

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday 29 May 2012**

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.K. Sneath)** took the chair at 14:19 and read prayers.

PARLIAMENTARY REMUNERATION (BASIC SALARY) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (SUPERANNUATION SCHEME) (MERGER) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (14:22): I move:

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

Motion carried.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES

85 The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (30 June 2010) (First Session). For the period between 1 July 2009 and 30 June 2010, will the Minister for Health list—

1. Job title and total employment cost of each position with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more, which has been abolished; and
2. Each new position with a total cost of \$100,000 or more, which has been created?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations): The Minister for Health and Ageing has been advised of the following information in relation to the period between 1 July 2009 and 30 June 2010. The information relates to the portfolios of Health and Mental Health and Substance Abuse.

1. Positions Abolished—Total Estimated Cost (TEC) \$100,000 or more:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC
Country Health SA	Director, Business Systems	\$102,625.00
Country Health SA	Executive Director, Aged & Major Projects	\$203,131.00
Country Health SA	Executive Director, Operations & Early Childhood	\$206,796.00
Country Health SA	Executive Director, Service Operations	\$214,033.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Clinical Leader	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Executive Director/Director of Nursing, St Margaret's Rehabilitation Hospital	\$107,039.00
Adelaide Health Service	Executive Director, Human Resources & Organisational Development	\$199,875.00
Adelaide Health Service	Strategic Manager, Employee Relations	\$137,863.00
Adelaide Health Service	Executive Director, Finance	\$190,958.00
Department of Health	Public Health Physician	\$134,816.53
Department of Health	Principal Scientific Officer	\$126,281.68
Department of Health	Executive Consultant	\$183,541.15
Department of Health	Director, Employee Relations	\$121,461.57
Department of Health	Director, Health System Performance	\$261,229.10
Department of Health	Director, ICT Projects	\$119,481.51
Department of Health	Director, ICT Contracts & Performance	\$109,001.19
Department of Health	Director, SAES Project	\$126,850.01
Department of Health	Manager, Workforce Reform & Information	\$107,538.42
Children, Youth & Women's Health Service	Neurosurgery Medical Unit Head	\$149,716.95

2. Positions Created—Total Estimated Cost (TEC) \$100,000 or more:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Country Health SA	Manager, Clinical Engineering	\$118,441.00
Country Health SA	Chief Operating Officer	\$229,033.00
Country Health SA	Mental Health Deputy Clinical Director	\$235,395.00
Country Health SA	Medical Administrator	\$117,697.00
Country Health SA	Manager, Performance & Projects	\$101,182.00
Adelaide Health Service	Chief Dental Officer	\$129,348.00
Adelaide Health Service	Director, Clinical Business	\$129,348.00
Adelaide Health Service	Director, Special Needs Unit	\$129,348.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Senior Dental Practitioner	\$125,017.00
Adelaide Health Service	Director, Safety and Quality	\$116,672.00
Department of Health	Director, Health System & Information Performance	\$223,680.95

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department of Health	Deputy Executive Director, Workforce Division	\$199,875.40
Department of Health	Principal Audit Manager	\$109,980.37
Department of Health	Director, ICT Operations	\$197,842.15
Department of Health	Director, ICT Programs	\$210,637.34
Department of Health	Director, Financial Turnaround	\$225,118.90
Department of Health	Chief Pharmacist	\$113,700.36
Children, Youth & Women's Health Service	Medical Imaging Head of Sonography and Ultrasound	\$128,260.30
Children, Youth & Women's Health Service	Manager, Health Informatics, Planning Performance, Outcomes—ICT and Information Systems	\$101,182.52

GOVERNMENT CAPITAL PAYMENTS

102 The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (30 June 2010) (First Session). What was the actual level of capital payments made in the month of June 2010 for each Department or agency then reporting to the Minister for Environment and Conservation—

1. That is within the general Government sector; and
2. That is not within the general Government sector?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations): The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has been advised:

1. Within general Government sector:

The former Department for Environment and Heritage recognised capital expenditure of \$6.5 million in June 2010. The former Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation's capital payments for the month of June 2010 was \$2.96 million. The Environment Protection Authority made capital payments of \$136,000 in June 2010. Zero Waste SA made no capital payments in the month of June 2010.

2. Not within general Government sector:

The total capital payments made for the month of June 2010 for SA Water was \$141.4 million on an accrued basis and \$121.7 million on a cash basis.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. G.E. Gago)—

Regulations under Acts—

Business Names Act 1996—Revocation of Regulations

Business Names Registration (Transitional Arrangements) Act 2012—Fees

Liquor Licensing Act 1997—Dry Areas—Long Term—

Gawler

Port Elliot Area 1

Port Pirie

Partnership Act 1891—Fees

Rules of Court—

District Court—District Court Act 1991—Criminal and Miscellaneous—
Amendment No. 12

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. R.P. Wortley)—

Reports, 2011—

Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology

University of Adelaide

University of Adelaide By-laws—General

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

National Environment Protection Council Report, 2010-2011—Erratum

Regulations under Act—

Harbours and Navigation Act 1993—Restricted Areas—Glenelg

ABORIGINAL CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (14:24): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to constitutional recognition of Aboriginal people made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (14:25): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Revised Murray-Darling Basin Plan made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

SPEEDING OFFENCE PENALTIES

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:25): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to changes to speeding fines made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Police.

QUESTION TIME

OLYMPIC DAM EXPANSION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Regional Development a question about Roxby Downs and the BHP expansion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: On 29 November last year BHP Billiton announced to the world's financial markets and the people of South Australia that it welcomed the passage of the Roxby Downs Indenture Act. The legislation passed this parliament with the support of the Liberal Party; in fact, the Liberal Party has been supporting this mine and its expansion for some time, while of course the failed ex-premier, Mike Rann, was urging us to play it safe and leave the ore in the ground.

Roxby Downs now has the capacity to become the world's biggest copper and uranium mine, developed by the world's largest mining company. There is a timetable in that legislation. It specifies that, unless construction begins by the end of this year, the South Australian government has the right to revoke its indenture agreement. However, recently BHP Billiton chairman Jacques Nasser declared that the company will be keeping in its corporate safe the \$80 billion it had planned to invest in new mining projects by 2015. He said:

It is all about appropriate allocation of capital. We should pause, take a deep breath and wait and see where the pieces fall around the world.

This deferral could delay the Olympic Dam copper and uranium mine project. In a response that sent shudders around the mining world, South Australia has now indicated that the government might revoke the right to proceed. 'I will not be granting an extension to BHP,' resources minister Tom Koutsantonis said. 'They'd need a ministerial exemption to continue those approvals,' the state's Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Tom Koutsantonis, said; 'Thus far I've seen nothing that would incline me to grant an extension.' My questions are:

1. Does the Minister for Regional Development support the decision of the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy not to grant an extension?
2. What will be the effect on rural and regional South Australia if this mine development does not go ahead?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his question. As usual, we see the opposition come into this place and try to talk down and bag the government's hard work. We know it is full of

doomsday predictions and talks down the hard work of this government, and that is exactly what the Hon. David Ridgway is doing here today.

An enormous amount of work has gone into the indenture, the EIS and the government's response to BHP Billiton, and negotiations continue in relation to a number of different issues. We know that BHP Billiton has started a number of developments in preparation for the beginning of the mine expansion, so we know that that work is already underway, that they have already undertaken that.

We know that the BHP Billiton board is expected to make its decision on its investment associated with Olympic Dam. We know they are expected to do that by the end of this year. We are still within that time frame and, as far as the government is concerned, proceedings are running well and we are confident that this project remains absolutely intact and viable.

It is a disgrace that the opposition comes into this place day after day, full of doom and gloom, and tries to talk down the prospects of this state and rattle people's confidence and rattle the confidence of members of the public. It is an absolute disgrace, and it's irresponsible behaviour.

OLYMPIC DAM EXPANSION

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): By way of supplementary question arising from the minister's non-answer, does she support the statement of the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, when he said, 'I will not be granting an extension to BHP'?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (14:33): Of course I support the decisions of my cabinet colleagues. I am sure the minister considers all relevant matters and will absolutely proceed in the best interests of this state. Day after day we come into this place and find the opposition bagging South Australia, bagging our prospects, talking us down, full of doom and gloom, and trying to rattle the confidence of our business sector and the confidence of consumers, and, as I said, it is totally irresponsible.

COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:33): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for State/Local Government Relations on the subject of council boundaries.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Fairly recently, the Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide made the remark that more council amalgamations should be in order, which was not met well by his colleague from the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the Mayor right: should we have more council amalgamations?
2. Has he received any representations on this matter?
3. Does he have any plans for local council reform?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:35): The Hon. Steve Yarwood, the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, did make announcements the other day calling for—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Do you or don't you want to hear the question? Is it not important enough?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Do you want to hear the answer?

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Yes. Now I understand why they put you on the back bench, mate. If you behave like that in your caucus, I can understand why they dropped you from the front bench. This government has no policy for forced amalgamations. There is constant reform in local government. We are constantly looking at reforms in governance and asset management. We are constantly looking at local government working better and more efficiently for the residents of this

state. If a number of councils decided to amalgamate, I would be only too happy to facilitate that, but we do not have at this stage a policy of forced amalgamations.

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion a question in relation to the Parks Community Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On Saturday 26 May, the government announced a new \$28.7 million funding package for the Parks Community Centre. My questions for the minister are:

1. Where will the funding for the works come from?
2. Is it new money and, if not, from where it is being re-allocated?
3. Where will the revenue from the sale of the 6.6 hectares of land be directed?
4. Will the existing community workshop be kept as part of the redevelopment?
5. Will the childcare centre be moved from its current location adjacent to the Hells Angels' bkie headquarters?
6. What services and facilities will be removed from the Parks?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. It is important to note at the outset that the responsible minister for this is the deputy leader in the other house, the Hon. John Rau. But I can advise the chamber, in some respects, in relation to the questions that have been asked by the honourable member.

It is correct that the government has committed \$28.7 million to redevelop the Parks Community Centre in the 2012-13 budget. Funding will deliver, as I understand it, a new 25-metre pool and an indoor children's pool, a new playground, a new entry cafe and public plaza, a refurbished and extended childcare centre, a refurbished multipurpose building, refurbishment of the existing two theatres, two new soccer pitches and a new car park with additional spaces. I am advised that work will start in the final quarter of 2012.

The honourable member is correct; I understand that there is a parcel of land of about six hectares or so to be rezoned for development by the Urban Renewal Authority. I am advised that the government has committed \$4.6 million to assist a range of government and non-government organisations to relocate to more suitable locations as part of this development. The government has dedicated community engagement staff who will be in regular contact with tenants. Additionally, there is a hotline and an email account. For the record, the hotline number is 1300 002 033, and the email for the contact is dpti.communityrelations@sa.gov.au.

The planned development builds on Monsignor Cappo's report and incorporates elements identified through the community consultation process. The government is proud to have listened to the community and will deliver a fresh new hub for the people of the north-western suburbs to enjoy. As we all know, 'The Parks Community Centre: A practical approach for the future' report was released on 23 June 2011. The report, prepared by the former commissioner for social inclusion, proposes a new recreation and sporting hub, refurbishment of the children's centre, a new health centre, and a new library and community centre. I am very proud to say that the government will be delivering on the promises to the western suburbs in refurbishing this wonderful facility.

HORTICULTURE

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Regional Development a question about support for covered horticulture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: One of the great innovations in recent years has been the increasing availability of flavoursome tomatoes. This great resource for cooks has become available with the development of covered horticulture, or glasshouses. With the increasing sophistication and use of covered horticulture to grow this important base ingredient for so many

cuisines, in glasshouses or in covered cloches, good quality tomatoes have really become readily available for the majority of the year. Can the minister advise the chamber about a recent grant to further expand the use of covered horticulture in our regions?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. I am very pleased to advise that in my capacity as both Minister for Regional Development and Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries I recently approved a grant of just under \$1 million towards water infrastructure to support a significant expansion of the Como Glasshouse near Two Wells.

