

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 26 June 2012

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 15:18 and read prayers.

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

LIVESTOCK (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MENTAL HEALTH (INPATIENT) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY CHAMBER

The **SPEAKER (15:19)**: Members, today is a historic day for the House of Assembly as I believe it is the first time that we have sat in this place since our chamber was built. The last week has been a very difficult time in organising this session today, so I would ask you to put up with what is happening.

I want to give particular thanks to all of those who have made this possible: firstly, to the President and to the clerks of this place for allowing us to sit in here; also to my Clerk, Malcolm Lehman, who appears to have lost his hair worrying about this last week and organising the sorting of the asbestos problem; to the Government Whip and to the Opposition Whip and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition; to Hansard particularly, Philip Spencer and Anthony Hudson; to David Woolman, Building Services Manager; to our attendants and to the many others who have been involved in organising this week.

I would also remind members that the acoustics in this place are much better in here and ask them to understand that, if noise levels are not kept at minimal levels, it could be quite unacceptable in here. I notice the interjections are a lot louder already. I believe that this place is not used to the robust discussion and the interjections that may happen in our usual place, so please be aware of that. Your comments will be very easily picked up. Apart from all else, I hope that this all works and it all goes to plan.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The **Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:23)**: I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable routine business to be taken into consideration and the period for the asking of questions without notice to take priority over other items of routine business.

Motion carried.

The **SPEAKER**: We will move straight to questions without notice. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

QUESTION TIME

CADELL FERRY

Mrs **REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:24)**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am sure we can make the people who usually reside in this chamber understand how wonderful it is to have us in here. My question is to the Premier. When did cabinet first discuss the closure of the Cadell ferry and why did the Premier not stop the ferry's closure when this was first raised in cabinet? The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure told radio this morning in relation to the Cadell ferry closure, 'The matter was studied internally. Cabinet was notified of the considerations some time ago. The people were sent out then to consult on it. In my view, when they examined the process, they had not consulted the community early enough.'

The **Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (15:25)**: Cabinet noted the decision. It was not a cabinet decision, but as is the process certain

decisions are noted by cabinet. The simple truth is that we made a mistake, and that is what we have sought to do—correct the mistake.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

IRRIGATION AUSTRALIA

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:25): My question is to the Premier. Premier, what were the key issues that you raised at the Irrigation Australia 2012 conference?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (15:25): I thank the honourable member for this important question. Earlier today I opened Irrigation Australia's 7th Asian Regional Conference at the Adelaide Convention Centre. It was a very large gathering of irrigation interests from around the nation and overseas. The conference provided an opportunity for us to communicate to upstream irrigation interests exactly why South Australians are fighting for the River Murray, why we are campaigning to take this fight beyond the borders of our own state.

It was a chance to tell a broader community the story of our irrigators. Many people would be unaware of the way in which we have pursued this issue and the way in which we have respected this river over the decades, so it was an opportunity to tell them about that and the catastrophic effects that the depletion of the waters by the upstream states have had on our state.

Many would not have been aware that it was South Australian taxpayers and our own irrigators who used their own money to invest in the best irrigation practices that are now in place here. They would not be aware that 40 years ago we capped our take from the river. They are not aware of the fact that it is only 1 per cent of the waters of the river that are taken. They would not be aware that it is only 1 per cent of the waters of the rivers that are taken, that are taken for Adelaide and the surrounding districts. It is important that we take every opportunity to tell this story.

Many would also be surprised to learn that just this week we are still experiencing the effects of the overallocation in the drought with the EPA using lime slurry to tamp down the effects of acid sulfate soils leaching the acidified material back into the stream. That is happening this week, two years after all of the rains that we have seen.

Our campaign, of course, is growing in momentum. Just today we announced that people like Victorian environment educator and Prime Minister's Environmentalist of the Year for 2007, Arron Wood, has joined as a river champion. South Australian businessman Brett Charlesworth—many of you would be aware of his iconic brand for South Australia—has joined our campaign as a river champion. They will assist us in getting our message out to the broader community.

For those who seek to sell out our position by saying that somehow the current plan is a good start, my message to them is this: every time there have been questions raised about this river over the last 100 years, what has been applied is a bandaid solution that shuts out discussion and then the river continues to deteriorate. The poor compromises are over, just as the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —Deputy Leader of the Opposition reminded us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —earlier when he first saw the plan, he said that we would be duded. He was right then. I do not know what has changed his mind now, but we need to pursue most vigorously this campaign to make sure we get a healthy river on behalf of all South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can I just remind members and ministers that, because of the microphone situation here, it will be harder for Hansard to hear us. I have already been told to make sure that I have my microphone in front of me. Can you make sure that the microphone is pointed at you and that you are facing the microphone.

CADELL FERRY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:29): My question is again to the Premier. When the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure notified the cabinet of the considerations relating to the Cadell ferry, why didn't the Premier recognise the problem with the consultation process and why did the government proceed to announce the closure on 7 June, only 23 days prior to the ferry's planned closure, without bringing it to the attention of the people of the district?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (15:29): I do not know how many different ways I can say it: we made a mistake, but we sought to remedy it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, order! The member for Port Adelaide.

CRIME STATISTICS

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide) (15:30): My question is to the Attorney-General.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Port Adelaide, can you sit down. I cannot hear anything. It is very loud in here, and it has been pointed out to me that it is very difficult to hear.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You have had plenty of opportunities to ask questions. Member for Port Adelaide.

Dr CLOSE: Can the Attorney-General inform the house about the current crime rates in South Australia?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:30): I thank the honourable member for her question. This week, the government launched the latest edition of the Crime Mapper website, which includes updated statistics and statewide crime rates. The website, which was launched by the Office of Crime Statistics and Research, allows citizens, researchers, councils and other agencies to access data about crime in their local area. The website uses data sourced from SAPOL from 2006 to 2010 and allows users to compare data from over the past five years.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is a government question, please. Between 2006 and 2010, the total number of offences recorded by police decreased by an average of 6.5 per cent each year, resulting in a 23.6 per cent reduction over the five-year period. That is good news. Property offences are down 24 per cent, or 34,004 offences. Driving offences, and this is very important, are down 52.7—I will say that a bit louder: 52.7—per cent, or 30,511 offences, which means there are significant inroads being made into bad behaviour on our roads. These decreases were offset by comparatively—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will behave.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. I do not want to have to do it, but the reason people are arcing up is because the member for Schubert is taking photos. It is out of order.

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, you know it is out of order to take photos. You will leave the chamber for five minutes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! As the grandfather of the house, you should know.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will have some semblance of quiet for the minister, please.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The member for Schubert's sense of history got the better of him, Madam Speaker. As I was saying before I was rudely photographed by the member for Schubert, these decreases were offset by comparatively small increases in drug offences and offences against good order, which are up 3.1 per cent, or 1,135 offences, and SAPOL is trying to tackle this problem. All metropolitan LGAs recorded a decline in total offence numbers, with reductions ranging from 35.4 per cent to 13.8 per cent.

This year's edition of Crime Mapper has been improved to include statewide statistics, so that everybody can look up their electorates, as well as crime rates for metropolitan and regional South Australia. The website now allows users to download statistics as a spreadsheet.

CADELL FERRY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:34): I am tempted to congratulate the member for Schubert on achieving the historical event of being possibly the only House of Assembly member ever to be thrown out of the Legislative Council. My question is to the Premier: is the backflip on the closure of the Cadell ferry an admission from the Premier that his government failed in its pledge to consult, failed to consider the impact of its decision on the people of Cadell, and failed to be any different from the announce and defend Labor style that South Australians have suffered under for a decade?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Some of that was very provocative.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (15:35): I must note that the Leader of the Opposition does seem very disappointed with this decision. In fact, we could not get a question or a public comment from her on this issue until after it was resolved.

An honourable member: Wouldn't ask a question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Would not ask a question about it while it was an issue. It was only after it was resolved that it seems to be a matter of interest to her. I suspect it reflects—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: But I can answer her question candidly. It is true that the standards we set for ourselves have not been met on this occasion. That is why we have reversed the decision.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CADELL FERRY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:36): I am so used to Dorothy Dixers from the other side during estimates. My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. When the closure of the Cadell ferry was first discussed in cabinet, why did the minister not advise cabinet of the adverse impact of the ferry's closure on emergency services in the Cadell area, and why didn't she consult with the people of Cadell?

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) (15:36): I thank the member for Morphett for his question. I can inform the member for Morphett and the house that on 17 May SAFECOM provided me with the following advice: that Cadell is inside the south side of the Murray, the same side as the township, prison

and farms/properties; the other side of the river is pastoral country with some conservation parks, in essence, except for a few shacks and buildings near the river, mostly uninhabited.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am telling you what I was advised. You can have your own view.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: You can have your own view. I am telling you what I was advised.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I direct you back to the question.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: From an emergency response perspective—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley, order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Morgan is 8.9 kilometres away by road but across the river and Waikerie is on the same side of the river as Cadell. I was further advised practically all the population and infrastructure will not be affected in terms of emergency response from the existing Cadell CFS site if there were no ferry service.

The Deputy Commissioner of Police advised in a minute that the Cadell ferry service operates on the River Murray near the township of Cadell. The service sits between the Morgan and Waikerie ferry services. There are police stations at Morgan and Waikerie that both service the Cadell township. SA Police have reviewed this proposal and advised that if the Cadell ferry was closed it would not adversely impact on the policing services to those communities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman: Where your own prison was.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman: Didn't you know what side of the river it was on?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg, order!

ADELAIDE FESTIVALS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:38): My question is to the Minister for the Arts. Will the minister update the house about the economic impact of South Australia's festivals?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:39): I thank the member for Reynell for her question and I acknowledge her very strong interest in arts festivals. I am very pleased to advise the house that the economic impact of three of South Australia's major festivals has topped \$74 million in 2012, and each of them recorded an increase compared to the previous year.

The Adelaide Festival generated an estimated \$14.7 million of visitor economic expenditure and a total box office income of more than \$3 million. It attracted 13,950 interstate and overseas visitors, slightly more than the previous Festival in 2010. The Adelaide Fringe had an economic impact of \$48.2 million, based on ticket sales, overall attendances, food and beverage consumption, transportation and accommodation. There were an estimated 1.59 million Fringe event attendances. That is up 10 per cent on 2011. They generated about \$9 million in ticket sales. Hotel bed nights were up 10 per cent too on 2011, to 44,000.

WOMAD attracted nearly 50 per cent of its 87,500 attendances from interstate and generated an economic benefit to the state of \$11.1 million in 2012. It also generated the equivalent of 137 full-time jobs. This year's Adelaide Cabaret Festival, which finished last Saturday

night, claimed the highest box office income in the event's 12-year history, smashing the previous year's record by 12 per cent.

All those festivals have done very well. At Cabaret there were more than 30 sold-out performances this year, and the event reached its targeted total box office income. The line-up included 110 international artists and 194 Australian, and that included 110 South Australians. These, I think, are outstanding results and demonstrate the importance that festivals play in our economy and how successful we are in South Australia, and in Adelaide in particular, at running festivals. This is to do, I guess, with the geography, our culture, our size and the expertise that we now have here.

That program of festivals, of course, will continue. The South Australian Living Arts Festival will be held from 3 to 26 August, and the program for this free event, which celebrates and promotes the diverse talents of our local artists in a whole range of places across the metropolitan and regional areas, will be distributed on 7 July. The Guitar Festival will be mounted from 9 to 12 August, and tomorrow night the Premier will launch the program for the 2012 OzAsia Festival, which will go from 14 to 30 September. This year the OzAsia Festival will focus on the cultural diversity of India.

All these festivals are obviously good for the vibrancy of our city. They are good for a whole range of artistic reasons, but importantly they are great for our local economy. I would like to thank in particular not only those who run the festivals but the support that we get, and they get, from the corporate sector, which has supported all these festivals very well.

CADELL FERRY

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:42): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When the closure of the Cadell ferry was first discussed in cabinet, why did the minister not advise cabinet of the adverse impact of the ferry's closure on schools, students and parents in the Cadell area, and why did she not consult with the people or the parents of Cadell?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:42): Thank you to the member for Unley for this question. I repeat what I said I last week. The future of the school was never in question. This government does not close schools; it was you that used to do that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley, you have asked your question. The member for Bragg.

PRIORITY BUS LANES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:43): You will be glad it is not about Cadell. My question is to the Minister for Transport Services. What formal discussions did the minister have with the Adelaide City Council about bus lane restrictions in the traffic on Grenfell and Currie streets prior to announcing the changes? A freedom of information request lodged by the opposition for all correspondence between the minister (including her staff) and the Adelaide City Council has been refused on the grounds that no documents exist.

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (15:43): One does not refuse something that is not there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.C. FOX: The member for Bragg is looking for something which is not there. I cannot invent things for her to look for when they are not there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ashford.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Will members on my right behave?

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. You had not called any other member.

The SPEAKER: Alright.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: She did.

Ms CHAPMAN: She did not. Sit down, Jennifer; just calm down, will you?

The SPEAKER: Order! I will allow you some indulgence today.

PRIORITY BUS LANES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:44): Thank you, Madam Speaker, I appreciate that protection. My supplementary question is to the Minister for Transport Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the member. The acoustics are really good in this place. I would like to put a reduction on here. I can pick up your conversations and I will be able to tell you afterwards what you have been talking about so please keep your voices down; very interesting conversations. Member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: My supplementary question is, what consultation was undertaken with the businesses affected by the Grenfell and Currie streets bus lane changes?

The SPEAKER: I will count that as a question.

The Hon. C.C. FOX (Bright—Minister for Transport Services) (15:45): I did meet with the mayor on a number of occasions to discuss this particular matter. He, in his own right, with the council, consulted businesses and we, also as a department, consulted businesses. The overwhelming response that we had in terms of these bus priority lanes was an extremely positive one. The people who live and work and do business along those stretches of the city want to see them operating as best as possible. I have only praise for this idea. I defend what we are doing. I do not think it needs to be defended and, unfortunately for the member for Bragg, this is just another opportunity for the member to talk something good down. In the entire time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.C. FOX: —that I have been doing this job—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta, order!

The Hon. C.C. FOX: In the entire time that I have been doing this job, I have never, not once have I heard, one idea, not one suggestion, not one shred of vision from the member for Bragg or, indeed, any of her team, for the future of public transport in this city—not once.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ashford.

POLICE, NATIONAL EMPLOYER SUPPORT AWARD

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:46): Can I first of all celebrate the fact that this is the second time we have had a woman in the chair in this chamber, and also celebrate the Labor majority in the Legislative Council. My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Can the minister inform the house about SAPOL's latest award for supporting its employees and improving safety around Australia and beyond?

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) (15:47): I thank the member for Ashford for her question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am pleased to advise that SAPOL has been recognised yet again. On 22 June, SAPOL was announced as the public sector winner of the 2012 National

Employer Support Award. This latest achievement comes on top of South Australia having the highest rate of operational police of any state for five years in a row. It stands alongside SAPOL's achievement over the past decade of being ranked first in Australia seven times in the community's confidence in police. In the other three years, we never finished off the podium. There is a winning culture within our police service.

SAPOL has around 170 officers who are also Defence Force reserve personnel for the Army, Navy and Air Force. This award recognises that SAPOL makes every effort to ensure these officers are supported to do their bit for the state and also do their bit for the nation. Officers who work part time with the Defence Force exchange ideas, learn new skills and then bring these experiences back to their anything-but regular jobs. Employers may be technically required to provide certain conditions for the defence reserve staff; however, there is a big difference between grudgingly doing something because you have to and doing things because you truly believe it adds value to your organisation.

Assistant Commissioner Bryan Fahy attended the ceremony at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra and accepted the award from the Parliamentary Secretary for Defence, Senator David Feeney. The senator said the South Australia Police 'builds the skills of their officers, creates strong community and business partnerships, and also supports the security of our nation'. I trust the opposition will join me in congratulating SAPOL on yet another award.

MARINE PARKS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:49): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Now that all of the 10 councils on Eyre Peninsula have lost confidence in the government's marine parks process, will the government finally concede that its consultation has been flawed and that the proposed sanctuary zones will have a devastating effect on our state's economy? At last week's meeting of the Eyre Peninsula Local Government Association, a motion was passed unanimously by the member councils expressing their lack of confidence in the government and the department regarding the consultation process.

The SPEAKER: Before the minister stands up, member for Flinders, that was a very provocative question. In your explanation you did cover it somewhat, however. Minister, I think that you need to answer that question.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:50): Madam Speaker, the member for Flinders is one of the outstanding people on the other side, and I was not provoked nor did I find his question provocative in any way. I understood what the outcome of the vote was going to be before it was taken, and I say that on the basis that I had met with representatives of the Local Government Association. I can see my friend smiling over there because he obviously knew the result before it was voted upon as well—that they would join together in voting that way in support—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, this is a chamber in which the noise does travel quite a lot across it. I will try to answer it, and I would ask the Leader of the Opposition not to interject so that I can answer it in a timely fashion. I knew which way they were going to vote. There is certainly some concern on the Far West Coast with respect to the proposed sanctuary zones which are undertaking a further process of consultation. Once the draft management plans are put in place, we will undertake that.

The marine parks are something that this state government is committed to, hence the very reason we brought together stakeholders to look at priority conservation areas. We expected there to be some concern expressed by some people on the West Coast, but quite simply I met with a significant number of individual councils through their Local Government Association leading up to that stakeholders' meeting that we held some time ago, together with representatives of the recreational fishing industry, the commercial fishing sector and the Marine Parks Alliance, as well as the Scientific Working Group and the conservation sector, where it was unanimously agreed that the priority zones would be put out for this further process of developing the marine parks based on those high-conservation areas.

Do we shy away from the fact that this state is committed, as the Liberal opposition was, it seems, back in 1999, I think it was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, member for Davenport.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: If the Leader of the Opposition—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —is not aware of what the comments were at that particular time with respect to marine parks and the need for higher levels of protection within what they were proposing as marine parks, well, I will send that media release over to the opposition. This state has a very, very productive future. That future—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —will be underpinned by robust, sustainable, commercial fisheries. It will be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —underpinned by the continuation of some of the best recreational fishing that will occur anywhere on this planet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —and it will be further enhanced by a marine park system that has sanctuary zones that will in turn enhance those activities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ramsay.

SKILLS FOR ALL

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:53): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can the minister inform the house how the state government's Skills for All reforms will benefit South Australia's Indigenous community?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:53): I thank the honourable member for her very important question. The state government has set a target of halving the gap between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal unemployment rates by 2018. Currently, the unemployment rate is more than three times that of our non-Indigenous population. That is why it is important that the government's Skills for All reforms take positive steps to redress that imbalance.

The Learner Support Services Program is fully funded by the government and is available to students with complex needs whose chances of completing their course without assistance are often much reduced. A trial of the Learning Support Services Program has been run through TAFE SA in 2011-12 and will be expanded during 2012-13 to include a selection of other training providers. These services can include personal support and mentoring, study skills support, liaison with and referrals to external services, career guidance, in-class support, vocational placement and volunteering support, support in transition into training and employment. These support services have been shown to significantly increase completion rates.

The Aboriginal Access Centre aims to lead prospective Aboriginal students from unemployment to vocational education and training and then on to sustainable employment. Based in over a dozen metropolitan and regional TAFE campuses, the service provides individualised

case management, tutorial assistance and e-learning resources, and can assist with providing financial support for courses. Support is provided for the duration of study and up to a further 12 months to assist participants to find a job.

The Tauondi Aboriginal College is an independent Aboriginal-owned and operated organisation, with funding support through the state government. The college provides Aboriginal people with accredited or non-accredited training and plays a significant role in building the confidence, capacity and capability of the state's Aboriginal community.

Fee concessions will also be available to students who hold a health care card and may further reduce the cost of training for courses at certificate III level and above. Certificate I and II level courses will, for the first time, be fee-free from July. These are, indeed, worthy initiatives that focus on addressing Indigenous disadvantage but it is important to also note that our state as a whole will benefit significantly through the contributions that Indigenous South Australians can make to our economic wellbeing.

ONLINE GAMBLING

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:56): My question is to the Minister for Finance. Has the government undertaken any modelling regarding the impact on newsagents of allowing online sales of SA Lotteries products? If so, what are the results and, if not, why not? The Newsagents Federation is concerned that the government sale of SA Lotteries will lead to a greater emphasis on internet sales, diverting revenue from members.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:56): I thank the member for the question. My dad actually was a newsagent so I have given this a great deal of thought. We had a newsagency in—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: —and I spent a great deal of time working in the family business. When this proposition was raised with me, my initial concern was: what is going to be the impact on the business of newsagents? Those members who have been following the debate around Fairfax, with the potential move away from the print media, would be aware that the amount of revenue that has been flowing into newsagencies from the sale of newspapers and magazines over the last decade has been in decline and, increasingly, a significant source of their revenue has been by way of gaming: so it is an issue, indisputably.

Our dilemma is that we are the only state in Australia that has not allowed online gambling and, as a result of that, revenue that could be ultimately flowing into our hospitals has been going across the border.

Ms Chapman: You don't still believe that?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Well, that's the fact of the matter.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Irrespective of what we do in South Australia, people will, increasingly, move to online gambling. It was the view of the board of SA Lotteries that this was forgone revenue and the smart thing to do would be to recognise that people's behaviour in relation to gambling was beginning to change. We made the decision, and there was extensive discussion with the industry, and I think there was a realisation that, approached in a constructive manner, we might actually be able to preserve the level of revenue that was flowing into newsagents by virtue of diverting some of that business into bricks and mortar. The impression that I took away from the discussion was that there was an acceptance of the new reality. I think that is the acceptance that in place within Fairfax as well.

The world has changed, and people increasingly will access their news by way of iPads and the like and increasingly will also go online. What newsagents have to do is alter their business plans in line with the changing reality. I took great satisfaction from the fact that SA Lotteries had taken the time to discuss these matters with the industry, and I think they did it in quite a sensitive and constructive manner. They did not do the modelling per se, but they knew the percentage of business that was going interstate that could be pulled back into South Australia. I think the manner that was adopted in these discussions was constructive. I think newsagents are of the

understanding that they have to make the necessary changes to deal with the fact that the world is changing, as all retailers are.

SA LOTTERIES

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:01): Supplementary question: what consultation did the government undertake with the Newsagents Federation and the newsagency owners prior to announcing the sale of SA Lotteries?

The SPEAKER: That is a new question, member for Adelaide; it is not a supplementary.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (16:01): Within the contractual arrangement with their agents my recollection and the advice that I have been given is that there is a clause that necessitates a formal process of negotiation if a significant change is to occur. I have been advised by the CE that they followed their contractual obligation to newsagents through the Newsagents Association and that at least one meeting was held.

It is my understanding that individual newsagents were given the opportunity to quiz SA Lotteries, to quiz the CE and put forward their particular concerns; so there was a formal process of consultation. They were made aware before the decision was made that this was the thinking of the board, but the decision was made by the board (this is my understanding) after the process of consultation had occurred. I will come back to the member just to give certainty on that particular point.

