

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 20 February 2007

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, assented to the following bills:

Criminal Law Consolidation (Drink Spiking) Amendment,
Development (Building Safety) Amendment,
Emergency Management (State Emergency Relief Fund),
Forest Property (Carbon Rights) Amendment,
Genetically Modified Crops Management (Extension of Review Period and Controls) Amendment,
Liquor Licensing (Authorised Persons) Amendment,
Road Traffic (Notices of Licence Disqualification or Suspension) Amendment,
Southern State Superannuation (Insurance, Spouse Accounts and Other Measures) Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Domestic Partners),
Statutes Amendment (Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme),
Statutes Amendment (Justice Portfolio),
Statutes Amendment (Public Sector Employment),
Summary Offences (Gatecrashers at Parties) Amendment.

ROADS, LINCOLN HIGHWAY

A petition signed by 15 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the Minister for Transport to allocate funds for the immediate sealing of the road from the Lincoln Highway to the ferry terminal at Lucky Bay, was presented by Mrs Penfold.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to questions, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 68, 117, 119, 131, 134, 136, 138, 139, 142, 143, 145, 147, 157, 181, 187, 190, 191, 198, 200, and 202 to 204; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

TRANSPORT CONNECTIONS

68. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH**: What is the frequency of late trains and impact on local bus connections along each of the following Metropolitan lines—Tonsley, Belair, Outer, Harbour, Grange & Gawler?

The **Hon. P.F. CONLON**: I provide the following information:

The frequency of trains running more than 5 minutes late is as follows.

- Noarlunga Line with a spur line to Tonsley:
Formal bus connections occur at Brighton, Hallett Cove and Noarlunga Stations. 97.7 per cent of trains on the Noarlunga line were on time (0-5 minutes late) in July.
Southlink is the bus operator responsible for intermodal connections at these stations. In the event that late running occurs, TransAdelaide's Operations Controllers immediately

advise Southlink of the impending late running on the Noarlunga line. Southlink will delay departures from these stations up to a maximum of 5 minutes to ensure that connections and transfers occur.

The Tonsley spur line does not cater to connections therefore late running impact to bus services is nil.

- Belair Line:

Formal bus connections occur only at Blackwood Station on the Belair Line. 81.5 per cent of trains on the Belair line were on time (0-5 minutes late) in July.

In the event late running occurs, TransAdelaide Operations Controllers immediately advise Torrens Transit, the bus operator assigned to the Blackwood Belair area of the impending late running. Torrens Transit will delay departure from Blackwood up to a maximum of 5 minutes to ensure that connections and transfers occur.

- Outer Harbour Line with a spur line to Grange:

Formal bus connections occur at Woodville, Port Adelaide, Glanville and North Haven Stations. 86.0 per cent of trains on the Outer Harbor line were on time (0-5 minutes late) in July.

Torrens Transit is the bus operator responsible for intermodal connections at these stations. In the event that late running occurs, TransAdelaide's Operations Controllers immediately advise Torrens Transit of the impending late running on the Outer Harbor line. Torrens Transit will delay departures from these stations up to a maximum of 5 minutes to ensure that connections and transfers occur.

- Gawler Line:

Formal bus connections occur at Mawson Lakes, Salisbury Interchange, Elizabeth and Munno Para stations. 93.2 per cent of trains on the Gawler line were on time (0-5 minutes late) in July.

Southlink is the bus operator responsible for intermodal connections at these stations. In the event that late running occurs, TransAdelaide's Operations Controllers immediately advise Southlink of the impending late running on the Gawler line. Southlink will delay departures from these stations up to a maximum of 5 minutes to ensure that connections and transfers occur.

This is a contractual requirement (clause 12) under the contract for the provision of public transport services between the Public Transport Division and TransAdelaide. It was reduced from 10 minutes on 1 January 2001.

CHILDCARE WORKERS

117 and 191. **Dr McFETRIDGE**: What initiatives has the Department implemented in 2006 to encourage the recruitment of qualified child care staff in Child Care Centres?

The **Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH**: The Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) has collaborated with many partners to address issues related to qualified staff in childcare. These include the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (DFEEST), the Commonwealth Departments of Employment and Workplace Relations (DEWR) and Education, Science and technology (DEST), child care employers and Registered Training Organisations.

A pilot Up-skilling Program that supports child care workers to commence a traineeship in the Diploma of Children's Services has approved 19 contracts in 2006 in addition to the original 60 contracts approved in 2005. This is the first time that State Government training subsidies have been available to staff undertaking the Diploma in Children's Services under traineeships.

Priority has been given to child care centres that have a history of difficulty in recruiting qualified staff. The strategy has been particularly welcomed in rural and remote areas where a range of flexible 'on the job' training methods are being successfully implemented.

TAFE SA has also provided 50 additional child care places in the Diploma of Children's Services. All of these 50 additional places have now been filled.

DECS has also provided advice to DEST in relation to the Skilled Migration Program, particularly the occupation of 'child care coordinator', with the aim of enabling suitably skilled migrants to take up child care employment in South Australia.

A fact sheet has been produced for child care centre licensees outlining legislative requirements, the importance of qualified staff, recruitment strategies and the qualified staff exemption application procedure.

If a licensee applies for a qualified staff exemption on the grounds that they have been unable to recruit a qualified child care worker, they must supply evidence to support this claim and outline strategies that will be implemented to recruit a qualified person or upskill a current worker within a specified timeframe. A qualified staff exemption is granted only if a licensee can show that the safety, health and wellbeing of children in care will not be compromised.

SCHOOLS, JUNIOR PRIMARY TEACHERS

119. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How many additional teachers have been provided this year to disadvantaged junior primary schools?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: In 2006, an allocation of an additional 152.9 full-time equivalent junior primary teachers was provided to disadvantaged schools with an R-2 enrolment.

This allocation was to schools in categories 1 to 3 of the Index of Educational Disadvantage and ensured that as of the time of teacher allocation, no junior primary class need be greater than 18 in category 1 and 2 schools and 21 in category 3 schools. Each teacher allocation also attracts an additional 4.68 hours per week of School Services Officer time.

AUSLINK

131. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What is the status, including total cost, the respective State and Federal Government's funding contributions and estimated completion date, of each of the following AusLink projects:

- (a) Salisbury Highway—Virginia access controls;
- (b) Dukes Highway—shoulder sealing;
- (c) Dukes Highway—pavement rehabilitation;
- (d) Sturt Highway—Truro hills realignment;
- (e) Sturt Highway—Riverland Passing Lanes;
- (f) Adelaide to Port Augusta—shoulder sealing;
- (g) Adelaide to Port Augusta—passing lanes;
- (h) Port River Expressway Stage 1;
- (i) West Avenue;
- (j) Adelaide Urban—new northern access;
- (k) Hampstead Rod—intersection with Mullers and Regency Roads;
- (l) Sturt Highway—5 year upgrading program; and
- (m) Port River Expressway Stages 2 & 3 and associated road and rail works?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Project Description	Status	Total Cost \$m	State \$m	Federal \$m	Estimated Completion Date
Salisbury Highway – Virginia access controls	Incorporated into Northern Expressway	-	-	-	-
Dukes Highway – shoulder sealing	Project complete	4.7	-	4.7	-
Dukes Highway – pavement rehabilitation	Project complete	14.7	-	14.7	-
Sturt Highway – Truro Hills realignment	Not to proceed. Funding re-allocated to Sturt Highway 5 year upgrade program	6.5	-	6.5	-
Sturt Highway – Riverland passing lanes	Project substantially complete except for landscaping	18.48	-	18.48	September 2007
Adelaide to Port Augusta – shoulder sealing	Project Complete	5.0	-	5.0	-
Adelaide to Port Augusta – passing lanes	Project complete	14.5	-	14.5	-
Port River Expressway Stage 1	Project complete	84.93	45.26	39.67	-
West Avenue (\$5m excludes council contribution to project)	Construction has commenced	5.0	-	5.0	Early 2007
Adelaide Urban – new northern access (Northern Expressway)	Planning phase has commenced. Australian Government commitment to be confirmed	550.0	110.0	440.0	2011
Hampstead Road – intersection with Mullers and Regency Roads	Work commenced 15 January 2007	5.1	-	5.1	Mid 2007
Sturt Highway – 5 year upgrading program	The program of works is underway	44.0	-	44.0	Mid 2009
Port River Expressway Stages 2 and 3 and associated road and rail works	Construction in progress	175.0	107.25	67.75	Late 2007

SOUTH-EAST FREIGHT TRANSPORT

134. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What budget funding has been allocated to implement the recommendations for the \$85 million investment to support the 'Plan for Freight Transport for the South East/Limestone Coast Region of SA'?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information: As outlined in a media release dated 26 September 2006 the State Government has set aside more than \$10 million for transport

improvements in the Limestone Coast, for the 2006-07 financial year. I refer to the list below:

- Shoulder Sealing Program (\$1.3m)
Princes Highway—23km of shoulder sealing will be undertaken on the Princes Highway north of Kingston (from Henry Creek to Kingston) in 2006-07
- Overtaking Lane Program (\$1.7m)
Riddoch Highway—One overtaking lane is proposed on the Riddoch Highway in 2006-07 near the Mt Gambier airport.

- Long Life Roads Program (\$5m)
Clay Wells—Penola road widening and rehabilitation.
- State Black Spot Program (\$1.71m)
Riddoch Highway—Seal shoulders, improve delineation and edgelines.
Under Safer Local Roads Program of the State Black Spot Program, a joint funding arrangement with Local Government to fund various black spot upgrades on local roads (with local councils contributing a third of the project cost).
- Responsive Road Safety Program (\$0.065m)
Improve Roadside Hazard Protection on Bordertown—Hynam Road, by removing trees to provide safe clearance envelope.
Kalangadoo—Compton (Kangaroo Flat Road) improve delineation and warning by installing Chevron Alignment Markers and guideposts.
- Maintenance
Periodic maintenance (resurfacing)—contracts are being called. As the rates are unknown at this stage the number of jobs or lengths of resurfacing cannot be quantified.
- Fishing Industry Enhancement (\$0.4m)
Beachport Jetty Upgrade
- AusLink Black Spot Program (\$0.655)
Riddoch Highway, Seal shoulders, improve delineation and edgelines.
Carpenter Rocks Road/Dixons Road/Burrungule Road—Installation of a staggered T-type cross intersection, allocated to District Council of Grant.
Princes Highway/Glencoe—Kongorong Road Improve priority at intersection, widen lanes and delineation and signage
Princes Highway 8km section of road between Millicent and Tantanoola—shoulder sealing and remove roadside hazards and improve delineation
In addition, \$4 million had been set-aside in the 2007-08 financial year to fund the Penola Bypass should the Wattle Range Council obtain funds under the Federal Government's Strategic Regional Program. Unfortunately the Council was not successful in obtaining funding from the Federal Government's AusLink Strategic Regional Program. Nevertheless the Bypass remains the highest priority intervention in the Plan for Freight Transport for the Limestone Coast Region and DTEI will continue to work with Council on ways to progress this very important project.
A further \$10 million has been set aside for the rail network, subject to backing from the private sector.

TRANSPORT PLAN

136. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Will the Transport Plan, developed in draft form during the previous Parliament, be finalised during the current Parliament and if not, why not?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

This Government considers that a stand alone transport plan is no longer necessary as the key elements in the draft Transport Plan of April 2003 had been rolled into the Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia. The Infrastructure Plan provides a strategy to address the major transport issues facing this state, based upon the objectives and targets in South Australia's Strategic Plan. These two plans provides a vision for the development of this state with a level of specificity not seen prior to this Government.

This Government has committed to the implementation of initiatives that will fundamentally enhance the effectiveness of the transport system. The first tranche of these initiatives include the completion of the deepening of Outer Harbor, the completion of the Port River Expressway, the underpass on South Road at Anzac Highway, and the proposed Northern Expressway.

ROADS FUNDING

138. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How much funding will be provided to address the sections of the following roads identified as unsafe in a recent RAA audit:

- (a) Dukes Highway—13 kms near Yumali; and
- (b) Sturt Highway—38 kms in the Riverland?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Unlike the November 2005 AusRAP report 'How Safe Are Our Roads', which assessed the National Network on a performance basis (i.e. crash risk), the October 2006 AusRAP report assessed and rated the specific design features of the existing National Network. As a safety rating system this latest AusRAP report only addresses

physical features of the road corridor and not traffic volume and mix, both of which influence safety performance and thus affects any comparisons made across Australia.

(a) Dukes Highway near Yumali

A 13km section of the Dukes Highway south from Yumali was given a 2-star AusRAP rating, with the AusRAP report indicating that the rating was associated with roadside hazards and intersections. Insufficient information is provided in the AusRAP report to outline why the 13 km long section south from Yumali was rated lower than the rest of the Dukes Highway that was rated 3-stars. The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) intends to undertake a roadside hazard investigation on the Dukes Highway commencing in 2007-08.

Shoulder sealing through the 2-star rated Yumali section was undertaken in 2001-02 and the lane and shoulder seal widths are to National Network standards. In 2005-06 work was undertaken to correct pavement rutting in a 1 km long section about 5 km south of Yumali.

The State Government is working in conjunction with the Australian and Victorian Governments to develop a corridor strategy that will identify the challenges and deficiencies for the corridor, and guide the future direction, planning and investment for the Highway.

(b) Sturt Highway in the Riverland

The 2-star rated Sturt Highway sections in SA were the 10km Waikerie Bypass section of the Sturt Highway and 17km of the 28km section of the Sturt Highway between Barmera and Renmark. The actual length of 2-star rated Sturt Highway is 27km, not 38, as 11km between Barmera and Renmark was given a 3-star rating. Insufficient information is provided in the report to outline why these sections were rated lower than some others, however, the ratings seem associated mainly with roadside hazards and intersections.

The upgrading of the 2km Waikerie Curves section of the Waikerie Bypass was completed in April 2006. In DTEI's opinion the 2-star rating given to this section does not take into account this project and thus the rating should be higher. The remaining 8km of the Bypass is proposed to receive a \$2.726 million upgrading in 2006-07 from the Sturt Highway Five Year Upgrading Program.

Works undertaken in the last two years on the section between Barmera and Renmark include major upgrading of the two intersections with the Old Sturt Highway, construction of two overtaking lanes near Monash, and shoulder sealing, road widening and intersection upgrades on the approach to Renmark.

Future upgrading between Barmera and Renmark is likely to include shoulder sealing and addressing roadside hazards on the 13km Berri Bypass and further intersection upgrades on the approach to Renmark. The priority for these works will be considered as part of the AusLink Sydney-Adelaide Corridor Strategy that is due to be completed in 2007.

UNCURBED ARTERIAL PROJECT

139. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Has the \$8.5 million allocated to the Uncurbed Urban Arterials Project in 2005-06 been fully expended and if not, why is this budget line discontinued in the 2006-07 Budget.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

The Uncurbed Urban Arterial Roads Program was established in 2001-02 to facilitate infrastructure improvements and treatments that include kerbing of arterial roads in the outer metropolitan areas.

The program's total allocation of \$8.5 million reported in the 2005-06 budget papers has been fully expended. The works under the program included an upgrade of Hancock Road, St Agnes and Black Road, Flagstaff Hill. These works have been completed.

This particular budget line has not been discontinued. There is \$1.1 million allocated under the program in 2006-07 for works on a new connector road at Hallett Cove. This is outlined in the 2006-07 Budget Papers, Capital Investment Statement (Budget Paper 5).

BRITANNIA ROUNDABOUT

142. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What solution does the Government now intend for the Britannia Roundabout and what has happened to \$8.8 million allocated in the 2005-06 budget?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) is investigating low cost traffic management solutions for improving the operation of the Britannia intersection, including improved signage and minor alterations to the existing roundabout layout.

Funds previously allocated to the Britannia intersection have been put towards other transport projects.

ROADS, MASS ACTION PROGRAM

143. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Has the \$3.5 million Budget allocation to the Mass Action Program in 2005-06 been expended and if so, how was this spent and what outcomes were achieved?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

The Mass Action Program was established in 2004-05 to address infrastructure improvements over longer sections of road with a poor crash history.

The program, as outlined in the 2005-06 budget papers was \$3.5 million. In the first half of 2005-06, an amount of \$1.2 million was deferred to 2007-08 to partially fund expenditure brought forward on Transport Security in response to the bombings on the London Transport system on July 2005.

Subsequently, \$2.3 million remained to be allocated across the Mass Action Program for 2005-06. Expenditure under the Mass Action Program in 2005-06 included shoulder sealing, roadside hazard protection and guard fences along the Noarlunga to Cape Jervis Road. Additionally, work involving the installation of guard fences, rest areas and the removal of roadside hazards along various roads with poor crash histories was also undertaken. \$2.1 million was outlaid in 2005-06 and the remaining minor amount being distributed within the 2005-06 capital program.

ROADS, DUKES HIGHWAY

145. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What efforts or consideration has been made by the Government on the construction of dual carriageway roads on the Dukes Highway between Taillem Bend and the Victorian Border and also on the Princes Highway between Port Wakefield and the Port Augusta?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Both these Highways are part of the AusLink National Land Transport Network. AusLink is a major Australian Government initiative designed at improving planning, decision-making and funding for Australia's national land transport infrastructure—road and rail networks. South Australia has five AusLink corridors;

Adelaide Urban and Adelaide to Perth, Melbourne, Sydney and Darwin.

The Dukes and Princes Highways are part of the Adelaide-Melbourne and Adelaide-Perth corridors respectively.

Under direction of the Council of Australian Governments, strategies are being prepared for all of the AusLink corridors that comprise the defined national land transport network. These studies are being undertaken for the purpose of identifying and establishing priorities for the development, investment and maintenance of each corridor.

The issue of possible dual carriageways on the Dukes and Princes Highways will therefore be addressed via these corridor strategies. Those strategies are currently under development and the Council of Australian Government has requested that they all be completed by June 2007.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

147. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What are the individual projects and funding allocations considered under the \$74 million Road Maintenance budget in 2006-07 and is the construction of new roads or road improvements included within the definition of road maintenance?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Road maintenance expenditure in 2006-07 comprises a variety of programs across a range of road transport assets. The \$74 million covers maintenance expenditure on State assets and does not include expenditure on new roads, or minor road improvements.

Regarding your request for individual projects, maintenance works occur in a number of forms across these network of assets, including a cyclic 'as required' basis and on a programmed priority basis. For example routine maintenance activities on the roads include routine inspections, patrols, and repair of minor defects undertaken on every road section throughout the year as required. Routine maintenance works are also carried out on traffic signals, street lighting and signs as faults occur or to repair accident damage.