The project is set to add a further 10-hectare capacity to the existing 17 hectares of glasshouses run by the company (which trades under d'VineRipe) and currently produces about 10,000 tonnes of hydroponic tomatoes to supply supermarkets throughout Australia. The company has expanded its footprint and production of covered horticulture tomatoes since completing its first glasshouse in 2007 and now looks to invest further in business with a total project cost of approximately \$31 million, which is set to see the production of tomatoes grow to over 15,000 tonnes per annum on completion of the staged project.

The plan looks to build on the previous developments on the site, which involves using generators to secure power supply and a reverse osmosis treatment system for water captured from the roof of the facility and from the nearby Bolivar treatment works. The grant will be used for further water augmentation on the site by constructing an evaporation pond and a 100-megalitre rainwater pond.

These facilities will add to the existing water infrastructure of two 35-megalitre dams to capture rainwater and a reverse osmosis plant to treat rainwater and reclaimed water from the Bolivar Wastewater Treatment Plant. The sum of \$372,500 is expected to be devoted to a rainwater pond, which will collect roof water to be used for tomato production instead of using mains water for the plant. In addition, the evaporation pond is to be used to settle out saline water which has been treated using reverse osmosis so that potable water will not be needed.

As part of the \$31 million project, an additional gas pipeline will be constructed and a new gas turbine generator installed to provide additional power. This is to generate heat to warm up the glasshouse through winter and absorb excess CO₂ gases. This, combined with high-voltage generators, will enable the applicant to even out energy costs and ensure continuity of supply. Of course, a development of this size requires roadworks to link stage 1 and stage 2 glasshouses to the new construction.

I am advised that fresh tomatoes, such as those produced by the facility, are one of the areas of horticulture which are showing strong growth in value on the domestic market and it now comprises the largest category of sales in the fruit and vegetable area of supermarkets. The controlled covered production methods used enable the tomatoes to be differentiated, with a number of varieties grown, and to specialised sizes, from the cherry tomato size to the tomato size most favoured by consumers for salads.

One of the key benefits of this type of climate control technology with measured application of nutrients is that it allows the grower to consistently produce the high quality product demanded by markets and consumers. I understand that the project, which is expected to be completed later this year in time for the summer growing season, will enable up to a further 100 FTE jobs to add to the approximately 200 existing FTEs provided at the site. I also understand that the expansion will allow Como to export about 12.6 million kilograms or 84 per cent of its product interstate. I congratulate Como on their work to date and look forward to tasting the produce from this expansion project.

SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION INNOVATION FUND

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Disabilities questions regarding the Supported Accommodation Innovation Fund (SAIF).

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: On 3 April, in a joint media release, Prime Minister Julia Gillard and federal minister for disability Jenny Macklin announced the nationwide grant recipients for the SAIF. The release states:

Twenty-one organisations across Australia will share \$60 million to help build community-based accommodation for adults with severe or profound disability. People with disability need access to a range of supported accommodation models that will allow them, and their carers, to participate as valued members of their communities. The Supported Accommodation Innovation Fund will help address a shortfall in supported accommodation and respite for people with disability. It will encourage innovation and drive change in the way supported accommodation services are provided. Negotiations for funding agreements are in progress with the successful 21 organisations, which will be responsible for 27 projects providing 169 supported accommodation and respite places across the country.

Now, this all sounds wonderful, particularly for this state that has more than 500 unique clients on the Category 1 unmet needs list for accommodation support. However, it would seem the money has not flowed to South Australia.

Of the \$60 million, our state (a state representing about 8 per cent of the national population) has received a miserly \$740,000 of grant funding for only one project. This represents just 1 per cent of the funding that was available. Tasmania, the Northern Territory and ACT all received larger portions of funding than South Australia did. It is my understanding that the state's Disability Services department needed to sign off on grant applications before they were submitted. So, my questions to the minister are:

1. How many grant proposals generated by South Australian organisations did the department support for the accommodation fund?
2. Did the state department choose not to sign off on some grant applications?
3. Does the minister know why South Australia received such a low level of funding for SAIF grants?
4. Is the minister concerned that South Australian projects seem to be held in such low esteem by his federal counterparts?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:47): The Building Innovative Accommodation for People with Disability fund saw the commonwealth government dealing directly with non-government organisations. As I understand it, this was a desired mechanism for this funding round.

The state government has done a great deal to help address the accommodation needs for people with disability. I have highlighted this work many times in this chamber and I can refer honourable members to *Hansard* of both 14 March 2012 and 3 May 2012, where I spoke at great length on this issue. The information has not changed since I was asked a question on this issue but I will, once again, recap.

As I have said before, the move away from institution style accommodation for people with intellectual disabilities and complex behaviour issues has had a major impact on the unmet need list for accommodation. We need to provide these clients with high-needs, smaller supported accommodation houses within the community. Typically, these houses are shared by four, sometimes five, residents, and they often require around-the-clock care. These houses are expensive to build and operate.

However, the South Australian government has committed funding to a number of supported accommodation projects that will boost the availability of supported accommodation for people with disability. These include:

- Disability Housing Project: \$30.4 million of state government funding will deliver 61 new disability-accessible homes, providing 132 accommodation places.
- Bedford Homes for 100 Project: The state government has committed \$5 million, as did the Bedford Foundation, to fund 32 new developments to provide accommodation for 70 people with disability.
- Minda 105: The state government committed \$15.7 million and, to date, 47 accommodation places have been created, with a further 41 places available in the next year in the Minda 105 program.

Early intervention responses, including the provision of equipment that can assist some people to remain in their own homes rather than require supported accommodation, are also a priority. We have done some good work in this area, but there is always more that needs to be done. I acknowledge that, at the moment, demand outstrips the supply of services available. We know this

is the case. Governments have to balance competing priorities for services, and within disability we have to balance competing needs in critical areas such as supported accommodation, intensive in-home support and equipment.

This is not an excuse: it is just the reality. The current system is broken and needs a significant overhaul. That is why we are moving our system away from just topping up crisis situations to one of self-managed and self-directed funding where people can use that money to keep themselves in their own homes with limited supports rather than impose a need on supported accommodation when they do not really need to go into that accommodation at that time in their life.

SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION INNOVATION FUND

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:50): I have a supplementary question. Will the minister answer the question? How many applications did the department sign off and how many did they choose not to?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:50): The government did not choose not to sign off on any applications at all.

LIFE QUILT SA

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the minister advise the council about the Life Quilt SA initiative?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. On 20 April I had the honour of launching the South Australian Life Quilt and associated videos and stories. Life Quilt SA is a community art project which commemorates the lives of people who have tragically died or been seriously injured as a result of workplace accidents. The project is based on the Canadian Life Quilt, a memorial dedicated to young men and women who have died or been injured while at work.

In 2009, the Working Women's Centre, SA Unions and the Australian Safe Communities Foundation came together to commence working on a South Australian Life Quilt. Last month the families of those represented on the quilt, along with volunteers, friends, work colleagues and supporters, joined me at the unveiling of the Life Quilt SA. There are 10 families currently represented on the quilt in memorial of the following workplace deaths: Darren Millington, Jack Salvemini, Daniel Madeley, Max Logan, Damian Harris, Matthew Keeley, Sophie Schulz, Brett Schmidt, Brian Murphy and John Posnakidis.

While this project is primarily about commemorating these workplace deaths, it also acknowledges the families and the impacts that these accidents have had on them. The Life Quilt serves as a powerful reminder of the family, social and community impacts of a workplace tragedy. I reiterate my thanks to these families for having the courage to share their stories to help others dealing with such grief and loss. They have also become strong safety advocates in the community, playing an important role in helping to prevent similar tragedies from occurring.

The videos and stories launched at the event will also form part of the Passport to Safety program. Delivered in high schools, the program aims to educate young people about their rights and responsibilities at work. These young people will soon be entering the workplace for the first time, and it is vitally important that they have a sound knowledge of safety in the workplace from the beginning of their working lives. These resources also provide a reminder of the long-term effects that a workplace death or injury has on the families, friends and workmates left behind.

The quilt will be displayed at various events and forums as part of the Passport to Safety program. I also saw it impressively displayed at the International Workers Memorial Day service on Saturday 28 April. At what was a very moving day, several attendees I spoke with remarked at the incredible efforts and work that had gone into the quilt and the strong emotional meaning behind it. When the quilt is not travelling, it will be displayed in the SafeWork SA library as a constant reminder of these lives tragically taken while in the workplace.

More than 70 people were involved in creating the Life Quilt, and I thank each and every one of them for their commitment and dedication to this important cause. I especially thank Ms Sue Morley who has been instrumental in the coordination and development of the Life Quilt project. Ms Morley has been involved in quilting community arts groups since 1997, but this is the

first community arts project she has managed. She has successfully promoted the cause and assisted with securing financial and in-kind support from Arts SA, Australian Safe Communities Foundation, Working Women's Centre, SA Unions and Effective Australia.

We all know that one injury or death in the workplace is one too many. It is imperative that we do all we can so that other families do not need to add their loved ones to the quilt. The Life Quilt is a small tribute to those who have been touched by workplace tragedy and a lasting reminder of the importance of workplace safety.

I have organised for the Life Quilt to be displayed in Parliament House this week and I urge all my colleagues to take some time to view the quilt. It will be located on the first level in Centre Hall so that it is accessible to both parliamentarians and members of the public. Some booklets and information about the quilt are also available at the display.

Finally, last week I sent all members of this chamber a copy of a DVD that incorporates some moving tributes to some of those workers on the quilt. I am grateful to those families who courageously shared their stories. Again, I urge all members to take some time to watch that DVD.

CARBON TAX

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Recently, the federal Minister for Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Jenny Macklin MP, announced the carbon tax compensation package, which provides cash bonuses and supplements to people receiving Family Tax Benefits A and B, Austudy and the pension. A compensation payment will also be made to self-funded retirees. Will the minister give an assurance that moneys received from the federal government by these people will not be included when calculating income for the purposes of determining housing trust rents?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. In relation to the carbon tax reimbursement payment, it will be made by the federal government. The Premier and I negotiated with the federal government for that to be paid, in respect of pensioners and those receiving housing trust rental subsidies, by way of a supplement, and as such it will not be counted as income and will therefore not affect the rent they pay on their housing trust accommodation.

OUTBACK ROADS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Tourism a question about outback roads affecting tourists in the outback.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: It was reported on ABC radio on 15 May 2012 that an outback station owner in the state's north-east corner says that the bad condition of some roads is making it difficult to truck cattle as well as causing difficulties for road trip holidaymakers. Cordillo Downs Station's Anthony Brook says that it should be a state government responsibility. Mr Brook continues:

It's a public road, it's a state-owned road...and the wash outs are quite dangerous. They are just left there for tourists to accidentally drive into so there's wash out that reappears in the same place each year.

Even on the Outback Australia website, the Cordillo Downs Road is rated as difficult due to the ill-maintenance, especially after rain, and it states that 'this road may be impassable for days or weeks'. The Cordillo Downs Station hires international tourists to help with the land, and this location is reasonably popular for four-wheel drive tracks, therefore making it essential for travellers to check roads and weather conditions for the area before entering. On 17 May 2012, the minister tabled an answer to a question I asked on 9 February. The answer states:

The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure has been advised that in 2011-12 the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has an allocation of \$3.09 million to invest on flood damage repair.

My questions are:

1. As the Minister for Tourism, what safety measures will the minister advocate for our international and local tourists?
2. Since the ill-maintenance of outback roads has been an ongoing matter for local truck users and tourists, can the minister advise how much out of the flood damage funding allocation will go to repair the Cordillo Downs Road and surrounding areas?

3. Can the minister advise what percentage of the \$3.09 million allocated in 2011-12 has been expended and what flood-damaged areas are still waiting for repairs?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for her important questions. I will refer them to the Minister for Transport in another place and bring back a response. The issue of our outback roads in particular is a very challenging one for us. We are a state that involves vast distances, much of which are in remote areas, and many of those roads are unsealed, which means that they are open to the vagaries of weather conditions and also road usage.

We know that unsealed roads do not offer the same degree of resilience as sealed roads. That means, when there are heavy rains from time to time, we end up with all sorts of flood damage, and the issue of repair and maintenance of those roads is a real challenge for us.

I have been advised that the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is obviously responsible for the care, control and maintenance of our 10,000 kilometres of unsealed roads in the unincorporated areas of South Australia. These roads are divided into four categories, depending on their strategic importance and their connectivity between towns, traffic types and volumes.

