

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 1 May 2012

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

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

VISITORS

The **SPEAKER:** I draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of a group of students from Mount Torrens Primary School who are guests of the member for Kavel. It is nice to see you here and we hope that you enjoy your time here this morning.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. **KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (11:03):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. **KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (11:03):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL 2012

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 April 2012.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:03): It is a most interesting situation that the Supply Bill has run on for so many weeks. The house generally disposes of the Supply Bill in one go rather than moving on to other matters and coming back weeks and weeks later. Supply, obviously, gives the government access to finances to continue the operation of government during that period before the budget is formally adopted and passed by the house, so it is really a technical bill but it is essential for the operation of government.

Obviously, the debate on the Supply Bill gives members the opportunity to talk about just that—supply—the use of taxpayers' money to run the state. We have seen in this state a very sad situation arising in recent years where the government has absolutely lost control of its expenses. Former treasurer Foley eventually admitted that he had a problem with expenses. He said, 'We just can't control our expenditure.' That was a problem of his and the government's own making.

Notwithstanding that this government has sought to rebadge itself as something new and fresh, the reality is that the current Premier has sat at the cabinet table whilst every decision of this government has been taken since it first came to office back in 2002. So it is impossible for this Premier and this ministry to divorce itself from the poor decision-making and the poor financial management of the state over the past 10 or so years.

Interestingly, when we look around the nation we see that this disease that afflicts governments is not unique to South Australia. It is a disease that has afflicted governments—Labor governments, more particularly—right across the nation, not only in the states but also federally.

It seems that it is indeed a part of Labor's DNA that it does not know how to manage the finances of the state or the commonwealth. It is Labor's DNA that it cannot control its expenditure. It has happened in every state in the nation; it has happened in the commonwealth. It has happened, probably to a greater extent, right here in South Australia than anywhere else. The

reality is that the ministers sit around the cabinet room and simply do not understand what they are doing.

Strangely enough, I assume that every one of them has run some sort of domestic budget. I assume that every one of them takes their pay packet, and has taken their pay packet ever since they entered the workforce, and worked out how they are going to manage their personal expenditure. I assume that they have been able to manage that reasonably well. The problem with the DNA of the Labor Party is that, when they get their hands on somebody else's money, they treat it completely differently from the way they would manage their own money. That is the flaw in the Labor Party's DNA.

Good governments manage public moneys as though it were their own. Good governments understand the necessity to be frugal, and they understand the necessity to not spend beyond their means. That is the difference between a good government and a not so good or bad government. We in South Australia have endured too many of the latter over the last 40-odd years, and that is the reason that South Australia finds itself in the position it is in today; that is, a state whose economy is going backwards relative to every other state in the nation. Even Tasmania's prospects have moved ahead at a rate greater than that of South Australia.

I have said before in this place that, when I was a schoolboy, South Australia was on the verge of becoming the third powerhouse in this nation. We were on the verge of overtaking Queensland; Adelaide was on the verge of overtaking Brisbane as a major city. Perth was a very small city; Western Australia was a very small economy. I never expected to see the situation where South Australia was languishing as a much smaller economy than that enjoyed by people in Western Australia.

The first time I went to Perth was in the late 1960s, and I got quite a shock when I went back there some 20 years later and saw the difference in what was just a large country town, as Perth was in the late 1960s, to a thriving, bustling, modern city that it is today.

It was not because they had any sort of luck, it was just because the state governments in Western Australia saw how to build a prosperous future for their communities. They knew how to manage the finances of the state, and they got on with it. In South Australia, we had a completely different attitude, and we continue to pay the price.

One of the key problems that besets the South Australian economy is the shift from the private sector to the public sector. The percentage of the economy in South Australia that has shifted from the private sector to the public sector over the last couple of years is quite dramatic. There has been something like a 3 per cent shift of the economy that was previously in the private sector which has moved into the public sector. That simply masks the underlying problem that we have here in South Australia.

These numbers come out of the budget papers; if members look at Budget Paper 3, they will see these numbers. I do not have the page with me, but there is a table there that shows the percentage of the revenues and expenditure of the state government as a percentage of the total state product, and there has been a dramatic shift. The problem that that signals for South Australia is based on the fact that it is just not sustainable.

The state's debt in 2007-08 was about \$1.6 billion. For a small economy and a small state like South Australia, that was not an unreasonable position in which to find ourselves. At that time, that debt was not created by any great infrastructure spend; it was created by mismanagement, but it was not a level of debt which was frightening. But, between 2007-08 and the projections in the out years of the budget (2015-16, when the new Royal Adelaide Hospital comes to book) that debt will have increased to \$11.2 billion—\$11.2 billion worth of debt. That is not sustainable.

It is not sustainable for this state to rack up debt at that rate. At some stage, somebody is going to have to say, 'Enough is enough.' That is why this problem of shifting so much of the economy from the private sector to the public sector does not augur well for South Australia, because when the brakes go on on the public sector the economy is going to come to what we could call a hard landing. At some stage, South Australia is going to suffer from a hard landing.

We are not going to be saved by the Olympic Dam project, as fantastic as it is going to be for South Australia. That project in itself will not save South Australia from the hard landing which this government has ensured we are going to have. I expect the mining sector will grow in South Australia and will be part of our economic future, but we have a more immediate problem. We have a problem we are going to face within the next few years, when I believe we are going to have a

hard landing. That will be the legacy of the Rann/Weatherill years of South Australia. That will be the legacy, and that legacy will be borne by our children, and that saddens me greatly.

Just to illustrate how the government can get itself lost—the biggest part of the budget goes to health. Those of us who have been around this place for a few years remember that, when the Labor Party came to government in South Australia, one of the first things they did was have a major inquiry into our health system—not an unreasonable thing to do. They brought in John Menadue, who prepared, over a period of time—and it did take some time—a major report into where we should take our health system in South Australia.

By and large, what Menadue said was that the cost of providing health services is going to continue to rise if we keep doing the same thing that we have been doing, that is, waiting for people to get ill and then trying to treat acute illness in a public hospital system. That is what we have been doing for a long time. We have all seen where it is going. It is costing more and more to treat these people, and the costs are just going to continue to rise, and that in itself is unsustainable.

Menadue advised the state government to do a complete about-face with regard to the way it delivered health services. He advised the government that it should be concentrating on primary health, putting our resources back out into the community, and encouraging, supporting and aiding people to lead a more healthy lifestyle. He advised that the government should be tackling health issues in the community and making sure that the community faced up to these health problems before they became chronic, keeping people out of our hospital system.

I did not agree with quite a few of Menadue's proposals, but I think the fundamental points behind what he told the state government were soundly based. I think it is still a soundly-based approach, yet what has this government done? I think the former minister for health, Lea Stevens, was at least trying to head down that path. However, the minister who has been in control of health for the last seven years, John Hill (the member for Kaurana), has turned that completely around. He has obviously either never read Menadue's report or he has just simply ignored it, because the whole focus of health in South Australia is on centralised care, it is on building a new hospital on the other end of North Terrace, it is on headlines in the daily newspaper, and that is coming at a great cost to the state.

The government has sought advice and it has been given some sound advice, but it has then ignored that advice and gone in the complete opposite direction, expending the resources that we have in a way that we can all see is going to be unsustainable. We have committed ourselves for the immediate future to a path which is just unsustainable, that is, to a centralised, acute-care system based around a small handful of major hospitals here in Adelaide. That has undermined the health system's ability to deliver services at the community level right across the state. Not only has the government, I think, got the policy setting incredibly wrong with regard to health, but it seems that on a day-to-day management basis it just continues to get it wrong.

We have seen the Auditor-General's Report—which was released nine months late—a damning report on the way in which the health department has been managed in South Australia. How on earth can the government expect to manage adequately, let alone properly, a department the size of health when it does not even know what it is spending on a day-to-day basis? How on earth can it manage its expenses when it does not even know what they are? This is indicative of the problems with this government.

One of the portfolio areas for which I am directly responsible on behalf of the opposition is water. We have the exact same mentality with regard to water—the desalination plant. It was not good enough for this government to build a desalination plant of about 50-gigalitre annual capacity which would safeguard South Australia from a water catastrophe, because that was what we were looking at, that was what we were all fearful of, and it was a reasonable policy position to say, 'We need to have a safeguard to insulate us from that sort of catastrophe.'

A 50-gigalitre desalination plant was a fair and reasonable response to the circumstances we found ourselves in, but the decision to double the size of that desalination plant to 100 gigalitres was pure madness. It is not necessary. It will not be necessary in the next 40 or 50 years, and it is coming at a great cost. It saddles us with a technology for the life of that plant which surely will be replaced by something much more effective and much more efficient in that time. On every count, it was a dumb decision to double the size of that plant.

It gets worse. In the total cost, I include the north-south interconnector, where the two parts of the Adelaide water supply system are being connected, as I speak, at a cost of about \$400 million. That was only necessary because of the size of the desal plant being doubled to

100 gigalitres a year. The total cost including that interconnection is about \$2.2 billion. Every household in South Australia has to fund that and fund the operation and maintenance contract for the desal plant.

I was saying that it gets worse. Of that \$2.2 billion, about \$328 million, I think, off the top of my head, was provided by the commonwealth government and there were a number of headlines: 'How wonderful are we! We've negotiated this money from the commonwealth government to support us building this desalination plant.' It was not until a little while later that the opposition was able to reveal that that payment was offset by reductions in our GST payments from the commonwealth. I think it was only about a week ago, in the Budget and Finance Committee of the upper house, that the Under Treasurer, Brett Rowse, in fact said that the net benefit South Australia got from those commonwealth payments was a mere \$26 million.

The public of South Australia was told that we were going to get \$328 million towards the desalination plant. Treasurers—and this includes former treasurer Foley and current Treasurer Snelling—regularly stand up and say, 'Oh, woe are we! The GST payments coming to South Australia are being reduced.' Well, hello, South Australians. You got the money, and one of the places where you got the money was to pay for the desal plant. I would argue that the people of South Australia were seriously misled when those announcements were being made that the commonwealth was kicking in money for the desal plant.

We saw water prices in South Australia rise by 40 per cent last year. There will be another announcement before the end of this month about water prices for the next year and the government has already indicated that they will be of the same order as last year—another 40 per cent on top of last year's 40 per cent, and that is on top of huge rises in water prices over the previous few years. That is why it was a dumb decision to double the size of the desal plant. We did not need it and it is very costly.

I have to wind up now because I see that my time is almost finished but, unfortunately, in debating the Supply Bill, the reality is that this state is heading for even tougher times than we have already experienced. and it all comes to the feet of this government.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:24): In a similar vein to the member for MacKillop, I will continue and indicate that clearly the opposition will be supporting this bill. It is a necessity. However, we need to put a few things on the record, and I would like to put a few things on the record that pertain particularly to my electorate. We seem to be struggling to apportion money in the right areas, and one issue that is causing a good deal of angst in my area is mental health and mental health funding. Simply, we seem to have an epidemic of mental health issues across Australia and South Australia and also in my electorate. I do not think I have ever been so conscious of the mental health dramas that are taking place in people's lives and the impact that it is having.

In relation to education, for example, a number of schools are having to deal with the mental health issues of some of their students. Many of the schools in my electorate are small and do not have the resources, and some of the larger schools, with 500 to 600 students, even with their special needs category, are finding it really difficult to deal with these matters. That is only made worse by the fact that the centralised bureaucracy that has come into place under this Rann/Weatherill government is ignoring these matters and pushing them under the table. They are heavy handed and dictatorial on principals and staff in my schools and, I suspect, other schools, and it is simply not good enough.

In the wider community I note, through health services, a continuing demand for mental health services. Only last week a constituent from Mount Compass rang me in desperation because there is nothing to assist her and her family; and I am working through that one.

The issue of road funding is also something that needs to be put on the table in this place again. It is interesting that we are now seeing work being undertaken on the Southern Expressway. Let me say thank heavens that Dean Brown bought the land and the Labor government have not sold it like they did with South Road so that we can duplicate the Southern Expressway. It will be a boon. It is a pity it was not done some years ago. It is interesting that the announcement was made prior to the 2010 election about half an hour before we were due to announce it, so you can form your own conclusion on that.

Let me turn to the issue of transport. Much has been said lately about public transport and, more to the point, the disaster that public transport is becoming, it seems, in South Australia. Once again, this morning I heard the Minister for Transport Services waffling through excuses and

whatnot on what should be done and what can be done. That is all very well, but let me point out that services that are coming in from the south, the frustration of people who cannot get on trains or trams, or the buses being late, is an enormous issue in the metropolitan area. It is not so much of an issue in my area, because apart from Sellicks Beach we do not have any public transport. Like many of my regional areas, if not all of them, we just do not have public transport and we just have to make do.

However, it is interesting how topical this very issue has become, and the ducking, weaving and excuses that have been found by ministers to apologise for and explain the debacle in the public transport services. I have been following it with interest, and continue to follow it with interest. I point out that the member for Bragg, the shadow minister for transport, seems to be all over both ministers on this matter, and it is not going to go away.

The devolving of funds for country health and dental health are other matters that have been discussed in this place. Country health has been crucified by this government. Once again, the central bureaucracy has taken over. All decision-making is taken out of the regions. With the abolition of the regional health boards and the regional country hospital boards, they really have no input whatsoever into where health is going in this state. We have the current minister, minister Hill, who is looking older by the day, over an out-of-control—

The Hon. C.C. Fox interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: It's not an unfair comment; it's a reality. The minister's department is totally out of control. With the budget well over \$100 million it will be interesting to see where it is by 30 June, but we will probably have to wait 12 or 18 months to do that. Quite clearly, increasing the number of bureaucrats running the health system in the city has been a disaster for country health; you only have to look at places like Keith Hospital, and others, that are struggling to cope. The loss of the boards and the putting in place of the health advisory councils—despite the best intent in the world the people on those councils have absolutely no say. The bureaucrats are reigning supreme. I think it is a sad indictment on this government where that has gone.

As the member for MacKillop stated, former minister Lea Stevens had a great handle on health, particularly country health. She had a passion for it and she understood it. She understood that boards, whether they are metropolitan hospital, country hospital or regional, are actually a very good way of running the health system and providing some sort of leadership through local units. That has all gone. I have not spoken to Lea Stevens lately but I would imagine that she would be quite distraught about where it has all gone.

Now we have the bureaucrats running amok. Only yesterday, I had a communication from a constituent who informed me that an X-ray machine from the Mid North has been placed down at the South Coast. Apparently, the X-ray machine was funded by the public of that Mid North community but it has been moved (by the bureaucrats) down to my area, and they are just wondering exactly what has taken place. So, there will be more to come on that matter.

Equally, the question of public housing is another debacle that this government has not faced up to. It is embarrassing. The lack of public housing is embarrassing. If you look at what Sir Thomas Playford put in place so many years ago and what we have now (what the government is not doing), you have to ask yourself: why is this government so directionless and rudderless on this issue of public housing and so many other issues? I have my own thoughts on that. However, it is very concerning when constituents contact my office, or come in to see me, and they are totally distraught over the fact that they cannot find public housing—Housing SA has none.

So, what do we do? I turn to the local church groups, in this case in Victor Harbor, and they have some accommodation where we can put people for two or three days and they can feed them. This government has abandoned its public housing responsibilities. There will always be people in need. There are so many people out there who simply cannot cope and who are increasingly struggling. Why are they struggling? As other members have said, and as I will repeat: the lack of direction, accountability and financial management skills of this government are legendary.

People simply cannot pay their water bills or their power bills, they are having increasing trouble paying their council rates, and they are desperately looking to see what can be done about all of this. So, that is a challenge for my side of the house to work out where we are going on that. In the case of water bills, it is total mismanagement by this government that has led us to this situation. I can tell you that the constituents of South Australia (the public) will not forget where they are at—where we were and where they are at now.

The desal plant was mentioned a while ago. What a hideous waste of money and an electoral opportunity for the federal government to come in and double the size of a desal plant which is simply not going to be required. The jolly thing will be in mothballs for years, I would think. Who knows? We cannot foresee the weather in the future. This was another concession to the great green monster: the great green monster which needs to be continually fed. You know: it will produce our water and take the pressure off the Murray. It is all mixed up in the middle of it, as indeed is another feed for the great green monster: marine parks, and I will say some more on that at another time, but what a debacle that has been.

Once again, bureaucrats are totally out of control. It is interesting to see what the Premier announced the other day: it would appear from first reading that his Department of Environment and Natural Resources, particularly those involved with marine parks, has taken an absolute belting, but it is still not good enough.

I heard some radio this morning on the issue of facilities for handicapped people, and I think there has been a federal announcement on where they are going with funding for the handicapped.

Mr Gardner: Eventually.

Mr PENGILLY: Eventually—sooner rather than later, perhaps, but it will not happen with the way the federal government is in chaos at the moment, I would have thought. I, along with other members in this place on all sides of the house, seem to have growing numbers of handicapped people to deal with, and the fact is they are having increasing difficulty just coping with life. Where we are going with this, I am not so sure. I do not know where the government's priorities are. The Treasurer will be handing down the state budget on the 31st of this month, and it is going to be interesting to see where he goes.

Last week, the Treasurer got himself all tied up in knots and in a horrible mess over the sale of car parks and God knows what else. I think he is relying totally on what his bureaucrats tell him without any understanding. It is a failing of this government that, with the exception of the Minister for Finance, there does not seem to be anyone on the other side who has any understanding of the way business works or the fact that people have to have jobs and have got to be paid. We saw the debacle over shopping hours a few weeks ago which I suspect will continue to play out for some time.

I would also like to raise the issue of support for small business. Small business is a great driver of our economy and a great employer. It is a critical issue in my electorate—and I see other members shaking their head in agreement.

Mr Griffiths: Nodding.

Mr PENGILLY: Nodding, yes, not shaking. Small business is being cut adrift by this government. They could not give two hoots about it. There is all this talk about mining, and I see that the minister for mining said yesterday at a conference that we are going to be a Titan in mining in South Australia in the next few years. I hope he is right and I hope it comes to fruition because the *Financial Review* two or three weeks ago gave no surety to that argument whatsoever, with the perhaps rethink by BHP Billiton on just exactly what they may or may not do.

I think we are in a very, very parlous economic state in South Australia. There are the downturns that are taking place in China, the enormous financial mess that India seems to be getting into—which was going to be a saviour a few years ago—the debacle in Europe, the announcement that Spain is in recession, and the list goes on. We are not isolated from that. Our tiny state of just over 1½ million people will be struggling to deal with these issues, and it remains to be seen just where this mining industry will go.

School funding is a major issue to me, and I mentioned education a while ago. Once again, the government just does not seem to get its head around how these schools operate. The Flinders Street bureaucrats are walking all over the top of principals and all over the top of school councils, and the amalgamations issue is a classic example of that. In my own area of Victor Harbor, R to 7 schools were to be amalgamated. They simply do not want to amalgamate.

It works very, very well as it is, it has worked very well for years, and all it is is a cut to funding—that is all it is. It is purely and simply a cut to funding. They have expressed severe reservations about it. They do not like it and they do not want it. Likewise, the smaller schools in my electorate of Finnis are greatly concerned about where they are going to go in the future. They

simply do not trust this Weatherill government. They did not trust the Rann government, but they trust this one even less, so where that goes I am not quite sure either.

The issue of tourism is close to my heart. The savage funding cuts that have been made to the tourism budget in South Australia alarm me greatly and they also concern me about where the tourism direction and strategy is. Even last week there was an announcement made by the tourism people on the matter—not to put names into it—and when I rang the chairman of the local tourism board to see whether he knew about it, he said, 'I had no idea about it.' So there has been no communication. The communication between the SATC and the regions is now non-existent. They have been shafted. We have the former CEO of the SATC who left under a cloud; he was shafted.

Tourism is a great industry. It is hard work, and it brings few financial rewards. It brings a lot of jobs to rural areas, a huge number of jobs in my electorate alone, but I have no doubt that in the next state budget in a couple of weeks we will find they will get duded again—all in the name of saving money. It is all very well for ministers and members of the government to go out and say what a wonderful job tourism is doing, but they cannot do it if it is not funded. We need to have a total rethink on tourism.

It is likewise with police services. I have a huge amount of respect for SAPOL in this state; I think they do a great job, but still they are being starved of resources in areas. Mud fuddling around by the state government to make announcements on more police in the city has only led to fewer police in the regions, from where they have been dragged back in. I have talked about it in this place before, but there are stations in my electorate that struggle to be manned appropriately, where officers get no relief and they take the job home with them 24 hours a day. When someone goes on leave, unless someone is put in their place—which does not always happen—it puts huge amounts of stress on the officers still working.

Having said that, I would like to say that I have a great deal of respect and time for the way my area is run out of Mount Barker; I believe we have very good people in there. Finally, let me talk about emergency services. I want to point out the ridiculous state of play in relation to where we are going in this state with the expenditure on emergency services and the mess that some of these are in. No greater mistake was made than by the department of environment a couple of weeks ago, which lit up a fire in Deep Creek against the better judgement of the local CFS. In fact, they were not even consulted; they were given an email to say that they were going to burn.

What did it do? It got away. So for five or six days the local CFS volunteers on the Fleurieu were down there in Deep Creek scratching around in prickles and heavens knows what else trying to put out a fire that was lit up against the better judgement of CFS officers. The message I have got—and I will verify it when I do a freedom of information on it—is that that fire cost \$500,000. It never should have happened. Once again, we have department of environment officers, who think they know everything but who do not know everything, who do not take any notice of the locals but then expect the locals to go out for five or six days and monitor and try to repair the damage that has been caused.

I flew over it a week ago, just to have a look at the area that was burnt. I am a great believer in burning, but if you are going to burn you need to do it right—and you do not have to have a university degree to know how to organise a scrub fire, trust me. Local knowledge should be put to the fore. Once again, down in Deep Creek it did not happen, and as a result local people were put out for many days.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (11:44): In rising to speak on the Supply Bill I note that the bill in question seeks to allow \$3.16 billion of revenue to be spent by the South Australian government for the next financial year. We do this now because the state budget is being delivered on the last day of May, and of course it needs to be passed before the funds are available. This just guarantees that we can keep going through July, August and September; and, of course, the opposition will support that because government must have money to pay its public servants.

But for 10 years this state Labor government has been managing the budget so poorly that I have some very serious concerns about the ways in which that money is currently spent, particularly the deficit and debt that has been accumulated, which means that now we have some serious crises in government—and particularly in some of the portfolios that I look after—that I am not sure that the government is able to tackle. Because it had some very, very good years. It had some magnificent years with unbudgeted for GST revenue coming in, which the previous treasurer (Hon. Kevin Foley) and the cabinet (which, of course, our current Premier was a member of for every single day) did not see a spending priority that it did not want to sign off on.

It never saw a cheque that it did not want to sign, and consequently, with no thought to accumulating money for the bad years, it managed to continue running up debt and deficit for all those years. In 1976 Margaret Thatcher famously said that the problem with socialists was that they eventually run out of other people's money to spend, and 36 years later we see this state government apparently run out of taxpayers' money to deliver the services that taxpayers need.

It has done this before, and in 1991, when the state Labor government was laughing off suggestions by Dale Baker and Jennifer Cashmore that we might be approaching some sort of problem in our State Bank (and we eventually had to bail that out), we ended up in \$8 billion of debt which cost South Australians dearly. It took a Liberal government to fix that problem and we had to make some very hard decisions to do that. That was the result of a State Bank disaster the likes of which the state had never seen before.

We are going to be topping \$11 billion in public debt once the government's hospital on the rail yards has been completed—\$11 billion in government debt, higher than the State Bank disaster, and what is the cause? Has there been a State Bank disaster? No. We have had seven years of ongoing revenues to the Treasury of more than half a billion dollars unbudgeted for. Every single one of those budgets had about a half a billion dollars each year coming in in unbudgeted revenues. It is extraordinary! At a time when it put up taxes to the highest in the country, at a time when GST revenues had been coming in in unbelievable manners and at a time when it has been selling off thousands of public houses this Labor government will also have managed to run up debt approaching \$11 billion once we have sold off the hospital.

It is ten years of Labor mess. South Australia has been left in recession. We have the nation's highest taxes, we have the nation's worst economic growth, we have the nation's highest decline in job vacancies, the nation's highest capital electricity and water charges, we have the nation's worst business confidence, the nation's worst business approval figures, the nation's worst performing workers compensation system and the nation's slowest growth in wages, but we have the nation's fastest growth in consumer prices.

How extraordinary that a cabinet of which the Premier was a member for every single day of this government's life can present itself to the public having had such extraordinary conditions, such waste and to now cry poor and suggest, 'Oh, it's all the fault of the global financial crisis,' or, 'It's all the fault of those nasty Eastern States who have been mean to us at COAG.' How extraordinary! For 10 years Labor has failed to manage the state's budgets and invest for the future, so state debt is heading to \$11 billion, and the most vulnerable in our community have some serious assistance that is now needed. The state government has a moral obligation to ensure that people's human rights, particularly people with a disability, are looked after, and I will be going more to that issue in a moment.

Premier Weatherill was in state cabinet for every single day of the Labor government. He was there when every single one of Labor's bad decisions was made since it took government in 2002 and he stands by them. As he said last year, 'We've had a change of leader, not a change of government.' He must take responsibility for the lifetime of problems that this government has caused. Of course, for the significant part of that time Premier Weatherill was the minister with responsibility for some of the things I look after. He was the longest-serving minister in the Rann government for disability, families and communities, youth and justice and he must take a personal responsibility for the extraordinary mess that so many of those areas are now in.

