of our demand curve of electricity usage in South Australia, you very quickly pick up that the demand goes up dramatically late in the afternoon as people come home from work.

The reality is that very, very many of the installations of rooftop solar panels that have met all the criteria are basically working in a gross feed-in way. I suspect that a number of people might even slip down to the shed and switch the beer fridge off during the day and only run it at night-time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You can't do that!

Mr WILLIAMS: What do you mean you can't do that—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's the beer fridge!

Mr WILLIAMS: —if you're not going to it every five minutes? I am sure people out there are doing things to minimise the amount of energy their house uses during that afternoon period when their solar panels are most actively generating electricity. I do not buy the argument that the individuals who would be helped by this amendment in some way have a gross feed-in tariff whereas everybody else is doing the right thing and operating in a net system.

I do not want to hold up the house any longer on this. I have put the position, the minister has put his position, and I am sure it will be debated similarly in the other place; the minister has given an undertaking that he will consider the matter between here and the other place. This is a real problem, as I and my colleagues on this side of the house have pointed out and as the minister has acknowledged.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I want to ask a question for an update, not to debate anything. As part of the briefings we had prior to the end of June when the legislation was being debated, I have a very clear recollection that some 93 per cent of households in South Australia did not have photovoltaic cells. My colleague the member for Hammond and I have talked about how, as we drive around, our perception is that a lot more than 7 per cent of consumers now have photovoltaic cells. Is the minister able to update the house on what level of take-up there has been amongst consumers?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I can get you an exact number, but on recollection—and I do not want you to move any motion that I misled the parliament—I think it is about 113,000 households. I will get back to the house with an exact number, but I saw a figure of 97,000 households. There are 97,000 households installed, I am advised, and I am advised that there are 113,000 who have the inverters or have approvals—I am advised, which is subject to change.

Mr WILLIAMS: To help my colleague the member for Goyder, my understanding is that there are about 700,000 electricity customers in South Australia, so I am sure the member for Goyder can do the maths.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I guess 15 per cent, so we are getting pretty close, aren't we?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I want to read out a standing order before we vote on this:

No Member to vote if personally interested—

This is standing order 170—

A Member may not vote in any division on a question in which the Member has a direct pecuniary interest, and the vote of the Member who has such an interest is disallowed.

Rule 303!

Mr VENNING: I seek to make a personal explanation in relation to this matter. This motion moved by the member for MacKillop does not affect me in any way whatsoever because we are on one meter. The whole thing was changed when we put it in there. It is all through one meter, so it makes no difference whatsoever.

The ACTING CHAIR (Ms Thompson): Not having examined the electricity accounts of every member, I ask members to note the standing orders.

New clause negated.

New clause 13B.

Mr WILLIAMS: I move:

Page 6, before line 23—Insert:

13B—Amendment of section 36AE—Feeding electricity into networks—requirements on holder of licence authorising operation of distribution network

Section 36AE(6)(a)—after 'electricity' insert:

, unless the alteration was approved before 1 October 2011 by the holder of the licence authorising the operation of a distribution network to which the generator is connected

This is to overcome another small anomaly that has arisen. I will briefly explain it. I hope we will not take as long as we did on the previous matter. We have another set of circumstances where there was a cut-off date on 30 September to get approval to install a PV system to qualify under the feed-in tariff.

We have two sets of people who were able to apply for PV installations prior to that date. One set was somebody applying for a new system. So I could have come along on 30 September last year and applied to install a five-kilowatt system on my house. I would have got the approval and then, under the legislation, I would then have to fulfil that approved application in a certain time frame and a certain way.

I applied to install a certain size inverter. The inverter is the piece of machinery between the solar panels and the grid which changes the direct current (DC) which is created by the solar panels into an alternating current and feeds it into the grid. The key point about the inverter is that you get different sized inverters depending on how many solar panels you want to put on your roof, how much you want to invest and how much electricity you want to generate. The approval was for the inverter. So, I might have got an approval for a five-kilowatt inverter, had that installed, had it ticked off and only put two kilowatts worth of panels on my roof. I could have then come along six months later, reinvested and put some more panels on the roof and then months later (and it might not have been for a number of years) I got to the point where I had the capacity of solar panels on my roof to match the capacity of my inverter.

Basically, what I could have done is bought the inverter, bought the part of the capacity of that inverter in panels and made that level of investment and then each few months (or each set of six months or 12 months) built up my array of solar panels until I got to the capacity of the inverter. No problems. You can do that quite legitimately and be paid the feed-in tariff at the end of that process on the amount of electricity that I feed in to the grid up to 45 kilowatt hours per day.

The other person may well have been an early mover. They might have been the person who invested a significant amount of money way back in 2008 because they had a genuine desire to do something about the impact of electricity generation on our planet and they might have put in a one-kilowatt system. As the price of the systems came down and as the price of electricity came up, they may well have been convinced that they needed to put in a larger system. So, on

30 September, that person may well have gone in and received an approval to increase the capacity of their system from one kilowatt to five kilowatts.

This is where it starts to get complicated. Because there is another section in the act that provides that you cannot alter your system to increase its generating capacity after 1 October 2011, that person who had got an approval to increase the size of their system actually had to have all of the work done before 1 October. So, the early mover who decided to increase the capacity of his system is treated completely differently from the person who comes along and gets their approval on the last day. It is an anomaly, it is a nonsense and, again, it has caught people out.

I indeed have several examples of the second category who were caught out because they had every intention of meeting the deadlines but, for one reason or another, their supplier and/or ETSA (I think it was their supplier, not ETSA; I should not blame ETSA for this) did not meet the appointment to fulfil the upgrade of the system by the date that it had been agreed, and they have fallen off the system. I have one constituent who has been told that, at the very best, she might be left on the system and receive the feed-in tariff if she goes out and takes the panels off the roof and goes back to the size system she originally was approved for, notwithstanding that she had an approval before the due date to increase the size of the system.

It is a small anomaly. The second amendment would add that section 36AE(6)(a). The first part of it says that, if you do any work after 1 October to increase your generating capacity, you fall off the feed-in tariff system. I would like to add, via an amendment, the following words:

...unless the alteration was approved before 1 October 2011 by the holder of the licence authorising the operation of a distribution network to which the generator is connected...

What it would mean is that those people who made the decision to increase the size of their system are treated exactly the same as those people who came in and just made a decision to put in a system and get approval, both of them on or before 30 September last year. There is one little point which has now escaped my mind, but it is essentially so that these people are treated exactly the same as those who were installing a new system and, as I said, there are a number of people.

I have talked about some of the numbers of people who I thought were impacted by the earlier amendment or may be impacted by that scenario. I suspect that this scenario would affect very few people. I have had a few calls about it, probably fewer than 10. I do not know; I would be guessing, but I do not think there are hundreds, but there could be possibly up to 100 people across the state who are caught up by this.

Again, it is about equity; it is about treating people the same. Again, I accept the minister's point. I think the system is costly. I think the system is a bad piece of public policy—I have said that publicly many times—and it adds to the cost of householders' electricity bills. That is no reason not to make it such that the system is equitable and treats everybody fairly.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The government moved amendments (I do not have the exact date) that provided:

If the generator is, on or after 1 October 2011—

- (a) altered in the manner that increases the capacity of the generator to generate electricity; or
- (b) disconnected and moved to another site,

a credit under this section will not be payable from the date of the alteration or disconnection.

It is clear. The member for MacKillop is a politician, and politicians are allowed to make points to try to get votes, and I understand that. I understand that perfectly, probably more than he does; hence why we are here and you are there—and I mean that in terms of the popular vote. What you are out there saying publicly is: this renewable energy stuff that Mike Rann and Jay Weatherill are pushing on you pushes up your power prices.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition has come up with a new wind policy that is about giving people the right of veto over wind developments within a certain distance of their property. Every time there is a study done on electricity prices in South Australia, he is out there arguing that the reason your power prices are going up is because of carbon tax and this climate change stuff and that the lefty loonies in the Labor Party are putting up all these alternative schemes to combat carbon, which personally I think he does not really believe is a pollutant, but I will take him on his word that he thinks it is. Yet, he comes in here and says, 'By the way, you know how I was out

there in the public saying that solar rebates, wind power, geothermal and all these renewable energies increase your power costs, I want to open that up to more people.'

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Then why does the member go out publicly and say that these things increase electricity prices and then come in here with amendments to allow more people to get the subsidy which, according to him, is increasing power prices? There is a definition for this. It starts with an H. It is a Greek word. It is 'hypocrisy'. If you are talking about equity, you would be supporting a price on carbon that delivers compensation to people on an equitable basis. If you are talking about equity, you would be supporting more means testing, but you do not. What the member for MacKillop wants to do is ensure that those people in this scheme who are already getting a benefit cannot increase their benefit, which he claims is adding to the cost of electricity prices for people who do not have photovoltaic cells.

It was clear: these were the rules. The member for MacKillop does not want anyone new getting the 44¢. He says that will increase our power prices, and he does not believe in that. What he says is that if you already have the 44¢ and you have a five-kilowatt inverter that was approved, then he wants you to be able to increase your capacity. So, if I take his argument to its logical end, he is happy, according to him, to increase power prices on the neighbours to subsidise that increase in capacity, but he will go on Leon Byner's show and Matthew Abraham and David Bevan's show and say, 'These photovoltaic cells are the spawn of Satan, they are increasing prices, climate change is rubbish and the carbon tax is going to end the world.'

Quite frankly, I know what he is doing. He is trying to speak to two constituencies at once. It is not going to work. I will expose you. I prefer it when the Liberal Party is pure. They believe in private capital, we believe government plays a role. They do not believe in subsidy, we believe in co-investment. I prefer it when they are pure. This mixture of all things to all people according to the audience does not work. You will be found out.

Here is my tip for the day, Koutsy's tip for the day: be pure in your message. If you think renewable energy increases the cost of electricity for ordinary South Australians who do not have access to the subsidy then perhaps you should not want to increase the amount of subsidy going out. If you do not think it increases the cost then stop saying so and back it up. My dad always said to me, 'Believe what a man does, not what he says.' The member says that solar energy, wind energy, geothermal and renewable energies increase the cost of power, yet he is here in parliament today increasing the subsidy for more people. So, I will believe what you do, not what you say.

Mr WILLIAMS: I suggest the minister go back and read what I said in proposing this amendment and get a good briefing. I also recommend he reads my contribution in the *Hansard* going right back to, I think, late 2007 when we first started debating feed-in tariffs. I think I have been fairly constant, saying that I was very sceptical about the whole scheme and I thought that it was being promoted for the wrong reasons and it was going to be costly. I think I have been fairly consistent in saying that.

I said a few minutes ago that that does not mean that we should have a system which is not only bad but is also unfair. I think the minister failed to understand the point I was making.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No, I understand the point.

Mr WILLIAMS: No. Minister, if I got approval to put in a five-kilowatt system on 30 September last year, I could have had my inverter installed and put one kilowatt of panels on it. I could go out next week and put another kilowatt of panels on it and I could go out next year and put another kilowatt on until I got to five.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Until you couldn't.

Mr WILLIAMS: Until I got to five.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Yes, that's right.

Mr WILLIAMS: Right; nothing to stop me. But if I installed a one-kilowatt system and then got the approval to upgrade that to five kilowatts on or before 30 September last year, I am treated completely differently. I had to have installed those panels by 1 October. So, I am treated differently, and this is the anomaly. You have created two classes of people, and the people who you are really kicking in the guts with this are the people who have decided to invest more because they were the early movers when the things were really expensive. They were the genuine people.

They were the early movers who went and put their system in way back in 2008 and 2009 when they were really expensive. When the price came down, they said, 'We can afford to upgrade.' All these other people who have come in late on the scheme and who have taken advantage of the scheme to make money out of it, as opposed to genuinely wanting to do something for the planet, went out and put in the largest schemes they could possibly put in—maybe a five-kilowatt system—but when those early movers, the genuine people, sought to increase the size of theirs, they got caught out and they are treated differently.

All I am trying to do, minister, is make your scheme, which is a bad scheme, not quite so bad. It has always been a bad scheme, minister. It has always been bringing an additional cost to the average electricity consumer in South Australia. It is the highest cost carbon abatement scheme you could ever come up with. It is the highest cost technology that you could utilise to abate carbon. It does nothing to reduce the cost that we see on people's electricity bills attributed to the cost of maintaining and upgrading our distribution networks. It is a scheme that has delivered very, very little benefit—in fact, I would argue, no benefit—to South Australia, but it has come at a great cost.

That does not mean that I accept that it should also be unfair. It is also unfair on the level that it treats people differently. It treats those who were early movers, and then decided to upgrade their system a little bit, differently from the late movers who decided to come in and make a profit. Minister, I urge you to go back to your ministerial office, talk to your advisers, get somebody in your office to read the *Hansard* and read the argument that I have put and then reflect on what I have said because I think your contribution a moment ago completely misinterprets what I have said.

You have created two classes of people and you are treating one of them unfairly, in my opinion. I would like that the committee agrees with me rather than you and I am sure the other place will. Anyway, minister, as I said a while ago, I do not want to hold up the committee. We have both put the position. You have the numbers here. I am fully aware of that and you alluded to that moment ago. As I said, I have brought this on fairly late in the period and I acknowledge that you have not had the opportunity to be fully briefed on these couple of matters. I have put them here so that, certainly by the time they get to the other place, there will be a full understanding of the implications of the matter.

New clause negatived.

Remaining clauses (14 to 38) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (12:51): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (IMPLEMENTATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 March 2012.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:52): As I acknowledged to the house earlier, I got the two bills mixed up. This is a bill to implement law that was passed through the parliament about 12 months ago. It will institute the customer framework at the national level and move the regulatory regime—that regime that works between customers and electricity and gas retailers—to a national framework. As I said earlier in the day, as far as I can ascertain from briefings from the government and from reading the bill, there will be little change in the regulatory arrangement between customers and energy providers or retailers here in South Australia as a result of this. The opposition supports the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (12:53): I would like to thank each member for their contribution to this lively debate. These bills propose amendments to the National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) Act 2007, the Electricity Act 1996, the Gas Act 1997, the Essential Services Commission Act 2002, the National Electricity (South

Australia) Act 1996 and the National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008 to implement the National Energy Customer Framework in South Australia. The Energy Customer Framework delivers on the government's commitment to a national framework for regulating retailers and distributors who sell and supply electricity and gas to customers.

I want to thank the opposition for the timely way in which it has dealt with these two bills. People in our community often think that all politicians do is fight amongst themselves. There is certainly some of that but, often, most legislation that passes through the house passes in a bipartisan way.

I look forward to this legislation passing both houses of parliament. As I said in my second reading speech, Madam Speaker, this bill delivers on the government's commitment to a national framework for regulating retailers and distributors who sell and supply electricity and gas to customers. In June 2006, COAG amended the Australian Energy Market Agreement to provide for, among other things, a national framework. That national framework—and it is this as its final component—known as the National Energy Customer Framework (referred to here as 'the customer framework') consists as a package of laws, rules and regulations.

There is no doubt that energy generation and supply is a hot topic; it is a topic of great concern for a number of South Australians. Our job is to make sure that the lights are on when South Australians turn on the lights, to make sure they have consistency of supply, and that it is provided in an equitable manner. I commend this bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (12:55): I move:

That this bill now be read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 12:56 to 14:00]

BUSINESS NAMES REGISTRATION (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

BUSINESS NAMES (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (FURTHER RESTRICTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

TOD HIGHWAY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 630 residents of Eyre Peninsula requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to widen and upgrade the Tod Highway between Karkoo and Kyancutta.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

UNEXPIRED RISK EXPENSES

In reply to the **Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport)** (7 October 2010) (Estimates Committee A).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): The unexpired risk expense arises from the best estimate of the present value of future claims in respect of the unexpired risk period, (known as the premium liabilities). In other words, it is an estimate of the value of risks arising from premium income that MAC has received but has not yet earned. The value of these risks is an actuarial calculation which takes into account a risk margin.

In the Statement of Comprehensive Income for 30 June 2009, an expense of \$12.7 million was recorded for the un-expired risk expense. At 30 June 2010, actuarial calculations resulted in a positive adjustment of \$11.7 million being recorded in the accounts for the un-expired risk expense. The variance in these two numbers over the two years is \$24.4 million. The amount recorded on an annual basis is an actuarial calculation of the value of the outstanding risks and is subject to fluctuation.

MEDICAL PANELS SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): The Minister for Workers' Rehabilitation has advised that there are currently no plans to cease the operation of Medical Panels SA.

VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Norwood)** (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I have been advised of the following information:

1. 1,880 applications.
2. 1,403 payments were made to victims under the Victims of Crime scheme in 2010-11.

- (a) The average payment was \$9,676.
- (b) 74 payment at the maximum payment level.
- (c) The proportion of payments in each \$10,000 range are outlined in the table

below:

\$0—\$9,999	1,035
\$10,000—\$19,000	202
\$20,000—\$29,999	46
\$30,000—\$39,999	27
\$40,000—\$50,000	93
Total	1,403

3. 103 applications.
4. 33 payments were made to victims of abuse in state care 2010-11 under the Victims of Crime scheme in 2010-11.

- (a) The average payment was \$14,697.
- (b) Two payments were at the maximum payment level.
- (c) The proportion of payments in each \$10,000 range are outlined in the table

below:

\$0—\$9,999	10
\$10,000—\$19,000	13
\$20,000—\$29,999	7
\$30,000—\$39,999	1
\$40,000—\$50,000	2
Total	33

5. Of the 103 applications received from victims of abuse in state care under the Victims of Crime scheme in 2010-11, 54 did not give formal oral evidence of make a submission to the Mullighan Inquiry. It is possible however, that some of the 54 made an anonymous submission to the Inquiry.

COURT ORDER COSTS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I refer to your Estimates Committee B question taken on notice of 8 October 2010, about whether the Government was looking at changing the Summary Offences Act, as recommended by the Sustainable Budget Commission, 'to clearly define circumstances in which costs can be awarded to acquitted persons to reimburse them for reasonable costs of professional representation'?

I advise that the Government is currently not considering any further amendments to the Summary Offences Act that include criteria to be considered by a Court when determining an order for costs against an unsuccessful party in criminal litigation.