The category of road determines the level of maintenance required, and a road of the highest category, such as the Strzelecki Track, will be scheduled to receive maintenance, as I understand, four times a year, whereas a road in a lower category, such as a station access road, is likely to be graded only once a year. There was recent flooding of the Thomson and Barcoo rivers feeding into Cooper Creek, and damage was reported.

I have been advised that DPTI officers have been negotiating with Mr Brook from the Cordillo Downs station in relation to offering the opportunity to grade the road on behalf of DPTI. It is the understanding of DPTI that Cordillo Downs has happy to undertake this work, and was preparing to return accepted paperwork to actually formalise that agreement.

I have been advised that DPTI has advised that a further inhibiting factor to DPTI undertaking grading in that area is that a causeway at Innamincka had been flooded, and hence access from the south is cut off for grading and other travel. I am further advised that DPTI was contacted by Ms Nicola Gage from the ABC in regard to that matter, and was informed that DPTI were in discussions with Cordillo Downs to undertake this work on a formal basis, but the ABC did not report that, Mr President, which is always disappointing when they report only part of the story and not all of the facts.

I am advised that, in 2010-11, \$18.6 million was spent on the outback unsealed roads, which comprised \$8.7 million for patrol works, \$6.8 million for resheeting, and \$3.1 million for Roads to Recovery works. In addition, a further \$0.6 million was allocated during the financial year for the operation of the Cooper Creek ferry. In the 2011-12 financial year, the allocation is \$18.159 million, which comprises \$8.975 million for patrol works, \$6.054 million for resheeting, and \$3.130 million (\$0.9 million for unsealed roads) for Roads to Recovery works.

In addition, \$3.3 million in funding has been allocated in the 2010-11 and 2011-12 budgets to undertake flood damage repairs on outback unsealed roads. On 16 May 2012, I was advised that there were no major issues relating to the unsealed road network.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Dawkins has a supplementary.

OUTBACK ROADS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:03): Does the government intend to lay more of the short stretches of bitumen road intermittently along the Strzelecki Track?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (15:03): To seal? To provide sealed roads? Is that what you're asking?

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Yes, well they are there now—

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: That is obviously a question for the Minister for Transport, and I am happy to refer that to the Minister for Transport in another place and bring back an answer.

YOUTHCONNECT GRANTS

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:04): Will the Minister for Youth inform us about the outcomes of the 2012 round of *youthconnect* grants?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. I am very pleased to announce that the 2012 *youthconnect* grants were made available to organisations that support young people to achieve positive life outcomes in the following priority areas: Health and Wellbeing, which are projects that focus on keeping people safe from harm; Education, Employment and Skill Development, which are projects that support disengaged young people aged 17 to 19 to re-engage in education, leading to a formal qualification; Engagement and Participation, which are projects that support young people to actively engage in their local communities; and, finally, Better Connections, which are projects that develop practical guidelines, resources and tools to support community organisations that work with young people.

youthconnect grants have a total annual budget of \$500,000 which eligible organisations can apply for; they can apply for grants between \$10,000 and \$50,000 per project. Of the 120 applications received, 17 were successful across the four priority areas I have just mentioned. Projects funded through the 2012 grant round include:

- \$15,000 for Streetlink Youth Health Service, which provides services for homeless and at-risk young people with high and complex needs;
- \$35,000 to the Riverland Youth Theatre to engage young people by providing opportunities to create artistic expression, increase skills and pursue personal development pathways; and
- the Adelaide Hills Council has received \$28,000 to provide a youth mental health wellness project to be run through its Youth Advisory Committee.

These projects are great examples of local initiatives to respond directly to the needs of young people and provide a better future for young South Australians. *youthconnect* grants represent the largest pool of funding specifically available for youth participation and engagement programs in South Australia, and *youthconnect* is an integral part of the Labor government's youth strategy. I commend the successful applicants for their ongoing work in this area.

OLYMPIC DAM EXPANSION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Industrial Relations a question about fly-in fly-out and drive-in drive-out workplace practices as they relate to the Olympic Dam expansion.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The minister would no doubt be aware that currently there is a federal inquiry into FIFO and DIDO practices, and there are growing concerns both in the community and obviously represented in the media, most pertinently on *Four Corners* last night. Issues of FIFO-DIDO workplace implications—where workers are hot bedded and often suffer from loneliness, drinking, depression, and gambling, as well as their families suffering—also have implications for those mining communities that are in the so-called 'two track' economy, when it becomes incredibly expensive to live there, where the workforce is lopsided, and where we see some of the worst examples of rapid socio-demographic redefinition. Outcomes include increased levels of violence and sexual assault also being reported. My questions are:

1. Given that in Queensland in the 1970s then premier Jo Bjelke-Petersen told mining companies to build towns or they would not be able to dig up the so-called 'black gold'—and that is, in fact, why those communities are there—yet 40 years later Moranbah, for one, has morphed into a big miners camp, housing prices have gone through the roof, businesses are collapsing and families are in crisis, what guarantee does the Minister for Industrial Relations have that the Olympic Dam expansion will not see similar outcomes?

2. What is the maximum number of FIFO or DIDO levels this government will accept for that project? How will it guarantee that into the future?

3. Will unions be given access to the workforce and the workplaces there?

4. Will there be a commitment to a percentage or number of family homes in this project?

5. How will this project be conditioned to meet the needs of the community around it and create rather than corrode that community?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for her very important questions; the issues the member raises are very important and need to be sorted out in the not too distant future. They are very complex, and probably cover quite a number of different portfolios, so I will take them on notice and ensure they get to the appropriate ministers. With regard to unions having access and the like, they currently do have access to various mining sites, and I cannot see any reason why that would change going forward.

OLYMPIC DAM EXPANSION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:10): By way of supplementary question, will the government give clarity on the percentage of FIFO and DIDO in the workforce it will accept as part of this project within the next month?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations) (15:10): I will refer the question to the appropriate ministers. As far as I am concerned it is an issue that needs to be addressed, and I will seek that an answer is brought back as soon as possible.

CEDUNA QUARANTINE STATION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question regarding the Ceduna quarantine station.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: The quarantine station located on the Eyre Highway just west of the town of Ceduna is a vital roadblock for biosecurity threats to South Australia's agricultural and horticultural sectors. Late last year in response to my questions about this station the minister indicated that negotiations were going on with the Western Australian government regarding a possible relocation of the facility. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will she indicate the current status of the negotiations with Western Australia?
2. Is it the intention of the Weatherill government to co-locate the quarantine station on or near the South Australian/Western Australian border?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his questions. In relation to the negotiations, they are ongoing; they continue. To the best of my knowledge the matters have not been resolved or fully explored. My understanding is that there are a number of different options and models being looked at and explored in those negotiations. Discussions continue and no final decision has been made.

CEDUNA QUARANTINE STATION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:12): By way of supplementary question, is one of the options the minister refers to the possibility of subcontracting the whole of the quarantine station out to the Western Australian government?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (15:12): To the best of my ability, or I should say to the best of my knowledge—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: They are very easily excitable. To the best of my knowledge, no, we are not considering that as an option. To the best of my knowledge it is not. I am happy to look at that further and bring back a response if I need to.

CEDUNA QUARANTINE STATION

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:12): By way of further supplementary question, will the minister rule out the subcontracting out of the whole of the quarantine station to the Western Australian government?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have not considered this model at all, so this is the first, to my knowledge.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: They're the rumours running around.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Well, I'm just saying that to the best of my knowledge it is not a model I have looked at or considered and not a model I am considering. I have already said that I am happy to take that question on notice and bring back a response.

WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE AND BUSINESS

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about Women in Agriculture and Business.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I know that the minister is very committed to both women and the regions. Will she tell the chamber about the grant recently provided to Women in Agriculture and Business and other initiatives for regional women?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for her most important question and her on-going interest in these important policy areas. As members would be aware, isolation can be an issue for women living in rural and remote areas. The internet and other forms of electronic media can be an excellent way for women to keep in touch to exchange news and also to network. To that end I am very delighted to advise that in this Year of the Farmer rural women from across South Australia will benefit from technology workshops due to a one-off grant of \$10,000.

Women in Agriculture and Business (WAB) was formed at Riverton in 1917, which is quite remarkable, to meet the needs of women who were isolated and working with their families to establish farms and homes in rural districts. Today, WAB is a statewide support and communication network for rural women, especially those interested or involved in primary industries. It has 29 branches and approximately 500 members across the settled areas of the state. Branches usually meet monthly to work for local community projects, discuss wider issues and attend workshops.

Women in Agriculture and Business has grown and evolved to meet the needs of modern-day women involved in agriculture. The grant will fund these workshops and provide women with valuable tools to enable them to expand and reach the WAB across the state. It will also enable them to further engage with women in an online environment. The three technology for rural women workshops, coordinated by Women in Agriculture and Business, will teach rural women new technology skills. As members would appreciate, technology is a vital part of communication, both socially and in business, especially in regional areas, where distance is obviously a factor. Topics covered in the workshops include community basics, Microsoft, social media, using email and other online forums.

I am also pleased that this year's SA Rural Women's Gathering will be held in Penola, from 17 to 19 August 2012. The inaugural Rural South Australian Rural Women's Gathering was held in October 1996 at Murray Bridge. The SA Rural Women's Gathering was organised by a committee of committed rural women, including those who work incredibly hard to develop communication networks, knowledge and skills, through participation, experience and contact with other women. The gathering also importantly links women from a rural background with members of formal and informal networks across South Australia and provides access to opportunities for self-development, self-expression and information. The gatherings are community organised and developed, driven, owned and run. PIRSA provides in-kind support to the gathering by working with the committee and attending meetings.

Further, through the Office for Women, I have been able to provide \$1,000 towards the 2012 gathering. I understand that the gathering will be held in Port Pirie in 2013 and in Jamestown

in 2014, and discussions are being held for the location of the 2015 gathering. I am advised that speakers at this year's gathering include legendary journalist and businesswoman Ita Buttrose, Sarah Mott from the University of South Australia's Centre for Regional Engagement, and local author and photographer Joanna Fincham.

PHYLLOXERA

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question regarding phylloxera.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: On Wednesday 16 May, during the last sitting week, I asked the minister questions about phylloxera protection for South Australia. I had spoken with constituents about their concerns that the protections were being relaxed without sufficient evidence. The minister stated that the industry had been involved in the decision to relax restrictions. The minister also referred to the national phylloxera management protocol. I understand that this national protocol forced the change upon South Australia and, whilst the board may have technically endorsed it, as the minister claimed in her answer on the 16th, I have some questions about whether they felt that they had much choice.

The relaxed protocol meant that machinery from possibly phylloxera infected regions interstate could come into South Australia with a certificate indicating that they were free of the insect, rather than their being required to be washed down under the current standard. Every wine grape grower pays a levy to the board to ensure South Australia remains phylloxera free. If we were infested with phylloxera, it would cost hundreds of millions of dollars to rectify the issue.

The ABC national *PM* program and the ABC *Country Hour* recently reported that the phylloxera board has now reviewed the protocol and decided to revert to the previous conditions. I ask the minister, based on the above information:

1. Did the board tell the minister that it was completely happy with the relaxation of the restrictions?
2. Was any pressure applied to the board by any state, interstate or federal government agency to accept the protocol condition?
3. What was the reason the board seemingly reversed its position and now accepts the tougher protocol that I was asking the minister about only a week ago?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. As I have said in this place before, South Australia is incredibly unique as it is the only state in Australia which has an independent statutory authority, the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia, which was established to deal solely with the threat of phylloxera. The board is made up of key industry leaders. I think to suggest in any way that the board did not independently come to its own decision and its own recommendations is quite insulting to those industry leaders.

The South Australian government takes the threat of phylloxera very seriously and is very proud of its close relationship with the board. The charter of the board is to prevent phylloxera from entering the state, to control outbreaks of phylloxera in this state and to develop plans for the eradication of phylloxera if it were ever to occur. The board members must be nominated from South Australia's major grape growing regions and all members must demonstrate proven experience, knowledge and commitment to the improvement of this state's grape growing and wine industries.