Yesterday, along with the member for Norwood, the member for Adelaide, the member for Taylor, I believe representing the government, the Hon. Kelly Vincent and the Hon. Tammy Franks from the other place (I think that is everyone from the state parliament who was there), I was able to attend the rally supporting the National Disability Insurance Scheme. We were joined by some federal members of parliament. Kate Ellis and Christopher Pyne both spoke on behalf of their respective parliamentary parties in Canberra. It was a terrific occasion. It was terrific to see the bipartisan nature of the desire for real rights to be considered when funding disability services in Australia. It was, I think, encouraging that both parties, through their federal representatives speaking, recognised the significant challenges being faced, that need to be faced by parliaments and governments across Australia.

We have perhaps higher expectations for the lives that are going to be led by people with a disability in our community than we once did. We recognise that it is important to take a rights rather than a purely welfare based approach. These are people with lives to lead, with contributions to make, with an extraordinary capacity for resilience and an extraordinary capacity and desire to

contribute to the community, but they need support in doing so and that is support that unfortunately they have not always had.

This is a direction that has been coming for some time. When the Hon. Robert Lawson QC was minister for disabilities in the late 1990s he was, I believe, the first disabilities minister to recognise the importance of individualised funding in South Australia and started us on the track that eventually we are now getting to. I note that earlier this year the minister sent out letters to a number of people offering them the opportunity to have self-managed funding. This morning on radio he said that all the people are going to get it, but just for the record there were about 2,000 letters sent, and the other 90 per cent of people with a disability in South Australia are, of course, still waiting for the opportunity to have that self-managed, individualised funding approach.

The NDIS will hopefully eventually get us there, but South Australia is a state that needs the NDIS more than just about every other state. People living with a disability in South Australia are living with substandard services even by the poor national standards that we have currently in Australia. In documents putting together the proposed model for the National Disability Insurance Scheme, the Productivity Commission noted that government support across Australia for people with disability is 'underfunded, unfair, fragmented and inefficient, and gives people with a disability little choice and no certainty of access to appropriate supports'.

That is across Australia. The situation in South Australia is that we spend 15 per cent less per capita than the national average. On top of that, we have a higher proportion of people living with a disability in South Australia than other states. We have noted before—or I have noted before; the government seems to be blind to the possibility—that many people in South Australia who are upwardly mobile, young and seeking a career move to Perth, the Gold Coast, Melbourne or overseas, so consequently we have a significant need in South Australia.

In South Australia we spend \$234.90 per capita according to the Productivity Commission, well below the national average of \$275.90, streets behind states like Victoria, New South Wales and Tasmania. I note that the New South Wales government recently promised another \$2 billion to go into their system. This is all before the NDIS comes on board. Bear in mind that the NDIS is a process. Hopefully next year there will be some opportunities for some people to start reaping the rewards.

Hopefully at some stage in the next few years the states, the commonwealth and both parties will have the opportunity to be involved in the final design of the system and it will in fact deliver great benefits to all people, but in the meantime people right now who are living in South Australia with disability are suffering housing and accommodation stress and severe stress because they do not have the opportunity to fully achieve the things that they could in life. Their families and their carers are in extreme stress due to the lack of respite services, particularly in rural areas. The member for Stuart talked to me just recently about a lack of respite services in the Clare Valley region. It is a story that we hear across South Australia, particularly in the rural areas.

In the last few years Monsignor David Cappo and the Social Inclusion Unit worked on what was eventually released as the Strong Voices report, with its recommendations on a number of aspects for a blueprint for the future. In December, minister Hunter and Premier Weatherill basically signed up to all the free ones and said that everything else would be considered in light of this year's budget. This year's budget is rapidly approaching and I put this to the government. For 10 years it has been talking big on disability services. The Premier in particular has made some grand statements about disability. Minister Hunter, in the months that he has been in the job, has talked about what the government would like to do for people with disability. For 10 years they have been hearing this rhetoric. This government will be judged by what it delivers in this year's budget and whether it takes seriously the recommendations of the Strong Voices report. People with disability in South Australia have heard it all before.

We know that the challenges facing government are more significant than they have been in the past. Our understanding of this issue means that we no longer have large institutions full of people who are kept out of people's sight. We look forward to the opportunity for people to make a contribution and to be involved in the community. In the meantime, the support services that needed to be in place in the community for people to achieve that have not been put in place. People are living longer because of the wonderful benefits of better health care so the support will potentially cost more than it once did because of our expectations and people's longer lives but it needs to be delivered in line with that. For 10 years people have been waiting and the government will be judged at this year's budget.

Where are we now? We spend 15 per cent less, generally, than the national average according to the Productivity Commission. The Gonski review of education in Australia did some work on this as well. The Gonski review was a review of funding for schooling and it produced a chart on average funding per student for students with disability in government schools by state and territory in 2009-10. I hesitate to tell the chamber this because I know many members will be upset to hear that in South Australia our figure of \$4,808 is up to eight times less than some other states. Indeed, we come straight last across Australia. The Northern Territory spends more; New South Wales spends three times as much; in Victoria the figure is \$19,800; Western Australia and the ACT are over \$20,000 per student; in Tasmania they take it seriously with over \$40,000 per student with disability in government schools; and in South Australia, \$4,800—it is quite shameful.

We also have to cope with the issue of the category 1 unmet need list for supported accommodation. These are people with a severe disability who have been identified as at critical risk of homelessness and immediate and high risk of harm to themselves or others. At the time of the last election the figure from December 2009 was 306. Just in the life of this parliament the number of people on the category 1 unmet need list for supported accommodation in South Australia—people with a disability and at high and immediate risk of harm to themselves or others—has grown from 306 in December 2009 to 413 in December 2010 to 504 in December 2011. It went down for the first time in a while: in January 2012 the monthly figures went down by six which is fantastic. We are now down to 498 (under 500 again) people with a disability in South Australia at immediate and high risk of harm to themselves or others. It is not a very encouraging start.

I would love to tell the house what the February figures are but we have been waiting two months for them. They are supposed to be released monthly and the last time we had an update was at the beginning of March for the January figures, so we look forward to that. This is the sort of issue that must be tackled in the May budget by this government. They have a responsibility to the vulnerable in our community and people with a disability in particular. They cannot just say there is a national disability insurance scheme coming in over the next seven years and wash their hands of responsibility for what happens to people with disability in South Australia in the meantime.

We must have a response now. We must have a response to the Strong Voices review. People with disability deserve much better than they have had from this Labor government and they deserve much better from the Premier who, as minister for a number of years, met with so many of these people. He should know that this is a vitally important step for his government to take, and it must be a high priority in his May budget.

One group of people in South Australia with disabilities who are particularly vulnerable as we approach what is likely to be a cold winter is those who suffer from heat-dependent medical conditions: those for whom the Liberal Party announced a policy prior to last year's budget—which the Labor Party (we were glad) took up in its budget—of providing increased concessions so that people with heat-dependent medical conditions would not be afraid to have their air conditioners on on the warm days and their heaters on on the cool days. It is important, with a number of conditions, that these people be able to have constant body temperature.

The Labor Party followed suit in the budget, and the new minister, looking for a good news story just prior to Christmas, went out and encouraged people to apply. He said, 'People will need to have a doctor's certificate to say that they have a condition that requires them to use continuous cooling or heating,' and, of course, many did. In fact, we know now that, as of the beginning of April, 1,894 people had followed the minister's advice and applied. As of 12 April, only 280 had been approved, only 130 had been paid, 766 had been declined and 338 were still awaiting a determination. In explaining why so many applicants have been declined, minister Hunter went to the press and in a conference said:

I think a lot of people said, 'Wacko, this is fantastic, let's apply,' but didn't really drill down into what the qualifications are, and about 700 of those people who applied won't meet the qualifications.

If minister Hunter wants to know why these people might not have drilled down into all of his details, he need look no further than the mirror when he gets up in the morning. I remind people that he said, 'People will need to have a doctor's certificate to say that they have a condition that requires them to use continuous cooling or heating.' We have met a number of these people who have a doctor's certificate to say they need continuous cooling or heating but, because they do not meet the bureaucratic technical definitions that the department under minister Hunter has put into the requirements, they are unable to get it.

Half of the people for whom determinations have been made—more than half—have now been rejected. With the spiralling high cost of living and spiralling electricity prices—which are only going to get higher under Labor's toxic carbon tax as of 1 July—all these people with heat-dependent medical conditions need to have the comfort of knowing they will be able to turn on their heaters in the cold days of winter and not be caught in the poverty trap.

Government, of course, does not help these people. They generally will turn to welfare agencies if they are under family stress. Figures for February show that requests for assistance by welfare agencies had increased massively. One of the things the government did, of course, was cut the early intervention anti-poverty unit measures such as the financial counsellors who were going to help people. There were 40 financial counsellors in the government and they have been cut.

These were people who would save the government money later on, of course, because, if you can keep families together and reduce their financial stress levels, they are less likely to need acute services later on. This is understood by even the Gillard federal government, which has put in 50 of these around Australia in recent months, even despite cuts elsewhere, because they know that it saves the government in the long-term. The short-term thinking of this government has seen the extraordinary increased demand on our charities.

I note that figures released by SACOSS for February show that UnitingCare Wesley saw requests for assistance increase 34 per cent between November 2010 and November 2011; the Salvation Army requests increased by 69 per cent; the Salvos Doorways of Hope phone line increased by 42 per cent; and Anglicare reported an overwhelming 373 per cent increase in requests for assistance. Welfare agencies can only do so much, and the extraordinary increase in demand on them because of the extraordinary cost of living pressures that have skyrocketed under this Labor government have actually seen people in this situation, in unprecedented numbers, turned away by welfare agencies.

Figures released on 20 April by Anglicare show that their annual survey of people they have turned away during a week in March has increased to 325 people in 2012, a 35 per cent increase on the 241 people turned away in 2011. For the vast majority of Labor's 10 years, they had rivers of unbudgeted revenues coming in—a staggering \$500 million per year extra, on average, during the course of Kevin Foley's tenure in Treasury. Labor squandered money in the good times. This government, of which Jay Weatherill, the Premier, was a cabinet minister for every day, squandered money in the good times and now, when we find we need the money to support extra services in our community, there is nothing left.

I have not even had time to get into the Cavan issue, but I can tell members that this government has messed it up for 10 years, and South Australia deserves better.

Time expired.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (12:04): It is my great pleasure to rise to speak on the Supply Bill proposed by the government. Of course, this is the bill which guarantees the money supply from 1 July this year until the time the Appropriation Bill is passed by this government sometime thereafter. In fact, what the government and the Treasurer are asking us to do today in the house is to authorise government expenditure of \$3.16 billion without us actually seeing the budget and without us seeing what it is going to spend the money on.

As I have pointed out in my last three speeches in this house on the Supply Bill, I come from the commercial sector, and this would never ever happen in the commercial world. Never would you have a situation where a managing director or a chief financial officer would go to their board and say, 'I need you to give me money, but I am not going to be able to tell you what I am going to spend this money on,' and this is the precise situation that we find ourselves in here again this year.

Let me put on the record that other states in Australia are able to deliver their budgets in a timely manner. Other states in Australia are able to get their act together, work backwards from 30 June, the end of the financial year, which occurs on the same day each year, and get their budgets to the parliament for approval in time so that there is no need for wasting the parliament's time with this Supply Bill. Unfortunately, in the 10 years of this government it has not once been able to bring its budget to this house for approval in time, and it is a mark of its tardiness.

In reality, I think this government would like to defer this budget into oblivion, because we know that it is going to be a very tough budget. We have already had an indication of what is going

to come. Yesterday, Premier Weatherill announced that the government would be closing seven of its eight overseas trade offices. Incidentally, the government has not been managing these particularly well. In fact, two out of the eight overseas offices have not even had any staff in them for the past 12 months. That is how well this government is spending our taxpayers' money.

Yesterday, the Premier announced that seven out of eight of these trade offices are going to close. This is, I think, a precursor to what we are going to see in the budget later this month. Of course, this has been lifted directly from the Sustainable Budget Commission report, which the government received in 2010. It received this report in 2010. The question is: why is the government leaving these decisions so late to implement? Why is it putting us in such a perilous situation?

Of course, the government has been very keen in the media and in the parliament to talk up the impact of those matters which affect our budget and which are beyond their control, so it wants to tell us all about the global financial crisis and the high Australian dollar. What the government does not want to tell us about is what is within its ability to influence. The government wants to be seen as the victim: 'Poor old South Australia. Look at what has happened with the GFC. Our GST receipts are well down. Oh, poor old South Australia. Our exporters aren't doing very well because of the high Australian dollar.' That is great. Let us take that as a given.

Again, going back to the commercial world, you would never have a situation where a managing director would go to the board and say, 'Look, I've done really, really badly, but it's not my fault.' Boards understand and parliaments should understand that there are things that are within the control of government and there are things that are outside the control of government. What we need to look at is: after 10 years of this government, how has this government performed in terms of those matters that are within its control?

This government has been in this place for 10 years and over this time we have had good years, from a macroeconomic perspective, and we have had poor years, and it is well documented. I do not need to go into it in too much detail, but this government has experienced what many refer to, both in this place and in the popular press, as 'rivers of gold' in terms of GST revenue and property tax revenues over and above what could have ever been budgeted.

The guts question to ask the government members is: how have they used that unexpected windfall gain into South Australia? Have they used it to reduce our debt? Have they used it to build productive infrastructure that is going to drive economic activity for our state moving forward? Have they used it in some way to build our capacity as a state? The answer to those three questions is, of course, no.

In each and every year of this government, despite having all this additional revenue coming into the state that they have never even budgeted for, this government has managed to overspend its own budget—the thing which is in its own control each and every year. In each and every single year of this Labor government, they have spent more money than they themselves budgeted. They have spent more money on the things they can control, not the things that they cannot control which they always want to talk about, but on the things they can control (their own spending). Each year they have failed South Australia.

Treasurer Foley knew this. He knew that his government was out of control in terms of spending, so in 2009 he set up the Sustainable Budget Commission to go into each government department and look at how they were spending the money and look for obvious waste that was existing within the government ranks. Interestingly, treasurer Foley decided not to release the information prepared by the Sustainable Budget Commission until after the 2010 election. He did not want to tell us about the pain which was about to hit us in South Australia, but he did recognise the need to rein in the spending of the government departments here in South Australia.

It would now seem evident that the government will be returning to that Sustainable Budget Commission report. The question is: why have they left it so long? Why have they left it until we are in crisis? Why have they left it until our AAA credit rating is completely and utterly in jeopardy? This is a government which has no-one else to blame except for itself.

In the Mid-Year Budget Review, only announced a few months ago, we heard from the Treasurer that there are going to be further deficits and further spending beyond the revenues that we are receiving. This financial year the government has predicted a deficit of \$367 million. Next financial year, it is predicted to be \$453 million. In 2013-14, it is predicted to be \$348 million. We just have to look at the next three years of the forward estimates to see that this government is

going to be racking up \$1.168 billion worth of spending over and above the revenues which we are going to receive into South Australia.

It is a very frightening situation, but to calm people down the Treasurer likes to explain it in simplistic terms. He likes to say that it is just like running the household budget. Let me tell you, I would like to have a look at his household budget. It is just like running the household budget! In fact, at the time of the last budget, he said to the South Australian people that he would not be putting spending on to the household credit card. Let me tell you, I have just given you the three figures—\$1.168 billion over the next three years that he is putting onto the credit card. He is putting it onto the state's credit card. We do not have money sitting in the bank; we do not have cash reserves to fund these deficits. The deficits come through additional debt.

That is spending on the current account—money in, money out—but that is only part of the story. Let's take a look at the capital account. In addition to the deficits that the government is running, it is also massively running up debt at the moment. In fact, in this financial year, the financial year we are currently in, if we add the deficit to the expenditure on the capital statement over and above the money coming back in on the capital statement, we will be running up debt in this state of \$1.5 billion in one year. That is more than \$4 million every single day. So, to go back to Treasurer Snelling's simplistic example of the household credit card, this government is putting \$4 million onto the household credit card—not every week, not every month, not every year, but every day. Every single day of this current financial year we have spent \$4 million that we just do not have, and that is what is ratcheting up our debt in South Australia.

Interest on the existing debt within the government is predicted by the end of the forward estimates to reach almost \$2 million a day; so on our existing debt levels, as projected within the forward estimates, \$2 million every day is just paying the interest on the debt we have actually already accrued. During these great years—rivers of gold, money coming into the state—we were still ratcheting up the debt, and \$2 million a day is going to this process. What is the government's response to this increasing and spiralling debt? Its response, incredibly, is to increase the debt. So, we have a situation where our debt is out of control, we are paying \$2 million a day in interest, and what is the government's response to this? Well, we will spend \$4 million a day that we do not even have.

Cost cutting is of course part of the solution necessary at the moment. We have seen profligate waste within virtually every single government department. We often hear about examples of government waste, in terms of our spend of over \$200 million a year on consultants, in terms of massive amounts on outsourced media advice—\$156 million over three years is spent in South Australia—and that gives you a real indication of where this government's priorities lie when you know it can spend \$156 million on outsourced government media advice, a key priority for this government. What about getting on with reducing wasteful spending within our government, getting our budget back into surplus, driving down the debt and investing in productive infrastructure in South Australia?

As I said, cost cutting will be a major focus for this government in the upcoming budget, but we need more from our government than just wholesale cost cutting. We need a government that is prepared to listen to people, listen to the business community, listen to the wider community, on how we can develop a shared vision of where we will go in South Australia. We need a lean and efficient government at this point. We do not need a government that is spending willy-nilly. We need a government that is focused on outcomes.

All too many times in this parliament, when we ask questions of the government about the performance of its departments, its answers only come back with inputs. They only want to tell us how much of our money they are spending on a process. They never want to focus on the outcomes for that process, which is absolutely crucial. Going back to the commercial world, you can imagine the scenario when the managing director sits down with the marketing director and says, 'Our sales are down; why are they down, we are performing really poorly?' and the answer comes back, 'Well, I'm spending lots of money.' Come on; get with the program! We need a government focused on delivering outcomes and not continually talking about what it is putting into the process.

We also need a government that is focused on delivering for every South Australian and not just for the ministers they serve. I strongly and genuinely believe that our government departments now spend too much of their time pandering to the needs of the minister. The minister is not the ultimate goal for our government. The ultimate goal is to serve the wider population. Too much of their time at the moment is running around creating photo opportunities, ribbon-cutting

opportunities and press release opportunities for government ministers rather than knuckling down to do the hard work to deliver for every South Australian.

Our government departments are in complete disarray—there is no doubt about it. They need to be focused on outcomes for South Australia and, most importantly, we need government departments that are focused on value for money. We do not want to just cut spending without there being a focus on value for money. Where money can be spent effectively, we need to maintain that funding and that is one of the things that worries us in the lead-up to the budget, that money being spent and delivering for South Australia will be cut.

In my own areas cuts to BEC funding, funds cuts to CITCSA, to the SME IDP, to Innovate SA, to Small Business Week, are just a few examples that I can think of off the top of my head that were delivering outcomes for business in South Australia but have been cut. Yet the profligate waste continues in each and every government department here in South Australia.

It is also important for government to recognise the importance of the small business sector and the family business sector here in South Australia. These sectors are doing it tough and we need to ensure that the cuts that the government makes in this upcoming budget are not cuts that are going to significantly and permanently disadvantage our small business and family business sector. They are the backbone of the South Australian economy. This is a government that has turned its back on these two sectors. There is no doubt that we have seen massive cuts to these sectors already, and we need to make sure that this government does not cut into the muscle when it is trying to trim the fat that exists.

We need a government which is focused on delivery and a government which is less focused on the spin which consumes each and every government minister most of their waking hours. We need a government which, importantly, pays its bills on time. We have seen plenty of press lately and we have had admissions from the government that its performance in terms of payments is completely unacceptable. We heard only last month that the government's late payments last financial year topped \$1.5 billion. This is money which should sit within businesses in South Australia. It is money that reduces their borrowings and therefore reduces their costs but, importantly, it actually provides capital which is so necessary to grow businesses in South Australia. If that money is not available to businesses then they cannot grow their businesses and they cannot employ South Australians.

Most importantly what we need is a government that thinks beyond the next press release (or rerelease); we need a government which thinks beyond the next election. We need a government which has a long-term vision for how we can move our state forward. I expect that this budget is going to be extremely tough, but what we need from government is not hours and hours in this house telling everybody, 'It's not my fault. GFC has overtaken us. The high Australian dollar has overtaken us. I'm the victim in this situation.' What we need is a treasurer, a premier or a government who stands up and takes responsibility and says, 'These are the things which I can control and these are the actions I am going to take,' not a government which stands up and says, 'Woe is me. All my money has gone. I can't help it. You're going to have to suffer the pain.' What I would like to see is a government that takes responsibility, takes action and delivers for all South Australians.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (12:22): I rise to speak to the Supply Bill. This bill is necessary for the first three months of 2012-13 until the Appropriation Bill is passed through parliament and receives assent. I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the economic mismanagement of this government.

Despite a warning from the Auditor-General who said the state 'may have developed a culture of expecting growing revenues to continue to supporting increasing expenses', Labor has continued to spend more than it earns. This government is a high spend, high debt government. State debt will reach \$11 billion once the new hospital is included, around the same figure at the time of the State Bank collapse. This debt factors in the selling of the Lotteries Commission and the forests, which I think is appalling. Total liabilities, including debt and unfunded superannuation, will soon reach \$23 billion. Things will get even worse if the state loses its AAA credit rating, as interest rates will increase.

There has been an \$800 million worsening in the 2011-12 budget position over the past four years. The government was forecasting a \$424 million surplus for 2011-12 but years of unsustainable spending and waste have led to a \$367 million deficit. This government cannot even call tenders properly. We have seen huge blowouts in many major projects, particularly the

Bakewell Bridge and the Anzac Highway underpass. There is also the electrification of the Gawler line: it is three years since the tenders were called but nothing has been decided. A lot of money has been wasted—a lot of money from private companies tendering—but I understand that has not progressed at all.

We talk about this government having these austerity measures, with cuts being implemented in so many areas, but do we see a cut in the Premier's spin team? Expenditure of \$186 million over the next three years on contract media services and \$500,000 (that is half a million) for a United States company, Socialtext—and this is on top of the community engagement division the Premier has within his own department. What a disgrace in times like this. We do not see cuts here, do we? This is on top of the new initiatives, as described on the government's tenders and contracts website, over the next two years—and I quote:

Over the next two years, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet will be leading and trialling cutting edge public engagement initiatives...Through this procurement process, the Department aims to establish a panel of specialists' providers of communication and community engagement services...

How much taxpayer money is the Premier and the government going to waste on spin doctors? How can this be justified? When the Keith hospital needs a lousy \$300,000 a year to remain open, how can you justify these huge expenditures? When Stirling CFS is out rattling the can to raise \$180,000 to cover the shortfall for its new station, how can you justify the expenditure in the Premier's department? When country hospitals are having staff cut back in cleaning and maintenance areas, how can you justify it? When the budget for agriculture has been gutted, with funding to the Advisory Board of Agricultural ceasing this year, cuts to staff and the PIRSA budget totally devastated and when so many South Australian families are struggling to make ends met, how can you justify these huge, wasteful expenses?

I would like to hear how the Premier justifies the following expenditure. An amount of \$32 million has been spent on consultants for the new RAH PPP. SA Water spent \$33 million in one year on consultants, which is funded out of our water bills. And what about SA Water's office? As I drive through Victoria Square, I can see that massive office up there for SA Water—what it cost just to fit it out was huge. Then, when I drive along the country roads and see the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline rusting to bits—what a disgrace!—and I am told that it is even rustier on the inside.

You drive between, say, Spalding and Burra and have a look at the pipeline. It is a disgrace—it is rusting—and this is a most important asset to the community. Imagine what it would cost to replace that pipeline, for the sake of a coat of paint. It is rusting; it is terrible. Yet they can fit out the 'Taj Mahal' in Victoria Square. If you ever saw a government that has lost control and has lost its priority, that is a point in time. I ask members to go and have a look—I am not making this up. There are miles and miles of pipeline just rusting to bits and, if it is rusting on the inside as well, I am very concerned about that.

At least \$68,000 was spent on Rann's farewell party, and there is an additional \$100,000 for perks he will enjoy post politics. Almost \$1 million was spent on printer cartridges by government departments, possibly at inflated prices and in exchange for personal benefits. Cartridgegate! An amount of \$900,000 was spent by ministerial offices without the necessary approval. \$900,000? I cannot believe that.

After 10 years of running the state's finances, Labor has got the budget into such a bad position, even though South Australia is the highest taxed state in the nation already and the budget already includes the revenue from the forward sale of the state's forests and the Lotteries Commission. It is already in there! So, what is left for next time? And the state is still faced with its credit rating being downgraded. I presume we will learn that, with the state budget coming up very shortly.

WorkCover's unfunded liability has now blown out to \$1.17 billion. Labor's management of the WorkCover scheme has been an unmitigated disaster—and I sit on the occupational health and safety committee, which is doing the inquiry. Employers are paying the highest levies, and the scheme is suffering from the worst return-to-work rates in the nation, even after we revisited that in this parliament.

A large company in my electorate has brought a situation to my attention which demonstrates how, under this government, the WorkCover scheme has got out of control. A contract employee for this company (a cleaner) working approximately five hours per week for an 18-month period put in a claim for hearing loss and was awarded nearly \$20,000. I will say that this

person was in their later years, so it could be questioned whether that partial hearing loss can be attributed to old age, or whether it was in fact caused by their employment.

There is another case I am aware of where an employee went on WorkCover for an extended period of time due to stress in the workplace. At the same time, she was trying to get a wage increase. Her case manager said she could not return to work until her remuneration claim was worked through; basically, the employer was held to ransom. This small employer nearly lost his long-term business as a result.

I do not begrudge people being compensated when they are genuinely injured at work, but the escalating unfunded liabilities and the poor return-to-work rates demonstrate that it is not working. No wonder it is hard to maintain a business in South Australia, as well as all the other hurdles we put in their way.