ROAD SKID RESISTANCE

157. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What are the locations of the thirty nine sites where road skid resistance work is planned and in each case, what is the respective amount of Federal, State and Local Government funding provided?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Road Number	Road	Section	MM ¹ Start	MM End
03160	Main North Road	Spalding—Clare	171.9	173.5
03160	Main North Road	Clare—Auburn	182.3	182.8
03160	Main North Road	Tarlee—Roseworthy	253.4	253.7
03160	Main North Road	Tarlee—Roseworthy	255.4	256.1
03163	Wilmington—Ucolta	Orroroo—Peterborough	50.5	51.8
03400	Barrier Highway	Cockburn—Olary	13.8	15.0
03400	Barrier Highway	Cockburn—Olary	15.0	19.0
03400	Barrier Highway	Nackara—Oodla Wirra	199.0	203.0
03400	Barrier Highway	Nackara—Oodla Wirra	213.0	213.4
03400	Barrier Highway	Burra—Main North Rd	353.1	354.7
04009	Port Wakefield—Yorktown	South of Pt Clinton	18.3	21.0
04009	Port Wakefield—Yorktown	South of Pt Clinton	21.0	25.7
04009	Port Wakefield—Yorktown	East of Yorketown	115.7	116.2
04009	Port Wakefield—Yorktown	East of Yorketown	116.2	119.0
04009	Port Wakefield—Yorktown	East of Yorketown	119.0	120.5
04009	Maitland—Yorktown	Minlaton	44.0	46.6
04015	Maitland—Yorktown	Minlaton	46.6	51.6
04015	Wallaroo to Moonta	Wallaroo to Moonta	9.2	12.0
04138	Wallaroo—Pt Wakefield	Wallaroo to Kadina	7.7	8.3

04141	Lincoln Hwy	South of Tumby Bay	277.5	281.6
02600	Flinders Hwy	Coffin Bay—Pt Lincoln	372.0	372.8
02200	Main North Road	Wilmington—Ucolta I/S	23.4	23.5
03160	Main North Road	Quorn—Wilmington I/S	20.7	21.0
03160	Lock—Cowell	Rudall to 2kms West	50.5	52.5
02409	Lock—Cowell	2—5 kms West of Rudall	48.2	50.5
02409	Cleve—Arno Bay	Cleve—Arno Bay	0.2	24.0
02603	Riddoch Hwy	Keith Bypass within Keith Township	0.2	1.9
08000	Riddoch Hwy	Padthaway—Naracoorte	101.6	101.9
08000	Riddoch Hwy	Penola—Nangwarry	169.9	170.3
08000	Riddoch Hwy	Penola—Nangwarry	175.6	177.0
08000	Riddoch Hwy	Nangwarry—Tarpeena	180.5	181.7
08000	Riddoch Hwy	Nangwarry—Tarpeena	185.0	186.1
08400	Princes Hwy	Mt Gambier—Victoria Border	356.0	359.0
05045	Phillip Hwy	Main North Rd—Grainger Rd	0.0	2.8
06146	Fullarton Road	Greenhill Rd—Grant Avenue	1.8	2.7

¹MM—Maintenance Markers

These treatments will all be funded from the State operating maintenance budget under a specific \$2.3 million allocation.

HEAVY VEHICLES

181. The Hon. G.M. GUNN:

1. When will the new laws relating to the operating and loading of heavy vehicles commence?

2. How will the Government and the Department co-operate with industries affected by these laws?

3. What tolerance will be given in relation to loading?

4. How many meetings around South Australia were held to explain the new laws and who conducted these?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

1. The Statutes Amendment (Road Transport Compliance and Enforcement) Act 2006 is scheduled to commence on Monday 30 April 2007. This follows direct consultation and consensus reached with various State business and industry organisations, including the South Australian Farmers Federation, the South Australian Freight Council and the South Australian Road Transport Association.

2. The Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) continues to work closely with affected parties, including both industry and business interests, to raise awareness about these pending legislative reforms and assist parties prepare for their introduction. This includes directly working with various peak organisations in identifying specific industry impacts and opportunities to provide relevant information and advice as part of the overall communication strategy.

3. New measurement adjustments for mass breaches were introduced nationally on 1 July 2006. These replace the previous National Association of Australian State Road Authorities (NAASRA) tolerances developed during the 1980's. These new arrangements provide greater legal certainty for mass assessment and account for any potential inaccuracies in measuring equipment, differences in site characteristics, different measuring methods and the conditions under which such measurements are made. Enforcement officers will still maintain their discretionary powers under these compliance and enforcement reforms, including the ability to issue a formal warning in respect of minor breaches.

4. To date, some 20 information sessions attended by over 400 farmers and industry operators and clients have been conducted throughout South Australia as a joint initiative of DTEI and SAPOL, and additional information sessions are proposed in the lead up to these reforms prior to introduction in April 2007. These sessions were conducted by DTEI/SAPOL staff with relevant practical and operational experience, including those who will have key compliance and enforcement roles under the new legislation.

These information sessions are only part of the overall communication strategy for these reforms, which involve a broad range of initiatives to ensure an appropriate awareness and understanding

by both the transport sector and those who use transport as part of their business.

EDUCATION, STATEMENT OF DIRECTIONS

187. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What is the total cost of implementing the 'Statement of Directions 2005-10' and how much expenditure has been allocated to implement this program in 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07, respectively?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Statement of Directions 2005-10 is the presentation of the Department of Education and Children's Services' priorities, plans and targets. In each of the stated years, it is not a separate series of strategies for which additional funding is required but is the plan for the use of the Department's existing resources towards these priorities.

STUDENTS AT RISK

190. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What State Government initiatives have been developed or implemented in 2006 to improve processes for early identification of, and timely intervention for, children and students at risk of not achieving adequate levels of literacy, numeracy and social proficiency?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Government's initiatives to reduce class sizes in the early years through the Junior Primary (JP) 160 and Early Years Scheme have resulted in over 280 additional Year 1 and 2 teachers to provide the attention needed by individual students. This will be extended through employment of a further 100 Year 3 teachers in 2007.

The Government's \$35 million Early Years Literacy Program is designed to improve literacy engagement and achievement in all schools and preschools and includes funding to provide identified Year 1 children with additional support.

The program includes provision for the equivalent of 60 extra teachers to provide one-to-one assistance for Year 1 children identified as requiring additional literacy support. It has also provided funding to enable 30 full-time equivalent mentor teachers to work alongside classroom teachers in Index of Disadvantage Category 1 to 4 schools, to guide effective literacy teaching. The program enables District-based Early Childhood Initiative Coordinators to support teachers in individual preschools and schools and through district networks.

The Premier's Reading Challenge has been an important stimulus for literacy development and has seen a spectacular increase in the uptake of reading, with more than 129 700 students involved in 2006. Children are identified for additional support through the use

of a range of assessments including SA School Entry Assessment and running records along with the day-to-day observations of teachers. Students may also be assisted through specific programs including Reading Recovery and Accelerated Literacy.

Additional funding, based on the numbers of students in the lowest skill bands in the Year 3 and Year 5 2005 State Literacy and Numeracy (LAN) tests, was distributed during 2006 to further assist schools in supporting these students.

Professional development is also offered focussing on analysis of LAN test data and identifying action plans for teachers in districts where results are below the State average.

The First Steps in Mathematics Reception to Year 7 program trains facilitators in each district to deliver professional development courses for teachers and supports them to better understand how students learn mathematics, use diagnostic tasks and interpret work samples.

The \$1.25 million Maths for Learning Inclusion initiative funds cluster coordinators to provide teacher professional development to improve teaching, learning and assessment in mathematics for students from low socio-economic backgrounds and Indigenous students in Years 3 to 5.

The DECS Learner Wellbeing Framework for birth to year 12 highlights the social dimension of well-being as a developmental area that teachers must support. The framework uses a variety of tools to assess the social and other wellbeing related skills and attitudes of students.

Through the Essential Learnings of the South Australian Curriculum Standards and Accountability Framework students learn to understand themselves, manage relationships and interact with business and community organisations. In doing so, they develop social proficiency and contribute to their own well-being.

Literacy, numeracy and social proficiency of students are also supported through a range of services provided through DECS district offices. These include speech pathologists, early childhood psychologists, hearing impairment coordinators, guidance officers, social workers, disability coordinators and behaviour management teams.

BUS SERVICES

198. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action will be taken to address community concerns about changes to bus routes 560 and 209, which makes it difficult for passengers to travel from Parafield Gardens to Ingle Farm?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Bus route 209, City to Modbury Interchange, travels via Pooraka, Walkley Heights and Ingle Farm and runs through the eastern side of the Parafield Airport. As part of the October 2006 service changes this service received a minor service design change in Walkley Heights to service the Elms Lifestyle Village.

This service has never travelled into the suburb of Parafield Gardens, located on the western side of the Parafield Airport.

Bus route 560, Elizabeth to Modbury Interchange, travels via Salisbury, Para Hills and Brahma Lodge and runs through the eastern and northern sides of the Parafield Airport.

This service has also never travelled into the suburb of Parafield Gardens, located on the western side of the Parafield Airport.

Passengers from Parafield Gardens are able to reach Ingle Farm Shopping Centre by using either of bus routes 411 or 412 to Mawson Interchange and then transferring onto route 565 services to Ingle Farm Shopping Centre.

BUS SERVICES

200. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action will be taken to address community concerns about the lack of east to west bus service connections linking services and shops across the northern suburbs?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Many east to west public transport bus services exist in the outer northern suburbs of Adelaide that allow public transport users the ability to travel between various destinations. As an example, a public transport passenger can travel between Burton in the west via Hollywood Plaza Shopping Centre, Salisbury Station and Salisbury Shopping Centre. The flexibility of transferring at Salisbury Station allows the passenger to continue further east on to Golden Grove, or to travel by rail either northbound to Gawler or southbound to the city.

Similar passenger movements are also available in the inner

northern suburbs where passengers can travel between Burton and Mawson Lakes to Ingle Farm, Paradise or Tea Tree Plaza or southbound to the city.

Transferring from one mode of transport to another (or same) mode of transport is common practice in the provision of mass public transport systems around the world. Such a system is required to provide a cost effective network in a low-density city whilst catering for a large number of passengers with diverse travel patterns.

All public transport interchanges on the Adelaide Metro Network are located adjacent or in shopping centres, medical facilities and/or other modal connection points that enable passengers multi travel choices.

BUS SERVICES

202. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action will be taken to address Ascot Park community concerns about changes to bus route 241, which has left Robert Street, Railway Terrace, Adelaide Terrace and West Street without any service?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Torrens Transit notified the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) on 23 October 2006, that a decision has been made to withdraw route 241 bus services from Robert Street and West Street.

On 1 November 2006, staff from DTEI met with the Marion City Council regarding the suspension of the bus services along this route. Council agreed to letter box drop affected residents within approximately 300 metres either side of the crossing on 10 November 2006, advising them of the suspension of the service and inviting their feedback on what were the preferred public transport service options in the area.

Council also agreed to convene a public meeting on 4 December 2006 to be attended by representatives of Torrens Transit and DTEI to discuss alternatives for future options for the route with the community. The time delay was to allow the community to consider the various options.

At the public meeting on 4 December 2006, which approximately 140 residents attended, DTEI proposed an additional option to alter the route of the 241 so that it would follow Towers Terrace then Raglan Avenue, Brooks Terrace, Flinders Street, Adelaide Terrace and then the normal route along West Terrace.

This option provides access to the Castle Plaza Shopping Centre, as well as retaining access to the Westfield Marion complex. The overwhelming majority of those attending the meeting supported this option.

BUS SERVICES

203. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action will be taken to address Burton community concerns about changes to bus route 401?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

Bus Route 401 travels between Elizabeth Station and Settlers Farm Shopping Centre via Burton and Paralowie.

The new Springbank Waters Residential development comprises over four hundred housing allotments to be developed over the next two years. The first five stages of the ten-stage development are complete with housing construction well under way.

Discussion regarding the provision of public transport delivery to the new estate commenced in early 2004 with the then Office of Public Transport (OPT) agreeing to an alteration to bus route 401 to run through the new development at a future date. The PTB determined the location of three new bus stops in the new development at that time in conjunction with the developer, AV Jennings and the City of Salisbury.

Recently a proposal has been forwarded from Southlink Bus Company to alter bus route 401 at the western end from Waterloo Corner Road, Barton Crescent and Kensington Way to Waterloo Corner Road, Springbank Boulevard and Kensington Way as part of proposed service changes in early 2007.

The proposal would require passengers using stop 63 Kensington Way to use stop 63A Springbank Boulevard and passengers using stop 62 Barton Crescent to use stop 62 Waterloo Corner Road. Some passengers may have extra walking distance to their new stop and other passengers will have a reduced distance to their nearest stop.

No other changes are being planned at this stage to route 401 services.

BUS SERVICES

204. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action will be taken to address community concerns about changes to bus routes MA1 and MA2 loop services between the Flinders Medical Centre, Centennial Park Cemetery, the Repatriation General Hospital and the Marion Shopping Centre?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information:

As part of preparations for the October 2006 service changes, officers from the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI) and Torrens Transit held a briefing session for senior staff at the Repatriation Hospital and the Repatriation Consumer Representative Group.

Both these groups agreed to formal feedback to DTEI if there were any problems with volunteers, patients, or family members of patients accessing the Repatriation Hospital after the service changes took effect.

No issues have been raised by either group.

Post implementation monitoring of the service changes effects on passengers indicates that:

- All passengers previously served by the Marion Access still have access, without change of bus, to Westfield Marion, the major destination;
- Those travelling the greater part of the Marion Access route still have direct access to Bedford Industries, the Panorama TAFE, Centennial Park Cemetery and the Repatriation Hospital;
- Those travelling along the eastern side of the route still have access, without change to bus, to Flinders Medical Centre, Pasadena Shops, Centennial Park, Panorama TAFE and the Repatriation Hospital; and
- In the Darlington area they are still able to travel to Flinders Medical Centre and Westfield Marion without changing buses.

Only a small number of passengers travelling from west to east of the previous route are required to transfer at Westfield Marion and therefore will take longer to make their journey than with the Marion Access services. The monitoring indicates that there are very few people who are now required to transfer at Westfield Marion to continue their trip.

At the same time the changes have allowed a large number of people from suburbs northeast of Marion direct access for the first time to the Westfield Marion complex, Repatriation Hospital and Flinders Hospital and University.

I would be happy to arrange for representatives from DTEI and Torrens Transit to meet with people who have been disadvantaged by the changes to the Marion Access services.

MINISTERIAL DELEGATIONS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (5 December 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised:

On 16 September 2005, I approved a standing authority for the Chief Executive, Department of the Premier and Cabinet to incur expenditure for the 2005-06 financial year for the Libraries Board of South Australia (including Public Library Services) and the Carrick Hill Trust. The responsibility for these arts agencies was assigned to me, as Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts, by the Premier and Minister for the Arts by proclamation under section 6 of the *Administrative Arrangements Act 1994*. I signed the standing authority for these agencies for the 2006-07 financial year on 6 July 2006.

There is no requirement for me as Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts to sign any other instruments of financial delegation for the arts portfolio.

Two instruments of delegation were signed on 9 July 2005 for the Southern Suburbs portfolio for the year ending 30 June 2006 pursuant to Treasurer's Instruction 8 (Expenditure for Supply Operations and Other Goods and Services):

- An instrument providing the Chief Executive of Primary Industries and Resources South Australia with the authority to incur expenditure for the 2005-06 financial year.
- An instrument providing authority to enter into contracts and deeds as a delegate of the Minister for the Southern Suburbs to the persons who hold or occupy the following positions:
 - Chief Executive, Primary Industries and Resources South Australia
 - Deputy Chief Executive, Primary Industries and Resources South Australia
 - Director, Office of the Southern Suburbs

In reference to the documents I indicated that I have signed recently, these related to the 2006-07 financial year.

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Housing SP's purchasing delegations are complex due to the wide range of property business operations undertaken and therefore many officers have different delegation amounts for different types of expenditure. The online purchase order system only allows for one delegation limit per user and for this reason many transactions are processed—using a manual voucher system. The manual voucher system is restricted to certain transactions in accordance with a purchase order exemption list which is outlined in Housing SP's Accounts Payable and Purchase Order policy.

The Auditor-General prefers the use of the online purchase order system due to inbuilt controls within the system. As part of the audit of the Accounts Payable function, the Auditor-General referred to two instances totalling \$440,000 where a purchase was made using the manual voucher system without the proper level of authority. The total value by which delegations were exceeded for these two purchases equates to \$15,000.

The Auditor-General's department has advised that it did not conduct a representative sample and therefore its working papers should not be relied upon to determine the extent to which purchases have been made without the proper level of authority.

To accurately determine the total value of purchases made without the proper level of purchasing authority would require every manual payment voucher to be reviewed, an exercise that would absorb extensive time and effort.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised:

1. The loss of the Adelaide Entertainment Centre contract during the 2005-2006 year cost BASS \$522 000 in lost revenues. This loss was partially offset by savings in direct expenditure of \$145 000, resulting in a net loss of \$377 000 for the financial year.

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised:

1. The Adelaide Festival Centre undertakes an independent valuation by a Certified Valuer every three years. The assets reviewed are land and buildings, plant and equipment, works of art and lease-hold improvements. The valuations are prepared as per AASB 116 Fair Value, of fixed assets for financial reporting and management purposes. The assets are inspected for the purpose of determining value and existence.

The Festival Centre is currently undertaking a full in-house asset stocktake in all locations.

A further in-house stocktake will be undertaken in June 2007 and annually thereafter.

2. The independent valuer did not advise of any missing assets in completing the June 2006 valuation.
3. The last valuation of plant and equipment was completed in June 2006.

In reply to **Hon. I.F. EVANS** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised:

1. Management and the Board have reviewed each of the issues raised by the Auditor-General in his audit report.

In the matters of stocktakes and Masterpiece access levels, the Auditor-General acknowledges the AFC's intention to implement suitable controls. Those control measures are now in the process of implementation.

At the time of the audit, the Adelaide Festival Centre had been unable to find a procedure for processing accounts payable that would satisfy the Auditor-General's expectations. However, it has recently become possible, through the availability of a new report from the mandated Masterpiece accounting package, to resolve concerns regarding the accounts payable process since the new report will offer a secure control document to facilitate a valid checking process.

All matters raised through the audit have now been addressed.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REORT

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O FOLEY: The property in question does not belong to the South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC). It is only a contingent asset with a set value of \$39.5 million as contained in the put option referred to in the notes of the SAAMC annual financial report. Any changes in the tenancies will not change the put option value.

As I indicated in my response to the first part of this question (provided separately), there is no requirement to perform a valuation for this property at any time before its acquisition.

The purpose of the June 2005 valuation was to establish a guidance of the value of the property at its fully leased status and determine whether SAAMC would have been required to write down any of buyback price in 2008 if the owners exercised their put option.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The value of funds invested for 2005-06 was higher than that for 2004-05 and accordingly there were higher management fees.