OTHER PERSON GUARDIANSHIP PROGRAM

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (16:02): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house about what investments are being made to ensure the long-term care of children and young people placed under long-term guardianship orders?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (16:03): I thank the member for Lee for this important question. As everyone in this place well knows, this government has placed a priority on the care and protection of our children. We have invested significant resources in the system over the past decade, tripling the budget and ensuring we have a number of programs and initiatives that seek to produce the best possible result for our state's most vulnerable children and young people. The Other Person Guardianship Program plays an important role in that respect.

Once children are assessed by child protection professionals and the Youth Court of South Australia has endorsed that a child or young person be placed on a long-term order, a stable and nurturing placement is the best option. In South Australia the majority of children under a guardianship order reside with people like foster carers, relative carers or kinship carers in family-based care. I was joined last week in estimates committee by the member for Morialta in acknowledging these people who do an outstanding job caring for our most vulnerable children.

Whilst foster, relative and kinship carers provide for the day-to-day care and wellbeing of children or young people who are placed into their care, these carers do have limited authority to make decisions that many parents take for granted. An alternative guardianship order can be made when a carer shows lifelong commitment to the child or young person, has capabilities to manage the needs of the child in their care and has sufficient personal and professional support and resources to care for the child in the long term.

By transferring legal guardianship to a long-term carer, we support the carer to make everyday decisions much like any other parent, and that is incredibly important. What we know is that these types of orders facilitate the development of a secure attachment between carer and young person, which is built on trust and love, providing the very best chance for these children to reach their potential and have a happy and loving life.

This government recognises that ensuring a child or young person on a long-term guardianship order is in a stable, loving, family-based placement is the best result we can get. We are now working actively to transfer guardianship to a carer where careful assessment indicates that it would be in the child's best interests to do so. I am pleased to report that, to date, we have successfully placed 56 children and young people under the guardianship of another person and will continue to progress this program in the interests of these children.

ADELAIDE AND MOUNT LOFTY RANGES NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT LEVY

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (16:05): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Can the minister confirm that the government's latest backflip, this time on the NRM levy, was the result of a lack of adequate consultation with local government, the NRM standing committee—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The questions have all contained comment, but it is beyond a joke. You cannot simply make some sort of argument when you ask a question. They are specifically disallowed by—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am sorry, m'lud over there has fixed it up for me. You cannot put argument in a question; it is standing order 97, from memory.

The SPEAKER: I will uphold that. I ask you to be very careful about your wording of the questions.

Mr MARSHALL: Would you like me to remove the word 'backflip'? Is that the offending word? I can take that word out, if you prefer, Madam Speaker. They seem very sensitive to the term 'backflip' over there.

The SPEAKER: The member can bring the question to me, I will have a look at it and we will go to the next question.

Mr MARSHALL: I am happy to reword, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: If you can reword it now so that it is not controversial.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister confirm that the government's latest change in previously announced policy, this time on the NRM levy, was a result of lack of adequate consultation with local government, the NRM standing committee and the government's own backbench?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I want to help the member for Norwood. When you say 'confirm it was a lack of adequate consultation'—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —you are making an argument that there has been a lack of adequate consultation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I can do this slowly, if you like. When you ask someone to confirm that there was a lack of adequate consultation, you are making an argument that there is a lack of adequate consultation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is your dime. It is, therefore, argument, and I would ask the member for Norwood—I know he is new—to try to ask his question in an orderly fashion.

Mr MARSHALL: Was that comment an argument there, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Yes, there was.

Mr MARSHALL: 'I know he is only new.'

The SPEAKER: The member can ask—

Mr MARSHALL: I know he is only old, and a has-been.

The SPEAKER: —if there was consultation, but to make the statement that there was lack of consultation, you have enough people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: I will remove that, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: You have enough advisers on your side to know how to word a question.

Mr MARSHALL: Can the minister confirm that it will not proceed with a plan to increase the NRM levy for the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board by the proposed 11.2 per cent, now settling for just 6 per cent—still double the inflation rate—but certainly around half of what was originally proposed by the minister?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: That is better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (16:08): I will attempt to answer this in the four minutes that I have available to me. It is clear to me that the member for Norwood needs a greater understanding of how the NRM processes work. It was not a government proposal to increase it by the quantum—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —that was recommended by the board—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will listen to the answer or leave the chamber, order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —which, of course, I supported by referring it to the Natural Resources Committee.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: It is not your fault, then.

The Hon. P. CAICA: How can he call it mine, then? How can he call it my proposal, then? In essence, there is a process to go through. I make this point—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: I would have thought that the member for Norwood might be a little better informed, because he asked me a question on this matter in estimates, which finished just a couple of hours—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: He did, actually. How would you know? There is little you do know.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will sit down for a moment. We will have some order. The minister will not respond to interjections and members on my left will not interject or I will call question time to a close.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA: So, as a result of a process that had been undertaken for an extended period of time, which included consultation by the NRM boards with local councils and with local community members, a proposal was put forward to increase the NRM levy by 11.4 per cent. It was then referred to the Natural Resources Committee.

Under the act, the Natural Resources Committee has three ways by which it can deal with this: it can reject that quantum of increase, it can refer it back to me, or it can make a recommendation as to what the quantum will be. As a result of that process, it was referred back to me and I decided to set that fee at 6 per cent, which I understood reflected what was to occur in other members' areas.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: When they talk about doubling, we are very mindful of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: We are very mindful of the impact of fees and charges. Let me put this into context. We were talking about, for a significant majority of residents, depending on the council area they were in, a minimum of a \$3 increase over a 12-month period. A \$3 increase over a year—divide that by 52 and that will tell you how much a week—to a maximum of \$8, I think, for Walkerville council (but I will stand corrected if that is not the case). If you divide that by 52 it will show you the increase over a period of time—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: 40¢.

The Hon. P. CAICA: That is 40¢ my learned friend, the member for Kaurna, tells me. This is the point: it has been reduced from what was proposed to 6 per cent.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Norwood, order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: The other point I would make is that this proposed increase has been part of the four-year plan first mooted back in 2009, I understand. So the NRM committee had seen this figure each year for the last four years. They made a decision this time, it was built into it—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, it is a process that we undertake. Of course, part of it was about making sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —that councils have sufficient time to be able to allocate that amount of money for the collection for NRM. So it was made in a timely fashion, and it was reduced to 6 per cent based on the fact that no advice had been received from the NRM committee about what it would be. As I understand it, that went to cabinet last Monday; it was subsequently gazetted, and it is at 6 per cent.

That 6 per cent means that it is \$1.50 for the majority of people who pay NRM levies within that district, leading up to half of \$8, which is \$4, for those who are going to suffer the highest increase. Of course, when you talk in percentage terms it can be a high percentage increase, but not in monetary terms. Notwithstanding that, we have been very mindful of the impact of the cost of living and we are doing what we can to make sure that that is managed from a government fees perspective.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, they have been rather rude in this chamber, which is rather noisy.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The minister will sit down; his time has expired.

HOSPITAL PARKING

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (16:14): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Will the commercialisation of hospital car parks and their transfer to private ownership have any unintended consequences for businesses in respect of fringe benefits tax? If so, has the government consulted with businesses that may be affected? The government has acknowledged cabinet plans to privatise hospital car parks. The Australian Taxation Office website states that fringe benefits tax liability may arise for car parks provided by an employer for their employees where there is a commercial parking station within a one kilometre radius.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (16:14): Treasury has carriage of the issue. It is currently a matter that is being scoped by the department. They have not provided any formal advice, but that would be one of the issues which would be considered as part of the scoping. I am not a taxation expert, but I would have thought that, for staff who are being provided with a car park, that would normally be picked up in FBT issues for those staff—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Well, then, I am more than happy to have a look at that and get some advice back, but, as I say, it is something which is being scoped. It is in the early stages, the business case is being prepared, and that will be brought to me to take a recommendation to cabinet.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY TESTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:15): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Why does the minister's department use NAPLAN practice testing to prepare students in years 2, 4, 6 and 8 for the following year's NAPLAN tests when the federal education minister, Peter Garrett, does not support this? The federal education minister's office stated on 9 June 2012:

...it is not beneficial for schools to use the tests to prepare students for NAPLAN when they will not be sitting the test that year.

The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) also does not endorse practice testing.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (16:16): I thank the member for Unley for this question. He makes a number of assertions: the first is that practice testing is undertaken in these year levels, and I would ask him to give me the information that substantiates this assertion—

Mr Pisoni: I'll send the release out after question time.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: No—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: No, show me—

The SPEAKER: Member for Unley, order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: No, I am very happy to look at that because I am aware that there was one school (and I cannot recall whether it was a government school or a school in the non-government sector) where, in fact, they were doing a practice test in year 6. Of course, they do not do NAPLAN testing in year 6; they were doing it in anticipation of the test in year 7. My view and ACARA's view—in fact, we talked about it at our last SCSEEC meeting (our last national ministerial council meeting)—is that the NAPLAN testing has to be put into its appropriate context. It is one tool in the toolkit, and there is absolutely nothing to be gained by excessive testing.

The other thing, in fact, before I go on, is that our schools across all sectors do a variety of things to prepare their children for the NAPLAN tests but also, more importantly, for the ongoing requirements of literacy and numeracy.

Ms Chapman: So you agree with Peter Garrett?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: My view—and I have always maintained this, and I said this, in fact, just before we did the NAPLAN test here in South Australia—is that families, students and teachers should consider this test as simply one of the tools in the toolkit, that there is no point becoming anxious about it, and that we should approach it like we approach any other test. I think we get useful data from our NAPLAN tests.

In fact, I visited a number of fantastic schools with the member for Taylor this morning. I visited Two Wells Primary School, and I have to say I congratulate the principal of that school. Before, or possibly at the same time as NAPLAN, she arrived at the school, and she introduced a whole-of-school focus on literacy. I think it was an accelerated reading program—I can't remember the title of the program, whether it was accelerated reading or accelerated literacy—and then got results and then moved on to attacking numeracy, again seeing fantastic results in the NAPLAN data.

So, I congratulate our schools in the government and non-government sectors. We have a whole-of-sector commitment to improving our literacy and numeracy, not just because of NAPLAN, but I have to say, NAPLAN does give us useful data.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY TESTS

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:19): Supplementary, if I may, Madam Speaker: why then do South Australian schools have NAPLAN results below the national average in every category?

The SPEAKER: That is a question, not a supplementary. Minister.

An honourable member: I think you just answered that.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (16:20): I am happy to answer it again. The fact is that NAPLAN testing is simply one of the tools in the toolkit. It seeks to highlight literacy and numeracy in our community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I have made very clear to my agency that literacy and numeracy is a priority for us. I made it clear in this place that I was disappointed with our results. However, the fact that this government has brought together our child protection, our health services and our education services into the one agency in October last year places us in the strongest ever position and we will be to ensure that—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: —by the time our kids get to school they are in the strongest possible place, ready to be engaged in learning. We know from all the research—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Yes, we are still waiting to be not interrupted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: South Australia is a leader when it comes to early childhood and we know that, if we want our kids to do well in the NAPLAN test and all sorts of other testing, by the time we get them into our formal system they need to be ready to learn, and that is why this agency gives us the biggest lever we have ever had as a government.

RED CROSS BLOOD SERVICE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (16:21): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Has a cost-benefit analysis or impact statement been done on the possible scale-back of the SA Blood Services testing and processing capabilities, either by the Red Cross or the government and, if so, will he make the document publicly available? Public reports have proposed that the Australian Red Cross Blood Service is set to scale back its Adelaide operations, forcing blood donations to be shipped to Melbourne. It has been reported that the move would cost up to 70 full-time jobs, coming on the back of a slow downgrade of research and development capabilities in SA.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (16:22): I thank the member for Waite for his question. As he and other members would know, the blood service is not a government service. We at a national level contribute on a formula basis to support the blood service to collect blood and blood products right around Australia. They have looked at their own business case, and my understanding is that they have done an assessment (I am not sure whether it is publicly available) and come to the conclusion that there are more efficient ways of running the service, and that includes having the blood work done through, I think, Victoria.

I am happy to get some further details for the member. It is something that is obviously regrettable to see the transfer of operations from our state to another state. The other viewpoint of course is that that will take pressure off taxpayers, who have to fund these services. It is always a balance between wanting to maintain existing operational structures and wanting to make savings to make sure services can be delivered in the most cost-effective way possible. The blood service obviously has to make those decisions, and ministers have to consider the recommendations. Whether or not the paperwork, which I guess is really what the member is asking for, the business case, is available publicly, I am not sure. I will certainly make inquiries and, if it is, I will give him a copy.

MARINE PARKS

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (16:24): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Why is the minister claiming that only \$4 million will be lost from the South Australian professional fishing sector under the government marine park sanctuary zones? The Kangaroo Island fishing industry has calculated that it will lose just under \$4 million on Kangaroo Island alone through the rock lobster and scale fishing sectors. This does not include what will be lost through the abalone sector. When they met yesterday with the KI Futures Authority, a government authority charged and funded by the government to increase and enhance primary production, they were absolutely horrified.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (16:24): I am not quite sure where the assertion being made by the member for Finniss is coming from, but the state government made numerous commitments to the commercial sector throughout this marine park process. We have reinforced those commitments every stage of the way, and one is that we will pay for displaced effort

In addition to that, on the preliminary calculations that have been undertaken by the government, the commitment previously was—and that commitment still remains—no more than 5 per cent of GVP across the state with respect to impact on the fishing industry. Preliminary analysis is that it will be well under that. Of course, that will be confirmed through the process of the development of the impact statements and draft management plans.

We never suggested that it will not have an impact on commercial fishing in those areas of highest level conservation, but we have also underpinned this process by a four-step process, which says: avoid displacement where we can; zone in such a way that, where displacement occurs, you can fish nearby; buy out displaced effort; and finally, one that we hope we will not have to use at all (and I am confident that we will not), which is to compulsorily acquire. I am very happy with the process that has been undertaken to date. As I said—

Mr Pengilly: Consult and ignore.

The SPEAKER: Member for Finniss, order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —the introduction of marine parks with sound sanctuary zone proposals in them will enhance this state's capacity and be of economic, social and environmental advantage for future generations, and indeed this generation.

SHACK LEASES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond): Presented a petition signed by 1,950 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to enable local councils to take effective care, control and management of shack sites to allow shack lessees to sublease shacks from the local government authority rather than directly from the state government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

BUILDING INNOVATION FUND

260 Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (13 July 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 3, p134, Sub-program 3.2—

What projects have been implemented under the building innovation fund?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I am advised of the following information:

The Building Innovation Fund aims to establish South Australia as the nation's leader in demonstrating innovative approaches to reducing greenhouse gas emissions from existing commercial buildings.

The \$2 million fund was established in 2008-09 and provides grants for both capital works and feasibility studies to universities, not-for-profit associations and owners of private office buildings, hotels and shopping centres.

Three funding rounds have been completed, resulting in the provision of around \$1.5 million towards six capital works projects and four feasibility studies. The fourth funding round closed earlier this year and the outcome is expected to be announced before the end of the financial year.

Three feasibility studies have been completed. These include studies into living wall systems suitable for application on multi-storey buildings in Adelaide's climate, an evaluation of emission reduction technologies for commercial buildings and a façade improvement study using thermographic analysis. The results of these studies have been published on the State Government's website so that the entire property sector can benefit from the lessons learnt. The fourth study into building-integrated photovoltaic options for commercial building facades is approaching completion.

Two capital works projects have been completed. The first is the development of a prototype green wall, which was officially launched on 14 May 2011. This is Adelaide's first living wall installed at a commercial office building. The wall was developed with consideration of Adelaide's climate and it uses plants locally native to the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Region. The second project is the installation of green roof systems at the ANZ Building in Adelaide which was completed in June 2011.

The performance of the green wall and green roof systems are being tested and monitored for 12 months to estimate their impact on the buildings' energy and greenhouse performance. The projects will provide detailed data regarding the performance of green walls and roofs in Adelaide's climatic conditions.

Four capital additional works projects are currently underway. These include the development of a solar façade, the installation of 'BlueGen' ceramic fuel cells used in conjunction with a solar array, the installation of 'Climate Wizard' indirect evaporative cooling technology and the installation of a tri-generation engine in conjunction with a revised heating system.

These ten projects are collectively helping to advance a range of low carbon technologies for use in the commercial buildings sector and demonstrating South Australia's leadership in tackling climate change.

NATIONAL COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE STRATEGY

296 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (23 August 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 2, p196—

Why was there an underspend of \$1.2 million for the National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy in 2010-11 and a further underspend of \$2.2 million in 2009-10?

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The National Collaborative Research Infrastructure Strategy (NCRIS) program was designed to

reduce over the three years (2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12) of the program and monies were spent as determined by contractual arrangements. The actual spend amounts are detailed below:

Year	Actual Spend	Estimated Spend	Difference	Percentage Spent (estimated/actual)
2009-10	\$3,393,286	\$3,400,000	6,714	99.4
2010-11	\$1,140,571	\$1,200,000	59,429	97.5

SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

313 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (23 August 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 4, p160—

What are the details of the \$24.098 million payments for 'services and supplies' in 2010-11?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development): I have been advised of the following:

Services and supplies include most expenditure for the South Australian Motor Sport Board e.g. circuit construction, security, concerts.

Supplies and services include the majority of costs associated with the staging of the Clipsal 500 event, including circuit construction, marketing and advertising, and contract payment fees.

Circuit construction costs are the main component of services and supplies, totalling around \$13 million in 2010-11.

MOTOR SPORT BOARD

315 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (23 August 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 4, p160—

How much has the Motor Sport Board spent on travel or travel related expenses in 2010-11?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development): I have been advised of the following:

The South Australian Motor Sport Board spent \$26,972 on travel or travel related expenses in 2010-11.

CLIPSAL 500

318 Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (23 August 2011) (First Session). With respect to 2011-12 Budget Paper 4—Volume 4, p160—

Who will be the naming right's sponsors and major sponsors for the Clipsal event in 2011-12, and what are the amounts of sponsorship anticipated?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development): I have been advised of the following:

Total sponsorship revenue for the 2012 event was \$2,506,707.

The naming rights sponsor was Clipsal Australia.

Platinum and support sponsors were:

- The Advertiser
- National Foods
- Armor All
- ADCIV
- Bottle-O
- Coates Hire
- RAA Insurance

- Gliderol
- Ticketek

COURT ASSESSMENT REFERRAL DRUG SCHEME

350 Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (4 October 2011) (First Session).

1. What has been the aggregate number and percentage attendance rates of adult offenders diverted into the Court Assessment Referral Drug Scheme in each year since 2006?
2. What has been the aggregate number and percentage attendance rates of those individuals diverted into the scheme and have subsequently gone on to re-offend?
3. How many of those individuals diverted into the scheme did not attend and have subsequently gone on to re-offend?
4. How many of those individuals diverted into the scheme did not attend and have been subsequently prosecuted for either their non-attendance or for their original offence in each year since 2006?
5. What has been the aggregate number and percentage attendance rates for adult offenders directed into the Court Assessment Referral Drug Scheme (or its replacement), who then who have gone on to re-offend and subsequently been diverted again into the same program (or its replacement) on—
 - (a) one occasion;
 - (b) two occasions;
 - (c) three occasions;
 - (d) four occasions; and
 - (e) five or more occasions?

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

1. The aggregate number and percentage attendance rates of adult offenders diverted into the Court Assessment Referral Drug Scheme in each year since 2006 is:

Aggregate Number and Percentage Attendance Rates for CARDS					
	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
Referred	385	390	327	136	
Accepted	221	370	172	74	
Completed	107	267	105	44	2
Still in Treatment	48	102	41	5	
Completion Rate	62%	99%	80%	63%	

Note: CARDS ceased operating from 1 July 2010 and is to be replaced with a 6-month Drug Treatment Program (6DTP) which has the same programmatic components as the Drug Court except for the Drug Court requirement from home detention bail. The percentage completion rates are worked out by subtracting those still in treatment from the accepted number.

2. The Court Administration Authority does not have data on how many of those individuals directed to attend these programs have subsequently gone on to re-offend.

An evaluation of the pilot phase of CARDS 2004-06 was undertaken by the Office for Crime Statistics and Research (OCSAR). One aspect of the evaluation was concerned with re-offending. The full report of the evaluation of Adult CARDS is available from the OCSAR website www.ocsar.sa.gov.au.

3. The CAA does not have information on how many of those individuals directed to attend these programs did not attend and have subsequently gone on to re-offend.

4. CARDS participants were diverted to treatment under section 21B of the Bail Act, 1985 which stipulates participation is voluntary.

Everyone participating on CARDS was prosecuted for their original offence at the completion of the program and/or at the next hearing set for four months from the acceptance date. So regardless of whether someone completed or not they returned to court for sentencing after four months.

Under section 10(5) of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 participation in an intervention program, in this case CARDS, and the defendant's achievements in the program, may be treated as relevant to sentence. However, section 10(6) says that the fact that a defendant—

(a) has not participated in, or has not had the opportunity to participate in, an intervention program; or

(b) has performed badly in, or has failed to make satisfactory progress in, such a program, is not relevant to sentence.

5. There is no data readily available on the number of times an individual has participated in CARDS. The policy has been that, any outstanding sentence imposed after the individual was offered the option of CARDS and did not complete the program, would have to be served before the individual could participate in.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (30 June 2011) (Estimates Committee A).

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts): I am advised:

1. In accordance with accepted accounting practices, SA Health updates valuations of its assets on a triennial basis. The last valuation of assets was undertaken in 2009. At that time, the current value (being the Fair Value or Written-Down Replacement Cost) of the Royal Adelaide Hospital was deemed to be \$146,189,700.

This is the figure recognised in the accounting records for SA Health.

2. Currently a Master Planning exercise is being undertaken to assess the options for the Frome Road precinct.

3. The government will not be writing off \$1 billion.

SPORTS FUNDING

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (5 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The seven sports being transitioned out of the South Australian Sports Institute (SASI) are having their previous level of direct program funding of \$263,000 from SASI maintained for the 2011-12 financial year, principally through State-wide Enhancement Program grants (StEP). StEP grants will provide \$206,000 with the balance \$57,000 coming from the Office for Recreation and Sport budget for the next 12 months.

The exact determination of employment costs is difficult to determine as a majority of the coaches are actually employed by agencies external to the Government, that is State or National Sporting Organisations (NSOs). It is fair to say that the employment costs in all sports except Basketball and Tennis, are met from the combination of NSO funding and the SASI direct funding contribution. The average salary of coaches at this level is approximately \$65,000 plus on costs. In the case of Basketball and Tennis, the coaches have tended to be funded separately and wholly by Basketball SA and Tennis Australia respectively.

COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (16:27): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Would members please take their seats or be quiet.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am pleased to confirm that earlier today I announced the appointment of Mr Gary Burns to the position of South Australian Commissioner of Police for a term of three years. Deputy Commissioner Burns, a 43-year police service veteran, will begin his tenure on 21 July when the current commissioner, Mal Hyde, retires. Gary Burns was selected from a quality field of local and international candidates and is an outstanding choice to lead South Australia Police. He inherits a police force in good shape, with more police on the beat in South Australia than ever before, a crime rate that has fallen by 37 per cent since 2001-02 and a road toll that has reduced by 33 per cent from 154 fatalities in 2002 to 103 in 2011.