Let's examine the health portfolio for a moment—more than a moment. The recently released report by the Health Performance Council has exposed what we on this side of the house knew would be the case: the dysfunction and community dissatisfaction that has been caused as a result of the replacement of country hospital boards with health advisory councils (HACs). We on this side of the house fought tooth and nail to see our hospital boards retained, to no avail. This report has exposed a litany of failures with HACs. I wonder how much this whole exercise has cost, and for what? Very little return.

In fact, I know of many long-serving, hardworking members of the previous hospital boards who remained when the transition to HACs occurred, but no more. Many have just walked away, unable to feel that they are able to achieve anything. These good people, who were loyal volunteers for many years, are now lost to the health system. HACs are nothing more than a mouthpiece to the minister, with all their powers to bring about change and be effective advocates for their community removed. I was also a member of a HAC, and that is absolutely how I saw it.

The Health Performance Council's 'Review of country health advisory councils' governance arrangements', released in December 2011 has found that:

...the ingredients for successful change were not evident, lacked effective implementation, or were still under development, despite these relationships operating for three years...

The level of satisfaction with the governance arrangements between [country HACs] and the local health system from the perspective of community members, [HACs] and local health service staff is low...

Country HACs...are not well supported or promoted by the health system.

This report clearly brands the minister's approach to true community engagement and decision-making about country hospitals a failure. It is clear that HACs are not being supported and have been set up to fail.

HACs are not the only failure of this government in health. There has been a \$125 million overspend across the health portfolio, and a \$15 million blowout in the cost of Glenside hospital. This blowout places at risk of cancellation or delay many of the new capital works projects announced in the 2011-12 budget, including: hospital redevelopments at Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln, expansion of regional cancer services at several locations, a dental clinic at Wallaroo, the upgrade of Mount Gambier's ambulance station, the upgrade at Cummins Hospital, and a project in Adelaide and the regions to upgrade the regions' BreastScreen SA's digital mammography.

Largely, the projects at risk are those in rural and regional country South Australia. Of course, the Barossa hospital is not even a dream anymore. I have had it on the wish list for a long time and I have to say that, with a litany of problems like that, it is even further and further away, which is very sad indeed. Other failures I wish to highlight include the \$500,000 and counting which has been spent on consultants to try and fix the ministerial financial reporting mess—she's right; no problem; another half a million just to fix a mess that you have created—and the budgeted health workforce's blowing out by 458 positions. They are not doctors, nurses or orderlies: they are middle-order managers.

The number of full-time equivalent positions in the department of health's corporate headquarters has exploded from 938 in 2009 to 1,859 in 2011—two years; have a look at that. How can that happen? An increase of 921 full-time positions—almost double. Of these head office staff, those earning more than \$127,000 has risen from 63 in 2010 to 136 in 2011, an increase of 116 per cent. If just three of those extra positions had not been created, there would have been enough money to finance the operating costs of the Keith Hospital.

Just last week we learned that maintenance and minor works for our hospitals have been centralised, with local, loyal staff being the ones to lose out. Who will fix the leaky tap on the weekend? They will not be coming up from Adelaide, I can assure you.

The shared services initiative is another one of the government's failures. It was a flawed premise from the very start, aimed at moving jobs from country areas—payroll in particular—and centralising them in the city. The most recent debacle saw 1,250 South Australian ambulance employees waiting for two or more extra days to be paid. What a disgrace that is.

The government estimated that this program would make ongoing savings of \$60 million per annum once fully implemented, but this project also has been bungled. It was supposed to cost \$128 million (compared to an initial budget of \$60 million) and the Auditor-General has identified a savings shortfall of \$93 million over the forward estimates.

The government is not confident about meeting this savings task and has therefore parked a contingency amount from the budget to cover the shortfall, which will not adversely affect the budget's bottom line. I quote again from the Auditor-General's Report 2010-11, Part A, page 13:

The budget continues to include a contingency to allow for the possibility that savings from Shared Services are not achieved.

What a damning statement that is. Aside from the budget blowouts in implementing the flawed shared services initiative, it was recently revealed that money unpaid by the state government to its suppliers of goods and services has reached \$1.5 billion. This is what happens when services are centralised in Adelaide: local knowledge is lost and small and medium businesses are left out of pocket when they should not be.

In my own electorate office I have been embarrassed because accounts for the local newsagent, or similar, have been sent with a reminder sticker attached. I would bet that most other members would have similar examples. This is simply not good enough, and it further demonstrates the contempt that this government has for all South Australians.

The Labor government here needs to follow the lead of the Western Australian and Queensland governments, which have both abandoned this model. Queensland ditched its shared services scheme in 2010 following payroll problems and Western Australia followed suit in 2011 and scrapped its consolidated IT functions after substantial financial losses of \$400 million.

Moving away from matters related to economics, a big change went through recently with the grain industry. Glencore, which is a Swiss company (the second-largest grain company in the world), has been bought out by Viterro (the sixth largest company in the world). So the main handler of our grain will now be the second biggest company in the world, and no Australian directors will sit on the board.

Now that deregulation of wheat marketing has gone through, the Wheat Exporting Authority will go. The WEA was there to implement the quality control of our grain and to maintain the standard. What will happen without it? Grain that is classed as feed quality will probably be used in our food supply. It is time for the Australian federal and state governments to become more involved with our food security. We see money being put into manufacturing; why not into protecting our food interests?

I should say that I am not against Holden at all. I think it is important that we have a car industry in Australia, but all this \$270 million package is doing is compensating federal Labor's carbon tax. The government is taking with one hand and giving with the other. I understand that estimates of the impact of the carbon tax on Holden increased costs by \$40 million or \$50 million per year. Effectively, all this payment does is nullify the impact of this tax for five years.

I think it is important that we all stop and reflect on the result in Queensland. That result demonstrates that people are not going to put up with increased taxes. Over the forward estimates, the Labor government will collect almost \$800 million in extra taxes above the 2011-12 levels and increase the cost of living. When the government is supposed to be governing for the people, it is mismanaging and wasting revenue.

The state Labor government here should take note: it spends money on items that really are extravagant—as I mentioned earlier—and millions of dollars for nothing, and it has nothing tangible to show for it. The hospital on the rail yard is such an example: it is a pure extravagance. The hospital will cost \$3.2 billion (net present cost), not the \$1.7 billion promised before the election. Taxpayer payments to the hospital consortia will be \$1.1 million per day for 30 years, or

\$12 billion in total repayments—\$12 billion on one hospital. What a disgrace! Where are we going? What of the future?

These costs exclude doctors, nurses and medical equipment. Private investors in the project will receive 12 to 15 per cent annual profit for investing, amounting to a total of \$1.7 billion in profits. I cannot do that, even though I am a pretty good farmer. If you raise that sort of money, that is exorbitant. That really is a huge rate of return. It must be a bad investment, otherwise I cannot see why you have to pay quite so much.

The recent estimate that it will cost \$40 million for a footbridge to link Adelaide Oval with North Terrace is ludicrous. A similar project—the Seafarers Bridge, which links the Melbourne convention centre and the Docklands precinct—was built for \$17 million. How is it that Melbourne is able to build a similar footbridge, albeit a little smaller, for less than half the cost? Bob Ahrens and I inspected this site some months ago. I am very confident that his company could have built this bridge at a fraction of the cost, albeit not quite so glamorous.

Moving on to another topic that I feel very strongly about, I would like to say how appalled I am at the findings of the \$370,000 report into ANZAC Day. The report was undertaken by the ANZAC Centenary Advisory Board. The report claims that the commemoration is a double-edged sword and a potential area of divisiveness because of multiculturalism.

Some 288 people were quizzed for the report. How can they even think to endorse such conclusions from such a small sample? I do not believe these findings reflect what Australians think at all at any time. It is a disgrace and another gross waste of money. This report is an example of another Labor government—a federal Labor government this time—wasting taxpayers' money, which seems to be the common theme of Labor governments.

The skyrocketing cost of living that many South Australians are experiencing is a direct result of 10 years of Labor's economic mismanagement. After a decade of neglect, families, employers, small businesses and our economy are struggling under Labor. In a nutshell, Labor has governed in South Australia for over 10 years. It has had the greatest windfall receipts with record GST payments—money to burn, and that is just what they did. They burnt it.

I was on the Public Works Committee from 2002 to 2006 and we saw no major infrastructure work at all with all this extra money. It was amazing. You just wondered what they were doing with it. Where did it all go? Well, I have just told you: waste, especially in spin teams, mismanagement, jobs for the boys, bungles, bad tendering processes. Generally everything that they have done has turned bad and now we realise, 10 years later, we are the highest taxed state in Australia. How can this be, and what do we have to show for it?

It is a disgrace and, as an MP, I am sick of being stereotyped: 'You MPs are hopeless.' Just look at our position: industry closures, ever-increasing cost of living, housing shortages, shortage of rental housing. It is a disgrace and I am not very proud to be an MP with this around.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:43): I rise to support the Supply Bill. The \$3.161 billion is to be given the push ahead into South Australia and it really gives me a great pain just to look at the state of play in South Australia at the moment, particularly with what has come away from the budget, and particularly with a government that seems to be focused on looking after the capital city of South Australia but continually ignoring the needs and the demands of the regions within this state.

The main concern that I have with the regions is that they are suffering. The regions are suffering while this government continues to push huge amounts of funding into projects that are really cosmetic. They are feel-good projects. They are not projects for the long-term sustainability of the state. We look at some of the rising debt over forward estimates—\$8.2 billion. We look at a \$263 million deficit in 2010-11. Financial liabilities will be up to \$20 billion by 2014. That is a very, very scary projection of where the state will be in only two years' time.

The current government is unable to control spending, and it bothers me that they are unable to control spending as much as they are unable to control the waste. They are unable to control exactly how they can prioritise good spending. We look at selling off money-making assets and these large projects, particularly an election promise that we would build a rail yards hospital at a promised cost of \$1.7 billion. All of a sudden, the rail yard hospital costs \$3.2 billion. The Adelaide Oval promised cost was \$450 million and not a cent more; all of a sudden, it is \$535 million. Then we are going to have car parks and footbridges, all these added costs to an out-of-control spending program by this government.

The desal plant has been increased from a 50-gigalitre desal plant. I applauded that because I thought it was a great diversification, with Adelaide's water requirements and also as a drought measure. However, it was not accurately costed, and all of a sudden we realised that we would have to interconnect the south to the north with a large pipeline and pumping facilities at another cost of over \$200 million. The government does not have a good concept of just what the cost will be into the future.

We look at country health, particularly in the regions and up in Chaffey. This government took away the rights of hospital boards. The boards disappeared and now we have the HACs. As the member for Schubert just said, those HACs are just a mouthpiece for the minister. They have not achieved anything concrete, they have not achieved anything with fabric that would embrace country hospitals. It created a lot of angst that those country boards were not able to embrace their hospital and move it forward, and we now have these HACs that are gagged.

If I go to a department, a HAC, or someone for some information, looking for some advice or just progress, those HACs cannot speak to me. They have to go to the minister to get his permission. It is called 'protocol'. It is just outrageous that this government can gag anyone who is prepared to come out and give out some information.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Your government established that protocol.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister for Health? No. Again, more country people need to travel to Adelaide. There have been broken promises about surgery, particularly at the Renmark and Loxton hospitals. There were pledges that they would not take away services, they would not take away funding, and yet we have seen it disappear. Particularly in Chaffey, we have the Berri Hospital finally underway—two years late, and all of a sudden we are seeing staff taken away from the other hospitals and placed at Berri.

Funding has been taken away from other hospitals, particularly in the Riverland, and being redirected to Berri. That means patients have to drive over 100 kilometres to visit a hospital. Again, that is something for the regions that is completely different from the city and, again, it is a city-centric government that has no real balance in governing South Australia; it is a city-centric government that is governing for Adelaide.

The travelling time to country hospitals is increasing. Every time a service is centralised people have to travel further, and if they are not travelling further to a country hospital they have to travel further to Adelaide to receive treatment. Constituents are telling me that they are having their PAT scheme (accommodation allowance) taken away from them—a \$50 allowance for a visit to Adelaide. They have to travel 300 kilometres to Adelaide, having to stay the night, for either treatment or surgery, and now the government is taking away that \$50 allowance. It is outrageous, and it just goes to show that the people in the regions are given less and less priority when it comes to consideration for health.

The biggest ticket that South Australia is about to face is the cost of living, the cost of doing business here in South Australia. The average South Australian household is going to pay a projected \$750 extra per year in government charges, taxes and other utilities. It is outrageous that South Australia, which is slowly slipping down the economic ladder in the national picture, is being told to pay more, and that is for an incompetent government with out-of-control spending. Water bills have trebled under Labor. The impact of spending money on these big projects, particularly the desal plant, is that every person in South Australia is paying for that.

We see the removal of the River Murray levy for those people who are not using the River Murray. So, why are there constituents in Chaffey, who are not using desal water, who are paying for the desal plant? It is outrageous. SA Water is being treated as a cash cow by this government. Ageing infrastructure will be the next cost to the incoming government. What we are seeing is that we are spending all of our money on buying and paying for a desal plant but, as the member for Schubert said, we are not looking at the infrastructure: the rusty pipes, the old underground cement pipes that are breaking, the upgrade of pumping facilities and the maintenance programs. All we are doing is looking after our own backsides on a day-to-day basis. It is very concerning.

Only 4 per cent of small businesses in South Australia support Labor policies. Most of that lack of support comes through red tape. A lot of those small businesses need approval to expand their business, or approval to move into a new market or have the facilities to enable them to be a part of a new market. They are continually stonewalled by red tape, and this government is so good at putting up red tape. It is driving those small businesses interstate, particularly with power

upgrades and the concessions the government would give to underpin someone considering setting up a new business in South Australia.

I will move back to the desal plant. The interconnector pumping facilities are just now slowly having the ribbons cut. This government is looking at a ribbon-cutting exercise; it is not about getting those projects up and running. If we look at the desal plant, when is that desal plant going to be up and running? The desal plant has been on a promise for a long time now. I suggest that we will still be looking at that promise in another 12 months' time.

If we look at the funding that went behind that desal plant, it is absolute smoke and mirrors. There is \$228 million of funding. All of a sudden we are looking at GST revenue being scaled back to offset the plant. If we look at the water that had to be given to the commonwealth for that funding, it was six gigalitres of water. I do not see that anywhere. It was never projected that the state government would have to spend taxpayers' money on six gigalitres of water, at a mere cost of \$10 million to \$12 million. The state government has a huge water portfolio that it does not need to use on an annual basis. Why did it not go to its water bank and transfer six gigalitres of water out of SA Water's cash cow account and put it into the federal government's account, rather than put the burden on the South Australian taxpayers? It really does make you wonder where its priorities are.

The \$535 million Adelaide Oval upgrade: 12,000 seats for \$535 million. Yes, it will be a great stadium. Yes, it will bring football back to Adelaide. But at what cost, for 12,000 seats? It is a government that has the polish on the spin, it really is. Look at the \$3.2 billion rail yard hospital. Can anyone here today tell me that it is in a good spot? Is it in a good spot for parking? Is it in a good spot for access? Is it in a good central location for every person in South Australia? No, it is not. It is going to make it a more congested part of Adelaide.

We hear the Premier this morning saying that people need to walk more. Are they going to have to walk to hospital? Are we talking about the Adelaide council saying that we need to promote bicycles and we need to promote less parking in the city? How are people going to get to hospital? How are they going to park, exactly? Tell me there. We have got one railway line going past that hospital. Are they actually going to put a facility there for people to get off the train and walk into the hospital? To date, no, they are not.

I would like to just come back to the regions again. I think it is vitally important that we show a bit of foresight for what the regions are actually offering this state. Again, while we support having the Holden package of \$50 million from South Australia as part of a \$275 million package to protect up to 16,000 jobs, I wonder if anyone realises that the food industry here in South Australia is the biggest employer in the manufacturing sector—yes, it is the food industry.

Most people would say that manufacturing revolves around the automotive industry or the component industry—it is food. Not only is it the biggest employer in the manufacturing sector, we have the most reliance on the food sector here in South Australia. Yet, what we are seeing over and over again is that this current government continues to pull funding and pull support.

PIRSA's budget was cut by \$34 million last year in the budget. Labor is ignoring the contribution of agriculture to this state's economy. Again, the biggest driver of this state's economy is agriculture. Mining is not there yet. We are still coming away from a sector that is not fully developed. We are looking at the mining industry which is perceived to be our saviour. Let me assure you that the mining sector is not there yet. Agriculture has been there for 100 years and will continue to be there for another 100 years and we need to give them support.

Again, we look at cuts to SARDI research spending; that is short-sighted. We look at \$4 million of cuts to regional service. Again, I see that the women in agriculture and business have had funding cut and their role is absolutely pivotal. Every woman in this chamber today would agree that behind every successful man or business is a good woman. Those women are a huge support to industry, to business and also to their male counterparts who are in business. Whether it be in agriculture or business, again we see this government being focused on cost cutting and not looking at the bigger picture.

We look at biosecurity. It is being cut by \$12 million and now we are seeing this government looking at some more cost recovery for biosecurity. It is outrageous. The priorities they have are so wrong. It must be there to protect South Australia's most valuable industry. Those biosecurity threats are not only fruit fly, phylloxera and citrus canker: it is the livestock diseases. More importantly, the livestock diseases in animal biosecurity are steadily and inevitably becoming

closely integrated with human health. Those animal diseases are now being more and more closely related to humans being at risk of biosecurity threats.

Again, we have this government continuing to want to do cost recovery. They want to give the onus to the industry and take away the onus from them being responsible. Every South Australian relies on having the safety of biosecurity and no biosecurity threats. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

ZERO WASTE SA (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COMMUNITY AND STRATA TITLES) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

WATER INDUSTRY BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (LOOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SUPERANNUATION) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of students from Mount Barker Waldorf School, years 11 and 12, who are guests of the member for Kavel. Welcome; it is nice to see you here. We also have a group of students from St Michael's College, also years 11 and 12, who are guests of the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Welcome to you also; it is nice to see you here and we hope you enjoy your time here. I am sure members will be very well behaved for you.

PARADISE INTERCHANGE

Mr GARDNER (Morialta): Presented a petition signed by 1,088 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to provide funding for improved car parking facilities at the Paradise Interchange.

MC GEE, MR EUGENE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Presented a petition signed by 261 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the Attorney-General to refer the conduct of Mr Eugene McGee in relation to the death of Mr Ian Humphrey on 30 November 2003 to the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

DEFENCE SECTOR

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite)** (26 October 2010) (First Session).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): In response to a question asked of former Minister Foley, I am advised that Bardavcol Pty Ltd was the contractor awarded the site preparation works for stages 3 and 4 of Techport Australia.

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to various members (Estimates Committees A and B).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): TVSPs have been available since 1 November, 2010. Agencies report that as at 30 June, 2011, 430 employees separated either through TVSPs, or early termination payments to executives as a consequence of a savings measure.

The number of TVSPs that agencies ultimately offer in each financial year will be influenced by the extent to which FTE reductions are achieved through means other than TVSPs (for example, natural attrition); the timing of FTE reductions; the number of TVSPs offered for reorganisations not related to the savings measures; and the rate of uptake of TVSPs by those employees who are made an offer.

Thus, it is not possible in advance to determine, for each agency, how many TVSPs will be offered for the financial years 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 and 2014-15.

MANUFACTURING, INNOVATION, TRADE, RESOURCES AND ENERGY DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Norwood)** (29 February 2012).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business): I am advised, the Department's payment history for the financial years 2009-10, 2010-11 was within the Government benchmark of 90 per cent of invoices paid by the due date.

For the financial year ending 30 June 2011 the then Department of Trade and Economic Development paid 92.8 per cent of all invoices by the due date.

The new Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy is on track to surpass the 90 per cent threshold yet again.

The average for the first seven months is 89.8 per cent.

Only two months have been below the 90 per cent benchmark—December and January. I understand these two months were affected by the Christmas period in which many businesses are closed, making it difficult to finalise accounts.

I am confident this benchmark will be achieved yet again.

I am advised, the results for the year ended 30 June 2011 are an improvement of 2.02 per cent in performance for accounts paid by the due date from the 2009-10 financial year.

PRIVATE HEALTH INSURANCE REBATE

In reply to the **Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport)** (29 February 2012).

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): The Department of Treasury and Finance has not undertaken any modelling on the impact to the state budget from means testing the private health insurance rebate.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The state government will today give notice to introduce a bill to create an Independent Commissioner against Corruption and an Office of Public Integrity. The community expects its government to be open and accountable and should have confidence that decisions its government makes are made for the right reasons. The community also expects the same set of rules that apply to it should apply to office holders involved in public decision-making.

This bill provides a completely independent and easily accessible place to go if they have any basis for thinking this is not the case. The South Australian Independent Commissioner against Corruption will be completely independent of government, with powers equal to any crime-fighting body in Australia. If passed unamended, this legislation will create the most effective and publicly accessible anti-corruption structure in Australia. Not only will this bill create an independent and powerful ICAC, it will also establish a one-stop shop—the Office of Public Integrity—to process

complaints about public administration, ranging from misconduct to serious corruption. The OPI will be overseen by an independent commissioner, a position we will seek to fill as soon as the bill is passed.

The ICAC will have significant powers to gather evidence and compel witnesses to answer questions, based on the successful Australian Crime Commission model established in 2002. The ICAC's powers will be significant and its independence will be guaranteed. For this reason, the bill includes a number of important measures to ensure accountability and as much transparency as is possible for such a high-powered investigative body. The commissioner will have the power to make public statements about the ICAC's work in the public interest. However, he or she will be required to consider the prejudicial effect on a person's reputation or the capacity of a public statement to damage a potential prosecution.

A new joint committee of parliament will be formed to examine the ICAC's report to parliament and reports from the Police Ombudsman and the Commissioner of Police. The seven-member Crime and Corruption Policy Review Committee will report to both houses of parliament on any matter of policy affecting public administration arising out of any of these reports. The proposed committee will also review reports provided to parliament under the government's anti-crime gang legislation. In addition, a reviewer will be appointed each year to conduct a review of the exercise of the powers of the ICAC during that financial year, and a report on the review will be tabled in parliament.

Overseas and interstate experience shows us that preventing corruption before it arises is the best anti-corruption strategy. One of the ICAC's most significant functions will be education, with a particular focus on government departments and agencies. The legislation sets out the role of the ICAC as the identification and investigation of corruption in public administration, and the prevention or minimisation of corruption, misconduct and maladministration in public administration. The OPI's role is to receive and assess complaints about public administration and to make recommendations about which body should investigate each complaint.

Where a complaint is assessed as involving an allegation of corruption, the OPI must refer it to the ICAC. The OPI is the publicly accessible shopfront while the ICAC will have the powers and resources to investigate and root out corrupt activity. Neither the OPI nor the ICAC will prosecute offences. Rather, they will make recommendations to South Australia Police and the Director of Public Prosecutions about matters they believe should be prosecuted.

Under the bill the ICAC will appoint investigators who will hold search powers under a warrant to access personal details, to search people, places and vehicles, and to seize evidence. Investigators will also be able to use listening and surveillance devices. The ICAC will also have the power to conduct an examination: a powerful investigative tool which includes the use of coercive powers.

Failure to comply with the directions of an examiner may result in a witness facing contempt proceedings in the Supreme Court. A fine of \$20,000 or four years' imprisonment will be the maximum penalty for providing false or misleading evidence during an examination. The government will also introduce the Telecommunications (Interception) Bill 2012 to allow the ICAC to use telephone intercepts.

I am confident that this bill will give South Australia the best anti-corruption framework in the nation. This South Australian solution will balance serious powers with accountability and independence, and forensic investigation with public education. Ultimately, I believe this model will ensure that South Australians will have confidence in the integrity of our public institutions.

The SPEAKER: Order! There's a lot of background noise today; people are chatting at the top of their voices to each other.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Legal Practitioners—Fees

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Development Plan Amendment—

Adelaide (City) Development Plan by the Minister Report
Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale—Revised—Protection Districts by the Minister Report
City Centre Heritage—City of Adelaide Report
Installation of Freestanding Air Conditioning Units and Associated Screening Enclosures—Norwood Primary School by the Minister Report
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—Miscellaneous Schedule Variations 2012

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

Adelaide Oval Redevelopment and Management Act—
SACA Licence Deed between Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and South Australian Cricket Association Inc
SANFL Licence Deed between Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and South Australian National Football League Inc
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—
Carriage of Number Plates—Motor Trike
Historic, Left-Hand Drive and Street Rod Vehicles
Penalty Fee Increases
Road Traffic—Penalty Fee Increases

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

Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Annual Report 2010-11
Death of—
Kunmanara Brown Report of actions taken in response to the Deputy Coroner's Recommendations
Vincent Norman Rigney Report of actions taken by SA Health following Coronial Inquest
Health Advisory Council—
Barossa and Districts Annual Report 2010-11
Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal Annual Report 2010-11
Country Health SA Board Annual Report 2010-11
Eastern Eyre Annual Report 2010-11
Hills Area Annual Report 2010-11
Kingston/Robe Annual Report 2010-11
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Annual Report 2010-11
South Coast Annual Report 2010-11
Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2010-11
South Australian Abortion Reporting Committee—Annual Report 2010

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

Death of—Vincent Norman Rigney Report of actions taken by Correctional Services following Coronial Inquest
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Correctional Services—Drug Testing of Prisoners

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

Response by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation to the 60th Report of the Natural Resources Committee—Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002—June 2010-July 2011

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

Police Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Report 2010-11

By the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. T.R. Kenyon)—

Training and Skills Commission—Annual Report 2011

By the Minister for Transport Services (Hon. C.C. Fox)—

South Australian Local Government Grants Commission—Annual Report 2010-11
Local Council By-Laws—
Adelaide City Council—No. 10—Smoking Control

HEALTH, ORACLE CORPORATE SYSTEM

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:15): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In June 2007, I launched South Australia's Health Care Plan which aims to improve patient services by transforming the health system from individual, competing entities into a single, integrated system. System-wide service planning and delivery is essential in a jurisdiction the size of South Australia to ensure timely and equitable access to services and economies of scale. The 2008 Health Care Act provided the legislative framework for this new approach. The move to a statewide financial operating system, Oracle, and the centralisation of the financial services, provide the financial and procurement framework to support this new approach.