Additionally, SAICORP received some late invoices in 2005-06 for management fees incurred in 2004-05 which were not accrued in 2004-05.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In response to the question regarding the breakdown of the \$23.3 million in grants and subsidies, the table below shows the name of the recipients, the amount of the grant subsidy to each recipient and the purpose of the grant subsidy:

Recipient	Purpose	2005-06 \$'000
Industry Development		\$14,644
Abbey Rock Holdings	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Adelaide Baroque Inc	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Adelaide Top Food & Wine Tour	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
AGRI-PAC	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
AIP International PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Airbags Australia PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Amore Syrups Aust PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Armstrong Packaging Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
A-Rage Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Australian Croatian Chamber Commerce & Industry	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Australian Education Organisation	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Australian Immigration & Visa Solutions	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Australian International Recruitment	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Ballard Brian-Brougham Association	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
Barristers Premium Wines	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Barossa Fine Foods	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Beerenberg Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Benita Edwards Design	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Bienert Kari	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Bosworth Family Trust	Market Access Program (MAP)	9
Brave Vision PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Canfield Bay Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Celltrack Systems	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Chinese Language & Culture	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Clinical Nursing Specialist	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Coperpot Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Cultivate Design PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Dajsmaili Entel	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Daniel Corporation	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
Dover Fisheries Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Encounter Australia PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Engineering Australasia	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Eyre Regional Development Board	Market Access Program (MAP)	27
Ferguson Australia Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Food Services Solutions	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Fox Gordon Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
FS Media Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	5

Recipient	Purpose	2005-06
		\$'000
Gemtree Vineyards	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Gregory's Wines	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Hanger J	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Harbord Wines PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Harley Quinns Opal Emporium	Market Access Program (MAP)	
Hemer Australia	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Hickorys Run	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Hologram Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Hot Metal & Packaging Systems	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
IWH Developments	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Janesce Enterprises PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
John Austin Constructions	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Knipsel Bros PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Kukan Studio	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
L'Hotelier Group	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Macro Meats – Gourmet Game	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Macbryde Horwood Agencies	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Michelles Opals Australia	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Mighty Leaf Tea Australia	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
MM Strategic PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Naked Crush Wines	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
Northern Regional Development Board	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
NTS Global Group PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Nylon Films	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Nymet PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Opal Country	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
OZ Products PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Planning Advisory Services	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Possums McLaren Vineyards	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Re Angle Pictures	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Redarc Electronics PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Schacht Chris	Market Access Program (MAP)	7
Seascope Seafood Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Shottesbrooke Vineyards	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
South Australian Fresh Seafood	Market Access Program (MAP)	5
Southern Waters Marine	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
Springs Smoked Seafoods	Market Access Program (MAP)	6
Study Oasis	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
Suhas PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
The Big Miner	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
The People Republic of Animation	Market Access Program (MAP)	6
The QEH Research Foundation	Market Access Program (MAP)	4
Torambre PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Trade Moves Australia	Market Access Program (MAP)	2
Transport Connection	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Web Genie Software P/L	Market Access Program (MAP)	7
World Wine Brokers		1
United Opal & Gem Corp	Market Access Program (MAP)	3

Recipient	Purpose	2005-06 \$'000
Vitor PL	Market Access Program (MAP)	1
Volleyball SA	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
Vrama Fisheries Pty Ltd	Market Access Program (MAP)	3
SUBTOTAL	Market Access Program (MAP)	325
A Raptis & Sons Pty Ltd	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	3
Austrade	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	5
Australian Interactive Media	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	10
Barossa Olive Oil Co	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	11
B-D Farm Paris Creek Pty Ltd	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	2
Hallprint Pty Ltd	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	3
Loumic P/L	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	3
Rocktreader P/L	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	3
SA Fishing Industry Council	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	3
SUBTOTAL	South Aust Participation Program (SAPP)	43
Adelaide City Council	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
Aust Exhibition Services	Small Bus Service Centres	2.5
City of Salisbury	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
Eastside BEC	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
Gully Corp TTG	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	127.5
Inner Southern BEC	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
Inner West BEC	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
Northern Adelaide BEC	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
North East Development Agency	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	150
Southern Success BEC	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
Western Area BEC	Operational Support - Business Enterprise Centre	277.5
SUBTOTAL	BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CENTRES	2,500
District Council of Kimba	Community Development	25
Global Care Port Lincoln	Community Development	24
Murraylands Regional Development	Community Development	15
SUBTOTAL	Community Development	64
Adelaide City Council	Regional Migration Program	88
Eyre Regional Development Board	Regional Migration Program	53
Lifeline Funded Projects	Regional Migration Program	19
Limestone Coast Regional Development Board	Regional Migration Program	132
Northern Regional Development	Regional Migration Program	53
Riverland Development Council	Regional Migration Program	105
Southern Flinders Rangers Development Board	Regional Migration Program	26
Whyalla Economic Development Board	Regional Migration Program	53
SUBTOTAL	Regional Migration Program	529
Fryar GD	Emergency Management Virginia Flood	6
Lioulios Nominees Pty Ltd	Emergency Management Virginia Flood	10
Read Peter A	Emergency Management Virginia Flood	5
Tsanaktsidis Pavlos & Mavra	Emergency Management Virginia Flood	2
SUBTOTAL	Emergency Management Virginia Flood	23
Aust Academy of Technology	Research Reviews Feasibility Study	15
Aust Institute for Commercialisation	Operational Support for the Centre for Innovation	75
Australian Manufacturing Workers Union	Facilitate Union involvement in State Economic Development Specific Project	81

Recipient	Purpose	2005-06 \$'000
Australian Exhibition Services	Specific Project for Small Business Centres	
Australian Trade Commission	Sectoral Programs	10
AutoCRC	CRC Advanced Automotive Technology	100
Begakis Consultants Trust	Council for International Trade & Commerce	20
Brooke Engineering	Sectoral Programs	25
Business SA	Council for International Trade & Commerce	200
Business SA	Industry Sustainability	220
Business SA	National Expat Program (AIC)	60
Business SA	SABAN	110
City of Marion	Southern Suburbs Economic Development Plan	35
City of Onkaparinga	Southern Suburbs Economic Development Plan	644
Council for International Trade & Commerce	CITCSA program	44
DECS	Asian Taskforce	20
DECS	China Cluster	110
DECS	Prom/Aware Raising BDS	21
Defence Teaming Centre	Operational Support	719
DFEEST	Establishment of TRU	71
DFEEST	Immigration SA External Funding – population policy project	186
DFEEST	Holdens Labour Adjustment Fund	668
DFEEST	Return to Work Credit	960
Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	Tech Diff Demo BDS	10
DPC	Science Outside the Square	50
DSTC Pty Ltd	CRC Enterprise Dist Sys Tech	100
Education Adelaide	Alumni relations – Malaysia Pilot	9
Electronics Industry Association Ltd	Develop & Implement the Electronics Industry Strategic Plan	200
Engineering Employees Association	Operational Support - Research/External Linkages & Prom/Aware Raising BDS	117
Exporters Club	Grant program	90
Families and Communities	Emergency Mgt – Mid North Flood	1
Gail Jackman Consulting	Young Indigenous Entrepreneur	6
Global Maintenance USG	Tech Diff Demo BDS	16
Hemphill Communications	Sectoral Programs	14
Industry Innovation & Regional Development	Strategy for Manufacturing	20
Innovative Management Services	Sectoral Programs	3
IT Council for SA Inc	Prom/Aware Raising BDS	125
IT Council for SA Inc	SA Export Strategy Initiatives	150
Kukan Studio P/L	Research / External Linkages Prom/Aware Raising BDS	18
PIRSA	EAP Innovation Action Plan	400
PIRSA	Community Development	25
SA Film Corporation	Full Business Case	150
SA Housing Trust	Immigration SA - Arrival Accommodation program	256
South Australian Centre for Innovation	Centre for Innovation	1,062
South Australian Murray Darling Basin Resource Centre	Grant	400
South Australian Wine Industry	Wine Industries Export Program	612

Recipient	Purpose	2005-06
		\$'000
TGR Biosciences	Innovation Action Plan	200
Vivasa Inc	VIVA SA – core support	100
Welding Technology Inst of Australia	Operational Support for Tech Diff Demo BDS	165
Uniting Care Wesley Adelaide	Operational Support for the Business Helpline	165
University of Adelaide	Defence grant	202
University of Adelaide	Population Policy scholarship	19
University of Adelaide	Alumni	9
University of South Australia	Research/ External Linkages	1
University of South Australia	Centre Excellence Defence Industry System Capability	2,041
University of South Australia	Population Policy Unit – repatriation of skilled employees	19
Young Achievement Australia	Young Indigenous Entrepreneur	10
Rounding		1
SUBTOTAL	Various DTED programs	11,160
Regional Development Boards		\$2,810
Adelaide Hills Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	190
Barossa & Light Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	185
Eyre Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	260
Fleurieu Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	190
Kangaroo Island Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	165
Limestone Coast Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	215
Mid North Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	192
Murraylands Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	265
Northern Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	340
Outback Areas Community Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support – specific project funding	0
Regional Development South	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	8
Riverland Development Incorporation	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	215
Southern Flinders Ranges	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	185
Tradestart	Regional Development Board Support – specific project funding	0
Whyalla Economic Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	185
Yorke Regional Development Board	Regional Development Board Support including core funding	215
SUBTOTAL		2,810
Regional Infrastructure		\$5,080
Alexandria Council	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	450
Berri Barmera Council	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	800
Chickenmate	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	60

Recipient	Purpose	2005-06
		\$'000
Clare and Gilbert Valley Council	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	102.5
Coorong Cockles	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	80
Davis PK & LE	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	20
District Council of Cleve	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	250
District Council of Coorong	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	169
Eight Tynte Place Nth Adel	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	85
Kangaroo Island Abalone PL	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	75
Keith Seeds	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	39
Langhorne Creek Winery	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	111
Marcou S & M	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	246
M S Hein & Sons P/L	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	22.5
Naracoorte Lucindale Council	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	40
Ozone Seafront Hotel	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	71
Port Pirie Regional Council	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	538
Southern Flinders Rangers Development Board	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	100
Snowtown Meat Service	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	9
Tarac Technologies	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	373
Teys Bros (Naracoorte) PL	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	513
Wakefield Regional Council	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	80
Rounding		1
SUBTOTAL	Regional Development Infrastructure Fund	4,235
Port Augusta City Council	Upper Spencer Gulf Enterprise Zone Fund	200
Port Pirie Regional Council	Upper Spencer Gulf Enterprise Zone Fund	400
Northern Regional Development Board	Upper Spencer Gulf Enterprise Zone Fund	25
Southern Flinders Rangers Development Board	Upper Spencer Gulf Enterprise Zone Fund	140
SUBTOTAL	Upper Spencer Gulf Enterprise Zone Fund	765
Northern Regional Development Board	Outback Fund	80
SUBTOTAL	Outback Fund	80
Other		\$766
Australia-Indonesia Business Council	Sponsorship – Tsunami Reconstruction	14
Australian Interactive Media	Sponsorship	3
Australian Population Institute	Sponsorship	15
Australian Trade Commission	Sponsorship – IBW 2006	10
Business Innovation & Incubation	Sponsorship	18
Business SA	Sponsorship	30
Business SA	Sponsorship – Industry Sustainability program	220
Council for International Trade & Commerce	Sponsorship	10
Dept of Defence	Sponsorship – Land Warfare Conference	8
Dept Environment & Heritage	Sponsorship	4
Dept of Immigration & Multicultural Affairs	Sponsorship	9
Dept of Premier & Cabinet	Sponsorships	23
Dept of Premier & Cabinet	Institute Business, Economics & Law	75
Design Institute of Australia	Sponsorship	5
Euromoney Conferences	Sponsorship	17
Graedi Group	Sponsorship	9
Indian Aust Association of SA	Sponsorship	2
IPAA SA Division	Sponsorship	8
Marratville High School	Sponsorship	10

Recipient	Purpose	2005-06
		\$'000
Murraylands Regional Development Board	Sponsorship	10
Property Council of Australia	Sponsorship	6
Regional Development Board	Sponsorship	
Sacome	Sponsorship	1
SA Centre for Economic Studies	Sponsorship	50
SA Great	Sponsorship	105
SA Tourism Commission	Sponsorship Eventful Adelaide	50
SAPMEA	Sponsorship	5
Silverstone Events Pty Ltd	Sponsorship	5
Tradestart	Sponsorship	5
University of Adelaide	Sponsorship	34
Water Industry Alliance	Sponsorship	5
SUBTOTAL	Various sponsorships	766

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In response to the question regarding the three lots of land at Monarto held for sale, prior to purchase by the government the land was used for farming.

The South Australian Government, through the Department of Trade and Economic Development (DTED, formerly Department of Industry and Trade (DIT)), purchased these parcels of land (amongst others) at Monarto for economic development purposes. DIT established the Monarto light industrial area as a means of attracting larger enterprises that relied on transport into the Murray Bridge area, boosting the local economy. Big W was targeted and secured by Invest SA (DIT) as the anchor enterprise for the area.

Three parcels remained available for development at 30th June 2006. The date of issue of the Certificate of Title on the land is 12th September 2000.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Department of Trade and Economic Development (DTED) updates financial delegations each month. Upon any approved change to financial delegations the officers are requested to acknowledge the change in writing and provide a sample signature. This signature is included in the signature register and is forwarded to PIRSA in a timely manner. Following advice from the Auditor-General a full review was undertaken with any anomalies corrected.

In relation to breaches of Treasurer's Instruction 8 'Expenditure for Supply Operations, and Other Goods and Services' the following is provided.

The Auditor-General did not identify any breach of TI 8 during the year.

During the financial year in addition to the audit undertaken by the Auditor-General DTED undertakes two types of internal audits.

The first audit is undertaken by Departmental officers who verify weekly that all paid Supplier's Invoices for \$10,000 or over have been authorised by an appropriate Financial Delegate. In addition on a three monthly basis 2 per cent of all payments up to \$50,000 are verified that there has been correct authorisation by an appropriate delegate.

Of the total number of invoices processed for 2005-06 that is in excess of 9,000 only one transaction was not properly authorised. This was corrected and further training of the staff member concerned has occurred.

The second audit is undertaken by Deloitte, who are the Department's internal auditors. They identified no instances of breach of Treasurer's instruction 8.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In response to the question regarding the dollar value of unassigned reconciling items between the accounts receivable ledger and the general ledger I provide the following.

The total dollar value was \$63,629.28 and related to differences in timing of transactions between the General Ledger and the Accounts Receivable subsidiary system. These amounts have been resolved.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Government's reinsurance program is due for renewal on 30 September each year. Therefore the reinsurance premium expense figures in SAICORP's financial statements are a combination of premium expenses from successive renewals.

The figure of \$9.4 million in the 2004-05 statements is made up of three months premium expense in respect of the 30 September 2003 program renewal and nine months premium expense in respect of the 2004 renewal. Similarly the figure of \$7.9 million in the 2005-06 statements is made up of three months premium expense in respect of the 30 September 2004 renewal and nine months premium expense in respect of the 2005 renewal.

The 2003 renewal included a component covering standing timber. This component was not renewed in 2004.

The property component of the program was renewed with a premium reduction of about 15 per cent at the 2004 renewal and a further reduction of about 9 per cent at the 2005 renewal.

The level of professional indemnity cover was increased from \$150 million to \$250 million in 2004 and the level of directors and officers liability cover was increased from \$30 million to \$100 million. In addition, both components were fully placed, whereas almost half of the components had been held by SAICORP to its own account in 2003. Notwithstanding these very significant increases in placed covers, the combined premium for the general liability components of the program increased by less than 4 per cent in 2004.

The level of medical malpractice cover was increased from \$70 million to \$100 million in 2004 and the per event deductible was reduced from \$16 million to \$12.5 million. Notwithstanding these very significant increases in placed covers, the cost of the medical malpractice component of the program was very significantly reduced at the 2004 renewal as a result of the incorporation of that component with the general liability components of the program.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Claims expense for each line of insurance business is a combination of:

- payments made in relation to the management of claims;
- payments made in relation to the settlement of claims;
- estimates of claim liabilities for new claims; and
- changes in estimates of claim liabilities for existing claims.

For confidentiality and commercial reasons, it is not appropriate to detail any specific incidents that have resulted in claims or any specific claims that may have contributed to an increase or decrease in claims expense figures.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).
The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:

Recipient/Purpose	Amount of Grant
Department for Environment and Heritage: Contribution to the Bushfire Cooperative Research Centre bushfire research program	\$20,000
Department of Health: Sponsorship of Medico-legal conference, June 2006	\$ 2,500
	<u>\$22,500</u>
	(rounded \$23,000)
Risk Management Institution of Australasia: Sponsorship of RMIA National Conference, Adelaide, November 2005	\$ 3,000
Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme: Contribution for provision of risk management services for State Government owned airstrips	\$ 6,000
University of Adelaide: Grant to meet the costs of the South Australian Cerebral Palsy Research Group in carrying out further research into the causation of cerebral palsy	\$157,820
	\$166,820
	(rounded \$167,000)
Total risk management grants	\$190,000*

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Department of Treasury and Finance—Accounting Policy Framework (APS3.7) requires that ‘an independent valuation appraisal will be performed at least every 5 years’.

Australian Accounting Standard AASB 140 Investment Property, paragraph 32 states that ‘an entity is encouraged, but not required, to determine the value of investment property on the basis of a valuation by an independent valuer who holds a recognised and relevant professional qualification and has recent experience in the location and category of the investment property being valued.’ The standard then goes on to state in paragraph 75 that an entity shall disclose inter alia ‘the extent to which the fair value of investment property (as measured or disclosed in the financial report) is based on a valuation by an independent valuer...and if there has been no such valuation, that fact shall be disclosed.’

The Australis (SA Water House) property is disclosed in the SA Management Corporation's (SAAMC's) financial report in the form of a note relating to a contingent asset. There are no specific protocols of how to attach a value to a contingency. It is known that irrespective of any valuation, SAAMC has an obligation to buy this property for \$39.5 million on 15 November 2008, when a 15-yearput (buy-back) option expires. In this case however it was regarded prudent to test the value of this possible future asset and disclose it in a note to the accounts under AASB 140.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: On advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance, no Cabinet submission has been prepared on the Accrual Appropriation Excess Funds Account as these matters fall within my ordinary Ministerial responsibilities. Accordingly, the on-going management of this account, and the employee entitlements to which its use relates, have been the subject of process of continuous improvement over a number of years. These improvements include the following:

- The Department of Treasury and Finance now processes the annual credits to the Accrual Appropriation Excess Funds Account on behalf of all agencies.
- New items in the general government uniform chart of accounts have been created to establish budget records of employee entitlement expenses and liabilities and to produce Accrual Appropriation Excess Funds Account cash drawdown estimates.
- Employee entitlement budget account entries for the forward estimates period have been created for all agencies.
- FTE caps are being implemented which recognise these on-costs.
- Agency communication and documentation of new arrangements for use of the Accrual Appropriation Excess Funds Account, and for variations to employee entitlements budgets and FTE caps, is under preparation in DTF for implementation in the immediate future.