Gary Burns commenced with SAPOL in 1969, when he joined as a 16 year old just out of Enfield High School. After a three-year cadet course and three years' service as a patrol officer in the city and suburbs, he transferred to Kadina in 1975 and Moonta in 1977. He returned to Adelaide and joined the newly-formed STAR Group, with which he would remain for the next 12 years. In 1991 he won promotion to inspector after he emerged as dux of his commissioned officers course.

After a promotion to chief inspector in 1996, he rose rapidly up the ranks, even skipping two along the way. He was appointed as assistant commissioner in 2000 and deputy commissioner in 2007. He has extensive experience in various aspects of policing and has commanded several major operations, including the 1996 Yatala prison riots, the Whyalla Airlines search, and the police response to the Woomera Detention Centre breakout and Baxter Detention Centre protest.

As you would expect for such a position, we had an exceptional field of candidates. The fact that four of the five candidates were senior SAPOL officers shows the depth of talent and experience SAPOL has access to. With any of the candidates capable of filling the role, SAPOL is well placed to meet future challenges with an outstanding leadership group. Deputy Commissioner Burns brings a range of attributes to his job; and his knowledge of our state, his deep experience in policing and his very strong intellect all led the police minister and cabinet to endorse him as South Australia's next Commissioner of Police.

I would like to take a few moments of the house's time to record the appreciation I believe all members of parliament would show for the service to South Australia provided by Mal Hyde AO. His performance as police commissioner has been outstanding and has been instrumental in maintaining stability and integrity within the South Australian police force.

Throughout his period as commissioner, Mr Hyde has managed to uphold an enviable reputation for leading a professional and ethical police service and enjoys the longstanding support and confidence of the community. I am delighted with the shape in which Commissioner Hyde is leaving SAPOL. He has served this state with distinction and his retirement will be a loss for the South Australia Police.

I might just add here that the reason we had such a wonderful field to choose from must in part be to the credit of Commissioner Hyde. We congratulate Deputy Commissioner Burns on his appointment and look forward to his leadership and continued focus on helping South Australian police serve South Australian families and communities.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The SPEAKER: As I advised members in the notice issued on 21 June, pursuant to standing order 57, the business to be transacted in this earlier meeting of the house at 9am tomorrow morning is government business set down on the *Notice Paper* for Wednesday 27 June, which has been distributed.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (16:32): By leave, I move this motion in an amended form:

That standing and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to provide that government business has precedence over Private Members Business, Committees and Subordinate Legislation on Wednesday 27 June and that any private members' business set down for that day be set down for consideration on Wednesday 11 July.

Motion carried.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2012

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (16:33): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

Mr PICCOLO: I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:
That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the votes and proceedings.

Motion carried.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee) (16:33): I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport) (16:34): I move:

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

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (16:34): I indicate that I will be the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition in response to both Estimates Committees A and B. I am glad to see that the Premier was here and clearly uninjured from his latest backflip. That would be in response to—let me see—the backflip on the Keith hospital, the backflip on The Parks Community Centre, a somersault with triple pike demonstrated beautifully for the people of Cadell, and, of course, not forgetting the backflip on the ICAC. But at least the people of Cadell did not have to buy a seat at a Labor Party fundraising dinner to get their backflip. I seem to recall that at least some of them—

Mr Williams: The people from Keith did.

Mrs REDMOND: The people from Keith might have had to buy a seat at a dinner. What was their mantra again, the Labor mantra of debate and decide or decide and duck for cover?—one of those. Sadly, the Premier's rhetoric falls flat. This new broom, the so-called fresh approach, is clearly just a charade. There is no difference from the old days. There is no consultation. There is no sign that anything has changed. Basically, if the government can get away with it, it will. I am sure the member for Mount Gambier knows what I am talking about: the sale of the forests in the South-East is still going to proceed in spite of any level of consultation. The old announce-and-defend philosophy still seems unshakeable.

When the Premier said on radio yesterday, 'We're below the standards we have set ourselves,' what standards was he referring to? Perhaps double standards. And to so publicly slap down minister Conlon, a senior minister. Of course, minister Conlon and the Premier have not been friends ever since the Premier made his initial attempt against Kevin Foley. Remember that, just after the last election? They have not been all that close since then. Slapping down the minister and grabbing the good news announcement for yourself is very transparent, but it is also very much in mind of the former premier Mike Rann.

Where was the Premier when the people of Cadell were crying out for help, when their school, their tourism and their community was being threatened with destruction? I think the protest on the steps of parliament house was going to be tomorrow. That could well have been the first protest group that this new Premier was to face on the steps of Parliament House. I suspect that that might be what has been behind the backflip.

Of course, the Cadell fiasco featured heavily in estimates because nearly every minister had weighed in on it, demonstrating that Labor, having perfected the backflip, is equally good at belly flops. I am still curious, though, about where the government is going to find the extra \$400,000 per annum that it planned to gain by stopping that ferry. I think the government owes it to the people of this state to explain how the budget is today magically able to accommodate a \$400,000 turnaround.

Let us look at the management of the Cadell ferry for a moment. Transport minister Conlon revealed what the rest of the world already knew: that he did not undertake enough community

consultation before deciding to wield the axe. In what can only be described as an extraordinary admission, minister Conlon said, and I quote, 'Can I say, I have discussed with my people that I do not think we did enough consultation with the locals.' To me, it smacks of a tired, lazy minister. It is high time to get out into the community and actually talk to people.

I have always been interested in how the government thought it could explain \$40 million for a footbridge to the \$535 million Adelaide Oval—and then, of course, the car parking on top—but it could not find anything for the people of Cadell. Of course, we have had a long history in this state of this government being focused very much on Adelaide and not caring at all about the areas beyond Gepps Cross and the tollgate. However, when there is good news, just like our previous premier, in comes Jay Weatherill to announce it.

The ferry farce extended across other portfolios. Tourism minister Gago made a startling admission in estimates that she was not consulted by minister Conlon regarding the impact of the ferry closure on the state's tourism industry. This is in direct conflict with the Weatherill government's own cabinet rules. There is no internal consultation and no transparency.

Minister Gago told the estimates committee that she had not been approached by anyone in the tourism industry expressing concerns, and yet we know that four days earlier a letter was sent to her by the chairperson of the Riverland's peak tourism body—an organisation called Destination Riverland—expressing very grave concerns about the impact of this proposed closure on the people of the Riverland, on tourism and, particularly, on their new-found organisation, Destination Riverland, which, of course, they have had to fund themselves because of the failure of this government to fund ongoing tourism development in the area. No wonder the Weatherill government gave us just 30 minutes to interrogate minister Gago on the state's tourism industry. It was clearly trying to save her from herself.

Then there was the hapless emergency services minister, Jennifer Rankine, trying to wriggle her way out of concerns from the CFS on the Cadell ferry. In estimates, she disclosed that she advised minister Conlon that closing the ferry would not have a big impact on the local community but, unbelievably, she never thought to pick up the phone and ask the CFS. In my opinion, no-one would know better than the local CFS brigades (and, for the information of those opposite, we have them at Cadell, Morgan and Waikerie) what impact this closure would have. Thank goodness that in the end common sense prevailed—and the people of Cadell did not even have to pay for tickets again to a fundraising dinner, unlike the management of the Keith hospital.

Can I go more generally to the issue of transport under these estimates. It is well known as a gaping black hole in the government of Jay Weatherill, and we have all watched Labor bungle and bumble its way through a myriad of issues, not once achieving an outcome let alone a satisfactory one. Does anyone remember *On the Buses* and Inspector Blakey?

Ms Chapman: Reg Varney.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, that's right. We think about Chloe Fox's handling of the transport system—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: We did not even have a minister for bus timetables; we have one with this government. When we think about Chloe Fox's handling of this transport portfolio, never was her incompetence more on show than in budget estimates, where she was simply unable to answer most questions about our bus services but admitted that the government was receiving, on average, only 350 complaints or suggestions about public transport every day—350 complaints every day.

Furthermore, she admitted that she does not focus on these complaints. If she is not focused on this, what on earth is she doing? Of course, it is well known that this is a made-up portfolio—

Members interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: —because, as is being discussed across the chamber at the moment, the caucus over there votes on who is going to be in the ministry. They vote on who is going to be in the ministry, and the Premier's only choice on that side is where he puts each person who has been elected by the caucus into the ministry. He had to make one up: he had to make up a ministry for Chloe, so keen was he to have her as part of the team.

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind the Leader of the Opposition: she does not address members by their names but as 'minister' or by their electorates.

Mrs REDMOND: The Minister for Transport Services—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mrs REDMOND: —was a completely made-up portfolio. I will not use the minister's name, but the Minister for Transport Services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: There was no such portfolio as minister for bus timetables, but now there is. It is no wonder to me that the Premier did not actually want to have her. The minister clearly, in my view, does not have what it takes to be a minister of the Crown and, of course, it costs about \$1½ million to \$2 million a year to have that ministry; however, we will move on from Cadell.

Let us look at some of the other matters, such as the emergency and police issues. The emergency services minister displayed an uncanny ability for contradiction and lack of consultation. We were led to believe by Labor earlier this year that \$36 million of funding was available for South Australian Computer Aided Dispatch (SACAD), but minister Rankine was adamant last week that the number was \$33 million. So, which one is right? Who does not know what they are talking about and, most importantly, where is the missing \$3 million?

Then came the bungling about budget cuts for police. Denying a \$116 million cut during estimates, the minister, in fact, said, 'But you are just making up that figure. It is not in the budget.' What she failed to actually understand about her own budget was that there was an \$88.6 million recurrent expenditure savings that SAPOL had to meet and that that was on top of \$28 million in the 2012-13 budget savings. Now if you add \$88 million and \$28 million, guess what you get? \$116 million! Yet the minister thought we were making it up just because we had managed to do the sums in her budget that she had not obviously managed. So she has obviously earned her place on the podium of ineptitude alongside certain other ministers. I think I can refer to minister Gago because she is only in this house (not this house when it is us, but this house the rest of the time).

Members interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, this house when it is not the house. Thanks to our estimates process—wonder that it is—the Minister for Emergency Services was like other ministers, able to keep our questions to a minimum through the Dorothy Dixers. Especially in the case of minister Rankine, she got Dorothy Dixers from her very own Michael Atkinson, the member for Croydon.

Ms BEDFORD: Point of order, Madam Speaker: government questions have a legitimate place in this whole process and I really object to them being referred to as Dorothy Dixers.

Mrs REDMOND: And the point of order was, Madam Speaker?

The SPEAKER: I am not quite sure what the point of order was.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is often a parliamentary tradition.

Mrs REDMOND: Could I point out to the member that in fact, given that the minister always had a long written detailed answer in response at the ready, it seems to me that it is a legitimate thing to refer to it as such. If you look up the dictionary, you will find that that is well known to be a Dorothy Dixer.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey!

Mrs REDMOND: The member for Florey is wanting to be thrown out of this chamber so that she can meet with the member for Schubert as one of two people thrown out.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey! The member for Florey will leave the chamber for five minutes.

The honourable member for Florey having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ashford will go, too, if she does not keep quiet. I apologise to you, Leader of the Opposition, for the unruly behaviour. We will have some semblance of order now.

Mrs REDMOND: Apology accepted, Madam Speaker. After all those performances, though, perhaps the gold medal is best reserved for the health minister whose arrogance and disdain have swelled to new levels after a decade in government and more than six years in this portfolio. It was almost painful to listen to minister Hill skirt around the issues of rubbery finances, failed projects and mental health.

On the emergency department (ED) crisis at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, he advised that only 50 per cent of casualties are being seen within the nationally agreed four-hour time frame, which funnily enough means that there is a 50 per cent chance you will not be seen during that nationally agreed time frame, and of course that is nowhere near satisfactory. That puts the hospital's emergency department operations as one of the most stressed in the country.

Further, the minister confirmed that in 2011-12, in northern suburbs hospitals including the Lyell McEwin Hospital 21 per cent of emergency cases at the emergency department were not seen within the required 10 minutes and 41 per cent of urgent cases were not seen within the required 30 minutes. They are hardly encouraging statistics if you happen to live in the northern suburbs. Staff need better resources, better facilities, better equipment and more beds for them to do their job properly. Treating patients on the floor should not be an option. It was very clear from estimates that minister Hill is in dispute with doctors at a time when smooth relations are essential.

He also brushed aside concerns about acute mental health bed closures, adding to the overcrowding in the emergency departments. He said, 'I dispute the claim that the closure of these beds are having an impact.' It should be 'is having an impact' but Michael Atkinson was not there to correct him on that. Of course, neither minister Rankine as the corrections minister nor minister Hill as Minister for Health seemed to have got their head around the fact that the lady by the name of Jacqui who became the subject of so much discussion in the last couple of weeks is suffering from a diagnosed mental illness.

I tried to ask a question about it but they both still went on saying that she did not have a mental illness. The fact is that the bible of mental illness in this state is a thing called DSM; that is the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. If you want to talk to a psychiatrist about it, they will explain it. If you go to our library, we have a copy of the most recent edition and in that you can look up whatever is wrong with you by looking up the diagnosis. For each thing—whether it is schizophrenia, bipolar disorder or depression, for example—that diagnostic—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Incompetence, unfortunately, is not a mental disorder, so we cannot have them locked up. The thing about it is that each diagnosis is set out separately and the terms as to what constitutes a diagnosis of that particular illness are set out in there. I think the mistake that the two ministers have made is that, in referring to borderline personality disorder, they thought what it meant was that the person had a borderline case of something called personality disorder, which is not really a diagnosed mental illness.

In the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual there is a thing called borderline personality disorder. Indeed, their own report states that poor Jacqui actually suffers from a very significant and serious form of that diagnosed mental illness. Neither minister seemed to get a hold on that throughout the whole discussion on that poor woman's situation. I am only thankful that eventually they came to their senses and realised that, no matter what the diagnosis and no matter what the circumstances, it was inappropriate, in the 21st century in this state, to have anyone chained to a bed for up to 20 hours a day as a way to secure them.

I recognise that that person needed to be secure from herself because there is a high tendency to self-harm with that particular illness, in fact they have a very high success rate with suicide attempts, which are very common with that illness, but in the 21st century we should not be handcuffing people to beds for 20 hours a day.

Back to other things. With winter here, I shudder to think how our health system is going to cope with the extra pressure and a minister who is, simply, in denial. There is the revelation of a

sharp spike in code black violent incidents requiring security staff. At the Lyell McEwin, for example, code blacks rose from 892 to 1,224. That is an increase of 37 per cent in one year.

It is no wonder our doctors are worried about overcrowding. It is no wonder medical staff are resigning, burnt out by just trying to do their day's work, with no real government support. When we asked the minister to confirm the dollar value of the tender for security guards, or the increase in the security staff required, there was no confirmation. There is time for a strategy, and that is now; there is time for a proper approach, and that is now.

Minister Hill also failed to alleviate concerns about proposals to use shipping containers and ATCO-style huts to house mental health patients at James Nash House. Indeed, his answers came in his usual dismissive style. First, he told estimates that he is reviewing a \$19 million plan for ten forensic beds to see if it could be turned into a 20-bed project. He then qualified that—when asked about the shipping container option—by saying:

We are thinking it through...which we hope to do pretty shortly, in the next few weeks, I will certainly make public announcements.

Quite frankly, I think the problem is that the government has decided it is going to adopt this stepping-down approach, which was recommended by Monsignor Cappelletti. That is all very well, but the mistake it is making is that instead of adding that on, it is trying to replace the acute care beds with stepping-down beds, when the reality is that we need to keep the acute care beds as well as have the stepping-down process.

How about answering the question, minister Hill? Are you going to use the old Labor approach of rack 'em, stack 'em and pack 'em for our mental health patients? If you are not, how are you planning to get twice the beds from the same money? It, again, sniffs of creative accounting by this government.

The cost of living and small business: it comes as no surprise that it has been virtually impossible to drag anything out of this government on cost of living issues. Minister Koutsantonis made suggestions regarding lowering energy costs. Quite frankly, it is downright laughable. Everyone one on this side of the house would remember Mike Rann promising lower electricity costs. Remember that? Before the 2002 election, the signed pledge that we were going to have lower electricity costs. Of course no-one on this side could forget minister Conlon's famous door snakes. Remember that? In fact, we should put a question on notice about how many door snakes are still in government storage—

Mr Goldsworthy: And light globes, wasn't it?

Mrs REDMOND: And light globes, yes. Now minister Koutsantonis has the idea that he is going to bring down power costs by giving every electorate office—are you ready for this—an energy toolkit to lend out to the community. The toolkit will contain (I hate to think) a digital thermometer, a compass and a stopwatch. It sounds more like we are going orienteering than fixing any energy costs. Up in Stirling, where it was 3° when I got home on Friday night, I cannot imagine how a digital thermometer, a compass and a stopwatch are actually going to help me to lower my energy costs or how I am going to persuade the people of my electorate, when I put a notice in my newsletter to say, 'Come and borrow the energy toolkit from me.'

Indeed, I have discovered on my new iPhone that in fact you have a compass there all the time; you just need to shake it around and it will tell you which way is north. That is what we are going to come up with—this laughable, ludicrous insult to the intelligence that we are going to have some improvement, but perhaps nothing more than demonstrating who the real tools are.

Let us not forget this government gave us the feed-in tariff. That is going to cost each household \$114 next year and it has given us two electricity providers: one that works when the wind blows and the other on standby for when it does not. There was also minister Koutsantonis. Remember Tiger Airways? Remember we asked about Tiger Airways and the money that was being given by the government. Remember what minister Koutsantonis said? He said, 'No taxpayers' money from the \$2.25 million will be lost.' But in estimates Treasurer Snelling revealed, 'I'm yet to make a determination about what is a reasonable amount for us to recover.'

When you start talking about recovering from organisations that have gone into receivership or who are just failing, it often seems to be that you get about 5¢ in the dollar—but that is to be awaited. Clearly, minister Koutsantonis was talking through his hat when he said nothing was going to be lost; no taxpayers' money would be lost—\$2.25 million. The upshot of it at the moment is that neither minister Koutsantonis nor Treasurer Snelling can retrieve any of the money.

Small business is used to short shrift but news from estimates took this to a whole new level with revelations that the Minister for Small Business has only 6.5 full-time equivalents to administer Labor's one and only program to help the 142,000 small businesses in this state. The minister's own office has more than 11 advisers for the minister but he has one program called Opportunities for Small Business and it has 6.5 people. Out of 87,000 public servants in the state we can only afford 6.5 of them to actually help small business, which happens to be the backbone of the state's economy. If they had realised that we might not have got into this hole in the first place—but we have.

Then there is the issue of social justice—nothing really in the budget for the state's most vulnerable. No, I take that back. There was an improvement in funding for disability, although I will wait to see what happens because, on at least six occasions previously that I can recall, this government has said, 'We are going to provide a one-off piece of funding and that will remove the waiting list for the unfunded need in disability services, the unmet need.' Six times they have said 'We are going to fund that and we are going to get rid of that unmet need,' and six times they have failed to do so. They did make some promises that might help in the disability sector but bear in mind that we are now coming off such a low base, we are the poorest funded disability sector per head of population in the nation—but there is nothing unusual about that.

Estimates revealed that fewer than half of those who had applied for medical heating and cooling concessions (clearly people who are very unwell) had been denied access to relief from their power bills. Fewer than half have obtained the assistance that was promised. You remember that we made a promise about this. We introduced a policy on this side of the house and the government decided they had better copy it. It was one of those situations where Jay Weatherill said, 'Uh-oh, the polling is showing that this is popular. We better fix it up. We will come out and pinch the Liberal policy.'

They have also made a real mess of managing children in crisis, with a 15 per cent increase in the number of children living in holiday rentals and bed and breakfast hotels supposedly under state guardianship—a 15 per cent increase. We should be trying to remove all children from that situation and, instead of that, we have a 15 per cent increase. This is the wrong place for children in these situations to be accommodated. They have been told that by all sorts of experts and yet, instead of the situation being fixed, it has got markedly worse over just the last year. It is not good enough; children need care, not room service.

Regarding volunteers, minister Ian Hunter revealed in budget estimates that the Office for Volunteers will now be embedded in the Department of Communities and Social Inclusion. I am glad that the original minister for volunteers, the Hon. Iain Evans, is in the chamber, because it was his idea to have a minister for volunteers in the first place. Many of us on this side of the chamber have spent most of our lives as volunteers. We know the importance of volunteers in the community. The last thing you would want to do is embed that into a department as large as families and communities, now known as the Department of Communities and Social Inclusion.

I take members back to the department of families and communities, as it was then called. When the government came in, in its first year it engaged Robyn Layton, who was subsequently made a justice of the Supreme Court and has more recently retired to do other things, very much a lady with a social conscience. It engaged her to do a report. Some of the longer serving members will recall that she came back with a report. It was commissioned in the first year, and she came back with that, I reckon, about early 2003. Part of that report was that she basically said, 'We need to do a workload analysis, because this department seems a bit dysfunctional.'

They engaged some consultants towards the end of 2003 to do the workload analysis, and a few weeks later the consultants came back, almost cross eyed and tearing their hair out, saying, 'We can't actually do the analysis you engaged us to do, so dysfunctional is this department.' What they ended up doing was getting a report which looked at what was wrong as far as they could tell in the department, and they knew back then that the major things were that one-quarter of the people in the department were in their first year as social workers—one-quarter of them—and they were overburdened because of all the reporting that was going on.

Indeed, one-half of them were in their first two years post graduation. On top of that, the department had people who were a bit older who were completely burnt out because the system was grinding them down. Instead of addressing that, they have just made that department bigger and more dysfunctional and added more into it over the years. Then they said, 'Okay, now let's put the volunteers into that.' So instead of having a separation of volunteers and recognising that

volunteers are such an important part of our community, we are actually going to manage them through the department of families and communities.

I have always been suspicious of this government and the way they deal with volunteers. I have been suspicious ever since they signed a little pact with volunteers and they had SA Unions sign it. You have to ask yourself why on earth SA Unions was engaged in signing a compact with the volunteers. What do they have to do with it? My view is that they do not actually like volunteers very much; they want to make them all into employees and union members. I have always been highly suspicious of this government in the way they want to deal with volunteers.

When I came into this place, the budget was somewhat smaller, but I remember that at that time the value of the work done by volunteers in our community here was roughly equivalent to one-quarter of the whole of the state's budget. That was even on a fairly limited estimation. I am sure that, if you actually added up the cost on an hourly basis of all the volunteer work done in this community, you would find that it is a massive amount of money, and that if they suddenly all withdrew their services the state would literally collapse. That would happen if we did not have the volunteers, not just the CFS and the Meals on Wheels and all those other people who contribute tirelessly to all the sporting organisations. Everything that is actually working in this state largely is done by the volunteers.

Mr Williams: I see the Minister for Finance is doing his homework; he has a book about Greece.

Mrs REDMOND: Oh good, the Minister for Finance is doing his homework with a book about Greece. Excellent! That is probably the place to look if you want to see the slope we are on.

The value of the work done by volunteers in this state was about \$4 billion. Embedding the Office for Volunteers in that department is likely to neglect the amount of attention given to the creation of important projects and initiatives which aim to attract people to volunteering roles. I bring your attention to the recent report about the CFS and how the number of volunteers in that organisation has significantly declined.