The new Oracle Corporate System is more than just a financial system replacing 18 separate and outdated financial systems. It includes a number of applications which, once fully implemented, will cover purchasing, procurement, cash and order management and warehouse management. In line with the move to an integrated health system, the Auditor-General has, quite properly, for the first time, audited the Department of Health and all of the regions and entities as a whole. Previously, the Auditor-General's Report to parliament contained only the financial reports for the Department of Health. The 2010-11 Auditor-General's Report identifies a number of audit issues, many of which, as has been noted, are associated with the implementation of the Oracle Corporate System.

In introducing this new system, SA Health sought advice from Ernst & Young, which raised similar issues to the Auditor-General in three reports presented in 2010. These reports, which I now table, point to an ambitious implementation schedule and an underestimation of the complexities of this task. SA Health endeavoured to mitigate the issues raised by Ernst & Young through a range of strategies, including engaging increased system support through the system integrator, IBM. SA Health has also engaged accounting firm PKF Business Advisers for work, which is now almost complete, at an estimated cost of no more than \$1,700,00. This work includes a review of finance functions around—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This work includes a review of finance functions around—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood, behave!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This work includes a review of finance functions around Cash and Debt management operations, following their integration within the Oracle module in September 2011. From October 2011, PKF also assisted in the review and consolidation of legacy banking arrangements and provided additional support to the bank reconciliation functions for the former Adelaide Health Service and the Children, Youth and Women's Health Service. Later, the department extended this work to all the health regions and the consolidation of legacy banking arrangements and the provision of bank reconciliation support.

Based on PKF's knowledge of the SA Health portfolio and, in particular, the revenue function and processes through their existing involvement, and the time critical nature of the work, the department engaged PKF without going to public tender. I am advised that this approach complies with State Procurement Board policies and guidelines and, in particular, is consistent with the justification for a direct negotiation procurement strategy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Following the reconciliation of around \$60 million undertaken by SA Health, with the additional support of PKF, the residual 2010-11 bank clearing issues of \$2.8 million are being finalised now. I am advised that throughout the reconciliation process no inappropriate transactions were identified. The bank accounts for all health entities are now being reconciled monthly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The challenges experienced during the first stage of Oracle's implementation have led to a—

Mr Marshall: What a mess!

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Norwood! You will have a chance to speak in the grievance debate if you have a problem.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The challenges experienced during the first stage of Oracle's implementation have led to a reconsideration of the phase 2 implementation. Advice was sought on how to manage this and has resulted in slowing the implementation of phase 2, increased oversight and the introduction of an independent board. In 2007, when the government introduced the SA Health Care Plan, we identified that there were many things that needed to be done to give us in South Australia a modern healthcare system. The main focus has always been on better patient outcomes, and figures released—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Our focus has been on improved health outcomes for the patients who use our system every day. Figures that I was able to release yesterday, from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW), show that our approach has paid dividends. This has required a lot of focused work by my agency, working in cooperation with other government departments, along with the efforts of our many thousands of doctors and nurses who work in our system every day of the year.

In time, the integration of our financial systems and the implementation of Oracle will enable a single consistent reporting format to be used, providing standardised reporting to every functional cost centre across SA Health entities. This will allow real-time reporting and visibility over health service operations down to a ward-by-ward level, enabling far greater managerial and financial control. Once fully implemented, efficiencies will also generate annual savings of up to \$8 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —how many chances does he get, Madam Speaker?—through finance staff reductions alone, and will support a total reduction of 220 full-time equivalent staff through reductions in financial, procurement and supply staff. These are savings which are administrative in nature and are designed to free up funds for frontline health services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Norwood, you will leave the chamber for 30 minutes.

The honourable member for Norwood having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME**ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL**

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Why did the minister's then chief of staff, Catherine Hockley, request information from the health department during the caretaker period of the 2010 election campaign in relation to the Liberal Party's plan to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital? The opposition has obtained emails under FOI from minister Hill's then chief of staff seeking health department advice in order to attack the Liberal Party's policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:26): It is an assumption that the member makes that it was to attack their policies. What it was about, I am sure, under my direction, was to find out what the cost of your policies were so the public were better informed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MARINE PARKS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the recent progress in completing South Australia's marine parks?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:27): I can, Madam Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for his question. Last November, the Minister for Environment and I postponed the release of the draft management plans for the state's marine parks to allow further discussions to occur with key interest groups to find common ground on marine parks zoning.

We had got to a situation where there was a stalemate between the various interests between the groups. So, I am pleased to inform members that this pause, which was to enable a re-engagement to occur, took place on Friday 27 April, when this government reached a key milestone in the path of creating these 19 marine parks for South Australia.

Last Friday, we unveiled a map of priority conservation areas agreed to by representatives of the conservation interests—the commercial and recreational interests. The map, which incorporates much of the work that had been carried out by the local groups (the marine park local advisory groups), is now the blueprint for the location of sanctuary zones in each of the South Australian 19 marine parks.

The detailed discussions that led to this blueprint focused on areas of high ecological significance and value for research, education and ecotourism. They also focused on the social and economic implications. Efforts were made to simplify the design of the sanctuary zones and make them less complex and more efficient to manage, while minimising impacts on recreation and commercial fishing.

Marine parks offer enormous value to South Australia. They are a means of protecting our precious marine environment for the future but also a significant marketing opportunity for the future. South Australia is home to an incredible array of truly unique marine ecology. Something like 80-odd per cent, or over that sum, is unique to South Australia. Things and places such as seagrass meadows, fish spawning areas, mangroves and reefs are absolutely crucial for the healthy ecology of our marine environment.

Sanctuary zones are an essential part of marine parks, where small selections of marine habitat and the creatures that call them home are set aside for conservation. We have now a proposed zoning plan that will set aside areas of high natural value while preserving access for South Australians who rely upon the sea for recreation and income. It is a win for the environment and for those who fish within our waters.

South Australians will continue to enjoy our recreational fishing pursuits, including shoreline fishing at our popular beaches and all jetties and breakwaters. The work of developing the draft management plans and impact statements incorporating proposed sanctuary zones is proceeding, and we intend to release the statutory process in the coming months.

I would especially like to thank the community volunteers in the 14 local advisory groups who gave up their time. They have done an enormous amount of work in what was, in some cases, quite challenging circumstances. I would like to thank the leaders from the conservation, recreational and commercial fishing sectors and the Chair of the Marine Parks Council and the Chair of the Scientific Working Group for their contribution. Most importantly, the recent forum was chaired by minister Caica, and I want to acknowledge the extraordinary effort that he made in bringing together these groups and landing what has been a controversial issue.

It is a testament to his skills, and I think that it is also a testament to those people who come together to seek common ground to advance this state's interest. It is another example of where we have done this and we will continue to do this. It is what the public expects of us—that we find solutions, that we do not engage in empty negativity.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. The Leader of the Opposition.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question, again, is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Why did the minister's then adviser now Chief of Staff, Dominic Stefanson, request information from the health department during the caretaker period from the 2010 election campaign in relation to the Liberal Party's plan to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital? The opposition has obtained emails under FOI from minister Hill's then adviser now Chief of Staff, Dominic Stefanson, seeking health department advice on Liberal Party policy.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:31): Madam Speaker, I would have thought that it was blindingly obvious: so that we could find out the cost of the propositions the Liberal Party were putting to the public of South Australia. I do not understand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I do not think that the opposition understands—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —about caretaker provisions. You cannot make major decisions, you cannot make major appointments, you cannot spend budget money out of normal provisions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: But there is absolutely nothing wrong asking questions, and that is, I assume, what my staff asked. If the opposition is embarrassed about what they put before the public in the 2010 election, I cannot help that, Madam Speaker.

Mr Pisoni: You should be embarrassed.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

EXPORT INDUSTRY

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:32): Happy May Day to all. My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. Can the minister inform the house on our current export figures and what is being done to maximise the returns on trade and investment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (14:32): Thank you, comrade. That is the first time I think I have ever used that term. I would like to thank the honourable member for his very important question. South Australia's export performance is the envy of the nation. ABS data shows that South Australia continually outpaces all other states in export growth. In the previous 12 months to February there has been an 18 per cent increase in the value of goods exported. This is an increase of \$1.8 billion.

However, this government does not want to rest on its laurels, and we acknowledge that we need to adapt and move with the times. That is why earlier this year the state government enlisted Roger Hartley of Hartley Consulting Pty Ltd to commence a review of the state's overseas

offices. Yesterday the Premier released that report (which is now available on www.dmitre.sa.gov.au), which found that our overseas offices are currently not performing at optimum levels.

The key issue is the inability to handle the shift in priority from trade facilitation to facilitation of inward investment. Going forward, a different approach is required to facilitate inward investment. Most Australian jurisdictions accept an old approach of bricks and mortar established in the city hoping that that will be an effective model where business will flow to those infrastructures.

We are entering a pivotal stage of economic development with over \$110 billion worth of projects in our pipeline, especially in the resource sector. There have never been so many opportunities for investment. That is why this government is looking for innovative ways to engage with the international business community and attract people, investment and ideas to South Australia. This review, along with the India and China strategies, the Manufacturing Green Paper and, of course, the RESIC Infrastructure Demand Study, provides the perfect groundwork for how this state can better leverage and export foreign investment growth.

We could just sit back and watch the hard work of our farmers (and, of course, the resource sector) benefit the state, but we want the whole economy to benefit. We want to see our manufacturing, services and technology sectors access new sources of investment as well as expand their horizons to a global market. This review shows that the state government has made the right move in establishing Invest in South Australia and providing seed funding to the state's largest chamber of commerce, Business SA, to provide trade facilitation. This government looks forward to working with the industry sectors to ensure South Australia remains an economic powerhouse of the Australian economy and a desirable destination for international investors.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Why did the minister receive from the health department, during the caretaker period of the 2010 election campaign, a detailed briefing on the Liberal Party's plan to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:35): I thank the member for the question. The question is: why did I receive it? I am not sure about the implication that I should have rejected something the department was sending to me. That seems to be the logic of what she is saying.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: All I can say is that I do not fully recollect the various documents that came up during that period of time. I am not sure what the point is. The Liberal Party put out some propositions which were absurd to most people, and the health department gave me some advice on the costings and the logic of it. If you recall, Madam Speaker, the design that was proposed at one stage had floors that were about four feet or 4½ feet between the floor and the ceiling—big enough for a hobbit to use. It would be a hospital for hobbits, I seem to recall.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I can't recall the details, but all I can say is if they sent it up to me I would have received it because they sent it up to me.

HOSPITAL STATISTICS

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister inform the house how South Australian public hospitals performed in the latest Australian Hospitals Statistics report released this week?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:37): This is a story that was too hot to publish in *The Advertiser* this week. I am very pleased to inform the house that a new national report released this week has reinforced the excellent care being provided in South Australia's public hospitals. The Australian Hospitals Statistics 2010-11 report (which I recommend to all

members), published by the AIH&W, has reconfirmed the great results being achieved in our emergency departments and elective surgeries.

For example, 71 per cent of patients presenting to South Australia's emergency departments were seen on time in 2010-11, which was equal second nationally. This has further improved to 72 per cent in the period to March 2012. The median wait time to service in our emergency departments (that is when 50 per cent of people are seen) was 20 minutes, which is three minutes below the national average. South Australia rated second nationally on this indicator and it is the first time that our state has bettered the national average since routine reporting began. The median wait time has further fallen to March this year, and we are now sitting at 19 minutes, the lowest result ever achieved.

The median waiting time for elective surgery was 38 days in 2010-11, compared to the national average of 36 days. Performance has since improved again and we are now sitting, at March this year, at 34 days. Of course, this is against the backdrop of a significant increase in elective surgery procedures. In metropolitan hospitals alone, procedures have increased from 38,348 in 2002-03 to 46,433 in 2010-11. So there are more procedures being done more quickly.

Also, 90 per cent of all patients in South Australia were admitted for elective surgery within 208 days in 2010-11, 17.5 per cent below the national average of 252 days. So, 90 per cent of patients were seen within 208 days in our state. Waiting times for this measure have further improved to 184 days in the period to March 2012. That is a remarkable improvement in the running of our services.

In addition, the number of doctors working in our hospitals is 10.8 per cent above the national average, and the number of nurses is 7.4 per cent above the national average. Our state also has the highest number of public hospital beds per 1,000 (3.1 beds), which is 19.2 per cent above the national average—which, in part, explains why we spend a lot of money on our health system.

The state and federal governments have invested significant funds to improve waiting times in emergency departments and increase elective surgery procedures. However, it is those who work at the coalface of our health system who can be commended for these major improvements in health care. Thank you to our doctors, nurses, allied health staff and others who work in our public hospitals for their exceptional work and dedication. We have made huge improvements in the performance of the clinical services we provide to people in South Australia. We are not there yet; we still have a long way to go, but we have made great advances, and I am very proud of the system that I lead.

CARETAKER GOVERNMENT CONVENTIONS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Why did the minister break the caretaker conventions by seeking political advice from the Public Service—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. To ask a question, 'why did the minister break the conventions' is to engage in argument. It is disorderly.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition would like to reword that to 'did the'?

Mrs REDMOND: Why did the minister not comply with the caretaker conventions—

The SPEAKER: Order! No.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. My point of order is that it is not established what the caretaker conventions are, therefore it is argument to say that the minister did not comply with them. Have another go.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Mrs REDMOND: Can the minister then explain what he did about the caretaker conventions, given the answers he has already given us and given that the caretaker conventions state, 'Officials will not be authorised to give opinions on matters of a party political nature.'

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:41): You answered the question yourself—'opinions'. I asked for facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! Members on my right, don't provoke them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! See, you have frightened off the school group.

ANZAC DAY

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs. Can the minister inform the house on how ANZAC Day was commemorated this year in South Australia?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:42): ANZAC Day is regarded by many as Australia's most significant non-religious day of commemoration. It is a day when we remember those who made the ultimate sacrifice. It is the day that every Australian pauses to remember those who have given so much in the service of our nation, including Australian Defence Force personnel currently deployed in operations overseas and within Australian territory who continue to make sacrifices in our name.

I was pleased to hear that 10,000 people attended the dawn service this year at the State National War Memorial here in Adelaide. Dawn services were also well attended in rural and regional South Australia. I, like many members, attended my local dawn service at the Salisbury RSL. Later in the day I went to the city to witness the ANZAC Day Commemorative March and attended the ANZAC Day Service of Remembrance at the Cross of Sacrifice. On ANZAC Day Eve I also attended the 13th annual ANZAC Eve Youth Vigil at the State National War Memorial. Other youth vigils were held at Blackwood, Marion, Naracoorte, Morphett Vale, Port Lincoln, Salisbury, Edwardstown and Whyalla. These popular youth vigils have allowed young people in our community from a range of backgrounds to experience how the ANZAC tradition belongs to us all, no matter our age or our cultural heritage.

Since the first march in 1918 volunteers from the RSL have planned and conducted ANZAC Day commemorations across the state. I applaud the State President of the RSL, Jock Statton OAM, and his team for all they do on behalf of the wonderful ex-servicemen and women who have given so much to our state and nation. I also acknowledge a memorial to commemorate the service and sacrifice of Sapper Jamie Larcombe, the 23rd Australian killed in Afghanistan. I travelled to Parndana campus, Kangaroo Island Community Education, last week to unveil the memorial with Jamie's family. I was particularly pleased that Jamie's mates from the 1st Combat Engineer Regiment were able to attend and participate, as did the member for Finniss.

I know that the veterans' community has a special place for Jamie and the entire Larcombe family. As a parent I have truly considered, but would not profess to understand, the pain visited on the entire Larcombe family by the tragic loss of Jamie. Jamie was an integral part of Kangaroo Island and a particularly important part of the Parndana community. I trust that the memorial will stand as a long-term testament to Jamie, as captured in the last lines on the memorial. Those lines read:

This school is proud of the student Jamie was and the man he became. We honour him as a fine example for all to emulate. Jamie will always be cherished and remembered by his community, this school, his father and mother Steven and Tricia, and his loving sisters Annmarie, Emily and April.

I would like to thank Mr Peter Philp and the staff of the Parndana campus for coordinating the commemoration, all members of the South Australian veterans' community who have contributed to this year's ANZAC Day events, Mr Bill Denny AM, and my agency Veterans SA for the work they have done to make sure that ANZAC Day is appropriately commemorated. Lest we forget.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Why did the minister tell parliament on 28 March that the delay in the Department of Health's annual report was caused by the 'change in audit methodology' when the Auditor-General told the Economic and Finance Committee on 12 April that 'The delay wasn't caused as a result of the implementation of the audit methodology or indeed the audit process?'

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:46): I thank the member for his question. I read the member for Davenport's Q&A to the Auditor-General and I am not sure that it was plain from the questioning which delay he was referring to. However, let me explain it to the house.

The Department of Health is a separate legal entity to the various health regions which, in the 2010-11 year, included the Adelaide Health Service, Country Health SA, the Ambulance Service and the Women's and Children's Hospital. The Department of Health finalised its report and submitted it to the Auditor-General in the appropriate legislated time frame, whatever that date was (some time in August I gather). That was done appropriately.

If the sequence of audit that applied in the 2010-11 year was the same as had applied in previous years, then the Auditor would have gone through the process and I would have been able to table the audited Department of Health report in the normal time frame. However, the Auditor quite properly—and I am not criticising him for it—decided to audit all the health entities in one go. He had not done that before. Normally he would do the department and then he would do the hospital or the regions, or however they were configured, at a later date. That would ultimately be tabled by me, as I understand it, when I tabled their annual report (I remember the member for Bragg getting somewhat frustrated by this in previous Auditor-General investigations). That is the way it used to happen.

On this occasion he decided to do the audit of all the entities in one go. So when I said it to the house it was not blaming; I was explaining that the reason I could not table the health department's report was because Audit had not finished with it and Audit was dealing with it in a way that was different to the way it had dealt with it in previous years.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:48): My question is to the Premier. What would be the impact to South Australia of Tony Abbott and the Liberals' plan to switch to a per capita basis for dividing GST revenue?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. A number of matters were raised in the question, but I do not know how the Premier might be responsible to this house for the answer requested. Also, the question seemed to me to be very hypothetical.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not usual in a question to reflect on a party policy. We will listen to what the Premier says, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Madam Speaker, I raise the question of argument—put eloquently by the Manager of Government Business in the house. The question contains an argument, and the argument is that the federal opposition has a particular policy which is—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: No, hang on.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The question contains argument, Madam Speaker, and I ask that you consistently rule it out of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! I am going to put that question aside; I am not going to allow that question for now until I have a look at it afterwards.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Are the payroll problems affecting nurses and ambulance officers caused by financial mismanagement within the Department of Health? If so, why has the minister not taken action

sooner to fix the problem? On Thursday 12 April, 1,250 SA Ambulance Service employees were not paid on time. In recent days, the Deputy President of the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission has made directions in regard to 1,952 pay discrepancies involving nurses.

The Auditor-General, in his recent report to parliament, warned of problems within the Department of Health payroll management system regarding timesheets, bona fide reports, review of payroll reports, incompatible access rights, master file discrepancies, reconciliation failures, overpayment problems, source documentation and out-of-date policies and procedures. When will you pay your people?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:51): I think it is a bit fresh of the member to ask that question having raised a point about argument in the previous question, given his whole approach was incredibly argumentative. I think it is obvious from the Auditor-General's Report that there are problems with a number of issues in the health financial system. That is why we have auditor-general's reports, so we can deal with those issues. As I pointed out in my ministerial statement today, we are doing a lot to deal with those issues.

Regarding the issues around payroll, issues related to the implementation of a new financial system which is replacing 18 legacy systems, it is deeply regrettable that moving from 18 systems to one new system has caused problems, but that is what you get when you try to fix up historical problems in any organisation. Whether it is a government organisation or a business there are transition issues. We certainly made some errors in terms of how we estimated we would go through this process, and I think they are acknowledged by the health department, they are certainly acknowledged by me, pointed out by advisers to us, and pointed out by the Auditor-General.

In relation to the issues of payroll, they are ongoing problems, which the Minister for Finance is well and truly on top of and he is working with my department, his own department and the representatives of the two organisations. In relation to the Ambulance Service, there is a range of issues. Shared Services came in at the time when the ambulance award was brought down. Revisions to that award brought in a new pay scale which paid paramedics a greater sum of money, and there was a whole lot of back pay that had to be worked through. It was a very complicated set of arrangements that had to happen, and it had to happen at the same time that Shared Services was being introduced, and at the same time we were introducing Oracle. That is not to excuse anybody for it not working properly, but that is the explanation for it. As to the nurses, I understand those issues are being worked through as well.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (14:53): My question is again to the Premier. What would be the impact on South Australia of a plan to switch to a per capita basis for dividing GST revenue?

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker: hypothetical questions are out of order. 'What would be the impact of a plan?' is a hypothetical question.

The SPEAKER: Hypothetical questions can be out of order, but in this case I do not consider it so. It is seeking an opinion of fact. I will let the Premier answer it and I will listen carefully.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer, behave!

Ms Chapman: Tell us about the carbon tax.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I find it amazing that it seems that the government has done modelling on a plan and has done no modelling of the impact of the carbon tax on South Australia.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:54): It will become apparent why they do not want to hear the answer. Shortly stated, the estimate of moving to a per capita basis for shares of GST would cost the state of South Australia around \$1 billion per annum. That is why I am deeply concerned about a proposal outlined by Tony Abbott today in Perth to split GST revenue on a direct per capita basis. In an article by Mr Ben Packham of *The Australian* online, Mr Abbott said these words:

I think that what ought to be very seriously considered by the government right now is the proposal that all the Liberal states have put up, that the GST revenue should be distributed on what is closer to a per capita arrangement.

This is a chilling development. Surely those opposite would disagree with slashing billions out of the state budget—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will read a bit more, actually, for those opposite: 'This is the unified—'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, sit down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He goes on to say these things, 'This is the unified position of the Coalition premiers. I think it makes a lot of sense.' This cut to our budget would be larger than the police and emergency services combined, and we have got a bit of an insight into how the leader of the federal opposition behaves. Remember that famous remark, 'Don't worry about a gigalitre of water here—'

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Not only has the Premier failed to read the article in context but he is now entering into debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, be careful with how you are answering it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is a very serious matter. It's a very serious matter if we are to believe from the recently published polls that this man has at least a reasonable chance of becoming the prime minister of this country. He was indicating that he is favourably disposed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He is favourably disposed towards putting a cut to South Australian revenues in the order of a billion dollars per annum. What is alarming about this is that we have heard him say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We have heard him say, 'Don't worry about a gigalitre of water here or a dollar of subsidy there.' That was code for, 'Don't worry about Holden's or the River Murray,' which was code for, 'Don't worry about South Australia, we've got this in the bag already.' That is what the coded message was and the worrying thing is that if this man was to become prime minister he would be prepared to—

Members interjecting:

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

Mr WILLIAMS: Standing order 98 clearly states that the minister must not enter debate in answering a question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for MacKillop. I would ask the Premier to return to the substance of the question. Have you finished answering the question?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:57): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Ageing. What is the current expected budget overrun in this financial year for the Department of Health, including all health capital works? The most recent advice the minister gave the house was a figure of \$125 million overrun in the operating budget with an additional \$15 million overspend for the Glenside Hospital redevelopment.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:58): I thank the member for that question. The estimations that I gave the house on the previous occasion are still the ones that the health department is working on and talking to Treasury about. There are always risks, of course—unforeseen things that may occur—but that is what we are working on; doing everything we can to minimise that.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: That doesn't sound very convincing. Are you going to stick to it?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I just said that. I said—

Ms Chapman: The \$125 million.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Madam Speaker, I just don't understand. I mean, it's not Socratic; they asked me a question and I'm trying to answer it. Yes, the \$125 million is the figure that Health believes it will be overrun by by the end of this financial year and I said there are obviously risks associated with that when talking about a \$4.7 billion budget. Something could go over—there could be a whole lot of extra people go into the system which we're not anticipating—so there is a whole range of issues that could occur but that's the most recent figure that Health settled on.

In terms of the capital budget it would probably, if anything, be under budget in capital as a result of the odd delay here and there. While there might be a \$15 million overrun in relation to the Glenside project which is associated with the discovery of a range of pollutants which weren't anticipated, generally across the board there could be other delays. There is no risk, that I am aware of, of an overrun in the capital budget.

SCIENCE EXCELLENCE AWARDS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. Can the minister inform the house about South Australia's Science Excellence Awards?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:00): South Australia's economy is rapidly transforming with growth in existing, new and emerging industries causing demand for higher skilled jobs to increase. Scientific research and innovation are fundamental to this transformation to a highly advanced economy and, in turn, our future prosperity. With this in mind, I am pleased to inform the house of our premier event rewarding outstanding scientific endeavour. Nominations for the 2012 South Australia Science Excellence Awards are now open with the nine awards available totalling \$100,000. These awards showcase the success of the state's scientists, researchers, PhD students and science, technology, engineering and mathematics (or STEM) educators, as well as recognising early career professionals.