The purpose of the Accrual Appropriation Excess Funds Account is to reflect accumulated provisions for employee entitlements and asset replacement and to provide an account from which agencies may access cash when liabilities are due to be paid or assets replaced.

The Account is consistent with the cash alignment policy which seeks to remove unneeded cash from agency operating accounts, for example when underspending occurs.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The movements in equity contributions for agencies listed in the Treasurer's Financial Statements, Part B, Volume V, page 35, Statement I of the Report of the Auditor-General 2006 are as follows:

Increases	
Department for Administrative and Information Services	\$8,000,000
Courts Administration Authority	\$3,140,000
Department for Families and Communities	\$10,763,000
Department of Health	\$58,030,000
Planning SA	\$357,000
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	\$5,228,000
Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure	\$20,000,000
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation	\$1,057,000
TOTAL	\$106,575,000
Repayments	
South Australia Police	\$6,256,000
SA Water	\$74,340,000
TOTAL	\$80,596,000

Increases in equity contributions in 2005-06 are provided for in the 2005-06 *Appropriation Act* and relate to budgeted agency capital acquisitions.

SA Police elected to make an equity return of \$6.256 million to Consolidated Account in 2005-06 under the Government's Cash Alignment Policy

SA Water Corporation returned \$74.340 million of its equity to Consolidated Account in 2005-06 in relation to the implementation of the new *Financial Ownership Framework* arrangements for public non-financial corporations. This is a once off return of equity relating to the timing of Community Service Obligation cashflows and does not represent any variation in the Corporation's earnings distribution regime.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Audit did not identify any specific issues in respect of clinical risk management within public hospitals and did not identify any specific hospitals as requiring further focus and evaluation.

Exactly the same statement has been made in the last four Auditor-General's reports.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Table 12.1 on page 61 of the Auditor-General's 2006 Supplementary Report, *State Finances and Related Matters: Some Audit Observations*, summarises the financial performance of the Government using the Australian Accounting Standard 31 (AAS31) framework. The table indicates deficits in each year from 2002 to 2005.

The deficits are the result of all revenues and expenses, for the entire SA Government sector. Over the same period, the net assets of the Government, as measured according to AAS31, have increased in all but one year (2001-02)—from \$14.3 billion in 2001 to \$15.6 billion in 2005—as shown in Table 12.2.

Whilst the AAS31 reporting framework provides one measure of financial performance of governments in Australia, caution must be exercised when interpreting financial results determined on this basis. In particular the AAS31 surplus/deficit records the financial effect of events that are outside the control of the Government, thereby obscuring the underlying financial result of government policies. A significant example of this is the way in which changes to the valuation of the Government's unfunded superannuation liability are recorded. In the AAS31 presentation, these valuation movements are recorded as revenues or expenses. For example, the 2004-05 result includes a valuation expense of \$1,503 million associated with superannuation, a large component of which arises because of a reduction in the Commonwealth government bond rate, which is used to discount the liability; from 6.0 per cent at June 2004 to 5.2 per cent at June 2005.

Australian government jurisdictions have recognised certain shortcomings in the AAS31 reporting arrangements (including the impact of volatility introduced into financial results from such things as movements in the Commonwealth government bond rates) and

as a result have adopted a *Uniform Presentation Framework* for budget, mid year budget review and outcome reporting, which is based on the Australian Bureau of Statistics *Government Finance Statistics* (GFS) reporting framework. The net operating balance reported under the GFS framework can differ materially from the AAS31 results.

For your further information, the Australian Accounting Standards Board (AASB) has taken steps to align its government accounting standards with the GFS framework. It recently introduced a standard on accounting in the General Government sector, which provides a presentation on a basis aligned to the GFS, and is

currently considering amendments to AAS31. It is anticipated a replacement standard will be released that will also achieve alignment with the GFS framework.

In reply to **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH** (6 December 2006).

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In regard to the question regarding the breakdown of the \$7.284 million described as 'Asset write-downs and transfers' in the Cash Flow Reconciliation, the table below shows the breakdown of the amount which relates to the transfer between government agencies:

Agency	Reason	2005-06
		\$'000
Department of Treasury and Finance	The <i>Government Gazette</i> (dated 9 June 2006) reported that the assets, rights or liabilities of the Minister for Industry and Trade or the Minister for Economic Development attributable to any contract or other instrument entered into or created in relation to the administration or application of the Industry Investment Attraction Fund, the Rail Reform Transition Program or the Structural Adjustment Fund for South Australia were transferred to the Treasurer effective from 1 July 2005.	6,367
Department of Premier and Cabinet	The <i>Government Gazette</i> (dated 22 September 2005) reported that the employees of the Department of Premier and Cabinet who worked in the Population Unit and Immigration SA were transferred to the Department of Trade and Economic Development to formulate the Population and Migration Division effective from 1 October 2005.	270
Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation	The <i>Government Gazette</i> (dated 1 December 2005) reported that the Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation was established and assumed responsibility for the Osborne Maritime Precinct. Net assets associated with this program were transferred from the Department of Trade and Economic Development to the Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation as at 30 November 2005.	641
Primary Industries and Resources SA	The <i>Government Gazette</i> (dated 23 March 2006) reported the resignation of the previous Minister for Industry and Trade and the appointment of a new Minister. Due to the change, the former Minister of Industry and Trade's Office budget was transferred to Primary Industries and Resources South Australia (PIRSA) effective from 1 April 2006.	6
Total		7,284

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Pursuant to section 131 of the Local Government Act 1999 the following 2005-06 annual reports of Local Councils:

Port Pirie Regional Council
Robe, District Council of

By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Mental Health Reform 2007-12—Social Inclusion Action Plan

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

Award of Route Service Licence on Adelaide-Port Augusta Scheduled Airline Route
Town of Walkerville—Local Heritage Supplementary Plan Amendment Report
Addendum to the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure Annual Report 2005-06

By the Minister for Energy (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Inquiry into ETSA Utilities' Network Performance and Customer Response January 2006

By the Attorney-General (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Security and Investigation Agents—Licensed Agents and Process Servers

Rules of Court—

District Court—Application for Review

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

Regulations under the following Acts—
Botanic and State Herbarium—General
South Australian Health Commission—Single Room

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Liquor Licensing—Naracoorte Area.

MENTAL HEALTH REFORM

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: In August 2005, I asked Monsignor David Cappo and the Social Inclusion Board to prepare advice to the state government on how to reform South Australia's mental health system. Today, I am pleased to table that advice in the form of the report 'Stepping Up: a social inclusion action plan for mental health reform 2007-2012' and to announce that the state government will commit to an investment of \$43.6 million as a first step towards major reform of our mental health system.

The Social Inclusion Board undertook a wide-ranging consultation process that involved more than 1 400 people. Based on its investigations, the board's report makes 41 recommendations focusing on:

- implementing a 'stepped' system of care with community mental health teams at the centre;
- tackling the needs of patients with severe and ongoing conditions by having a focused response to approximately 800 people with chronic and complex needs;
- aligning the South Australian mental health system with the COAG National Mental Health Action Plan; and
- redeveloping the Glenside Hospital Campus as a centre for specialist mental health services.

The measures the state government is announcing today will see 33 of the 41 recommendations adopted, even before the June budget. Normally, these measures would be announced in the budget process and through the budget process but, as a signal of our resolve, we are committing to 33 of the 41 recommendations in advance of the budget. So, this is a significant start to implementing a blueprint to reform the state's mental health care services.

The government will continue to consider the implementation of the remaining recommendations through the budget process. The government is today committing to the centrepiece of the action plan, which is the 'stepped care' model that seeks to fill the current gap between community care and hospital care. The proposed stepped system contains five different graduating levels of care: 24-hour supported accommodation; community rehabilitation centres; intermediate-care beds; acute-care beds; and secure-care beds.

These steps are designed to provide people with the most appropriate type of care to their mental health needs at any given time. They allow people to get the support they need when they need it, and they are aimed at helping people to stabilise and recover rather than be caught in a revolving door of becoming very ill, spending time in hospital and then returning immediately home without adequate support at different levels—either intermediate care or, of course, community care.

For instance, those who may be ready to be discharged from an acute-care hospital bed, but still require significant support before they return home, will have alternative care when needed. They will be able to be admitted to intermediate care, which is short term, fairly intensive care led by nurses. People who need longer-term assistance to rehabilitate will also be able to enter a community rehabilitation centre which provides for stays of about six months with therapeutic services provided on site. The system is also designed to work in the opposite direction, by allowing people to be admitted to community rehabilitation services or intermediate facilities before they reach crisis point and before they have to be admitted into an acute bed in hospital through our emergency departments.

This is a ground-breaking action plan and one that I believe will lead to the greatest reform of the South Australian mental health system in decades. I am delighted today to announce that we are committed to implementing the reform recommended by Monsignor Cappo and the Social Inclusion Board. I am told that the reform of the mental health system proposed in this first response to the plan will deliver an estimated 76 additional beds across all five levels of care, bringing the total number across the adult mental health system to about 506. The state government's \$43.6 million funding package includes:

- \$18.2 million for 90 new intermediate-care beds, with 60 at four centres across Adelaide and 30 in country hospitals;
- \$20.46 million for an extra 73 beds in 24-hour supported accommodation across Adelaide;
- \$1.84 million to allow a smooth changeover between the current system and the new five tiers;
- \$1.6 million to place eight mental health nurse practitioners in regional areas over the next four years; and
- \$1.47 million to provide priority access to services for about 800 people with chronic and complex needs, including those who also have drug and alcohol problems, a history of homelessness, or who may be involved in the criminal justice system.

The focus on those with chronic and complex needs will help provide more consistent treatment to prevent relapses for these patients, and to reduce their repeat admissions to hospital. Those in need will be identified and then given priority access to care services in order to help them out of hospital and improve their quality of life.

The development of new 24-hour supported-accommodation facilities will also be invaluable in providing for these people. The new system will build upon the three community rehabilitation centres that the state government is establishing across Adelaide, for up to 60 people at a time who need extra support. People who are ready to leave the intermediate care facilities, but are still not ready to go home, will be able to access services at these rehabilitation centres.

As announced during the March 2006 state election campaign, the Glenside campus will remain the site for specialist mental health services in South Australia. So, Glenside will remain at the very heart of our mental health system in this state. The rural and remote service will be retained, and drug and alcohol in-patient services will be provided on the campus—recognising the importance of treating people with both conditions. A master plan for the Glenside campus will be announced later this year.

The state government has already invested in the mental health system in South Australia. Let me just go through some of the things that we have announced and funded in recent times. The new Margaret Tobin Centre, which has 40 adult mental health beds, is now one of the best acute mental health facilities in Australia. I am looking forward to opening the Margaret Tobin Centre in the next couple of weeks. The Repatriation General Hospital also has a new facility consisting of 30 state of the art mental health beds. We have invested more than \$19.9 million in the most recent budget for an additional 56 mental health workers to support GP surgeries and to provide therapy for children and young people. We are employing more than 80 additional mental health workers across the system as a result of a \$10 million investment in late 2005, and we are supporting non-government organisations through an injection of \$25 million (a one-off injection) to help deliver mental health support services in the community.

The government has also recognised the importance of mental health to the community by appointing Gail Gago as the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I think that it is extraordinarily juvenile to say that against another female member of parliament in that way. I think it is a disgrace, an absolute disgrace. Our next step, announced today, will be the start of an historic change to mental health services in this state. It will put people with a mental illness at the centre of care

services in this state. It will allow them, their families and carers to enjoy a better quality of life.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank Monsignor David Cappo and the Social Inclusion Board for their dedication to, and passion for, mental health reform in South Australia. I would also like to thank the many consumers, carers, clinicians and experts who have so willingly contributed their experience to developing this report.

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I bring up the annual report for 2005-06 of the committee.

Report received.

HICKS, Mr D.

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): I give notice that, on Thursday 22 February, I will move:

That as members of the South Australian parliament we recognise the need to ask that members of the United States Congress take steps to bring about the return to Australia of Australian citizen David Hicks, a detainee held at Guantanamo Bay for more than five years, for prosecution here. I ask that the South Australian House of Assembly particularly recognise that:

- (a) the recently announced rules for Guantanamo Bay detainee trials will not afford David Hicks, or other detainees, a fair hearing, consistent with international legal standards Australian law. For example, Military Commission rules that permit hearsay evidence and evidence obtained by coercion and that restrict access to certain evidence violate essential guarantees of independence and impartiality.
- (b) there is an understanding that there was significant opposition in Congress to the Military Commissions Act 2006 in part because it denies rights, including resort to habeas corpus, to non-US citizens and does not adequately guard against mistreatment of prisoners.
- (c) Judiciary Committee Chairman Senator Leahy's concerns that, 'Not only would the military commission legislation before us immunise those who violated international law and stomped on basic American values, but it would allow them to use the evidence obtained in violation of basic principles of fairness and justice.'
- (d) the denial of justice in David Hicks' case erodes values and principles shared by Australia and the United States of America. We are concerned that the ongoing absence of justice in David Hicks' cases is serving to undermine international efforts to combat terrorism.
- (e) according to Australian psychiatrists, David Hicks is exhibiting signs of mental illness. This is not surprising because we understand that for much of the past five years he has been held in solitary confinement. Article 110 of the Third Geneva Convention, which is recognised in section 268.99 of the Australian Criminal Code, entitles David Hicks to immediate repatriation to Australia, pending trial before a properly constituted court of law.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I rise on a point of order. The honourable member is now entering into debate going far beyond what is required for a notice of motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is giving notice. As is the practice, the table staff will look at the motion and, given its length, probably edit it. That will happen, but there is nothing to prevent the member putting this on notice. The member for Morialta.

Ms SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate your judgment. My motion continues:

- (f) United States Congress colleagues and the Speaker Nancy Pelosi insist, perhaps by way of resolution in the Congress, that David Hicks be immediately repatriated to Australia. Expert legal commentary is that the allegations against David

Hicks can be considered under Australian criminal law. The issue of custody pending a trial would be considered by a properly constituted court. Be assured also that our anti-terrorism laws make provision for strict control orders to be imposed on terrorism suspects.

- (g) The return of David Hicks to Australia would be entirely consistent with the precedent established by the return of the British subjects held in similar circumstances, but failing return we ask that David Hicks be immediately put to trial before a properly constituted United States criminal court.
- (h) Current arrangements are unjust and contrary to principles that our respective parliaments have for centuries nurtured and cherished. Those principles provide a shining example to those who would seek to destroy or degrade our cherished heritage through arbitrary acts of violence.

QUESTION TIME

EMISSIONS TRADING

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Prior to pledging South Australian support for the Labor premiers' national emissions trading scheme, did the government consult with Mitsubishi and Holden regarding the impact the scheme would have on their continued ability to compete in the international export market and, if so, what was their response and, if not, why not? The federal Chamber of Automotive Industries, representing the automotive industry, has made a submission on the proposed premiers' national emissions trading scheme, raising concerns about its impact on the competitive balance between local manufacturers and importers in the automotive industry.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Isn't it interesting? As we heard yesterday, Alexander Downer came out against the weir. I was waiting for the story today about how he was split: he was going against his federal leader; he was going against Malcolm Turnbull, the alternative to Costello. In the election campaign, the Leader of the Opposition paraded himself in his former role as the champion in the fight against global warming. Yeah, right. When we announced our discussion paper, which we released last August, Morris Iemma, Premier of New South Wales, and John Thwaites, the then acting premier of Victoria, and I announced in Sydney a discussion paper, and we invited submissions and feedback from industry to that discussion paper. We still have not received a letter from the Leader of the Opposition; six months later we have heard nothing.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Lazy.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is lazy, as well as arrogant. Spin, spin, spin. That is all we get from the opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I welcome any submissions from the automotive industry. We are talking about setting up a national emissions trading scheme by the end of 2010. We have a discussion paper inviting feedback from industry and other members of the community. So that is what you do: when you release a discussion paper you get feedback before you set it up. What we want to do is make sure that we provide incentives for companies to do the right thing in terms of emissions. Not a tax on carbon, but incentives for companies to do the right thing.

When we released that discussion paper last August in Sydney, inviting comments from industry, the Prime Minister attacked me and the other premiers in parliament. So did a whole farrago of Liberals. It was the end of civilisation; it would destroy the economy. Now, of course, the Prime

Minister, apparently spooked by the opinion polls, believes that our position is not strong enough. He is going to have his own emissions trading scheme with global backing, so will you please work it out amongst yourselves. Are you for tackling climate change or are you against it? Work it out. In the meantime, I will give the parliament regular updates on when we receive a submission from the state opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HEALTH SERVICES, NORTHERN SUBURBS

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Minister for Health. How is the government improving public cardiovascular services in the northern suburbs of Adelaide?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): The member for Napier is a great advocate on behalf of his constituents in the northern suburbs. Last night I had the pleasure of opening a new \$2.5 million high-level cardiovascular intervention service established at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. This is the first interventional cardiac service for Adelaide's northern suburbs and it will allow people who need urgent treatment to receive it at Lyell McEwin, rather than having to transfer to other hospitals such as the RAH or the QEH, as they have done until recently. Immediate access to treatment for coronary patients has a major impact on their survival rates, but such high-level cardiovascular treatment needs to be supported by experienced doctors, specialised equipment and, of course, ongoing care.

If that support is not available, patients have to be transferred to facilities that can offer the service. I had the pleasure of meeting yesterday one of the first patients of that service, Mr James Greenwood. Mr Greenwood told me that he felt unwell on 3 January this year. He had had pains in his chest at 7 o'clock and turned up at the hospital at 9 o'clock. Medical staff quickly recognised that he was about to have a major heart attack, and by 10 o'clock he was under a local anaesthetic having an angiogram performed by the head of the cardiology department. He was sitting in the surgery, the cardiologist was working on him with a catheter into his heart, and he was watching the whole operation being performed on a television screen in front of him.

By that afternoon he had been taken out of surgery and was in recovery and by Saturday he was healthy enough to be discharged from the hospital. Had it not been for this service, he would have needed to be transferred to a different hospital and probably would not have avoided having that heart attack. The rehabilitation from such an attack could have taken weeks, not days, if it had occurred at all. The establishment of the cardiovascular intervention suite coincides with the development of a department of cardiology at Lyell McEwin, with Dr Margaret Arstall recently appointed as the new department head. Dr Arstall is a home-grown cardiac specialist who attended Elizabeth High School and was actually born at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. I was very pleased to meet her father, who was there yesterday proudly supporting her.