Why is it declining? Because of the stupid rules they have. They do not fund it well enough so that people who come along and want to become CFS members can get the uniforms they require. Then, of course, we had the fiasco with the uniforms that needed an extra strip of reflective material; they had to get rid of those instead of getting someone to sew on an extra strip of reflective material—but that is typical of this government.

I will move on to the next topic, that is, water. We have been trying to get answers for months about issues surrounding water, but all we have had is obfuscation from this government. We only got one hour to ask them about water, and that was to be half an hour on the Department for Water, which includes the River Murray, and half an hour for SA Water, which obviously is not enough time for two large and important agencies of government.

I understand that our estimates process this year involved not only having the usual Dorothy Dixers inflicted on us but I understand that overall we had some nine or ten hours fewer allocated for budget estimates but, at the end of the day, does it really make any difference if you are not getting answers for nine hours or 13 hours? We have been after answers to some questions for some time, and we have asked them in question time as well. I am sure that my deputy here, who asked questions about it today, got no more satisfaction than he has on previous occasions.

The Productivity Commission has now made it very plain in its report that they were wrong to go for a 100-gigalitre desalination plant, that all that that has done is add extra expense and that we will never, in the foreseeable future—the next 50 years at least—need anything more than a 50-gigalitre plant at most, so we have added cost there and, of course, the wonderful former premier insisted that it have green energy, so we will pay even more for the energy.

Then we found out a couple of other things we had been trying to get some answers on. Firstly, obviously when you have salt water you need to make sure your pipes are not going to corrode. We understand that the desal plant was to be built with—surprise, surprise—stainless steel pipes but, with some cost cutting and corner cutting, we ended up with a desal plant where the pipes were galvanised with some stainless steel lining. The only trouble is that they have already been failing and they already have to be replaced.

The other thing was that they did not get to first water on time. First water is the point at which the machinery is actually in place and starting to produce, and it is a particular trigger point

under the contract. The contract said, 'You have to get to that point by a certain date.' They did not get there—they did not get there even a year later, as I understand it, from their original date.

Mr Williams: It was about a year.

Mrs REDMOND: About a year later. They did not get to their original date, and there was to be a penalty under the contract for failing to get to the date with first water. When that happened, the government originally said, 'Well, they are going to pay the penalty for that.' But then somehow, in the last week or two, they turned around and said, 'We have settled all of that,' and we are still trying to get answers from the government as to exactly what that means.

We suspect it means that the people did not pay any penalty at all, that in fact they have all the money that they were ever going to get under the contract, notwithstanding that they breached the terms of the contract and failed to produce first water by the date they said they would produce it. There are a couple of explanations, one of which of course is that the contract was so incompetently vetted or drawn by the government that they could not enforce the terms of the contract; the other I am bewildered about.

As I have said many times, estimates should be about accountability, and I have made the point on numerous occasions. I take no issue with the government's right to run the budget of the state. They are absolutely entitled as the government to spend the public money as they see fit, but they are supposed to be accountable to the public for the way they spend it, and it is not just a matter of being accountable every four years at the election.

The opposition on behalf of the public has the right to ask questions and have the right to have explained to them the detail of the estimates process, but what it has done is basically reduce the time and have Dorothy Dixers. They have basically obfuscated and said that they will come back with answers, and in every possible, imaginable way avoided providing decent answers to perfectly reasonable questions.

One of the most startling things, of course, that came out during estimates—and I know that the shadow treasurer did media on it that day—was an admission from particularly minister O'Brien that it would be completely out of order for the government to use public servants during the caretaker period before an election to cost the opposition's policies or comment on or criticise the opposition's policies.

However, in fact, during estimates we got this admission, because, of course, earlier it had been revealed that minister Hill's office had emailed the health department and received a written brief—not from actual experts in the field but from bureaucrats within the health department—on the costings of the Liberal Party's plan regarding the upgrade of the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital. Furthermore, they had questions answered on that about that policy during the caretaker period, and when asked why, minister Hill said that the reason was, and I quote—this is minister Hill's response:

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.

Well, that is fine to go and find them but you are not allowed to use public servants to do it. That is the point. That is what the caretaker period is about—absolutely out of order to do it—and minister Hill might not understand it but honest Michael O'Brien obviously does. In fact, in estimates the head of Treasury, Brett Rowse was asked whether the minister could do that, and his answer was, and I quote:

You do not discuss those issues with the government of the day when you are costing and examining the opposition's policies.

That is what he said. Then he was asked, just to make clear:

So if minister O'Brien's office wanted to ask questions about our policy during the caretaker period that would be off limits. You could not go there because that would be against the protocol?

And Brett Rowse replied, 'I believe that to be the case, yes.' Absolutely unequivocal. That senior Treasury official understood, minister O'Brien understood, yet minister Hill—

Mr Williams: And the Premier.

Mrs REDMOND: And, indeed, the Premier, my deputy reminds me. The Premier also stood up and confessed and seems to not understand what the problem is with their behaviour—that this is totally unethical and against the protocol and not allowed under the rules, but it does not

seem to matter to them that they just break the rules. Sadly, the whole estimates process confirmed what we already knew about this government. It showed yet again that it is mired in financial mismanagement, coupled with blunders and arrogance.

Mr Venning: Not a business brain amongst them.

Mrs REDMOND: Well, no, honest Michael O'Brien probably has a business brain. Remember, he was the one who said, 'Well, actually, we're borrowing money to pay the public servants, and if you were in business you couldn't actually do that. It's unsustainable in the long term.' Remember? The bank would close you off. Remember? That was honest Michael O'Brien. It also showed that backflips have become de rigueur for a government that made an ill-thought out decision and then hit the panic button the minute it found out. The ministers, junior and senior, are hopelessly out of their depth and clearly not across their portfolios.

Premier Wortley—'premier Wortley', heaven forbid; you shouldn't put that name in my head. Premier Weatherill has learnt to stay out of sight, only popping his head out when it is a good news announcement. The people of South Australia have had enough of this ramshackle style of government where the left hand has no idea what the right hand is doing, where there is breathtaking disregard of accountability and where transparency and honesty in government have quite simply become dirty words.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (17:14): I want to make a contribution to the debate about the reports of the estimates committees and wish to endorse the comments of my leader. I will then touch on the areas for which I had responsibility, which were the Treasury and Finance sections of the estimates committees. I think it is telling about the management of this government that, after 10 years, what they have delivered to the people of South Australia is the highest debt and the highest deficit in the state's history. The economic performance and budget performance of this government have not improved over the 10-year period.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: At the 10-year mark, as the leader quite rightly interjects, the budget performance of this government is at its worst. We have a budget deficit for the 2012-13 year of near enough to \$900 million; the year after that it is near enough to \$800 million. This government is delivering, by its own budget, six deficits in seven years with a net operating balance, and the Treasurer admitted in the estimates committee that the \$187 million surplus in the election year was on the back of extra revenue from the commonwealth.

If you take out the extra revenue from the commonwealth, you can essentially say that over that seven-year period we have been running a deficit every year. Then if you go to the net lending balance you are actually running deficits in eight years out of eight. This government, as the Hon. Michael O'Brien said, has been borrowing money to pay Public Service wages. I rely on minister O'Brien's comment on that particular issue. The truth is that the budget position has never been worse. Our debt position, of course, has now increased to where this government is looking at a debt of over \$13,000 million.

The average punter out there is going to be paying significantly increased water charges, taxes and charges to pay the interest cost on that debt, and the interest cost is around \$832 million in the year 2015-16 into the forward estimates, or around \$2.3 million every single day. The reason people's cost of living is so high in South Australia—make no mistake about it—is that this government has driven up the debt and driven up the interest payments. They have to recoup the interest payments from somewhere, so they recoup the interest payments from the taxpayer, through general taxes and charges.

General taxes and charges have gone up, over the term of this government, at twice the rate of inflation for the decade. Bit by bit, the household gets squeezed and, bit by bit, business gets squeezed because of this government's budget incompetence. The reality is that the householder is getting squeezed bit by bit. You only have to look at the water prices to see the impact. There has been a 249 per cent increase in water prices. This is from a government who runs out and bleats that it cares about the cost of living. It is this government's own incompetence that has delivered a 249 per cent increase in water prices.

Its own incompetence delivered that through the desalination plant where the Productivity Commission has now said that we do not need a 100 gegalitre desalination plant and, in fact, even a 50 gegalitre desalination plant would not be used for many years to come. So, for purely political

reasons, they have delivered a huge cost of living impost on ordinary South Australians out there. Then they deliver a water rebate for one year, when the price of water is going to go up every year.

Then we went to the issue in the estimates committee about the cost to the state of losing the AAA credit rating. This is a miraculous piece of information here because, when the Treasurer wanted to go out and tell the state that it would not matter, that it only costs \$2 million to \$4 million a year if you lost the AAA credit rating, somewhere in Treasury someone could make that calculation for him.

When the head of the Economic Development Board waltzed out to *The Advertiser* and said that the Economic Development Board had calculated that the loss of the AAA credit rating was only going to be \$2 million to \$4 million, someone in Treasury had calculated that for him. We FOI'd all the documents, and guess what: there is no document with that calculation on it—not for the Economic Development Board, anyway. There is a one line email from a public servant suggesting a figure. So we asked the Treasurer, 'How much it is going to cost us if we lose the AAA credit rating, given the debt is significantly increasing to over \$13 billion?' The answer to that was, 'Well, it is a bit hard to calculate; there are too many variables, but don't worry, it's already built into the budget.' Well, if it is built into the budget and the public servants could calculate it when the minister wants to run a low figure, they can do the real calculation now.

What we do know is that, when Queensland lost its AAA credit rating under a Labor government up there, it was an extra cost to the taxpayer of \$200 million a year in extra interest—\$200 million a year extra interest. In New South Wales, on the very day we lost our AAA credit rating here, the government introduced legislation to protect the AAA credit rating because they estimated \$375 million a year extra cost.

So it is amazing, isn't it? Queensland Treasury can estimate the cost of losing the AAA credit rating, New South Wales' Treasury could calculate the cost of losing the AAA credit rating, but the South Australian Treasury cannot seem to calculate the cost of losing the AAA credit rating when the opposition asks them about it. The reason for that is, I have no doubt, the Treasurer does not want to come out and tell South Australians that it is a damned sight more than \$2 million to \$4 million a year.

If you pro rata the cost down, as the *Financial Review* did, pro rata the debt down to the cost compared to Queensland's and New South Wales' debt, the cost becomes around \$22 million a year in extra interest costs because of the AAA credit rating. And that is \$22 million you cannot spend on schools hospitals, disabilities, or even tax relief for the long-suffering taxpayers of this state. But the Treasurer will not bring out the figure.

Then, of course, what we find out during estimates is: guess which state is paying the highest level of interest on its debt? It is South Australia. And how do we know that? The Queensland Commission of Audit produced a report, released it in the last fortnight. Go to page 23 of that report and there it is in black and white for all to see: Queensland pays a higher level of interest on its debt than every state except South Australia. So South Australia, having lost its AAA credit rating, is now paying the highest level of interest on our debt.

We asked the Treasurer, 'When we will get back our AAA credit rating?' because the last time the Labor Party lost it took us 12 years to get it back—I think, from memory, 1993 to 2004; 12 years, near enough. It took 12 years to get it back and to do that a whole range of assets was offloaded off the balance sheet to reduce the debt, to bring down the appropriate ratios. When we asked the Treasurer, 'How long this time?' the answer was, 'No idea.' Essentially, they have not put a target on it, sometime out in the future.

The reason that question is important is that Moody's put out a document about South Australia's credit rating, and within that document it says that South Australia is going to refinance 73 per cent of its debt in the next five years. What that means is that we will be refinancing at a higher rate, because we have a AA+ instead of a AAA. Had we had a AAA, the markets would have reacted differently. Whatever the rate is going to be over that five year period, we are refinancing 73 per cent of the state debt over the next five years. Is there a worse time for the state to lose its AAA credit rating in a five-year period when you are about to refinance your debt over that period? They were the issues that came out in part during the estimate committees.

I just want to touch on the issue that the leader touched on, and that is the unsustainable position of the Minister for Health in relation to his office's use of public servants during the caretaker period to gain information about the costings of the Liberal Party documents. You might recall that the health minister told the parliament that:

Governments in caretaker...can ask for costings of the policy of the alternative government. Without this principle...the costings of the opposition could not be verified, and that will only lead to less transparency and a worse result for the citizens of our state.

The health minister told the parliament that it was blindingly obvious why he had used the public servants during the caretaker period to find out information about the Liberal Party policy—because:

I would have thought it was blindingly obvious: so that we could find out the cost of the proposition the Liberal Party was putting to the public of SA.

He also told the parliament, 'What it was about, I am sure, under my direction'—that is, the minister's direction—'was to find out what the cost of your policies were so the public were better informed.' Let's make no mistake about it: the Minister for Health told the parliament that the reason his office would use public servants to get information about Liberal Party policy during the caretaker period was so that they could attack it on the costing basis during the election campaign.

Of course, we have the documents released under FOI. There is a six or seven-page minute from Mr David Panter, dated 4 March, in the middle of the caretaker period. We have a number of emails dated 1 March from the minister's office, from various staff to the department, seeking information about the policy. I asked the head of Treasury and the Minister for Finance: can the government use public servants to analyse, or even discuss, the opposition's policies during the caretaker period? This is the question to minister O'Brien:

What is Mr Rowse's understanding of the protocol? Could he ring up and discuss our policy, or email and talk to the government of the day about our policy during the caretaker period?

Mr Rowse is brought to the microphone, and responds:

I have worked at the commonwealth level, Victorian government level and South Australian government level and it is quite common practice in the lead-up to elections for agencies to prepare incoming government briefs for both sides of politics so that an incoming government has adequate briefing on implementing its policies once it is elected. So, everything that the Department of Treasury and Finance in South Australia did in the context of the run-up to the 2010 state election was consistent with those sorts of policies and programs.

He continues:

You do not discuss those issues with the government of the day when you are costing and examining the opposition's (at that time) policies. You prepare a briefing in case that party is elected at that time and there is a briefing ready for the next day once the government is elected.

To clarify the position, I asked another question:

Your answer is that this happens in other governments—that is your experience—and the protocol says that you cannot discuss it with the current government during the caretaker period. If minister O'Brien's office wanted to ask questions about our policy during the caretaker period, that would be off limits? You could not go there because that would be against the protocol?

Mr Rowse says, 'I believe that to be the case...' I am not criticising the Department of Treasury and Finance on this issue because they did not provide the information to the minister's office. I am highly critical of minister Hill and his office, I think, whose office has breached the protocol, and the department people involved, because there is a trail of emails during the caretaker period where the taxpayers, the public servants, are asking a series of questions about a Liberal Party policy during the caretaker period.

The minister says that is quite all right and you can use the Public Service to cost the alternative government's policies during the election; that is what the minister told the house. I went to the head of the costing agency; I went to the head of Treasury. They would know a little bit about costing policies; they would know a bit about it. What the head of Treasury says is, 'You simply can't do it.'

Here we have a government that has no standards. It has no standards because it has a minister who, by any measure, in my view, has breached that convention. His office has been seeking information about Liberal Party policy during the caretaker period, and I am furious that the public servants responded to those emails and gave information about the Liberal Party policy during that time. The correct procedure was what Treasury did.

The government cannot have it both ways: you cannot have two positions on the one protocol, you cannot have two positions on the one caretaker convention and you cannot have two positions on the one Ministerial Code of Conduct. Michael O'Brien, when he was asked, said there were ethical considerations as to why it did not come up. In other words, the treasurer—and Kevin

Foley was treasurer at the time—is on the record as saying that he thought it was inappropriate to receive the information during the caretaker period. So Kevin Foley did not get the information and did not ask for it, and the head of Treasury did not provide it. But go to the health department and what do we have? We have a trail of emails from the minister to the health office, by his own admission and under his authority. That is what he told the house. Then you have the department answering it back up.

Now, good old Jay, the white charger, came in as the Premier and he was going to set the new standard. The Premier told the house that he had checked this out and that it was all okay. Well, I invite the Premier to go back and see what the head of Treasury said. The head of Treasury said that what the health department did, and what the minister of health's office did, simply cannot be done.

I will tell you why this is important: what it says to the public servants and the ministers is that if what the minister for health's office did, if that does not matter, then at the next election we will have 15 ministerial officers emailing down into the government departments during the caretaker period, getting all the opposition's policies costed or, indeed, the faults of the policies analysed by the department during the caretaker period. Does anyone think that is the way the process is meant to work? Clearly, it is not.

It is a nonsense that a government can think that it can use the Public Service during the caretaker period to analysis the opposition's policies. The minister says, 'I wasn't asking their opinion; I was just asking for a fact.' Really? So he can email down and say, 'Is it a fact that there is a costing error with the Liberal Party policy?' He can ask that question, can he, and ask for a fact? I do not think so. It is a nonsense.

The Minister for Health's position is simply unsustainable. It is unsustainable, and someone needs to go to the Minister for Health and ask him a very simple question: 'How is that the head of Treasury says you can't do what your office did?' Does anyone on that side of the house really think that at the next election they are going to have 15 ministers sitting there burrowing down into the Public Service, at taxpayers' expense, getting answers about the opposition's policies during the caretaker period? It is a nonsense. That position is simply unsustainable.

The head of Treasury has blown the whistle. Let us not forget that the head of Treasury has not worked for one government, he has not worked for two governments: he has worked for three governments. In every single one of those governments his understanding of the protocol is that what the Minister for Health did is simply off limits. It cannot be done.

The problem for this government is that it has no standard. You only have to look at the issue with Cadell. The whole cabinet sat there and signed off on the Cadell issue. The whole cabinet sat there and signed off on it—and there was not a bleep. It was not until the Cadell people took the fight to the government that they backed down—and good on the people of Cadell. But where was the cabinet? Where was the guts in cabinet to say no to the decision in the first place?

The government thought it could stick the knife into another regional community and it simply would not matter. Well, the regions are sick of this government sticking the knife into them. Look at the Keith hospital. They had to fight for three years just to keep their hospital—for the sake of what, \$320,000? Cadell was fighting for a measly \$400,000, which is just five hours' interest on the debt. It is tea and biscuit money for this government. And the government made that community go through all that angst because no-one at the cabinet table had the brains or the guts to say no. The problem with this government is that it has no standards.

Time expired.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (17:34): I would like to speak on the estimates process and the experience I had on that committee. I have to say that I had prepared many questions for the education minister because I remember her performance last year when she was minister for Aboriginal affairs, multicultural affairs, volunteers, and youth. I think the total collection of her responsibility was about \$20 million. But she was absolutely fearless in her estimates. There were no Dorothy Dixers from the other side, she attempted to answer the questions, and I had free rein to ask her questions when it came to questions on Youth, in particular, that I was handling for our Upper House spokesperson in that chamber. I thought, 'Well, this is a minister who obviously knows her stuff; she will be fearless again and she will be happy to take questions.'

But what did I find when I arrived at the estimates committee? Not only did we have an opening statement that was longer than the accepted 10 minutes, we then had a very strict regime

of Dorothy Dixers after questions from the opposition. I have to say, there was no opportunity for the opposition to examine questions in detail with the minister, because as soon as we got to three questions, it was thrown over to the other side for Dorothy Dixers with very long and prepared answers from the minister. These answers were read into *Hansard*, and I am sure that the minister had no idea as to what she was reading into *Hansard*; she was certainly not aware of the details of the answers that she was giving.

I think that is clear because, when she came across questions of mine that she found difficult—for example, a month ago, the minister was asked in the media about the fact that a contractor for the Department for Education and Child Development had been arrested for child pornography charges in March last year, which was around about the same time that the unnamed Labor person was charged. That person went on to continue working as a contractor for the education department until his conviction in March this year.

When I asked I asked about the screening process—the entrusted person process—the minister continued with the claims she made on radio that he was not working with children, so it was not necessary. Let me just inform the house that the Department for Education and Child Development has a publication entitled 'Screening and criminal history checks policy guidelines', and those policy guidelines make it very clear.

On page 3, the document describes an 'Entrusted person'. There are no different categories of entrusted persons; an entrusted person is, in other words, a person who performs duties for the department of education. An entrusted person is:

Any individual who works, trains or volunteers in an organisation where their position is defined as:

(a) working with or in close proximity to children and young people—

Now, that was the minister's argument: that it did not really matter, and was not that serious, because this person was not doing that. It then goes on—

(b) having access to records relating to children and young people or

(c) contributing to policy or decisions affecting children and young people in education and care environments

(d) supervising or managing persons who work with or in close proximity to children and young people

(e) a position defined under legislation as requiring a criminal history check

All of those areas, except for working in close proximity to children, as far I understand, with the information that we have so far, apply to this person who was charged with and then found guilty of accessing child pornography.

And yet the minister is convinced, with her arguments both here in the chamber and in the media, that it is a different set of circumstances if people have direct access to children. However, her own guidelines tell us that the circumstances are exactly the same, whether that person is working with children, have access to records relating to children, or contributing to policy. How do we know this person was contributing to policy? There is a document here that was easily available on the department's own website, a report to the regional executive about early years development.

The purpose of the forum at eastern Adelaide region early years includes opportunities and professional learning dialogue and networking for all staff, birth to age 8. Another heading in this policy work that was developed with the offender in partnership was phonological awareness and regional professional learning opportunities, again working with young minds and young people. This is the sort of work this person was doing for the education department. Again, the department's own screening and criminal history checks in the trusted persons' guidelines say that that person should not have been working for the department.

What was the minister's excuse? Well, that he should have told us that he was arrested with child porn charges. In other words, the minister's defence was that her department did everything right because it was up to the honesty of the person charged and arrested for child porn to tell the department that they had been charged with child sex offences. So, in other words, with somebody doing a very dishonest act, which they know is against the law and they know will cost them their job, it was their responsibility, according to the minister.

It was not the minister's responsibility to have a relationship with the police so the department would be advised when such people were charged and arrested with such offences.

No; it had nothing to do with the police and her department, but it was to do with this fellow who was participating in and was arrested for such activity, and it was up to him to tell the department what he was up to. The honesty policy obviously is not working in the Department of Education and Child Development.

It was interesting that we had a Dorothy Dixier to the minister about the family unit at Rose Park. Because of the complete block-out of access to the minister by the organised Dorothy Dixers, I could not get to this question in estimates in response to what the minister said but, yes, there was bipartisan support to find a solution for the family unit in Rose Park, but we did not support the \$1.2 million spent in the Felixstow property. We do not support the bus that goes to Rose Park Primary School every day to pick up about eight students to take them to the family unit. We do not support the fact that the family unit has resources far and above funding to other schools, including some of our most disadvantaged schools.

The amount of money per student that is spent, with an enrolment of around about 30 students: we have a principal on PS05 and three other teachers, guaranteed regardless of enrolments. No other school has that privilege. Even the Cadell Primary School was at risk of losing a teacher if they lost two students because of the ferry closure—even the Cadell Primary School—yet this minister has spent \$1.2 million of taxpayers' money on moving a school that is a dinosaur, a relic of the 1980s.