I can absolutely say in this place that every one of those board members is incredibly knowledgeable, incredibly experienced and absolutely and totally dedicated to fulfilling the reference and responsibilities they are required to under this act. The board has an ongoing role in developing policies in relation to the appropriate restrictions or conditions on the movement of machinery and equipment.

As we know, the national set of phylloxera standards has been developed and considered for many years. Those standards have been around for a long time, and the board has indicated for a considerable amount of time that its objective was to harmonise that standard, and that has been in the public domain for many years. My understanding is that discussions and negotiations around that have occurred over a period of many years.

However, we know that the recent implementation of those standards in South Australia met with some concern. There were many sections of the industry that were supportive and have written letters of support and made submissions to the board, so there was very broad industry support. However, there were also sectors of the industry that raised a range of concerns.

Those concerns were passed to me and I then passed them on to the board and asked the board to consider them, which it did. There was a board meeting yesterday evening, and an announcement was made this morning stating that the board has recommended to Minister Gago to reinstate the previous plant quarantine standards until such time as the industry has fully considered the most appropriate way forward. They write:

In response to recent stakeholder concerns received by Minister Gago regarding these changes, advice was sought from the [board], a body charged with the responsibility to develop programs and policies for the prevention of phylloxera [under the act].

The [board] is preparing a discussion paper to present to its stakeholders over the coming months, and will undertake a consultation process including regional meetings and written submissions.

The South Australian Plant Quarantine Standards were changed in October 2011, to align South Australia to the National Phylloxera Management Protocols. These protocols had been endorsed by the [board] in 2000 and were subject to further development over the next four years in response to industry feedback and research.

So the notion of harmonisation of this national standard is not new. It has been around in the industry for many years. It started a long time before my time. However, I will continue the rest of the statement. It says:

The [board] will be inviting all industry stakeholders to take this opportunity to comment on this important industry matter.

And it has a contact there. Obviously, I look forward to the outcome of these consultations. However, as I said, the board is quite an independent body; it is vastly experienced and knowledgeable, and it is most important that the industry takes carriage of this. It requires a high degree of industry understanding, science and technical expertise. That is why a board has been appointed—to ensure that they have those range of skills on the board and to ensure that all the policy matters are considered with that particular lens. These are industry matters, and it is important that the industry be engaged and that the industry forge the direction that it believes is in its best interests.

I think the board has done a good thing. It has listened to the concerns that I have put forward, it has listened to the concerns of the industry and it is being extra thorough in going back and doing another round of consultation. I think that is a good thing and, as I said, I look forward to seeing the result of that process.

PHYLLOXERA

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:27): I have a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the house whether the minister will be accepting the phylloxera board's recommendations from last night, namely, that they go back to the proven, tested way of ensuring that phylloxera does not enter South Australia? Will she be endorsing and signing off on the board recommendation?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women) (15:27): The board operates independently of government. I would be a very foolish minister to be directing people who are employed for scientific knowledge and technical expertise in terms of the way they should operate. I think that would be a very foolish minister indeed.

I have already put on the record in this place that I think that the decision that the board has made is a good one. I have already said that. I do not know how much more support I can give. I have already said that in this place, but I will say it again in case the honourable member did not hear it the first time. I said I think it is a good move and I look forward to seeing the results of that consultation. I am happy to put that on the record again. I am not too sure how much more supportive I can be without directing the board.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to various members (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations): The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

2010-11

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Controlled—Office for State/Local Government Relations			
Local Government Association	\$23,475	Contribution to The European Wasp Control Program. The European Wasp Control Program is administered by the Local Government Association (LGA) and State funding is provided to the LGA for distribution to councils. Councils meet the remainder of the costs of nest destruction over and above the State subsidy funding.	Y
Administered—Local Government Tax Equivalent Fund			
Local Government Research and Development Scheme—Administered by the SA Local Government Association.	\$1,776,690.00	Tax Equivalent payments made by the Local Government Finance Authority, consistent with National Competition Policy.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation (<i>Local Government Finance Authority Act 1983</i>)
Administered—SA Local Government Grants Commission			
68 South Australian Councils, 5 Aboriginal Community Councils and the Outback Communities Authority.	\$161,956,083.00	Distribution of Commonwealth Assistance Grants (General Purpose, Identified Local Roads and Road to Recovery) to Local Governments' Aboriginal Communities and the Outback Communities Authority.	Subject to both State and Commonwealth Legislation (<i>South Australian Local Government Grants Commission Act 1992</i> , <i>Local Government (Financial Assistance) Act 1986.</i>)
Administered—Outback Communities Authority			
Local Government Risk Services	\$41,751.80	Provision of Insurance for Outback Communities.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Regional Development Australia Far North	\$18,374.00	Tourism services delivered against RDAFN's tourism service delivery plan for the 2010-11 year.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Flinders Ranges & Outback SA Tourism	\$21,054.00	Annual Funding contribution.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Dunjiba Community Council and Bungala Aboriginal Corporation	\$71,077.27	Waste management provision for outback community at Oodnadatta.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Blinman Progress Association	\$11,949.48	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Copley and Districts Progress Association	\$13,732.67	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Andamooka Progress and Opal Mining Association	\$13,000.00	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Iron Knob Progress Association	\$21,118.69	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Marree Progress Association	\$11,058.72	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Mintabie Miners Progress Association	\$33,706.56	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Penong and Districts Progress Association	\$14,008.37	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Yunta District Hall	\$14,052.13	2010-11 Community Affairs Resourcing and Management Agreement.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Leigh Creek Progress Association	\$70,000.00	Places For People grant for Leigh Creek Signage Project.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Andamooka Progress and Opal Mining Association	\$11,450.00	Contribution to Creek Cleaning program.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Penong and Districts Progress Association	\$14,534.00	Subsidy payment for new shed at Penong.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Iron Knob Progress Association	\$10,000.00	Community Infrastructure Program—Playground and Park.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>
Aroona Aboriginal Council	\$13,280.00	Contribution to Resurfacing of Copley Tennis Courts.	Payments subject to South Australian Legislation— <i>Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009</i>

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPORTS INSTITUTE

In reply to the **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (29 July 2011) (First Session).

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations): The Minister for Recreation and Sport has provided the following information:

The reduction in the number of SASI programs will allow us to better fund the remaining SASI programs and focus SASI resources and activities on sports and athletes with serious prospects for national and international success.

The Office for Recreation and Sport participation programs have not been reduced. Sport subsidies for individuals are not and have not been part of the funding programs. Participation in sport will not be reduced. Families will not be excluded.

The reduction in programs has been based on sports not on social demographics. Elite sport pathways will still exist through the sports and state sporting associations. It is core business for state sporting bodies to ensure this.

HAMPSTEAD REHABILITATION CENTRE

In reply to the **Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (30 November 2011) (First Session).

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for State/Local Government Relations): The Minister for Health and Ageing has been advised:

1. The Minister has been briefed about issues as they have arisen with the planning, development and implementation of paid car parking.

Access ramp:

With the implementation of paid car parking at Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre, one ramp located at the front of an office building was impacted. The building, which is located away from patient care areas, is used primarily by Human Resources staff and the need for public access is limited. The ramp was not appropriate for disability access as per Standard AS 1428.1. However, a nearby ramp at the rear of the building is accessible. The area at the front of the building from where the ramp was removed has been cordoned off from use until a replacement is constructed and staff continue to access the building via the rear entrance. Planning has ensured that the replacement ramp will meet legislative requirements. Requests for tender have recently been distributed and it is estimated that the new ramp will be completed within approximately three months.

Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre has not been notified that any person using a power wheelchair was tipped backwards when trying to negotiate the ramp, which has now been removed.

Sensors and location of boom gates:

Car park boom gates are used to control vehicular access and sensors are located in the road to detect when a vehicle has traversed the boom gate zone so that the gate can close automatically. Sensors on the boom gates themselves are not considered normal industry standard. Neither the boom gates at Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre, nor those at any other SA Health site, have sensors to sense people underneath them as they are lowered.

Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre has pathways leading around the boom gates and appropriate signage alerting staff and clients to the location of these pathways. Staff, clients or the public who pass under a boom gate on foot or in a wheelchair would be doing so along a road designated for traffic only and therefore would be placing themselves at risk.

Fencing has been erected to deter staff from walking through the vehicular traffic only area. The addition of further signage is currently being investigated.

The location of the boom gates was determined through a rigorous planning process which included consultation with local management and traffic consultants. As appropriate, the boom gates are positioned at the main entrances to the car parks.

Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre has not been notified of any person being hit or nearly hit in the head by a boom gate or struck by a car in the car park since the boom gates have been activated. Nor has there been any formal complaint about the position of the boom gates from clients, staff or the public.

Vehicles trapped by construction works:

An incident involving vehicles being unable to exit the car park occurred during the initial construction of the south eastern car park. This issue was rectified within five to ten minutes to allow the cars to exit. There was no additional cost to the project and Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre received no formal complaints about the incident.

Noise and vibrations:

An inspection by a structural engineer determined that cracks in the building were pre-existing and did not result from the car park construction.

2. A planning team, under the direction of an Executive Director, oversaw the planning, development and implementation of paid car parking at the designated SA Health sites. The planning team gave careful consideration to the design of all car parks, taking into account the unique needs of clients, staff and the public at each site. Of those verifiable issues raised by Hon John Darley MP, most were pre-existing and did not result from the work undertaken to implement paid car parking at Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre.

Any minor issues were managed quickly and appropriately by the Car Parking Officer and the Manager Engineering and Building Services in consultation with the project team, with minimal disruption to services to the community or staff.

3. There has been no additional expenditure by the Car Parking Project in relation to the matters raised by Hon John Darley MP. A small additional cost of \$1,029 to install a section of fence in the car park was incurred by Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre.

4. The Minister is not aware of problems similar to those alleged by the Hon John Darley MP occurring at other sites. Where minor issues have arisen specific to individual sites, they have been managed appropriately at a local level, with a strategic overview being maintained by the Department for Health and Ageing.

DUCK HUNTING

In reply to the **Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (14 February 2012).

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has been advised:

1. Due to an administrative over-sight by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, the information provided to the Hon Tammy Franks MLC under Freedom of Information in 2011 has been identified as only partially complete. The Department advises that there were, 1,574 permitted duck and quail hunters during the 2011 South Australian open-seasons, and not 570 as advised. Of these permits, 1,362, or 87 per cent were issued to South Australian residents.

2. The Government implements a stringent regulatory framework to promote the conservation and sustainable use of waterfowl during regulated open-seasons. An essential aspect of this approach is that all duck hunters competently identify game species from protected species. For this reason, the Waterfowl Identification Test is a mandatory assessment for all permitted duck hunters in South Australia.

In addition, there are specific open-season conditions put in place during each open-season to minimise threats to protected species. The Department of Environment and Natural Resources monitors key habitats, and will close Game Reserves if flocks of protected species are present. The *National Parks and Wildlife (Hunting) Regulations 2011* prohibit a range of activities that present risks to wildlife.

Authorised officers enforce the *National Parks and Wildlife (Hunting) Regulations 2011*, and patrol both public and organised private hunting activities. Officers report strong compliance with hunting regulations and open-season conditions.

GRAIN INDUSTRY FUND

In reply to the **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (13 March 2012).

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women): I am advised:

1. I can inform the Honourable member that as of the 29 February 2012 I currently hold \$450,880.66 of voluntary contributions made by grain growers collected under the *Wheat Marketing Act 1989* for the purposes of the Grain Section of SAFF.

INTERNATIONAL WHEELCHAIR DAY

In reply to the **Hon. K.L. VINCENT** (28 March 2012).

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I am advised:

As at 31 March 2012, 160 clinicians have each prescribed at least one customised wheelchair for clients serviced by the Equipment Program in the 2011-12 financial year.

This does not include clinicians who prescribed only 'basic' wheelchairs.

GRAIN INDUSTRY FUND

In reply to the **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (1 May 2012).

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Tourism, Minister for the Status of Women): I am advised:

1. The Primary Industry Funding Scheme for the grain industry came into effect with a commencement date of 1 March 2012. Grain sales made on or after the commencement date had the rate of five cents per tonne deducted by the grain purchaser in accordance with the regulations. Grain purchasers remitted a total of \$15,273.14 for the month of April, the first month in which remittances for the new scheme were due to be paid to me by grain purchasers.