The awards aim to highlight the diversity of scientific research and provide a great opportunity to celebrate high quality STEM research and education, which is critical to building a strong foundation for South Australia's future across our key growth sectors. They also recognise the application of science in industry and help to create a better understanding of how research is linked to the development of new technologies and products. Nominees have the opportunity to

boost their profiles, build their careers and be rewarded with cash prizes, with the Scientist of the Year receiving \$20,000 and the other eight category winners \$10,000 each.

The five categories for the nine 2012 awards are: South Australian Scientist of the Year; PhD Research Excellence awards; Early Career STEM Professional awards; Early Career STEM Educator of the Year awards; and SA Early Career Researcher. It is clear from these categories that the awards reflect the state government's commitment to science and research and our aim to support more people taking up careers in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics fields through our STEM Skills Strategy. Nominations for the 2012 Science Excellence Awards close on Friday 8 June, with winners announced at a gala dinner on 17 August.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:02): My question is for the Minister for Health and Ageing. Why did the minister use a figure of \$60 million for the reconciliation figure in the SA Health accounts in today's ministerial statement when the Auditor-General's office told the Economic and Finance Committee the figure was \$90 million when they got involved?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:02): The \$60 million figure was the figure I recall that I most recently gave the house. It started off at a higher level and it has come down, so I think \$60 million was the last figure that I informed the house of. If you recall, when the question was first put to—I think, the Treasurer in my absence—the allegation was that it was \$200 million that was due to be reconciled. I think I came back and said—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A blowout. I came back and I indicated, I think, that it had been \$90 million and it had got down to \$60 million. I will check the details of this but, as I understand it, that was the last figure that I had given the house, and I am now telling you that it is down to below \$3 million, and all of the issues associated with it. The important point is that reconciliation from the 18 legacy accounts into the new Oracle system is largely complete and there is less than \$3 million to be finalised, and it is being finalised at the moment.

DONATED GOODS GUIDELINES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister give details on the new national donating guidelines aimed at helping communities when they are most at need?

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) (15:03): I thank the member for Florey for her question. Last Friday I was joined by the federal Attorney-General and Minister for Emergency Management, Nicola Roxon, to launch new guidelines for the management of donated goods provided in times of crisis. This will ensure that disaster-hit communities receive the help they need when they need it.

The National Guidelines for Managing Donated Goods gives clear and practical advice on effective ways to support people after disaster strikes. The guidelines are designed to help those who wish to help others, advice I know South Australians will appreciate when they are trying to respond quickly to calls for help during and immediately after emergencies. Importantly, they were developed through consultation with people who have suffered from disasters like floods, fires and cyclones. Our own Department for Communities and Social Inclusion led this work and it was of great assistance during the Queensland floods of 2010-11. They were also useful in managing donations for the people of Stockport when that small community suffered flooding.

The guidelines work because they are practical. They take into account the emotional reaction we have when we see others in need and are moved to help in some way as soon as possible. They harness that desire to help and direct it to where it is most needed. They also recognise that some people only have goods to offer and provide suggested alternatives that potential donors may not have considered, like having a garage sale, for example, and donating the funds raised. Without proper coordination, there is a real risk that the goodwill of donors is mis-targeted in ways that may cause more problems than good.

The Port Lincoln bushfires of 2005 highlighted the need for better processes in managing donations. A well-meaning organisation sent out a call for donated goods—blankets, beds; anything to support the victims. This created a lot of goodwill very quickly, but was done without

speaking to anyone involved in the recovery effort about how they could best help. What resulted was seven 40-foot containers full of goods not necessarily needed, at a time when local agencies were already dealing with significant donations.

In 2009, the Victorian bushfires led to more than 40,000 pallets of donated goods. This took up more than 50,000 square metres of storage space, twice the area of the MCG. It cost more than \$8 million to pay for storage, staff and transport, and stretched resources into areas that could have been better used elsewhere. I want to make it clear that the intention is not to imply that donated goods are never needed or appreciated. The guidelines are about better management and, as I said, getting the right help where and when it is needed.

One participant talked about the perceived obligation to accept second-hand goods. After losing everything and the emotional roller-coaster that followed, they simply wanted to get on with their lives and rebuild with a few new items, rather than feeling obligated to accept goods that they may not have wanted. Under challenging circumstances, the situation can become even more difficult as the focus has the potential to change to managing an influx of donated goods when it should be on getting communities back on their feet. In that respect, harnessing the goodwill of people to send money ensures that support is targeted to where it is needed most.

I commend this document to the house. If members seek further information, it is available from the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion's website.

HOSPITAL PARKING

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:07): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer stand by his public comments that he made on 24 April, after checking with his office, regarding the sale of hospital car parks, and I quote: 'I came back to the office, checked the records. It was something which was in the 2010-11 budget, but not something which was brought to me.' Does the Treasurer stand by that statement, given that Treasury signed off, in September 2011, a cabinet submission supporting the sale of the hospital car parks?

Three times on radio on 24 April the Treasurer denied that the government was selling the hospital car parks. After checking with his office, he advised that the car park sale had not been brought to his attention. However, his agency, Treasury, signed off on a cabinet submission supporting the sale in September 2011. Agency comments are normally brought to the attention of the agency minister as part of the cabinet process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There was quite a considerable—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order: a large part of that was argument.

The SPEAKER: —amount of comment in that. I am sorry, what was your point of order?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The last part of that question was argument: 'they are normally brought to'. That's just argument.

The SPEAKER: And there was comment. Asking a question is not an opportunity to make a statement. The honourable the Treasurer.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:09): Certainly I stand by what I said last week. The cabinet submission—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —that the member for Davenport is referring to—and if he can show it to me I can verify this—is a cabinet submission that was brought by the Minister for Health to deal with the installation of equipment to provide the equipment to the boom gates, signs and capital expenditure to enable the fees to cover car parks. It was not a submission to sell the car parks, it was a submission to expend the capital to enable the car park fees to be changed.

There was a reference in one paragraph in the cabinet submission to the possible future sale of the car parks—that is correct—but it was not a cabinet submission about selling the car parks. The situation remains the case that, as I said last week, it is something that has been dealt with at an officer level. The business case has not been brought to me and I have not taken anything to cabinet, nor has the Minister for Health, to sell the car parks.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ashford.

EMPOWERING LOCAL SCHOOLS INITIATIVE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:10): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house about what initiatives are being taken to support local schools in making local decisions with a view to improving educational opportunities for their students?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:11): I would like to thank the member for Ashford for this very important question. I was very pleased only last week to join the federal Minister for School Education, the Hon. Peter Garrett, at Hendon Primary School to discuss our next steps in supporting local decision-making in our schools. Can I thank the principal, the school community and students at Hendon; they made us feel very welcome.

This initiative will involve an investment of \$4 million to support 61 of our public schools in developing their own innovative approaches to support local decision-making with, of course, the underlying goal being to improve educational achievement and opportunities for all of our students. This new national partnership will enable schools to promote new practices such as the one I saw last week, where Hendon Primary School and Seaton High School (another great school) employ a coordinator to work across the two schools to support gifted students as part of their SHIP program (students with high intellectual potential).

It is this very innovation that will be promoted under this national partnership. Indeed, every time I visit our schools around the state I see just what a difference that our leaders and teachers are making for children. Of course, there is a great deal of research that supports what parents know instinctively and students also know from their experience, and that is what an amazing difference outstanding leaders and teachers do make to the lives of our students.

Members would be well aware of the significant steps we have taken as a government to support local principals in this regard. For instance, last year the government introduced a very significant reform to support our principals in selecting the staff that best suit their local needs and their local circumstances. We have introduced a number of initiatives to reduce the administrative burden on schools, including the provision of extra support for principals in managing IT.

Indeed, it is these sorts of reforms here in South Australia that led David Gonski, in his review into school funding, to conclude that South Australia already has one of the most decentralised education systems in the country.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: This national partnership means that schools can access a grant of up to \$50,000 to trial new approaches to improve their day-to-day work in areas such as school governance, finance, infrastructure, maintenance and, of course, local workforce management.

OVERSEAS TRADE OFFICES

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade. Why did the minister tell the house on 29 February 2012, in regard to overseas trade offices, that 'the establishment of overseas offices focuses on major economic growth in emerging markets such as China, India, South America and South-East Asia', given that the minister only eight weeks later is now closing offices in three out of those four markets?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business) (15:14): I do not think the member for Norwood has actually read the government's report that it commissioned. We are not withdrawing from our overseas representation; we are simply changing the model.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, we are. We want to leverage off the government's investment. The smart thing to do is that, while you have a federal government investing in very

large overseas representation through Austrade, it is much smarter to have offices embedded in Austrade than have your stand-alone offices. I know, Madam Speaker—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Weeks ago when the member for Norwood asked the question we were undertaking a review. The important thing about the review is that we are taking a considered approach to our overseas representation. What we are doing is making sure that we get it right. The government can sit back and do very little and still have double digit exports to overseas markets. Indeed, we are leading the nation in our export growth—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is not actually accurate, and the advice that I have is that South Australia, according to the ABS, is leading the nation in export growth. The member for Norwood wants to talk down the hard work of our farmers, the hard work of our miners and the hard work of our manufacturers. Quite frankly, with the Australian dollar at an all-time high, to have our exports doing so well is exceptional, and the only people who think that this is bad news are members opposite. What they try to do is to say, 'No, we don't want the 12-month rolling average. We want the rolling average that makes our figures look best.'

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order: This is debate.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I refer the minister back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The minister is responding to the constant interjections of the member for Norwood—perhaps he could just be quiet.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister for Transport. Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Madam Speaker, the ABS showed that South Australian exports hit \$11.75 billion in the 12 months to February 2012. This is a growth rate of 18 per cent, the highest in the nation. That is —

Mr MARSHALL: Point order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. The member for Norwood.

Mr MARSHALL: My question specifically related to the overseas trade offices and nothing do with the export performance.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Norwood. The minister can choose to answer the question as he wishes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: However, we do not want to rest on our laurels. We want to ensure that our export sectors are robust, not just mining and agriculture, and that is why we commissioned a review of our trade offices by Mr Roger Hartley. The Hartley review found that our SA overseas offices in their current form are not performing as well as we had hoped. Despite South Australia leading the nation in export growth, we want our overseas offices to be better at facilitating inward investment into South Australia, and that means changing the way we do business internationally.

Now, we cannot just simply have one approach which is basically a very 1980s/1990s bricks and mortar approach where we build an office, we rent an office space, we have offices in very large cities and hope that trade and investment comes. China is urbanising at such a rate that there are over 160 cities in China with a population larger than one million people. The member for Norwood would have us based in one city hoping to reach those markets. What we should be doing is adapting, moving, being agile, being able to get into certain markets so that they fit our manufacturers, they fit our agriculture sector and they fit our mining sector, not just to facilitate trade but for inward investment. The only people who think that our export figures are not doing well are members opposite.

The government has laid out a new policy direction for India and for China. We have put out a demand study and a green paper on manufacturing, and now we are reviewing our trade offices. We are leading the nation in our export growth. Our economy is doing exceptionally well. Our employment rate has a five in front of it, which those opposite cannot stand. We are making sure that we get the settings right for the next 20 years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Reynell.

METROCARD

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Transport Services. Can the minister update the house on the progress of the Metrocard across Adelaide metro train, bus and tram networks?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (15:18): Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I thank the member for Reynell for this question. The new smart card ticketing system known as the Metrocard is a very important part of the government's integrated and, indeed, important public transport network. As I have informed the house previously on a number of occasions, the Metrocard has been developed using smart card technology, which allows passengers to touch their prepaid card to the validator as they board. The other thing that I should mention is that, time and time again, some of the people opposite seem to think that there are these new machines in buses—

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The minister is now debating the answer to the question. She is not responsible to the house for what some of the members opposite think.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for MacKillop, but I am sure the minister will answer the question and stick to the subject.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: It may have been mentioned by some, who shall not be named, that the new ticketing system is confusing. We have something called dual validators, which means that you can use either your old card or, if you are using a new card, you can use your new card.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Yes, it is.

An honourable member: It's incredibly simple.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Anybody can do it, that is quite true. Currently, these particular validators have been installed on 762 buses, 36 railcars and five trams.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will not respond to interjections from either side of the house. Minister.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: Today I am pleased to announce that, as part of this, the buses servicing the O-Bahn are being equipped with these new validators.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Croydon, behave.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Bragg, order!

The Hon. C.C. FOX: To assist passengers who have not had the opportunity to experience this new system on other parts of our public transport network, Adelaide Metro information teams are attending all of the interchanges along the O-Bahn route with information on how to use the new technology. By June 2012, all of the regular buses will be fitted with this Metrocard equipment. The installation on trams will be completed later this year, while all the railcars will be done by the end of this year. As I said before, they are dual validators so you can use the old ticketing system and the new one.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I am glad that you are so pleased. When new validators have been installed—

Ms Chapman: My problem is the bus doesn't come.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Bragg!

Ms Chapman: She just spoke to me.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: It's true: I did. I responded to an interjection—

The SPEAKER: You did.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: —which was disorderly of me—

The SPEAKER: You will not respond to any more interjections.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: —but, then, there was an interjection which was in and of itself disorderly.

The SPEAKER: Minister, your time is running out, so I think you need to get back to the question.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: There have already been 8,000 Metrocard validations by commuters using this new technology, and it is encouraging to see the feedback we have had, which has been excellent. I can safely say that all those people who have been testing this have been very pleased with the outcome.

BUS TIMETABLES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:22): My question is to the Minister for Transport Services. Under the bus service contract signed by minister Conlon, does the government have the ability to change bus timetables before 1 July without incurring financial penalties?

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (15:22): As the member for Bragg is well aware (having been briefed by Mr Hook on this matter), we do have the ability to change timetables in a piecemeal fashion. What we are choosing to do, and I have directed this, is a changeover on 1 July so that we can do a wholesale change so we can re-establish connections—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I did not ask the minister whether she is going to do it in bits and pieces or altogether. I asked her whether she can do it without financial consequence.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Bragg, but, as you know, the minister can answer the question as she chooses.

The Hon. C.C. FOX: I think the member for Bragg is aware of the fact that any timetable change is, in and of itself, costly. Every time you change timetables you pay for the printing of timetables and the public information campaigns around the printing of those timetables. As far as I am aware, and I could be wrong, the actual changing of just one line and its timetable costs approximately \$10,000. In July we are changing the timetables for 80 services out of 97, so you can imagine that there will be a significant cost, but that is whether we do it now or on 1 July, and I would rather do these things as one big project and get it right than in bits and pieces and get it wrong.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Will the minister confirm whether transitional accommodation for mental health patients at the Glenside campus will actually be counted as part of the 15 per cent affordable housing component required by all new housing developments?

The SPEAKER: I am not sure who that was directed to, but the Minister for Health?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:25): This is a good try by the member for Bragg, but the transitional arrangements for the houses that the member is referring to were opened a year or so ago and are going very well.

Ms Chapman: But will they be counted?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Will they be counted against what? There is no other—

Ms Chapman: Against the housing development.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: But which housing development?

Ms Chapman: Next door.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, it is a separate development, member for Bragg.

JUVENILE DETENTION

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:25): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development with responsibility for child protection. Does the minister stand by her department's submission to the Youth Court last Monday that it is appropriate for an 11-year-old girl under the minister's guardianship to be kept on in Magill youth prison because there were no departmental staff available to transport her back to Mount Gambier after her court hearing?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:25): I thank the member for Morialta for this question. Of course, I will need to check the submission that he claims my department made.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Well, I will check the entire submission and I am very happy to provide a response. I am not prepared to talk about the circumstances of individual children. We are dealing with the most vulnerable children in our community and we will do our best—and I hope I am able to work with the member for Morialta in his capacity as the shadow minister in this regard—not to revictimise children who are already struggling.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (15:26): What we have heard of today in the house is a health department in total disarray led by a minister who is in total disarray. What we have heard today goes back, in fact, to the last election when clearly, as exposed today, the government was in the business of using the Public Service during the caretaker period for the express purpose of trying to cause political damage to the opposition's superior argument that the Royal Adelaide Hospital should have been rebuilt in situ at the east end. This is a blatant breach of convention and puts public servants in an extremely awkward situation.

The string of emails and minutes written from public servants to the minister demonstrate quite clearly that public servants were put in the position of having to engage in political argument to help the Labor government achieve its political goals. This is a terrible situation for any government to put hardworking public servants in, but I have to say that it also raises questions about the public servants themselves who should have questioned the appropriateness of the course of action the Minister for Health was asking them to take. It also raises questions about the minister for the Public Service at the time who, from recollection, may have been the Premier. Should public servants be used in this way during a caretaker period? I think it is a damning sequence of revelations and one of which the government should be ashamed.

It does not end there. We had an embarrassing ministerial statement from the minister before question time today, full of extraordinary revelations. We find that the figure for PKF consultants now is in the order of \$1.7 million. The Auditor-General told the Economic and Finance Committee in recent days that it was about \$500,000. We have had the extraordinary admission today that it has taken \$1.7 million of the taxpayers' money to sort out the mess the Minister for Health created, and it is still not sorted out.

This is a minister—and I want his colleagues to hear this—who for seven years has just delegated not only the work but also the responsibility to his department. He turned the strategy of his predecessor the Hon. Lea Stevens on its head, her focus on primary health care, and bucketed everything into hospitals. He has taken a proposal to cabinet to purchase an Oracle corporate

financial management system without a business case, bum drummed cabinet about the cost of it, failed to implement adequate management control over it, and now it is an absolute mess.

This is a minister who does not pay his suppliers and who does not pay his staff, ambulance officers and nurses, a minister who has delivered financial ruin to his portfolio. He has put a resources unit in at a cost of \$10 million over four years to try to sort out the mess, and we have had *The Australian* reveal that it has only met twice. It has failed to make any concise and constructive recommendations about change and financial prudence within the department, and it has been in place nearly six months. The minister also told the house today that phase 2 of Oracle is in doubt and that he plans to try to cut 220 more full-time positions from the department.

I could just go over the series of problems in this department, but I will leave that until the Auditor-General's questioning this afternoon, until another time. However, I will say this: the health department is in chaos and it is costing the taxpayers of this state millions of dollars to sort out the mess. This minister has delivered ruin while standing up and trying to pretend that everything is fine. We now go into an uncertain future in health, unsure about how we will pay the bills.

In the context of this, the health system itself is in very poor shape. It is time for this parliament to ask the health minister a simple question. Clearly he does not intend to continue on in the parliament beyond 2014, he intends to retire; say so, let us get a new minister and let us get someone in there who can try to sort out the mess this minister has created.

ANZAC DAY

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:31): I rise to follow the remarks made by the Minister for Veterans' Affairs earlier today and to mark ANZAC Day 2012. This was the 10th time a youth vigil has been held in the south. We were the first regional vigil to take its place after the city vigil, and I can only express my untold admiration for Brian Holecek, who was chair of the vigil committee and who was responsible for developing the very well-documented manual that is used by our vigil and, I understand, by most of the other youth vigils in the state now.

This year's vigil started by acknowledging the two local soldiers who have been killed in Afghanistan: Sapper Darren Smith, who was killed by a roadside device, and Private Thomas Dale. We considered it important for the young people participating in the vigil to recognise that death comes unfortunately close in all areas of combat. We also want to recognise Bob Slater from St John's, who had been with the vigil as an enthusiastic supporter from the very beginning but who passed away this year.

However, there is much that is positive about the ANZAC youth vigil in the south. It is now something that happens almost automatically, with the youth organisations, sponsors and supporters, volunteer supporters and schools participating almost with just a gentle reminder that it is time for them to do their bit. One of the organisations I have admired all along is Chem Loo Chemical Toilets which, every year, brings out the chemical toilet, puts it in place at about 4 o'clock on the 24th and at about 10 o'clock on the 25th takes it away again. We do not have to worry about it, but it would be a worry if it were not there.

We have two new sponsors this year: the Lonsdale Hotel and Muffin Break from Hallett Cove. We also have a new organisation involved in the vigil, and that is Eldercare Cottage Grove from Woodcroft. The residents of Eldercare, under the supervision of their craft coordinators, prepared rosemary tokens for the schools to lay on the memorial as part of the youth vigil ceremony. We had about 24 schools participating from Onkaparinga this year, and while the various youth organisations are undertaking their guard of the memorial, the schools lay tokens of respect on the memorial. This involves usually two children from the school, and they are usually accompanied by the principal or a senior teacher. It is quite a bit of effort, so we thank all those schools, principals, teachers and parents who participate in this.

It was very pleasing that this year the vigil ceremony, which is held about 8.15 on the 24th and concludes just after nine with the reading of the ode, was attended by about 1,000 people. The dawn service was attended by so many people it blocked the road, with a police estimate of somewhere between 7,500 and 8,000 people. The increase in the community participation in ANZAC Day has been noted everywhere, however I think the increase in the participation in the south has been brought about particularly by all those young people who now look forward every year to participating in the vigil and bring their parents and grandparents and everyone else to also participate in the ceremonies.

In talking to some of the parents, I learnt that their children text them in the middle of the night to tell them what times their duty will be and parents and grandparents come out at two o'clock in the morning to sit by while their children are part of the youth guard. We usually have about eight to 10 participants at any one time. We have found that it is really important to march them around regularly so that they do not faint. This becomes a bit strange in the middle of the ceremony sometimes, when the young guard is marching around, but it is very important to look after them. I am often struck by the measures we take to look after children who are not much younger than those who went to war and sacrificed their lives for us.

MARINE PARKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:36): It was with some degree of amazement that I heard the Premier this afternoon talk about marine parks and what a wonderful job they have done in fixing the sanctuary zones. I think it should have been rephrased 'death by a thousand cuts for the fishing industry', particularly in my area, and I know that the member for Flinders feels likewise.

The announcement on Friday by the Premier can only be seen as being told to do once again as was suggested by the SDA. For a start, we cannot even read the maps that they have put out. They are maps that are hard to define, and you really cannot tell where the areas are. People in my electorate have looked at them and cannot define the areas. It is just ridiculous what they have done. They have not listened to what the vast majority of LAG groups said, though they claim to have.

At the meeting in Adelaide a couple of weeks ago, apparently they were told that they were not allowed to come out and say anything; they were taken into confidence. However, the professional fishing industry is far from happy; it is far from happy. I can see that within a few years in South Australia we will all be eating imported frozen fish from Asia. That is what is going to happen. It is totally ludicrous. No regional impact statements have been done—which they said they would do—economic, social, environmental impact statements.

I can tell you that in my electorate there is at least one, probably two and probably even more, fisherman who are going to have to leave the area. They are out of a job, or they are going to be out of a job. Most ridiculously, areas that should have been in there have been taken out. For example, an area in Backstairs Passage around some sponge beds and corals in our temperate waters has been taken out to a large extent, while Shoal Bay, just north of Kingscote, which is a mud flat with declining seagrass, has been put in there. It is just ridiculous what they have done. They have lost the plot.

It is easy for the Premier to stand up and say what a wonderful job he has done, but all he has done is bowed to his electoral base to make sure he has their vote in 2014. He could not give a tinker's damn about what happens in regional areas, and I am sure the member for Flinders will raise the Ceduna area. It is just crazy what is happening.

Let's return once again to what these marine parks were designed to do. They are for habitat protection. This outcome that he announced on Friday is not going to save one single, solitary fish. Not one! Not one wretched hooded plover. Not one! They are not going to be saved. It is not going to save any of that. It was never about fishing. It is about the habitat protection, and he just does not seem to understand what it is about. As far as giving the minister for the environment a great big pat on the back, you would have to shake your head at that. He has been done over big time, as has the CEO of the environment department, and as has Chris Thomas. They have made them look damn fools, quite frankly.

The Premier has come out and made this wonderful announcement about how he has fixed up the sanctuary zones. I can tell you he has not fixed it up. When you start eating rock lobster from Western Australia, South Africa or somewhere else because large areas of rock lobster habitat are going to be ruled out in these sanctuary zones, and when you are paying extra money, do not come and talk to me about it, particularly if you are in the current government, because you have been told and told and told.

With due respect to the former minister for primary industries, the Hon. Michael O'Brien, he at least had the guts to get hold of this thing and give it a good shake. If you think we are going to sit back in our regional areas and take this quietly, we are not—not in the first instance, the second instance or the third instance. It is not over by a long shot. What has happened is absolutely crazy. Though he has appeased some areas, there are plenty of other areas he has not appeased, and he has just made a damn fool of places that do not count for much in his electoral cycle.

I say that Premier Weatherill's announcement on Friday has been an outstanding failure. It is not the be-all and end-all, and when people wake up to what has taken place they are going to be crankier than ever. The fishing industry will be crankier than ever—they are already. This morning in *The Advertiser* there was an article by Justin Phillips from the rock lobster association.

These people are out there earning incomes for South Australia and Australia. They are providing fish for South Australia, Australia and the world and they are going to be taken out of business in many areas—it is crazy. It was never, ever about fishing—they just do not get it—it is about habitat protection. Pull all the sanctuary zones, have the marine parks—great idea! You haven't got it right, you didn't have it right before, you still haven't got it right and you're not going to get it right in the future. All you are doing is feeding the votes that come from the great big green monster for no useful purpose.

HOOPS4LIFE

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:42): I would like to speak today about Hoops4Life. I recently had the opportunity to visit one of the longstanding local clubs—the Two Rivers Basketball Association and the Hoops4Life program—which currently use the Angle Vale Primary School gym on a Monday night.

This year the Two Rivers basketball club which has been running basketball in the north since 1995 has become involved with the Hoops4Life program. Included in this relationship is UnitingCare Wesley and local churches, and together they achieve remarkable things. Recently it received a Be Active grant to support this excellent social inclusion and sports program in the north.

The program is designed to support young people between the ages of eight and 19, their parents and carers to develop good physical and mental wellbeing and life skills through sports, in particular basketball. Participants in the program develop and grow their skills in sportsmanship, effective communication, goal-setting, problem-solving and decision-making, emotional control, positive motivation, habits, conditions and attitude—all in a team environment. Participants learn firsthand that if they develop these skills through the game of basketball they can use them in other areas of their lives such as school, work, family relationships and friendships.