FOI documents revealed that it had NAPLAN results lower than some of our most difficult schools. This is a school in Rose Park, because of its pedagogy, its philosophy. There are even reports of family unit children defecating from trees on other students. Yet this minister decides this is a priority for education funding here in South Australia—a school for middle-class parents who have every option in the world to send their kids to any school in the eastern suburbs or elsewhere, whether it be private or public, being subsidised and paid for by taxpayers of South Australia.

It is interesting that it was more than six years ago that this government promised that every school bus would have seatbelts. We now know that it will be at least 2016 before we see that delivered for our regional students in South Australia. Six thousand students today still travel to school on old buses without seatbelts and without air conditioning, six years after that promise was made. It will be another four years before it is even budgeted to be delivered, yet the family unit gets a department-funded bus for about eight students from Rose Park to Felixstow. So, you can see what the priorities of this government are.

This minister always boasts about the extra money that is going into education every year, but in the last two years we have seen an increase of about \$120 million into the education budget. The education budget remains about the same size now as what it was when this government came to office. Around 24½ per cent of the budget was spent on education when this government came to office and it is about that same figure today. However, what the minister does not say when she boasts about the extra money going into education is that last year alone \$298 million was required just to meet the requirements of the 2010 enterprise bargaining agreement with the Australian Education Union. So, in actual fact, we are seeing fewer resources per outcome going into education in South Australia.

Do not forget that we are in the cycle where we are seeing the cuts that were implemented by Jay Weatherill in his first year as education minister now coming into play, with the forced amalgamations, cuts to numeracy and literacy programs, cuts to new arrival programs and cuts to bus services for new arrival programs, particularly in the western suburbs. I know that is making it difficult for many new arrivals who must now either spin a line about their child's age or try to find alternative accommodation to get to a school that caters for the fact that they have very poor language skills. We know how important it is for students to be able to speak English in order to move ahead in their new home in South Australia. Again, the government has its priorities wrong when it comes to education outcomes in South Australia.

When talking about education, I cannot go past the fact that during the estimates process this government conceded that they have done no work about the funding that this state will require if the Gonski recommendations for an extra \$5 billion per annum are put into the education system in Australia. I can tell you now that, on my calculations, South Australia's share will be \$245 million a year, yet we have seen real cuts of over \$100 million from schools themselves in the education budget over the last couple of years.

I also note that the minister has conveniently ignored the importance that David Gonski placed on teacher quality when it comes to better educational outcomes and how, over the last

10 years, standards have slipped in education in Australia when it comes to Australia's position with our near neighbours. Also, the distance between those in our more difficult suburbs where I grew up, in the northern suburbs, and those in the leafy suburbs, is greater. The children of people living in the leafy suburbs are getting better outcomes with education than those children in our more difficult suburbs—generally the suburbs that are represented by the Labor Party; people that have been deserted by Labor over the years.

We cannot go past the fact that in the last 10 years we have seen a drift of 13,000 students from the public system to the private system. The biggest percentage drop in public school enrolments in mainland Australia is happening right here in South Australia. You have to ask yourself: what outcomes is this government delivering when we are seeing those sorts of figures? Poor NAPLAN results—the NAPLAN results are the worst every year since NAPLAN has begun and last year we did not even hit the national average in any category. We went backwards in 14 out of 20 categories while those states that were bouncing below us four years ago are now improving in NAPLAN scores right across categories.

Queensland and Western Australia, in particular, have implemented targeted and strategised NAPLAN plans for their students and we have seen significant results—14 out of 20 category improvements in Western Australia alone and dramatic increases in year 3 numeracy and literacy in Queensland—but here in South Australia, we have gone backwards in those key areas. There is nothing more important than reading and writing, and it is very difficult to learn about other cultures, about science, about community and society if you cannot read, write and add up.

These are core, fundamental, basic rights when it comes to education. It is no wonder that we are seeing a dramatic increase in the number of unauthorised absences in our schools in South Australia where we have 48,000 students who are not attending for 10 days or more per term in South Australia. It is disengagement. Of course, the government will point to the enrolments and say, 'Look at our enrolments,' but the facts are that those children are not attending school. Some 23,000 of those students are away without any reason—a dramatic increase on figures from just six years ago, and they are the government's own figures.

I would like to move to the area of employment and further education. We have had some extraordinary claims by this government over the years about their job creation. A hundred thousand new jobs—remember that cry just before the last election? A hundred thousand new jobs in six years: we found out today in estimates that there was no advice from the department of employment for the government to make that claim. We can see now that that was a promise that was made without any intention of delivering it, because the government's own budget papers and the government's own admissions say that that figure is now more likely to be 62,000 jobs over six years. It is a dramatic decrease—more than a 30 per cent decrease—in the promise that was made by this government.

The facts are that since the government made that promise, there is not a single extra full-time job here in South Australia. The only growth in jobs in South Australia since that promise has been in part-time jobs—not full-time work, but part-time work. We can understand why, when businesses are struggling under a very high tax regime here in South Australia. We have the highest taxes in the nation and the budget papers again confirm that. We have very high business-type taxes. We have payroll tax that cuts in at a low payroll figure compared to other states.

We thought we got off to a good start after the election when the government copied the Liberal Party policy in abandoning payroll tax calculations for apprentices and trainees, but we actually saw that that was removed in this budget without consultation. That again was confirmed in the budget estimates today. There was no confirmation with the industry about what impact that might have on training, when this Premier was in Canberra just two weeks ago at a training summit boasting about how important training is to South Australia.

We see a key element—a cost to training that was removed—now being placed back onto employers here in South Australia. We know it is particularly in those early years of training, when you have to take somebody off the job to help with an apprentice, that it becomes very expensive. It is at that time when the employer needs help to be able to deliver training for their apprentices.

Time expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. M.F. O'Brien.

SA LOTTERIES

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (17:54): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Today in question time I was asked by the member for Adelaide what she described as a supplementary question. This followed her previous question that dealt with the issue of online gambling. Because of her inference that this was a supplementary question and the acoustics of this chamber differing somewhat from those in the House of Assembly, I misunderstood the question.

What the member for Adelaide asked was not in fact a supplementary question relating to online gambling but, rather, a question about the consultation process in relation to the sub-licensing of SA Lotteries. The answer I gave related to the consultation process that occurred in relation to online gambling. Matters relating to the sub-licensing of SA Lotteries are the responsibility of the Treasurer. I have referred the question to the Treasurer.

[Sitting suspended from 17:55 to 19:01]

APPROPRIATION BILL 2012

Adjourned debate on motion:

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

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (19:01): I am pleased to have the opportunity to address the parliament as we now conclude another estimates committee period. This is an important opportunity for the government to explain to the people of South Australia the detail that sits behind their budget announcements. In the ten years that I have been here—this is now the 11th estimates—the confirmation of the government's commitment to squander that opportunity never ceases to amaze me.

Yet again, the government takes the view that it is convenient, cute, appropriate or whatever to fill this time with information which is often available on websites and the like, rather than using the opportunity to explain the detail of the budget. So, the great aspiration of the Hon. David Tonkin to make his ministers available for the first time in an estimates committee so that the parliament may have an opportunity to scrutinise and have this information has, yet again, in my view, been abused by this government. The ideal was important and, if the government actually took advantage of this opportunity rather than attempting to sit behind the veils of secrecy in the way that they obtusely deal with the questioning in estimates, then South Australia would be better served.

Nevertheless, we are in a situation in South Australia where we have a government which continues to rely on a high level of debt to service its bloated expenditure and fails to address very important issues, such as arresting the debt and deficits in their budget. They continue to career along, crippling the state's future with their addiction to debt and gross incompetence.

I was pleased though this year—and I wish to pay special tribute to Mrs Lucia Snelling, the wife of the Treasurer, who brazenly and bravely made a public statement on the day of the announcement of the budget when she said:

My two daughters catch the bus in the morning and they've been having a lot of trouble with the buses not coming and buses being late...It would be good if that was fixed.

Well done, Mrs Snelling, for speaking up on what has become a very important public outcry now as to the state of our public transport, and I am going to address that shortly.

I am just going to give a few minutes of dedication to the contribution made by the Hon. Gail Gago who is presently the Minister for the Status of Women in South Australia. I am used to making an observation about the shallowness of contribution by the minister, but this year's contribution was about as illuminating as a dead match. It concerns me that the minister continues to fail to deal with very important women's issues.

In short, this year, her contribution largely outlined a very important issue for women; that is, updates on strategies to deal with domestic violence and the safety of women—a very, very

important issue, the significance of which is never to be underestimated. Yet again, we come to committee and she cannot even tell us how many intervention orders there have been in the last 12 months, which was a keynote contribution by the government in response to the review on women and their vulnerability with domestic violence.

We know from last year, it took two years for the police to even be trained, then we got to this year and the fact that she did not even know about this key area of importance to women—that is, their personal protection and safety—is just mind-blowingly incompetent, in my view, as to the failure of this minister.

Of course, she succeeded the Hon. Jennifer Rankine as the Minister for the Status of Women. Frankly, she was not much better; in fact, I have to say that minister Gago is a marginal improvement or at least she has an opportunity to be. None would ever match the Hon. Stephanie Key in the time I have been here in the parliament when her contribution to this area was outstanding, and I am very happy to say that. We would get to estimates, she knew her subject matter; she had spent the preceding year fighting for issues important to women.

Where was minister Gago this year when a 20-year-old woman was shackled to a bed for nine months in a prison? Where was she demanding that this matter be dealt with? Where was she calling on her government to deal with the advance and development of the Women's Prison which has been called for over decades in this state and on which there had been a commitment made but then abandoned by this government. Where was she when it came to the regulation of the sex industry and the assessment of the legislation that was under consideration by our parliament? She did not have a clue about what was happening in the Premier's Council for Women. She could not even recall having any advice from her own department.

Where was she with the house of horrors when we saw women and children left in squalor and in disgraceful circumstances? Where was she calling on her government to deal with the protection of women and children in those circumstances? Where was she on the issues surrounding the fair work case for community workers which granted a significant percentage increase to salaries? Where was she in making a commitment of the government financially to support that when the fair work tribunal had announced that this introduction of an increased salary for people who are clearly underpaid should come in over an eight-year period? Where was she? Why was she not outraged that anyone else who had been granted a finding that suggested that they were entitled to a decent salary and return? Where was she in fighting for the implementation of that promptly? Well, she was nowhere to be seen.

Where is she on important issues? We have had allegations that young women across Australia are stolen or removed from the country illegally to be child brides. Has she made a statement on this issue? Dead silence. Where has she been in relation to the current issue that is very important—even the young women's association had put submissions to the government this year—about body image of women and the appalling treatment and oversexualisation of children and women in advertising? These submissions go completely unanswered. There is even no statement on them. There is no consideration of them.

As we speak, we have women in prominent positions being ridiculed publicly because they have frizzy hair. Now, I do not know what it is that attracts the media, for example, at the moment to get stuck into Gina Rinehart—

Dr Close: That's not why she's being criticised.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, wait for it. Allegations are made in public about why she cannot afford to have her hair cut or prepared properly. That is the sort of the statement that is out there. It is interesting, I have been around a few years, as have some other members, and I can remember Colleen McCullough, the eminent Australian author, who has long frizzy hair. She is a very bright woman, if anyone has read *The Thorn Birds* and all of the other great books she has written. She has certainly made a lot of money. I do not know if she is a rich person now, and I do not intend to take that any further. What I would simply say is this: she is a well-regarded, highly-acclaimed Australian author, but has anyone been complaining about her having frizzy hair? No.

Therese Rein, if you want to use the other arm of the political spectrum, suffered criticism because she had curly hair, and so forth. These body image issues are out there right now, but where is our Minister for the Status of Women? Nowhere to be seen. It is not acceptable that she puts her head in the sand, or the desert, or wherever she puts it, and does not deal with these issues, because they are important women's issues.

The list goes on. We can talk about food waste in this country. She is the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (or primary industries) as well and yet do we have a peep out of her about the fact that \$3 billion worth of food is wasted in this country every year? These are important issues that need to be espoused. She had the opportunity, with PIRSA, to reinstate the funding to the Women in Agriculture and Business organisation, which had its funding slashed for a support service officer, and its annual conference, in the centre of it, has now been threatened, in fact it has been reduced as a result of that funding.

So, she has had plenty of opportunities. She has been sitting in the cabinet. She has been able to make a statement, but not a tink, not a word, not a whisper, not a little shout about the Cadell ferry closing, and yet we had women in tears at the public meeting for the closure of the Cadell ferry. When asked, 'Were you consulted about this?' we got some rambling answer about the Minister for Transport Services recognising that he had not consulted enough.

Where was she sitting in the cabinet? Scratching her nose? I do not know what she was doing, but remember this: she knew about it, as did all the cabinet know about it. Members only need to remember that the Sustainable Budget Commission report was put out in late 2010. We had a leaked version first, which stated, on page 130, in detail, how much money could be saved with the closure of the Cadell and Lyrup ferry services. We then had the official report, dated August 2010, which clearly stated, on page 253 of the second volume:

Ferry services—discontinue at selected sites.

Close the River Murray ferry crossings at Cadell and Lyrup...

It could not be more clear. The report was sent to cabinet. They had a great long list available to start in the axing of services. Ferry services, again, on page 245, discontinue at selected sites and the monetary amounts. So, she knew about this and she did nothing about it.

I go back to minister Conlon. We had quite an enjoyable estimates with minister Conlon, but there are a couple of things I want to bring to the attention of the house. Although shortly after estimates the Premier announced that there would be a backflip on the decision about the closing of the Cadell ferry service, only hours before the minister was in here saying that he was disappointed about the level of consultation, that it was going to be looked into and that there were meetings organised. The reality is this: firstly, he had also been privy to the Sustainable Budget Commission report in 2010. Unless he did not read it, which would be unusual considering there are other initiatives in there that have been acted on under his portfolios, he knew full well what the position was.

Here is the incredible thing that came out of estimates. We were discussing the Urban Renewal Authority, which is a new unit set up, basically, to sell property from the Housing Trust, Defence SA and the old Land Management Corporation. It is in an embryonic stage but, nevertheless, has been set up by the government. It was announced late last year and is now awaiting the appointment of its final board, which is, apparently, imminent. While the minister was making decisions (this year) about cancelling the Cadell ferry service for a pittance of \$400,000 a year savings, at the same time he was privy to the fact that the new Urban Renewal Authority was purchasing a \$15 million site, known as the Caroma site, on Magill Road.

Why? He tells us in estimates that, in short, it is to protect it against inappropriate development. That is very interesting because sitting next to him in the parliament is the Minister for Planning and the Attorney-General (minister Rau). He, of course, is in charge of a number of planning laws—apart from those under the development act—the new structure plans that are coming in to deal with inner metro rim TODs (transport-oriented development). He is in charge of all the laws that protect against developments and, indeed, for the site in question to be developed in a manner which might be inappropriate if it got into the hands of the private sector. It raises some questions about the veracity and capacity of the planning laws we have in South Australia if you cannot trust your own planning minister and the legal structure that we have to protect those assets.

He says, 'I can say it's okay as the minister for the Urban Renewal Authority to borrow \$15 million from SAFA, which is our South Australian Government Financing Authority, to buy up land to protect it against a property developer's inappropriate development, and we will sit on it for probably at least four years because, really, the market is in a mess and we are not getting any money.' That was his explanation as to why the \$58 million estimated return from the Land Management Corporation was not delivered last financial year—not even one dollar as the dividend.

The market is flat, he decides he has \$15 million capacity to service a debt to borrow that money to go and buy a piece of property when, as he spoke, right at the other end he was closing down the Cadell ferry. It is just not acceptable. Ultimately, the people in the Cadell and surrounding community said, 'We are not going to tolerate this. We had to fight hard for the services we have. We have to fight even harder for what we need to keep.' They sent a very clear message to Adelaide that that was unacceptable, it was unconscionable and it had the potential to put the whole town at risk, not only its viability but the safety, education and residential arrangements for the families in it; not to mention what would inevitably follow, and that is an extra and significant cost to run Cadell prison or, alternatively its closure and relocation.

The government realised a few things on a number of fronts: one was that the public was outraged (even metropolitan Adelaide was outraged) so the polling was clear; secondly, Cadell is in a marginal seat and the penny finally dropped that this would put the government at risk in relation to the seat of Stuart; and thirdly, when it did a proper assessment of this rather than just try to cut it and get away with it by keeping it secret, the government realised that the cost was therefore going to be significantly greater with extra bus services and the like, and that it was not going to succeed in being able to convince even its own Treasury people that there was a cost saving.

The government did a backflip and we welcome that. I congratulate the communities in Cadell and the regional areas in the Riverland. I put out a high alert to the people in Lyrup and other surrounding districts: clearly this government has to have an eye kept on it because of what it will rip out of the community in those circumstances. I also commend the member for Stuart and the member for Chaffey, particularly, for their efforts in assisting people in their local communities to make that message loud and clear to the government.

Can I also say that all of this is at a time when he is a senior minister sitting in a cabinet that has approved that SA Water be raped financially of an extra \$125 million. To prop up the government's embarrassing deficit situation this year, about which there has been a massive turnaround from the predictions that it made a few years ago, it took another \$125 million off the top of SA Water's money. Why do I say they have raped it? They have raped it because in the 10 years of this government we had a 249 per cent increase in water costs. We have been told, softened up, beaten up, bullied, whatever, that we have to pay more in preparation—

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Point of order. The member for Bragg just spent the first few minutes of her address lecturing us on women's issues and the need to be sensitive about issues facing women and now trivialises rape with this little tirade over here. I think it is an objectionable use of the word. I think it trivialises rape, a very serious women's issue.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. I do not think there was a point of order there, but I would ask the member for Bragg to be guarded in her comments.

Ms CHAPMAN: I understand the sensitivity of an issue like that and I do not want the member to be offended in any way, but it might have escaped his attention that men are also victims of rape. It is the exercising of a violent act against another person without their consent and it is reprehensible, but so is this. The carnage that is left as a result of the raping—that is, the forceful taking—of funds which have been specifically accumulated for the purposes of paying for our desal water is unconscionable. That is not acceptable. The one thing in this year's budget that I think is so sneaky and underhand is the harvesting of that money—not to mention the funds they are already taking—off the water funds to prop up their deficit situation, and it is completely unacceptable.

I turn now to the Minister for Transport Services. She is a gem. What a gem she is! She is so predictable. In her session, I thought she came in to provide us with some answers on three basic issues; one was how much we paid the bus contractors in the last financial year and how much we were going to pay them in this financial year. It took about 15 minutes to get a straight answer out of her on that, and Rod Hook, of course, as the CEO, came to the rescue. We then went on to the cost of the changes to the timetable. This was very interesting because the—

The SPEAKER: Member for Bragg, I am not sure if you are aware, but your time has actually expired. We may have a problem with the clock, I think. I am not quite sure how to overcome this, but we have no 20-minute setting on the clock, unfortunately. The clock has been set for 30 and I am told when the 10 minutes is up. I would just ask you to wind up.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am happy to do that. The performance of the Minister for Transport Services was a sight to behold. Regrettably, her capacity was on show again, and Rod Hook had to

come to the rescue again. There are some very severe deficiencies in relation to the information provided, and I will be addressing this matter in a later contribution to the parliament.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member. Also, you did mention the Treasurer's wife, Lucia Snelling, and I am sure we all pass on our sympathy to her in the loss of her father—very sad for her. The member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (19:22): Thank you, my lady.

The SPEAKER: A fitting title for this place.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I get 30 minutes now, do I? The 10th budget, 10th estimates, different portfolios, but if there is one really good thing about the estimates committees it is that it makes you, as an opposition shadow minister, go through the annual reports, through the budget. I am glad the member for Croydon is sitting down here and going to listen to this contribution.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: Trust me, I have done a lot more reading in this job than I ever did when I was at university and in my five years at veterinary school. I had 156 exams, and I do not know how many other tomes of information I had to produce for reports and special topics, but I have done more reading in this job than I have in any other job. It is good for the grey matter to get in there and work out how things work.

However, I mentioned in my budget speech the way the budget papers are presented. Other state and territory governments present a guide on how to read their budget papers for people like myself, who are not accountants or economists. It would be good if we had one of those here to help us walk our way through them because you hear ministers coming out with particular figures but you cannot for the life of you find those figures in the budget papers.

Even today, I was reading over the estimates replies for the police budget. I think the police minister said in the estimates that it was \$767 million for the police budget, yet the figure in the budget papers, the net cost of services summary of the whole of policing, was about \$740 million. So, where the extra \$20 million came from, I do not know, I cannot find it, it would be interesting to find out. But what I can see in this budget is that there are so many issues that are going to face not only the people of South Australia but also the people involved in the portfolios that I have with police, emergency services, corrections, road safety, volunteers and Aboriginal affairs.

I will start with emergency services and minister Rankine. I said to one of the newer members of this place on our side that it is interesting in estimates, you can tell the ministers who really have some issues with their portfolios; as there are long introductory statements and lots of Dorothy Dixers. It was interesting this morning, Paul Caica, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, gave quite a short introductory statement, then there were a couple of government questions, and the rest of it was up to the opposition.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: The member for Florey is quite right, they are government questions but I think the colloquial expression is Dorothy Dixers. They provide important information and we in the opposition do not ignore those government questions because sometimes you can get little snippets of information out of them, particularly if the minister is feeling a bit comfortable and relaxed with the question, they will sometimes adlib a bit and that is when they can get into trouble.

We all remember that it was not the estimates committees or shortly thereafter that got a former premier into trouble, it was sometime down the track when people were going back over the estimates to see what was said, by whom, when it was said, and whether it was correct. We do that in opposition as well. Part of our job now is going back, reading the estimates, checking on what was said, and circulating the estimates to our various stakeholders to see what they think about it, and the feedback can be very interesting. Already there is some interesting feedback coming to me which I will be examining a bit further to make sure that what the minister said, and what the minister promised, is exactly what is going to happen.

With the emergency services, the current minister, the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, has made a lot about the increased funding, but my big concern is when you look at the savings that are being forced upon the emergency services, the fire services, the SES, and the police, there is a significant challenge ahead for the leaders of those. The Deputy Commissioner of Police, Gary Burns, who will soon be our new police commissioner, has admitted that there will be significant challenges for him. The current commissioner, Mal Hyde, has said it will be very difficult

to maintain operational services. The Police Association's Mark Carroll said you would have to have rocks in your head if you did not think there were going to be cuts to frontline services with budget cuts. In the Metropolitan Fire Service and the Country Fire Service, there are millions of dollars in budget cuts being forced upon those services.

The minister made a great point about the \$2.6 million that is being given to the CFS and SES for extra training over four years but, the problem is, when you divide that \$2.6 million by the over 15,000 volunteers, over four years—and assuming each of those volunteers does about three training sessions, and that is what is reported in the annual reports—that works out at \$43.02 per volunteer per year. They are doing three training sessions, so that works out at about \$14.34 per training session. The minister has just bought them morning tea and a bit of lunch. It really does not do more than that. That is assuming that that \$2.6 million is not going to pay for wages for extra trainers who are coming in, and those extra trainers are welcome, but is it at the expense of providing frontline training?