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I have been advised:

2010-11

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Port Augusta City Council	\$21,000	Funding Taxi Rank	Y
Taxi Council of SA	\$63,000	Rank Monitoring Sponsorship	Y

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I have been advised:

2010-11

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Office of Consumer and Business Affairs

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Australian Government—The Treasury	\$42,229	MCCA Strategic Agenda Project 2010-11	As per Standing Committee of Officials of Consumer Affairs (SCOCA) agreement.
Anglicare SA Inc	\$50,000	TIAS Financial Counselling Service	Y

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I have been advised of the following information:

Attorney-General's Department

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant \$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Anglican Community Care Inc	50,000	From Red to Green Project	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant \$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Australasian Institute of Judicial Administration Inc (AIJA)	15,697	SCAG Contribution to AIJA funding for 2010-11. The AIJA is set up to promote judicial administration throughout Australia.	Yes
Australian Bureau of Statistics	19,152	Contribution to National Criminal Courts Statistics Units	Yes
Centacare	21,000	Coolock House & Security Upgrade Grant	Yes
Central Northern Adelaide Health Service	174,169	Northern Violence Intervention Program	Yes
Children Youth & Women's Health Service	100,000	Forensic Medical Service for Victims 2010-11	Yes
City of Marion	59,973	Tram Stop Art Wall Project and Brain Snap Crime Prevention Project	Yes
City of Marion	49,123	Brain Snap Crime Prevention Program	Yes
Courts Administration Authority	66,524	Modified Committal Process	No—Payment to another SA Government Department
Criminology Research Council	15,119	SA State contribution for 2010	Yes
Department for Correctional Services	100,000	2010-11 Funding for Street Crime Initiative	No—Payment to another SA Government Department
Department of Correctional Services	179,646	Violence Intervention Program	Yes
Department of Environment & Heritage	25,000	Funding for Native Title Coordinator	No—Payment to another SA Government Department
District Council of Yankalilla	18,700	Youth Engagement & Community Art Project	Yes
Environmental Defenders Office (SA) Inc	92,012	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth Funding	Yes
Flinders University	210,000	SA Justice Chair in Forensic DNA Technology	Yes
KESAB Environmental Solutions	50,000	Graffiti Prevention Awareness Event & Clean Up Day	Yes
Land Services Group	350,000	Tenure History Search Unit provides resources, research and goods and services to provide a tenure history search service to the AGD Native Title sections and other Government Departments in relation to Crown Land that may be affected by native title.	Yes
Legal Services Commission	144,506	Drug Court Development	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant \$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Legal Services Commission of SA	32,993,000	Funding to provide legal assistance under Commonwealth & State Law	Yes—Subject to National Partnership Agreement & State Legislation
Legal Services Commission of SA	532,128	Reimbursement for legal costs in Expensive State Criminal cases which exceed funding caps imposed by the Legal Services Commission.	Yes—Payments are subject to an approved Case Management Plan
Mission Australia	49,879	Youth Beat Project Grant	Yes
Multicultural Communities Council of SA	21,400	2011 Crime Prevention & Community Safety	Yes
National Judicial College of Australia	23,104	SA Government contribution to National Judicial College of Australia	Yes
Nganampa Health Council Inc	16,000	Youth Anangu Women Education Project	Yes
Northern Areas City Council	10,000	Gladstone Youth Drop In Project	Yes
Northern Community Legal Services	580,759	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth & State Funding	Yes
NSW Attorney-General's Department	53,710	SA Government contribution to SCAG Secretariat	Yes—Standing Committee of Attorneys-General (SCAG) Agreement
Operation Flinders Foundation Inc	447,000	Operation Flinders Program	Yes
Port Adelaide Football Club	97,920	Funding for Aboriginal Power Cup	Yes
Port Augusta City Council	50,000	Crime Prevention Grant	Yes
Port Augusta Youth Centre	50,000	Bush Mechanics Project	Yes
Regional Eastern Adelaide Dev Int Inc	50,000	Grant for P Plate Driving Agreement	Yes
Riverland Community Legal Services	273,824	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth Funding	Yes
Road Trauma Support Team	70,000	Annual Grant for Road Trauma Support Team Inc	Yes
SA Native Title Services	1,000,000	South Australian Native Title Claim Resolution process	Yes
Service to Youth Council Inc	50,000	Restorative Justice through Art Project	Yes
South Australia Police	32,625	Funding for the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council	No—Payment to another SA Government Department. Letter of agreement with SAPOL
South Australian National Football League	20,000	Multicultural and Disadvantaged Youth Program	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant \$	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
South East Community Legal Services	301,558	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth Funding	Yes
Southern Adelaide Health Service	30,000	Child Protection Services—Children Victim Rights 2010-11	Yes
Southern Community Justice Centre Inc	863,861	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth & State Funding	Yes
Southern Junction Community Services	41,548	Onkaparinga Crime Prevention Youth Project	Yes
The Salvation Army	173,637	Central Violence Intervention Program	Yes
Town of Gawler	25,000	Gawler Graffiti Education & Prevention Project	Yes
Uniting Care Wesley Inc	673,005	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth & State Funding	Yes
Victim Support Service Inc	50,000	Security at Home Project	Yes
Victim Support Service Inc	320,800	DV Home Safety Brokerage	Yes—MOU between AGD & Victim Support Services
Victims of Crime	1,526,000	Annual Grant 2010-11 to Victim Support Services for Metropolitan & Regional Services	Yes
Victims of Crime	1,526,000	Annual Grant to Victim Support Services for Metropolitan & Regional Services	Yes
Vietnamese Community in Australia	50,000	Vietnamese Youth's Positive Thinking & Mentor Grant	Yes
Wakefield Regional Council	22,000	Illuminating the Parklands Project	Yes
Welfare Rights Centre	260,768	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth Funding	Yes
Westside Community Lawyers Inc	751,528	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth & State Funding	Yes
Women's Legal Services	656,900	Community Legal Centre Program—Commonwealth Funding	Yes
Wudina & District Road Safety Committee Inc	14,500	Surviving the Eyre Project	Yes

SURPLUS EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I have been advised:

There were no surplus employees in the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner as at 30 June 2011.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I have been advised of the following information:

Between 30 June 2010 and 30 June 2011, positions with a total employment cost of \$100,000 or more:

(a) Abolished:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Attorney-General's Department	Project Manager, Domestic Violence	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Systems Analyst	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Manager, Client Support	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Transition Project Officer	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Business Analyst	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Redeployment	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Manager, Corporate Communication and Public Affairs	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Manager, Customer Service Technology	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department	Project Coordinator Snowtown	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department	Solicitor/Prosecutor	\$111,753
Attorney-General's Department	Prosecutor	\$111,753
Attorney-General's Department	Ambassador for Youth Opportunity	\$123,236
Attorney-General's Department	Solicitor	\$132,240
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,240
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,240
Attorney-General's Department	Prosecutor	\$132,240
Attorney-General's Department	Fall Back Position—Executive	\$155,130
Attorney-General's Department	Managing Solicitor	\$193,563
Attorney-General's Department	Executive Director, Building Communities Division	\$230,529
Attorney-General's Department	Executive Director, Policy, Planning & Legislation	\$250,205

(b) Created:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Attorney-General's Department	Science Leader, Research Education & Quality	\$100,623
Attorney-General's Department	Transition Project Officer	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Project Manager	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Project Manager	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Change Program Manager	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Project Manager, Facilities	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Principal Policy & Project Manager	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Redeployment	\$105,191
Attorney-General's Department	Redeployment	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department	Services Manager	\$107,103
Attorney-General's Department	Redeployee Legal Officer	\$108,609
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Negotiator	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Legal Officer	\$132,241
Attorney-General's Department	Senior Solicitor	\$132,241

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Attorney-General's Department	Director, Southern Community Justice Court	\$141,362
Attorney-General's Department	Executive Director, Building Communities Initiatives (1)	\$230,529
Attorney-General's Department	Deputy Chief Executive, Building Communities	\$250,000
Attorney-General's Department	Executive Director, Legal & Legislative Services	\$250,205
Attorney-General's Department	Deputy Crown Solicitor (2)	\$279,563

(1) This temporary position was abolished on 29 July 2011.

(2) The position this replaced remains vacant.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (8 November 2011) (First Session).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): I am advised that this information was provided to the Hon Rob Lucas, MLC on 9 February 2012 as part of a Freedom of Information application.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (8 November 2011) (First Session).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): The Attorney-General has received this advice:

Specific building and facilities related consultancies were related to:

- A review of security systems across Court facilities which was undertaken by the consultancy firm SKM at a cost of \$41,899.
- A comprehensive review of the maintenance and building code compliance upgrade requirements of the Supreme Court precinct. This includes disability requirements for the Supreme Court precinct. This work was undertaken by Dash Architects at a cost of \$154,130.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg)** (8 November 2011) (First Session).

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers): The Attorney-General has received this advice:

In answer to the first part of the question, the amount of the net decrease in the un-locatable receivables in the period 2009 to 2011 attributable to receivables written off is \$34.8 million. Of this amount written off, \$977,255 has been reinstated.

In relation to the second part of the question, amounts written off 2009-11 by the categories requested are:

(a) People Un-located. On the 30 June 2009 \$34.8 million of Un-locatable debt was 'written off' under the CAA Fines Payment Unit Debt Write Off Policy. Any amount written off under the policy can be reinstated should be debtor be located in the future. Since that time \$977,255 has been reinstated.

(b) Court varied enforcement orders—\$43.7 million has been quashed by Court Order. The majority of this relates to Applications to Review Enforcement Orders on Expiation Notices. Where the application is granted all enforcement fees are written off and the expiation is returned to the Issuing Authority to collect the original fine imposed on the notice.

(c) Died—\$1.2 million

(d) Goaled Interstate—\$0. Since the introduction of the Service and Execution of Process Amendment (Interstate Fine Enforcement) Act 2010 on the 15 December 2010, the CAA Fines Payment Unit can now undertake enforcement action against interstate debtors.

(e) Imprisoned in South Australia—\$1.7 million has been written off to be recovered by the Institution. This relates to Victims of Crime Levies. The amount is forwarded to the Institution to be deducted and paid directly into the VOC Fund. When a prisoner is released the Institution notifies the FPU of the outstanding amount which is then pursued by the Unit. During 2009-11 \$234,474 was reversed to be recovered by the FPU.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—District Council of Mount Remarkable Annual Report 2010-11

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

AustralAsia Railway Corporation—Annual Report 2010-11

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

Professional Standards Council of South Australia—Financial Report 2010-11

By the Minister for Business Services and Consumers (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Commissioner for Consumer Affairs—Annual Report 2010-11

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Fair Trading—

Health and Fitness Industry Code of Practice—Variation 2012

Pre-paid Funerals Code of Practice—Variation 2012

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Motor Vehicles—Demerit Points—Entering a Level Crossing

Road Traffic—Miscellaneous—Photographic Detection Devices

By the Minister for Workers Rehabilitation (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Regulations made under the following Act—

WorkCover Corporation—Claims Management Contractual Arrangements

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

Tandanya—National Aboriginal Cultural Institute—Annual Report 2010-11

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

Upper South East Dryland Salinity And Flood Management Act 2002—Quarterly Report October to December 2011

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Members, I draw your attention to the presence in the chamber of a group of students from Our Lady of Mount Carmel Parish School who are guests of the Premier. We also have a group of TAFE ESL students, who are guests of the member for Adelaide, and a group of students from Concordia College, who are guests of the member for Unley. Welcome to all of you. We hope you enjoy your time here. I understand that we also have a group of students from the BOR Youth Association, South Australia (South Sudanese), and their President John Longar and his executive, who are guests of the Treasurer. It is lovely to see you here today. Welcome to all of you. It is very nice to see you here.

CITY OF ADELAIDE PLANNING

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Today the Deputy Premier and I have announced a package of reforms to our planning system that will help us to deliver a more vibrant Adelaide. A recent survey commissioned by the Property Council found that Adelaide is rated by Australians as the most liveable capital city in Australia. These reforms will help ensure that we build on that reputation. These reforms are built on a landmark agreement with the Adelaide City Council. My government has taken a collaborative approach to deliver these reforms, with the Deputy Premier working directly and intensively with Lord Mayor Stephen Yarwood, Deputy Lord Mayor David Plumridge, Councillor Michael Llewellyn-Smith and all councillors and council staff.

This is a very significant change, setting aside many years of disagreement between the council and the government about planning for our city—and a demonstration about how this government wants to work. The city centre of Adelaide is the heart of our state's civic, commercial and cultural life, and must be a place where we can showcase the best of South Australia to the rest of the nation and the world.

We are planning to ensure our city can both accommodate population growth and provide a dynamic urban environment that attracts business and investment, supports affordable living, provides long-term career prospects for our young people, and offers an exciting mix of social and cultural activities.

Our reform package includes once-in-a-generation rezoning of the city centre to attract more people to the city to live—supporting more jobs, more investment and more interstate and overseas visitors. A new Capital City Zone will provide for mixed use development across most of the square mile, while also setting high standards for design excellence and ensuring ground-level land uses which activate Adelaide's squares, main streets and terraces.

The government understands that there is currently in excess of \$500 million in investment-ready projects which will be unlocked by the new zone. The overwhelming support of the city council means that the new zones will come into effect tomorrow. This will not apply to existing residential areas of the city, which will be looked at separately in due course by the city council.

In addition, council will begin consultation on 77 proposed local heritage places. A heritage development plan amendment will commence tomorrow to protect these places during the consultation. The reform package also includes regulation amendments which will streamline the development assessment process.

A new case management system will also assist potential investors in the city to navigate the development assessment process, while ensuring the statutory independence of the assessment process is maintained. It will be complemented by a new Capital City Development Assessment Committee, operating under the supervision of the Development Assessment Commission, with a mandate to focus on city development.

Taken together, the reforms in this package represent a landmark reform to our city planning system. This will help Adelaide to maintain and improve its edge as the nation's most liveable capital city and deliver our vision of a vibrant place to live, work and enjoy.

FORESTRYSA

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:12): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: On Tuesday 3 May 2011, I confirmed that the South Australian government's intention was to proceed with the proposed forward sale of ForestrySA plantations in the South-East originally considered as part of the 2008-09 Mid-Year Budget Review. This decision was made following the preparation of a regional impact statement by an independent external economic consulting firm and a broad consultation process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: At the time I gave my pledge to the house and to the community that steps would be taken to protect the interests of the South-East.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, can you sit down, please, for a moment until we have some order in the place. Members on my left will behave or they will leave the chamber. Treasurer. Sorry.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: One of the most important steps taken after that announcement was the establishment of the South-East Forestry Industry Roundtable, which is made up of community leaders and union and key industry representatives. The round table was set up to examine the broader issues the forestry industry in the South-East is faced with and to provide me and the Minister for Forests advice on specific conditions to make certain we protect the long-term future of the timber industry and the interests of the South-East community should the sale of forward rotations proceed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: As I promised, the roundtable recommendations and my response to those recommendations have been made public, and I am pleased that, after thorough consultation, the government has reached a consensus with the round table. Through this effort I think that the people of the South-East can feel secure that jobs are now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —protected and that their futures in the forestry industry will continue to thrive. The agreed conditions of sale will be enforceable and will include four main measures of rotation length, domestic supply, reporting requirements and replanting obligations. Firstly, to keep the integrity of the standard of forest product coming out of the region, the new purchaser will need to achieve a minimum area weighted average clear fall age of between 32 and 35 years, which will be for at least 32 years. This length is consistent with the policies currently adopted by ForestrySA.

To guarantee a future local timber industry, the purchaser will need to ensure that there is a commitment to match ForestrySA's current level of planned viable domestic supply. The purchaser must offer uncontracted sawlog that it wishes to export for sale pursuant to a competitive open market tender process that incorporates domestic and international customers. This will not prohibit the purchaser from continuing to supply sawlog to domestic customers pursuant to existing sawlog sale contracts (including the extension of any such contracts), new sawlog sale contracts or spot sawlog sales. The purchaser is not allowed to enter into any sawlog export contract with a term greater than two years.

We have also set strong reporting obligations to make sure that the purchaser is meeting the conditions imposed on the sale. The purchaser will be required to report annually to the government on many matters over the life of the transaction. Additionally, there will be an obligation on the purchaser to report material breaches as soon as the purchaser becomes aware of them. If the purchaser breaches the contract, in certain circumstances this government could impose financial remedies and/or sanctions if the terms are not being met. For severe breaches, such as failing to use the estate for forestry purposes, the state can terminate the contract and, if necessary, take back complete authority over the forests.

To protect the long-term sustainability of the plantation, the new purchaser will be obliged to replant areas of the estate when they are felled or destroyed by fire. The purchaser will be compelled to use the available land for forestry purposes only. All other matters raised by the round table have been considered as part of the sales process. These include:

- the South Australian government retaining ownership of the Green Triangle forest land, the water rights and any carbon rights;
- all current ForestrySA staff will remain with ForestrySA as public sector employees; and

- the government ensuring the current level of community fire protection remains. The successful purchaser will be required to fund the specific fire management costs that would be borne by a private plantation estate. Additional fire service will be funded by the government.

This government recognises the importance of the state's forest industry and is committed to addressing the many challenges facing the industry, irrespective of the proposed forward sale of forest rotations. The government intends, and will act, to protect the interests of industry, the community of the South-East and all South Australians.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank round table chairman, Mr Trevor Smith, and members of the round table—Phil Lloyd, Ian McDonnell, Richard Sage, Brad Coates, Matthew Brookes, Chris Peterson and Mark Braes—for their countless hours providing comprehensive recommendations to benefit the forestry industry and the local community. I would also like to thank the member for Mount Gambier for his constant representation to me and for his questioning in this house on this very important matter on behalf of his constituency—in stark contrast to members opposite, who just want to play political games and talk down the people of Mount Gambier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The member for Mount Gambier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The member for Mount Gambier has demonstrated his genuine passion for the people of the South-East.