How does the program work? Each Monday night the players are taught and challenged with opportunities on the court that contribute to the development of these skills. The program is flexible enough to deal with a number of disadvantages including physical or mental disabilities, anger management issues, learning disabilities, and social, cultural or economic issues that the children face. The leadership of the team is rotated to allow all participants to experience what it is like to lead. On the Monday night that I attended I was delighted to see the level of respect given to the coaches and umpires, and the number of families supporting their children in achieving these important life skills.

Parents are also encouraged to participate in the program in a number of ways. Engaged volunteer parents can acquire the following skills: management and administration skills; build confidence and self-esteem for themselves and further their social networks; and skills including community senior first aid certificates, level 1 coaching courses, umpiring courses, timekeeping courses and scoring courses. For many people in the community in the north social isolation is a common feature so sport is an important way that they can contribute back to their community.

On the Monday night that I was there I took great pleasure in presenting some trophies to two young adults who have overcome a great deal and shown excellent leadership skills at the club recently. One of the young men that I presented a trophy to had overcome a lifelong disability to participate in the program and recognised that it was changing his life, and that of his parents and grandparents, and that it had, indeed, saved his life in many ways. Another newly arrived young person took it upon himself to coordinate and manage a team of friends each week during school-term-based competitions, and he was recognised that Monday night with a special trophy to encourage his leadership and his community's involvement in the team.

I would like to put on the record of this house my thanks and sincere belief in what they do at the club. My thanks to Mr Tony Moore, Coach and Program Development Coordinator for Hoops for Life; local Two Wells resident and longtime advocate for basketball in the north, Paul Schmelzkopf, who is the Program Liaison and also works at Centrelink in the north; and Julia Taylor, Community Development Worker with Uniting Care Wesley, for their dedication, compassion, good humour and respect for the young people and families of the north.

MARINE PARKS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:45): I would like to support the words of the member for Finniss who recently spoke on the marine park process and the latest draft release from the government. I felt it was a very timely opportunity for the government to address some of the anxiety and uncertainty that has been pervading much of the South Australian coastline, and much of our seafood industry, for the last number of years but, unfortunately, it has not happened on this particular occasion.

One of the very first constituents who came to see me when I first was elected in March 2010 was a recreational fisher who ran a tackle shop in Port Lincoln. He was concerned about the impact that sanctuary zones would have on his business and the broader recreational fishing population. Unfortunately, at no time during this process, and despite a lot of work and goodwill from the LAG groups, it seems to me that the government has taken very little notice of the efforts or concerns of these people.

Unfortunately, at this very point in time the LAG groups have been disbanded. In my mind, it is a great pity that they have seen fit to do that because, as the government has released this sanctuary zone proposal, it would have been a marvellous opportunity for those land groups that were already in place, that had already done so much work, and that had had so much experience and input, to once again review the sanctuary zones that have been put forward.

To my mind, one of the extraordinary things about this—the most extraordinary thing of all, in fact—is that last year this parliament, in the other place, set up a select committee to examine the marine park process, and to have hearings and listen to witnesses on the impacts, impost and management of marine parks. That committee has not yet handed its findings into the parliament. This government has seen fit to release a proposal such as this without even having the good manners and consideration to hear what the select committee has found in their report. I find that that is arrogance in the extreme.

Obviously, there are still grave concerns around the coastal communities of the Eyre Peninsula. Looking at the map before me, it is ill-defined, it is a large map, in no way can you tell exactly where the boundaries are, and they are broad boundaries, probably drawn in lead pencil on a large map. Some of the work done by the LAG groups isolated and pointed out boundaries down to GPS points. I doubt that the government has reached that point with this proposal.

There are grave concerns from fishing industries, and I will highlight a few but by no means will I cover them all: rock lobster, abalone, sardines, and, of course, recreational fishermen I have spoken about. The Northern Zone Rock Lobster Fishery has a quota of some 310 tonnes, and most of that is caught along the West Coast and southern Eyre Peninsula. It has been estimated by that industry that the impact of these proposed sanctuary zones will be as much as 55 tonnes on that quota, so you can see that it is a significant percentage. It could mean as much as 8 to 10 vessels out of 45 being removed from that fishing industry, so a significant impact on rock lobster, and also abalone, and sardines as well. Sardines fish right through the gulf, out along the West Coast, and, of course, feed into the not insignificant tuna industry in Port Lincoln. Everybody has heard of Port Lincoln and its tuna industry. The sardine fishery obviously provides foodstuff for that fishery.

If the government wants to shut down fishing in this state, they should come out and say so, rather than going about it through death by a thousand cuts, as the member for Finniss insinuated. There has been no consideration of the social and economic impacts as far as I can tell. There has been no regional impact statement done with regard to these proposals. Nor does there seem to be any consideration or costing of the management and policing of these zones.

It seems to me that it is becoming blatantly obvious that, in the second decade of the 21st century, shut the gate conservation is a thing of the past, whether it be on land or sea, and I think we need to progress from that mentality and approach.

ANZAC DAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:51): On Wednesday 25 April, the day after Kapyong Day observances, along with the members for Newland and Makin and an ever-growing number of people, I attended the Tea Tree Gully RSL's dawn service at the commemorative garden site on the corner of Memorial Drive and North East Road. The beautiful location is the result of a City of Tea Tree Gully initiative spearheaded by councillor Kevin Knight, who embraced the vision and proposed the purchase of the land, which will soon be too small if the attendance trend of the past

few years continues, and there is every likelihood that it will. I congratulate the Tea Tree Gully RSL members for another moving ceremony, officiated by Salvation Army Major Howard Trendell.

I was proud to have my son attending. Wearing my father's World War II medals, I laid a wreath on behalf of the electors of Florey. The Tea Tree Gully Redbacks Band, under the direction of David Gardiner, provided musical accompaniment for the choir and the public brave enough to sing, before they headed to the city to take their place in the march for two rotations, which is something the Tea Tree Gully Redbacks do every year.

At the conclusion, as the crowd headed for the clubrooms, we walked through a guard of honour of scouts and guides. Perhaps our ceremony will be able to consider a youth vigil next year to provide further opportunity for our young people to pay respect to those involved in defending our way of life.

Lois Ramage, Jeanette Martin and their wonderful team of helpers again provided the legendary (and often taken fortified) Tea Tree Gully RSL hot milk coffee, made to a secret recipe that many try to emulate. It is part of the breakfast of sandwiches, barbecue and sausage sizzle prepared by the local CFS members. I know I speak on behalf of all those attending when I thank everyone concerned for their work and support of this ritual opening to ANZAC Day.

Later, at home, I watched the TV coverage of the march through the city, enjoying the expert ABC commentary and crosses to Peter Goers, that knowledgeable and great friend of the services and veteran community. Then I saw the service at the Cross of Sacrifice attended by our Governor, followed by the coverage of Gallipoli and the dawn service there. Australia, New Zealand and Turkish officials have made this such a special ceremony at a place where so many of our men courageously fought and with many now still lying there at peace.

One such man is Charles Matters, brother of Muriel Matters. Charles died eight weeks after landing. His name is for all time on the Lone Pine memorial. While a peace activist, Muriel and many like her became conscientious objectors, supporting the troops but not the notion of armed conflict. Charles's is one of the thousands of ANZAC stories, which also includes the hidden contribution of Aboriginal Australians, invisible for many years because of the Anglo names they carried into battle.

Over 400 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander soldiers enlisted or served in World War I. When war broke out in 1914, many Aborigines who tried to enlist were rejected on the grounds of race. Others managed to slip through the net, pretending to be Maori or Indian. By October 1917, when recruits were harder to find and one conscription referendum had already been lost, restrictions were cautiously eased. A new military order stated:

Half-castes may be enlisted in the Australian Imperial Force provided that the examining Medical Officers are satisfied that one of the parents is of European origin.

That was as far as Australia officially would go. One Aboriginal soldier was South Australia's Alfred Cameron, the son of Alfred Cameron senior and Jessie Cameron (nee Forrest). He was born at Brinkley Station near Wellington on 17 May 1890. His father was a shearer and a highly respected foundation member of the Australian Workers Union. Before the war, he worked as a labourer in the Meningie district. He enlisted at Oaklands on 15 January 1915 and was allocated to the 8th reinforcements to the 3rd Light Horse Regiment. After seven months' training, Alfred embarked on the *Morea* with the rest of his reinforcements at Adelaide on 26 August 1915.

I also watched the coverage from Villers-Bretonneux, highlighting the amazing feats that took place in and around that district, which is now almost part of Australia, where Australians are rightly held in high esteem. The stories of the dark days of World War I conflicts that ravaged the now peaceful countryside and robbed so many of life gave freedom to those who survived what was then considered to be 'the war to end all wars'.

I am in awe of the generations who endured the wars and marvel at their tenacity and commitment to the democratic principles at the heart of the conflicts—the men who fought so bravely, the women who carried out so many roles while keeping families together. May we always remember their determination and their sacrifice for a better world.

As the centenary of the ANZAC landing approaches and more of the history becomes known and shared, the RSL's role in perpetuating commemorations will be realised and the future of this important national day guaranteed as new generations step up to take responsibility for this shared national remembrance.

Each of us will have our own feelings and understanding about ANZAC Day, its place in history and what it means for the future, how it now embraces all service men and women involved in all the conflicts, those who made the ultimate sacrifice in laying down their lives, those wounded physically and mentally, and the people whose lives have been changed forever by war. We will remember them. Lest we forget.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:56): I move, without notice:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the following Supplementary Reports of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2011—Audit Agency Reports, November 2011, Audit Agency Report, Department of Health and Associated Health Services, April 2012—be referred to a committee of the whole house and for ministers to be examined on matters contained in the reports in accordance with the timetable as distributed.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): We need to count the house to make sure there is an absolute majority present. There's not; ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

In committee.

The CHAIR: We will now inquire into the Supplementary Reports of the Auditor-General 2010-11. The first minister to take questions will be the Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Minister for Business Services and Consumers, for 15 minutes. The member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to the Auditor-General's Supplementary Report for the year ended 30 June 2011 as tabled in the parliament in November 2011 and the division relevant to the Attorney-General's Department commencing on page 1. I refer to the findings and comments on page 3 that this report was delayed because 'Audit did not meet with the expected quality standard'. What steps were taken between 30 June 2011 and November 2011 to ensure that the supplementary report did meet the quality standard?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that the following has taken place during the current financial year in preparation for the 2011-12 accounts:

- Early development of a detailed task list and plan for the preparation of the 2011-12 financial statements;
- A change in the mix of resources expected to be allocated to complete the accounts at the end of the year;
- A better understanding has been reached about the complexities and detail associated with the completion of the department's financial statements;
- Ongoing discussion with Shared Services has identified potential new risks and issues that will need to be considered for the year end statements; and
- Early discussions with staff of the Auditor-General's Department about various matters that require their opinion.

I am advised that staff of my own department are now confident that, based on the work undertaken with Shared Services, the department's financial statements will be in a position to be included in the Auditor-General's Department's main report to parliament for 2011-12.

Ms CHAPMAN: On that issue, Attorney, I think I understood that, for the purposes of preparing this year's annual report, you had done certain things which you are satisfied will make sure that you get it in on time next year by presumably October 2012, and I appreciate that. In the ongoing discussions you had with Shared Services, what was it that they had failed to do that you are now confident they will get right and get it in on time?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you for the question. I am advised that the matters that I set out before were in effect the matters that were drawn to the attention of the department as being—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay:

- Early development of a detailed task list and plan for the preparation of financial statements;
- A change in the mix of resources expected to be allocated to complete the accounts;
- A better understanding about the complexities and details associated with the completion of the department's financial statements;
- Ongoing discussions with Shared Services to identify risks that will need to be considered; and
- Early discussions with staff of the Auditor-General's Department about various matters requiring their opinion.

I am advised that those items to which I referred earlier were, if you like, matters which came out of last year's preparation of return process and which were identified as matters that needed to be improved.

Ms CHAPMAN: That answer really just outlined that there is a plan and that there will be some monitoring. As I understand it there was identification of risk but it does not actually tell us what went wrong and what is actually going to be done—apart from having a plan—to make sure that it is brought in on time. What were the risks? What were the issues that caused it to be late in this information coming from Shared Services?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think that I understand the honourable member's question, and I am advised that probably that is a matter that might best be directed to Shared Services.

Ms CHAPMAN: If it is a matter that you are not familiar with, how can you be confident that it will be remedied this year?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As I said, my advice is that there were a number of matters which could be and should be given greater attention in the course of the preparation of this year's returns. Those matters are the ones I went through a moment ago. I am advised that the taking of those steps should ensure that next year we do not wind up having the delay that occurred last year.

Ms CHAPMAN: So are you able to identify, then, any reason why they were late this year? What did they say to you? What was the explanation that Shared Services gave to you? I appreciate all the plans and processes to get it in place for this year, but what was it that went wrong or that they found impossible to deal with that caused you the real embarrassment of having to come here months later?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I do not want to be in a position of in any way being unhelpful to the honourable member in relation to these questions. I think, having exhausted my resources in terms of reliable information on the topic, that I should take that last question on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: On page 3 reference is made to the SA Aquatic & Leisure Centre. This was a facility that was built, of course, through DTEI and then transferred to your department under a management contract for the YMCA effective from April this year. I think it was officially transferred on 24 March last year. There is some complaint by the Auditor-General about the contracts not being signed until 29 June 2011.

My question is in relation to the handing over of responsibility of the swimming centre asset to your department on 24 March. Will the minister confirm what payments have been made to rectify the defaults, fix warranty issues or complete the unsatisfactory work since that date? As the minister is aware, Boulderstones were called in to mop up the mess and, of course, there is other litigation happening between the government and Mr Candetti about the operation. Could I have the payments made to remedy the defaults, and what other fixed warranty issues were there?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Whatever the role of the Attorney-General's Department may or may not have been in terms of the history that the honourable member has just given, it is my understanding that this particular session is about Business Services and Consumers, and I do not understand, unless I am misunderstanding my advice, that Business Services and Consumers had any role at all in relation to any of those processes.

The honourable member may be aware that the umbrella of the Attorney-General's Department, notwithstanding various machinery of government changes, has at various times had

a number of ministers with different portfolios under that umbrella. For example, recreation and sport certainly was there and I do not think it is there now but—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I know. I guess my point is that, as the responsible minister for business services and consumers, that aspect of the Attorney-General's function was not directly, as I am advised, involved at all in that particular series of events to which the honourable member referred. It may well be that recreation and sport, as an aspect of the AG's function in a broader sense had something to do with it—I do not know, and I am not in a position to answer that question. I am advised that Business Services and Consumers did not have anything to do with that particular matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: Even if the department of transport attended to the remedying of the problems to finish the facility ready for the sports events, will the Attorney provide that information if, in fact, he finds that there was an area of responsibility that his department had at that time? According to the Auditor-General's Report, the transfer did take place on 24 March. You inherited a \$100 million asset for management and the responsibility for it, and somebody somewhere in your government undertook probably millions of dollars worth but, in any event, significant work to it. It seems to me that somewhere along the line, if you are in charge of it and another department does anything on it, you either know about it or should know about it and have some understanding about why it is happening and who is paying for it.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I give this undertaking to the honourable member. I will ask those who advise me to review the questions and the answers that I have given and, if it turns out that I have in any way not fully explained the relationship between consumer and business services in that particular transaction, any omission will be rectified in that written answer.

But can I also say that I suspect—and this is only what I suspect—that the honourable member is possibly being led astray by the fact that the head of the Attorney-General's Department, Mr Maguire—who I wish to thank for his great efforts on behalf of that department and wish him well for his future in other endeavours. I am sorry that is a very short soliloquy but I will find another time for a more lengthy one.

The point is that Mr Maguire had at one point as I recall seven ministers to whom he was responsible. I, for one, found that rather frustrating because, number one, I could not have as much access to Mr Maguire as I often would have liked, although he was always very accommodating; and number two, sometimes some of the other ministers were asking him to do things that I would have preferred he did not do. But you see, he was able to do that because they were completely separate machinery of government units that were attached to the Attorney-General's Department with him as the chief executive officer of that agency. I think that is the correct way of describing it.

I suspect that what the honourable member has discovered is one of those elements which does not—even though it has got under the umbrella of Attorney-General's Department. Even now, not everything which is under the umbrella of the Attorney-General's Department is something in relation to which I have any ministerial responsibility. I think emergency services, for example, fit into that category presently.

Ms CHAPMAN: I assume from that that Mr Maguire is overworked and did not get a chance to tell you everything that he should have. Perhaps that is the reason why he is going off to look after the MAC and, if he only has that job, it might be a little easier for him to undertake that task. However, quite clearly at the bottom of page 4, the management of this contract is not just subcontracted out to the YMCA. The Auditor-General finds, in fact, that it is a dual responsibility of the department—that is, the department about which apparently you do not get reported to very much. It is raised in the context of some criticism of the Auditor-General about the contract not being executed until 29 July, but it is a joint management arrangement according to the Auditor-General. So, it is certainly something you should have known about.

In any event, the remediation of this work has taken place. As you are aware, the Minister for Infrastructure has informed cabinet that he had a conflict of interest concerning Mr Alex Candetti, the Director of Candetti Constructions, who had actually built this, and then of course as we know Baulderstone came in to remedy the breach as such to make it fit for purpose for a certain event. When did the Minister for Infrastructure inform cabinet that he had a conflict of interest?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If we are talking about a cabinet discussion, I am not in a position to get into that, as you know. More particularly, I think the problem from my point of view with the question is that it suffers from the same difficulty as the last few.

Ms Chapman: I know nothing?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, can I put it this way? Mr Maguire has been a very talented chief executive. He has been able to manage seven different ministers simultaneously and separately and independently. I give an undertaking to the honourable member that if, contrary to my belief and understanding, CBS has anything to do with the matters to which the honourable member has referred, I will get a supplementary answer to the honourable member.

The CHAIR: That concludes the examination of the Supplementary Report of the Auditor-General 2010-11 for the Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers. We now come to the examination of the Supplementary Report of the Auditor-General 2010-11 for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development for 15 minutes.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to the report of the Auditor-General: Supplementary Report for the year ended 30 June 2011, tabled on 22 November 2011 in this house. In particular, I refer to the Land Management Corporation, under this minister's portfolio, commencing at page 82. As the chairman will no doubt be aware, the Land Management Corporation is an entity which no longer exists; it has since been replaced by the Urban Renewal Authority. Nevertheless, it was operative during the relevant time.

Firstly, I refer to pages 89 and 90 and, in particular, to the Port Adelaide Waterfront Redevelopment. Subsequent to this report being provided, I was provided with a briefing by Mr Wayne Gibbings who was, at that time, the chief executive officer of this entity—and he is with you today—to confirm that there had been a delay in the reports to the Auditor-General in respect of a particular venture. Was the venture responsible for the delay in the report, the Newport Quays development?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I assume you mean the joint venture. In essence, as I understand it from memory, it was a dispute between the Land Management Corporation and Newport Quays. There was an argument between the Land Management Corporation and Newport Quays with regard to valuations on marina land, from memory, which of course was relevant to some land tax obligations, I think. It was thought to be resolved but, as I understand it, the Auditor-General then concluded that he was happy to sign the accounts without the resolution of the argument. It has not been of enormous moment for the accounts.

Ms CHAPMAN: Has that since been resolved? If so, has there been any land tax payment made?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No; they are still in dispute about the value of the land.

Ms CHAPMAN: On page 90, however, the Auditor-General refers to the delay due to a number of factors, including the 'inability to obtain all development approvals for proposed stages and the effect of the global financial crisis', etc. So in relation to the Newport Quays development, what development approvals were not obtained, and for what particular stages?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What you are referring to is the delay in the actual project development, and I would think that some of those approvals may not actually be relevant to this audit period. In fact, we inherited this project from you, from the previous Liberal government. I can get you some detail on some of those approvals. I knew there were difficulties with reports around Incitec Pivot. It has been pointed out to me, and I think you will understand, that those peripheral delays had nothing to do with the audit, nothing to do with the delays in the audit. In fact, it is probably not terribly relevant to the audit, but I am happy to provide whatever information I can.

Off the top of my head, it is a former industrial site. Issues were raised, I think, by WorkSafe or the EPA around Incitec Pivot's ammonium nitrate stores; I think that is what it is called. We are continuing in discussions with Incitec Pivot, hoping one day to have them relocated. There has been a series. There was that one, and I think there were issues around buffer zones around Adelaide Brighton Cement, but they are not relevant to this audit. We are happy to provide you with that information. Most of it is on the public record, I think.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy for the minister to take that on notice. I agree it did not relate to the reason for the delay in the audit, but it did relate to what the auditor had found in relation to

the development being delayed, and that is why I was asking you about that. I will accept that you are going to take that on notice and provide the detail of that.

Page 120 refers to capital expenditure commitments for the Newport Quays development, specifically capital works for precinct 5, which was underway in July 2010, but is now on hold. What expenditure was incurred by LMC in relation to precinct 5, and what was the total estimated cost for this precinct?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Neither of the officers here could give that to you off the top of their heads, so they will have to take it on notice.

Ms CHAPMAN: Page 124 sets out under paragraph 38 events after the reporting period, of which the Auditor-General makes some note. Now, of course, this is on the public record, that the Newport Quays development has been cancelled. Did the LMC advise the government that the Newport Quays development was not financially viable, and if so, when?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, that is not the case, so the second part of your question does not apply. I cannot imagine what sources the question. The Newport Quays development, as you know, was delayed by a number of things, but in particular the market for apartments after the global financial crisis was extraordinarily difficult. The underlying value of the land has not changed; the underlying capacity to have development there has not changed. The only thing that changed was there was a view that, since, for a number of reasons—including the Incitec Pivot that I mentioned before—there was going to have to be a hold on that part of the project for some time, because of the general attractiveness of the marketed apartments, it was a good opportunity to have another look, as I say.

This was a project that went to the market under the previous Liberal government in 2001. We had another look, at some length. We considered it at some length, and the board made recommendations. It is pointed out to me that one of the considerations was that we were not getting from the project what we had hoped, in terms of the rejuvenation of the port centre. That was fairly obvious. The consideration was that, given there was going to have to be a hold in that current stage of the project in any event, it was a good time to rethink whether it was achieving the objectives that we had set out to achieve. It was our view that the best outcome for the taxpayer, for the government and for the people of Port Adelaide was to start again. I think that was a very good decision.

Ms CHAPMAN: Should I take it, minister, from what you said that the board had discussed it, and that they had recommended the cancellation of the Newport Quays, and that they had recommended that it be aborted, because of Incitec Pivot, or any other reason?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I think they went a little further than recommending it; I think it was a decision of the board. Of course, if we didn't like the decision we may have said something about it, but it was not a matter that was taken on the spur of the moment. From my memory we had many discussions about the progress of the project; whether it was meeting its objectives over time and the fact that it was going to be held up by a number of things given that it was on pause. At the end of the day my understanding is that it is actually a board decision, which I am pretty sure I reported to the cabinet and cabinet agreed with the decision of the board.

Ms CHAPMAN: For the purpose of pursuing an alternate development that is underway now, is the necessary prerequisite to development that the superphosphate company is relocated and is that still being attended to?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We believe that it is a very wise thing to do in any event. It would certainly be necessary for some parts of this project—it is a very large project—but given that the ammonium nitrate is stored within a certain distance of existing dwellings that were there long before this project we believe it would be a wise thing to do in any event. I have not had an update on those discussions recently but they are continuing. Even if we weren't proposing to do further development down there—I see the member for Port Adelaide is here—we would be concerned, having been advised of this, to relocate that factory to what we see as a more appropriate place, in any event.

Ms CHAPMAN: Having made the decision that it would be wise to do it, is the government saying that it would not develop that site around the Newport Quays area unless that project is relocated, setting most things over and above the EPA?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I did not say that and after I have finished you may seek to reinterpret what I say in any way you desire. I know that you are of legal training and you are very

clever with words and I will do my best up against you. What I have said is we believe it is desirable to move that factory if we can, and we have not gone beyond saying that at present. That is certainly our ambition and we believe we will achieve it.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there any rule, regulation or EPA report that says you cannot build around it without breaching that?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You have to understand that part of the issue is that people have built there because it is zoned as a residential area. It is only when a development application is of a sufficient size that it actually triggers some of those people looking at it—by that I mean WorkSafe and the EPA. People have built in the same vicinity that the Newport Quays development would have been in, and that is why we believe it is wise, in any event, to seek to relocate that development.

My understanding of it is that the risk to the locals from ammonium nitrate is extremely low and the likelihood of there being an accident is extremely low, but given what we have been told we still believe it is wise to seek to relocate it. It was only drawn to our attention as a result of the development application triggering the involvement of those agencies.

Ms CHAPMAN: But having triggered it, it is your intention for as long as you are minister to not recommend to progress any redevelopment proposal until that issue is resolved?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Feel free to keep putting proposals that I am not putting. What I am saying to you is that we believe that it is desirable to move it. Another outcome would be that the licence conditions are changed in regard to how they handle materials, which removes the small risk that is there. So there is a range of things that might occur. What I am saying is that we believe the most desirable outcome at present is to relocate because we think for a number of reasons other than the ammonium nitrate it is probably more appropriate for those industrial sites to be in another place. We have industrial land and we are working with those people, but there is a range of ways that this thing might proceed if the company is not relocated.