I have been in the CFS since 1984. I had a few years off but I am back in it again now, and I understand that the minister is in the Salisbury CFS, and I congratulate her on that. This should give her a greater understanding of the challenges of volunteer firefighters and those in the SES, and the need to undertake those training programs you want to undertake so that you can feel fulfilled as a volunteer firefighter. Often, though, you cannot get on the courses and you cannot do what you want to do. The classic example here is first aid. The MFS firefighters all get trained in senior first aid, which you would expect, as sometimes they are the first people on the job.

If you are a volunteer firefighter in the Country Fire Service from a one-appliance brigade, only four people in that brigade can be trained in senior first aid. If you are a two-appliance brigade only eight people in that brigade can be trained in senior first aid. The fact that you might have 30 crew on your books, during the day time those four or those eight might be at work—and the local farmers and the people working in the area are the day crew—and they need to be trained in first aid because often they are the first on the scene.

Certainly Kangarilla and Meadows, the two CFS brigades closest to my place, are the first on the scene. At Easter time we had a crash out the front of our farm. I was there just afterwards. The Meadows CFS arrived and the ambulance arrived 10, 15 minutes later. If it was not for the fact that we knew first aid, the guy who was trapped in his car could have had very, very serious problems.

We need to make sure that all our volunteers get trained in the area they want to be trained in. It is not just a wish list for them to fulfil any fantasies. It is far from that. It is about training them in a complete range of volunteer or emergency services, and we need to make sure that this minister understands that. I would have thought that she would have understood that, being in the Country Fire Service.

The small amount (and it is a relatively small amount compared with the budget) that is being increased in training is not going to be enough to provide not only what is required by the volunteers but also what they want to have. I think that we should give them some of what they want, not just what they need.

The other big concern for me with respect to the emergency services, and particularly the Country Fire Service, is that we have got a small company called Remlap at Palmer, just outside the Barossa. Remlap has been making personal protective clothing for the CFS for nearly 15 years now and it has been doing an exceptionally good job to very high standards. But now, because of centralisation of purchasing, the purchasing of that protective clothing has gone to Stewart & Heaton, a company that has quite a significant presence in South Australia down at Ridleyton, I think it is.

They are not buying from Remlap: they are buying from a Queensland company using imported materials, which Remlap would be doing, anyway. They are buying a material called Tecasafe. You cannot get Tecasafe, I am told, at the moment. They are using Proban, which is quite a good product. Unfortunately, if you wash it out that fire retardant depletes, and then you will end up having a firefighting outfit that could actually catch fire.

The need to make sure that we are pushing South Australian companies, small firms like Remlap, cannot be overemphasised; six, seven, people will lose their jobs because Remlap will not have the contracts to supply personal protective equipment for our fire services. It is a shame that this is happening. There is the need to economise, to get the best bang for your buck, there is no doubt about it.

The social consequence in a town like Palmer is a smaller scale consequence to removing the ferry in Cadell, but let us see whether we can have a turnaround on getting Remlap back into the picture and get it supplying (as it has been doing for 15, 16 years now) to our fire services top equipment. My uniform for wildfire bushfires was made by Remlap. It is made from a material called Nomex, which is very good. They do a terrific job. It fits well and it has lasted a long time. The problem with PPE in South Australia, though, is not just about the suppliers and the types of material. It is absolutely unconscionable that people, the volunteers, are having to wait for that equipment.

I know in my case that I had to wait for a month or so for some boots. I could do that, not a problem. I was not going to every job that Kangarilla CFS had—far from it—because of other constraints on my time, but the captain of the Kangarilla CFS, Geoff Benham (who has been in the CFS for a very long time; he is a very experienced firefighter), has been waiting over 12 months for a pair of firefighting pants. Why is that so? That should not be so. We should be giving them everything they need to do the job they want to do, because there is just absolutely no way that we could pay a fire service to do the job that the CFS volunteers do.

For Geoff Benham to be waiting that long, or for any volunteer to be waiting to be fitted out with a uniform, is just something that this government should attend to. I hope that Stewart & Heaton has got its act together so that there are no delays in supplying personal protective clothing to our volunteers.

The other disappointing thing about supporting South Australian business with our fire services is that we are getting a whole lot of new fire trucks for our volunteers, which is fantastic. We are getting new 3/4 fire trucks. I can advise the house that the 3/4 is a 3,000 litre fire truck. It is a four wheel drive, so it is not three or four, they are 3/4 fire trucks. They are coming from New Zealand.

I have not seen the fire trucks personally. All the reports are that these are quite good fire trucks. In fact, they are exceptionally well made with parts being manufactured in New Zealand. The problem is that they are being made in New Zealand. The guy who owns the company is a South Australian, but he is not over there for fun. What is the problem? What is the issue with manufacturing in South Australia? Is it taxes here, is it overheads, is it WorkCover, is it land tax? What are the issues with being in South Australia? Is it that the wages are cheaper in New Zealand? Is occupational, health and safety less severe in New Zealand? I do not want to downgrade occ, health and safety in South Australia, or wages here, but let's find out why this chap went to New Zealand and is not manufacturing our fire trucks here.

Moore Engineering at Murray Bridge has done a terrific job in manufacturing fire trucks and they are still doing some work, but they should be doing a lot more work. We had another company here making fire appliances and they have gone through the hoop. We should be supporting South Australian businesses because there is a flow-on from this. The need to make sure that we support South Australians is not just out of parochialism; it is about the reality that there are jobs there. These people pay their taxes and GST and spend money in their communities. What goes around comes around, and that is why we need to make sure we are supporting our South Australian volunteers and those who are supplying our volunteers.

The South Australian Computer Aided Dispatch system that serves our volunteers, police, ambulance officers and Metropolitan Fire Service firefighters has been in place now for about eight months, since October 2011. It was a cost initially announced at \$36 million by then minister Wright and premier Rann. Now we find out in the budget it is \$33 million and \$3 million has been cut from that. I have a real issue with that, because there is a dire need to have extra support staff to implement SACAD so that we know SACAD is going to function the way it was meant to be working, that is, providing as quick a response as we possibly can for police, fire, ambulance and SES, sending the right types of equipment and the right responses so you are not going halfway across the countryside to do a job that could have been attended by somebody much closer.

That happened at Clarendon. An appliance from Kangarilla was sent to a job 200 metres from Clarendon CFS station. SACAD did not work in that case. There have been some 'typos' where other appliances would have been sent very long distances had the operators not been alerted by those who had local knowledge about what was going wrong. SACAD (South Australian Computer Aided Dispatch system) needs to be given the resources. The minister knows that system is not working as well as it should be. I have been getting information from officers in the CFS (volunteers and paid officers) that there are still issues there, and I know the chap in charge in the MFS is doing his very best, but they need more support staff to make sure that SACAD works.

Once SACAD was in place, the CFS was going to get an automatic vehicle location system to enhance their ability to see where the trucks and volunteers were so we knew where the resources were so an emergency could be dealt with as quickly as possible, but also to maximise the safety for the volunteers. We knew where they were and what was going on and we could get the extra assistance to them if they needed it.

However, the AVL system (Automatic Vehicle Location system) is still being worked on. They are still doing a business case. The minister said they did not want to rush into it in case the technology changed. For heaven's sake, technology is changing and you have to bite the bullet at some stage and you have to make a commitment. You may have to upgrade that equipment at some later stage, but you need to do it.

I was talking about supporting the volunteers, and the cruellest cut that we had to the CFS and SES was the volunteer support officers. There were six of them spread around the state and, because of budget cuts, it has gone back to two; and they are located in Adelaide and sharing a car. The minister said that has been topped up with some extra trainers so they are back up to six again, but they are still sharing that job.

The VSOs (Volunteer Support Officers) were helping the volunteer brigades with recruiting, retention of recruits, organisation of the management and governance of the brigade and everything down to their constitutions, which were changed just recently. It is a very important role but, because of budget cuts, we have seen that cut. It is just not a good thing to be doing.

The other thing that was brought up in estimates committee the minister had no answer for—in fact, I think she should go back and check her answers—and that is about an SES volunteer at Port Pirie, a lady who was doing home duties (I think that is the correct political term nowadays) looking after her kids. She was injured as an SES volunteer. Her husband had to take time off to look after her and the children. Some help from the government was offered, and whether that was taken up I do not know. The minister said it was not, but I understood there were some offers of help, but there was no insurance cover.

The CFS and the SES do have top-up insurance cover, but it does not cover people who do not go to work, it does not cover people who do home duties. This particular lady and her family are left out on a limb. The government needs to step in here and make sure that this family, these volunteers, are able to get on and do what they want to do, that is, volunteer, but then not suffer the consequences if something does go wrong.

The need to make sure that we look after our police force is something that I will talk about in last few moments, because \$116 million has been cut from our police budget. The minister said that I was making it up, but she should be able to add up the sustainable budget cuts, which have been in the budget for a time—\$88 million of them—and then there is a little bit over \$27 million in cuts in the current budget, and it adds up to \$116 million.

The Police Association and the current commissioner have all expressed real concern about the ability of the police to do their job. The new Commissioner of Police, Gary Burns, is an excellent policeman. He is a very practical policeman, who was part of the Focus 21 review of policing in South Australia. I know he will do his very best to make sure that front-line services will be maintained to the best of their ability, but the best of their ability may be constrained by the budget cuts enforced upon them in this budget.

The need to recruit police is another disappointment. This government made an election promise to recruit an extra 300 police. They are going to do that now, but not by 2014; it is by 2015-16. They are not doing what they promised. There is a real need to make sure that this government does do what it promises to do, does do what is expected of it, and does not announce and defend, does not do a Cadell ferry, and then have to turn around a decision they have made because it was ill-thought out, ill-planned, ill-conceived and certainly punishes those whom we are here to help.

This place is about making sure that South Australians get what they deserve, get what they want, if we can possibly give them what they want, and get what they need, and that is what they are not getting in South Australia. They are not getting a service from this government. The CFS volunteers, the SES volunteers and the police officers are not getting what they require, and that is the very best from the ministers. We have had a number of ministers now. I think we are on our third minister in a short period of time.

You need to get your head around the portfolios, you need to know the consequences of your portfolio and the decisions you are making. It is just not good enough to try to fob it off and say, 'Well, the budget cuts are there, there will be some austerity measures, and we'll still keep on delivering the services.' You cannot have it both ways. The current minister really needs to have a rethink, have a reread about what she said at estimates, because I think she will think about what she is doing, where she wants to go, and how she wants to do her job.

Time expired.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (19:43): We are indeed privileged, as members of the House of Assembly, to be speaking in the other place, which is now the House of Assembly, so I am not sure whether to call it the other place, and we are in the other place and the House of Assembly is the other place. Be that as it may, I hope we do the house justice and appreciate the upper house allowing us to sit here.

In my response to the estimates of the last few days I want to mainly reflect on my portfolios of agriculture, food, fisheries and forests. One of my first questions in estimates was about the Governor's speech, which is essentially written by the government for the Governor to deliver, and clean, green food is supposedly one of the seven pillars of this government. Yet, in the budget speech it was not mentioned at all. That just shows the importance of agriculture and food to this state Labor government. Not once was it mentioned in the speech, but it was put up in the Governor's speech. I do not reflect on the Governor, because his speech is written by the government, but it was not even mentioned, which I think is disgraceful, quite frankly, because we do have a vibrant agriculture industry.

I note the government always talks about the crops we have had in the last couple of years, the over \$4 billion contribution in each of the last two years from the crops, as if the Labor government was responsible for the rain. Obviously they were not and a much higher authority was, but they will certainly take the taxes and whatever they can get out of the farmers who are paying tax after some tough times and paying their way when they can make a profit.

I was interested in the accelerated plant breeding at the Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics. This is one of the small, bright lights, and I thought it was applicable to agriculture—that is, \$780,000 extra being put in for wheat breeding. The minister said to me, 'That that is not my line of questioning. I am not the minister.'

The Hon. S.W. Key: No, it is in Tom's.

Mr PEDERICK: As I am being reminded again by the member for Ashford it is in Science and Information Economy. It is in another portfolio and that is fine, but I would have liked to think—

The Hon. S.W. Key: We were not being rude; we were trying to—

Mr PEDERICK: No, I am not being rude, I am just making a point. You can make your point if you want to make a speech, but I would have thought that the agriculture minister might have known something about wheat breeding—even acknowledging that it was in another portfolio—and at least acknowledged that this money was going to help the agricultural industry, but the minister could not find anything positive to say even about that.

As we have seen over the last six years that I have been here, and I am sure previous to that, if a minister does not like a question (and I certainly noticed this when I was shadow minister for the River Murray) they fob it off and say, 'No, that's an environmental minister question,' or the other way around. I note that this year we lost a lot of time, and the leader talked about the allocated time over the whole of estimates being cut by nine or 10 hours, and agriculture certainly lost half an hour. I note the statement of minister Gago, when she says:

The South Australian government values the significant contribution agriculture makes to South Australia. Our vision is for an industry that is prosperous and sustainable.

It is hard to believe that this government will achieve this vision with the amount of cuts progressing through to the year 2012-13. We are currently in a four-year budget period when we are losing \$80 million over that time. We have projected \$24 million more coming out of agriculture, as well as another 98 jobs on top of about 400 other jobs that have gone in recent years from Primary Industries. We now see, because such a dearth of talent has gone from Primary Industries, that they are advertising for a director of agribusiness for Rural Solutions so that they can get someone out of the private sector to assist. I believe that too many good people have accepted packages and, essentially, left the building, and it has been a great loss to the industry.

It was not very clear on these job cuts over the next three years whether it was 50, whether it was cumulative or whether it was 98; certainly the budget paper states that it is 98, although I could not get a sensible answer during estimates. Any of these losses are significant when we have already seen massive cuts in funding right across the board in agriculture. I then asked some questions about the Cadell ferry and wondered whether the minister had lobbied minister Conlon, the transport minister, on the effect that closing the Cadell ferry would have on agriculture in the Riverland. Certainly, there had been none of that—no thought at all in regard to agriculture there.

Minister Gago is also the Minister for Regional Development. I talked about the Liebich family who have land on either side of the river at Cadell and do hundreds of trips annually to shift equipment and use the ferry for contractors to get across the river and back. I reflected mainly on this one farmer, but there would be not only many farmers and contractors, in relation to agriculture, who need to access this ferry but also people who need it to attend schools and as access for emergency service vehicles. Yet we saw what I called in my estimates questioning an act of political bastardry, when a few weeks ago the Weatherill Labor government did a Rann stunt of announce and defend and said, 'In three weeks' time we are going to shut off the Cadell ferry.' How ridiculous, in this day and age, to think that one of the 11 eleven ferry crossings in this state would be cut off. What are we going to see next? Are we going to see them come down to Taillem Bend and say, 'Oh, we won't need that one open; you can all go down to Wellington?'

We had the transport people do the numbers, and, from what I am told, on the Cadell ferry in the slow time—100 vehicles a day. Well, they want to be there in the busy times, when there are so many people who need access to get across, whether it is for tourism, education, or firefighting. There was a lady—I can't remember her name—who almost lost her life many years ago, but was saved because the Cadell ferry was there and emergency service vehicles could reach her in time. Sadly, she lost her sister, but if it were not for the ferry she firmly believes that she would have died on the scene as well.

This is what we are seeing with a city-centric government that has no idea about the regions. I say that with all due respect to the Speaker (the member for Giles). She is the one regional member in this government and would have some knowledge of the regions; but she is the only one on the other side. These people need to wake up and realise that it is not just small communities that are cut off by these poor decisions. We saw the Premier making his oh-so-gracious backdown. Well, he needs to think about his own doctrine, where he said that the government would consult before they make a decision—and this was to save a lousy \$400,000 out of a \$16 billion budget, and we can reflect on the decision with Keith hospital that had to be backflipped on as well.

I have already talked about the clean and green food bowl, and the lack of the government talking it up as one of its seven strategic priorities. There is a \$50 million decrease in operating expenditure from the 2011-12 budget to the 2012-13 budget, and we note that Primary Industries and Regions SA is one of the only agencies to see a continued decrease in operating expenditure from 2011-12 through to 2014-15.

Something else I also want to talk about is how the government wants to get clear away from research and development in this state, in regards to agriculture. In the past, and even now, we have one of the premium research entities in the South Australian Research and Development Institute. The government, in their early negotiations with transferring SARDI over to the University of Adelaide—this was supposed to be done by 30 June this year, but negotiations are still being finalised.

Even though I am not entirely happy about this, I firmly think that this is our only way forward for research and development in agriculture in this state, because the government, from what I understand, has just wanted to walk away and say, 'No more money; no more money to agriculture research and development.' The minister went on the record and talked about how the negotiations will be finalised, and said the merger is worth a lot of money. She also said, 'There are a number of complexities associated with it, and it is important that we take whatever time we need to get it right.'

I asked the minister about the \$70 million-plus of SARDI land-based assets, which include assets such as the Minnipa research station, West Beach (where a lot of the fish research is taken out), Turretfield, and Struan. There are a whole range of entities, that are worth \$70 million-plus, and the minister would not rule out whether these entities would be gifted to the University of Adelaide. What worries me is whether they will be sold off as time goes on as assets that the university does not want in the future, as it has done with some of its farms in the Mid North.

I want to talk about branched broomrape, which has been a big issue in the Murraylands, and my electorate has a lot of the branched broomrape impact in this state. We note that the funding will be cut back from about \$4.5 million a year of state and federal money. In the last 10 years about \$45 million has been invested by governments and about \$70 million of farmers money. I have certainly been concerned about where we go in the future with the branched broomrape. I admit that some farmers are saying, 'Look, we can't beat it; it's just another weed; let's just get on with life.' Others say, 'No, we must keep up the controls.'

I met with the Victorian minister just to get his angle on it to see that we do not have any trading restrictions across the border, and he said, 'No, I'm pretty sure everyone's going to be signing off at the cross-ministerial meeting so there won't be any restrictions on trade.' I hope that goes on in future, because this program has taken a lot of energy from a lot of people. The community consultation committee, headed up by John Berger, a very good man from up Wanbi way in the Mallee, now living in Murray Bridge, is doing a great job in making sure that the community can hear from the departmental people on a regular basis what is going on.

We are seeing a massive cut in funding to this program because we are going from eradication to management, and the federal government is only putting in \$400,000 this next financial year. I suppose I should be thankful when I ask the minister whether the state government will be matching that funding, and they will. We note across the sectors that there is more cost recovery; there are cost-recovery implications in the aquaculture industry, but there is really only a \$185,000 in real money increase in the aquaculture sector, which will be a major sector in promoting and filling our seafood void into the future as we need to feed more mouths. It does not say that we will not have a lot of wild catch, but aquaculture needs a bit more attention so we can promote it into the future.

I am also concerned with fisheries and aquaculture and even agriculture, where we see the property identification codes introduced. This is a cost recovery mechanism the government wants to keep imposing on our farmers and fishermen, hitting them with more costs but on the other hand taking it away. What are people paying for? They keep paying and paying and there is less and less government support. The governments are expecting millions of dollars to be put in by the private sector, yet they are more than happy to take out tens and tens of millions of dollars that would support our primary industries.

In regard to forestry, the government has decided to continue with the forward sale of the three forestry South Australia timber rotations, although the AAA credit rating is gone. This reflects on comments former minister O'Brien made down in Mount Gambier in October 2010. When he was asked by Ian McDonnell at a forum down there whether this was about protecting the AAA rating, minister O'Brien—good old honest Michael—said, 'Yes, it is; this is what it's about.' I ask, now that the rating has gone down to AA+, whether we need to sell the forests, because the impetus to keep the AAA rating has gone out the window. But, no, it is going to keep going and minister Gago has not lobbied the Treasurer to halt this sale.

In former years we have seen contributions of \$43 million, \$44 million, close to \$45 million annually from Forestry SA go to government coffers, which over 111 years would be close to \$5 billion as a contribution to government from this sector, yet we see in this year alone that where \$38 million was budgeted it has dropped to around \$18 million, and next year, because it looks like this is when the Weatherill Labor government is going to finalise the sale, forestry will actually cost the government \$3.8 million. On those numbers alone, over the 111 years of three rotations, it will cost the government \$422 million over time, without allowing for inflation. Instead of forestry being a major boost of income over time, it will become a major cost to government into the future.

There were confusing answers from the minister around the community service obligation, how the fire service cover will be maintained and whether ForestrySA will be the main provider of fire services. I was told that the new owner would provide some fire cover, then it was that ForestrySA would be the main provider and contract back to the owner of the forests, and in the end it was just, 'We are still working through that part.' It is confusing. We do not just have forests in the South-East. There are forests at Wirrabara, up in the member for Stuart's electorate—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Bundaleer.

Mr PEDERICK: —and Bundaleer. We have Kuitpo and Mount Crawford in the Adelaide Hills. All these forests will still need management, so this will become a cost to government over time. It is a disgraceful proposition that the forests will basically be given away for something like \$600 million when in reality it should be worth at least \$1,300 million to the economy. Another sad

thing is that the funding for the Advisory Board of Agriculture ceases on 30 June. They have been serving this state for well over 100 years with grassroots advice to government, but in another non-brilliant move—

Mr Gardner: Suboptimal.

Mr PEDERICK: —suboptimal move—former minister O'Brien decided to cut that funding, and minister Gago has done nothing to replace that funding to get that grassroots advice for agriculture in this state.

Reflecting on the River Murray, we heard today during estimates that work is still being done on getting the Narrung bund and Clayton bund back to as close bathymetry as possible. Here we are nearly two years from recovery of the river and we still have interference in the river. We still have people at Lake Albert who cannot irrigate because their water is in a terrible condition. We have people there now who, because they will be paying \$3.45 a litre from 30 June, are putting in lengthy pipelines through Lake Alexandrina so they can water their stock.

Time expired.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (20:03): Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. You are Madam Speaker in here, I suppose.

The SPEAKER: I was referred to as 'my lady' earlier by one of your colleagues.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: My dear lady Madam Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Thank you, my lord.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Whatever you think is appropriate.

The SPEAKER: We must remember where we are.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Things change in here. Yes, it is a very highfalutin place, of course. I cannot help thinking it is a little bit like the Crows or Port Power playing a regular season match on one of the outside ovals. It is not quite the same as being in the main stadium, is it? Nonetheless, we will do our very best and we will play as hard as we can.

We are here to talk about the estimates process. Let me say that from my perspective I share the frustration of many of my colleagues—and I am sure many government members as well—with regard to some of the difficulties of getting your questions up and some of the protection that some ministers enjoy through the estimates process. Nonetheless, I do think that whatever opportunities you do get are still well worth it. While in an hour you might only get 20 minutes of questions, it is 20 minutes that you would not get any other time. From that perspective, we should make the very most of it.

I would also like to thank all the departmental staff—department heads and all the other people—who put an enormous amount of effort into preparing for estimates. Of course, there are questions that ministers can answer, but a lot of the time they need a lot of help, so good on the hardworking departmental staff who give them as much support as they possibly can.

I participated in quite a few committees. Obviously I have portfolios which I focus on myself, but I was very pleased to participate in regional development, emergency services, education, tourism, local government and forestry. Recreation and sport was the last one I participated in today, one of my own areas of portfolio interest.