The next stage of the sale process is to release a Request for Indicative Bids to shortlist potential bidders following the release of the Information Memorandum last Friday. The Information Memorandum included the conditions that I have described in this statement to the 11 interested purchasers, so that they can put to the government their indicative bids for the asset. The short-listed bidders will then be able to determine their binding bids and submit an offer for final negotiation later this year. Cabinet will then decide if it approves the final bid for the sale. The forward sale process is expected to be completed by the end of this year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, behave.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

GM HOLDEN

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Now that the government funding package has been announced for Holden, how many jobs will be lost and when will these jobs go? At a briefing last night, Holden would not tell the opposition how many jobs would be lost under this funding arrangement, but stated that they have told the Premier how many jobs will go. So, tell the public, Premier, they deserve to know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There was some supposition in that question, but I will ask the Premier to answer the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:21): I had the pleasure, actually, of attending the parliament in Canberra and I can certainly tell you that question would have been dispensed to the boundary by the current Speaker of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, I must say your leniency is one that is welcome and I am more than happy to answer the question, but it certainly was disorderly. The proposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will be heard in silence. You have asked the question.

Mr Williams: He hasn't got to the subject yet.

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The purpose of the investment package is to grow the number of jobs. That's the fundamental premise that the investment package with Holden's is based on.

Mr Williams: So there will be more jobs?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's precisely what we are seeking to do here. We are seeking to grow Holden's here in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: At the very least maintain its operations, but hopefully grow it and, indeed, all of the component manufacturers. Can I say this: I can guarantee you that every single last one of those jobs would have disappeared without this investment package. That has—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —been confirmed by Holden's, confirmed by the Prime Minister and confirmed by the federal minister for manufacturing—without contradiction—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —from Holden's. I had proposed that we debate the Holden's motion today and I am very pleased to see that we will be debating it I think for two days. So, I am more than happy to set out the approach that we have taken in relation to this matter. On 21 March we received confirmation of Holden's accepting our proposition in relation to investment in the future of Holden's. What I did immediately after we had made the public announcements was to ensure that the opposition received a briefing, which they received—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I arranged for Holden's to give a briefing to those opposite yesterday evening so that they would have the benefit of all of the relevant information, answering all of the questions—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that they have.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am not going to put in the public sphere any material that Holden's has not been prepared to put in the public sphere, for this very important reason: we were investing in the future of Holden's to sustain its future. We are not going to undermine its competitive position with those that would seek to have this information by putting any information in the public sphere that they are not prepared to put in the public sphere.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: But I can tell you these are the commitments we have. We have, of course, the commitment to not close Holden's, an absolutely crucial commitment. That is what was at stake here. The second commitment we have is to invest over \$1 billion here in South Australia—\$1 billion of investment here in South Australia to ensure that we have a future for our car industry for the purposes of two new generation cars. That is the commitment we have. Thirdly, we have a commitment to maintain operations here in South Australia until 2022 at Elizabeth. We also have the commitment of Holden's to participate—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order. This is all very interesting, but the question was: will the Premier tell us how many jobs he was told by Holden's would be lost as a result of this package?

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The Premier can answer the question as he chooses, and I find it quite fitting the answer that he is giving.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The commitment that Holden's has given and the point they have made to us is that they cannot forecast the future growth or otherwise of their operations here in Australia. They have not even designed the two new models, they have certainly not invested—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in the new models here in South Australia yet. That is something that is going to occur in the latter part of this decade. We have a commitment to 2022. That is the commitment we have from Holden's, and we are not prepared to put into the marketplace information that would assist the competitors of Holden's to damage Holden's competitive position.

CITY OF ADELAIDE PLANNING

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:27): My question is to the Deputy Premier. As Minister for Planning, can he inform the house about changes to incorporate design into planning and how this will help the city centre?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:27): I thank the member for Torrens for her question—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, we didn't have a ministerial on this at all; this was a completely separate matter. Yesterday, along with the Premier, the Lord Mayor and the government architect, Mr Ben Hewett, we announced some reforms embedding design into the planning system. The whole object of this was to bring design from being something that was considered at the very end of the process, after the proponent had had their drawings prepared, had made their applications, had put their applications into the system, and at the very last minute somebody would ask, 'Oh, yes, what about design?'

All along the way the criteria were basically prescriptive criteria or a tick-a-box sort of the situation with 70-odd pages of boxes to tick. We have now completely changed the whole focus of this so that we have a system whereby planning is part of the beginning of the system, not something thought of as an afterthought at the end. So, the planning at the beginning involves design, a design panel, as I said, with the government architect as the chair of that panel, and it is designed to take us as far away as we possibly can from the cookie cutter view of planning approvals to one where ingenious solutions to particular planning challenges are being assessed from the beginning by a panel of experts.

The process will involve a case management system, which will be assisted by members from the department of planning. There will also be regulation changes, which are actually operating from today, to deal with rezoning to accompany all of this, and we are going to see quite an exciting period in the City of Adelaide. Can I say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I say, the planning reforms announced both yesterday and today represent the most substantial change in the planning regime in the city for probably a generation. I would like to say thank you very much to the very hardworking people in my department who have spent a great deal of time on this. I would also like to thank the people from the Adelaide City Council—both the elected members and the staff of the Adelaide City Council—who have actually worked in an extremely cooperative way with my departmental officers to get to this historic outcome where we actually have the government and the Adelaide City Council agreeing about a future path for the city which is going to create a vibrant, interesting place for South Australians to have as their capital. I congratulate all of the people concerned. This is a major step forward.

GM HOLDEN

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is again to the Premier. Will the Premier tell the house how many jobs have to be lost at Holden before triggering an obligation to commence repayment of funds back to government? At a briefing last night, Holden would not tell the opposition about the clawback provisions in this funding arrangement but stated that they have told the Premier about these provisions.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:30): The clawback provisions relate to the agreements that we have secured and I mentioned those earlier.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Avoiding the closure of Holden's, the investment of \$1 billion. This is, remember here, \$50 million of South Australia's investment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —\$1 billion of Holden's investment here in South Australia, in relation to two new generation vehicles. Now, absent that, we wouldn't have the commitment to maintaining operations to 2022 at Elizabeth here in South Australia and, fourthly, participate in the working party with South Australian government representatives to do two very important things.

This commitment is at the heart of our agreement to this proposal. We are assisted in this regard by Göran Roos, who designed a number of the asks that we had from General Motors which were the subject of intensive negotiations, and that is the first, to integrate our Holden's automotive manufacturing operations into GM's global supply. This is absolutely crucial. We can't have a unique industry here in Australia and somehow expect to withstand the pressures, especially in the context of a high Australian dollar. The second element of that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The second element of that is working on that same working party to ensure that our component suppliers are part of the global supply chain. This is an even bigger—

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mrs REDMOND: The relevance of the answer. The question was about the point at which—

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you.

Mrs REDMOND: —the government has the expectation to get any money back.

The SPEAKER: We know what your question was, thank you, Leader of the Opposition. Premier, continue your answer to the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have to outline the essential conditions of the agreement because it goes to the question of failure, in relation to those matters, that drives the clawback provisions. So, I will continue the answer because it is absolutely germane to the question.

The second element of the working party which was absolutely crucial is the importance of ensuring that the existing component suppliers in South Australia are insinuated into Holden's or General Motors' global supply chain. Now, this is absolutely crucial. This work means that those component manufacturers will have the capacity to actually reach a far greater audience in relation to their manufactured products and, importantly, they will work with those component suppliers to broaden their manufacturing supply base to ensure that they are not reliant solely on Holden's. This is a crucial part of the work that needed to occur after—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I was born here. It's Holden's if you were born here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It's just the way we pronounce it in this state. It's Holden's.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It was always Holden's to me, the way I was brought up. Can I say that this second element, insinuating the component suppliers into our global supply chain, is absolutely crucial. It is linked crucially to the \$35 million fund that has been established by the commonwealth in relation to which South Australia will co-administer. So, we have a \$35 million fund, which is about—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —well, you will find out if you allow me to complete my answer—all of those matters, the failure of which will trigger our capacity to either not pay the money, remembering that our contribution doesn't commence until 2016-17, or claw it back if there is a failure in those substantial matters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will leave the chamber for the rest of question time.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will leave the chamber.

Mr WILLIAMS: On what authority, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Standing orders. You have not been named; you have been asked to leave until the end of question time.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, can I draw your attention to section 55 of the Constitution Act?

The SPEAKER: I am sure you know that off by heart.

Mr WILLIAMS: I do, Madam Speaker. Section 55 of the Constitution Act says that for either of the houses to change a standing order, they have a vote and then they lay it before the Governor and for the standing order to become enforceable—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: It's a sessional order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Or a sessional order.

The SPEAKER: This is a sessional order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Or a sessional order. For it to become enforceable, it needs to be approved by the Governor. Madam Speaker, I have done a search of the minutes of the house and

I have been unable to find any message from the Governor to say that the Governor has signed off on the motion that was moved by this house some weeks ago.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for MacKillop. I will consult with the clerks after but in the meantime you will leave the chamber until the end of question time.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, again, I ask on what authority you are asking me to leave the chamber.

The SPEAKER: On sessional orders that were adopted two to three weeks ago.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, again, I call your attention to section 55 of the Constitution Act. I do not believe the sessional orders have been lawfully adopted.

The SPEAKER: That is your opinion. I will consult with the clerks after, but in the meantime you will leave the chamber until the end of question time.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: —I do not mind obeying the rules as adopted by this house. I do not believe that this has been lawfully adopted by the house. It is not my fault that the government doesn't know what it is doing. I am lawfully here to represent the people of MacKillop and—

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop—

Mr WILLIAMS: —I think the people of MacKillop expect me to be here when I am lawfully entitled to be.

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, they would also expect you to behave when you are here. I have asked you to leave the chamber. If you refuse to leave the chamber, I will have to name you.

Mr WILLIAMS: So be it, Madam Speaker.

MEMBER FOR MACKILLOP, NAMING

The SPEAKER: Then I name the member for MacKillop. Does the member wish to be heard in an explanation or an apology?

Mr WILLIAMS: I certainly do, Madam Speaker. I wish to be heard. I do not wish to make an apology; I have no apology to make. The fact that the government trampled over this house in a manner that it did not understand what it was doing and trampled over the Constitution Act of this state, I do not see why I owe the house any apology at all and I do not see why I should have to remove myself. As I said, I am legally here representing the people of my electorate. It is not their fault that this government is incompetent. It is not their fault. It is the fault of this Premier who thought he could run roughshod over the laws of this state and try to suppress the opposition.

Madam Speaker, I put to you—and I have invited you to consult the Constitution Act—and I put to you that I would be letting down the people who put me in this place if I left here when I was not obliged to. They expect me to be here representing them. That is my explanation to the house. I call on any member who thinks that this matter has been done lawfully to stand up and explain to the house how and why it has been done lawfully.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I note that in the past the opposition have called for a debate on such matters. I indicate that we are prepared to have a five-minute debate on either side, if that is the opposition's desire, before I will move that the explanation not be accepted. We're quite happy to debate it.

Mr WILLIAMS: Debate what? Have you consulted the Constitution Act?

The SPEAKER: Order! I would understand that they are not interested in a debate from that. Do you wish to debate this, with five minutes each side?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:40): I move:

That the apology not be accepted.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (28)

Atkinson, M.J.	Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.
Bignell, L.W.	Brock, G.G.	Caica, P.
Close, S.E.	Conlon, P.F.	Fox, C.C.
Geraghty, R.K. (teller)	Hill, J.D.	Kenyon, T.R.
Key, S.W.	Koutsantonis, A.	O'Brien, M.F.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Pegler, D.W.	Piccolo, T.
Portolesi, G.	Rankine, J.M.	Rau, J.R.
Sibbons, A.L.	Snelling, J.J.	Such, R.B.
Thompson, M.G.	Vlahos, L.A.	Weatherill, J.W.
Wright, M.J.		

NOES (18)

Chapman, V.A.	Evans, I.F.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Goldsworthy, M.R.	Griffiths, S.P. (teller)	Hamilton-Smith, M.L.J.
Marshall, S.S.	McFetridge, D.	Pederick, A.S.
Pengilly, M.	Pisoni, D.G.	Redmond, I.M.
Sanderson, R.	Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Venning, I.H.	Whetstone, T.J.	Williams, M.R.

Majority of 10 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

MEMBER FOR MACKILLOP, SUSPENSION

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:45): I move:

That my learned friend the member for MacKillop be suspended from the service of the house.

Motion carried.

The honourable member for MacKillop having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

QUESTION TIME**GM HOLDEN**

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): Thank you, Madam Speaker, after that short interlude. My question, surprisingly, is again for the Premier. Why did the Premier announce the Holden funding package with the Prime Minister last week, and why is this being debated in parliament this week, given that no contract for the government funding has yet been signed with Holden and the parties are yet to agree on the contractual terms? The Holden representative told the opposition last night at a briefing that Holden does not yet have contracts with state and federal governments. To date, the parties have only exchanged letters.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:46): What an extraordinary question from the Leader of the Opposition. We came in here and made a public announcement as soon—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —as we possibly could so that the community was aware of the agreement that was reached, I think it was on 20 March in Detroit in the evening. On 21 March we get our letters, on 22 March we make public announcements; so we go to the community at the earliest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Imagine the alternative proposition: that we didn't come in here or tell the public about this matter until we had the final legal agreements about the funding arrangements. We had the essence of the agreement reached between the parties—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —which is contained within an exchange of correspondence, and the final legal agreements will be executed in due course. Can I say this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —they are in much better shape than the Victorian community because Premier Baillieu wouldn't even tell people how much he contributed. When he was asked on ABC radio by Jon Faine, 'How can South Australia kick in five times more than we do when the bulk of the jobs you are trying to save are in Victoria?'—well, Jon, you are making a couple of assumptions there that aren't correct. We don't get in the business of declaring how much we've contributed. So, here we have—they won't even tell you how much money they are putting in. We've not only—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, if she wants to ask another question I am happy to answer that one as well, but we'll just take them one at a time. Just sticking to this particular question, we have come to the parliament at the earliest opportunity, and we gave those opposite notice of the fact that we wanted to debate it today. For some reason they want to debate it tomorrow. We are happy to talk about Holden's all week.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: So, I would have thought that they would be pleased to have a debate about the funding package before we executed the final funding agreements, and that is what we are doing. We gave them notice, we invited them to tell us whether they needed more time, they said they wanted more time, so we put it on tomorrow. We arranged for Holden's to give them a briefing, and they have received that briefing at our request. We encouraged Holden's to be as open—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members! Premier, could you sit down, please. Members on my left, there is far too much noise here, I can't hear what is going on. You are being very rude. Premier, have you finished your answer? The member for Mitchell.

GM HOLDEN

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:50): Thank you, Madam Speaker; I'll try again. My question is to the Premier. How does the Holden co-investment package relate to the government's manufacturing green paper and the Thinker in Residence report by Professor Göran Roos?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:50): There is a critical relationship between the investment that we have made to secure the future of Holden's here in South Australia and our capacity to have any sort of manufacturing industry, let alone an advanced manufacturing industry. Professor Göran Roos made the powerful point to us in relation to the Holden's package that it is almost impossible to rebuild a manufacturing industry once it is lost; and, make no mistake, ripping 16,000 jobs out of the South Australian economy and out of the heart of our manufacturing industry would make it an extraordinarily difficult job to rebuild that industry, and that is what those opposite would do. They would destroy the Playford legacy. They would be prepared to destroy and tear down the Playford

legacy. We are seeking to build on it, and that is the difference—the constructive versus the destructive, and that is where they always are, Madam Speaker. They are always in the negative destructive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, the reason why it is such an important task for us to save manufacturing, and in particular Holden's, is because a number of the capabilities and skills that exist in Holden's are the raw materials that will drive and advance a manufacturing future for our state. I have seen evidence of this with my own eyes in going around to range of businesses—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —which could fairly be described as 'advanced manufacturing'. They have drawn on the skills and capabilities of the managers and the tradespeople and the process workers who exist at Holden's or the other automotive manufacturers. Indeed, I was at the air warfare destroyer assembly project, the ASC, down in the electorate of the member for Port Adelaide, and I was very pleased to see some former Mitsubishi workers there who were working in that factory, and their skills were valued.

Their process line skills and their understanding of advanced manufacturing skills, which essentially is what car manufacturing has become now, was absolutely vital in the participation in that particular project. The four areas where South Australia needs to transition (which are laid out in the advanced manufacturing paper) are referred in two regards to 'smart firms' and 'smart people', and that is what is at the heart of our advanced manufacturing sector—growing those skills and capabilities, keeping Holden's. Working through the working party to lift skills and capabilities will be at the heart of our advanced manufacturing future.

GM HOLDEN

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): My question, again, is to the Premier. What was the purpose of allowing the opposition to be briefed by Holden on the details of the funding package if the details are all either not yet decided or commercial in confidence, or both, and doesn't this prove that the Premier is no different from Mike Rann?

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

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The question is so full of comment and argument. We have to draw a line somewhere. It is completely out of order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:53): I answer that question and preface it by saying that we have had the opportunity to communicate with Holden's since that first question was asked, and they confirmed that they have not told the opposition that they told the government the number of job losses at the Elizabeth plant, so I think it outrageous that the approach they have taken in question time is predicated on that fact.

We in good faith arranged for a briefing between Holden's and the opposition. We invited them to be as open as they felt that they could be with the Leader of the Opposition in relation to this matter, but, naturally enough, they are not prepared to disclose material which would give a competitive advantage to their competitors. Why would they do that? Why would we insist that they do that? We are putting \$50 million into promoting and securing their future; why would we take steps to undermine it?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That question was out of order; however, the Premier chose to answer it. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to be very careful in the wording of her questions.

GM HOLDEN

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on support or otherwise for Holden remaining open in South Australia, and what is his response for the people in my electorate?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her question, and note her keen interest in the future of Holden's. Of course, many of the workers also live in her electorate of Taylor. It has been a confusing picture about support or otherwise for it; we have lots of different positions within the Liberal Party on this. We have Mr Birmingham saying, 'Of course, it happens in a range of places [that is, the funding] in a range of ways but, globally, there's got to be a question here that governments can't afford to keep undertaking these activities.' That was Simon Birmingham, 'can't afford it'. Mr Abetz said, 'Australia is in a special situation. It is one of 13 countries in the world that has the capacity to make motor vehicles. Now it's a pretty special capacity and I think it's within the national interest to have that sort of wherewithal.' So he is on the team.