Ms CHAPMAN: What was the total government expenditure on the Newport Quays development, and what was the total revenue to government from the project?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is obviously not all in this audit period so we will have to go away and get that information for you.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point 3.5 on page 106 refers to the Lochiel Park development. Will the minister confirm the status of that development? In particular has all of the land that was supposed to be handed over to the Campbelltown council been handed over and, if not, why not?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: As you would no doubt be aware, those discussions with Campbelltown council are still ongoing. We would expect the council to hand it over within a 12 month period. By that we refer, of course, to the open space, not the development that is owned by the people who built houses there.

The CHAIR: That concludes the examination of the Supplementary Reports of the Auditor-General 2010-11 for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, and the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. We now come to the examination of the Minister for Health and Ageing.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT ACCOUNTS

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (16:32): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: In question time today, the member for Davenport asked me a question about the amount of unreconciled accounts, and he questioned the figure of \$60 million and compared it to a figure given by the Deputy Auditor-General in a review of the audit by the Economic and Finance Committee, I think.

I said today that I thought the figure of \$90 million was the original one I gave, and then I gave a subsequent figure of \$60 million, which I thought was the figure we were then at, and then the Deputy Auditor-General used a figure of \$90 million. I have since checked the record and I inadvertently and mistakenly used the figure of \$90 million myself.

On 24 November last year, I then corrected the record and said it was a \$60 million figure. So, I created the error and the Deputy Auditor-General may well have picked up on that error, because my advisers tell me that it was \$60 million, and that they had written to the Deputy Auditor-General to advise him that that was the figure that we were relying on. So, the advice I have is it was \$60 million. I made a mistake when I said it was \$90 million. If there is any further evidence or information that pertains to this, I will obviously bring it to the house.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee (resumed on motion).

The CHAIR: I now open the examination of the Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, and Minister for the Arts, for a period of 30 minutes. It is to deal with the Supplementary Reports of the Auditor-General 2010-11, so I would ask that people refer to those reports only, and questions related to those reports only will be allowed.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Can I go in the first instance to the Oracle Corporate System, particularly pages 21 and 22 of the report. In regard to consultancy costs, I note that the Auditor-General says on page 40 that those costs are up from \$1.15 million to a bit over \$2 million in 2011. The minister provided some information on PKF today. Could he tell us how much is being paid respectively to Ernst & Young, KPMG and Deloitte for consultancy work?

The CHAIR: In the audit period?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In the audit period, or since would be nice, but we are discussing the audit period.

The CHAIR: We are discussing the audit period, so any question relating to the audit period I am happy to allow. Any answer related to the audit period will be allowed.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am happy to get whatever information the member wants, in or out of the audit period. Are you talking about in relation to the Oracle system? Is that what you are referring to?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In total, for all financial management issues, because I know the Oracle system is part of an overall financial management challenge facing the department.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not sure that this is going to be such a simple thing to do today, but I can certainly take it on notice. I gave information today about the PKF, which was directly associated with the implementation of Oracle. We certainly had some information from Ernst & Young and I will get that for the member. In relation to the other two consultancies, they may have been broader than financial controls, but I will get whatever information I can for the member.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: What has been the total cost so far of phase 1 of the Oracle system and what is the projected cost of phase 2 of the Oracle system?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I will give advice to the member that cabinet approved in September 2009 Health's proposal to implement a new enterprise finance and procurement system, Oracle Corporate System, in order to replace a number of ageing legacy systems across the portfolio, at a cost of \$22.853 million—\$21.14 million for implementation and \$1.713 million for procurement and project planning. That is what we have done at the moment.

As I think I have indicated to the house on previous occasions, the cost of securing the Oracle system through the contract we have with Oracle could only be for five years. There was a difference, I think, in the procurement board's figures, which estimated what it might be for 15 years, and they estimated an extra \$12 million. Health has yet to finalise the cost of the next stage, and that is being worked on at the moment.

As I indicated in question time today—I think it was in question time today—the costs will have exceeded these amounts, because the savings that we anticipated, which will eventually flow, have yet to be brought to book, because of the delays in rolling the system out. All of this will come out in the process of detailing the budget. It may well be that the Auditor-General in future may want to comment on these things. That is the information I have at this stage. When we know what the next stage is we will make that available to you.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Did I just hear the minister say there was \$22.8 million for the system, but then did I hear a figure of \$21 million, or thereabouts, for the implementation? Is that an additional amount? Does that come to a \$44 million figure?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It was a \$22.8 million project, 1.713 was for procurement and project planning; so, the externals, if you like.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In regard to timing, when will phase 1 of Oracle be complete in your current estimation and when will phase 2 be complete?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised that phase 1 is now complete and we are in the planning process for phase 2. We hope that will be completed and rolled out within a two-year framework, but, as I say, we are going through the planning process and we will not have that finalised for a little while.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Which legacy systems being replaced by Oracle have been closed and which are still being maintained and operated?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: There are 18 legacy systems operating across 100 or so bank accounts, I think. All of them are still being maintained because of the rollout of this system. They will all be closed and none of them will be maintained. In the end, as I recall it, there will be the one Oracle system and each of the LHNs will have three separate bank accounts.

It will transform dramatically the way all the health units are being operated, which will produce a much better system. Its transitional process is obviously complex and difficult and it has not been without its problems, as the Auditor has pointed out. I am absolutely convinced that it was something that was essential to do. Notwithstanding the problems about the implementation, the benefits to the system and to government will be profound once it is introduced.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Still on the Oracle system, pages 16 and 17 of the report talk about centralised logistics management as part of the Oracle warehouse management system. What problems have been identified and, in particular, what impact have these problems had upon suppliers to SA Health through its distribution centre?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I think the member might be conflating two issues. I think you are probably suggesting it in relation to payment of accounts. It is not as a result of the warehousing system as I understand it. The general issues with implementation of Oracle have been really to do with the training of staff and getting staff familiarised with the system.

The advice I have is that controlled weaknesses identified by the audit highlight the part-year changeover between the master plan general ledger and the Oracle general ledger and associated issues with the adoption of new processes. There was a range of issues in relation to the payments to external organisations, but I do not think it relates to this particular matter.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I thank the minister for his answer. To explore that further, I have had concerns raised from industry about the increasing centralisation of logistics within health through a distribution centre at Camden Park. I am just trying to find the connection between that centralisation and what is happening with Oracle and really striking to the question of whether there is a process of central ordering going on that might result in local suppliers, if you like, being cut out from everything from paper rolls, and so on, to a more centralised distribution?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: They are separate issues. Sorry, I understand the issues the member is getting to now. The procurement systems were centralised two or three years ago now, from memory. In the past every individual hospital had responsibilities for a procurement. There were some incredibly poor practices in place, particularly when it came to reasonably expensive medical hardware or even business hardware.

Individual hospitals, small country hospitals and city hospitals would be out in the marketplace trying to procure a particular item. They would have contracts in place with suppliers, and individual units were then paying a lot more than we were getting in a city hospital. What we have done is to centralise the procurement process so that we can get the best deal for the taxpayers and for the units. We also, of course, now that it is centralised, have expertise that can apply equally to the smallest hospital as to the largest hospital; so, there are huge benefits to the system both financially and in terms of contract expertise.

There were some objections around the edges, particularly from country communities, that local suppliers were being left out of the picture, but there is a balance, and I think that food and those kinds of things which are best supplied locally are still supplied locally. The things which are common to our whole system that are not perishables are managed through a central system. We managed to get the old state supply warehouse and we have centralised the warehousing

functions in that location. I think that it has settled down pretty well. I have not heard any complaints.

Just as there is in everything you do in government, not just Health, every time you introduce a new system there are teething problems and there are people who feel that they might be disadvantaged and make complaints, but I certainly cannot recollect any correspondence or concerns expressed in recent times.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Still on this question of logistics, minister, the directive from Ms Margo Mains got some media attention recently about a tightening up in supplies and services in the northern area. Could you just explain what that measure is, why that measure was necessary and what savings you hope to achieve from it?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We are now talking about budget control issues more than the Auditor-General's Report, I suppose. As the member knows, health has always been in this position as long as I have been aware of it, not just in my period but in the period of the former government. Health has always spent more money than it has been given. There is a range of reasons for this and one of them is increased demand. We have managed to reduce growth in demand but there is still a little bit which causes cost pressures, but there are also other functions in a health system which cause cost pressures.

I just put it to the house this way: we have thousands of beds in our health system (I think 5,000, or thereabouts—3,000 plus in the city and a couple of thousand around the country), and all those beds are allocated into wards. They have people in charge of those wards who make decisions about what is required in those wards and what staffing levels are required in advance. There are formulas that apply, but, obviously, you cannot wait until after the shift has occurred before you work out what level of staffing you need: you do it in advance.

If it gets busy people have authority to make decisions in the short term about bringing in extra staff. It is very hard to get a management system in place that properly and completely and accurately 100 per cent of the time allocates staff according to formula. There is often over-expenditure associated with those practices. We also have individual doctors and hospital managers who order supplies and things that are required on the clinical or administrative side of the hospital and sometimes they may order a large lot. What this memo from Ms Mains (who is highly regarded and an excellent manager) was about was just to say, 'You are all part of a system. You need to be cautious in the way that you make decisions which have financial impacts, and we can manage our systems in a tighter way,' and she gave some clues as to how that should happen. It is certainly what we would expect all of our managers to do, as I am sure the member would if he were in this position.

You cannot just have people making ad hoc decisions. You must have strict protocols in place but you also have to allow for the fact that individual managers in difficult circumstances (and health managers often find themselves in difficult circumstances) sometimes are not going to get it 100 per cent right. I think that explains a lot of the cost pressures that we find ourselves in in Health. We are trying to get the system right—and Oracle will help us do this—so that everybody understands where the money is going and how it is being spent, and then get management at the appropriate level to take responsibility for decisions. All of those things are part and parcel.

As to how much will be saved by the measures that Ms Mains is suggesting, I do not know if there is a particular figure in mind: it is just saying, 'Let's all do the right thing and try and be sensible about how we spend public money.'

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: In various parts of his report, the Auditor-General deals with the issue of contracts and contract management, particularly for supplies and services. One of the contract issues that has arisen is to do with Spotless, which I understand is a principal supplier to the department. Are there any problems at the moment in our hospitals with linen services? I am getting reports that hospitals might not be getting their linen on time, or whatever. Are there any issues?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: No, my advice is that there are no general problems. From time to time people say there are not enough pillows in a hospital, or blankets and things, but that is really just making sure they are moved to where the patients are. I do not know how many pillows the health system owns, and I would hate to think about it, but they move around the hospitals.

In fact, a bit of hoarding goes on in hospitals. One of the things we hope to do in the new RAH is to have everything bar coded and have a just-in-time system in place in each hospital so

staff will not feel the need to hoard. Wheelchairs, in particular, are hoarded. You can walk down a ward of a hospital and see stuff everywhere and, largely, it is because it is being hoarded. What we want is a proper system where all the equipment that is used, and the linen and so on that is used, is properly stored and provided to the people who need it so they do not feel the need to set up their own storage system. That is partly changing culture and partly putting in good systems, and Oracle and all of these management systems are part of that. I am not aware of any particular issues. If the member has some specifics, I am happy to have them followed up.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Was there a contract failure—and the Auditor-General refers to some of these issues—with a contract being let to a Danish company (which has its head office in Sydney) called ISS that won a tender to provide linen services to Health; and did that tenderer prove not to have the capacity, the proper machinery or the infrastructure in place to meet its contractual obligations; and was it necessary then for the department to terminate that contract and let the work out to Spotless without a re-tendering process in order to keep linen supplies functioning? What went wrong in that case with that particular contract?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As I understand it, I remember the matter coming forward. We went through a tender process and I think a couple of contractors—Spotless and ISS, from memory—were the successful tenderers. They had geographic cover. We broke the system into various areas and Spotless won some and ISS won others, and there was an appropriate tender process. I think there was a third company as well which was looked at but was not successful.

ISS then, through a range of processes, was not able to deliver on the contract that they had agreed to, so that contract was breached and we did not pursue that contract. I think Spotless was then awarded the rest of the contract. The procurement board process was brought into it and the agreement was made to award it to Spotless. I cannot remember the details of whether or not they had come in second in the other areas. I cannot recall. I will not make that claim because I just do not recall. The department certainly went through the procurement process. I am aware that there is probably an aggrieved party who has been making claims about these matters. I looked into it at the time and I am absolutely certain that it was done properly.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Moving to the non-government organisations and their funding on page 14 of the report, could you list the principal NGOs that have had their funding cut?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Mr Chairman, I seek advice from the member. The member has asked me to list the not-for-profit/non-government organisations which have had their funding cut. I am not sure which audit point the member is referring to. I am happy to get that information—

The CHAIR: I am sure he will bring it to our attention straightaway because he knows the rules.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Let me clarify that. There is a list of them on page 43 of the Auditor-General's Report which lists the funding from 2010-11. I understand that there have been a number that have had funding cut since then.

The CHAIR: No. That is outside the audit report.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I will give what advice I can. If you look at these figures, it lists both the figures for 2010 and 2011, so you can work out for yourself who has gone up and who has gone down between 2010 and 2011. I am not sure that we have all of the bits in place for 2012, and that will be reported in due course. Certainly, there has been some controversy around SHine where we have reduced their funding based on a negotiation with them. They have given the public of South Australia based on funding from the health system to provide a range of sexual health services. There was a desire by the department to sharpen their processes and have better outcomes and that has produced the change, but that is a result of what we wanted them to do, not through any sense of cutting them for any other purpose.

I am not aware of any other ones that have changed overly in this time. There have been a couple that have not got their funding. The organisation associated with the Hon. Ann Bressington was not re-funded because it just did not win the tender but another organisation would have got the money that it otherwise would have got. To the extent that we can do it prior to the end of the financial year, I am happy to perhaps get the half-dozen top changes for the member. That might satisfy him.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Moving to page 22 of the report on the Office of Business Review and the Resources Unit that has been put together, the price has been given at \$10 million over four years, led by Mr Archer. Can you clarify a few things for us? Is that group reporting and

completely under the control of you as the Minister for Health or is it reporting to the Treasurer? Could you confirm and clear up the issue of how many times it has met, what it has done and what recommendations it has made in regard to improved financial management so far?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The basis of the question needs some clarification. The group that has been set up is a team that has been established following negotiations and discussions between Treasury and Health. Treasury were of the view, and we certainly agreed with them, that Health did not have sufficient numbers of resources of a financial management type to manage the issues that went before Health. It was a way of supplementing the basic systems that were in Health, and there was a cabinet submission and approval to allocate the funds the member referred to. As the member said, a senior public servant, Mr Archer, was appointed to that job. He reports to the head of the department, Mr Swan—and I apologise, I should have introduced Mr Swan, the CE of Health, to the house before.

We have also established a joint committee with Treasury which the head of Treasury, the head of Health and Mr Archer are on. That is a kind of oversight body to make sure that both departments are happy with it. In addition, the ERDC committee of cabinet receives a report on a quarterly basis, I think. Further to that, I meet with Mr Archer and the head of the department on a regular basis. The joint committee of Treasury and Health has met about three times; that is not the working group though. The team would meet every day; it is working together, so it is not a separate body.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I thank the minister for that. Can the minister just clear up, for the house, how these entities will all work together? There is the resources unit that you have just described, then you have the normal management structures of the department under Mr Swan and his own executives, then you have the group you announced today, you mentioned a committee a moment ago that had been formed to ensure that all this was working, and you have announced today the formation of an independent board to manage phase 2 of the Oracle introduction—which I presume will report you as health minister or to the CEO. What I am seeing is overlapping layers of bureaucracy: an independent board, a resources unit, an existing structure. How is this going to work without inefficiency?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I think that is a fair question to ask; I do not criticise you for asking it. It is putting a system in place. Bureaucracy, by its very nature, is levels of accountability from the minister, if you like, down to the person doing the job on the floor, and you need systems in place to support the worker on the floor. So we have clinical systems, we have administrative systems, we have financial systems, IT systems, legal systems, a whole range of governance systems in place in Health, and there are people who are accountable for those. They are disposed in a series of directorates which report through to the CE, who then reports to me.

Mr Archer's team is a separate directorate that has been established. Mr Archer is at a very senior level, and he has authority to make interventions in the system to make sure that we are performing well. He will advise on particular savings tasks and give advice to the CE about how to implement a particular savings initiative, for example. He will also look at the system generally and get an understanding of where the costs are greater than we would benchmark it.

For example, we know what the cost of providing cleaning is across our system—I do not know if this is one of the things he is looking at, but let us just take cleaning as an example. How much does it cost to clean a square metre in hospital X, and how much does it cost across the whole system? We have so many cleaners, so many square metres, it will cost X dollars to clean our system; yet in this hospital it costs X plus two while everywhere else it is X or below.

So X plus two is a place you want to look because, on paper, that is where there is a more expensive way to deliver a service. There might be good reasons why it is more expensive to clean floors in hospital X; it might be an old hospital and the floors might be made of a particular material. Then you would look at that and say 'No; that is not a cost savings area.'

If you can imagine doing that across \$4.7 billion worth of expenditure, looking at all the systems we have in place, all the operations, that is the kind of territory that Mr Archer and his team will be exploring. It is a very detailed bit of work, and it is not something that can be done in the day to day jobs of other people who have other functions. So the person who runs finance will make sure that the financial systems are appropriately operating, and the independent board which will advise on how Oracle should be implemented will give advice to that directorate through to the CE. I do not think there is overlap there. There is oversight, which is exactly what we need.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Just a final question on the hospital. Page 22 of the Auditor's report mentions this, and I am remembering that the Treasurer and, I think, yourself in a previous presentation said there would be \$397 million required each year to pay for the hospital. Can you explain how that is going to work going forward, because the Auditor-General makes reference to this? Will that money all come to Health and will you then pay the whole amount? When it kicks in in the near future, will that \$397 million required each year to finance the hospital cost all come to the health budget and then you will pay it? Could you also tell us what component of that \$397 million will be for the capital cost of the hospital, compared to the operating cost of the hospital, because I note the Auditor is foreshadowing a separate report of some kind on this in this budget report?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That is a complex question to answer in zero minutes; I will do my best. The advice I have is that the money will come to Health. Some of it will, of course, already be in Health, because once we close down the existing RAH we will not need to spend money there. Treasury is not foolish; they will not give us new money and let us keep the old money, so there will be some sort of reconciliation between those two. No doubt there will be argy-bargy about what that should be; that is just the normal course of doing business.

The annual figure which we pay the project company works in this way. It is a bit like a house mortgage; more like a house mortgage on a serviced apartment, I suppose, where you pay an annualised fee which gives you occupancy, the cleaning services, the maintenance services, partly the electricity services, the orderly services, car parking, and all the other things that are required; all those kinds of services. If you imagine a serviced apartment (I think that is the model I would get to), over a 30-year period you pay all those services and at the end you have paid it off. It is yours and then you can either renegotiate or you just own it.

It has to be maintained as new all the way through, so at the end of the 30 years you get a brand new facility which you then own. As with a house mortgage, you normally start with a higher amount of interest and a relatively small amount of capital and over time they move, so that the interest amount you pay goes down and the capital amount you pay goes up. Over a 30-year period you balance all that out and at the end you have a zero amount.

Just as we do in a house mortgage, you have a fixed amount, say, or a variable interest rate, but you have a regular amount that you pay. It is fixed in today's dollars, so over time the relative value of that amount you pay declines as CPI increases and other price pressures increase. It becomes a relatively small part of your overall budget; it starts off relatively high and becomes relatively small.

The bits that will increase, though, in relation to CPI are the bits with a non-capital and a non-interest, and that is the services, the maintenance, the cleaning, the car parking and all those arrangements. There are some refurbishment elements too, so there are some lumpy bits in it as well which will flatten out. That is as I understand it. I am not sure if that completely answers the question of the member, but I am happy to organise a briefing for him if he wants to get somebody who can go through the technicalities of it. That is pretty well how I think it works.

The CHAIR: That concludes the examination of the Supplementary Reports of the Auditor-General for 2010-11 involving the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Health.

SUPPLY BILL 2012

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:11): Resuming my support for this bill, reluctantly, I come back to food production and regional issues. Before I move on to one of the Premier's seven priorities I would like to touch on the water issue. One of the big issues has been the desalination plant and the outrageous decision by this government to increase the capacity of the desal plant from 50 gegalitres to 100 gegalitres. I wonder whether this government has done any research into or looked at aquifer storage? It has spent over \$200 million putting a pipeline from the south to the north—interrupted traffic, interrupted people's lives, interrupted people's businesses—yet how much aquifer storage has been looked at?

Look at the water saving incentives. It seems, now that the drought is over, that the government has wiped its hands of any water saving incentives and just walked away, and I think that is quite irresponsible. Look at roads, particularly rural roads. Today we heard the minister responsible for small business and mining talk about the Mindarie mines in the Mallee (quite close

to Loxton) and how the mining sector will have to pick up the tab on repairing the roads. I think the argument will be that the roads were in a state of disrepair before the mine even got underway for the second time, so for the minister to come out and say that the mines are going to pick up the tab on road maintenance, repairing the roads and getting those roads back into a credible state is something that the minister needs to look at again.

Rural roads, in particular, take produce—not only horticulture and viticulture—to the markets and ports. We need to look at what that is doing to the quality of produce, particularly the soft fruits. There have been a number of incidents where produce has got to the market or the port in a very poor state and that has been due to the condition of the roads with their undulating surfaces and it really is a poor indictment of what our regional roads are doing to our produce.

Again, this highlights one of the Premier's seven priorities which he is clearly not focusing on. The carbon tax that he supports is going to increase the cost of food production. Look at the Premier's outrageous calls for 4,000 gigalitres through the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's plan. What impact is that going to have on food production here in South Australia? I wonder if the Premier has thought about that? I would say no because he is being so political about this. He has been so consumed by the environment sector, photo opportunities and political spin that he is so renowned for now, having only been in the job for a very short amount of time, that he has no understanding of what this is going to mean to the cost of living.

The cost of living is going to be the big ticket at this coming election and he is prepared to support a substantial increase in the cost of food, the cost of growing food, the cost of getting food to market and the cost of getting food into the export markets. Again, I think that the Premier's seven priorities—particularly the one-off with food production—are more political spin. We saw the Premier come out today, looking at hollow words on GST impacts. He needs to concentrate on his own backyard. Pointing his finger at the commonwealth government is clearly showing that he has not got his finger on the pulse here in South Australia. He is continuing to increase debt, continuing to increase uncertainty, and continuing to increase the concerns of the food growing sector.

Mr Deputy Speaker, this government, which, unfortunately, you are a part of, clearly does not have its finger on the pulse with food production, and with the reliance upon food that South Australian people deserve. I think that that priority is something that this government needs to look at hard and fast. I think that supporting a carbon tax, particularly, is going to put another nail into the coffin of food producers.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (17:16): It is my pleasure to rise to make a contribution in relation to the Supply Bill. May I say at the outset that I always find it a little bemusing that we do the Supply Bill every year, because if the government was actually organised, it seems to me that we could deal with the budget in time for 30 June, and not need a supply bill, so that we could continue to pay for public servants once we get past 30 June. That said, the very thing that this government specialises in is delaying the bad news, and it is indeed bad news after 10 years of Labor in this state.

What we have in this state at the moment, of course, is a Labor government that has taken us from bad to worse in terms of the economic performance of this state, and over the 10 years, people forget that in the first seven years, they had the best economic times that this state has ever seen. We had money coming into this state that you would not believe. We had a property boom. The amount of stamp duty and other property taxes coming in were enormous compared to previous years and, furthermore, on top of that, we had the untold riches of GST revenue coming in. Indeed, the Auditor-General warned the government some years ago that, and I quote:

The State may have developed a culture of expecting growing revenues to continue to support increasing expenses.

That is exactly what this government did for all those years. Every year, year upon year, for the first seven years, they got about \$500 million—about half a billion dollars—every year, over and above the money that they should have expected, and the money that they had budgeted to receive in their own budget papers. Now you would think that if you had received half a billion dollars—\$500 million extra each year—even if you got it for one year, you would be pretty happy. But if you had got it year upon year, you would think that you would have been able to put a little bit of it aside.

You would think that. You would think that a government would be able to stick to its budget—you might have some small overruns, you might eat into your \$500 million a bit—but this government not only spent the whole lot, but they got us a debt on top of that. They dug a hole in

spite of having \$500 million a year extra above their budget estimates coming in, and the result is that we now have a debt of about \$8 billion in this state.

People have trouble conceiving what that debt means to the state; \$8 billion is so much money that the ordinary person in the street cannot understand it. However, when I explain to them that the cost of that is an interest bill, everyone understands that on their mortgage they pay interest on the amount that they have borrowed; they understand that there is an interest bill on a loan and a debt; and they understand when I explain to them that the interest bill already on the \$8 billion debt we have in this state is about \$2 million a day, each and every day.

I invite them to think about just what this state would look like if, instead of the payment of that \$2 million each and every day, year upon year while we have this debt, we were able to spend \$2 million on all different things around this state. If everyday we could say, 'Here, Mount Gambier, have \$2 million. Here, Port Pirie, have \$2 million. Here, Marion, have \$2 million. Here, Elizabeth, have \$2 million.' On and on and on, \$2 million, day upon day upon day. The story gets worse not better. Not only do we have \$2 million a day in debt at the moment, but this government—and when he first became Treasurer, he famously said, 'We don't want to run up a credit card debt. We don't want to put things on the never-never. We don't want to run up a credit card debt but we are proceeding with a new hospital.'

So, in addition to the \$2 million a day for the interest bill on the debt we should not have, when that hospital is completed in 2016, guess what, we are going to have to start to pay for that on the never-never. That will add another \$1.1 million a day, each and every day, from then until 30 years later. The person who is 16 years old at the moment will have that bill hanging over their head for all of that time. When you total up all the state debt and add in the unfunded liability of WorkCover—and I will come back to that in a moment—we will very shortly have a total liability of \$23 billion. When you think that \$8 billion is costing us \$2 million a day, you can imagine what the effect of a \$23 billion debt might be.