Ministers go about things in a wide range of ways. There are ministers who just lay it all open and say, 'Ask me whatever you like; I don't need a great deal of protection,' and there are certainly ministers who make long opening statements and then look for protection and get protection. One dreadful example, as far as I am concerned, is one minister who twice, I think, used up 15 minutes of a one-hour questioning session just for their opening statement and then, of course, sought protection from government colleagues for the other 45 minutes. So, it really narrowed down a one-hour questioning session by probably 15 or 20 minutes for genuine questions.

Members interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Let me just say that the offender is not here at present. That is the only thing I will say. The bottom line is that that is pretty disgraceful stuff. If you had any courage, you would stand up and face the questioning with some confidence. I am sorry to say that that did not happen. By the way, more than one person behaved that way.

I would like to start off by saying a few things about the Cadell ferry, a very topical issue. I will not talk about the Cadell ferry for too long, but let me tell you, it is in Stuart, so I feel that I have every right to talk about this issue. The first thing I would like to do is congratulate the Cadell community, the broader regional South Australian community, and also those people in Adelaide who supported Cadell. Those people who supported Cadell did it because Cadell deserved and needed support and because they knew that they might be next. They also had my full support as well as my staff's full support. Many people worked incredibly hard. Local government and every single council on the river approached the government about this, because they knew this was a shared issue of significance.

I will not dwell on all the aspects of this, but I will just point out two key things. I know that hard decisions need to be made in government. Anybody in government and anybody who aspires to be in government knows that hard decisions need to be made, but if you want to make a hard decision, you have to do it properly. Two key things were not done properly in this case. Number one, the government did not follow its own internal cabinet rules. I will just read a short excerpt from 'A guide to regional consultation' by the government:

The inclusion of a regional impact statement (Diagram 1)—

and there is a diagram 1, and it makes it pretty straightforward how it has to be done, so there is no excuse—

is...a mandatory requirement in cabinet submissions. Cabinet requires that it be fully informed of the regional impacts of any proposal being presented in a cabinet submission.

Clearly that was not done. I also point to an agreement signed in May this year by the Premier entitled 'State/Local Government Relations. An agreement between the State Government and Local Government in South Australia'. Point 8 of that agreement states:

The state government commits to:

- b. consulting with individual or multiple councils...on issues affecting specific individual communities or groups of communities;

Neither of these things were done, and that is a great shame. As I said, hard decisions have to be made. If you want to make a hard decision, or an easy one, you have to make sure that you do it properly. That was not done in this instance, and, because it was not done in this instance, it actually brought all of regional South Australia together to stand up for Cadell, because they knew that if Cadell fell it could be them next.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: We weren't invading.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Minister for Mineral Resources says they were not invading. No, Madam Speaker, they were not invading; they were overtaking. They were trying to overtake; that is what they were trying to do. We stood firm, we resisted and we made sure that it did not happen.

Let me just say that credit has to be given. The Minister for Transport did say that he made a mistake and he did do everything he could to correct his mistake, so I stand here and give him credit for that, but let me just say that he had no choice. He had no choice because the people of Cadell stood up for themselves. They stood up for regional South Australia. I applaud them for that and I applaud all the people who supported them doing that. I think that is a shining example for all other country towns that the government might try to run roughshod over the way they have at Cadell.

Let me move on to some other aspects of estimates. I would like to start with regional development. I will certainly concentrate on regional development and work through a few things that stood out for me. One of the key issues we need to focus on in regional South Australia is making sure that the money that is promised to us comes to us. There was \$20 million promised to the Riverland through the Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund, which is very important money, but that money has not been spent in the timely fashion that was committed; that is, \$5 million per year over four years has not been spent as we were told it would be.

It was very important through this estimates process to make sure that, while it might be delayed, the full \$20 million is still spent in the Riverland because the Riverland deserves and has been promised that money. We cannot let even a small amount of it slip through the deserving hands of the Riverland communities. Exactly the same applies to the Enterprise Zone Fund for the

Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback. There was \$4 million over four years, which is a lot less money but nonetheless very important money to the Upper Spencer Gulf.

I pass on a very friendly reminder to the government and all government members not to make the same mistake that one minister made today in estimates in referring to the Upper Spencer Gulf as the Iron Triangle. I can assure that minister that, if they ever visit the Upper Spencer Gulf and refer to it as the Iron Triangle, the Mayor of Port Augusta will ensure that that minister departs not fully intact. That is a very serious breach in our part of the world, so it is 'Upper Spencer Gulf', please. It is a very important issue that that \$4 million is, again, not being spent in the timely fashion that was promised. It deserves to be, so an important aspect of estimates is to make sure that the full amount of money is spent in the Upper Spencer Gulf.

I was particularly alarmed to see that the Upper Spencer Gulf heavy industry hub study promised in the lead-up to the 2010 election, which was promised at that time to be completed by mid-2011, has not been completed yet. We are in mid-2012, but I have been promised that it is nearly done; I hope that is the case because half a million dollars of taxpayers' money has gone towards that.

I would also like to just concentrate on the replacement of the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund by the Regional Development Fund. The Regional Development Infrastructure Fund has been a very good program. It was a good Liberal initiative that was continued by the Labor government, and it has brought great rewards to regional South Australia. I recognise the fact that the government has the right, if it chooses, to make a change like that, to swap \$3 million from one fund towards another fund, but I think it is also important to recognise that, while on the surface it appears to be a swap of \$3 million for \$3 million and just changing the way the money can be spent, it is actually a swap of \$3 million for what is currently \$7.1 million in place for regional development in South Australia.

There is the \$3 million Regional Development Fund, but we also have \$4.1 million at the moment of core funding to Regional Development Australia organisations throughout South Australia. I wholeheartedly support the three-tiered model the Labor federal and state governments put into place with federal government, state government and local government contributing together to Regional Development Australia. I think that is a very positive thing; it should live on regardless of Liberal or Labor governments at state or federal level. I think it is despicable that the state government has decided just after that model was implemented that it would withdraw the state government funding. I think that is disgraceful.

I was particularly disappointed to hear the Minister for Regional Development trying to pretend that it did not matter, trying to say, 'Look, that was a previous decision. I am just swapping the \$3 million for the \$3 million. The \$4.1 million, a previous minister said that was going to go, a previous treasurer said that was going to go.' That is disgraceful. Right now the state government contributes \$7.1 million in regional development funding and after this financial year that we are about to enter into there will be \$3 million, and I think that is dreadfully disappointing.

With regard to the way the money is made available, aside from the quantum, the fact is that right now there is core funding. On average there is something like \$585,000 per Regional Development Australia organisation per year. The new Regional Development Fund will give RDAs a maximum of \$400,000 each through the two streams—a \$1.4 million stream 1 and a \$1.6 million stream 2. RDAs can only access a maximum of \$200,000 each per year out of each of those streams. If they are as successful as they can possibly be under the new competitive model, they will get \$400,000 but on average they currently get \$585,000 and some can actually get approximately \$700,000 at the moment towards the work that they do.

When the Minister for Regional Development was asked, 'How do you expect them not only to continue the work but to do more work and to improve?' She just said, 'Well, they will just have to manage.' That is my precis, but essentially she said they will just have to manage, they will have to cut their cloth, they will have to do more with less. I think that is absolutely disgraceful because I think we all understand that there is not as much money as we would all like. It does not matter whether it is health or education or transport or regional development, no portfolio has as much money as it would like to have, but to go to regional development organisations and say, 'Number one, we are just pulling the rug out with regard to core funding and, number two, we are going to give you approximately two-thirds on average of the funding that you currently get.' That does not happen anywhere else. I do not see health taking two-thirds of their money; I do not see education being cut down to two-thirds; I do not see mining or mineral resources being cut down to two-thirds of their funding. It should not happen for regional development.

The other point I would like to make on this issue is the fact that, while I am not fearful of competitive funding, I think competitive funding for projects is a very positive thing. You have to stack the projects up and you get the money, you get the support, you get the resources for the best ones. Competitive funding for organisations to do ongoing long-term work to pay people to stay in regions and do a good job or to come to regions to do a good job does not work if you are trying to do that on a competitive funding model. To hire really good people to work in the regions and tell them that 'we can give you an employment contract for one or two years' is not good enough and that is not going to attract the best people.

When I asked the Minister for Regional Development about that, she said, 'I think they just get three or four or five-year contracts at the moment,' and again she just does not get it. She does not understand. I said that there is a big difference between a one or a two-year contract or a three to five-year contract—a gigantic difference. It did not seem to make any difference to her but I suspect if her eight-year term was going to be cut by that magnitude then she would certainly get it. Let me say that that competitive model is no problem at all for projects but when you are trying to supply core funding to organisations that do good work, that is just not an option. It is just not the way to go. For her to say that they will just have to manage is not good enough.

I would like to move on to one of the government's highlights in the budget. Again, under regional development, it said that it facilitated four regional consultation visits by the Regional Communities Consultative Council and supported its work on identifying opportunities from the seven state government priorities. It makes pretty good sense. I asked the minister, 'What were the opportunities identified for the seven regions in South Australia that were linked to the seven government priorities for the state overall?' She told me all about the seven government priorities again. I said, 'No; what were the opportunities that you found in each region to make these government priorities work?' Not a clue. She kept going back and saying, 'These are the government's seven priorities, the regions will just have to manage.' I said, 'No; you have a highlight here, a highlight in your budget, that says that you have identified opportunities, now what were they? Don't just read me the Governor's speech again that the Premier wrote for the Governor.' She could not tell me.

I move on to another target: continue to work with regions to finalise a statement that outlines the role of regions in delivering on the state government's seven priorities. It is the same thing again: using the regions to deliver on the government's priorities. Stand aside an argument about those seven priorities, whether they are good or not good, this needs to be turned around. This is not about using regions, RDAs or businesses to provide support for the government's plans, it has to be the other way around: how can the government support regions to achieve what they identify as the priorities in their regions?

Some of the seven regions in South Australia will have common goals and some of them will have very different goals. You cannot go down there and say, 'These are the government's priorities and you will work on all of those. In fact, we have come to tell you that it is your job to help us implement our priorities.' It has to be the other way around. Mr Deputy Speaker, as a peri-urban, semi-rural electorate representative, I am sure you would understand that this is important stuff. You cannot just tell the regions, 'You have to do what the government has decided.' The whole issue here is: how can the government help the RDAs achieve what they identify as the priorities for their regions?

In the context of this government assuming the setting of priorities for regions, I asked the Minister for Regional Development, 'Right now we have RDA boards that are set up to be independent, to run their own ship, to do what they need to do in their regions, but it seems to me you are trying to subsume them, you are trying to bring them into your system. Is there any chance that you or the government intends overtaking RDAs that currently work in South Australia, just like you have overtaken natural resources management boards? You have taken what were independent natural resources management boards and you have brought them under the wing of DENR. So, essentially you have stripped that independence, you have pulled it back and now you have extra resources to do your own government departmental work. I fear that that is what the government is likely to do with Regional Development Australia organisations.' To the minister's credit, she said, 'No, there is no intention to do that.' But let me put on the record that I am extremely worried that that may well be exactly what the government intends to do with Regional Development Australia in regions—overtake them.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Kavel.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Kavel will be heard in silence, please, minister.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (20:23): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I certainly appreciate your protection from the lion of the parliament, the member for Little Para. I am pleased to make some comments with regard to the estimates committees, that particularly the members of the opposition have had to endure for the past couple of weeks and what I have had to endure for 11 years. I have been in this place for a bit over 10 years, this is the eleventh estimates committees that I have been through and I have to say it does not get any better from what we were experiencing a decade or so ago.

I want to focus my remarks particularly on the areas of my responsibility on behalf of the Liberal opposition, which are: consumer and business services, veterans' affairs and state/local government relations. The first committee was that of Consumer and Business Services. I had a long list of questions but, as usual, you do not get the opportunity to get through all your questions for one reason or another—long answers and so on and so forth. I acknowledge that the Minister for Business Services and Consumers (that is his title, even though the agency is called Consumer and Business Services) did not put up any Dorothy Dixers during the course of that committee. I certainly acknowledge that, even though his office made the offer to me that we would knock back some time if Dorothy Dixers were held.

However, I did not agree to that arrangement so we ran the full three-quarters of an hour and we did not receive any Dorothy Dixers, anyway. It just goes to show that you have to be aware that the government can try some of these tactics on. We have experienced that in previous years and I know the minister for mineral development and trade has tried to negotiate that strategy in previous years and, alas, he has failed as well.

Members interjecting:

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That's not me, minister. The questioning initially encompassed liquor licensing fees. We have seen the government make a real habit of this in terms of backflipping on policy announcements. We saw the backflip, as the leader communicated and spoke about this afternoon, on The Parks Community Centre, the Keith hospital funding, the Cadell ferry, and now we see the Minister for Business Services and Consumers do a backflip on the liquor licensing fees.

We know that a fee schedule was added to the regulations and the regulations had been tabled in parliament. There was a significant backlash from a sector within the liquor licensing industry at the magnitude of those fees, particularly the small bars and clubs sector that open past 2am and 4am. The new tax structure—and let us not make any bones about it, it was a new tax that the government was going to introduce—could well have been the death knell to those businesses in terms of the dollar amount of that new tax and the impost on those businesses. The communication I received was that some of those businesses, those small bars and clubs, just could not afford to pay the level of tax that the government was trying to strip out of them.

It is my understanding, and I am happy for the minister to come in and correct me if it is wrong, that there was strong representation made to the Premier's office. There was representation from the small bars and clubs sector to a senior staff member within the Premier's office to have this new tax structure rejigged. I would like to know what pressure the Premier put on the Deputy Premier (who is the Minister for Business Services and Consumers) to go back and rejig or rework this fee structure on liquor licences.

That is what I think has happened, because I received some communication from an owner of a bar who told my office that that person had been dealing with a senior staff member within the Premier's office. It is my take on it that the Premier communicated that to the Deputy Premier. I am more than happy for them to come in and put their version of events and say what took place in relation to how it proceeded. However, what we have seen is a backflip by the government and a new set of fees tabled, and I understand the minister did that in the last sitting week. I think by and large the revised set of fees has been relatively, I would not say well accepted, but accepted, by the industry. It has less of an impact on their financial sustainability within the industry, so it is my understanding that it is more palatable, if you like, than the previous tax regime that the government was going to impose.

The tax was to raise \$3.6 million, and if you look at the budget figures it appears that that amount of \$3.6 million was to basically make the liquor regulatory service—that is the name of the

subprogram—cost neutral. It was to cover the costs of running that program. I asked the minister whether the new regime of taxation that has been introduced, at a reduced level through the different sectors within the industry, is going to result in \$3.6 million or thereabouts.

The minister prevaricated at the time of my asking the question but, remembering the answer, he said, 'I think so.' We will have to wait and see, because the invoices, the payments for this new tax will not be until the end of the year, so it will be well into the last half of this budget year, I think, before the minister and the agency know how the land lies, so to speak, where things sit in terms of what level of funding the tax will bring in.

The question I want to ask the minister is, if this revised tax regime does not result in about \$3.5 million or \$3.6 million, is there an intention by the government to impose other fees or ramp up other fees, penalties and so on, to make up the difference between what the tax raises and the \$3.6 million? I want an answer from the minister in due course on what his intentions are in making up the difference between the level of tax that is raised and the \$3.6 million, which was a figure specifically stated in last year's budget and obviously also in this year's budget.

In relation to other questions, I only had time to ask one or two questions concerning the performance of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal. The minister admits that that part of his agency is delivering a less than satisfactory level of service to the industry it serves, being, obviously, the real estate, landlords and tenancy industry. The minister admits that, but we want to know what he is he going to do to fix it.

I know he has issued a discussion paper in relation to some proposed amendments to the Residential Tenancies Act. That is all fine and dandy, but I cannot see much in that discussion paper that will actually have an impact, an effect on the performance of the agency now. That is what we need; we need an improvement in the performance of the residential tenancy branch now. I will read from an email I received from somebody within the industry. They have been told that a bond hearing will be a 90-day wait and they say that when you are trying to get through on the phones you are put on hold for up to 20 minutes and then get cut off. To wait three months to have a bond hearing matter heard, I think, is unacceptable—a 90 day wait. If there is a dispute in relation to a bond, it takes at least three months for the Residential Tenancies Tribunal to start assessing the matter. That has to be a less than satisfactory performance.

I have received some quite interesting information through freedom of information. We received a whole swag of documents through FOI, and it is interesting reading. Three months ago, the minister realised that his agency was, I think, in chaos on a whole range of fronts—in the occupational licensing area, the Residential Tenancies Tribunal and the tenancy branch area—and they are all issues I have highlighted here in the house and publicly.

The report in relation to the performance of the residential tenancy branch (and I am not necessarily criticising individual members of the tribunal) identifies problems with the performance of the tribunal, wanting hearings to start at 9am instead of 9.30am, and I understand that that has happened recently. I also understand that the workload of the tribunal has reduced; however, the hearings are taking longer to conduct. Despite having a reduced workload as a result of the July 2010 introduction of an application fee, hearings now take longer to conduct. That came through some information received through the FOI process.

I understand that one of the recommendations was that the tribunal members do not need to produce reports after every hearing, but some of them are ignoring that instruction and still producing reports, which obviously takes some time. I also understand that there was a note that highlighted that usually the residential tenancy branch and the tribunal only take a break during those three or four days between the Christmas and new year period, but last year they took a two-week break over the Christmas and new year period, which produced a backlog, and I think (and I am happy for the minister to come in and tell us otherwise) that the tribunal has been battling to address that backlog ever since. It is my understanding that they do not usually take that break over that period, only between Christmas and new year.

I think the minister has a fair bit of work to do now and should not wait until the end of the year when he thinks the discussion paper will be finalised and some legislation will be introduced into the house to amend the act. He has some immediate work to carry out to improve the performance of the residential tenancies branch.

I will move on to the next committee, veterans affairs. I see the clock winding down; it is amazing how time flies when you are having fun. I want to highlight an issue, again, with the negotiations that ministers try to make with shadow ministers in relation to reducing the time of a

particular committee. The veterans' affairs committee was about to start, and the minister rolls in and says, 'Hey, Goldy, we'll hold our Dorothy Dixers back and we'll knock the time back from an hour to half an hour.' I said, 'Well, no, I'm not going to agree to that. We'll split the difference and we'll go for three quarters of an hour so long as you hold your questions, your Dorothy Dixers.' So that was the agreement made. We are sailing through the opposition questions—fine. Then all of a sudden the government member pops up and says, 'Hang on, I want to ask a question.' I said, 'All right, well, that's fine but the deal's off.' We were going to run for an hour, because I had more than an hour's questions, I can tell you.

You might think that, with about one page in the budget and a \$700,000 budget allocation and about 3.5 FTE, it might be difficult to get an hour's worth of questions, but I can tell you that I had a couple of hours worth of questions, because it is a very important portfolio and one that I have a great deal of interest in. So, all bets are off. After the government member asked that question, I said, 'Righto, all bets are off. We're going to run for an hour.' What had happened was that someone had texted up to our side and also texted the government side. The arts portfolio was on next. The leader came a quarter of an hour earlier and the minister, also with his entourage—all the advisers rolled up.

I told the leader what had taken place and she was quite happy. She left and came back in a quarter of an hour after we ran the full hour of questions. I just tell the government and its ministers that if they make a deal, a deal is a deal. Do not, halfway through the show, try to change things because we will go back to the original process.

The Hon. S.W. Key: It was one little question.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It might have been one little question, but it was quite a lengthy—

The Hon. S.W. Key: And it was an important one, too.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, it was an important question, but I actually had that as part of my questions. It was quite a lengthy answer, too. Anyway, do not whinge to us about the time that is being set. You set the timetable. The government set the one hour timetable for veterans' affairs. If the minister thought it was too long, his office could have rung me weeks before and said, 'Hey, we think an hour's a bit long. Do you want to knock it back to half an hour?' Negotiate a couple of weeks before the estimates committee actually gets going, not the day it starts. Don't walk in at the start of the committee and try to negotiate knocking back time. Your government sets the time frame, so if you do not like it come to us a couple of weeks before to see whether you want to knock back the time, not a minute before the committee starts. That was veterans' affairs.

I have only got about a half a minute to go, but I want to talk about state/local government relation and, wowwee! The poor old beleaguered Minister for State/Local Government Relations. He has been in that job for a year. I had him 12 months ago and he had only just been appointed, but the poor old Minister for State/Local Government Relations, I do not think that the year has really helped him much in understanding the portfolio, unfortunately. He really struggled with the questions that were asked of him. He really did struggle with the questions asked of him, particularly when we came to the issue of the carbon tax.

Time expired

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (20:43): This is 20 minutes of opportunity I have to respond to the estimates process that we have just been to. Other members have commented at length on how the process works. I will limit my comments in that area to just two observations: first, in relation to the time. I think that overall it would be great if we had a lot more time so that all the opposition questions and all the government questions could be asked in each portfolio, but specifically the Families SA area within the education portfolio.

I note that the member for Kavel was concerned about the limit of only one hour for the veterans' affairs portfolio. Families SA, of course, the care and protection within education and child development, is some \$300 million of the state budget and dealing with the most vulnerable children in our community. We had half an hour to deal with that section of budget estimates, and I would suggest to the minister and whoever organises the schedule for estimates committees that it would be greatly appreciated if next year we could have more than half an hour, and preferably at least an hour or two hours, for that part of the budget. The opposition would be grateful and I think it is an appropriate change that needs to be made.

The second observation on the process, which other members have talked about, is how some ministers take questions as they come and answer them quickly and get through them as

much as possible and some make long opening statements and take protection from government questions, and so forth. I want to pay particular tribute to the Minister for Transport, who was in my first estimates session, and was happy to take as many questions as could be thrown at him, and I give him credit for that.

I also want to give the Minister for Transport excellent credit, before I get into talking about some of the issues in my portfolio areas, for what I think was the highlight of the whole estimates process, which was confirmation that Gorge Road will be resealed in the next 12 months.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Obviously, my estimates committee was the highlight of the whole process, not the Minister for Transport's estimates process.

Mr GARDNER: The Minister for Small Business gave the people of Morialta nothing in his estimates process, so he will not get the credit that I give to the Hon. Patrick Conlon on this occasion. I feel like I should, because minister Conlon went on to say (apparently, because I want not there at the time) that I am quite a nice fellow, whom he quite likes, so bravo to minister Conlon. That said, there were many things in the estimates process that concerned me, and I will get to those in due course, but I want to touch on each of my areas in the 17 minutes I have remaining and tell members what I have learned. It feels like a school report.

Quickly, on minister Conlon's responsibility of housing, we talked about a number of things and one that I want to draw to the attention of the house, for those who were not able to attend that riveting estimates session, is the concerns that I have in relation to Housing SA stock in the new redevelopments. River Street, Marden and Woodville West have recently been transferred from the Housing Trust to the URA. I am aware that, particularly at River Street, Marden, and I am sure at the other location, a number of those Housing Trust properties were kept vacant for a long period of time. Although they could have been tenanted, they were not, so that the government could sell them off and do the developments that the URA is designed to do.

It concerns me that the level of Housing Trust stock is not going to be maintained at the levels prior to the sales. I think at Woodville West the minister identified that, out of all those houses, there were I think 150 that were transferred recently and we will have 60 Housing Trust stock after the redevelopment. For River Street, Marden there was no commitment made. There will be some more community housing but there was no commitment made as to the level of Housing Trust stock that will be there after the development.