Then we have Mr Macfarlane. He looks like he is supportive, and he wanted to make that communicated quickly. Then we have Mr Abetz again (so he has got confused), who said, 'We are committed to reducing government expenditure. In that context we have indicated we have reduced by \$500 million part of the government support.' That is to the car industry. Mr Billson looks like he is in favour. Barnaby is reliable: 'If we want to be a country that means something we've got to be a country that makes something.' A great line. Then of course there is Joe Hockey. Joe has let the team down, 'Well, that's a very good question Mel of course. We all welcome further investment in General Motors of a billion dollars, but I have deep deep reservations about handing to one company nearly a quarter of a billion dollars of taxpayers' money.'

Then, of course, who could forget the Leader of the Opposition—where is it? It's an important quote here. After questioning why I was in Detroit in the first place, she then goes on to say, 'I think for us to have a future in this country generally in cars when you look at the map of the world, if you wanted to produce something very heavy and transport it around the world this would probably not be the place you would choose.'

I think it is high time for those opposite to clarify it, to come clean, and instead of nosing around this issue and pretending that they are somehow generally in support, make it clear whether they are behind the government in investing in Holden's, securing a future for Holden's in this state, a future for the constituents of the member for Taylor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Trade, order!

GM HOLDEN

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): Why should the public trust Labor that the new Holden funding package will guarantee Holden's future when former premier Mike Rann promised three years ago that the \$180 million in federal and state funding for the Holden Cruze would 'guarantee a future for the plant, a future for the workers, and also a future for the car industry'?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The question started, 'Why should the public trust Labor'. It is pure argument; it invites debate on the question. The Premier may well answer it, but it simply invites debate if you put argument in the question.

Mrs REDMOND: I am happy to reword the question, if you like.

The SPEAKER: Yes; I would ask you to reword the question or I will not allow it.

Mrs REDMOND: On what basis does the Premier say that the new Holden funding package will guarantee Holden's future? Three years ago then premier Mike Rann promised that the \$180 million in federal and state funding for the Holden Cruze would 'guarantee a future for the plant, a future for the workers, and also a future for the car industry'.

The SPEAKER: I am being very lenient. Premier, do you choose to answer that question?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:59): Yes, Madam Speaker. There is the small matter of the over \$1 billion in investment that has been put in by Holden's; there is also the specific commitment for Holden's to remain open and producing cars, two next-generation cars, at Elizabeth until 2022. There seems to be some

confusion here about the Cruze. If there was not the co-investment in relation to the Cruze we would not even be sitting here talking about the future of Holden's, they would already be gone. The Cruze is the single most important reason why Holden's actually continues to exist in South Australia. So, there is a rewriting of history here about that arrangement. But for that commitment, we would not be having a Holden's here. Cruze rescued Holden's here in South Australia. The government was central to that investment and that is why we are even having this debate here in South Australia at this time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GM HOLDEN

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. How does the South Australian government's co-investment package compare to assistance packages internationally?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:00): There has been a lot of discussion about whether or not the South Australian government, the Victorian government and the commonwealth government should be entering into a co-investment with Holden's. I was on the ABC *Drive* program with Mr Michael Smyth and we were talking about it, and the truth is that Australia is one of 13 countries in the world that manufacture motor vehicles. In fact, we are one of the few countries in the world that are capable of starting the process, from design right through to the assembly line right here in this country. It is a capability that is strategically important to this nation.

Every car on South Australia's roads, other than probably some very extreme prestige cars, has a form of government investment in it, whether it is tariff protection or taxation. South Australians driving to work—whether it is in a Mazda, a Nissan, a Toyota, a Ford, a Holden or a Hyundai—have a form of government investment in that vehicle, yet there are some members opposite and members of the Liberal Party who believe that that should not be the case.

I want to point out that last year Holden's sold 40,000 Commodores, No. 2 in the country—a good brand. Alexander Downer, the modern father of the Liberal Party of South Australia, says, 'Holden are making cars people don't want to buy.' That is not true. The Cruze was No. 5 nationally, selling over 33,000 vehicles. The Sapphire research group commissioned a study—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who is that back there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and it was done in response to people talking about how much investment there is in Australia compared to overseas, because, ultimately, a lot of people think that the automotive industry can survive on its own. I want to give a few figures to the house based on this research. In Canada, \$4 billion was provided in loans to the Canadian automotive industry in 2008-09. In France, €6 billion was provided in loans to car makers Peugeot Citroen and Renault, €600 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —was provided for the automotive industry suppliers and €2 billion was provided to the financial services arm of Renault and Peugeot Citroen. The German government provided €1.5 billion—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I don't spend as much time in Paris as you; I spend time in Adelaide.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, I think he's getting a little bit obsessed. The United Kingdom provided £2.3 billion in loans and the Swedish government provided over 20 billion kronas in assistance to their automotive industry. In the United States, the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) provided net assistance of \$73.8 billion in the form of assistance.

Mrs Redmond: How many 'Pergios' can you buy with that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's the point, isn't it?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Members opposite don't want Australian subsidies in Australian cars, because they prefer to buy foreign-made cars. They would much rather drive around in Land Rovers and BMWs rather than drive around in Australian-made vehicles.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's the truth.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order: standing order 98, debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Actually, the minister's time has expired. The member for Florey.

ANZAC CENTENARY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs. Can the Treasurer inform the house of the planning that is being undertaken in preparation for the centenary of ANZAC?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:05): I would like to thank the member for Florey for her question and acknowledge her strong support of the veterans' community in her attendance at many veterans' activities. The centenary of ANZAC in 2015 will be one of the most important commemorative events in our nation's history. It will fall within the broader commemoration of World War I, starting in 2014 and concluding on Remembrance Day 2018.

Media reports this week have claimed that commemorating ANZAC Day may be considered divisive due to multiculturalism, or may be unpopular with young people. Nothing is further from the truth. Here in South Australia our ANZAC Day commemorations have a major multicultural focus and involve a large number of young people from a wide variety of different backgrounds.

The ANZAC Eve Youth Vigil is an event created by the RSL in 2001 that became the Adelaide City Council Community Event of the Year in 2010. Since its inception it has been supported by the state government. The youth vigil is attended by many community organisations and participants from many cultures. The Aboriginal community is involved as well as the Turkish community. Participants have also come from Italy, the Netherlands, Serbia, Ireland, South Vietnam, Greece, Malta, Poland, the United States, Scotland, East Turkistan, the Cook Islands, Somalia, the Philippines, the Ukraine and Tonga.

The concept of the youth vigil is entirely South Australian. It commenced with a vigil at the War Memorial on North Terrace, but vigils are now also conducted at Marion, Blackwood, Morphett Vale, Naracoorte, Port Lincoln, Salisbury and Whyalla. The concept may become nationwide as a Centenary of ANZAC event.

Other plans for commemorating ANZAC are also well advanced, so that we can suitably acknowledge the 60,000 Australians lost at a critical time in our nation's history, as well as a similar number who died soon after. Many of those are among the 4,000 graves in the Australian Imperial Forces Cemetery at West Terrace, carefully tended by the staff of the Adelaide Cemetery Authority and the Office of Australian War Graves.

Members might recall that last year the Prime Minister appointed the Hon. Warren Snowdon MP as Minister Assisting the Prime Minister on the Centenary of ANZAC, and in October last year the membership of the ANZAC Centenary Advisory Board was announced. That board will be chaired by the former chief of the Defence Force, Air Chief Marshal Angus Houston AC AFC (Retired). The Premier and I have already met with minister Snowdon and with Air Chief Marshal Houston.

The Centenary Advisory Board has 16 general and four ex-officio members, including prominent South Australians. His Honour Judge Rauf Soulio, Chair of the Australian Multicultural Council, and Professor Christine Charles, Chair of the Resources Technology Innovation Centre, are among them. I would like to congratulate Judge Soulio and Professor Charles on their appointment. I am sure they will represent our state exceptionally well.

In February, minister Snowdon announced the membership of six working groups that will report to and support the ANZAC Centenary Advisory Board. These groups comprise 48 Australians drawn from all walks of life and include historians, business leaders, academics, journalists, a sports personality, a singer, teachers, artists, former service personnel, an Indigenous Rhodes Scholar, a war widow, two Victoria Cross recipients, and a former politician.

The board and working groups will play a pivotal role in planning for the ANZAC Centenary commemorations and will look particularly at the areas of education curriculum, military and cultural history, business, ceremonial and commemorations, youth, and engagement with state and local government.

I am pleased that South Australia is represented on these working groups by Rebecca Richards, an Indigenous Rhodes Scholar, who is on the Youth Working Group; John Schumann, a well-known singer and songwriter, who is on the Military and Cultural History Working Group; and Mr Bill Denny AM, Director, Veterans SA, who has been appointed to the state and local government working group.

Separately, but as part of the overall commemorative board initiative, ACM Houston has invited distinguished former governor, Sir Eric Neal AC CVO, to be his conduit with South Australia during his pre-commemoration period. Sir Eric is very close to and highly respected by the people of South Australia and will gauge the community pulse as we work towards 2014. I would like to thank Sir Eric for offering his services. South Australia is well advanced. As we approach the centenary of ANZAC, I look forward to updating the house further in due course.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I did give you a little bit of extra time. The Leader of the Opposition.

GM HOLDEN

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): My question is again to the Premier. What guarantee was there that the \$180 million of state and federal funds announced in December 2008 would secure Holden against future job losses? Will the Premier explain why, subsequent to this money being announced, there have been 470 jobs lost at Holden?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (15:10): The essence of that previous commitment is that we have now a thriving, existing manufacturing industry here in the northern suburbs—remember this. There were, I think, 90,000 vehicles produced at Holden's last year and there are forecast to be 90,000 again this year. Indeed, but for the change in the Australian dollar, it would have increased by more than that; that is what explains the recent lay-offs.

It is impossible to forecast, having regard to the Australian dollar, the new design, market conditions and a competitive global environment, what is going to happen in the future at any point, whether it was the time when they made the investment in the Cruze or the time we make the investment now. What we do know is, absent this investment, this factory closes—that is clear. That is a certainty and that is what we are dealing with here. The best available commitment we have for the future is the fact that there is \$1 billion of investment going here into South Australia to make sure that we have two new-generation vehicles being manufactured here in South Australia.

Just remember this: with the \$275 million, which is the nature of the commitment that we are looking at here, and the \$1 billion that is going here into this investment, the lion's share of that benefit will be enjoyed by South Australians. Now, on most planets, except in the parallel universe that constitutes the other side of the parliament, that would be a cause for celebration and they

would be saying, 'We are right behind you, Premier. Get a few more deals like that for us,' but, instead, we have a negative opposition that wants to talk down—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —the state at every available opportunity.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, have you finished your answer? You have, yes. The member for Norwood.

GM HOLDEN

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. Was the minister wrong when he told the media last week in regard to the Holden funding announcement: 'The guarantees we've got are no forced redundancies...they've promised no forced redundancies'?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:13): Last week, what the Premier announced with the Prime Minister was one of the biggest leverage deals in the state's history. We put in \$50 million, and we get—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The State Bank? Yes, great; thank you. What we have done here is leverage \$1 billion worth of private investment into the state's manufacturing arm and we still don't know whether members opposite support it. They still haven't said publicly whether they support the package. We don't know whether the Liberal Party supports \$1 billion worth of private capital. Holden have a policy of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: the minister is clearly debating. The question was: was he right or was he wrong? Not every question asked is about him.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, that's enough. You don't need to explain your point of order. Minister for Trade, back to the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: since the other side like to take points of order, it is also out of order to interject and the interjections are horrendously loud. I can't hear the minister.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Members on my left will be quiet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We will get you an ear horn soon so don't worry.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, Madam Speaker. The Liberal Party is the only party in the world who think \$1 billion of private investment won't guarantee jobs. They actually think two new vehicles, two new platforms, in opposition to closure, won't guarantee jobs. Are they the only—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Another point of order. I presume you are talking about relevance.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, 98. He continues debate. Please direct him to the substance of the answer to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I ask you to return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, Madam Speaker. The idea that Holden will be manufacturing into the future into 2022, producing two brand new vehicles, obviously means that Holden are committing to staying in South Australia. It takes a fair amount of workforce to build those two vehicles. I believe that Holden are here to stay. This deal guarantees that. This

investment guarantees manufacturing jobs into the future and the only people upset about that are those members opposite, and they won't tell us whether they support \$1 billion worth of private investment into this state.

LOWER LAKES

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Can the minister inform the house about what recent work has been undertaken—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry. Member for Port Adelaide, could you read the question again? I cannot hear you.

Dr CLOSE: Can the minister inform the house about what recent work has been undertaken to return native fish to the Lower Lakes region?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for Port Adelaide for her question and acknowledge her lifelong commitment to improving the environment for all South Australians. I am pleased to inform members about the vital work the government is supporting in the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth region. As all members should be aware, it was just a few short years ago that the unprecedented drought saw flows into the lakes dry up, with many fish species coming close to extinction.

The lack of freshwater inflows resulted in important wetlands and fish habitats drying out which had a severe impact on populations of native fish throughout the region. The fish that remained were detected through monitoring as part of the Department for Water's The Living Murray program and were rescued for breeding programs with the intention of returning the fish that were bred in captivity to their natural habitat once the water returned.

I am pleased to inform members that this week about 4,000 native fish bred in captivity will be returned to their natural habitat around the Lower Lakes. Over the next few days, native species such as the Yarra pygmy perch, southern pygmy perch, Murray hardyhead and the southern purple spotted gudgeon will be released into the wetlands and waterways around the lakes. This project is a result of a very successful collaboration between the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Department for Water, Flinders University, Aquasave, SARDI, PIRSA, the SA Murray-Darling Basin NRM Board, the South Australian Museum and Native Fish Australia (SA).

This work has also produced a groundbreaking scientific approach to enhancing the prospects of survival for reintroduced fish populations, and in this aspect I acknowledge the work by scientists from Flinders University led by Professor Luciano Beheregaray. I am also pleased to inform members that the work previously undertaken to repopulate native fish species in the region is proving successful.

Late last year, the Premier and I helped return around 1,000 southern pygmy perch bred in captivity to habitat on Hindmarsh Island. Recent samples—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I actually saved him. I was ready to take the dive, you know, to distract attention. But we managed it very well, and I do thank *The Advertiser* for using probably the worst photograph that they possibly could have used at that circumstance. Nonetheless, I saved the Premier. Recent samples taken from the area—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, and he saved the fish. Recent samples taken from the area have shown the fish to be in good health. This government is committed to ensuring that the Coorong, Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth region is a healthy, productive, resilient wetland system that maintains its international, local and cultural significance. Of course, having in place a robust Murray-Darling Basin plan that is based on the best available science will go a long way towards achieving this goal. That is why the government would welcome the opposition coming on board with other South Australians to support our call for the best plan for the basin—not a second rate plan, as the shadow minister appears prepared to accept.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think there are too many trumpeters in here today.

LABOR LEADERSHIP

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:19): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier have a meeting at the home of *The Advertiser* journalist Miles Kemp and his wife, minister Grace Portolesi, where they discussed the issue of the appropriate time to move against former premier Mike Rann?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (15:19): Were things going so badly today that they had to call on the member for Unley? Were things going that badly? I thought we were talking about Holden's; but no, apparently we are not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have a little question: do you want Holden's in South Australia or not?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes or no?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Standing order 98: debate. Clearly the answer has nothing to do with the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the question invited all sorts of responses. It was a very personal question and I do not think the Premier needed to answer it. Have you finished, Premier?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ashford.

BREAST SCREENING

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:20): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Ageing. How will the upgrade in digital breast screening benefit South Australian women?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:21): I thank the member for her question and her interest in women's health. I know all members of this place are interested in women's health. I am very pleased to advise the house that digital breast screening is now available at most locations where we have BreastScreen SA in metropolitan Adelaide.

The state and federal governments have provided \$36.7 million to roll out digital breast screening right across South Australia. Digital technology is now available at BreastScreen SA's Frome Road training centre, city clinic and Arndale clinic in the city's west. The conversion of these clinics follows on from the Elizabeth GP Plus Health Care Centre clinic and two country mobile units which began operating using digital technology in late 2010. A newly converted clinic at Marion is scheduled to open on 2 April this year. A third mobile unit, a dedicated assessment clinic, a screening clinic at Wayville and a new screening clinic in the southern suburbs will also be delivered as part of the upgrade program in 2013, along with a new archive and communication system.

This updated technology will allow faster and more precise screening and, I understand from having looked at the machinery and talked to some of the women, more gentle screening, so that women can be screened and more cancers can be detected and treated. In fact, it is anticipated that the total number of South Australian women screened will increase from approximately 74,000 this year to more than 96,000 by June 2015. As a result of that we will be able to screen sufficient numbers of women to potentially detect 340 more cancers.

Screening mammograms can detect breast cancers early before they are large enough to be felt and potentially before they spread. Early detection also allows women to be treated with less

invasive, simpler procedures and reduces the need for care in hospital. This digital technology, of course, has less radioactive material, therefore it has less impact on the patients in the longer term.

We know that one in 11 women will develop breast cancer by the age of 75. It is the most common cancer among Australian women, accounting for 28 per cent of all cancers diagnosed. Ninety per cent of women diagnosed with breast cancer do not have a family history of the disease, so it is well worthwhile going through this process. It is a free service, screening at two-yearly intervals, to women aged 50 to 69 across the state. I would encourage all members of this place to spread the word in their electorates to encourage their constituents, particularly those between the ages of 50 and 69, to have these tests.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry, we will have to bring question time to an end. We have only about 30 seconds left.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I remind honourable members that His Excellency the Governor will receive the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly at 3.30pm today for the presentation of the Address in Reply. I ask all honourable members to accompany me to Government House.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. If there were 30 seconds left of question time, why was the opposition denied the opportunity to ask a question during that time?

The SPEAKER: Because we were supposed to leave at 3.15pm and I did give some flexibility there until now. Considering there were about 20 seconds left, I think it was in order.