2. As indicated earlier, as of the 29 February 2012, I held an amount of \$450,880.66. Since then, further contributions have been remitted for grain sold prior to the commencement of the new scheme. This combined with interest earned takes the total I hold at the end of April to \$529,497.51.

The South Australian Farmers Federation have agreed to share equally between themselves and the new grain grower representative group Grain Producers SA (GPSA) these withheld funds. This was on the condition that funds will be expended by both organisations as is intended by the objectives of the Wheat Marketing Act. To ensure this happens, I have asked that both organisations provide a list of costed projects on which the residual funds will be expended.

3. The *Primary Industry Funding Scheme Act 1998* and the Regulation establishing the new grain industry fund under the Act establishes how the funds will be collected, remitted and applied. As you know from the provisions of the Act and Regulation, in effect grain growers through the five year management plan established for the purpose, dictate how the grain grower funds contributed to the scheme will be spent. The funds cannot be used for any other purpose but for grain grower benefit. Provisions within the Act allow recovery of reasonable costs to Government for administration and audit of the fund.

4. An independent consultant has been engaged by PIRSA to consult widely with grain growers and industry to inform the draft of a five year Management Plan for the scheme. The consultant will report on these outcomes and provide a draft Management Plan that incorporates the wishes of grain growers. The Management Plan will be presented at a public meeting called for the purpose during August 2012 after which applications for funds by appropriate grain grower organisations can be made. However, funds available for projects will be limited until the next grain harvest commences, when deductions from proceeds of sales of the new season grain will be remitted into the new scheme by grain purchasers.

SUPPLY BILL 2012

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 May 2012.)

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (15:29): I rise to support the Supply Bill 2012. As to be expected of a fiscally responsible government, the state is well run within a budgetary framework and this bill allows the continuation of that responsible government. I will highlight some of that ongoing responsible expenditure. The big ticket items of health and infrastructure continued to dominate the political landscape during last year's Supply Bill debate. I talked about the building of the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Progress is continuing well, and I know all will be celebrating its opening.

While the portfolio of health will always have its challenges no matter who is in government, this government has demonstrated its commitment with more staff, more beds and a better integrated health system across our state. We have for the first time, in line with the move to an integrated health system, the Auditor-General auditing not just the Department for Health and Ageing, as was the practice in the past, but all the regions and entities as a whole.

A good economic barometer of any state is its unemployment rate. While we all recognise that things are tough for a lot of people, it is still positive to see that the headline unemployment rate for April remains steady at 5.2 per cent. As well, I understand there were some recent economic positive trend signs with retail turnover, new motor vehicle sales and dwelling approvals all rising in April.

In my contribution last year I remember talking about jobs and job creation, and the government has continued to deliver on these fronts. Minister Kenyon rightly pointed out that the April ABS figures show growth in total employment in South Australia rating 18.4 per cent since 2002—more than double the figure of only 8.4 per cent during the term of the last Liberal government.

An important fact of getting people into jobs is training and from 1 July this year our Skills for All reforms will see the VET system providing people in training with free courses for pre-vocational Certificate I and II courses. A few weeks ago minister Kenyon also announced the continuation of the LaunchPad program—\$100,000 over the next 12 months has been earmarked for the program.

The program is aimed at providing training to youth who are either in or at risk of entering the juvenile justice system and, more importantly, given the challenges they face, to then find jobs. I understand that last year 29 participants undertook the program, and the minister recently announced that there will be more opportunities like this program through our Skills for All reform which ultimately is about raising the workforce's skills and getting more people into training and jobs.

An important decision of this government has been to take the initiative of establishing the TAFE SA statutory authority. The legislation is before our chamber at this time. The legislation will establish a separation between TAFE SA and the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology. When the legislation passed the other place, the minister commented that it would allow the department to focus on driving the Skills for All reforms and to be able to make independent decisions regarding the allocation of training funds.

More importantly, the passing of this legislation also means that we would meet an important requirement of the commonwealth National Skills Reform agenda which allows students studying at diploma level and above to access income-contingent loans under the VET scheme.

For those not familiar with Skills for All, it is important to have a recap. The fundamental aims of Skills for All is to bring changes to the state's training system in order to raise the skills levels, increase the number of South Australians with post-school qualifications and increase labour force participation. The government has committed an extra \$194 million over six years to support 100,000 additional training places from 2010-11.

I have some recollection of hearing somebody from the opposition on radio in the last month or so talking down our exports. The fact is that South Australia's export performance in the 12 months to February has outpaced all other Australian states. I think it worthwhile placing on the record that South Australia recorded the fastest export growth compared to the rest of Australia. It outpaced New South Wales with 15 per cent, Queensland with 10 per cent, Victoria with 8.4 per cent and Tasmania with 0.2 per cent growth rates. We should be very pleased to see analysis of the latest ABS figures showing that the value of goods exported by our state in the 12 months to the end of February rose 18 per cent to \$11.75 billion.

The minister rightly pointed out that what these figures highlight is that exports remain a key driver for economic growth, helping to further create jobs and generate income for exporters in agribusinesses and resource sector. None of us would be surprised to see that the export commodities recording that strong growth come from those two sectors. In relation to infrastructure spend, work is continuing on the duplication of the Southern Expressway and other major transport upgrades, and upgrades to the RAH and the research centre, along with the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, amongst others.

For many years we have heard complaints about Main North Road near Clare needing an upgrade. At the end of February, minister Conlon announced that the first stage of the \$10.23 million upgrade to realign Main North Road and the Black Rock Clare Road near Clare would commence in the near future. Minister Conlon went on to say that, given the strategic nature of this transport route, works would be undertaken in four stages. Ultimately, it will improve safety and freight efficiency on this important section of the northern arterial road network.

Whether it is law and order legislation for serious and organised crime, the announcement of a sentencing advisory council, the establishment of an Office for Public Integrity or record police numbers, this government is delivering on the strong law and order area. In relation to our resources industry, we now have some 20 operational mines. Our PACE scheme has been very successful. Like most in this chamber, I welcome the bipartisan approach to the Roxby Downs indenture bill.

Adelaide is well and truly on the map when it comes to the consideration of resources. In these tough economic times, our government is doing all it can with incentives to see businesses attracted to our state. I think we would all agree that the Premier is providing leadership and has been active in raising our state's profile and standing up for our state, whether it is in the interests

of the River Murray debate, as he has announced today in a ministerial statement, or the investment attraction drive in London recently.

Given that I am speaking a few days before the budget is brought down, I welcome the already announced initiatives that we have seen, be it the abolishing of stamp duty for all off-the-plan city apartments to encourage more people to live in the CBD—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That is why Isobel suggested that last year.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: —I am glad to see we have some bipartisan support—or the provision of \$28.7 million towards the redevelopment of the Parks Community Centre. As well, the assistance with the one-off water security rebate to alleviate costs of increased water prices has also been very well received. We already know that our GST revenue grants are expected to be revised down by more than \$1.3 billion over four years, but I am certain we will see another responsible budget from Treasurer Snelling in the next few weeks. I am happy to add my support to the Supply Bill in the interim.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:37): I rise to support the formality of the second reading of the Supply Bill, but in doing so want to have a look at some of the facts in relation to what are the crises confronting the state in terms of its financial management and look at some of the incompetence, ineptitude and negligence of not only the state Treasurer, Mr Snelling, and the Premier, Mr Weatherill, but indeed all the ministers who are culpable in terms of the current crisis that confronts our state budget and our state books.

Just before moving on to the particular points I want to make, I note the comments made by the Hon. Ms Zollo in her contribution to the second reading. I think it is a perfect example of the dilemmas of a backbench member of the government being given a script which they then parrot or repeat verbatim on behalf of the government. The Hon. Ms Zollo had been given a part of a contribution which said that they had noted that the opposition had raised some critical comments in relation to export performance and she then went to repeat the government's claims of how, in essence, outrageous that was because the government's export performance had been pretty good.

I remind the Hon. Ms Zollo and government members that in the period 2002 to 2004, soon after the government was elected, former premier Rann and the government announced their plan, which indicated they would almost treble exports in the period from 2003-04 through to 2013. They would take exports, in broad terms, from \$9 billion to \$25 billion, and that was a key focus of their State Strategic Plan, their economic plan—that exports were critical to the future of the state's development and that they would, as I said, almost treble export performance.

Here we are, just a year away from 2013, and the state's export performance has limped from approximately \$9 billion to just \$11 billion in exports, which is not much more than the rate of inflation over almost 10 years. In real terms, the dollar value of our export income is not much more than it was when this government was first elected. It is clear that it is a long, long, long way short of the Strategic Plan objective of \$25 billion in exports.

I should note that along the way the government has recognised that they were not going to achieve their objective; I think they tried to describe it as a 'stretch target'. I understand they then said that they would meet the target by 2014 and, in the most recent incarnation, they have extended that target date to 2020. So, when you compare their original objective with where we are now, they have extended it by seven years. The reality is that if this government were to stay in power until 2020, they would still not be within a bull's roar of the objective of achieving \$25 billion in export income by that target date.

Everything this government has done has been geared towards, in essence, making it harder for our small and medium-sized businesses to export: the gutting of organisations like CITSCA which were geared towards assisting small and medium-sized enterprises to export; the gutting of our trade offices, which were, again, geared towards helping small and medium-sized enterprises to export; the gutting—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: The RDAs.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —of the RDAs, as my colleague the Hon. Mr Dawkins has talked about—and the gutting of the trade department itself. Yet, the government still has the gall to pat itself on the back and say, 'Look at what a good job we've done. In the most recent 12-month period, we've done relatively better than some other states.' Let's compare the government with its own rhetoric, its own objectives, and its own key performance indicators, that is, \$25 billion in

export income, firstly by 2013, then by 2014, and now by 2020. As I said, they will not get within a bull's roar of even a pro rata allocation of that target.

I admire the gall of the Hon. Mrs Zollo to stand up and repeat the garbage that has been given to her to read. It shows some courage to stand up and read it on occasion, but occasionally I would have thought that a government backbencher would look at some of the drivel they are given and say, 'Look, I am prepared to say this—at least that's arguable—but that is really just a step too far. You can't expect me to stand up with a straight face and repeat that sort of drivel on behalf of the government.'

Sadly, I think that is symptomatic of one of the problems we are seeing with the government's economic performance, and I want to address a number of those issues in the Supply Bill contribution. I seek leave to have tabled in *Hansard* without my reading it a purely statistical table of budget balances.

Leave granted.

Table 1: Budget Balances

	8-9	9-10	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16
Net operating balance	-233	+187	-53	-367	-453	-348	+334	+591
Net lending	-872	-1,092	-1,422	-1,519	-1,148	-500	+230	-2,479
Cash	-721	-1,154	-1,319	-1,445	-1,089	-492	+234	NA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This table of budget balances looks at the government's budget performance over the period of 2008-09 and projected through to 2015-16, as outlined in recent budget documents and, in particular, the Mid-Year Budget Review. It shows the three measures of deficits that are used by the government in terms of its performance. One measure of performance is the cash measure, which is used by the federal government and which had previously been used by the state government in South Australia, and the next two measures are what are called accrual measures of deficits. One is called the net lending balance and the other one is called the net operating balance.

As I said, the cash position is used by the federal government and was used in South Australia, and is one of the measures that is recorded in the budget documents. The net lending position is the one that, when first elected in 2002, former treasurer Foley said was the one true measure of the health of the state budget. He said, rightly, that cash has significant problems and that you had to have an accrual measure of budget performance and budget balance, that the one true measure was a net lending measure, and that was the measure that he would be judged by during his term as treasurer.

Of course, what happened was that in a short period of time the then treasurer realised that he was not able to balance his books in accordance with the net lending measure of budget surplus and deficit because it kept on showing—inconveniently for him—that the budget was in deficit. So, soon after that he went to the third measure of a budget balance, and that is what is called the net operating balance. It is an accrual measure, and is the measure that he and this government have used for a number of years now to say whether or not we have surplus or deficit budgets.