In relation to the portfolios of communities and social inclusion, disabilities and housing, we met earlier this week—yesterday, it probably was—with minister Hunter. The Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion identified in relation to the medical heating and cooling concessions that the government introduced last year that, as at 31 May 2012, 2,397 applications for the concession had been received, 1,196 had been approved (of which 678 had been paid), 1,017 applicants are assessed as currently not eligible for the concession and 184 applications are being validated or followed up with the applicant or the medical practitioner for further details to support their application.

This was a program that was identified in last year's budget papers, and I am quoting from the 2011-12 Budget Paper 6, page 41 if the minister doubts me, because he seemed to yesterday when I quoted these figures. It states:

This initiative provides \$0.4 million—

which, I assume, is \$400,000—

per annum (indexed) along with establishment costs...for the creation of a concession on energy costs for people on low incomes who for medical purposes require the regulation of temperature in order to control the symptoms of their disease.

The symptoms of conditions like Parkinson's Disease and Multiple Sclerosis can be affected by ambient temperature levels.

The measure was identified in a press release by minister Hunter on 20 December last year saying that up to 2,000 vulnerable South Australians will receive this additional financial assistance towards their energy bills. What was established yesterday was that, far from 2,000 vulnerable South Australians receiving this additional assistance, in fact, as I said a moment ago, 1,196 will receive it; 1,017 have been denied. Then we got into a discussion about the eligibility criteria. The minister listed a number of conditions that the department has determined will add up to someone being eligible to receive this concession. Again I am quoting from yesterday's draft *Hansard*:

Qualifying medical conditions for the concession include multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, motor neurone disease, muscular dystrophy, fibromyalgia, lymphoedema, post polio syndrome, poliomyelitis, systemic lupus erythematosus and tetraplegia.

Those conditions require this concession to be applied, and that is appropriate. However, what was initially in the government's announcement last year was that it would not be an exclusive list. If you had one of those conditions and support from a doctor saying you needed to have regulated temperature control, then you would get the concession. Also, last year the government said—and I am quoting from minister Hunter's press release of 20 December—'A qualified medical practitioner may also nominate other conditions that may be eligible.'

However, yesterday in estimates the minister changed his tune and confirmed, when asked a direct question as to whether that list was going to be exclusive or whether there was flexibility if somebody had other conditions, that the list was, in fact, exclusive and that there would be a medical panel appointed that will eventually give other advice to the government on other conditions that may be received. However, last year the government was specific. They said that potentially 2,000 people would be helped by the measure and that if somebody did not have one of the conditions on the list—and I am quoting from that 20 December press release—'A qualified medical practitioner may also nominate other conditions that may be eligible.'

It has completely changed the goal posts for this scheme. That is why people with a disability, people with medical conditions who require that their temperature be regulated, took the advice of Mr Hunter, who announced program several times last year. He went on TV, he went on radio and told people they needed to get a doctor's certificate saying their temperature needed to be regulated, fill in the forms, send it in, and they would get the concessions. That is why so many of these people have been disappointed, and that is why so many of these people are upset with the government, because the government overpromised and under delivered.

There is a question about the budget. We went into it a bit yesterday, and the minister did not have a firm answer. I know that someone in his office checks the *Hansard* for the House of Assembly for any potential mistakes that I might make. I am sure I have not made any yet, but maybe it will happen. We went into this at some length. The budget last year was set at \$400,000 per year. However, yesterday Mr Hunter said:

...the amount for 2011-12 has not changed; it is still \$316,000. For 2012-13, the budget for medical heating and cooling concession is \$348,000, which includes an additional amount of \$18,000.

When I pointed out that that is in fact \$59,000 a year less than the government advised last year, the minister said, 'I am a loss to understand the question.'

The budget paper from last year said \$400,000, the budget paper for this year says \$330,000 a year. Last year's announcement and subsequent press releases said that there would not be an exclusive list, there would be flexibility depending on people's conditions. This year the minister says, 'If you are not on the list you do not get the payment.' That is why people are upset. I urge the government to seriously rethink this.

I noted the Premier on television last night appearing to back down from the minister's intransigence on this issue. I hope that this is going to be another one of those backflips that we have seen over the course of the last couple of weeks where the Premier listens to the community. How about listening to his own government's press releases just from last year in which they promised one thing and now are delivering another?

More than 1,000 South Australians, the most vulnerable in our community, have been distressed and let down by the way the minister has handled this measure. I trust that it will be addressed in the not too distant future so that these people, who need to be kept cool in summer and who need to be kept warm in the winter, do not have to suffer through too many cold winter nights without their heating on because they are too afraid that they cannot afford to pay their bills as the cost of electricity spirals out of control.

Another area that I am somewhat concerned about is in relation to juvenile justice facilities. There is a range of questions on all these areas, but I have eight minutes left. I note that many of the questions that were put were taken on notice and I look forward to getting the answers so that we can explore those issues more fully.

There has been some concern in recent days about the number of people in our prisons who are on remand: a much higher proportion than elsewhere in the community. I can inform the house that the situation is far worse in our juvenile justice facilities. The Australian Institute of

Health and Welfare, in recent times, has done quite a bit of work on this. Last year it released a report that showed that South Australia had the greatest increase in juvenile detainees on remand, as opposed to having been sentenced—I think 'non-sentenced versus sentenced' is the terminology they use—and it was a 50 per cent increase from 2007 to 2011.

We have to nail down what their figures exactly are at the moment. I can advise the house that yesterday the minister advised that, at the moment, over the 2011-12 year (with a week left, obviously), 18 per cent of our juvenile justice detainees have been sentenced. Less than one in five people in our juvenile justice system have been sentenced. Thirty-six per cent, so twice as many as have been sentenced, are on remand, and the remainder (which, by my year 6 maths, adds up to about 54 per cent) are in police custody. So, 54 per cent are in police custody, 36 per cent are on remand and only 18 per cent of the juvenile justice clients at Magill and Cavan have actually been sentenced, and that is something that very much needs to be addressed.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You're like Michael Dukakis; you just leave the doors open.

Mr GARDNER: Right. Moving to the disability area, the other nice thing I will say about the government during this speech—we have all been asked by the Premier to be kinder and gentler to each other, so I am trying to make sure that I say something nice for every criticism I make, which is very hard, on occasion—but the other nice thing I want to say about the government, and I have said it before, is that it is thoroughly appropriate that the government has taken the opportunity, in this year's budget, to respond to the Strong Voices review into disability services and to provide significant input (let's be fair) of funding.

We know that between 2002 and 2012 the share of the South Australian budget that had gone to disability went up in absolute terms. It is a bigger number now than it was before, but as a share of the budget it went from 2.8 per cent of budget revenues to 2.3 per cent of budget revenues. The injection of funds into this year's budget goes a long way towards bringing it back to the level, the share and the importance within the budget that it was in 2002, and I commended the minister for that yesterday, as I have before.

There are some issues with how it was spent, and those who are particularly interested can read the *Hansard* to learn about some of the issues in relation to the moving of people with disability currently residing at Strathmont into other areas, into community housing under the new model that the government has picked up in the last couple of years and which the opposition has been pushing for much longer than that, and that is great. There are a lot of challenges that the government is going to have to overcome for that to go well, and we will be keeping a close eye on it.

I note that, in relation to the Community Visitor Scheme which was funded in the budget, the minister confirmed that although the Strong Voices report recommended that the Community Visitor Scheme report to an independent person, and Monsignor Cappo identified the Office of the Public Advocate, the minister confirmed yesterday that they will be reporting to him. So, the Community Visitor Scheme will not go to an independent reporting mechanism, and that is something that I think we need to have a serious look at.

I will be interested to know, because the minister said that most of the Strong Voices report's recommendations have been picked up in full by the government. This is one where I will be interested to see how they classify it, because it is quite important that the Community Visitor Scheme, according to Monsignor Cappo, report to the Office of the Public Advocate, so I suggest that they have accepted this one in part only and it will be interesting to see how the minister classifies it when he gets back to the question on notice.

The Hon. Kelly Vincent has a bill before the Legislative Council dealing with community visitors and a range of other measures, and I note that the minister yesterday confirmed that the budget measure makes no provision for the way that the Hon. Kelly Vincent has structured her bill and suggested the budget measure is not compatible with the Hon. Kelly Vincent's bill, which I think we will need to have a look at when considering it.

I know that the Hon. Kelly Vincent put a lot of work into it, and I hope the government has had a very serious look at it so that when they have made the determination that there will be no funds made available for it they have good reasons for doing so. I look forward to hearing more about that in due course. With three minutes left, I hope I can at least touch on all the areas for which I have responsibility, and I apologise to those who have been hanging out to hear about some of them.

In the area of youth, the minister confirmed yesterday that he is in negotiations with the YMCA at the moment because, with our being in this chamber and not the other one, we have also had to move forward our next sitting by a week, which means that we are moving forward into the week that was going to be Youth Parliament. The youth parliamentarians are having to deal with the fact that they either have to delay their program or move to a different venue, which is a crying shame, but what is to be done? This is a very strange circumstance, and the minister was good enough to indicate that he is looking at it.

In the area of Families SA and child protection, I can identify that there was not a lot of time. I think the opposition got to ask questions on about six lines, which is very disappointing. In relation to the child abuse reporting system, we regularly hear concerns and complaints from mandatory reporters who are kept waiting for half an hour—somebody said recently it was 50 minutes before they gave up waiting, and somebody else said that the phone was answered after half an hour.

These sorts of complaints come in all the time because the waiting times for the Child Abuse Report Line are extraordinary. I note that last year the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, in an answer to the member for Bragg, reported that waiting times, at that time, were between six and seven minutes. This year, the Minister for Education and Child Development identified that the waiting time is in fact now between nine and 10 minutes, which is extraordinary—and that is the average waiting time.

Anyone who calls at a low time is going to be waiting for a minute or two, and then a whole heap of others are going to be waiting for 20, 30, or 50 minutes, as we have identified. The minister, in her answer, said, 'I often walk into a school and see a teacher on the phone to the Child Abuse Report Line.' Often walking into schools and seeing teachers waiting on the phone to the Child Abuse Report Line, yet she does not see that there is a problem there—it is extraordinary.

As the Child Abuse Report Line and the electronic Child Abuse Report Line are redeveloped, I put the minister on notice that we will be keeping a very close eye on this because it is important that if somebody has a notification to report—that they are required to report and that we want them to report—that they be able to do so in a timely manner so that it can be dealt with and so that they can get on with their important job as a health worker, or as a teacher, or as a police officer, or whatever else they are doing. I look forward to estimates next year hopefully being a better process, and thank you for your time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Morialta.

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: I try to be courteous.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sure member for Norwood will make up for it now. Member for Norwood.

Mr MARSHALL (Norwood) (21:03): Yet more impartial comments from the Chair; that will be another paragraph in my letter to the Speaker on you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is okay, just keep adding to it.

Mr MARSHALL: Anyway, Mr Deputy Speaker, it is my great pleasure to speak tonight on the Appropriation Bill. It is always hard to follow the member for Morialta because he is a thorough, hardworking and very articulate member, and I wish I was put after some of our other members. But, he is an outstanding member—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Which one? Which ones do you think are incompetent?

Mr MARSHALL: There is a list.

Mr Gardner: He was talking about other members in the house.

Mr MARSHALL: Other members in the house. Can I just say that he is a credit to his electorate of Morialta. We have several boundaries which abut, and it is a pleasure to work with him. I am rising to speak on the estimates process, which we concluded today. It has been an interesting time. There is no doubt that it is time to reform this situation, the estimates process that exists in the parliament. This is a once-a-year opportunity where the government is held to account in detail, each minister and department, by the shadow minister. I think it is an excellent process. Many other parliaments have adopted different public accounts scrutiny processes, and I think it is

probably time for a review of our current system and perhaps provide something that goes over the entire year and is not just focused on a particular week or couple of days in parliament.

It is good for the opposition to ask questions freely of the minister and his department to get detailed answers that go to and fro, but it is also very good for the minister and for the government to be held to account because, when you have an active and engaged scrutiny process, you have a better government. From that perspective both the government and the opposition should be joining in a review of the process.

I would like to start by thanking the ministers for their time. Most of them were very forthcoming with information, and I thank them for that, and I particularly thank the staff who put in countless hours preparing their answers for the ministers to read out. Thank you to the staff who come along and give answers to the best of their ability.

This year I was the lead opposition spokesman on seven committees. It was a bit of a mixed bag. We had some excellent sessions and some not so excellent sessions, but overall I found the process to be a very good one and I appreciate the minister's interaction. I would make some comments regarding the process, in particular the time allocation. I know that other people have already spoken on this, but I would like to add some of my anecdotes.

For example, we had a fulsome hour for small business, and I must say that the minister was very forthcoming and answered all of my questions directly. We had a fulsome hour for \$1.9 million worth of expenditure, yet for the EPA, which has a budget probably 30 times larger, we had half a hour. In that EPA process not only was it half a hour, but the government insisted on a lengthy opening statement and a series of Dorothy Dixers (as they have been referred to today) government questions, which really restricted the amount of time to provide scrutiny to this important regulator to around 15 minutes: 15 minutes for \$50 million worth of expenditure I do not think is adequate, and this would be something we could also incorporate into this area.

I now switch to talking about some of the information that I learnt from the estimates process, and I will start with the small business area as it is an area particularly close to my heart. We hear a lot of rhetoric from governments about the small business, the SME sector, the family enterprises, being the backbone of the South Australian economy, and they are—there is no doubt about this. The minister in his opening remarks made the point that there are 142,000 SMEs or small businesses, in South Australia. It is an outstanding contribution to the South Australian economy.

We do not have the large corporates that other states around Australia have. In fact, South Australia has one ASX200 listed company in South Australia. So the SME sector is vitally important to our economy. You can imagine my surprise when I learnt from the estimates process that, of the 89,000 public servants in South Australia, we are down to 6,500 supporting SMEs in South Australia, and the budget for the backbone of the South Australian economy is \$1.9 million. I have the calculator out and I reckon that is about \$14 per SME per year. To me, that is outrageous. As I said, this is a government that pays a lot of attention to putting out press releases, calling press conferences and telling us what they are doing, but let us run our eye over some of the things that this government has cut: cut to the small business sector, cut to the engine room of the South Australian economy.

I start with none other than the Small Business Month itself. The government has turned its back on the small business sector—gone. Budget saving. What has it done with the SMEIDP project? This was a very important program that was providing much needed funds to facilitate small businesses investing in technology which would grow their business. What did the government do? Cut it. It did not just cut it at the end of the program or at the end of the year: it cut it halfway through. That gives you a clear indication of precisely what this government thinks about the SME sector.

As an aside, I must say I am grateful to the minister for considering reimbursing some of the firms that were significantly out of pocket putting in their applications. Anyway, that aside, it is still disgraceful that the government has dropped that program. The small business helpline was cut by this government. These are just some of the programs that this government has cut to the backbone of the South Australian economy.

Let me tell you—and I know the minister knows this—that small businesses in South Australia are doing it tough at the moment. There is no doubt about it, they are doing it tough. We have high taxes in South Australia, we have cuts to the payroll tax exemption for the small business sector and now we have cuts to the specific programs that were helping this sector. I also

want to turn to the area of family enterprises. There is overlap with the SME sector, but family enterprises do actually differ markedly from the SME sector by itself. Again, family enterprises are a crucial part of the economy here in South Australia.

Of course, I asked the Minister for Small Business: 'Tell me, minister, about that wonderful report under the Thinkers in Residence program presented by Professor Dennis Jaffe. Tell me which if its recommendations have actually been implemented by this government.' He is going to take that on notice and I look forward to the response. I specifically asked about the family business manager, which was one of the recommendations of that report.

The previous family business manager has left that post and he is not to be replaced. This is a very, very important component of the South Australian economy. A lot of those people opposite want to make little jibes about, 'Family business, born with a silver spoon in their mouth,' and all this sort of rubbish.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No-one says that. Who said that?

Mr MARSHALL: The Premier and the minister, and I am very happy to present to the house the *Hansard* references to both.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Point of order: I only said that you were born with a silver spoon in your mouth, no-one else.

Mr MARSHALL: You were making those comments in reference to the family business sector. I am a very proud ex-president of Family Business Australia, the South Australian chapter, and the simple fact of the matter is that there are a lot of people opposite who think, 'Well, do you know what, the family business sector—these people have inherited businesses from their family.' I will tell you one thing: a lot of people going into the family business sector have choices. They can go interstate, they can work for a multinational, or they can stay in South Australia and employ South Australians.

I cannot think of too many things that are better for the South Australian economy than people in family businesses following their family into employing South Australians. That is what I stand for and that is what our party believes in. If those people opposite want to knock it then they knock it at their peril, and it is an absolute disgrace.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: The heckling from opposite reinforces their hatred of the enterprising sectors of our economy. I now want to turn to DMITRE, because there are a number of elements in this budget as well that I relate to and, in particular, manufacturing, innovation and trade. I can deal very quickly with the innovation component, because there is not much left. They closed Innovate SA. In fact, I was at Innovate SA last night and let me say that it is an excellent organisation. I do not know what the government is going—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Was.

Mr MARSHALL: It still is. It finishes on Saturday night. I was there last night. Where were you? Nowhere to be seen.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I closed it and I am proud that I did.

Mr MARSHALL: You should hang your head in shame because, quite frankly, innovation is a crucial component to enterprise in South Australia. I am yet to find any shred of evidence of any government programs to promote innovation. Innovation creates the businesses of the future, and I cannot find it anywhere. In fact, I went looking for it today with the Minister for Science and Information Economy. I asked him if he had any program—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, Member for Croydon, the member for Norwood has the floor.

Mr MARSHALL: —and the minister said there was nothing in his budget which dealt with innovation. Those opposite say: why should government be involved in innovation? Government does not have a role in every single part of innovation, but government does have a role where there is market failure, and there is market failure in the innovation process in South Australia, and if the minister does not understand that process, he should get a briefing. It is absolutely incredible.

He does not have a clue about how business operates in South Australia, and that is why his department leaks like a sieve.

There is another important area where this minister actually looks after manufacturing, and again this is an area where, unlike the minister, I have considerable experience. I applaud the government for its green paper by Professor Göran Roos on manufacturing futures in South Australia, but I do not applaud the South Australian government for its pitiful support for the implementation of this project. The government went to great lengths to actually point out that it was going to spend \$8 million—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: 8.1.

Mr MARSHALL: —\$8.1 million on implementing this process. We scratched the surface and found out that it is \$8.1 million over four years. It is \$2 million a year. In fact, in that line in the budget, in a line under manufacturing and innovation, the budget goes down by 20 per cent next year. So, do not believe a word the government says when it puts out a press release talking about what it is doing for the manufacturing sector. It is an absolute disgrace. The whole department is in complete and utter disarray.

I want to touch very briefly on the overseas offices. There are eight overseas offices; 25 per cent of them do not even have any staff. This is complete disarray. They have not had staff for more than 12 months. It is an absolutely hopeless situation. It is a hopeless situation because we have a hopeless minister. Anyway, I will leave DMITRE there because I have other areas to talk about.

I would like to now turn my attention to two other areas: the EPA and Zero Waste SA, for which I have shadow portfolio responsibilities. I thought DMITRE was bad. Let me just say that, in terms of the EPA and Zero Waste SA, the government has again got it wrong. These are regulators. What has the government done? The government has made these into profit centres. This government is incredible. Things that it should be running profitably—no hope; things that it should be regulating—'We will make a profit out of them.' Give me a break! Where do these people go to school? Probably in their own system, no doubt. Again, with the EPA, we had less than 15 minutes worth of scrutiny. This is a government department—

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: I went to a public school.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: We have learned today about the appalling standards in schools under your jurisdiction.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Is that right? Appalling?

Mr MARSHALL: Absolutely; bottom of the class. You should listen to question time more often. Let us go back to the EPA.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TRELOAR: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members on my right!

Mr TRELOAR: I am having great difficulty in hearing what the member for Norwood has to say.

Mr MARSHALL: I hope my time will be extended.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I will move an extension, don't worry.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not accept it.

Mr MARSHALL: They have the votes, Mr Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I will not put the motion though.

Mr MARSHALL: You are not the only one to ignore that minister. Can I just say in terms of the EPA, and I will be brief, that the EPA has a total expenditure of \$45 million, but they have a total income of \$51 million. This is a profit centre. This year is the first year in the history of this state where the EPA will actually make a profit—a projected profit of around \$1 million. Next year, that is increasing to \$6 million; that is not what our regulators are there for.

In terms of Zero Waste SA, the story only gets worse. This is an organisation which was set up to divert material from landfill—to recycle, reduce consumption and try to keep valuable resource out of our landfill. Let me tell you that this year that organisation will make a profit of \$9.7 million and that is all being driven by the solid waste levy increases put through by this government.

This is an absolute disgrace because this year there is no way that this government can justify an increase in the solid waste levy. The minister repeatedly says that this is sending a price signal to people who put product into the landfill. That is just a complete load of bunkum. The simple fact of the matter is the carbon tax is coming into effect on Sunday and that is going to have a massive increase on the cost of material going to landfill.

We are getting a double whammy at precisely the time that ratepayers are suffering from cost of living increases, councils are getting a massive increase in their costs associated with this carbon tax, NRM levy increases and so forth, and businesses are struggling in this economy. There is no justification whatsoever. This is a greedy tax grab by a cash-strapped government.

I will now move to DENR. We remain very concerned about this department. Our institutions in South Australia are massively underfunded and I particularly speak of the Botanic Gardens, which is again—

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: In case you have not worked it out, that is precisely what I am saying. Your priorities are all over the place like a mad woman's breakfast. You have no idea. You are underfunding some things and you are pulling the guts out of other things—pay attention! Anyway, the Botanic Gardens—

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: I hope I am getting at least five minutes extra.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members on my right! Member for Norwood.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Botanic Gardens is an institution which I value greatly. It is an institution which has been attacked mercilessly by this government. In fact, this year we have learnt that the government, as a \$46,000 cost saving measure, has decided to cut out the heating to the bicentennial rainforest conservatory. This was South Australia's bicentennial project. It is an iconic structure in South Australia, has massive visitation each year and is recognised throughout the world. They want to turn off the heat to save \$46,000.

At precisely the same time, this same department spends—are you ready for this? I am glad you are sitting down, Mr Deputy Speaker—\$29 million per year on policy advice, yet they do not have \$46,000 to keep our tropical rainforest Bicentennial Conservatory going. This is a government which has no idea about their priorities.

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Have I really only got 15 seconds?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will extend it by a minute.

Mr MARSHALL: One minute?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thirty seconds if you like.

Mr MARSHALL: Alright. I am being told to wind up, despite the fact that I have been interrupted the entire way through and I am only just starting to get up a bit of steam. Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to talk about estimates. It can be a frustrating process but I think that, if we work together, I am sure that the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade and I in a moment of rare bipartisanship can sit down and assess the public accounts review process within this parliament. Estimates would have to be a component of that. There is no doubt

that the time allocation and the frequency of the visitation of estimates needs to be reviewed. I look forward to working with the government on this important review to improve outcomes for all South Australians.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

At 21:25 the house adjourned until Wednesday 27 June 2012 at 09:00.