[Sitting suspended from 15:25 to 16:04]

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

GM HOLDEN

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (16:04): Today we have heard much talk in this house about Holden. We have heard many words on Holden, but we have still got very, very little detail from the government. The government has been at pains to ask themselves Dorothy Dixier questions and put many things on the public record—their support for the Holden motor company, for their automotive supply chain and, indeed, for all of manufacturing in South Australia.

Of course, we are a little bit bemused on this side of the house because we are wondering to ourselves why they are going to such an extent to talk about the importance of Holden, the importance of the automotive sector, and the importance of manufacturing in South Australia when that has been the long held position of the Liberal Party. On this issue we are in furious agreement, and we are glad that the Labor Party has finally come around to this point of view.

They, of course, have been latecomers to the idea of the importance of the automotive sector in South Australia. Do not forget that this is the government which, when they came to power, one of their first acts was to close down the South Australian centre for manufacturing based down at the old Holden site in Woodville. This was the government which actually closed down the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing, and then they closed down the body which came after that, Innovate SA. They closed down the BECs and they closed down the business centre on South Terrace.

This government has been no friend whatsoever to the manufacturing sector in South Australia since they came to power. If we look at the statistics, we can see that 10,000 fewer people are employed in the manufacturing sector in South Australia since this government tore away the support that the Liberal Party, the Liberal government, was offering to the manufacturing sector in South Australia.

I speak with some authority on this issue, having my entire working life operated in the South Australian manufacturing sector. In fact, I served for five years on the state government's Manufacturing Industry Advisory Board under both Liberal and Labor governments. In fact, it was my pleasure to serve under the former minister for industry and trade, the Hon. Kevin Foley, when he was the minister for this important sector here in South Australia.

I understand the challenges which are faced by the manufacturing sector. Unfortunately, those opposite do not. But they have finally come around to this point of view and we are very grateful for this. Of all their failures to the manufacturing sector the most heinous of these has been unequivocally their support for the toxic federal government carbon tax, a tax on productivity, a tax on exports and, of course, a tax on South Australian jobs.

This tax will come into effect in less than 100 days. This government here in South Australia remains the only mainland government in Australia which is in support of the federal government's tax on jobs, their tax on exports, their tax on productivity. My question to the government is: what work have they done to determine what the cost of the carbon tax will be to Holden? It would be a very interesting question to determine how many years' subsidy the \$50 million that the taxpayers are going to be paying to the Holden motor company will provide for Holden? How many years of carbon tax subsidy will our \$50 million actually provide?

The answer is: very few, probably one or two years at best, and thereafter this industry will be suffering at the hands of this federal government's carbon tax. Personally, I am delighted that Holden have made a commitment to the ongoing manufacture of vehicles here in South Australia. As somebody who grew up in the western suburbs I understand unequivocally the importance of manufacturing and the importance of the automotive sector.

In fact, my father was apprenticed at Holden at Woodville. He was a fitter and turner and became a tradesman there, and it was a great start to his career. It has been a great company in South Australia, but make no mistake, it is under attack by this government and their support of carbon tax. As said, I am very pleased that we are going to make sure that one of our firms in South Australia is going to survive the carbon tax impost. Now my question to the Premier is: what is he going to do for the 200,000 other companies in South Australia where no subsidy is going to be provided?

The simple fact of the matter is this will attack Holden's supply chain, it will attack every manufacturer; in fact, it will attack every single individual in South Australia. It is a toxic federal government policy, and it is one the Premier should hanging head in shame for supporting. It is completely un-South Australian. If he wanted to do something to ensure the future of Holden he should move away from it with great alacrity.

Time expired.

DYSLEXIA ACTION GROUP

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (16:09): Today, I would like to bring to the house's attention a public meeting which took place last week in my electorate. The public meeting was organised by the Dyslexia Action Group, Barossa, Gawler and surrounds. At the outset I would like to acknowledge the wonderful work undertaken by Dr Sandra Marshall and Ophie Renner. Ophie was the Gawler Citizen of the Year this year and also the South Australian Citizen of the Year. These two people, with a small group of volunteers, have been very active in bringing the issue of dyslexia to the attention of the local community and also ensuring that particular children with dyslexia are given a fair go in the education system.

I had the honour and the privilege to be asked to chair the forum, both last week and an earlier forum late last year. The forum was attended by a number of parents, teachers and other community members and both forums have had capacity crowds, so there are a lot of children in our community, and obviously families who are concerned about their children's development because they have the disability of dyslexia.

The forum, apart from myself who actually chaired the session, was also attended by the local mayor, mayor Brian Sambell, who spoke about some of the positive outcomes for young people in addressing the issue of dyslexia. Ms Angela Weeks, the Clinical Director of Specific Learning Difficulties of South Australia (SPELD), gave a presentation on the importance of goal setting for students with dyslexia and also provided some explicit strategies that teachers could implement to support those students. Ms Sandy Russo, a teacher at SPELD, presented information about assistive learning technologies that were available to assist students with dyslexia to access and participate successfully at school and also in the home environment. She talked about the use of MP3 players, digital recording devices, computers, software, etc., which actually help students learn.

The local Barossa regional director for education, Kathryn Bruggemann, talked about the need for teachers to have an understanding of dyslexia and the impact of the condition on their

self-esteem and learning outcomes for young people diagnosed with dyslexia. She spoke from personal experience. She has a child who actually suffers from dyslexia, so she has quite a passion to address this issue. Julie Aschberger, who works in the department, talked about some new initiatives that the department was introducing to roll out a greater awareness of dyslexia in the classroom and also how teachers can actually support students and how they can just change their teaching style, which not only helps students with dyslexia but the mainstream class as well because those styles are adaptable for both.

Ingrid Alderton, again another person from the department, spoke about dyslexia-friendly school packs, which is a UK initiative to support students with dyslexia in the classroom. The point was made that education is actually managed differently in the UK, where local authorities have a lot more say. Therefore, there is actually a different approach to students with disabilities. Mr Dave Pisoni, the opposition spokesperson, also attended the meeting. He provided, if you like, a Liberal Party's opinion on where education is in this state, and I will let him talk about that more. I do not need to use my time to discuss it here.

At the end of the meeting, as chair of the session, I was asked to have a discussion with the people present and talk about what sort of things they wanted at future meetings. The people who attended indicated they wanted more information about other learning difficulties, ways of supporting students with dyslexia and special provisions particularly around the SACE program to ensure that their children have the best opportunities through not only education but also training. There were suggestions about some smaller specific interest groups being formed to explore and address issues and to build the knowledge of attendees. There were a number of parents who would like to know what they can do to support their child in the home.

There was a really positive mood in the forum; in other words, a focus on what we can do to help our young children, particularly with early intervention, how to support them and how to help them maintain their self-esteem so they do not actually lose interest in their education, which has been a problem in the past. Kids who have not coped with the mainstream program have actually opted out, which is unfortunate because, obviously, those children would have had a lot of potential which has not been realised.

The students also talked about how we actually help with transition because, in private schools, children often have one teacher and, in secondary education, they might have multiple teachers. A whole range of issues was raised but it was a very well-attended forum. I also indicate the government's support to help these children.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (16:14): Today, I speak of the history of the Glenside Hospital development over the past 10 years. Members will be forgiven if they assume that the control over the Glenside Hospital development in the last 10 years and the supervision of this was largely at the behest of then premier Rann—indeed, concluding at his goodbye party last year on the Glenside Hospital site at the Australian film hub (now Adelaide Film Studio) where \$68,000-plus was spent for his goodbye party—and that this was all his baby. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Premier Weatherill, in particular, has had his fingerprints all over this development in the last 10 years. Members may recall that there are a number of different ministers in that last 10 years, but when I first came into office as the member for Bragg in 2002, minister Hill was the then minister for environment. He now has portfolios of arts and mental health. In between, covering health issues were the Hons Lea Stevens and Gail Gago (covering mental health, for example). We had various other ministers in these portfolios.

Members may be interested to know that the then minister Hill contributed state government funds of \$15,000 to help rebuild the heritage wall. We then had promises from then minister for health, Lea Stevens, in June 2004 in which she made it very clear that the Glenside Hospital would be retained for mental health purposes. She went on to say on 10 June 2004, 'I can confirm, however, that at this stage there are no plans to dispose of the land for either residential and/or commercial functions.'

Of course, we then had the era from 2004 to 2007 when the now Premier (then minister for housing) proposed a major development of Housing Trust on the Glenside site. In fact, the plans were drawn up and the matter ended up in the Supreme Court. In the end, the minister's adviser gave notice that there would be a withdrawal of the appeals in the Supreme Court and the major Housing Trust development would not proceed.

To have this assumption that he has not been anywhere near this, bear in mind that he was sitting all the way through in the cabinet dealing with these matters. Then we had the Capps report, as you might recall. We had minister Hill saying that, as then minister for environment, he could not expand the Glenside proposal because it was needed for mental health facilities in the future. Finally, in September 2007, the then premier Rann and minister Gago announced a redevelopment on the site which included a major cultural hub.

However, by May 2008, the premier then announced that there would be a \$43 million film and sound hub built on the campus. His department was going to buy the property for a few million dollars, they were going to have this major development and the Film Corporation would be relocated to it.

I mention that because that is really the issue that has been alive today—the acknowledgement publicly by the SA Film Corporation, who are now tenants of the premises on the Glenside site, where they have admitted that the *Resistance* television series is no longer going to be made by the Film Corporation and that the \$1.5 million financial incentive that had been provided for this would not be available. So we still need to have from the government very clear answers as to what payments have been made to the Film Corporation in support of this, not just the cash investment incentive payment of \$850,000 but whether any other in-kind support had been provided. What is the loss of revenue that they have received on this issue since they had announced that they were going to do the resistance program and also what other projects have been sent away.

We do not know any answers to that because we do not have the annual report of the SA Film Corporation. It is now six months overdue to be tabled in this parliament; it has still not been presented today. What we do have, though, is some information that was presented to the Public Works Committee of the parliament in an update. This was a report that had been prepared for the Public Works Committee giving them an update on financial material for this project. I will refer to it another day.

PORT ADELAIDE LION SOCCER CLUB

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (16:19): I rise today to speak about my local soccer club, The Pirates. I recently attended a pre-season dinner and had a great time with the club as it prepares for what I am sure will be a highly successful season.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

Dr CLOSE: An interjection on your own side? The Port Adelaide Lion Soccer Club was established in 1903 making it one of the oldest soccer clubs in Australia. The club has been in continuous operation through the Great Depression and both world wars. It has moved location a number of times and it has been at the site on the John Hart Reserve in Ethelton since the 1950s.

Currently the Pirates have 180 players and 500 members. They have teams ranging in age from under seven years old to a professional senior team that plays in the Football Federation of SA premier league. The club has a strong focus on developing its junior players. Last season the senior coach was awarded the Premier League Coach of the Year and three senior players were signed up by Adelaide United. The Pirates have a policy of selecting highly experienced coaches and providing them with quality training so that they are better able to pass on the skills of the sport.

The club recently received a Move It grant from the Office for Recreation and Sport. With this money the club has established a Soccer for Everyone program. The program is aimed at children of Aboriginal heritage and also children who are new arrivals. The program involves training and mentoring children in these focus groups in soccer skills. If they reach a level of proficiency where they can compete at the appropriate standard, the club will provide scholarships to help them integrate into the Pirates teams and club. What a wonderful way to open the club up to all!

The club has been limited by its small grounds and has been greatly encouraged by the suggestion that the local council facilitate their move to Taperoo onto a large block of land owned by the council that was formerly the site for Taperoo Primary School. The Taperoo site is an ideal location for the Pirates and the Taperoo area would benefit greatly from having the club and its facilities located there. The site can accommodate four to five pitches. It is a flat site with well-draining soil. This site has the additional benefits of a train station and bus stop close by. It is also

close to the Lefevre Community Stadium, so young people involved in the club could also play indoor soccer as part of their training or in off-season competition.

I would like to pay tribute to the Pirates club's impact on the community and how much it is valued by that community. What was clear at the pre-season dinner was that the club is able to rely on dozens of small sponsorships from local businesses and individuals supporting their local club. This is not a rich area and it is not a wealthy club, but it is a successful club because the community has taken it into their hearts.

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (16:22): Last week marked the halfway point of the government's current four-year term, before the people of South Australia judge Labor's performance in March 2014. Ten years into this Labor government and the state's economy continues to go from bad to worse. After 10 years of Labor, South Australia is not only in recession, it now has the nation's highest taxes, the nation's worst economic growth, the nation's highest decline in job vacancies, the nation's highest capital city water charges, the nation's worst business confidence (businesses are leaving the state), the nation's worst approval figures, the nation's worst performing workers compensation scheme, the nation's slowest growth in wages and the nation's fastest growth in consumer prices.

Tourism activity is falling. Other states are outperforming us. The Barossa has gone from the second most popular tourist destination to the seventh and will fall further if we do not take drastic steps. The government is totally devoid of any entrepreneurship. All these cruise ships coming to South Australia and look at the way we welcome them!

Premier Weatherill was in state cabinet when every one of Labor's bad decisions were made since it took government in 2002. Shared Services—what a debacle! It cost jobs in the country regions and millions have been wasted with no tangible result. What we have now is the same ship, just with a different captain, and it continues to sink.

Under the Labor government since 2002 water bills have increased by 178 per cent. That is unbelievable—178 per cent! Electricity bills have increased by 95.2 per cent and state taxes have increased by 88 per cent. Two weeks ago figures showed the lowest level of real estate transactions in South Australia since 1985. Is anybody surprised? The Treasurer was reported as saying at the time, 'We have a serious revenue shortfall.' No doubt. Is he preparing for the worst when we discuss our credit rating? Yes, Mr Acting Speaker, we have two years left before the people of South Australia can pass judgement on the worst government South Australia has ever seen.

The situation is dire indeed, just ask the charities who look after the victims of poor government. All charities are reporting a huge increase in demand for provision of basic services—food, housing, clothing. People are very anxious. They are concerned at their future prospects, concerned at the government's inability to turn the ship around and concerned at continuing government waste and poor investment decisions. The new Royal Adelaide Hospital is but one, and that goes from worse to worse and from crisis to crisis.

Ask the people in business. Confidence is low. Why? Because people realise they are falling behind. It is almost impossible to balance the family budget, so they go without while this state government still spends out of control. We must address the problems otherwise by March 2014 our state will be a financial basket case. We can look at the result of the Queensland election and make relevant comparisons to South Australia. The Queensland result was so emphatic because the Labor government should have been retired at the previous election, but they snuck in the same way that this mob snuck in.

It is the same in South Australia. South Australia really should have a Liberal government now, and the Hon. Isobel Redmond should be the premier. She and the team won 51 per cent of the vote, and even the Electoral Commission said that last week. It said that we did not try hard enough in the marginal seats. Well, that is a surprising comment. I think that we need to revisit that.

I believe that the people of South Australia will send a stronger message in one year and 357 days' time. People will revolt. They are hurting in the hip pocket. They are very stressed at the cost of living increases. They are concerned at the money this government wastes, especially on things like government spin teams—\$186 million over three years. Tell that to the battler out there.

I was here when the Liberals won by 37 seats to 10, and so was the member for Spence at the time. Well, I think that come 2014 the economy will be worse than it was in 1993 and the result will be 39 to eight.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): The question is that the house note grievances—one more, sorry. The member for Reynell. My apologies.

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (16:27): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I would be very sad if my opportunity were missed, because I wish to pay tribute today to the people involved with the Onkaparinga collaborative approach to the prevention of domestic violence and Indigenous family violence and their efforts in the De-Myth-Defied Myth Buster Sticker Project.

This project, I think, took about two years. It was a community consultation to address the fact that, while many people today recognise that domestic violence is simply inappropriate, there are still myths which remain within the community and which need to be addressed. The research shows in the National Community Attitude Towards Violence Against Women Survey from 2009 that progress has been made in this area. For instance, the vast majority of the community now agrees that physical and sexual assault and threats are domestic violence—between 97 per cent and 98 per cent compared with between 91 per cent and 97 per cent in 1995.

The community was more likely in 2009 to recognise the spectrum of domestic violence behaviours as very serious than they were in 1995—98 per cent of people today say that domestic violence is a crime compared with 93 per cent in 1995. Also, 93 per cent of people agree that forced sex in an intimate relationship is a crime. Very few people believe that women who are raped ask for it. One in 20 believed this in 2009 compared with one in seven in 1995.

At this stage I would like to pay tribute to the work of the former attorney-general, the member for Croydon, and the legislation he brought before this house relating both to what might be in common parlance known as rape in marriage or in intimate relationships and making it very clear that a marriage licence is not a licence to have one's way with people. One has to respect sexual partners on each and every occasion. This was important legislation, as was the women's safety legislation, which enabled women to stay in their homes and the perpetrators of domestic violence to be removed. However, given that, we still have a way to go with people really being able to come to grips with the problems that domestic violence causes—and it causes huge problems, on an individual level, on a family level and on an Australia-wide level. The latest estimate is that the cost of domestic violence in our community is \$13 billion a year.

People associated with the Onkaparinga Collaborative Approach, women and men together, have set about addressing this, and have produced a series of stickers to be displayed in prominent places. The words on the stickers are, as I said, the result of wide community consultation and reflect discussions held in many community groups with a wide range of community organisations. One sticker says, 'His abuse impacted on my confidence, my health, my ability to work...', and the myth pointed to there is that domestic violence is a private issue. The response on the sticker is:

Domestic violence is not a private issue, it is a community issue. The effects of violence against women permeate all levels of society. What you say and do can make a difference to a woman or child affected by domestic violence.

Another sticker says simply, 'I believe you.' I wish someone had said that to me years ago.' That is attributed to Veronica, and it repeats the message that domestic violence is not a private issue. Another sticker says, 'He never physically hurts me, but he says he will if I leave.' That is attributed to Wendy. The myth here is that women can easily leave a violent relationship. The sticker's response is:

There are many reasons why a woman can't leave a violent relationship. Women experience both the violence, and the blame for not resolving the situation. It is also incorrect to assume that if she leaves, she will be safe.