The table I have incorporated into *Hansard* shows that, on the net operating balance, which is what the government now uses to say whether we are in a deficit or surplus, in five out of six years—starting in 2008-09 and going through to 2013-14—the state budget will be in deficit, and in significant deficit: a \$233 million deficit in 2008-09; a \$187 million surplus in the election year 2009-10; a \$53 million deficit in 2010-11; a \$367 million deficit this year; a \$453 million deficit next year; a \$348 million deficit in 2013-14; and then supposedly it will turn to surplus in 2014-15 and 2015-16. What we see there in terms of deficits is just over \$1 billion of accumulated deficits in 5 out of 6 years in terms of managing the state budget on the one measure the state government now uses.

Now let us turn to the net lending measure—which, I remind members, is the measure that Kevin Foley, the former treasurer, said was one true measure of the health of the state budget. That shows in 2008-09 a deficit of \$872 million; in 2009-10 a deficit of \$1.092 billion; in 2010-11 a deficit of \$1.422 billion; in 2011-12 a deficit of \$1.519 billion; in 2012-13 a deficit of \$1.148 billion; in 2013-14 a deficit of \$500 million; and in 2014-15 a surplus. Then in 2015-16, after the next state

election, this government is predicting an annual deficit of \$2.479 billion in that one financial year after the election.

When you look at those accumulated deficits from 2008-09 on net lending, the one true measure according to former treasurer Foley, you are looking at \$9 billion or \$10 billion in deficits. This is just annual overspending, right across the board. The net lending includes budgeting for capital works and investment expenditure of \$9 billion or \$10 billion. Then, for finality, the cash measure, which is the measure the federal government still uses: in 2008-09, a deficit of \$721 million; in 2009-10, a deficit of \$1.154 billion; in 2010-11, a deficit of \$1.319 billion; in 2011-12, a deficit of \$1.445 billion; in 2012-13, a deficit of \$1.089 billion; in 2013-14, a deficit of \$492 million; and, in 2014-15, supposedly a surplus.

I have put those figures in a table in the *Hansard* record because they do not conveniently come like that, surprisingly, from the government; one has to pull them out of the Mid-Year Budget Review and old budget documents as well. I have put them together in a convenient table to demonstrate the ridiculousness of the claims of this current Treasurer and Premier in terms of any level of financial competence and financial management.

By any measure this is a budget in crisis, by any measure, this is a government which is massively overspending in accordance with the amount of money it is collecting, and by any measure all this government is doing, essentially, is saying, 'We're going to spend, spend, spend, to hope to win the election in 2014, but if we don't win the election in 2014, well, stuff it all, it's not going to be our responsibility, someone else is going to have to fix up the problem.'

That, sadly, is the driving force for the Premier, the Treasurer and the government as it leads up to budget day on Thursday and as it leads up to budget day next year, I am sure, in the final budget before the election. I also seek leave to have incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it a purely statistical table on the non-financial public sector key balance sheet in aggregates.

Leave granted.

Non-financial public sector key balance sheet and aggregates (\$million)

As at 30 June	Net debt (a)	Unfunded superannuation (b)	Net financial liabilities	Net financial worth	Net worth
1988	4,397				
1989	4,197				
1990	4,457				
1991	5,418				
1992	8,142				
1993	11,610				
1994	10,550				
1995	8,844				
1996	8,432				
1997	8,170				
1998	7,927				
1999	7,657	3,909	13,099	-12,256	10,624
2000	4,355	3,543	9,914	-8,986	12,445
2001	3,223	3,249	8,151	-7,109	14,816
2002	3,317	3,998	8,973	-7,902	14,721
2003	2,696	4,445	9,096	-8,811	15,288
2004	2,285	5,668	10,031	-9,550	15,760
2005	2,126	7,227	11,511	-11,004	16,359
2006	1,786	6,146	10,451	-9,889	19,703
2007 (c)	1,989	5,075	9,518	-8,795	22,128
2008 (d)(e)	1,611	6,468	10,208	-10,487	23,741
2009	2,872	8,939	14,302	-14,921	24,146
2010	4,487	9,478	16,626	-16,997	36,231
2011	6,541	9,096	18,273	-18,402	40,958
2012	8,453	10,619	21,827	-21,988	39,500
2013	8,738	10,577	22,216	-22,188	39,956
2014	9,141	10,509	22,751	-22,557	40,296
2015	8,963	10,416	22,706	-22,367	41,268

- (a) Net debt data for the years before 1999 are sourced from Australian Bureau of Statistics, Government Financial Estimates 2003-04 (Catalogue number 5501).
- (b) There is a structural break in the methodology used to calculate superannuation liabilities between June 2003 and June 2004. This accounting change, which involved the adoption of Commonwealth Government bond rate for valuation purposes in line with AASB119, Employee Benefits, resulted in a significant increase in superannuation liabilities.
- (c) There is a structural break in 2007 reflecting the amalgamation of SAFA and SAICORP on 1 July 2006. The transfer of SAICORP assets and liabilities from the general government sector to the public financial corporations sector resulted in an increase in non-financial public sector net debt of \$99 million at 1 July 2006 and an increase in net financial liabilities of \$90 million at 1 July 2006.
- (d) There is a structural break in 2008 reflecting the amalgamation of the South Australian Community Housing Authority (PFC) with the South Australian Housing Trust (PNFC). This results in an increase in net debt and net financial liabilities and a decrease in net financial worth of \$98 million in 2007-08, with no impact on net worth.
- (e) There is a structural break in 2008 reflecting the first time recognition on the general government balance sheet of South Australia's share of the net assets of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. This has no impact on net debt, however results in a reduction in net financial liabilities of \$615 million in 2007-08, and increases in net financial worth and net worth of \$615 million.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This document comes from page 63 of the Mid-Year Budget Review and summarises the net debt of the State of South Australia, the non-financial public sector, from 1988 through to the estimated net debt in 2015. That shows that in the aftermath of the State Bank debacle our net debt in South Australia was \$11.6 billion. At the changeover of government in 2002 that had been reduced, through the ETSA privatisation and financial management policies of the former government, down to a more than manageable \$3.2 billion in 2002.

These figures now show that the net debt, having gone from \$11.6 billion down to just over \$3 billion, will now climb to \$9 billion in 2015. Interestingly, this table does not include the 2016 number because, if it included the 2016 number (and we will see this in next year's budget document) that \$9 billion will go to over \$11 billion because there is a \$2.8 billion Royal Adelaide Hospital figure that will have to be added to the net debt position of the state.

While we will not have the exact figures here yet, next year we will see a net debt figure in this state of over the peak of the net debt in 1993 with the State Bank. The \$11.6 billion will, after a decade of this government, have been surpassed. They have had to work hard at it: that degree of incompetence and negligence does not come easily. I am sure they have had to work very hard to turn a \$3 billion net debt position into a net debt position of almost \$12 billion in just over a decade, but that is the record of this government.

Similarly, the unfunded superannuation figures at the time of the change of government, in 2001, were \$3.2 billion. That number in June 2015 will be \$10.4 billion, and will see a total of our net financial liabilities, which is our debt and unfunded super, in 2015 of \$22.7 billion. As I said, the following year, when you add in the Royal Adelaide Hospital, that will take that figure over \$25 billion in 2016.

They are a lot of figures, but I have incorporated those into *Hansard* for those voracious readers of *Hansard*. For those who are interested, it demonstrates very clearly the extent of the financial crisis and the budget crisis that is confronting the government and the state. A key part of the reasons for that has been a decade of financial mismanagement, of overspending, by this current government and its administration.

We had a period soon after the pay down of the debt, the renegotiation of the GST deal, where rivers of gold were flowing into the state's budget coffers. We were getting about half a billion (\$500 million) a year, on average, more each year than we budgeted. Simply, that means that, at the start of each budget year, Treasury would estimate that we were going to get \$9 billion or \$10 billion in terms of what we were able to spend, and every year we were winning X-Lotto and getting an extra \$500 million to spend.

What the government did every year, when it won X-Lotto, was to spend the whole dang lot of it. It did not spend it on a capital asset. What the government did was lock in ongoing expenditure of an operational nature—employees, staff, services and a range of other commitments right across the board.

If the money had been either spent on a capital project as a one-off, because it was an unexpected benefit—it was, as I said, the equivalent of winning X-Lotto in that particular year—or the government had put aside some of that money for the days when you do not win X-Lotto, when you do have problems and when there is a downturn in income flowing into the state, either of those options would have presented, first, a better set of books and prepared us for the inevitable downturn when it was to come.

The reality is that the former treasurer could not believe his luck, because he did not win the equivalent of X-Lotto one year: he won it for six or seven years in a row. Every year he would go in, roll the dice and he would win, on average, an extra \$500 million, which was unexpected, and every year, he would line up to lock in expenditure of an ongoing nature, using the extra \$500 million of unanticipated revenue that had been received.

So, when the inevitable downturn came, the rivers of gold stopped flowing, and there was a return to normal growth levels and, in some cases for some years, with the GFC, even a downturn, we were left with the position where we were locked into ongoing expenditure, but we did not have the rivers of gold flowing into the state anymore; we returned to normal levels of revenue and income.

That is why we see net operating balance deficits of up to \$453 million a year; that is why we see net lending deficits of up to \$1½ billion a year; and that is why we see cash deficits of up to \$1½ billion a year being accrued in terms of the final budget balances.

Soon after this government was elected in May 2002 (and I am returning to this notion of overspending as a key problem this government has failed to address), it sought to construct a set of circumstances where, shock horror, it said that the former government had not managed the books, there was a black hole, and those sorts of claims.

In May 2002, the former treasurer was very critical of a policy the former government had adopted that basically said that if you were an agency with a history of overspending you needed to be penalised or held to account for that persistent record of overspending. We are not talking here about an isolated example but about agencies with an historic record of overspending. What the former government decided to do was to say to some agencies (and in those days it was education and human services), 'You've overspent your budget—education in one year by \$25 million—and you need to repay the budget over a period of time.'

I think in the education department's case it was two years, and in the health department's case I think what was being envisaged was three or four years. My colleague the Hon. Caroline Schaefer interjected at the time I raised this issue in May 2002 and said that the previous position—that is, where you reward departments, CEOs and ministers who overspend by just writing off their deficit and their debt—was 'a reward for inefficiency'.

That was the view of cabinet ministers around the former government's table—to say it was unfair on those ministers and CEOs who, having been told they had to meet a budget requirement, worked hard to meet the savings target, delivered on the savings target and then, as they sat around the cabinet table, another minister and CEO who had persistently overspent in their department or agency conveniently had their deficit and their debt written off and could blithely go on with their overspending.

That was the policy of the former government. The first thing this government did—the former treasurer, but the cabinet took the decision—was to say, 'We're going to get rid of that policy.' The first decision it took, the first message it sent to ministers and CEOs was, 'If you overspend, then we will write off the overspending, we will write off the debts and you can start again afresh.' I said at the time, on 8 May 2002:

As I said, I place on the record again that the current Treasurer's soft [touch] approach to overspending by government agencies is a recipe for financial disaster. A few bureaucrats in government departments and agencies will be delighted to hear that the overspending policy of the previous government has now been overturned by this Treasurer.

He is quite relaxed about overspending: there will be no sanctions; there will be no repayment; those issues will be written off.

Those were my words of warning on 8 May 2002. I just wish that perhaps they had not come true, that those warnings had not come true and that the former treasurer, if he were here now, would be able to report that that in fact had not occurred; however, we know that in fact that is exactly what has occurred over the 10 years. Agencies continued to overspend, ministers overspent, CEOs overspent, and they did so in the full knowledge that the government would just write off the deficits

and the debt and allow them to start again—until we found out, and it was not announced at all, that the Budget and Finance Committee established, that last year for the first time the health department was told that it was now going to have to repay its overspending from the 2010-11 financial year.

Very quietly, without being announced, the government reversed the decision that it took in 2002 and has returned to the position adopted by the former government in the period from 2000 to 2002; that is, they said to the health department, 'We are not going to tolerate this overspending: we will now require you to repay the budget for your overspending.'

When the CEO of the health department came before the Budget and Finance Committee this year and we are looking at another significant overspend for 2011-12, he indicated, and so did the Under Treasurer, that the option of requiring some repayment, or all repayment, of the overspend for 2011-12 was firmly on the table in relation to the health department. I think the government's intention is to try to present the accounts in the best form possible and I suspect they will adjust the books for the health department to require some repayment over the coming years, as they have done the previous year.