More than 110 procedures have already been performed in the service, which will operate 24 hours a day later this year. It is estimated that 30 per cent of all cardiac disease-related hospitalisations or deaths in metropolitan Adelaide occur in the northern suburbs. This service is supported by an eight-bed coronary care unit and an 18-bed cardiac step-down unit to provide continued support for patients following any cardiac interventional treatment. This is not to say that

this is the only way we should treat cardiac problems: all of us should eat and exercise properly and make sure that we look after our own general health—

The Hon. M.J. Wright interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As I do, as the Minister for Industrial Relations reminds me. This is yet another step in the government's drive to improve and expand the services of our public hospitals, in this case, the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier confirm that the Labor premiers' own modelling estimates that, under the premiers' national emissions trading scheme, wholesale electricity prices across the national electricity market in each year are expected to be on average 17 to 22 per cent higher than they would otherwise have been? The federal Chamber of Automotive Industries has stated in its submission on the premiers' national emissions trading scheme that wholesale electricity prices across the national electricity market in each year are expected to be on average 17 to 22 per cent higher than they would otherwise have been.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): That is not what I was told, but I can reveal to the parliament today that the best advice I have is that the Leader of the Opposition's plan for a nuclear power station in Adelaide would increase the wholesale price of electricity in this state by 100 per cent. I do not believe that the member for Waite, the shadow minister for energy, would have come out and announced his plan without discussing it with the Leader of the Opposition. Members opposite would not be worthy of electing if they did not discuss it amongst themselves. That is what the Liberals offer: a 100 per cent increase in the price of wholesale electricity in South Australia; and that is why we will not have a bar of it.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker. The Premier was asked a direct question about the impact of carbon trading, and the diatribe he is going on with now has no relevance to the question at all.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: And it is untrue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is debating the answer.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I beg your leave, sire; but the fact is that what was being put out by the opposition was directly about reducing emissions—because that's why they will go to nuclear power.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has completed his answer. The member for Mawson.

MAJOR EVENTS

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What action is the state government taking to attract local and interstate visitors—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has the call.

Mr BIGNELL: What action is the state government taking to attract local and interstate visitors to participate in

the range of major events and festivals being held in South Australia in the first few months of the year?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): Sir, I thank the member for Mawson for his question. As you know, he is a great supporter of major events, particularly the sporting events, at which he is a well-known visitor and enthusiast—I might even say a celebrity at some of them. Our festivals and events are not only good for the local community but are especially good for visitors who come here, whether on business or other trips, but who also stay longer when they know there are special events during the first three months of the year. This time a year ago many thousands of visitors enjoyed visits to Adelaide. They came for the whole range of events such as WOMAD, Fringe, Festival—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I cannot hear the minister's answer. The house will come to order. The Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Thank you. I will repeat that, sir, in case anyone missed what I was saying. This time a year ago many thousands of visitors enjoyed Adelaide when there was a feast of activity during the first three months. Indeed, in the first three months of last year the Adelaide hotels noticed the highest occupancy rate in nearly a decade, when one after another special event flowed on and people were staying for many events in series. This year we are again using a strategic approach to market our brilliant blend of events, which are going through the next month, extending from Clipsal, through to WOMAD, and also the World Police and Fire Games. Rather than treating each event separately we are working with event organisers and the tourism industry to spend funds concurrently and work in partnership to promote the events, and we use this under the banner, of course, of Brilliant Adelaide, which allows us to market all these activities together. This year we are investing \$370 000, working to promote events right through until April, when, of course, we will also have the Rugby Sevens for the first time, a stellar event that will attract visitors from both interstate and overseas. On top of that, this year we are using a new modality to promote the event to people who are increasingly technology savvy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! These conversations occurring across the chamber while the minister is attempting to answer a question are highly disorderly. That is enough of it. And members will stay quiet while I am on my feet. The Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Thank you for your protection, sir. I was saying that this year for the first time people will be able to use modern technology, available through the 3G type of mobile phones. The technology we are using, of course, is called Podmo, and that will be used for visitors and locals alike, and they can check programs of events, they can search for nearby restaurants, they can access discounts on attractions, and can look for accommodation, and even listen to the South Australian bands and watch movies, all on their mobile phones.

I am delighted that the state government is actually working with the local, young business operation called Kukan Studio, to help develop this technology. The program means that there will be access to local maps, public transport information and news, about the brilliant blend of activities

in Adelaide, and it is all freely available through Podmo. An added bonus is the brilliant music, video clips and more that are available, and this smorgasbord of goodies on their mobile phones during the Brilliant Adelaide events will continue right through to April. This includes over 100 films, animations, MP3s, and more, all created by leading South Australian artists. I would be happy to give members—those young techno-savvy members of the house—details of those 30 hot spots. I particularly note that there is a hot spot by the railway station and the Convention Centre, where some of the big events will be held, particularly the Police and Fire Games, around coffee shops and bars.

Beyond the creativity of this mobile technology, which I am sure we will all be ready to access, Brilliant Adelaide events will be engaged and enjoyed by 300 000 international, local and interstate visitors. We have been working, through mail and email campaigns and inserts into newspapers, to promote all of these activities. All of this is backed by our web site, SouthAustralia.com. While the campaign covers events early in the year, we have more on the horizon, of course, with us all looking forward to the first Rugby 7s event at Easter. This is a very important event for South Australia, but let us remember that the Brilliant series of events do not just occur in Adelaide: they occur around the state. There are more than 100 regional events and festivals throughout South Australia, all of them supported by the state government, amounting to \$640 000 worth of funding. I encourage you to get into Podmo and enjoy access to this wonderful information.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Premier outline to the house how he expects the South Australian car manufacturers and the automotive industry to remain competitive in the international market with electricity prices that are some 17 to 22 per cent higher?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Let me just draw people's attention back a few years when the Leader of the Opposition was one of the most senior and powerful ministers in the former government. Do you remember that? That former government announced before the 1997 election that it would never sell ETSA. In fact, not only did the then Premier—A0 these days, and doing a terrific job in New York—

Mr Williams: Mr Speaker—

The Hon. M.D. RANN: No; this is very relevant.

Mr WILLIAMS: Point of order, Mr Speaker. There is no relevance, even though it may be relatively recent history, to the question about the future of the automotive industry in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! I will determine that. I will hear the Premier's answer.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The then deputy premier said, 'No, no, no, full stop. No sale of ETSA.' But this minister was one of a group of ministers who, after the election, was absolutely the power behind selling off ETSA. And what did they tell the people of this state? Competition was going to keep down power prices. And what happened? There was a massive increase in power prices because of the Iain Evans plan. So, do not talk to me about raising power prices. We are the ones who spent years, day by day, fighting the Iain Evans sell-off of electricity in this state, and we will never let him forget it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

STATE STRATEGIC PLAN, WOMEN

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Can the Minister for the Status of Women advise what the government is doing to achieve the target specific to women in South Australia's Strategic Plan?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Transport and I warn the member for MacKillop. When a minister is answering a question I do not expect this hurling of insults at each other across the chamber. If you have an argument, take it outside the chamber. The Minister for the Status of Women.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for the Status of Women): Thank you, sir. As you would know, the state government is committed to ensuring equity for women in South Australia. Indeed, South Australia's revised strategic plan strengthens our commitment, with targets focused on women on government boards and committees, at executive level in the public service, the numbers of women elected to state parliament and a supplementary target on women in local government.

For the most part, we are tracking very well with something like 42 per cent of women making up the membership on state government boards and committees. We also have a new target in relation to women in the Public Service and that is 50 per cent of the executive level positions being made up of women, including chief executives, by the year 2014. So, there are great examples of best practice strategies under way to achieving this target, including leadership training, board training and the sorts of innovative family friendly practices that facilitate and encourage a woman's decision to pursue career advancement. It is clear that the issue for many women is often not the lack of ability or competence, but often it is an issue of confidence. Programs aimed at lifting confidence levels in mid-level public servants have also been initiated. However, a more difficult target will be that of achieving 50 per cent of women elected to the state parliament. In the Labor Party, we are far closer than those opposite to achieving the Strategic Plan target of 50 per cent female members of parliament. In the House of Assembly, we have something like 46.4 per cent representation of women.

Sadly, the figures are not so good on the other side of the chamber, and I am told that they are likely to go down from three to two and, if the Hon. Caroline Schaefer in another place is not replaced by a woman, the opposition's total number will go from five to three. The weekend, in particular, was a dark one for women in the Liberal Party here in South Australia. How many women senators are likely to be elected this year? None. It is quite unfortunate that female Liberal parliamentarians seem to be an endangered species.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: A point of order, sir: I am not quite sure how this minister is responsible to the house for the Liberal Party.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: All South Australian Labor—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Just wait a minute. The minister has to be careful that in her answer she is not entering into debate. I will listen carefully to what the minister has to say and I will pull her up if that is required. The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir. All South Australian Labor senators currently are women. In local government, we now have a supplementary measure to help boost the numbers of women involved. Numbers of elected members are currently sitting at around 27 per cent. Last Friday, I had the pleasure of attending the inaugural AGM of the South Australian branch of the Australian Local Government Women's Association and launching a new state government funded kit aimed at involving women who are interested in local government. Let me say that this group of women is very much committed to increasing female representation, not just in the elected ranks but also in administrative roles. With just one woman chief executive for 68 councils, their task will not be an easy one but it is one that they are firmly committed to, as am I and as is the government.

This government recognises that promotions should be made on the basis of merit. We also recognise that the most meritorious candidates are not always the ones putting up their hands and being promoted and that is why our Strategic Plan targets serve as a reminder to us all that, with so many outstanding South Australian women across so many fields, we can find meritorious women if we look for them. It is obviously something that the Liberal Party cannot be bothered doing.

The SPEAKER: That last remark was debate.

EMISSIONS TRADING

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Has the government undertaken any economic modelling to determine the impact of the premiers' national emissions trading scheme on the South Australian automotive industry and, in particular, the potential impact on employment levels within that industry? If so, will he release the details?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Let me go through this very slowly for the Leader of the Opposition. I am sure you have asked the same question of the Prime Minister with his national emissions trading scheme. If you do not support a national emissions trading scheme, have the guts to say so. Come out today and say that you disagree with the Prime Minister and with the federal cabinet. At the moment we have federal Liberals supporting a national emissions trading scheme.

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop has a point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: I would hate the Premier to break his record, sir. He has not answered a question yet, but we were hoping that today he might answer one.

The SPEAKER: Order! That is a frivolous point of order. The Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is quite unfair, particularly for someone so sensitive. We have the federal Liberal government promising a national emissions trading scheme—

Mr Williams: International.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Oh, yes, so it's okay if it's international. We have the federal Howard government promising a national emissions trading scheme linked to an international scheme, even though it would not sign Kyoto and we have federal Labor committed to a national emissions trading scheme. What we have done is issue a discussion paper from the states and we look forward to submissions

from industries so that we can ensure that it works for industry and for the environment. That is why we have an incentive scheme rather than a tax. If the Leader of the Opposition is opposed to our model for an emissions trading scheme, perhaps he supports a carbon tax, and, if he does, let him come out and say so.

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): Can the Attorney-General inform the house about the appointment of several female judicial officers to the Supreme Court and District Court benches during his time in government?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): South Australia's legal community features many outstanding women barristers and solicitors. Since this Labor government first came to office in 2002, I have worked hard to ensure that suitably qualified women are not overlooked for judicial appointments.

In 2002, there was only one female justice on the Supreme Court bench, the Hon. Justice Margaret Nyland. I wanted to change that. With the appointment of the Hon. Justice Patricia Kelly, the Hon. Justice Robyn Layton and the Hon. Justice Ann Vanstone to the Supreme Court bench, we now have four female justices. That is the highest number of women on the Supreme Court bench in the nation and, indeed, is a milestone worth celebrating. Each new justice has brought experience and knowledge to the Supreme Court.

Late last year, the Premier sought more women to balance the bench. I was pleased to appoint two women: the Hon. Justice Patricia Kelly and Chief Magistrate Elizabeth Bolton to top jobs in this state earlier this year. The Hon. Justice Patricia Kelly had a long and successful career as a barrister and solicitor before her appointment as a judge of the District Court in 2003 and as a Supreme Court justice this year. Justice Kelly was admitted as a practitioner of the Supreme Court in 1974. She has been an admitted practitioner in South Australia, the Northern Territory, the Australian Capital Territory, Victoria and Queensland. She has worked in both public and private practice. In South Australia she has been a senior legal officer with the Equal Opportunity Commission, the Crown Solicitor's Office and the Crown Prosecutor's Office. Justice Kelly's skills were recognised with her appointment as Queen's Counsel in 2002.

Last week, I elevated Stipendiary Magistrate Liz Bolton to the position of Chief Magistrate, the first time a woman has headed a South Australian legal jurisdiction. Chief Magistrate Bolton was admitted to practice in 1985. She was an associate to Justice Jacobs of the South Australian Supreme Court before joining the DPP in 1987 as a prosecutor. In 1991 she joined the commonwealth DPP, where she worked in corporate prosecutions, including fraud. In 1995 she became the manager of the general prosecutions section in the commonwealth DPP and then the manager of the Darwin office of the commonwealth DPP. Magistrate Bolton has served as a magistrate in the Elizabeth and Christies Beach Magistrates Courts.

In 2005 we appointed Her Honour Judge Marie Shaw to the District Court bench. In 2004 I appointed Anne Bampton as a Master of the District Court. The Hon. Justice Robyn Layton was appointed to the Supreme Court bench in 2005. The Hon. Justice Ann Vanstone was appointed to the Supreme Court bench in 2003. In 2005 I appointed the Hon. Judge Leonie Farrell to the Industrial Court bench.

There have, of course, been many skilled female appointments to the Magistrates Court—our state's most important court, in my view. I am sure that the wealth of talented South Australian female lawyers will ensure that many more female judicial appointments will be made in the future.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, as the member for Bragg well knows, I offered Wendy Abraham appointment to the District Court bench in South Australia, I offered to make her a judge. No wonder opposition members are shifting uneasily in their seats: the ghost of Mary Jo Fisher's political career is hovering over them this day.

EMISSIONS TRADING

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Department of Treasury and Finance advised the government that, if a national emissions trading scheme is introduced, stamp duty could be applied? If yes, has Treasury provided any broad estimate of the possible revenue flows to budget? On 10 February *The Weekend Australian* reported that, under the states' plan, state governments are planning to raise revenue through stamp duties associated with emissions trading. The Western Australian Treasury has already drawn up its plans to tax carbon trading through stamp duty, and the states' agreement recommends that any revenue raised from the auction of carbon credits be given directly to the states.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I will take that question on notice and check what I have on file.

MATURE AGED EMPLOYMENT

Mr PICCOLO (Light): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. How is the government encouraging greater recognition by South Australian employers of the value of mature age workers?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the honourable member for his very important question. South Australia's demographics are changing rapidly. We have the oldest population in Australia, and it is ageing rapidly. We only have to look over at the other side to know that it is ageing very quickly, but they are an example that we can keep older people in the work force longer. They are a fine example of that—we just do not want to replace them.

It is expected that over the next 10 years about 250 000 in South Australia will be retiring from the work force and, quite simply, there will not be enough younger workers coming into the work force to replace those who will be retiring over the next few years. The implications of these facts are inescapable. This trend will have a profound effect on our labour force. Businesses and industries will need to keep older workers longer and they will need to attract mature age workers.

One of the government's strategies in assisting older job seekers to find work is through SA Works for Mature Aged People, which helps workers to develop new skills, to reskill and to build on existing skills. Last week I attended the first of a series of forums to be held in both metropolitan and regional areas, including the Barossa and the South-East—I know the member for Schubert will be very interested in this—specifically for the benefit of South Australian employers. It is an initiative of DFEEST. It is the Employment 40 Plus for Employers forum and it is designed to raise

awareness among employers of the need to prepare for the changing labour market by taking a positive approach and attitude to the hiring of mature age workers, as well as highlighting the advantages to the workplace of having a diverse workplace.

Mature age workers are sometimes overlooked because of negative perceptions about their capacity when compared to their younger counterparts. The Employment 40 Plus forums for employers are designed to disperse and dispel the myths surrounding mature age workers and better inform employers about the benefits of hiring and retaining older workers. Mature age workers possess a unique set of skills and personal attributes that make them extremely valuable in the workplace. They are generally very loyal, dedicated and committed to producing high quality work. Indeed, some employers already recognise that there is a competitive advantage to be gained by employing older workers and tapping into their invaluable expertise and experience. Evidence suggests that companies with an older workforce benefit from lower absenteeism, increased profitability and lower staff turnover. Some employers also recognise the value in having mature age workers involved in mentoring younger staff.

The government is committed to ensuring that older job seekers are able to gain vocational education and training to enable them to remain in or re-enter the workforce. Through programs such as Employment 40 Plus for employers, the state government will continue to assist employers to find ways to retain or recruit older workers so that South Australia can continue to enjoy sustained economic growth into the future and provide opportunities for all members of our community.

ROXBY DOWNS

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house as to how much funding the government is contributing to the desalination proposal as part of the expansion of Roxby, and can he advise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Could the deputy leader repeat her question, please? I could not hear.

Ms CHAPMAN: Certainly, sir. Can the Treasurer update the house as to how much funding the government is contributing to the desalination proposal as part of the expansion of Roxby, and can he advise where this funding is in the budget papers and in the mid-year budget review papers?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): That is a somewhat bizarre exchange between members.

The SPEAKER: Order! Calls to order about hurling insults across the chamber also apply to hurling pleasantries. The Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The government is still working through the scope and size of the desalination plant that would be required. As yet, we have not—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry, did you want me to answer the question, Vickie, or do you want to talk amongst yourselves? We have secured from the federal Labor Party a commitment to the project, consistent with the funding we have sought from the commonwealth government as a

contribution to the project. The final cost has not yet been determined because BHP is still working through the scope of the project, as are we, in terms of how much larger the plant would need to be to meet the water requirements of the Upper Spencer Gulf and the Eyre Peninsula should we choose to go ahead with that particular process.

Mr Pisoni: Build one in Adelaide!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What's his name—Pirone?

An honourable member: Pisoni.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: He always has something to say, hasn't he! The final details have not been worked through and the timing has not been decided, so therefore there is no provision in the budget or the mid-year budget review. Once we determine the final cost and what the state's contribution needs to be, we will then make the allocations, either from unallocated capital in the forward estimates or, if it is a recurrent payment stream, which it yet may be, we will make appropriate adjustments in our forward estimates, should that be the way to go.

I attended a BHP planning session on the Fleurieu Peninsula just a week ago where the BHP team assembled from around the world are currently working through on the EIS, working through on the desalination proposal and other proposals with the project. They are an incredibly dynamic group of people who are working on the largest mining development in the world's history. I was very pleased to be part of that session. One of the matters we did talk through was the desalination, but that has not as yet been decided, because we want to be in a position, if we can—did you want an answer?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We think it would be good public policy, if it is affordable and deliverable, to provide desalinated water to the Upper Spencer Gulf and to Eyre Peninsula, because I think Eyre Peninsula could benefit from water from that desalination plant, and I think that is worth doing.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Why are we taking so long, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks. Why are we taking so long? How can you be taken seriously as an alternative deputy premier of this state with stupid questions like that?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We are working on it—because BHP are working on it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Why aren't you running BHP?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly. I don't run BHP. We are working to BHP's time lines; we are working to BHP's needs; we are working with BHP on the largest desalination proposal in this nation's history, and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition asks why haven't we done it already. Fair dinkum, you would have to be one of the silliest members of this house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WELLINGTON WEIR

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

My question is to the Minister for the River Murray. When did the minister first receive advice that the chance of having

to build the weir at Pomanda Point was now less than 5 per cent?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): The issue of the chances of actually building a temporary weir at Wellington will be determined by the climatic conditions as they eventuate. We recently had a briefing with Dean Brown, a former premier of this state who, as the member would be aware, is the community liaison manager, working between the community and the government to ensure that issues that are raised by the community and those in government who are dealing with those issues can be connected.