I commend all the people involved in the preparation of this sticker series.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (16:32): I move:

That the sitting of the House of Assembly be not suspended during the continuation of the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL 2012

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 March 2012.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (16:33): I indicate that I am the lead speaker on this issue, the Supply Bill. The Supply Bill gives the government the opportunity to obtain the money it needs to provide services until the budget proper is brought down and adopted through the correct procedures in the house. It also gives the government the opportunity to correct some of the errors that are occurring within the budget and within the economy more broadly. I wish to speak in relation to where the supply should be directed to try to correct areas that are issues for the state to address. Since the last budget things have only got worse—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Of course they have, says the member for Croydon; I will get that on the record.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, the member for Croydon—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): Order! The member will be heard in silence.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I said it, the member for Croydon repeated it, and I am glad to have that on the record. The reality is that since the last budget things have got worse. The deficit is worse, the debt is worse, the amount of interest we pay as a state is worse, taxes are worse, costs to households are worse, costs to business are worse, red tape on business is worse, the economic performance of the state is worse. So, the state government needs to address its attention to these areas when it gets the Supply Bill through because it needs to explain to the people of South Australia why the South Australian economy is struggling in so many areas and why the budget is in such bad shape after 10 years of Labor government.

Let us just walk through it. With the budget deficit, they are talking about five deficits in six years. In 2008-09 the deficit was \$233 million. In 2009-10, there was a surplus of \$187 million—that was the election year—and it is interesting to see that the only surplus that they could deliver in this six-year period happened to coincide conveniently with the state election. In the financial year 2010-11, a \$53 million deficit; in the financial year 2011-12, a \$367 million deficit; and projected deficits in the next financial year 2012-13 of \$453 million and the year after that in 2013-14 of \$348 million.

We know that minister O'Brien has already put on the public record that the government is borrowing money to pay Public Service wages and that is simply unsustainable. Those are the words of minister O'Brien. What we have here in reality is a deficit. If you add up the deficits, it is about \$1.4 billion over that six-year period. This is simply in the operational side of the budget—not the capital works side of the budget—so this government is running operational deficits in five years out of six, and it is borrowing money to pay Public Service wages over that time and, as a result, debt will ultimately increase.

We have a treasurer who is facing the stark reality of not being able to deliver a surplus at all, in any of his budgets since he took the office, until the election. We have a treasurer who is going to go to the election saying that he is not capable of delivering a surplus—that is the reality of his own budget papers. This from a treasurer who waltzed in and said in his budget speech that he did not want to run up a credit card debt and, yet, five out of six of those budgets are running operational deficits.

Every business knows, and every family knows, that if you continue to spend more than you earn then your debt increases, and that is exactly what is happening in South Australia. Not only are we running budget deficits in five out of six years but our debt is increasing. In the financial year 2007-08, the debt was \$1.6 billion. By the time of the financial year 2015-16, when the new RAH comes on board—as one of my local constituents said in the pub the other day, 'The RAH is

the Rann and Hill hospital'—and comes onto the books, there will be an extra \$2.8 billion added onto the debt, and at that point the state debt will be around \$11.2 billion. It would have gone up from \$1.6 billion to \$11.2 billion over that period from 2007-08 to the year 2015-16.

Incredibly, the debt increases regardless of selling the forests and regardless of selling the Lotteries Commission. So, after the state gets the revenue (whatever that figure may be) from selling the forest; and, after we get the revenue (whatever that figure will be) for selling the Lotteries Commission, the state debt continues to climb. What the government is doing—and I would expect, and I will be interested to see—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: When did Lucas run a surplus? What year was that?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Croydon has been here since 1989 and I am staggered he does not know how to read a budget paper yet. If he wants to see the performance of past budgets, go the budget papers and read them. The reality is that, after selling the Lotteries Commission and the forests, debt will continue to increase.

It will be interesting to see, when you add together the amount we get in revenue from the sale of the forests and the Lotteries Commission, whether that adds up to the level of deficit the government has been running over the last five out of those six years. It will be interesting to see whether the revenue figures even cover the deficit. The reality is that what we have is a government that is running budget deficits and increasing our debt.

Of course, they are selling assets when they promised they would not. We all remember the Mike Rann pledge card: 'No more privatisations'. What is the government doing? It is privatising the forests and it is privatising the Lotteries Commission, and after privatising the forests and the Lotteries Commission the debt still manages to go up. We have a government that is running budget deficits, increasing our debt and breaking its promises.

Does that sound familiar? Fancy that: a Labor government (anywhere in Australia) running deficits, running debts and breaking promises. The Queensland government had a \$85 billion debt, a \$2.1 billion deficit in one year and the occasional broken promise. If you go to the Gillard and Rudd governments, they took the John Howard Future Fund with something like \$100 billion or whatever it was—I cannot remember the exact figure, but I think it was around \$100 billion.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, billion. Ultimately, through the mismanagement of their insulation programs and their school hall programs, which were poorly managed, there was a huge debt run-up. There was the broken promise about the carbon tax and we are running budget deficits. There is speculation federally: can Wayne Swan actually deliver a budget surplus? There is all this speculation.

There is a pattern with Labor governments: they run budget deficits, they grow your debt and they mislead the public. When you run budget deficits and when your debt goes up, one thing is certain: you have to pay more interest, and the South Australian public are paying more interest. The state paid \$290 million of interest in 2008-09. It is now predicted to pay \$705 million in the 2014-15 year. That is before the \$2.8 billion debt goes on-stream for the hospital, but in the 2014-15 year there will be \$705 million in interest payments.

That does not include over \$400 million of interest paid to top up the superannuation scheme, which is totally underfunded to the tune of about \$10 billion. It will not be fully funded until the year 2034, and I will make some more comments about that later in this address. The \$705 million does not include that \$400 million in regard to superannuation interest.

If you run budget deficits and you increase the debt, your interest payments go up and guess what happens? The state government has to get its money from somewhere, so it increases taxes and charges. There have been at least three and possibly four independent reports done into state taxation, and there is one consistent theme: that South Australian taxes are the highest in Australia. The state government taxes our population and businesses at a more aggressive level than other states.

For instance, land tax in South Australia is charged at 40 per cent above the Australian average. That concerns the opposition. The Property Council say that the land tax is so high that property developers control their release of developments around the land tax implications, which constricts land supply, and a constriction of land supply drives up house prices. That was in a report released in the last six to eight weeks. We know that land tax is a problem. We moved in the

Economic and Finance Committee for an investigation into land tax, to have a look at it, and the reality is that the government used its numbers to quash the enquiry. They did not want to have a look at land tax. They did not want to have a look at land tax for their own reasons, but we know that it is charged at 40 per cent above the Australian average.

Insurance tax in Australia is charged at 53 per cent of the Australian average. It is interesting because there is this national debate about the national disability scheme and how we can better service those who are unfortunately in the disabled community, how we can better help them, and that is a good debate to have. However, it was this government that had a court case fall in its favour. Ultimately it means they can charge stamp duties on disability insurance (they are called life riders). In actual fact, disability insurance has become more expensive as a result, which means that fewer people take it out, which exposes more people to financially difficult circumstances if they happen to fall into that category, which we obviously hope they do not.

Stamp duty is charged in South Australia at 27 per cent above the Australian average. This is what happens when governments run deficit budgets, when debt increases, where the interest payment increases and, guess what? Taxes and charges increase—exactly what has happened in South Australia. So what does that mean? It means that costs on households ultimately increase and costs on businesses increase because the government increased taxes—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Plural. The walking dictionary over there keeps correcting me, Mr Acting Speaker. The reality is that household costs continue to increase. The public only have to get out their water bill to see what we are talking about. Water bills have trebled for the average household in the last five year period. Included in that is a 40 per cent increase expected to come on 1 July. The reality is that households are hurting, and they are hurting because of high costs. The high costs go directly back to budget deficits, large government debt, interest payments increasing as a result, and taxes and charges therefore need to increase.

Then there are business costs. You wonder why the business community is struggling in South Australia. You only have to look at what this government has done to them. I have already mentioned the highest taxes in Australia—that is a given. Not only do we have the highest taxes in Australia but we also have the worst compensation scheme in Australia. WorkCover recently announced another increase in its unfunded liability, up to around \$1.16 or \$1.15 billion. When the Liberal Party left office it was around the \$55 to \$60 million level of unfunded liability. The government has come in on a number of occasions with its grand schemes to change WorkCover and it is going to fix it. The reality is that the unfunded liability is now north of \$1.1 billion and not looking to come down any time soon.

They have had a decade to deal with this. It went up, and up, and up. We asked questions, we made speeches, we did all sorts of things to draw it to the government's attention, and they have simply dropped the ball. The reality is that not only are businesses in South Australia stuck with the highest taxes in Australia but they are also stuck with the worst compensation scheme in Australia, the highest WorkCover rates in Australia. Of course, the reality is that the poor old workers—this is what the scheme is all about—get the worst return to work rates in Australia.

This is not the Liberal Party's scheme; this is a scheme designed by this government that has been in office for 10 years. They have no one to blame but themselves. Then, what do they do? As if business is not suffering enough with the highest taxes in the workers compensation scheme, no, no, no, what the government is going to do is increase more costs and more complexity onto the employers, because somehow having more costs and more complexity on the employers helps employees. I do not follow that argument, but what they are doing is bringing in more complicated, more costly and more complex occupational health and safety laws.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So fewer people will be injured.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Even though—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That would be terrible, wouldn't it?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Sorry?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Fewer people would be injured—that would be terrible.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Croydon says, 'Fewer people would be injured.' The member for Croydon should go and look at the figures. The reality is the number of injured workers has dropped significantly. Workplaces are safer now than they ever have been. Go and

look at the record. What problem are you trying to fix? The numbers are coming down significantly—we acknowledge that on this side of the house—but you have not addressed and will not address the worst WorkCover scheme in Australia from a cost point of view.

Then they introduced more public holidays, which is an added cost and added complexity and, just to top it off, just in case the business community have not got enough problems trying to provide employment for South Australians, the government, through the federal government, is going to introduce a carbon tax. They are going to introduce a carbon tax. Everyone who has been involved in business and employing people knows that red tape and taxes increase costs. The more cost you have, the less likely you are to employ or you pass the cost on to the consumer so household cost goes up.

The poor old consumer is getting hit from both ends. They are getting hit by direct taxes from the government, whether that be through water tax or its levies, and then getting hit indirectly, because of all the taxes on the business—the land tax at 40 per cent above the Australian average, stamp duties at 27 per cent above the Australian average, insurance at 53 per cent above the Australian average. I have not mentioned payroll tax, but we all know they collect about \$1 billion in payroll tax a year.

All that flows on to business costs. They pass on to the consumer what they can and, ultimately, the consumer pays a higher price for the goods. If you wonder why retail figures are so bad in South Australia, if you wonder why real estate figures are so bad in South Australia, the consumers are getting squeezed, if you like, at both ends.

Let us just talk about the economy for a second. We have gone through the deficit, we have gone through the debt, we have gone through the interest payments, the taxes and the increase in charges. What is really happening in the economy?

What this government has been able to produce after 10 years of being in government are the worst real estate figures since 1985. Even when the State Bank occurred, the real estate figures were better than now. So, this government really has some major problems within the state economy. The housing industry approvals are absolutely disastrous for the housing industry. In the retail area, the sales of goods and services are the lowest in Australia.

There was some media comment about South Australia being in recession and the poor old Treasurer, who cannot take a trick, comes out and says, 'No serious person or economist is going to say South Australia is in a recession,' other than of course, on the very next day, when Tim Colebatch and Darryl Gobbett, who have basically spent their whole lives studying economics or being economic commentators, both came out and suggested that South Australia is in a recession.

That is why South Australia ultimately has very low business confidence. The reality is the government have belted them with the highest taxes and they have belted them with the worst WorkCover scheme. They are all looking up saying, 'My God, I have got the carbon tax coming down at the end of the financial year.' We have the new public holidays, we have new occupational health and safety laws and the businesses just feel swamped. The reality is they have simply lost confidence in this government because of the way they have handled the economy and the budget.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You are conceding that they once had it.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Sorry?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You are conceding that they once had confidence.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, I am not conceding that at all. They started out with a low level of confidence and it has got worse, member for Croydon. The member for Croydon should look at the latest surveys, which will show that business confidence in South Australia is the worst in Australia.

The point I make to the government is: why is the South Australian economy performing so badly compared to the rest of Australia? The government will trot out the global financial crisis back in 2008, it will trot out GST revenues, but those impacts are Australia-wide. The GST is an Australia-wide tax; the global financial crisis affected every state in Australia. Why is it that our state is going worse than other states? Part of it is that the government are very poor managers, and I will come to that in a second.

I mentioned WorkCover earlier. I want to walk through that. The reality is that the WorkCover scheme in South Australia, which is essentially another tax on payroll, is acknowledged

as being the worst scheme in Australia. The government has had two or three goes at trying to fix it up.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: By whom?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The government has brought in—the poor old member for Croydon. I am happy to respond to the out of order member for Croydon's interjections because we all know that the member for Croydon has been here since 1989 and maybe his memory is not what it used to be. I think if the member for Croydon looks at the *Hansard* between 2002 and 2012 he will find numerous ministers coming into the house saying, 'Here is the latest set of WorkCover reform that is going to fix the scheme.'

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Including you.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I don't think I actually introduced any legislation to fix WorkCover. I think I did ask some questions on it, but I—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You were a member of a cabinet that did.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Not between 2002 and 2010.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, between 1989—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The poor old member for Croydon, I hope he gets help because I was not here in 1989. I was not here in 1990. I was not here in 1991. I was not here in 1992. I came in on 11 December 1993. So, unfortunately, between 1989—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Croydon should note that between 1989 and 1993 there was a Labor government and workers compensation was a basket case then as well. Then the Liberal Party came in—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And how did your reforms go?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): Order!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Well, I'm asked a question, Mr Acting Speaker. How did our reforms go? Let me guess. I do recall sitting here very late one Thursday night, one Friday night, one Saturday morning. It was in the grand old days of the parliament when we worked all hours of the night for the best interests of South Australia, not like this part-time mob over here these days. We sat all Thursday night, all Friday night and all Saturday to get the WorkCover changes through, and they went through.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And that's what I was referring to.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Right! That's what he was referring to. I thank the member for Croydon for the interjection. If I wait long enough, he always jumps in. As a result of those changes, when we lost government in 2002, the unfunded liability was not \$1.16 billion like it is now, not \$1 billion, not even \$900 million. It was a bit under \$800 million, a lot under \$700 million, it was lower than \$600 million. It did not even get close to \$500 million. You couldn't see \$400 million. Actually it was \$55 million to \$60 million. Damn those Liberals! All they did was get the unfunded liability down to \$55 million and \$60 million. Gee, they mismanaged it—if you believe the member for Croydon's argument! The poor old Labor government has been there 10 years and the unfunded liability has gone up from about \$55 million to \$60 million to \$1.16 billion. So I think there is a fair argument to say that the Liberal Party managed WorkCover a little bit better than the Labor Party.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Well, you would say that, wouldn't you?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Well, the figures don't lie, member for Croydon. Of course, the sad thing is that the \$1.16 billion unfunded liability does not even include the public sector liability; that has to be added on. The reality is that this government has mismanaged the workers compensation scheme. Then we go to the superannuation scheme. Back in 1989 to 1993, when there was a former Labor government, and when the Liberal Party came in on 11 December 1993, one of the issues that—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How many seats did you have back then?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thirty-seven. One of the issues that confronted the parliament was that the superannuation for the Public Service was unfunded. The then Liberal Party, through (I think) treasurer Baker at the time, set up a scheme so it would be fully funded by 2034. The unfunded liability in 2002 was about \$3.2 billion. The unfunded liability as we speak is \$10.6 billion. It has gone from \$3.2 billion to \$10.6 billion; just in the last year it has gone from \$9 billion to \$10.6 billion.

The point I make in this address is that the state has major problems with its budget. It impacts on the economy because the business community simply no longer has confidence, if they ever had confidence at all in this government. The simple reason is that the government cannot manage. If you cannot manage the little things, you struggle to manage the big things. People in business understand that. If you cannot manage the little things, then you cannot manage the big things.

How is it that the Treasurer did not even know for five months that he did not have observers on the zoo board? Did he issue instructions for the observers to be appointed? Did he follow the instructions through? Was he meant to be getting monthly reports and just did not notice he was not receiving them? How is it that a treasurer can sit there for five months thinking he had appointed observers to the board and it simply not occur?

How is it that the Minister for Transport Services is having so many problems getting the buses to run on time? There are hundreds of complaints about the simplest issue of getting a bus to run on time. We have the farcical situation where the minister stood up in the house and said, 'I can't tell you about any penalties because it is confidential.' When we asked her how it was that public servants could release the penalties, essentially she said it is confidential because the minister says so, not because it was necessarily a contractual arrangement. Then we have the bizarre situation of the minister for employment and training who cannot even buy a car without getting into trouble. One day, one press release about the new ministerial car—it was changed. The simplest thing—he cannot even buy a car.

Then we go on to bigger picture issues. We have had the government bail out the tenderers in relation to the prison PPP project. We had the payout of \$5 million to Marathon Resources. We had the bailout of the Newport Quays development. These were all issues of the government's own making, and it is all taxpayers' money. The cheque has been written out, the debt is going up, the deficit is getting bigger, taxes are getting higher, household costs are going up and this government is writing out cheques to all these entities because of the government's own mismanagement. The government's mismanagement is ultimately hurting households and businesses.

The government cannot even organise the Clipsal race and a symphony concert. Can you imagine anywhere else in the world where the state leader is ringing up from the concert saying, 'Can we delay that car race, because we have had a year to plan it and we have actually put them on at the same time, so we can't hear?' My point is that it is a simple management issue.

Then, of course, some capital works projects have had problems. We all remember that famous promise with the Adelaide Oval—'\$450 million, not a cent more'. Then we had the poor old member for Croydon who was so embarrassed he had to go into his caucus and move a motion to cap the expenditure that cabinet could possibly spend on the Adelaide Oval. Just to back him up we came in here and moved that the cap be \$535 million. The parliament had to essentially cap the expenditure because the cabinet was so incapable of capping the expenditure.