How any administrator, how any treasurer, how any administration could believe that you could adopt the policy which essentially said, 'We are setting a budget but, in essence, you don't have to keep to the budget and if you overspend we'll just write off the debt,' is beyond me. I know there are not many in the government who have had much experience in financial management practices of either a private sector business, a government sector organisation or an NGO. There are some, but there are not many.

How you could even contemplate that, if you were running a business, with divisions and units, the CEO of that business would say to a divisional CEO, 'Here's your budget but if you don't meet your budget and you overspend, don't worry about it, we will just write it off,' and still manage to run a successful business is beyond comprehension. That is the mentality, that is the logic, of this Labor administration. That is the policy that the former treasurer and former premier, supported by the current Treasurer and the current Premier, adopted.

That has been their policy: 'Don't worry about overspending. There's plenty of money to go around. We can always tax and charge more, and there's more where that comes from in terms of being able to write off the overspending.' That is the cultural shift that has occurred in the last 10 years, and that is the cultural shift which will have to change. It cannot and it will not change under this government, because they are incapable of understanding the simple logic that you cannot run budgets in the way this government has sought to run them.

You only have to look at the health department with the disasters that the Budget and Finance Committee has looked at in terms of the implementation of the Oracle IT system and a range of other IT systems within the health department, the massive budget overspending and the massive waste that goes on within that particular agency to see that it is not all about (and I acknowledge in some years it has been) increased demand and increased costs within health, as is experienced nationwide.

The government has inflicted upon itself the additional problems of budget because it has not been able to actually manage things like ICT programs and a range of other programs within the health department. I had an answer only today to a question on the health department. It is a question I asked almost two years ago, so I ought to be grateful, I guess, that I have got an answer today.

My question in relation to the health department was: what are the job title and total employment costs of each position with a total estimated cost of \$100,000 or more which has been abolished in the financial year 2009-10—it is more than two years ago now—and the job title and total employment costs for each new position which has been created? Just in this one financial year, unsurprisingly, there were more positions created at \$100,000 a year or more than were abolished. There were about 30 that were abolished and there were a bit more than 30 that were created.

I want to give you an example of where the money goes within Health. Two of the positions were abolished in Health. One was a director of ICT projects—payment \$119,000 a year—and the other was a director of ICT contracts and performance—payment \$109,000 a year. In the same year, two new positions were created: a director of ICT operations at \$198,000 a year and the second position was a director of ICT programs at \$210,000. We have two new positions created at

a total cost of \$400,000, and two old positions were abolished at an approximate cost of \$228,000. It has almost been a doubling of the salaries in one financial year.

They changed the titles, so you cannot say someone has had a \$100,000 salary increase. They changed the titles and abolished the positions but they created a new position doing almost exactly the same work. I am sure they will come back and say that these are significantly increased responsibilities, but the information provided to me, and one of the reasons for answering the questions, is that these were just restructured and renamed so that they could pay significantly increased salaries.

That is part of the problem within Health. They are living within a system which said that money is unlimited, don't worry about overspending, if you want to abolish a couple of positions, double the salaries and call them something else, hop on the gravy train. I am intrigued, too, that one of the new positions that was created in 2009-10, and I am sure we are all eternally grateful for this, was a director level position paid \$225,118.90—so, almost a quarter of a million dollars—and this person is the Director of Financial Turnaround.

Aren't we lucky! We have had a director for financial turnaround since 2009-10, and what has happened with the financial performance of the health department? It has continued to massively overspend, budgets have blown out and they have not met their departmental budgets at all. I would love to see the key performance indicators for the Director of Financial Turnaround.

Let me be frank here, I am being a little unkind to the Director of Financial Turnaround because of the title that has been given because the responsibility of the overspending does not rest just with that director position. It rests with the CEO, it rests with the minister in the first place, and all of the other director level positions—too many to count at over \$200,000 a year or more. Just going through these positions created in that financial year, there are six being paid at more than \$200,000 a year, another two or three being paid more than \$190,000. So, there are about eight or nine being paid more than \$190,000 a year. That is a problem that this government faces in terms of its own budget.

In concluding my remarks on the Supply Bill, I only list those as examples of the problems. Again, I place on the record that the need for this parliament—through the parliament itself, through questions and through its committees such as the Budget and Finance Committee and the Economic and Finance Committee in the House of Assembly, if it was allowed to—to continue to probe government waste and overspending.

I make one final comment in relation to these committees. In recent days I have been involved in the recruitment of staff for some of the committees, and I have noted now having had to take advice from various parliamentary staff (House of Assembly mainly) that a number of these committees have two full-time staff members. Some of the more recent committees have one full-time staff member, generally remunerated at a higher level.

When talking about efficient expenditure, if the committees that are staffed full-time are to continue to have two full-time staff, in my view, they should have a full-time researcher and a full-time administrator. I think having, in essence, a committee secretary and a committee research officer, with the committee secretary paid at the higher level at the researcher at the lower level, should be reviewed and changed. Sadly, this government is unprepared to take those decisions, even though some members of the government backbench, I suspect, strongly share my views.

If there is to be an incoming government, or a re-elected Labor government, I would urge someone within that government to have the courage to look at this particular issue and start making some changes. As I said, if you have a committee with two full-time staff, it would seem to me that the sensible way to go would be two full-time researchers/administrators or one full-time researcher and a researcher who takes on the administrative functions of the particular committee. Some standing committees have to survive the historical practice of one staffer who does the lot: the research and the admin work. Those committees seem to survive, and that may well be a model.

As members know, this chamber has actually passed a motion supporting the provision of a full-time staff member for the Budget and Finance Committee. I know that we will get nowhere with you, Mr President, but I hope that the new president—who will come in, we understand, in a few months (Octoberish)—will be prepared to address this important issue and reflect the views of this chamber. This chamber has voted and has expressed a view to the President that the Budget and Finance Committee should be staffed by a full-time staff person.

As I said, I hope that the incoming president will be prepared to look at the views of this chamber and put them into action, and there will be a capacity over the medium term, I believe, to do this in a revenue-neutral way. The Liberal Party has indicated that, if elected, it will look at a review of the committee systems of the parliament, and it might be through a rationalisation that some efficiencies and savings might be able to be made. In the short term, the decision rests, of course, with the presiding members—whether it be the Speaker or the President—in terms of the budgets they control and whether or not they are willing to listen to the views that have been expressed by a majority of their chamber in relation to the Budget and Finance Committee.

I will just repeat again what I have said a couple of times: I believe that, whether there is a Liberal or a Labor government, the Budget and Finance Committee will be a permanent feature of this chamber's work. I certainly believe that it should be. If a Liberal government were elected, I would be mightily amazed if the Labor opposition, together with Independents and minor parties, did not support the continuation of the Budget and Finance Committee.

However, the work of the Budget and Finance Committee is obviously most effective when it has a combination of both efficient and effective staff, together with efficient and effective members of the committee. Not every member of parliament will have the financial background necessary to work on the Budget and Finance Committee. That is why it is important—if people could see beyond their noses—for the Budget and Finance Committee to have staff that can assist members of the committee in the important work they do in trying to keep the executive arm of government accountable.

I can see that, sadly, this Labor government and yourself, Mr President, are unwilling to provide, in accordance with the wishes of the Legislative Council, that sort of staff assistance to what is an important committee of the parliament. Yet other committees, because they have been established by historical precedent and an act of parliament, have two full-time staff members operating on those particular committees.

It is a historical anomaly, in my humble view, and it ought to be corrected, in my humble view, hopefully by an incoming president, prior to the election, and if not then either by a new government after 2014 or (unlikely, I guess, that it would do it) a re-elected Labor government that would be prepared to allow the Legislative Council committee to try to undertake the sort of work that it should in terms of keeping the executive arm of government accountable. With that, I support the second reading.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (16:21): I rise to speak in support of this bill. I understand the bill is necessary to ensure the proper functioning of government for the first three months of the 2012-13 financial year until the budget passes through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2012 receives assent. I would just like to take an opportunity to remind members what this government has been doing in a number of key areas, including health, disabilities and regional investment.

On the matter of health, the 2011-12 budget outlined extra spending of \$133.3 million over the next four years. One example of the investment was the extra \$19.3 million over the next four years so that 23,000 more women by 2014-15 would be screened for breast cancer, potentially detecting 340 life-threatening cancers. This support for health funding went hand in hand with infrastructure investment into some of the most heavily utilised hospitals in the state.

For instance, last year's state budget allocated \$498 million for capital works, including the redevelopments at Glenside, Lyell McEwin, Modbury, Queen Elizabeth (stage 2), the Repatriation Hospital, Whyalla and the Women's and Children's Hospital. The state government also included the allocation of \$69.5 million in partnership with the commonwealth over the next four years for expansion of regional cancer services in Whyalla.

I would also like to take you through some of the activities the government has been undertaking in terms of mental health reform. The government's Social Inclusion Board's Stepping Up report was released in 2007. Since the reform was commenced in 2007, the government has committed over \$300 million to reforming and improving mental health services and infrastructure, and is achieving this through reforming and rebuilding the state's mental health system, implementing a new stepped system of care which will provide an additional 86 mental health beds and places, including 10 acute beds in country SA.

Construction is advanced on the new mental health and substance abuse facility at Glenside campus. Other features of the redevelopment include a 129-bed state-of-the-art mental health hospital; an outpatient unit for substance abuse treatment; and a 15-bed intermediate care

facility. Not every person with mental illness needs hospital admission, though. Historically, the majority of mental health services have been provided as inpatient hospital care. Mental health reforms include a new model of care to provide more appropriate care to people through different stages of mental illness in the community.

Intermediate care centres provide a home-like environment and reduce the emphasis on acute inpatient care with community-based mental health step-up and step-down services. 'Step up' refers to short-term residential therapeutic support offered to people who have become unwell in our community but who do not need hospital admission; 'step down' describes therapeutic residential support for people who are recovering after being an inpatient in a mental health facility.

In the south, there is a new 15-bed intermediate care centre at Noarlunga and a purpose-built mental health centre at Marion to provide care options and improve early intervention mental health services. A 20-bed community rehabilitation centre at Noarlunga has also been providing mental health services for the past four years. In the north and east, there is a 15-bed intermediate care centre located at Glenside, 20 new supported accommodation houses at Glenside, a 20-bed community recovery centre at Elizabeth, as well as a new community health centre in Tranmere that has opened this month.

All these facilities will provide other care options and improve early intervention mental health services. There is also a new 15-bed intermediate care centre at Queenstown in the western suburbs, as well as a 20-bed community rehabilitation centre that opened at Mile End in 2007. Construction has also commenced on a new 20-bed aged acute unit at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. All these facilities allow mental health clients to seek services closer to where they live.

Work is also being completed on the final 59 supported accommodation houses across the metropolitan area, which are due to be completed by June. Work and planning continues on other facilities, including a new intermediate care centre for the northern suburbs and construction of the remaining four community mental health centres in the north, outer south, west and north-eastern suburbs. The development of all community care centres is being achieved with funding of \$34 million.

Clients who are not suitable for hospital admission can receive treatment at home from their GPs, mental health professionals through community mental health services, non-government organisations and improved access to psychological therapies. In country South Australia intermediate care centres are to be established closer to where people live, in Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Berri and Port Lincoln. Country South Australia will also benefit by 10 limited treatment centre beds to be provided in country locations between 2013 and 2014. Three beds will be located at Mount Gambier, three at Whyalla, two at Berri, and two at Port Lincoln.

It is also pleasing to note that with the recent Council of Australian Government funding of \$79.4 million over four years, there will be an additional 159 beds and bed equivalents in a number of new facilities and services that include crisis respite centres, supported accommodation, community rehabilitation centres in the country, youth subacute inpatient services, and a forensic step-down facility. All these will be completed by 2013.

On the issue of disability services, Treasurer Jack Snelling pledged further support for disability funding, building on the Labor government's record since 2002 in supporting our state's most vulnerable. The Treasurer pointed out that disability funding had almost doubled since 2002, and in the 2010-11 financial year South Australians with a disability and their families and carers benefited from a wide range of budget measures.

General disability funding was boosted by more than \$37 million to meet the needs of South Australians living with a disability and their carers. More than \$10 million was provided to meet future demand for equipment, and it is pleasing to note that the South Australian government has got on top of the waiting list for disability equipment. In pledging this support for disability services, the Treasurer went on to say:

We are making progress but there is more that needs to be done and that is why this Budget has a strong focus on supporting those who need it most.