In a meeting with Dean Brown that took place about a week and a half ago, maybe two weeks ago, there was consideration of what the percentage chance might be. There has been discussion about whether it is a 10 per cent chance or whether it is a 5 per cent chance, but the point of the matter is that it is a very low chance that we will have to build the weir. As a government we need to plan for that circumstance. I am pleased that the deputy leader has raised the issue because the situation is quite evident from the 12 January statement from the federal government, when the Hon. Mark Vaile, as the acting prime minister, and the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull made a statement at a press conference regarding the contingency planning that was necessary for establishing the weir.

The Hon. Mark Vaile said that the other key proposal being considered and feasibility being assessed was the building of a temporary weir near Wellington on the Murray River in South Australia which was secure—more secure as far as the ability to pump water out of the Murray into those storages for Adelaide. Malcolm Turnbull, on the same day, said the single biggest measure in terms of creating additional water availability was building a weir at Wellington. He also went on to say that that is probably the single most important piece of infrastructure as far as South Australia—as far as Adelaide is concerned because Adelaide draws in a drought year, such as the one we have been going through, up to 90 per cent of its water from the Murray River.

So, the Prime Minister supports the contingency planning and construction of a temporary weir, if necessary. The new federal Water Resources Minister supports contingency planning for a temporary weir. Unfortunately, from last night on the TV it has become evident that, after a couple of hundred protesters arrived at Parliament House, Alexander Downer has now caved in. Clearly, Alexander Downer has demonstrated that political expediency, particularly in an election year, will always prevail over the tough decisions. This is why the Premier is right to demand independent management of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. There is a low likelihood of a weir having to be built at Wellington.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: And so do you!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: MacKillop, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance of the Attorney-General, thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for the River Murray.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: I will reiterate: this government does not want to build a weir at Wellington. The opposition is oblivious of the fact that there is a severe and

extreme drought gripping this nation. In case the opposition has not noticed, the levels of the Lower Lakes, Lake Alexandria and Lake Albert are dropping rapidly. Those levels are dropping because of drought, not because of a weir that has not been built.

Ms CHAPMAN: Will the Minister for the River Murray confirm that the estimated cost of a weir at Pomanda Point could be \$130 million, notwithstanding the Premier's announcement last year that it would be \$20 million?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The importance of getting to the public information that is correct and accurate cannot be understated. There has been advice that a temporary weir built of sheet pile at a narrower section of the river may have cost \$20 million. There are now Alexander Downer's comments yesterday that he has been advised that it may cost up to \$130 million. When I receive the advice from the consultants about what is the most likely option and the best option for building a temporary weir, should it be necessary, I will provide that information to the public and I will provide the costs of that design and that weir. Once I have that design, I will be releasing that information.

HOSPITALS, CLASSIFICATION DISPUTE

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: —is to the Minister for Health. Why has the dispute over the classification and pay structures for radiographers and cardiac technicians at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital not been resolved in the past two months? On 5 December 2006, staff across 24 health professions walked off the job, seeking reclassification and a pay increase to bring them in line with other states. The Minister for Industrial Relations announced to the media on 18 December 2006 that the dispute was resolved.

The directors of cardiology at the Lyell McEwin and Queen Elizabeth hospitals have written to the CEO of Health, Dr Tony Sherbon, on 9 December 2006, 8 January 2007 and 9 February 2007, warning that if the reclassification of pay scales for radiographers and cardiac technicians was not followed through, there would be 'an imminent collapse in these technical services'. I am advised that the most recent letter alleges that the chief executive officer has not even responded to or acknowledged the previous two letters.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): Before getting to the particulars of the issue, in the health sector in Australia there is a range of shortages across a range of professions. As a result, various states, in order to fill their vacancies, have been putting up the salaries they have been paying to a whole range of professions, so there is very fierce competition across Australia.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That competition occurs at an international level as well. There are two or three things that are driving that competition for clinicians. One is the ageing of the clinical workforce itself and the fact that many people are retiring or getting to retirement age or wanting to reduce their hours. Secondly, we have an increase in demand for services in Australia, and in South Australia in particular because of the ageing of our population, which has been

mentioned before. Thirdly, and most importantly, the federal government a number of years ago reduced the number of training positions that were available to young people wanting to become doctors and other clinicians.

It is a matter of great regret and a great tragedy for Australia that we are now having to import clinicians from other countries to provide services to people in South Australia. There are obviously great people, like the member for Adelaide, who have been brought in to Australia to provide some of those services, but it is a tragedy that we have to rely on importing people to provide services in our hospitals. We have a surfeit of young people who have the skills and the talents and the abilities and the desires to provide those services. The tragedy is that they cannot get into our universities because the places have not been created by the federal government. However, the federal government has just recently expanded the number of places, and that is a good thing. But the benefits of that will not come through for a particular period of time.

In relation to the particular matter the member referred to, as the member would know, an enterprise bargaining agreement process was gone through towards the end of last year with the PSA, and these people, as I understand it, are generally members of the PSA, though some are members of the other union, the HSU, and the PSA recommended to its members to accept the package that was given. The HSU took a contrary position. After the ballot came in, there was an overwhelming vote across the public sector for the package that was offered, and that was agreed to. Since that time there have been a number of breakouts in locations where individuals and groups of health professionals have sought additional support.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I can assure the house that the government is working through these issues in the best possible way to get outcomes which are for the benefit of the people in the state.

E. COLI OUTBREAK

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Now that we have 11 reported cases of E. coli and the food source is still a mystery, will the minister fund a public advertising campaign to highlight the need for all of those people who may be suffering severe gastroenteritis and cramps at home to come forward to see a general practitioner? General practitioners only have been instructed by the Health Commission to collect faecal samples for E. coli testing of all patients who present with severe abdominal cramps or blood in their diarrhoea. I have been advised by the public health department in a briefing arranged with them that this has not resulted in any increase in samples being sent in for testing, and the greater the number of people coming forward to GPs with the illness the greater the chance of pinpointing the toxic resource. Mr Speaker, as you would know, the Premier has placed public announcements and advertising on issues of water on television, radio and print, at great cost.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leave is withdrawn. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for the question. The issue of E. coli is one of some concern at the moment. There have been a dozen or so cases

identified in South Australia. The public health department has been working with the medical profession and with those patients to try to identify a common source, as the member said. They have yet to be able to identify a particular source, though they have taken something like 200 food samples from across the metropolitan area trying to identify some source, without success.

The 12 or so people have now contracted the illness over a period of, I think, from memory, about six weeks or thereabouts. Those people are right across the metropolitan area, particularly in the northern part of the metropolitan area, but that is where the majority of South Australians are, and there have been one or two, I think, in the country. They have interviewed all of those people. They have checked what they have eaten, and they have failed to find anything particular that they have in common. They do not shop in the same shops, they have not been eating the same kinds of food other than general things like lettuce and carrots, and all those kinds of things, particularly fruit and vegetables. All of those people seem to consume a reasonably healthy diet of those things. So the public health officials have been checking out those kinds of products. As I said, they have checked 200 or so food samples without finding any link. It is highly probable that they will not establish any link. It is not even certain, of course, that the E. coli that has been found in each of those people is linked. They may be separate sources.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: But they have not been able to establish that. This is an issue. I know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is desperate to try to make a political point out of this particular range of E. coli cases. She has been trying now for something like four to six weeks to make it political. In fact, this is actually a health issue, and it has been handled appropriately and competently by the—

Ms Chapman: You are the Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, I am the Minister for Health, thank you very much for reminding me. I am the Minister for Health and I trust the advice of the public health officials, the people who are skilled in these areas. I have said to them, 'You tell me what we need to do and we will do it.' There is no budget issue. If they want to advertise, there is money there to advertise. I find it extraordinary that the only point of criticism that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition can make in relation to this issue is that I have not agreed to a large advertising budget. Every other time, of course, that we advertise as a government, we get banged. But, I guess I can arrange an advertisement with the Premier telling people to wash their lettuce and carrots of a night. And I am sure that he would be happy to do it, but that is all that we could actually put in the advertising because we do not know what the source is. If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is seriously thinking that someone who is seriously ill with gastro and diarrhoea would not go to see a doctor unless they saw an advertisement with Mike Rann in it telling them to do it, I think she is seriously misjudging the average intelligence of South Australians.

INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL AND VETERINARY SCIENCE

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Minister for Health. Will the minister advise the house when the Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science will be amalgamated with other research institutions and operate as a single entity? Will the minister

assure the house that the institute will retain its name, and will he rule out any cuts to its funding and service delivery?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for the question. During the last budget I announced that we would bring together three pathology services. We have the IMVS in South Australia, which is the largest service providing a huge range of services right across the state. It is the service of choice for the majority of people in country South Australia, for example. It provides an excellent service and is able to convey data electronically into a GP's surgery, and is well valued. We have two smaller services: one at the Women's and Children's Hospital and a third at Flinders which, I think, provides some services, from memory, to the Repatriation Hospital. It seemed very sensible that we bring these services together so that we could have one statewide pathology service. We are working our way through that. There are a number of technical/legal issues which are being worked through. There is not a rush to do this; there is not particular rush to do it.

In terms of the name, IMVS, I have said to those organising the amalgamation that I wish to retain the IMVS name because it is a well-known name. It would be silly to destroy the commercial benefits that accrue to the state from having that brand. IMVS, of course, provides services outside the state, and I introduced legislation sometime last year to ensure that it could do that on a legal basis. We want to maintain that brand. Of course we are looking for efficiencies but not as a result of reducing services. We would want to see services maintained and, in fact, expanded, and I know the IMVS has quite strong ambitions as to areas that they may expand.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the minister confirm that there will be no sale of any of the land at the Glenside Hospital site and that the whole property will be maintained for mental health purposes?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition understands, in his ministerial statement today, the Premier indicated that Glenside would be maintained as a key part of the mental health service. I will ask the minister responsible for mental health to give the honourable member a reply.

Ms CHAPMAN: My question is again to the Minister for Health. Does the report on mental health that we received today support the government's September announcement that it will transfer drug and alcohol services to the Glenside site? If not, will that relocation proceed and, if it does, what extra provision will be made for security at that site once the service has been relocated there?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I thank the member for her question. I do not believe today's statement addressed that particular issue but I am happy to get a response for her from the minister in the other place.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

STUART ELECTORATE

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I want to raise a couple of issues this afternoon, one of which relates to the ongoing battle that my constituents in Spalding are having with their aim to retain the school bus. I want to read from a letter, which I received recently, as follows:

We held our monthly Governing Council meeting last night at which there was some correspondence regarding the Spalding Primary School Bus Run. I have attached with this cover letter a copy of the correspondence we have received from the Education Department updating the progress of the proposed termination of the bus run. We discussed in some depth last night, the scenarios should the bus run be terminated and all feel that it is a vital part of the school environment we can't afford to lose and therefore we are very keen to do all that we can to retain our bus run.

They have right on their side. It is a time of difficult economic circumstances in many parts of rural South Australia. It is unconscionable, unwise and unfair to take away school buses.

The second issue I raise concerns the call by some councils, including the Port Augusta council, for a limited curfew so that delinquents and other hobos who are racing around the streets terrorising the neighbourhood are dealt with and controlled.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Hobos? Could you be more specific?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: They are villains and scoundrels—that is what they are—and they have no regard for the welfare of ordinary hardworking people. They have no regard for their privacy, property or wellbeing. It is no good for government members, bleeding hearts and do-gooders saying that these are proposed draconian measures. They have all had an opportunity to do something about it and they have failed miserably and the long-suffering public are sick and tired of the approach we are taking.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Zero tolerance.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I would put the birch on some of them if I had my way. I make no apology for that. About a week ago *The Advertiser* carried the headline 'Statewide curfew call for youth' and it talks about the Playford mayor and other mayors around South Australia, including the City of Port Augusta. A few days later the City of Port Augusta got prime time on the AM program right across Australia. The mayor had something to say about these interesting characters who are walking the streets of Port Augusta and other cities, including five year old and eight year old children, unsupervised. What can the police do with them? One of the things that should happen is that, if the children do not go to school, the parents should lose the money they get paid for their children to go to school. That is the first thing.

The second thing that should happen is that, if the children do not go to school, they should not receive any CDEP money. The police are at their wit's end in relation to these particular children. If a gang of children ranging in age from five to nine years was walking the streets with lumps of wood, I can assure you they are not industrious little apprentice carpenters on their way to work; they are up to no good. We have hardened eight year old criminals. These are the children that I was targeting back in 1990, and if you trace them you will see that they are now those youth who are embroiled in the justice system. That is where they are going

to end up. They are going to end up in a correctional services institution. Not only is it unfair but it is unreasonable, and I will continue to raise these issues. By way of an example, an interview involving one of my constituents states:

'I am angry and petrified they could come back, but will fight the best I can.' Those were the words of a 78-year-old home invasion victim who was subjected to a terrifying attack on Friday night. The *Transcontinental* had an exclusive interview with the victim and her 77-year-old husband. . . The attack has left the victims calling for tougher penalties for offenders saying that current laws are too lenient. 'It's time the lash was legal again,' the female victim said. 'I hope the justice system of this country wakes up and makes the punishment fit the crime.'

These people were at home. The offenders came into their home, assaulted them with a broom handle, stole their money and got away. The time has come to deal with these scoundrels.

Time expired.

SCHOOLS, MORPHETT VALE HIGH

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Last sitting week, I advised the house of a problem that had arisen at Morphett Vale High School as a result of falling enrolments. I advised the house that students would not be missing out on their subjects. I indicated that I would obtain the details of how this was being done from the district director the following week.

I was a little optimistic in believing that the answer for all students would be finalised in a week, as a couple of students are still sorting out their preference. But what I know so far is that the first action of the department was to provide an additional 0.6 teacher to reinstate the core subjects of maths and science. Students were then asked whether they would like to reconsider their choices in light of the different enrolment patterns from what was expected. If they wanted to maintain their existing preference, options for doing this would be explored. This is not peculiar to Morphett Vale High School: it happens in many schools around the state and probably around the country.

I commend all at Morphett Vale High School, the surrounding schools and the district office, who worked so hard to minimise the impact of this unfortunate situation. My dealings with parents show that overwhelmingly they understood the problem that the school encountered and appreciated the efforts to support their children's education. A much publicised demonstration attracted only one parent couple. A few students showed their support for the school but most got on with their business.

The local federal member has done everything he could to turn a difficult situation into a political situation, and to turn into a crisis something which is not easy for everybody but which occurs, as I have said, in many schools (secondary and primary) at the beginning of a year. Although people might quickly have thought it was a crisis, the situation was managed through.

This invites scrutiny of what exactly is going on with the federal Liberals and their attitude to schools, to our students and to where they think schools should be going in the future. It invites us to think about the way the federal government very clearly delineates the sort of education it believes that particular students are entitled to. It also invites us to think about the way John Howard and his cohorts like to play down issues of class in Australia whilst quietly going about reinforcing the walls around the haves to keep the have-nots out.

I have spoken in this place many times before about Prime Minister Howard's blatant anti-education stance, and I can assure members that, when he is telling kids that university is not the only way to improve their future, when he is saying that more students should be looking towards on-the-job training, and when he insists that there is too much emphasis on a university education in Australia today, he is not suggesting that the sons and daughters of lawyer dads and doctor mums in blue ribbon Liberal seats forgo the university education that they have been groomed for all their life by their parents, and he is not suggesting that students at Scotch College or St Peters or any of those sorts of schools should reassess whether or not university is important. If he were, he would have put technical school out there. He is suggesting that kids from schools like those in Reynell should relinquish their opportunities for a university education. He is suggesting that they undergo workplace training, or worse, no training at all.

After the last federal election there was much questioning about who voted for the Howard Liberal government to give them such a dominant majority. The general consensus seemed to be that aspirational voters had given the Liberals both houses of the federal parliament. While these voters perhaps did not fit into the traditional mould of Liberal voters, they aspired to the lifestyle that the Liberals hold dear. Sadly, there was no intention on the part of Howard and his cohorts to enable them to access that lifestyle through education, no efforts to address the poor year 12 retention rates in our poorer suburbs and no efforts to provide income support for poorer families to enable them to complete high school and then university.

Time expired.

TAFE, VICTOR HARBOR

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I want to return to a subject that I have spoken about within the last 12 months; that is the subject of the Victor Harbor TAFE and the failure by the government to deliver the new TAFE college to the South Coast district. In about 1972 there was a gentleman elected as prime minister of Australia who had an election theme of 'It's time'. Well, it is way past time that the Victor Harbor TAFE, the South Coast TAFE, was built. The hour is late and they have failed to deliver the goods. It becomes an issue of social justice for the people of the Fleurieu Peninsula and the South Coast that they get this TAFE college delivered. The substandard conditions that students are currently now being forced to endure and the lack of programs due to the size of the TAFE operation are no excuse whatsoever for not going ahead and building this new TAFE facility.

I say to members opposite, I say to the government and I say to the minister: it is well past due, and your budget planning for the financial year 2007-08 should take this into consideration and you should get on with the job of building the South Coast TAFE for the benefit of the young people of the Fleurieu Peninsula, and I include Goolwa, Victor Harbor, Yankalilla and all points in between. These students, as I have said before, are currently having to come to Noarlunga or north of Adelaide to do TAFE studies. Many of them have to reside up here, and it is most unfortunate that they leave the town in which they were brought up, cannot do their study down there and on many occasions, once they have completed their study, they do not come back, and the whole community suffers, with young people leaving.

I believe that if the government had any social conscience whatsoever—and it pontificates long and loud about the issues of social conscience—it would get on with it and actually provide this TAFE college; that the minister would not get rolled in cabinet again, like he did last year, that the government would bite the bullet on something that was announced five years ago and was in the last Liberal government's budget in 2002, and that it would deliver this facility in the next financial year.

I think in fairness—and it does not matter much what side of politics you are on—that these young people should have the opportunity that this facility would afford, and I refer not only to young people: many older people also attend TAFE to expand their education and provide more by way of input into the community. I get concerned when this project continually gets rolled. I am not going to go away: I will continue to talk about it, and I would sincerely hope that those members in the chamber opposite would pick up on my speech because it is important. It is important to the south, and it is important to South Australia, quite frankly. You are not going to put a TAFE college at Roxby Downs of any significant size.