Then we had the issue with the Royal Adelaide Hospital blowout. Before the election it was going to be \$1.7 billion. We now know the debt going on the books is \$2.8 billion and the cost itself is somewhere around, I think, \$3 billion—these are some figures that have been used. Then we had the bizarre situation about the desalination plant. When the opposition first said we should be looking at a 50-gig desal plant—25 per cent of Adelaide's water supply—minister after minister came out and said, 'We don't need a desal plant; we can't afford a desal plant.' At that point the contractor constructing the Western Australian desalination plant would have been happy to build one in South Australia for \$400 million—just \$400 million.

The government said, 'No, no, no. We don't need it.' Then all of a sudden—typical of the Hawker Britton model—they did a bit of polling and, guess what? The drought was occurring and South Australians thought that maybe having a bit of reserve water might be a good idea. So all of a sudden they announced the desal plant not at \$400 million but at \$1.1 billion. Then they needed

some pipe work with it, which was another \$0.3 million. So it ended up being a \$1.4 billion announcement.

Later on when they did further costings, all of a sudden—without the pipes—the desal plant itself was going to cost \$1.4 billion. The pipes were just not in that particular announcement. Then later on when they decided that 50 gigalitres was not enough for a desal plant (we needed 100 gigalitres for some reason), the desal was then \$1.8 billion and the pipe was \$0.4 million, it ended up being a \$2.2 billion project. The reason this government has problems with its budget, the reason our taxes are so high, the reason household costs are so high and that businesses are struggling is this government's management.

I have one other example. Go to the pipeline project that is being done through the metropolitan coast for pumping sand. This announcement was made because there has been a longstanding practice of trucking sand. We have a south to north drift of sand, so sand is trucked down to maintain the southern beaches. The government came up with a scheme to pump the sand down to the southern beaches. They announced the project as a 22 kilometre long pipe costing \$17.6 million.

When they finally got to do the project, all of a sudden it was not 22 kilometres long, it was only nine kilometres long—so less than half its length—and the cost had gone from \$17 million to \$26 million. It cost nearly \$10 million more and it was less than half the length. That is a classic example of mismanagement by the government.

If you want the pearly of them all, you would only have to go to everyone's favourite, Shared Services. Every time you speak to members of the Public Service about Shared Services they are just glowing—not in praise, they are scathing of Shared Services, and here it is. They were going to spend \$60 million on Shared Services. They have spent nearly \$130 million on Shared Services. I think it is \$128 million, so \$68 million more on Shared Services. Having spent \$68 million more, it has delivered \$100 million less savings than predicted.

This is an agency that is so incompetent that it cannot pay the phone bills of members of parliament on time. We have members of parliament who have had their phones cut off. Can you imagine that? The phones of members of parliament have been cut off because the government agency responsible for paying the bill cannot pay the bill on time. Having spent \$128 million on Shared Services, they cannot pay an MP's phone bill on time.

I would love to have been a fly on the wall—this is, I think, a *Yes Minister* program to be made—but I wonder who the public servant was who had to go and explain to the minister responsible for Shared Services that the reason the delivery of his newspaper was cut off was because Shared Services could not pay his News' account on time. It is just unbelievable that an agency could be that bad.

Then we have the tragic circumstance of the businessman from the Mid North who was waiting five months for his money and who essentially had to close his business as a result of cash flow problems because the government agency responsible could not pay the bills on time. Then, just to add insult to injury, the brainwaves in Treasury who came up with the Shared Services concept have now decided to opt some of the functions out of Shared Services. This is the agency that set it up, and it was under Treasurer Snelling. Treasurer Snelling handballed the poison chalice to the Minister for Finance, minister O'Brien (and ultimately it was transferred to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet), and when that occurred Treasury took a decision, we understand, to withdraw some of its functions at least out of Shared Services.

If you want another example just go to the media grabs today. There is the \$48 million Mike Rann film hub at the Glenside Hospital, and the biggest and most expensive production to come out of that so far is Mike Rann's going away party. It is a classic example. The member for Torrens shakes her head, but that is actually the truth as far as I understand it.

The reality is that there is a very simple story that is happening to the South Australian budget and to South Australian businesses. This government has been in 10 years; there has been a Labor administration for 10 years, and it did not control its expenditure when it should have. Its expenditure was well above its budgeted expenditure. In fact, over a 10 year period it spent about \$3 billion more than it budgeted to spend. As a result, the government is now running budget deficits; five out of six years it is budgeting deficits.

When you spend more than you earn your debt goes up, and the debt is going up from about \$1.6 billion to \$11.2 billion. When your debt goes up you have to pay the interest, and the

interest is going up from in the mid range of \$200 million to over \$702 million. So, how does the state government recover its interest? Through increased taxes and charges. We are the highest taxed state in Australia, and households are hurting out there in South Australia.

Remember two things about this particular government. It came to the parliament last year and said that this budget was a budget for families. How are families better off in March 2012 than they were in May or June (whatever date it was) 2011 when the budget was introduced? They have increased charges hitting them left, right and centre. The other issue is that it was the treasurer who said that he did not want to leave a credit card debt yet, by its own admission, this government is borrowing money to pay Public Service wages.

Where does all that leave us? It leaves us with our AAA credit rating under threat, despite the fact that we are the highest taxing state in Australia, despite the fact that we are selling our forestry assets that bring in about \$43 million a year to the budget, despite the fact that we are selling the Lotteries Commission that brings in, I think, \$80 million from memory. So, despite having all the revenue from the highest taxes in Australia, all the revenue from the sale of the forests, all the revenue from the sale of the Lotteries Commission, by the Premier's own admission the AAA credit rating is under threat.

The problem with losing the AAA credit rating is that there will be no discipline within the Public Service or the cabinet with regard to expenditure. Once you give up the issue of the AAA credit rating, trying to maintain pressure on expenditure—and this government has had enormous problems trying to control its expenditure; its budget expenditure has had an increase of about 1.6 and its real expenditure has been about 6.5 per cent—and discipline on the Public Service and on the cabinet becomes harder.

The Supply Bill gives the government the funds to operate until the budget proper is put through its processes, but if ever there is a time for a change of government, if ever there is a time for a change of direction in South Australia, it is at the 2014 election. We cannot continue to run budget deficits, we cannot continue to drive up the debt, we cannot continue to borrow money to pay Public Service wages. We cannot, as a state, continue to penalise our businesses with the worst workers compensation scheme and the highest taxes in Australia. We cannot expect our households to suffer a trebling of water prices in five years and not hurt, or for car licences and rego fees and all that to be increased significantly to cover the high taxes. That is the reality of it. We need a change of government in 2014. The opposition supports the Supply Bill, and we hope that at last the government will start to make some decisions that do something for the economy and something for the terrible budget position in which we find ourselves.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (17:15): Sadly, the Supply Bill comes to the parliament after over 10 years of Labor government, which has seen the state reposition from a state in vibrant recovery to a state in decrepit decline—or certainly a budget in decrepit decline—all the doing of this Labor state government. It could have been such a different story, but I will come back to that in a moment because I think the problem is that the Labor Party has lost its way. I think we are seeing that federally. We have seen it in New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria and WA. Increasingly, we have a Labor Party which seems no longer to be driven by ideology or by principle, but rather simply seems to be driven by the need to remain in power, and to do whatever it takes to stay there. As a result, it has attempted to reinvent itself in whatever form is required to stay in power.

It is interesting that the party that once championed the cause of no privatisation, now privatises. The party that once stood for the working man and heralded themselves as the champions of education and health is now spending money on stadiums and big picture infrastructure projects—the sorts of things that, arguably, in previous governments they have criticised us for doing. When they were in opposition, they made an art form of criticising us for the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium. They criticised every infrastructure project we attempted, yet they have realised that they have to build these things, and here they are doing all the things they criticised us for doing. However, I will come back to that in a moment because I think the story could have been quite different.

What was done? In 2002 the government inherited a good set of accounts. They had wrecked the state in 1993 with their State Bank farrago. It took the Brown and Olsen governments eight years to fix it. We had to make some extraordinarily tough decisions about asset sales but we got the debt virtually to zero—or it certainly zeroed shortly after the current government came into office as a result of the work we had done—and we set the state up for recovery. Having fixed the state, the people of South Australia voted for change. What they got was a government which,

instead of holding its expenses to inflation, knowing that it was looking at vibrant times and buoyant revenues, simply let out its belt as quickly as it swallowed the cash. Incomes were vibrant from 2002 right through until recent years. They were awash with cash and, instead of holding their expenses down and banking that excess revenue either into a future fund or an infrastructure fund so that they could build for the future without having to borrow, they spent it.

We know that because the facts simply speak for themselves. There were buoyant revenues in those years. If you look at the facts on unbudgeted revenues alone, in one year, 2002-03, \$528 million (over half a billion dollars) was taken in unforeseen, unbudgeted revenues. A year later in 2003-04, there was \$794 million in windfall revenue on top of what you would have expected to receive. So it went on in subsequent years, with well over half a billion dollars of unexpected revenue in most years that followed.

However, the problem was that there was a whole lot of unbudgeted spending. I mentioned 2002-03 when there was \$184 million of unbudgeted spending, and in 2003-04 there was \$467 million of unbudgeted spending. Kevin Foley, then treasurer, was crowing that he ran a good budget. He did not at all. This was the Labor lie. What was happening was they were not containing their costs at all. They were blowing their budget year after year, but they were being saved because on each occasion there was unbudgeted revenue.

It is easy to cover up your mismanagement when you have unbudgeted windfall revenues, and that is simply what the facts tell us. That all came to an abrupt end in around 2009-10 with the GFC, and now we have a situation where revenues are falling short of expectation. Of course, the government now is forced to have to try to rein in years and years of poor budget discipline. That is essentially the situation we are in. For those listening to this debate, it is just like running any other business: you have money coming in and you have costs. If you allow your costs to blow out, it does not matter how much money you have coming in, you will not make a profit and you will not make a surplus. That is what this government has done.

How did they do that? In a range of ways, but particularly they blew the payroll. There are over 18,000 additional public servants, hired year after year. It was around 66,900 in 2001-02 and it is well above 85,000 now, and that is FTEs. When you count the bodies, I understand it is well over 100,000 people. That has happened in a range of ways. We have 15 ministers for the first time in the state's history. That means you need more interdepartmental committees, more CEOs and more bureaucracy as they all communicate with one another. We have created all these schemes and all these projects, many of which, arguably, we never needed and which employ all these people.

Bureaucracy and Labor governments have something in common: in order to survive they need complexity and complication. However, business and Liberal governments need simplicity. We like small governments. We like to keep the costs down. We like to leave South Australians to get on with their lives, but not Labor and not the bureaucracy that they have built.

The story of the Labor government since 2002 has been one of financial mismanagement and failure to control its expenses. It was rescued initially by windfall revenues, all of which has now come to a crashing halt. It could have been a very different story. Imagine if those costs had been kept to inflation. Imagine if those extraordinary excess revenues had been put aside into an infrastructure fund. We would not need to borrow now to build roads, hospitals and desal plants because we would have the money, or at the very least the borrowing we did need to carry out would have been significantly less. However, we are not in that position because of this government's mismanagement.

For former premier Rann and former treasurer Foley to claim that they were good financial managers is simply a joke. Look just for starters at the tax increases that this state has had to endure. We have gone from being one of the lowest-taxed states to one of the highest. It has all been said before. Land tax alone is up 345 per cent under Labor—taxes across the board. The very people who were their supporters—people with an investment property, particularly from the multicultural communities, upon which they relied for their retirement, are being charged extraordinary land taxes. There are motorists. People with low incomes are struggling to pay their taxes, their water bills and their power bills. It is a terrible and shocking legacy and it simply needs to be fixed, and the only way it will be fixed is with a change of government.

As I look back over the last 10 years of Labor, as I mentioned, I see a party that has lost its way, that is no longer in touch with its core values. This is a debate that I am sure is thriving within the party after the results in Queensland just this weekend.

But worse than that, I do not see any strategic thread in the decisions this government has made over 10 years. I do not see any grand vision. In fact, I think they spent their first four years just struggling to hang on in the hope that they would get a second term. In their second term, having built or done nothing, they then started to make some announcements about what they would do if they got a third term.

Now, we are hoping to get delivery in this third term on some of those projects which, arguably, should have been under way in their first term. The trouble is that by now they have run out of money; they left it too late. Had they had those projects on their books earlier, they might not have bloated the Public Service, they might not have wasted the money, they might have run a tight ship through necessity, but that was not done.

I want to comment on some ironies as we consider this budget, and I want to start with privatisation. Isn't it an irony that the party that railed against the sale of ETSA, the party that railed against every attempt the former Liberal government made to outsource, for example, our water contracts or our bus contracts, is now doing exactly the same thing.

I commented at the time, in 2003, regarding the position of this current government on the sale of our electricity assets: why didn't you buy them back? If you were so unhappy about it, why didn't you rush out to the bank in 2003 and offer to borrow that \$6 billion back so that you could run off and buy the assets back again? You never had an answer; in fact, you had the union movement suggesting that. Of course you were not going to do that because, quietly, you agreed with what we had done.

You criticised us for outsourcing the management of water infrastructure. Oh, we'd sold off our water to the French (I think it was). 'Oh, it was a terrible thing. That shocking Liberal government, selling off our water.' What have you done? You have renewed the very same contracts that you railed against. Now we have got the poor, hapless minister for public transport services trying to manage privatised bus contracts, the very thing you railed against when you were in opposition. And now what are you doing? You are not only renewing the contracts, you are diversifying the privatisation of the bus system to the point where it is simply chaos.

I do not know how members opposite can actually look at themselves in the mirror. The party that railed against privatisation—the quotes are all there in the *Hansard*—and they are doing exactly what they promised they would not do, and they have taken it to new heights. They are now going to sell the Lotteries Commission—even we did not do that—and they are now selling the forests. We would never dream of doing that.

You are taking privatisation to new heights, to Mount Everest levels. You people are the princes and the princesses of privatisation, and you hold yourself out there as the government for re-election. You must be joking! If you ever need an example of a party with no principles, a party that has no ideological foundation, and a party that is out of touch with working men and women, look at what they have done on privatisation.

It just amuses me extraordinarily to compare the electricity privatisation with the forest privatisation. We were forced in the end to lease our electricity assets rather than to sell them outright. And what are they doing? They are selling forward rotations of our forests and arguing that because they still own the asset it does not matter whether the rotations are sold for the next 100 years or so: we still own them. Well, that was exactly the same argument we put up about ETSA, that we still owned the assets, we had just leased them for an extended period—and that was terrible then. You people have no principles at all, none whatsoever.

Of course, that is not the only irony. Look at the current government's revelation in regard to a 'vibrant City of Adelaide'. All of a sudden, we had an outburst today that we need a new vision for the city, we need new planning rules for the city. Not only, as my honourable friend the member for Davenport noted earlier, have you come with us on desalination but you have come with us on the stadium. You railed against the stadium; it was the worst thing. We were going to have football down at West Lakes. It was never, ever going to happen, and you came in hook, line and sinker. You are the champions of a new stadium now and, frankly, it will be lovely. I am a great supporter of it. It will be wonderful. You adopted our idea and made it your own—well done! If you do not have any ideas of your own, it is always a good idea to copy the ideas of someone who does. I commend you for it and I have given several examples of how you have done it.

Now the current Premier is out there wanting to reinvigorate City West. He wants a new vision for the City of Adelaide. I can point him to the dates and the documents when I announced those very things on behalf the Liberal Party and when the Liberal Party laid claim to them. The

reinvigoration of City West; our announcement that any project within the CBD over \$10 million should be taken over by the state government. All of this that the current Premier is touting now about City West and a new vision for the City of Adelaide, the need to invigorate it with face to river, no longer Victoria Square, were all our ideas.

He must have been sitting over there when Pat Conlon and the former premier were describing our vision as 'a squint, not a vision' and saying in cabinet, 'Wow, this stuff the Liberals have come up with is terrific. Why don't we copy it?' Of course, now that he is Premier, he is doing exactly that. It is just the ultimate irony. I just say to the people of South Australia: why bother with a Labor government that does not have any ideas of its own and just copies the Liberals' ideas? You can have the real thing at the next election. Vote Liberal and we will give you more of that because all you have is the Labor Party copying our ideas. They have come with us on an ICAC. There is a long list.

They are wandering around there. There is sort of an empty vacuum between the left ear and the right ear. Someone is looking to flick a light switch so that a bright bulb will go pop. You know what? They have to come over here just to work out what they want to do for the future of South Australia. I can tell you the real deal is over here. We are ready to go. If you do not have ideas of your own, get out of the way. We will take over and we will fix the mess you have created. Sadly, it will take time.

I just want to start winding up my remarks by making some comment on health because this supply budget comes before us at a difficult time for the health system. It is around \$4.5 billion in 2010-11 of government spending of \$15.5 billion. By 2014-15, it will be \$5 billion of government spending of around \$16.7 billion. Around 30 per cent of government outlays is spent on health. It employs nearly 30,000 people and there is no portfolio more important.

Every single one of the people who vote for us has come into contact with the health system. It is important for them, it is important for their loved ones and I have to say that we could be doing better. I think, as a nation, we do well in health, as a result of the work of successive governments going back many decades, compared to some other countries. I think we have avoided some of the major mistakes other countries have made strategically going back 30 or 40 years, but it could always be better. It could always provide a better service to those for whom we care.

I talk in particular about our emergency departments and our elective surgery waiting lists. There are very, very significant issues at our emergency departments. Looking at the statistics on how we compare relative to other states, there is massive room for improvement. When we have people who are emergency presentations and urgent presentations not being seen within the 10 and 30-minute time lines respectively, in such crushing circumstances as we are seeing at Lyell McEwin and Flinders, then we clearly must do better.