I mentioned WorkCover a moment ago. When we left office in 2002, we got the unfunded liability of WorkCover down. They had it out at about a billion dollars, but we dragged it back down. We got it down to about \$56 million or \$59 million. This government has so far managed to turn that around so that we are now back once again with more than a billion dollars in unfunded liability for WorkCover.

You might not even mind that so much if you had a good operating WorkCover system, but the reality is that we have the worst operating system in the country. We have a system that has the worst return-to-work rate of any system in the country and amongst the highest levies. We know that it is the way the government has managed this that is the problem. If you look at the people who are called exempts—they are operating under the same legislation but they are big enough companies not to have to go through WorkCover—they operate the same system under the same legislation, and they are doing fine. Their levies are often only about a third of the average levy in the businesses that are under the WorkCover system.

This government has no idea how to manage anything. As I said, they were warned by the Auditor-General for years and years. What is more, they keep painting these fanciful pictures of the future. They keep saying to us all sorts of things. They said three years ago, in 2008-09, that what we are going to have in 2011-12 is a budget surplus of \$424 million. Then came the Mid-Year Budget Review and they had reduced it a bit, then the next budget it reduced a bit further, then a bit further at the next Mid-Year Budget Review, and on and on it went.

In three short years they have turned it from an expectation of a \$424 million surplus to a \$367 million deficit. That is an \$800 million reversal of our fortunes in this state thanks to the mismanagement of this government, who crowed about having a AAA credit rating. They got that only because of the hard work done by the previous Liberal government. As Matt and Dave said on 891 the other day, it was probably a good thing that we had the worst treasurer in history at a time when we had probably the best income in history, because his problems did not show up until after he departed. This government is a disgrace in the way they have dealt with the fortunes of this state. As the Auditor-General said, they have relied on incomes that they had no right to continue to expect.

I have been talking to a lot of people in the real estate sector. Anyone can tell that in the real estate sector we are having a great deal of difficulty. Many people who work in that sector are complaining. Many more are now out of work because the real estate sector is doing it so tough. How tough is the real estate sector doing it? It is doing it so tough that the government has had to

revise downwards the amount it expects to get by way of stamp duty. Stamp duty in this state is particularly high, and the real estate sector is going to be putting into the government coffers, on the government's best expectations, \$274 million less stamp duty than what they expected a year ago.

My eldest son recently bought a house with his wife. They bought at about the average price and paid about the average stamp duty of \$14,000. In terms of the number of transactions, that means that on an average price with an average stamp duty of \$14,000, that \$274 million equates to no less than 19,571 transactions. Is it any wonder we are in a bad way in this state?

You then look at things like land tax. I have been getting complaints about land tax from all sorts of people. The previous treasurer's attitude was that land tax is just a problem for the rich, because only people who are rich can have extra properties, who then have to pay land tax. The problem with that way of thinking is, firstly, that it fails to recognise that virtually every business in this state—because it is nearly all small to medium enterprises—operate out of rental premises. That means that somewhere there is a landlord who has to pay land tax and, guess what? That land tax comes home to roost eventually in the price that that landlord is going to charge for rent. So, there is the first problem.

The second problem is that there are a lot of hard working people, particularly in migrant communities, in fact, who, rather than going into other forms of superannuation, try to provide for themselves, try to make themselves independent for the future. How do they do that? By not only buying their house but then by buying some other property so that they have got that security into their retirement and they have got a mechanism by which they can fund their own retirement.

This government failed to recognise that and made the land tax regime so oppressive. They have increased it by something like 374 per cent over 10 years they have been in office. They made it so oppressive that people are now leaving this state in droves and taking their investment with them. Indeed, I had someone come into my office just a few months ago. This chap was about my age. He had spent his entire working life, virtually, building up a property portfolio, and that property portfolio was what he generated his income from and, again, he expected to fund his retirement using that property portfolio. But, the land tax regime on his total \$15 million property portfolio had become so oppressive that he decided to leave the state and take his entire investment portfolio to another state.

Why did he do that? Because, he said to me, 'I have to use the first six months of rent just pay land tax; just to pay the land tax, six months of rent. I still on top of that then have to pay the council rates. On top of that I have to pay the insurance and the maintenance.' He said, 'I'm lucky if I make one or two weeks rental out of each rental property for an entire year's rental. That is the only profit that comes to me. It is simply not worth the bother of holding property in this state.'

Indeed, our previous treasurer on his disclosure return to this parliament showed that his investment was not in this state at all; it was in Sydney. There is a smart idea: let's not invest in this state even if you are the treasurer of the state. The reason why? I do not know what his personal reasons were but I have a suspicion that he was not damaged nearly as much by the land tax regime in other states as he would be if he had made the same investment in this state.

The government of this state has led us down a dreadful path in terms of where we are going to get to economically. Indeed, I mentioned a little earlier the fact that we now have a net operating deficit of \$367 million in 2011-12. The fact is that that is the kindest interpretation. There are actually three different measures upon which you can measure deficits. There is the net operating deficit, which is \$367 million, or you can look at the cash deficit. The cash deficit is \$1,445 million for this year. The net lending deficit is \$1,519 million for 2011-12. So, we are going from bad to worse under this government.

Can I mention some more things about our tax regime? Not only is stamp duty an horrific tax and land tax absolutely pushing investment out of this state, but look at things like payroll tax. I have had a number of business owners come to me and say, 'I will not put on more staff. I'd like to grow my business, but I am not going to put on more staff because the cost of that will be too much. It will push me over the threshold for paying payroll tax in this state, and that will mean that I then have to pay so much that it becomes uneconomical for me to put on extra staff.'

When you compare our threshold, which is about \$600,000, with places like Queensland, where the threshold is more like \$1 million, you can understand that Queensland is doing a lot more to make it a viable place for businesses to operate than this state is. The reality is that we

have in this state the highest tax regime of any state in Australia and we are the state that can least afford to have that. We are the state that actually needs more people, more businesses.

This government for years and years has relied on this promise, the promised land of a wondrous future in the mining industry. They have ignored everything else: they have ignored small business. It does not matter about small business. They do not understand that successful government means we have got to have successful small business in this state.

It is the backbone of our economy, but instead of understanding that they go out and spend money that they have not got and rely on this promised land of the mining sector that is going to produce all these riches. Well, let me tell you, Madam Speaker, that last year we made about \$200 million in this state from mining royalties—\$200 million. Compare that with Western Australia where, from mining royalties in the current year, it is expecting to make closer to \$5 billion—or \$5,000 million—in mining royalties; or Queensland, where it is getting up close to \$2 billion in mining royalties.

Our \$200 million is paltry, but for 10 years this government has been talking about a mining boom that is yet to happen and we have been led down the garden path by a government promising things that it cannot deliver. Not only do we have the highest taxes of any state, we have got the nation's worst economic growth over the last 12 months. We have the highest capital city water charges, and, of course, we have the wondrous situation where the one thing where we are getting a bullet to the top is our electricity prices.

We know that we already have the third most expensive electricity in the world, the third highest electricity prices in the world, and that is without adding on the carbon tax. By the time we add on the carbon tax we are going to No. 1 with a bullet. We are going to have the highest cost of electricity of anywhere in the world and the highest capital city water charges. This government just does not seem to get that the cost of living is doing nothing but go up and up and up at a rate much faster than any increase in wages. Indeed, we have got some of the lowest wage increases. We have the slowest growth in wages but the fastest growth in consumer prices of the whole country.

We had the worst jobs growth in 20 years. Do you remember that before the election the previous premier, Mike Rann, promised an extra 100,000 jobs. Strangely, not only have they not materialised but we have fewer people in full-time employment in this state than when the former premier made that promise; and, what is more, had we just kept up with the national average in terms of jobs growth we would currently have 41,000 more jobs in the system than we have. This is a disgrace and this is going to kill this state.

We desperately need a change of government in this state. Sadly, I have always favoured fixed four-year terms. I have always thought that was one good thing in our system. In fact, it was one of the first conversations I had with a previous premier, John Olsen. I thought that we should have fixed four-year terms. The problem with them, of course, is that when you get a bad government you can get a lot of damage done to the state in four years, and that is exactly what they are doing.

We have got the nation's worst business confidence and we have got the nation's worst retail sales figures. I have already mentioned the nation's worst performing workers compensation figures. We have got the nation's worst housing finance commitments, we have got the nation's worst jobs growth and the worst monthly building approvals figures in the last 130 months—that is more than 11 years. We have got the nation's worst—the worst property sales figures in 27 years and the lowest quarterly dwelling commencements in 10 years, yet this government seems to decide that, in spite of all that, we can still go out and spend money where it does not belong.

I am still personally really angry about the fact that they cannot find \$300,000 to keep the public patients' component of the Keith hospital going. It has the cheapest occupied bed days of any hospital you could get, but they will not spend \$300,000 on that, yet they are prepared to spend \$200,000 giving Mike Rann a golden handshake when he leaves this place. That is an utter disgrace and you should all hang your heads in shame over that. Any idea that it was only \$100,000, as bleated by the Premier, is just a nonsense. It was definitely \$200,000 because your government's own document from the Sustainable Budget Commission made it clear that a car with a driver cost \$300,000 per annum.

If that cost \$300,000 per annum then just supplying the car with a driver for six months makes it \$150,000; and on top of that he was to get an office, a secretary and all sorts of other benefits—a phone, I believe—and all sorts of things, yet for six months he gets that. He could have

stayed as the member for Ramsay if he had so much work to do when he stopped being the premier—he already had staff supplied—instead of costing us a by-election, but that is them.

Then, today, we have got the announcement about the mere \$1.7 million that they have spent on getting consultants to help them sort out the mess they created in installing a new computer system. I said in a press conference just after question time I consider all computer salesmen to be snake oil salesmen, and I will never resile from that comment. They always promise what they cannot deliver: they always mess up.

What we should have done was go at it piecemeal, not decide they are going to be let loose to go in and destroy perfectly operating systems. Combine the Oracle system with the so-called benefits of shared services. I am yet to meet a public servant who thinks that shared services has been anything other than a dismal disaster for this government and something that frustrates public servants no end.

Madam Speaker, with those few comments I will draw to a close. Suffice to say that I am unimpressed by the economic mismanagement of this state by an incompetent and self-interested government that has done nothing for the people of this state and everything towards its own ends.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:35): I rise to make a contribution regarding the Supply Bill. As we have just heard from our leader, the government for the last 10 years has been getting an extra \$500 million worth of GST money that was never budgeted for. They say, 'It's not what you earn, it's what you spend.' Instead of putting away that money and reducing state taxes and building for the future, they have actually spent every cent, and more, and left us in debt. During the best economic times when we could have put away money for a rainy day, they have spent every single cent of it.

There are a few topics in my electorate that are particularly important to me. One is Adelaide Oval, which is another example of bad policy and bad financial management. On the back of a very popular sports stadium, a covered stadium, that the Liberals put up, the Labor Party patched together a bit of an idea of increasing the size of Adelaide Oval at a cost of not a penny more than \$450 million. Of course, it was not long before the \$85 million SACA debt was included in the figure, bringing that to \$535 million, and it was not long again before the bridge that was originally included in the figure became a separate figure of \$40 million, when a very similar bridge was built in Victoria for \$17 million.

I think when property developers or engineers see the state government of South Australia coming they just double the price, because we seem to have no idea. It is a sad indictment on the state for 12,000 extra seats. Mind you, the Crows and Port Power, I do not believe, have ever got 50,000 to a game. I doubt they have even got 38,000, which is the capacity of Adelaide Oval, anyway.

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms SANDERSON: Not very often, and certainly for the amount it will cost. We could have actually brought football to Adelaide Oval without expanding it and then built up the crowd capacity and paid for it out of the money from ticket sales rather than taking it out of government funds and not funding things like the Keith hospital.

It is a ridiculous thing to pull down the Bradman Stand (that was only built in 1990) and the Chappell Stand (only built in 2003) and, even worse, when the furniture inside those buildings is seen on the nightly news falling out of the building when, as we know, there are plenty of people in need who could have used that furniture—even if it was given away but, even better, if it could have been sold. We also know that Adelaide United was very keen to have the sails for their use and they were not reused, either. It is just another example of the absolute waste by this government.

That is not to mention that we are destroying what was the most iconic and beautiful Adelaide Oval without providing adequate parking, so now we are going to have people parking on the parklands and throughout North Adelaide causing traffic jams. This is all for 12,000 seats and no roof; and, even after building the \$95 million stand only one or two years ago, we now have to add to that the media unit, extra toilets and a bar; and we know from experience that the rain cover will only cover about the back five rows so it is not even weather-resistant, as it supposedly was. It is an example of the absolute waste by this government.

The bridge concerns me greatly because now we are hearing, in order to use the bridge on approximately, I believe, the 24 days a year that there would be football played there, they have to

close off Memorial Drive. So, for the rest of the year if you have walked across that bridge, you have to walk down to the lights to cross over anyway, so why don't we just walk down King William Street? Why would you pay \$40 million and have a bridge used 24 times a year that really will not be of any use for the rest of the year because you will have to walk down to King William Street to cross at the lights because they cannot close off the road for the whole year?

Another example of ridiculous, last-minute policy is Adelaide High School. Only about six days before the March election in a last-ditch effort to try to get votes in Prospect and Walkerville, the state government came out with a plan that would expand Adelaide High School to allow for an extra 250 spaces, not encroach on the Parklands and expand the zone to include Prospect and Walkerville.

Two years on, what have we got? Last week the City Council approved, at a 6:5 vote, encroachment on the Parklands, so the building that will be built is on the Parklands and against their initial policy. It will cost \$17 million and, at this stage, there has been no declaration of any expansion of the zone into Prospect or Walkerville. As to the 250 spaces and whether they actually mean a building fit for 450, as Adelaide High School is already 200 over capacity, I have asked questions in estimates and the governing council (of which I am a member) has written to the previous minister for education and now the current Minister for Education asking the exact number. Are we really getting a building for 250? We are 200 over so that means there are only 50 extra spaces which means we will not be expanding the zone at all into Prospect or Walkerville, so why are we spending \$17 million for a bandaid solution that in one year will be over capacity again? Why would you waste that money? It is just another example of why I cannot sleep at night thinking about the devastating financial situation that this Labor government is leaving us.

As far as business goes, after 17½ years in business and currently still being a business owner, I can tell you it has been the worst two years in my business life under this government, and there are many reasons for that. When doorknocking my electorate, I hear that many people are experiencing the same thing. Our leader was just talking about examples of people taking their money out of our state. I have doorknocked business owners who have housing construction businesses that will still be doing building and construction in our state but, as far as all their administration and office staff, they will move to Queensland or elsewhere interstate where the payroll taxes are lower, the land taxes are lower and where they have a government that is supportive of small business.

At the moment, as an example, as graduate accountants coming out of university we had training where all of the new graduates from around the country came together and we discussed what we were earning. At the time—and this was about 1991—accountants were paid under the clerk's award, so it was \$22,000 in our first year out, and that was for South Australia. It was about \$24,000 in Victoria, \$26,000 in New South Wales, \$27,000 in the ACT, and pretty well the wages were dependent on the cost of living in all of those states.

Julia Gillard in all of her wisdom has brought in a national wage system which means now that everyone gets paid at the highest rate. If you are a South Australian graduate, you will now get \$27,000 because you have to be in line with the rest of the country. We only have 1.6 million in population, so the potential turnover is a lot lower. The charge out rates are a lot lower, the payroll taxes are higher, the land taxes are higher and now we even have two new half-day public holidays courtesy of the SDA union. How difficult can you make being in business in this state?

Mr Goldsworthy: They run the state.

Ms SANDERSON: Who is running this state? Yes, exactly. We are now officially the laziest state in Australia because now we have 11 plus two part-day public holidays. New South Wales are the only state with 12 public holidays and we know what a financial mess they are in, so the Liberals will have a lot of mess to clean up there. The last thing we needed was more public holidays and higher rates when businesses, as we know, particularly in retail and hospitality, are absolutely struggling. The number of letters that I have received from business owners who own restaurants or cafes—who have started cafes that have even gone out of business.

Look at Melbourne Street, Prospect Road, O'Connell Street and you will find empty shops all along there. For someone to make a coffee on a Sunday it is over \$30 an hour, so the only cafes that open are extremely busy and popular or they have their family working or the business owner has to do all the hours. They are working 80 hour weeks because they cannot afford to have any staff in; the union is so strong that it has outpriced the ability for businesses to actually stay open.

What kind of state do we live in when taxi drivers are earning \$8 an hour and a 16 year old stacking shelves in Coles on a Sunday is earning \$30 an hour? That just goes to show how strong the SDA union is, how out of touch it is with this society, and why it will be the death of this state if we do not bring back the balance of power.

Business owners are not all rich people living off the backs of their young workers that people might think they are; most business owners in this state are very hard working, working 60 to 70 hours. Again, go to cafes along Prospect Road and you will see the owners looking exhausted because they have just worked a 70 hour week; they cannot afford to employ staff at the rates we have. Included with that are all the government taxes, the payroll taxes and everything that goes together with that. We have to start encouraging business to this state. We are absolutely destroying our state.

In the eighties, when I was looking back through the financial records of businesses—I was an auditor in an accounting firm—we were booming here. We used to have some of the top 100 companies. We had John Martin's, we had Faulding's head office here, Harris Scarfe used to have all its buying department and advertising here, we had Young and Rubicam. We have lost many big businesses out of our state.

We say that we put money into Holden because of all the other businesses it supports; well, every two weeks John Martin's would have a catalogue and that would be thousands and thousands of catalogues printed. So that is printers who lost money, advertising agencies that lost money, models who lost money, art directors, make-up artists, hairstylists, photographers. There are thousands of people affected by every business that shuts down; Holden is not the only business that passes on work to other industries.

We need to start supporting small businesses in our state, because they will have a knock-on effect. We are losing too many of our young, valuable people out of the state because we do not have the job opportunities, and the job opportunities come from small businesses that grow into medium-sized businesses and then into bigger businesses. If they cannot even survive being a small business because of this oppressive tax regime and the red tape, and because of just how difficult things are in this state, we are never going to get any better and we will not ever entice young people to stay.

What kind of a government sells all its income-producing assets? How will we ever get ahead? We are in massive debt, and the last thing you would do is sell the only things that make you money when you are in debt. Why would you sell your Lotteries Commission, which brings in millions of dollars a year? Why would you sell your forests? Why would you sell your hospital car parks? Everyone I know who has any investing capacity says that investing in a car park is a ticket to write your own money, and now we have the government wanting to sell all the hospital car parks.

There will be nothing left to sell and you will have no income-producing assets, and the only way you will be able to make money is by taxing people—and you know how much people love being taxed. If you actually kept assets that earn money, and if you had learnt to live off the GST, you could by now have got rid of most of the state taxes—which is, in fact, what most South Australians thought was going to happen.

There are a lot of issues with this government, and I just hope that it does not put us into any more debt or commit us to any more really bad contracts. The Royal Adelaide Hospital would be one of them. First of all it was going to be the Marjorie Jackson hospital, until the government finally listened to the public and saw how unpopular that idea was. But to move it to not only a flight path but to one of the major intersections in our city—the intersection of Port Road, West Terrace and North Terrace—could you make it any more difficult for people to get to? We do not have a train stop there yet; maybe we will, that would make a lot of sense.

Where the hospital is now it could have been rebuilt on its existing site for about \$2 billion less than the government is paying. In every other country in the world they somehow manage to keep buildings over 100 years old and build next to small sites. If you have ever been to Hong Kong, they could have built extra buildings even in the alleyways between two buildings. It is ridiculous how difficult things are in Adelaide. Why do we need to waste prime land on a riverbank and turn it into a hospital, of all things, which has fewer facilities than the original hospital. We are not even getting something better. We are getting something less, that we cannot even get to, that we will be paying off for 30 years. It is a monolith. It is disgraceful and such a waste of money.

That leads me to the BER money, which I know was a federal source of money, but it is an example of how Labor governments work. All this money has been given to schools to build school halls. The North Adelaide Basketball Club has about 53 basketball teams and they are operating out of two very old courts in Hillcrest. At one point, due to water damage, they only had one court. I rang Basketball SA when I saw that in the paper and said, 'What about all the BER money? Surely you could have built at the Roma Mitchell School,' which is actually built on the minister for sport's land. Why would you not put on sports land a four-court basketball facility? It is right opposite the hockey and the velodrome, and it is on the minister for sport's land. Why wouldn't you put four courts there? They said, 'We did ask for four courts there, but we only have two.' I said, 'Well, what about all the other school halls that were built? Why can't we use those for basketball?' They said, 'Because most of them were built at 75 per cent of the size, so now we cannot use them.'

For example, St Andrews School is right across from Walkerville Primary School and the Walkerville YMCA, which is very old and run down; why wouldn't you have put the money from the three school halls together and built a sports stadium for the whole community? Why would Norwood Primary School have its third school hall at the one primary school when it did not need it? Clearly, the money could have been used for better purposes. It is just another example of Labor mismanagement of money.

As for the cost of living, I do Meals on Wheels in my electorate and I meet a lot of elderly people who are living in their family home, where they were born. They are now 80 and 90 and now they cannot afford to live there because everything is rated on the cost of your home. Just because you live in an area where the housing has appreciated does not mean that you are earning any more money. Most of them are actually on the pension and that is why they are getting Meals on Wheels at \$6 a day or whatever it is.

They have lovely homes and council rates are based on the value of the home, as are water rates, the emergency services levy and the River Murray levy. We are pushing people out of their own homes. It is an absolute disgrace. Just because you were wise and bought an asset that improved in value does not mean that you are rich and should be punished and that we should take you away from your home.

I recently had a constituent who sold her home for \$500,000 less than the Valuer-General's value, so for the last 10 years she has been paying rates, water rates, ES levies and River Murray levies on \$500,000 more than the value for which she could sell her home. It is an absolute rip-off, and everyone is putting everything up all the time.

Now let us talk about Rundle Mall. Rundle Mall certainly needs some investment. Why would you put more shops on the riverbank when we cannot even fill the shops we already have in Rundle Mall? Let's fix what we already have. I think there are 110,000 city workers who come in and out of the city, and a lot of them work in Rundle Mall or nearby. I know that Rundle Mall Management Authority is doing its very best to encourage people into the mall, and hopefully we will not be seeing the potential price increases of the car parks.

I have certainly had a lot of complaints about the state government's doubling of parking fines throughout the whole state. The City Council has been taking the wrath, because they are the ones who actually issue the fines although it was a state government initiative. It is just another example of penny-pinching because it has so many bad policies that are costing a lot of money—including the desal plant. The pipeline is going right through Walkerville Terrace and hugely affecting retailers there. They are absolutely struggling with their road being closed for so long.

It has definitely gone over time. That was \$403 million that we actually did not need. The only reason we needed the \$403 million north-south interconnector was because the state government doubled the size of the desal plant. As mentioned, that was not on the basis of any information. That was just to double the Liberals' policy rather than having the Liberal policy of a 50-gigalitre desal along with stormwater harvesting, aquifers and storage of the water. Potentially, we are about to be funnelling the most expensive water we have ever had out to sea because we have nowhere to store it. Given that the Murray River is running and it is raining, it is going to be the most expensive waste of money.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. P. Caica.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SERIOUS AND ORGANISED CRIME) 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 9, page 8, line 34 [clause 9, inserted section 3A(2)(b)]—After 'Supreme Court' insert:
or the District Court
- No. 2. Clause 30, page 22, after line 13 [clause 30, inserted section 83E]—After subsection (7) insert:
(8) For the purposes of this section, a legal practitioner acting in the course of legal practice will be taken not to be participating in a criminal organisation or in an activity of a criminal organisation.
- No. 3. Clause 30, page 22, lines 22 and 23 [clause 30, inserted section 83G(1)]—Delete 'beyond a reasonable doubt' and substitute:
beyond reasonable doubt
- No. 4. Clause 38, page 23, line 30 [clause 38, inserted subsection (3)]—After 'Supreme Court' insert:
and the District Court
- No. 5. Clause 41, page 27, line 24 [clause 41, inserted section 34KC(1)]—Delete 'court' and substitute:
judge
- No. 6. Clause 41, page 27, line 33 [clause 41, inserted section 34KC(1)]—Delete 'court' and substitute:
judge
- No. 7. Clause 41, page 27, line 43 [clause 41, inserted section 34KC(2)]—Delete 'court' and substitute:
judge
- No. 8. Clause 41, page 28, line 1 [clause 41, inserted section 34KC(3)]—Delete 'court' and substitute:
judge

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (IMPLEMENTATION) 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. 2. Clause 4, page 11, after line 26—Insert:
29A—Review
- (1) The Commission must conduct a review of the operation of the *National Energy Retail Law* in South Australia after the expiry of 2 years from the date fixed under section 4.
 - (2) The review must focus on the impact of the *National Energy Retail Law* on consumers of energy and whether the implementation of the Law has—
 - (a) resulted in increased efficiencies; or
 - (b) adversely affected customer protection in pursuit of national consistency,
 and may address such other matters as the Commission thinks fit.
 - (3) The Commission must prepare a report on the outcome of the review and provide a copy of the report to the Minister.
 - (4) The Minister must, within 6 sitting days after receiving a report under subsection (3), have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.
 - (5) The Commission must, between the date fixed under section 4 and the completion of the review under this section, publish, on a quarterly basis,

statistics about the de-energisation of premises due to inability to pay energy bills during each quarter.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW IMPLEMENTATION) 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. New clause, 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 a site owned or occupied by 1 customer, 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 customer on 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).

No. 2. New clause, 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

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

MINING (EXPLORATION AUTHORITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:01 the house adjourned until Wednesday 2 May 2012 at 11:00.