There is an incredible need for young people particularly to do TAFE courses and do things. Not everyone wants to go to university or do apprenticeships. People want to do TAFE courses. We are short on skilled workers. Having a child who has attended a TAFE course at Noarlunga, I can loudly and clearly let members know how good the course in that particular case is, and how successful they have been. So, I urge the government to revisit this. There is an election in 2010. I am really not fussed. The government can open the thing in February 2010 and I would be quite happy going to it, quite frankly. But the fact of the matter is that the government needs to bite the bullet, put the money in the budget, sell the current land where the TAFE site is and build it alongside the police station at Victor Harbor. It should put in a facility that all South Australians can be proud of so that young people can go and get educated. I am very conscious that I will probably have to push this forever and a day. I will speak on it again as needed, but I ask that members opposite take up the issue with their colleagues and help me pursue the issue of a new TAFE college on the South Coast.

BLIND SPORTS SA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Last weekend it was my honour and privilege to attend the second annual South Australian Blind Sports Awards, a celebration of unity and achievement. The organising committee of Sam Rickard, Sarnya Moss and Ray McKay was ably led by Matt Hueppouff (who is also the President of the South Australian Blind Athletics Club) and Heidi Meakins.

The awards ceremony was held at the Ridings Room at Adelaide Oval, and our thanks go to the staff who made the day there so enjoyable. I am Patron of the Association of South Australian Blind Sporting Clubs, and I acknowledge the kindness of other members of parliament in donating towards the success of the day, in particular, my colleague the newly elected member for Newland who I know contributed, and also to all the other sponsors who made the day such a great success.

The Association of South Australian Blind Sporting Clubs has recently adopted the trade name of Blind Sports SA, an umbrella body to all affiliated blind sporting clubs (five clubs in all, supporting 10 sports) which offers these clubs support

through many avenues, the most important being a single voice to government and other funding bodies. The BSSA is the peak sporting association for blind sports in South Australia.

The ten affiliated sports are: tandem cycling, athletics, goalball, judo, powerlifting, swimming, lawn bowls, indoor bowls, tenpin bowling and blind cricket. The BSSA was established in 1982 and incorporated in 1985. The service of the association shows in its longstanding commitment to blind sports. Our thanks go to Sarnya Moss OAM, a Sydney Paralympic gold medallist, who is Administrative Officer for Blind Sports SA.

Guests were lucky to hear from Mr Anthony Clark OAM, who was our speaker and also a blind judo player. He has competed in four Olympics and looks towards Beijing before, as he says, his 47 year old body gives out. He had many entertaining stories to give us on the day about stays in games villages, in particular, a Canadian team mascot that kept disappearing and reappearing all over the village. He also told us of the opportunities he has had, especially that of being able to visit Japan where he trained with able-bodied judo players by their dozens and being still on his feet at the end of the session. We all wished Anthony well in future competitions. He presented the award for the South Australian Junior Blind Sportsperson of the Year to Brad Henderson, a B2 powerlifter, who is Australia's top junior male powerlifter, currently holding national records in squat, bench press, dead lift and total lift. Our congratulations also go to the other nominee, Kieran Murphy, a B3 swimmer who has attracted the attention of the Australian Paralympic Committee.

The award for Most Outstanding Newcomer was presented by Penny Bennett, and we are grateful for Penny's assistance through the Blind Sporting Council, which recently released a DVD. The winner was Daphne Arnold, a B3 athlete who, at 80 years of age, has proven you are never too old to start. Daphne has played bowls without fail every Monday, achieving club ranking of number 2 in her first year of participation.

The teams category saw the tenpin bowling team of Des Warner and Susan Earles, both B3 athletes, against the 22-strong lawn bowling team, which will be travelling to the Queensland nationals in April. Des and Sue represented Australia in June last year, coming third overall in a competition where other teams had 10 members. Unfortunately, they were not able to beat the lawn bowlers on the day for the award who had finished second overall in the 27th national titles in Sydney.

The Blind Sportsperson of the Year was a tight contest between Felicity Johnson, a B3 tandem cyclist; Janine Rosser, a B3 swimmer, who has a visual as well as intellectual disability (she has won five events in national competitions, breaking Australian records in each event); Susan Earles for tenpin bowling (bowler of the year at her local club); Des Warner, the other member of the tenpin deadly duo (Des's highest score is 252); Val Tydeman, a B2 indoor bowler (Val is the best player for her club); John Cornaggia, a B1 lawn bowler who is in our national team; and the overall winner and the last nominee, Colin Priestly, a B1 powerlifter who is classed as Australia's top masters powerlifter, having broken the men's over 60 category (that is the 90 kilogram class) in squat and bench press at the recent Riverland challenge.

While congratulations go to all blind competitors, we must also acknowledge and thank their guides, drivers and other

supporters, especially their families. I also acknowledge the judging panel, Kath Murrell, the association's retiring president, and Mr Ray McKay, who have both had a long-standing commitment over many years to blind sports. Ray and his wife, Jill, are the reason I have become involved, and I look forward to a long association with the Blind Sporting Association.

MULTICULTURALISM

Mr PISONI (Unley): While celebrating Australia Day, I was privileged to attend citizenship ceremonies hosted by both the Burnside and Unley councils. As the son of an immigrant and someone with a keen interest in multicultural affairs, I look forward to these ceremonies. I meet amazing people from so many different parts of the world. I talk to them about their hopes and experiences, and learn of what they bring to share as new citizens to our community. They are tangible benefits, cultural and economic, viable to the growth and prosperity of our state. Through my new role as shadow parliamentary secretary assisting with multicultural affairs, I look forward to meeting our new citizens at diverse functions and events as they share their individual cultural experiences with our South Australian community.

Like much of Adelaide, Unley is diverse in culture, language and religion. The list of names and countries of origin of those who took the pledge as Australian citizens on Australia Day illustrates better than anything else the continually changing origins of those who choose to call Australia home, and Australia's coming of age as an international community. To their great credit, both Unley and Burnside councils have been promoters and supporters of cultural diversity, quite rightly seeing it as a foundation stone of our community's strength.

This month I attended the Unley Greek Festival—the seventh year this wonderful cultural event has been held—with around 7 000 people attending. The Greek community is well represented in my electorate. The St Spyridon Church Greek Orthodox Community and Parish in Unley was established in 1959 to cater for the religious, cultural and educational needs of the large numbers of Greek immigrants who settled in the inner southern suburbs of Adelaide. It is a great pity, however, that St Spyridon's College shows an enrolment level above that needed for provisional funding yet it serves the educational needs of a clearly identifiable group within the community. It has been unable to obtain provisional funding under section 7(g) of the Non-Government Schools Planning Policy.

St Spyridon's College has made great efforts to fund itself through donations from its community members and has also been able to resource recurrent funding from the Howard federal government. Appeals from the college, and myself as the local MP, for the minister to use her discretionary powers to move this funding issue forward have so far been unsuccessful. St Spyridon's College is providing real choice, quality and diversity in the provision of education, and I call on the minister to use her discretionary powers to provide state education department funding for the college and recognise the significant contribution of the Greek community to the social fabric and community diversity of Unley and this state.

The member for Hartley recently suggested to me on radio—and I was quite hurt by this—that in order to obtain a more enlightened perspective on multiculturalism I should, 'Get out of your community, David; move outside of Unley.'

I can assure the member that at every opportunity I circulate widely in our diverse South Australian community, as well as my electorate of Unley. I do this in an official capacity and because I enjoy the company of those I meet. This month I represented Liberal leader Iain Evans at the Giornata Marchigiana at Paradise, which annually celebrates regional Italian culture and shares this with the wider community.

It was a wonderful event, as was the Greek Flambouron Philanthropic Society launch, its dinner dance and the closing barbecue, which I attended and at which I presented awards to the hard-working volunteers. I attended the Carnevale to enjoy the regional cultures of my father's country of origin, and was warmly received. Last weekend I celebrated the Chinese New Year, the Year of the Pig, with the South Australian Zhu-Lin Buddhist Association. What I see as I attend these events reassures me that diversity is alive and well, that we should continue to foster multiculturalism and its positive aspects and that our state will continue to benefit from the skills, enterprise, shared values and outlook of our new chums, now and in the future.

SCHOOLS, MOBILE PHONES

Ms FOX (Bright): I want to speak today on the use of mobile phones in schools. I should make very clear from the outset that this is really more of a reflection, a discussion of the issue, than a desire to apportion blame, but I think it is a discussion that needs to take place in our community. Mobile phones certainly are an invaluable tool of communication for children and parents, and I recognise that. However, like most people in this house, I grew up in an age when we did not have mobile phones and people communicated in different ways—by pigeon and smoke signals—and there were a number of occasions on which my parents were running late or I had failed to communicate adequately with them and, if my parents or I had owned a mobile phone, none of this would have occurred.

From the outset, therefore, I accept the benefits that a mobile phone can bring. However, I am seriously concerned about the use of mobile phones in the playground and in the classroom. Individual principals decide with their governing councils mobile phone policy. This is as it should be. However, I wonder how many adults have spent any time at all on the web site YouTube. Go on it: join up; type in the name of your own child's school or suburb and there is every likelihood, depending on the day, that something will come up. Very recently *The Advertiser* reported an incident of a nasty fight with racial overtones that took place amongst year 9 boys. I do not live in an ivory tower. I am well aware that kids in playgrounds fight: the problem is that now they are fighting, filming it on their mobile phones and putting it on the internet. That takes bullying to a whole new level.

Very early in my career I taught a child who seemed to think that it was acceptable to video on a phone other children urinating, and then to place that footage on the internet. We had a conversation and that action did not occur again. As a teacher, I find it deeply frustrating to know that school policies about mobile phones are continually undermined. There is no need for a mobile phone in a classroom. They should not be in students' pockets: they should be turned off, in a locker. I fail to understand on any level why a student should be allowed to have a mobile phone in a classroom. While I understand that parents may wish to be in continual contact with their children in case of emergency, I remind the house that every single school is contactable by land line and

that urgent messages can be conveyed to students with simplicity and ease.

I would urge governing councils and parents to work together on reassessing mobile phone policies in their schools, because, if parents do not support a change in the mobile phone culture, it will not work. The discussion needs to be had. I really would urge all governing councils and all parents to take a good, hard, long look at what is happening with phones in their schools. We do not need them in the classrooms. We need them turned off, in the lockers. We certainly do not need them in the playground.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (AFFORDABLE HOUSING) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 February. Page 1755.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): On the last occasion on which this matter was debated, I advised the house of the extraordinary difficulty faced in this state by first home buyers in the accessing of the private housing market, which was having the effect of reducing the number of those who could be self sufficient and who therefore would not be placed in the category of requiring assistance in some form of subsidised housing via government. The aspect of stamp duty payable by first homebuyers in this state, comparable to those interstate, was frighteningly high, and the revenue upon which this state relies in its government expenditure for the provision of its services that has its origins in property, as a property-based tax, is quite extraordinary. I think I concluded on the point that the private rental vacancy rate in Adelaide is already at an alarming low at 0.05 per cent, and that, of course, makes it more difficult for those who are already excluded from the purchasing market and who cannot even get into the private rental market.

During the adjournment of debate on this matter there has been even further publicity surrounding this aspect, and I was disturbed to read a publication of the *Guardian Messenger* of 7 February 2007 which identified a critical shortage of affordable rental accommodation in the southern metropolitan regions of Adelaide. In the *Guardian Messenger* it was recorded in an article entitled 'Rental lock out' that not only was there a significant shortage resulting in people living in cars, as reported in that article, or sharing homes in overcrowded circumstances, but that the average income for a Housing Trust tenant in the region that was the subject of the article was \$318 a week, whereas the average rental price of a home in Mitchell Park was \$218 a week. So it is not difficult to appreciate how impossible it is for people living in the southern metropolitan area to even access the private rental market. It highlighted in that region that there were rental price rises by 80 per cent in some of the suburbs over the preceding five years. So that is something that we are having referred to quite often.

The other categories of persons who are struggling in areas that I traversed in the previous debate on this matter include the homeless, and we have seen the headlines in the *City Messenger* during the intervening period, which tell us that for nine years the Parklands around the city of Adelaide have been the home of some residents, and these largely are

people who are homeless, and in the indigenous community, and they have told of a social inclusion investigation, and we are aware, of course, of the government's announcements to provide for the 800 people who sleep in the streets or in a car every night. We have been told by the government how it is facilitating this, but we have the rather confronting aspect here that, whilst we know this is not a new issue, we have got some families who are living in this accommodation and it has been their home for year after year.

Indeed, on behalf of those who are excluded from accommodation, some advocates have given consideration to a permanent and dedicated area of the Parklands around the City of Adelaide area specifically as a homeless camp, involving a permanent facility to be built for the city's homeless, in particular, Aborigines. I note that Shelter SA Executive Director Gary Wilson has this week supported calls for a permanent camping ground in the city for Aborigines struggling to adapt to the suburban lifestyle.

It seems that these park dwellers have made a decision that this is the best option as a place for them to reside. I think it is a very sad thing—quite an indictment on any government—to call for permanent accommodation in makeshift tents for people who have now been living for nine years in our city Parklands. It is not a solution that I personally endorse. I think that it is important that those who are living in the Parklands are not unfairly treated and that they are provided protection, because they are exposed in a very real sense to those who may wish to cause them some mischief and harm.

That in itself not new. We have had people living in parks in the City of Adelaide for 150 years. It is not a new aspect in relation to the Parklands. I remember reading about legislation that was passed in the 1860s to exclude people and move them on when they were homeless and sleeping in the Botanical Gardens which, of course, in the very early days of the history of South Australia were established as a magnificent centre for the development and study of our botanical plants. And, that too became a camp ground for the homeless. It is not a new phenomenon, but to now talk, in 2007, about the need to set up a permanent camp in our Parklands as an answer and some kind of remedy to providing a home for our indigenous homeless families is, I think, a very sad situation indeed. However, that is the stage we have reached, because the situation is so dire.

I acknowledge that the minister has apparently indicated publicly that he will not support such a measure. I think that that is the right decision, but it will probably not meet with the support of persons such as the Lord Mayor or other persons who make decisions about these matters. However, it just emphasises what a startling, tragic situation these families are facing. In the last few days, we have seen an article in the *Eastern Courier* (covering a third of the metropolitan Adelaide region), entitled 'Door slammed shut on the most vulnerable', which refers to another group in our community who are in tragic circumstances. The article discusses supported housing for the mentally ill, disabled, homeless and vulnerable as 'closing fast and buckling under the strain of poor funding and lack of resources'. The article states:

In the past three years, four local boarding houses have been forced to shut down out of seven to close across metropolitan Adelaide. Operators say this has forced more than 150 people either into other supported boarding houses or back into the community.

Today's announcement by the government that it will invest funding to assist the mentally ill in our community is a

welcome move. I think it amounts to some \$43 million, from the way I read it, over the next four years. The 800 homeless in South Australia, who will have specific funding of about \$1.5 million, will not actually see the benefit of that, I suggest, for several years. Certainly those who are to have the mental health accommodation under the Step Up Step Down program, which has been picked up and supported by Commissioner Cappo, are unlikely to be accommodated until at least 2010 or 2011.

We still have a very pressing and immediate need for the homeless. We have an increasing group of those from the mentally ill who are moving into the category of demand. We have our indigenous community whose members seem to be left with no option other than to seek to have a permanent camp ground in the parklands, and we have an ever-diminishing pool of people in the community who can either afford to buy or rent. I will return to the other aspects involving those who can be self-sufficient.

I turn now to new homes. If you cannot afford to buy or rent an existing house in the private market, what are the options available in South Australia for new homes? Here we have the imposition of direct government charges and taxes on new developments. Interestingly, a report commissioned by the Property Council of Australia, entitled 'Residential development costs—benchmarking study April 2006', compared the impact of direct government taxes, charges, levies, fees and planning approval delays on the price of new homes and units in each state. The report found that, next to construction costs, which account for something between 40 and 60 per cent of the total cost of new dwellings, federal, state and local government charges are the second largest cost faced by buyers of new homes, averaging 25 per cent.

The report found that, in regard to building a 50-apartment complex in Adelaide, the government taxes, charges and costs account for 28.4 per cent of the total cost—that is, \$111 653 on an apartment built and sold for just over \$432 000. This is an escalation of government charges of \$84 788 in five years from \$26 865 in 2000 to \$111 653 in 2005. Likewise, government taxes and charges on broadacre developments providing a house and land package have increased in South Australia from \$12 289 in 2000 to \$53 303 in 2005. Importantly, the Property Council of Australia convened in South Australia recently a residential development conference. I was invited to that conference and I note that the minister was invited to address that conference. Before the minister's arrival, Mr Ross Elliott, the federal Chief Executive Officer of the Residential Development Council, addressed the assembly which was largely made up of members of the Property Council of Australia and advisers from various stakeholder groups. When he addressed the gathering, he made it abundantly clear that the issues confronting affordable housing were land supply, excessive taxes—and, in particular, stamp duty, land tax and infrastructure costs—the local government costs of compliance, the regulatory costs of compliance (and I will address those shortly) and the planning rules. The minister will be pleased to hear that he gave some compliment to the state government for developing some advance in the planning law reform in this state—

Mr Kenyon: Opposed by you.

Ms CHAPMAN: Opposed by me, indeed, and for good reason, and we will have a debate on that again to highlight how ineffectual that has actually been. However, it was embraced by this house in the wishful expectation that something might actually improve. We will be very interested to read the annual reports of each of the metropolitan councils

come end of 2007 to see if there has been any improvement. In fact, the government may look to an idea I had at the time, which I still think is a good one, and that is that until local governments, in particular the councils themselves, on behalf of the new panel structure they have, accept some liability for the cost of people having to go to court to challenge these decisions when they were made on poor information or without the terms of their PAR, then we will not see a remedy to that issue and we will continue to have problems. Nevertheless, we will see. At least, at this event, the Property Council gave some credit to the state government for opening up the ambit and starting with some reform. I look forward to when the government gets serious about this issue and about how it might actually deal with the plans themselves and not just the implementation of them. We need to get really serious about the plans that are endorsed by local government which require the approval of ministers for planning. So, we have some serious work to do there but, nevertheless, this was the fourth area that was highlighted by Mr Elliott.

When it came to the question of interest rates which, interestingly, is the mantra I hear from the state government here (and state governments all around the country) as being a significant player on the issue of housing affordability, Mr Elliott addressed that issue in his contribution to the conference. In short, he made it very clear what he thought about that argument. He said, 'It's bullshit.' He made it absolutely clear that state governments that trot out that excuse are erroneous in their assessment. Some in this house will remember when interest rates were very different to what they are now. I will not go into the reasons as to whose governments were good or bad at getting interest rates down but the reality is that we have very low interest rates in this country—as we have had for a number of years—but some of us are old enough to remember when they went way above 20 per cent for any kind of serious funding for land ownership. Housing was usually a bit below that, but it was a very serious situation in this state at the end of the 1980s and early 1990s. We had a reduction in the value of property and people had to sell their homes.