In terms of country health, the 2011-12 budget provided \$62.7 million over four years in partnership with the commonwealth to improve regional health services, including: redevelopments at Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln hospitals, a new five-chair dental clinic at Wallaroo Hospital, and a new purpose-built ambulance station at Mount Gambier. An amount of \$15.6 million in 2011-12 was provided to continue the expansion of regional cancer services, to deliver chemotherapy to country

patients under the guidance of Adelaide-based specialists. As I already mentioned, \$69.5 million is also included in partnership with the commonwealth over the next five years for the expansion of the regional cancer service in Whyalla.

I would also like to talk about some of the investment the government has made in regions. In the 2011 state budget, the government is continuing to deliver significant investment in key service areas and infrastructure, with \$276.3 million allocated to regional South Australia. The Treasurer said that the state government would invest \$54.8 million over four years to improve regional road networks by investing in shoulder sealing, rehabilitation and resurfacing on high priority regional roads, and the continuation of the rural freight improvement program, and \$8 million of this is to go towards road surfacing over the next four years.

The Mid-Year Budget Review in December showed that since the 2011-12 budget global economy uncertainty has intensified beyond any expectations, and this has precipitated ongoing softening in our domestic economy, particularly in the property and retail sectors. The 2011-12 Mid-Year Budget Review shows that the changes in economic conditions have resulted in a significant deterioration in the budget position since the 2011-12 budget was released. The government remains committed to its significant capital program, with the expenditure of \$6.5 billion for the general government sector, and \$9.5 billion for the non-financial public sector forecast over the next four years.

In addition to the state's capital program, more than \$3 billion will be spent on infrastructure associated with the construction of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. The 2011-12 Mid-Year Budget Review includes new savings and revenue measures totalling \$141.1 million over four years, which more than offsets the cost of the new policy decisions made since the 2011-12 budget of \$130.2 million over four years.

Ultimately, if the last year or even the last 10 years show anything it is that this government is continuing to work hard to prioritise the needs of the most vulnerable in our community in the face of economic adversity. It is a government of value and determination. I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

GRAFFITI CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 May 2012.)

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

A quorum having been formed:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wade.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:38): Thank you, Mr President. I thank the council for its patience. It does raise the issue of whether the council wants to continue to allow deadlock conferences to continue while the house is sitting. In relation to this bill, I stress that graffiti is a crime; it is against the law. It also offends community values to use the property of another, or the public property of the broader community, without consent.

Graffiti damages the property of another and puts them to the inconvenience, even grief, of an expense of their needing to restore their property. Graffiti often undermines people's living environment and often leads to people feeling violated or invaded. Graffiti also affects the broader community, and undermines the amenity of the physical urban environment, and promotes within the community a lack of a sense of safety and a lack of connectedness within the community. At times, it can even have more sinister connotations, where gangs use graffiti to claim territory.

The Liberal Party supports action against crime; the Liberal Party supports action against graffiti but, having said that, we are not uncritical of the government in this bill. We are very critical, for example, of how long it has taken for the government to bring this bill forward. The government's lack of interest in this area is stark. Let us remember that this is the government that legislate on anything that moves—in fact, even anything that does not move. It legislated to stop people eating cats—not that there were any substantiated reports of any cats having been eaten, but it legislated nonetheless—yet this is the first time it has legislated to deal with graffiti in its 10 years of office.

The Hon. Bob Such, a member of the other place, has had a series of bills and this government bill picks up a number of the elements of those bills. The Liberal Party supports the key elements of the bill which include increasing and in many cases doubling a range of penalties; introducing a penalty for supplying a prescribed graffiti implement to a minor; introducing an offence of advertising a graffiti implement in a way that is likely to encourage or promote unlawful graffiti; introducing a specific and higher penalty for marking graffiti on or within a cemetery, public memorial or place of worship or religious practice; introducing the use of community reparations for offenders by empowering courts to order that reasonable costs of removal be paid, or participation in graffiti removal programs; and allowing police to temporarily confiscate graffiti implements in the possession of a person in a public place if the officer reasonably suspects the implement has or may be used in contravention of the Graffiti Control Act 2001.

The opposition is keen to observe the impact of the legislation. For example, it will be interesting to see whether a doubling of maximum fines will see a doubling of the average fine. The average fine imposed by courts on adults convicted of graffiti offences has been \$258 and for juveniles \$117. While the bill doubles the limits, the discretion does remain in the courts. The Liberal Party also has a number of concerns with the current proposals.

The Attorney-General wants graffiti implements to be defined in a broad list by general regulation. Comments by the Attorney-General in the House of Assembly debate suggest that this list, in his mind, could include a broad list of items such as 20-litre cans of paint, compasses, glass cutters, screwdrivers, sandpaper, and fine textas.

The Attorney-General apparently intends to prescribe through regulation a broad list including items that one could possibly foresee would be used to carry out any form of graffiti. Some of these items will need to be secured by businesses, some will be unable to be supplied to a minor, some may be unable to be carried in a public place and some may be confiscated by the police. The result is a long list of random items. Putting restrictions on relatively low-risk items is, in our view, an unnecessarily onerous burden on businesses and targets innocent minors who simply need these items for school, work or legitimate recreation.

The Liberal Party believes that we should include a smaller and more appropriate list within the act itself that imposes a more reasonable duty on businesses and a fairer outcome for minors. In this context, I note that the opposition's concern at the burden on retailers of these provisions is supported in a government discussion paper by the then families and communities minister, the Hon. Jennifer Rankine. Her submission stated:

Such a provision will likely also place a significant and unjust imposition on retailers who would likely grapple with the complexity of determining a graffiti implement.

The bill also provides for a court to have discretion to order an extension of an offender's learner's or provisional licence or disqualification of a driver's licence, ranging from one to 6 months. However, there is no requirement for the person's offending to have a connection with their driving record or use of the vehicle.

The Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007 already allows courts to order the clamping or impounding of an offender's vehicle for offences including graffiti. The government's own figures show that these penalties are rarely called upon. From 2002 until 2009 there were 1,298 court cases where the major charge was graffiti, yet in only 26 cases were offenders' licences disqualified, and this was where the use of a motor vehicle was related to the offending behaviour.

Studies suggest that penalties are most effective when they relate to the offending behaviour. What we do know is that studies suggest that many disqualified drivers still drive while disqualified. One study I recall suggested that figure could be as high as 60 per cent. A licence disqualification which is ignored is no penalty at all. To the extent that disqualifying someone's licence places limitations on an offender's ability to attend school, work and other community activities, it increases the prospects of reoffending in the future.

In this context, the opposition will be moving amendments to put a sunset clause on these provisions, and a review, so that we can assess whether, in fact, they have the impact that the government hopes they might have. I look forward to discussing these and other amendments in the committee stage.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:45): I wish to place on the record my rather vehement opposition to this bill. Indeed, whilst I can to some extent appreciate the premise on which this bill

has been created, I must say that I find the bill itself far too prescriptive in nature and too simplistic and far-reaching in its scope.

I would like to begin by stating that I am particularly affronted by the bill's tendency to overwhelmingly correlate graffiti with young people. I am not amenable to the condescending, generalist and reproachful attitude toward the youth of our society which this bill perpetuates. It may or may not be the case that the majority of graffiti is created by young people. Regardless, I do object to the overall tone of this bill, which would seemingly have you believe that all our state's young people are out on the streets late into the night creating havoc and blanketing our buildings, bus stops, railway stations and the like with senseless scribblings.

I believe that the blanket approach to all graffiti and young people which this bill seeks to instate is most highlighted in the section of the bill which would flatly prohibit the sale of spray paint to persons under the age of 18 years. To me, this says, 'Young people are more likely to engage in graffiti than other people. It is possible that not all of them do, but we had better make it unavailable to all of them, just in case.' To me, this seems quite ridiculous. I oppose most of the bill on similar grounds.

I also take issue with the suggestion that, where a court finds a person guilty of creating graffiti for a second time, it must prohibit that person from obtaining or using a driver's licence for a period of one to six months. I find this absurd for many reasons, not the least of which is the fact that this is, once again, a measure which is seemingly focused on young people for insultingly generalist reasons.

There is, of course, no direct correlation between graffiti and a person's ability to drive a car, particularly drive a car safely. Therefore, I assume that the government has put forward this idea with a view to punishing young people specifically, as we all know that often when a young person obtains a driver's licence it can be a great door opener for them, something which gives them a lot of liberty and autonomy which they may not have had previously. Therefore, taking that away from them as a young person is sometimes seen as an effective way to punish them.

I also think it is ridiculous, as the government is suggesting that everyone has a licence, like it is something that all young people have. I am able to report to you that I do not have a driver's licence but could theoretically still mark graffiti around the place—but, of course, Mr President, I am quick to assure you that I do not plan on doing that at any time soon. How, then, would you penalise someone like me for an offence?

There is no connection between driving a car and graffiti. If someone drives a car dangerously or while over the legal alcohol limit, we do not remove their job as a surgeon, for example. This is because there is no connection between the crime and the punishment, and this is perfectly logical legislating.

Indeed, I think it would be fair to say that this technique of licence removal is often employed by parents to punish their own children, and I suppose that as parents that is their right. However, I think most honourable members would agree with me that there is and should be a line between the role of parliamentarians in this state protecting its young people and having too much control over them. It is my belief that this section of the bill oversteps that line all too much and that there should be only room in our statute books for punitive measures which directly relate to the offence committed.

Finally, I place on record my concern about an issue which does not relate to this bill per se but rather to the current Graffiti Control Act itself. As I am sure the members are aware, the current act does not actually give a definition of what exactly does constitute graffiti, therefore I am concerned that if this act is amended in the way that is proposed by this bill we would not only limit the opportunities for young people to create what I would define as harmful graffiti, we would also limit their opportunities to create what I would consider real graffiti.

Because of the blanket approach this bill takes, it is possible that we may also limit the opportunity to create what we may call legitimate street art—murals and the like—which can be seen on many of our beloved Adelaide buildings and streets. While I understand that street art may not be everyone's cup of tea, I think we can all agree that it does add some colour to our city and is in no way harmful.

As we all know, the arts industry is highly competitive and difficult to break into in the first place, so I think it would be a great shame if we were to further limit the opportunities available to the artists of our state to add colour, vibrancy and perspective to our lives through their work. In

fact, an Adelaidenow article from 1 June 2011, if my memory serves me, has shown us that this has already occurred: the Stepney council painted over a legitimate mural on a gallery wall after mistaking it for graffiti.

As I said, I am concerned that the lack of definition of graffiti in the current act, in addition to the narrow-minded blanket approach to the issue of graffiti taken by the government in the form of this bill, will take away unnecessarily from the civil liberties and opportunities of the people both young and old of South Australia and, therefore, I am quite unable to support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.M. Gazzola.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (WEAPONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (CRIMINAL INTELLIGENCE) BILL

The House of Assembly agreed to the alternative amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW IMPLEMENTATION) BILL

The House of Assembly disagreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council for the reason indicated in the following schedule:

No. 1. New clause, page 6, after line 22—Insert:

13A—Amendment of section 36AC—Interpretation

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

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

No. 2. New clause, page 6, before line 23—Insert:

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

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

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

LIVESTOCK (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

No. 1. Clause 30, page 10, lines 1 to 15—Delete the clause

No. 2. New clause, page 10, after line 15—After clause 30 insert:

30A—Amendment of section 82—Extension of period for prosecution and issue of expiation notice

- (1) Section 82(1)—after 'Act' insert:
(other than an expiable offence)
- (2) Section 82—after subsection (2) insert:
- (3) Proceedings for a prescribed expiable offence against this Act must be commenced within 2 years of the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed and, despite section 6 of the *Expiation of Offences Act 1996*, an expiation notice for such an offence may be given after the expiry of the period of 6 months from the date on which the offence was alleged to have been committed.

- (4) An expiation notice for a prescribed expiable offence against this Act cannot be given after the expiry of the period of 2 years from the date on which the offence is alleged to have been committed.

At 16:55 the council adjourned until Wednesday 30 May 2012 at 14:15.