On that point, I direct the house's attention to what I think was a very important strategic mistake this government made. The former health minister, the Hon. Lea Stevens, based on the Menadue report, had a strategy that was very focused on primary health care. Her view as health minister was that we should spend our money getting out there intercepting people before they came to the hospital system. She listened to Menadue's advice that, if you had a centralised hospital-focused health strategy, the bucket would never be deep enough. The current health minister in the current government changed that strategy to a very centralised hospitals-based system.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: That is totally untrue.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, the minister says it is totally untrue. It is not totally untrue because the centrepiece of his policy is a \$12 billion hospital in the rail yards we do not need which will be a white elephant and a millstone around his neck for years to come. As a result, doctors and nurses are underresourced, emergency departments are underresourced. He has tried to close country hospitals to build his Taj Mahal that he dreamt up on the back of an envelope over a cappuccino so that he could drive past for years to come in some egotistical exercise and say, 'I built that hospital.' Well, we don't need it. He could have saved billions by rebuilding the Royal Adelaide where it is.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, minister!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: And that money could have been put into doctors and nurses where it belongs.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Waite, minister, thank you.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have said enough, I think, minister.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (17:36): With all the discussion that was going on, I thought they were still arguing. I rise today to support the Supply Bill and place on record some of the priorities of this state government in the 2011-12 budget, particularly in the key areas of communities, health, transport, infrastructure, education and justice. I will start with the health system, as it has been of discussion this afternoon in the chamber.

The state government has made a record investment of about \$4.6 billion in the 2011-12 year to help cater for the demands of a growing and complex health system to support the state's hardworking doctors and nurses—the people at the coalface of our health system. This expenditure includes \$69.5 million over three years to expand and improve regional cancer services, including additional beds and equipment at the Whyalla Regional Cancer Centre, new chemotherapy chairs in regional locations and expansion of the radiology and oncology services at my local hospital, the Lyell McEwin in the north of Adelaide. I know the regional cancer centre at Whyalla (in the member for Giles' electorate) is welcomed there as well.

The expenditure on health also includes \$55.9 million over four years for the redevelopment of the Port Lincoln Country General Hospital and the Mount Gambier Hospital, and \$6.8 million over the 2011-12 and 2012-13 year to construct a new Mount Gambier ambulance station and Wallaroo community dental health clinic.

This government has also prioritised funding for community services and provided \$140.7 million over four years to support those who need it most in our community. This funding includes \$41.7 million over four years to meet the growing area of children needing alternative care and extra support arrangements—something that is welcomed in my area; \$37.5 million over four years to provide extra resourcing for people with disability, their families and carers—again, a most welcome initiative which I have only had positive feedback about; \$19 million over four years to increase the level of reunification of children in state care with their families; \$10.8 million over four years to build extra adult and children disability equipment to reduce waiting lists—again, a needed and welcome opportunity for people in those sectors; \$7.7 million over four years to move 32 residents at the Strathmont Centre into community supported homes—a slow but very important process for those families who need to be dealt with gently and carefully.

This government is also easing the burden for those most in need by providing \$23.9 million over four years for extra concessions, including increasing the current water concession as well as introducing the new medical heating and cooling concession—something that many people in my electorate have been keen to find out about and apply for.

The government remains dedicated to supporting the education system with an extra \$56.1 million to be spent over the next four years on initiatives that include \$18.8 million over four years to expand and improve facilities through the construction and refurbishment of infrastructure in many schools, including the Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School, Cleve Area School, Keith Area School and Eden Hills Primary School. Sitting on this side of the chamber, I often hear the opposition decry the lack of money being spent in areas, and I say to members opposite that these are deserved as much as we deserve them and we should welcome these initiatives. The expenditure also includes \$14.4 million over four years to relocate preschools to primary school sites to improve educational outcomes for children, especially to achieve a seamless transition in the early years for early childhood development and education in kindy to reception and year 1.

The government has committed about \$22 million in the 2011-12 budget to keep our community safe by supporting our emergency services and justice system. This funding includes a \$6.4 million upgrade to improve and upgrade courts in our state; \$3.8 million to upgrade prisons across the state; \$2.5 million to provide more resources to the State Emergency Information Call Centre; \$2.1 million to provide extra support in DNA analysis and forensic services; and \$2.1 million for training resources for the CFS and SES volunteers to provide essential response services to the public—again, something I visited recently in my electorate and I know that the people in those units welcome them.

In Adelaide's north, where my electorate is based, the government has also made a commitment to local jobs and community services. In nearby areas the government will be investing \$994,000 over four years to upgrade the plant and equipment at Endeavour House and Innovation House in the Technology Park precinct at Mawson Lakes to attract more companies and jobs to the precinct. We will also be investing \$201.7 million in the stage C redevelopment of the Lyell McEwin Hospital for inpatient accommodation, a new multideck car park and expansion of support facilities for increasing demand and growth in the northern suburbs, a result of the 30-year plan.

Finally, the government's investment in infrastructure to help boost our economy and secure jobs will continue in the 2011-12 budget, with around \$9 billion being invested in key areas over four years. Major expenditure during this time will include \$345.1 million for the South Road superway, the state's biggest individual road project; \$265 million for the 100-gigalitre desalination plant and the pipeline to the Happy Valley treatment plant (something I had the opportunity of reviewing when I was the presiding officer of the Public Works Committee); \$254.6 million for improved connectivity between the northern and southern metropolitan water supply systems; \$160 million to extend the Noarlunga train line into Seaford (very welcome for people in the southern suburbs); \$114.4 million for the electrification of the Noarlunga train line; and \$97.4 million for the electrification of the Gawler train line (something very important for the people in the northern suburbs; it affects many of my neighbouring MPs and myself); and \$75.7 million for the duplication of the Southern Expressway.

Additionally, in the Mid-Year Budget Review the government and BHP Billiton announced \$25 million over two years to upgrade the road between Port Augusta and Olympic Dam to facilitate the safe and efficient transport of goods and the Olympic Dam expansion.

The state government's investment during this financial year reflects our commitment to responsible fiscal management, something the opposition continually complains that we do not have but which we demonstrate year on year. As outlined above, we are targeting funding where it is needed most, for critical infrastructure in our state, for the people who need the services, for future generations and for our state's betterment. I am proud to be part of a government that uses its resources to look after the most vulnerable in our society and I think the last budget demonstrated that we will continue these priorities moving forward.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (17:42): The government's decision to proceed with the \$48 million development of the Glenside site and in particular for the Premier's department to acquire the heritage buildings within the centre of the precinct and develop the Adelaide film and screen centre, which was later to become the Adelaide Film Studio, was one which premier Weatherill was up to his neck in. He sat around the cabinet table that made those decisions. He had been very involved in the site prior to that decision being made, and he had in particular overseen for some three years the proposed Housing Trust development on that site under the Rann government when he was minister for housing.

In the last 24 hours it has been announced that the ABC television program to be titled *Resistance* has now been cancelled. I think originally it was going to be 35-odd episodes, it was then halved, and now we find that the SA Film Corporation's making of this television series has been abandoned.

The government, of course, prior to this abandonment, had already made a commitment of some \$1.5 million in incentive and direct payments to film this children's television series. That included a \$850,000 cash payment for *Resistance*, \$130,000 in-kind support via free rental of the studio facilities, and \$130,000 producer development funding to revert \$300,000 of the SA Film Corporation's share of *Resistance* profits if the second series was filmed in SA and underwrite the production company's application for payroll tax exemption up to a maximum of \$100,000.

Having been abandoned, we have not had a squeak from the government about the actual cost in government funds that have already been applied for the development of this television series now abandoned. We have not had a squeak from the government about what programs or opportunities of production have been abandoned as a result of the film studios being booked for this service. We have not had any indication whatsoever of what the cost to the taxpayer is in the abandonment of this project, but we have certainly had the announcement from Mr Richard Harris, the Chief Executive of the SA Film Corporation, that the program has been abandoned.

Obviously we must have that information. Today, of course, I at least expected—six months late, nevertheless—that the government would finally come in with the SA Film Corporation

annual report—not a page, not delivered. We know, of course, that the financial accounts have been attended to and even audited. It is referred to, of course, in the audit report last year, yet we still do not have the annual report. How convenient! We have an organisation which receives about \$6 million a year in recurrent funding and which has just been given a brand new home that has been upgraded at a total cost of some \$48 million, yet it does not have to provide any information to us, and not a squeak from the minister, not a ministerial statement and no explanation whatsoever as to where that money has gone.

What is particularly interesting about this project is that you will recall, as I said, it had been announced in or about April/May 2008 by the Premier that this is what he was going to do. I am not sure whether that was before or after he had been in cabinet, but nevertheless he threw that out there. And then in June 2009 a report was prepared by Eracon on the Adelaide Film and Screen Centre, Arts SA Project Details Update Report, and in that, members might be astounded to know, their justification for the investment of these dollars is that it would be a project over the next 10 years that would actually bring enormous financial contributions to the state.

This report actually suggests that, after the first three years, there would be some 450 jobs a year as a result of this new opportunity of moving into this facility. No business plan, of course, was produced—never a business plan produced to actually justify why it was ever necessary to move to the Glenside site, but nevertheless this was the promise; and furthermore that the gross state product would culminate in a \$30 million a year benefit to South Australia.

This was made up of some benefit from existing services of about \$3.5 million, that is, a continuation of their existing services. They also said to add on to that \$7.6 million which was going to be brought in from film production, another \$1.9 million on supplies and \$14.6 million flow-on from the state benefit. All round, close to \$30 million a year was supposed to be the benefit in this financial year (in 2012) the report says to us. What do we hear today? We hear from Mr Harris that, I think, they brought in an income of \$100,000—\$100,000 is the income.

They have certainly got some tenancy in the facility. It is a beautiful facility. I invite any members to go down and have a look at it—absolutely magnificent; half empty, of course, studios closed down. No-one is there to actually do anything. 'Hello, lights on, anyone home?' But nevertheless those who are in their offices, expensive as they are, the elite in the film world who actually get access after a tender process to get into this facility are there and, of course, enjoying the ambience of such a beautiful facility.

Now, if that is not the biggest white elephant, if that is not the biggest financial pet project of the former premier, which the cabinet—including the current Premier—has gone along with, if that is not a project which scandalously was advanced during a time when we had the global financial crisis, while we had the hospital sitting behind it actually delayed for the mental health patients, then I do not what is.

I think it is a scandalous lack of priority, and to actually have promoted that above mental health is absolutely abominable, and I add to this at a time when we pick up the paper today to read a tragic story of a lady whose son has died of suicide. Let me remind the house that we have some 200 suicides a year in this state that are known and recorded. That is double the road toll, fatalities on the roads, in this state. Yet we have a government that is prepared to bulldoze and sell off parts of the premier statewide hospital for mental health acute services and progress a multimillion dollar private housing development on a large northern portion of that site. It is bad enough that Dr Cornwall, under the Bannon regime, sold off large strips of that hospital. Fortunately minister and then premier Brown decided against any further sale of that site and saved it during his administration. We now find that the government is going to sell off 42 per cent and progress along those lines.

It is all very well to have a beautiful place for the outgoing premier to have a great big, swanky party, but it is absolutely scandalous that that sort of extravagance is pursued by this government in light of the financial crisis. We had the former premier and treasurer coming into this house bleating about how difficult and tough things were, yet they advanced that project above all others at a time when they were delaying critical projects for services in this state.

I also take this occasion to indicate to the house what a joy it has been to take on responsibility, on behalf of the opposition, for dealing with questions of infrastructure and transport. The leader has granted me responsibility for women again, and I am loving every minute of it; it is something I really enjoy. But I have to say that infrastructure and transport has brought a new paradigm to my life.

I will confess that, in relation to rail, I have probably only ever been on two major interstate rail trips. One was on the old Ghan—which some of you are not old enough to remember; it used to go up through Marree and was on a different gauge—when I was about 12, to Alice Springs, and one was an overnight train trip up through the member for Davenport's electorate en route to Melbourne with my children. I remember going to the dining car on that trip only to find that it was not really a dining car; you just got a choice of a chicken roll or a pie or a pasty—with a strong recommendation not to try to the chicken roll or we might end up needing other treatment.

I have very limited experience but, like all good, self-respecting mothers, I did ensure that my sons had a Hornby train set—which of course they have left behind with all the other junk that kids leave behind when they leave home. That was actually quite fun; my late husband and I probably got more fun out of that Hornby train set than anyone else did. So yes, I came to this portfolio with very limited experience of the rail network and the incredible service that rail provides to our state. On the other hand, I have had a bit more experience with buses, but understanding the details and intricacies of contracts and the like is all a new experience.

I have to say that infrastructure is a whole new world, but it is also fair to say that in the 10 years I have been here major projects in health and education, which are the portfolios for which I have been responsible on behalf of the opposition, have come across my desk many times. On water, we have had a decade of drought and the government has developed significant infrastructure, which I think has been mismanaged. I think the level of secrecy over projects such as the desal plant, the refusal to publish contracts, the refusal to provide this material to any of us as members of parliament, is scandalous. Nevertheless, that is the continued secrecy which prevails with this government.

On electricity infrastructure, I was recently briefed on a major \$750 million power station proposed by a private company in South Australia—in the member for Schubert's electorate, in Tepko near the River Murray—and we look forward to that. In fact, other speakers have mentioned the contribution that was made by the previous Liberal government to the privatisation of power, as it has been described; that is, the long-term lease of ETSA assets. I want to say that unlike New South Wales and Queensland—which I have recently visited and which, I understand, have wholly-owned public electricity systems—we are actually in the box seat as a result of the decisions of that previous government.

We now have private investors interested and participating in the opportunity to provide power infrastructure in this state. Had we not had that, we would be facing a billion dollar expense, because one thing I have found in this area is that meeting future power needs will probably be South Australia's greatest challenge. Already there is a question of supply, so the generational supply of power in this state is clearly the biggest infrastructure challenge that we face, and I will have much to say about that in the future.

Within weeks of taking on this responsibility, I learned that the brand-new bridge at Port Adelaide had come crashing down, and ran into a barge, and all sorts of interesting things happened there. We had train derailments, bus deliveries, and services in chaos. And then, of course, talking about the bridge, the other side of the bridge did not open when the *Endeavour* ship came to South Australia. So, I was having lots of fun learning about how things go terribly wrong when you do not provide adequate maintenance to infrastructure and/or the people in management are absolute amateurs.

Minister Conlon has been around for quite some time and he ought to know better about how some of these things are managed. I think he is fortunate having Mr Rod Hook as the CEO to manage a number of very significant transport and infrastructure projects but, nevertheless, there are clearly deficiencies there and he needs to take responsibility.

The new minister, of course, needs to have an opportunity to get used to her portfolio, but what a mess! We have bus drivers complaining that they are being spat at; we have train derailments; we have issues of buses either being late or not coming at all; we have 7,500 complaints that have been recorded—on the front page of the paper—so she is certainly on her L-plates. There needs to be a major improvement if South Australia is going to have any confidence in this government to deal with future transport requirements.

I have also had the opportunity to visit the superway and a number of the major projects that are currently under construction. We may find in due course that some of these projects will not have been the best way to spend large amounts of money. That is an \$850-odd million project—and a bit will be bought back with money—but these projects will need to be looked at.

Finally, it has become very clear to me, very quickly, that there are a number of intersections—not only Britannia roundabout because that is something close to my heart and part of my electorate—where the government has abandoned projects when they have become too hard. I know about that one. It is still right up there with the RAA's report to say that it needs to be attended to.

But I have also since learned that the South Road/Port Road upgrade is a project that has become too hard for the government. Clearly it needs to be dealt with—and I am with the member for Croydon on this—he is very keen to have it dealt with. We find that when things get a bit hard, they just dump them. With the Britannia roundabout, they needed to knock down a few trees, and they could tear down and bulldoze hundreds of trees to put the tram down Port Road but they could not get rid of a few to fix up the Britannia roundabout. So, to minister Conlon and minister Fox—fix it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.D. Hill.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have to inform the house that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the address adopted by the house on 28 February 2012, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

The honourable the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly, thank you for the Address in Reply to the speech with which I opened the Second Session of the Fifty-Second Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray that your deliberations will add meaning and value to the lives of our South Australian community.

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

- No. 1. Clause 4, page 3, lines 11 to 13—Delete clause 4
- No. 2. Clause 5, page 3, lines 15 to 17 [clause 5(1)]—Delete subclause (1)
- No. 3. Clause 5, page 3, lines 19 to 28 [clause 5(3), (4) and (5)]—Delete subclauses (3), (4) and (5)
- No. 4. Clause 5, page 4, lines 1 to 10 [clause 5(7)]—Delete subclause (7)
- No. 5. Clause 7, page 4, lines 21 to 40 and page 5, lines 1 to 28—Delete clause 7
- No. 6. Clause 8, page 5, lines 29 to 31—Delete clause 8
- No. 7. Clause 9, page 5, lines 32 to 38—Delete clause 9
- No. 8. Clause 10, page 6, lines 1 to 25 [clause 10(1)]—Delete subclause (1)
- No. 9. Clause 12, page 6, lines 38 to 41 and page 7, lines 1 to 7 [clause 12(1)]—Delete subclause (1)
- No. 10. Clause 14, page 7, lines 13 to 15—Delete clause 14
- No. 11. Clause 15, page 7, lines 16 to 25—Delete clause 15
- No. 12. Clause 16, page 7, lines 26 to 31—Delete clause 16
- No. 13. Clause 17, page 8, lines 1 to 41—Delete clause 17
- No. 14. Clause 18, page 9, line 5 [clause 18, inserted section 62A]—Delete 'Subject to section 59A but despite' and substitute 'Despite'
- No. 15. Clause 21, page 10, lines 6 to 11 [clause 21(3), inserted subparagraph (ia)]—Delete inserted subparagraph (ia)
- No. 16. Clause 22, page 10, lines 17 to 38 and page 11, lines 1 to 6 [clause 22, inserted section 76A]—Delete inserted section 76A
- No. 17. Clause 22, page 11, line 9 [clause 22, inserted section 76B]—Delete 'but subject to section 76A'
- No. 18. Clause 33, page 14, lines 1 to 18—Delete clause 33
- No. 19. Clause 34, page 14, lines 19 to 21—Delete clause 34
- No. 20. Clause 35, page 14, lines 22 to 24—Delete clause 35
- No. 21. Clause 36, page 14, lines 25 to 38 and page 15, lines 1 to 22—Delete clause 36
- No. 22. Clause 38, page 16, lines 9 to 24 [clause 38, inserted section 224A]—Delete inserted section 224A

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council insisted on its amendments Nos 1, 2, 5 and 6 to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Wednesday 28 March 2012 at 11:00.