There is no question as to the impact of interest rates in that climate when there was a massive and rapid increase in rates—a level that people had to pay because they had taken out significant loans. Soon the equity was swallowed up in their homes and they were forced to sell at a reduced value. They lost a lot of money and it was a very sad example of interest rates having been a significant player. So, there is no question that interest rates can play a part, but to trot out that argument in 2006-07 as some kind of excuse for the housing affordability crisis that we have in the state at present is completely without foundation. A representative of the Property Council has been generous enough to indicate where governments are on the right track but also he has been equally critical when they are not. He has made it abundantly clear what he thinks about that kind of excuse or explanation by state governments. Frankly, I thank him for being so honest.

I now turn to new houses, in particular, the cost of meeting the new regulations. The Housing Industry Association of South Australia concurs with the Property Council, finding that approximately 25 per cent of building costs are attributable to government taxes and charges. However, the Housing Industry Association SA has also recently completed a study of the additional cost to developers to meet new government regulations on building new dwellings. The association

recently introduced legislation such as the chemical toilet, the 4-star efficiency to 5-star, the rainwater tank obligations, detention tanks, stormwater management, 100-year flood zone requirements, pressure reduction valves on water supplies, waste disposal obligations, site contamination rules and regulations, noise pollution obligations and adaptable housing considerations. All of these—no matter how meritorious they are and sound like at the time of their announcement—have added an impost on housing costs. The Housing Industry Association SA report indicates that that has been between \$76 000 and \$100 000 per dwelling.

I was interested to read in its report that the mandatory rainwater tank obligation—when looking not just at the acquisition price of the rainwater tank but at the plumber's fees, the installation cost, the plumbing into the property, the pumps, taking over a 10-year lifecycle—that started out at \$600, \$700 or \$800 a tank, on their calculations and investigation, has a cost of \$4 837. So, one starts to realise how great an imposition these obligations create in real dollars for real people who are trying, in this instance, to at least build a home if they cannot afford to buy one that has already been built.

In addition to the physical costs of purchasing the rainwater tank, the labour, and so forth, there are all sorts of other new requirements, such as scaffolding, traffic management and site preparation, which is estimated at an extra \$15 000 to \$20 000 per home. I will give you an example. We have a new occupational health and safety rule which says that ceiling fixers are not allowed to walk along the tops of ceilings when the ceilings are put in. I am paraphrasing the rule, but it is there obviously to avoid the situation where someone is in a dangerous position, falls through the ceiling, causing themselves or some other person on the work site an injury. So, on the face of it, it sounds like a good rule, but it comes at a cost. The cost in this instance is that they have to build scaffolding up underneath the ceiling for the tradesmen to attend to the ceiling fixes. That costs money. You cannot escape the fact that it is adding on a massive cost. As I said, the report estimates between \$15 000 and \$20 000 per home. For new housing to comply with all of the new environmental, planning and water regulations, an additional \$100 000 per home is needed. So, it is not difficult to imagine that this is now another area in which it is very hard for new people to get into the market, because the cost is so prohibitive.

Another area touched on by Mr Elliott at the Property Council is that new homeowners now have to foot infrastructure costs as well. I was interested to read recently that Mount Barker—which until recently was described as (and I think still remains) the fastest growing metropolitan area by population in the country—is moving to develop further housing estates over the next few years, from something like 14 500 persons who currently reside in Mount Barker to 20 000. I do not have the exact number immediately available to inform the house, but it is not difficult to imagine the extra pressure that will be placed on the infrastructure obligations necessary to accommodate a 25 per cent increase in the number of houses in that township. It will be massive.

In addition to the benchmarking study across the capital cities, the Property Council last year also embarked on an infrastructure cost study, because governments now shift to the user-pays means for developers who are paying for the community infrastructure. We all know that developers do not just take on that cost themselves and absorb it; it gets passed on to the home purchasers. Developers are now paying for the direct infrastructure under these plans which include

water and sewerage headworks, reticulation, electricity, telecommunications and roadworks, as well as the developer costs associated with the indirect infrastructure. These include parkland and open space—that is, the obligation for them to have the open space within the developments that they are proposing—streetscape, drainage systems, cycle paths, recreation and child-care facilities, and other community infrastructure.

There is no escaping the fact that if you transfer the obligation for the developer to absorb the cost of these infrastructure aspects of the development then it will ultimately be transferred to the new homebuyer. There are some questions about the equity of this because sometimes, when you significantly increase a township, you actually add new aspects of infrastructure. So, if you have a township of 1 000 or 2 000 people, you do not necessarily have a Woolworths supermarket, but when you get to 10 000 people you start to need them, in the sense, obviously, of having a facility that is commensurate with a large number of population to provide for. You start to have a critical mass that demand a higher standard of transport access to their next major city or capital. You start to have a community who say, 'We should have our own cinema,' and you start to have infrastructure requirements, not just for a local school but for childcare facilities, kindergarten, after school care, etc.

So, the increase of a township comes at a cost. At the moment we are seeing an infrastructure cost which is being transferred to the new owners in the new development, even though the whole of the township—for some of these infrastructure aspects—will have the benefit of that. So, it does raise some questions of equity. The Property Council study found that over the past decade the total infrastructure charges passed on to the consumer have increased by \$56 000 to \$68 000 per new house in Sydney, increased by \$12 600 to \$17 000 for a new house in Brisbane, and although Adelaide has not had a similar direct calculation there is an indication in their report that there is a similar history and a similar significant increase.

The Housing Industry Association of SA—obviously who are much more focused on what is happening in this state—estimate that a typical cost for an allotment in a greenfield site, once roads, footpaths, stormwater, electricity, water, gas, telecommunications and reserves are put in, would be about \$25 000 per lot. For dwellings in a multi-unit development the infrastructure share would be around \$8 000 per unit. The critical thing to understand here is that we are talking a lot of money and we are talking about money that goes to the new home owner—they are the ones who pick up the bill.

The current chief executive officer, Mr Robert Harding, of the Housing Industry Association has advised me that there has been—and I think made a public statement on this—a 12 per cent decline in housing approvals in the past 12 months. That should also send a signal of concern as to the impact that this is having, because there is not much point in proceeding with the approval of developments if there is no-one who can afford to buy them. Overall, both the Housing Industry Association and the Property Council want these things addressed: they want lower taxes, to invest in strategic planning and an increased land supply. They have sent that message loud and clear.

I just want to reflect on a couple of other aspects that are, I think, important. One is the question of urban boundaries and the question of making land available. Probably not surprisingly, we see situations where the federal government says the state governments are responsible for this and they

are the ones who need to be able to give access to land, and that, while they maintain these boundaries and do not review them, that has a significant negative impact on this issue by virtue of increasing the value and the cost of housing. You might say that, 'Well, that is probably to be expected as the political colour of one government against another,' but when other stakeholders make it absolutely clear that this question of access to land is a significant factor, and the restriction of it, that causes the high increase in land, therefore, ultimately, the cost of dwellings on it, then you have to start to listen. I think it is time that the government stopped trying to say, 'Look, this is not a problem,' or, as I commonly hear, 'Sure, we have got property in our entities that provide some restriction on land supply, but so does the private sector. We have got other people out there who own large tracts of land and they are holding onto their property until they get a good price for it and they can lock up this land and drip it out. It is a bit like the person that might own all the diamonds in a country; they do not flood the market with it, they just dribble out a few every year so that they keep the price up. So, this is the private sector's fault.'

There is no question that the group that are in a position, both to remedy it and have a social obligation as a government to do so, are not doing so—and they can. The excuse against doing anything about it is that the charter of the structure that owns the land and becomes the registered proprietor on behalf of the government, the land management entity, has a charter which requires, basically, that it make money. We have heard of this before. We have heard of the claim that over the last 15 years or so there has been a change, progressively, of governments, and rather than the Land Management Corporation having a charter to provide accommodation for those who need it—and I am paraphrasing the position at this stage—that they have their charter and obligations by statute amended so that it imposes on them, essentially, an obligation to make a profit, that it would be contrary to their charter to do otherwise, and that therefore it is in their interest to achieve their charter and their obligations to drip out the land. Well, there is a very simple way for that to be remedied, and that is to change the charter.

Change the legislation and/or provide the ministerial consent to facilitate that entity having the power to do just that. So, there is no question that the government has been saying repeatedly for nearly five years that this is the previous government's fault because it changed the charter. It has been changed a number of times, actually, over the last 20 or so years, and all the governments in that time have been keen to keep it in that direction. But it is no excuse for this government to say that this is its charter so we are stuck with it. That is just a complete nonsense. It could have brought it back here and remedied it 4½ years ago, and it has not done so.

Treasurer Costello has made some fairly significant comments in the debate on land release and, again, this has been endorsed by the Productivity Commission in its 2003-04 report. So it is not a new issue: this has been out there for some time. As I have indicated, you might say that they are not too keen to line up and give a pat on the back to the state governments because they are of a different political colour, but the reports have been prepared by people who are not staffers in federal ministers' offices: they are the stakeholders, and it is time the government listened to what they have to say about this issue and not be dismissive of it and not take responsibility.

We also have another, I think, very important group in the community which has weighed into this debate, and that is the Australian Population Institute (APop, as it has been commonly called), which was a co-sponsor of speakers on this issue, along with the Housing Industry Association. I think there was another body that assisted in bringing speakers to South Australia to canvass the issue, in particular, that there is an urgent need to deal with housing costs because it is a growing threat to a stable, if not growing, population in South Australia. So, they say this is a factor which has a very significant impact and the government says that it has a target to increase South Australia's population to 2 million people by 2050, but it is evident that, because of the increase in home values in Adelaide, we have the brain drain and the exodus of our young people from the state.

Prices are affected by all of the factors that I have referred to, and one in particular which is obvious, and that is the question of stamp duty. Why would a young couple buy a property in South Australia of \$300 000 in value (which is the sort of money they have to come up with, often, to be able to buy a residential property within the metropolitan area of Adelaide) and pay \$10 000 in stamp duty when, if they buy the same property in Queensland, they pay nothing? It is not difficult to see why this state is losing 3 500 people (mostly young people) net a year, and they are going to live elsewhere. It is not surprising that Queensland has a net increase of 18 000 a year in its population (principally younger people who are moving into the state). You do not have to be very bright to see that this housing affordability issue has a very significant effect on the future population of our state. It ought to be abundantly clear to everyone in this house by now that South Australia not only faces the loss in numbers but also, every day, we are increasing our older profile in the population.

So, if we want to be serious about having anyone left who is young enough and fit enough and able to work and earn money to look after all of us in another 30 years or so when we are sitting in our nursing homes (some of us will get there a little bit earlier), we need to think very seriously about this issue, because it is a very real one. There are people at the level of APop, in particular Mr Michael Hickinbotham, its chairman, rather sadly making statements such as this:

Housing affordability once had been the key advantage in attracting and retaining people in Adelaide. It's slipping. . . . While housing affordability was one area in which SA had a significant advantage over other states, that gap is closing fast. There are strong links between land supply, housing affordability and population. Therefore, SA needs to act immediately to free up constraints on land supply and lead the way in driving affordability and housing.

So, you do not have to hear it from me. You do not even have to hear it from John Howard or Peter Costello. We have people at a high level of understanding of these issues in the stakeholder organisations who are sending the message every day to state governments—but, for the purpose of this exercise, our state government, that it has gone in the wrong direction and is failing in keeping accessibility to affordable housing for South Australians. Mark Sanderson, who this year—

Mr O'Brien: You are proposing the scuttling of the urban growth boundary, are you?

Ms CHAPMAN: I will come to options in a minute. Mark Sanderson, the President of the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, said, as late as January this year (and there have been many statements put out by him), that home affordability has become a major challenge for our nation and there

is no doubt that rising house prices are making it harder to get a start in the market. He went on to identify areas of reform. They all repeat the same thing but are not being listened to.

I was very interested to read this morning a statement issued by the architects' association, known as Archicentre, whose managing director, Mr Robert Caulfield, identifies a link between housing affordability and what he describes as a major health crisis. I think it is a very important statement where he links issues in relation to health, and I cannot imagine that anyone in this house would not appreciate what a significant cost that is to our community, both financially and personally. He makes the following observations:

Governments have been warned Australia's record low housing affordability rate will translate into a major health and welfare budget blow-out into the future. The Housing Industry Association and the Commonwealth Bank in January 2007 estimated that for the first time in 25 years the average Australian household could not afford to buy the average house.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics details annual changes in house prices for the December quarter 2005 to the December quarter 2006—and they list all of the other states—Adelaide: plus 6.4 per cent. That is an increase. Mr Caulfield says:

Housing affordability in Australia is not only an economic disaster but it is a major public health issue with people desperate to get and keep a roof over their head being placed under enormous mental and physical strain.

He goes on to say that depression costs the Australian economy \$3.3 billion in lost productivity each year, and from information provided by the organisation Beyond Blue he reports that 6 million working days are lost, with another 12 million days of reduced productivity, and economic studies indicate that each employee with untreated depression and related conditions will cost their organisation nearly \$10 000 a year. Mr Caulfield makes this link:

There is little doubt the lack of housing affordability in Australia is a player in the area of depression. Many Australian families are facing the shortage of housing and skyrocketing rents where, in some cases, people are having to have rented premises auctioned, with renters forced to compete with each other just to rent.

He said that against these odds and pressures many desperate people are signing up to buy properties, with no hope of maintaining payments and sadly losing what savings they had when the home was repossessed by financial institutions. He goes on to say:

Even worse is where the people have paid inflated prices for the home and it is sold at a reduced value, leaving the original owner facing debt to cover the gap, which can be tens of thousands of dollars.

So Archicentre state that often their organisation is called in by home buyers who have purchased a property without professional inspection before signing the contract of sale, and are often confronted with the unbudgeted costs when the housing faults are found. So this is an organisation which is right at the coalface of dealing with these people who have bought a property, who then have to face extra costs where there may be some building or architectural fault, someone comes in to inspect, and these people find that they have no extra money because they are so heavily in debt with the obligation to which they have signed up and they then have to sell and face a loss. So we have people who are stretched financially, but they have no other option than to add the cost of repair to the mortgage or, even worse, sell the property and then put their family again at risk, with the property being devalued and losses being incurred, etc.

I suppose a scandalous side to all this is that those who might be unscrupulous in the building of properties—who cut

corners or do not comply with the rules and carry out illegal or unsafe building work—then do not have to pay the price and are getting away with it. So we have lots of consequences flowing from this problem. The Archicentre pre-purchase home inspections of some 250 000 Australian homes show that one out of every five homes inspected has some form of illegal building activity, which is staggering in itself, and one can see the cost consequences in which a heavily stretched new owner might be involved. Being able to obtain shelter is a key and fundamental foundation stone to maintaining a stable family relationship in the Australian way of life, Mr Caulfield said. He went on to say:

As a community we should not only be focusing on the economic cost of housing affordability, but also on the health issues that can be triggered by the housing affordability crisis, including the cost of depression, family breakdown, alcoholism and stress.

So we have a pretty clear message from those who are working in the industry at the coalface with people who are suffering, in this case involving a group of people who are trapped in the financial position of sometimes not being able even to afford the cost of remedying a building defect and, therefore, facing further loss and possibly family breakdown and resultant health issues. So it is not just the cost that a new owner might face: it is the huge cost that we as taxpayers will all carry in funding a health system which then has to cope with providing for the treatment of these people and for their accommodation and recovery.

There is no question we have had a pretty clear message, and it is now important that the government understand that it has an obligation to come up with some options that will remedy the situation. However, it will be the opposition's position that the proposals put up by this government in fact will just make it worse. That is actually sad because, when we are looking for some answers here, one hopes that a bill such as this, for which we have waited such a long time, will provide some assistance.

However, it seems that the principal proposal, which requires the accommodation of affordable housing in new developments, will actually add another cost to housing of the order of \$50 000 per dwelling. So, there is no relief. There is no way out of this, and the option being presented to us is going in the wrong direction. I would now like to consider a summary of the areas of change of governance before I move to the amendments to the Development Act that deal with the principal initiative of providing for affordable housing. The bill proposes to provide a significant amendment to the structure of the South Australian Housing Trust and to the community housing structure, the South Australian Community Housing Authority and the South Australian Aboriginal Housing Authority.

The change of governance provisions abolish these existing boards, and the power that they currently operate will vest with the minister and the chief executive officer. The structure to accommodate the South Australian Housing Trust as an entity and the Community Housing Authority will be the South Australian Affordable Housing Trust. The minister, in his second reading explanation, said that the government wants to 'work with industry and community partners in finding innovative solutions.' I will refer in due course to the future developments that include 15 per cent affordable housing, with 5 per cent of that being for high-need housing. The establishment of the Office for Community and Aboriginal Housing within the Department of Families and Communities is part of this review, and a number of administrative amendments providing for the review of decisions

formerly by the South Australian Housing Trust have been included.

There will be a new appeal panel, which will put recommendations to the minister for his determination. In a nutshell, we are going to move from three structures which are under the direction and guidance of independent boards and which will be brought inhouse, and we will have a whole new regime. I want to acknowledge the boards that are about to be sacked, some of which have, interestingly, prepared reports in the last few months in which they are saying that this will be the last one they will be giving because there is to be a restructure effective from such and such a date, from which their services will no longer be required. It is very interesting, because in the short time I have been here I have often seen this situation, where people, in anticipation of legislation being passed, have said their goodbyes.

It is a very interesting phenomenon because, even though it is this parliament that makes the decision, if the government announced it nine or 12 months before it is put in concrete as a given and people start writing up their reports as though it is inevitable. That is a matter that I find quite concerning. I thought when I came in here that it would be this parliament making the decisions and not just for governments to announce what they thought should happen and just presume—and the level of arrogance is extraordinary—that it will walk through the parliament without amendment and that that reform, whatever the government has announced on a late-night radio show or thrown out in a press release or called a press conference about, would be the law.

In any event, those who have been members of the South Australian Housing Trust Board—Ms Mary Marsland, Mr Don Lee, Ms Jan Connolly, Mr Graham Foreman, Ms Michele Slatter, Ms Julia Dance, Ms Mary Patetsos, Mr Jay Hogan and Ms Susie Herzberg—at least ought to receive some acknowledgment for the work that they have done. I am still completely at a loss as to why they will all be sacked. Nevertheless, I thank them for what contribution they have made. In relation to the South Australian Community Housing Authority, Professor Eleanor Ramsay is the chairperson and members of her board include C.M. Davidson, G.J. Gow, C.D. Halsey, D.R. Lee, E.H. McCarthy, J.D. Whitehouse and M. Woodward. I thank them for their contribution in their role as members of that board. The chairperson of the South Australian Aboriginal Housing Authority is Elliott McNamara, and members of his board include Shereen Rankine, Yami Lester, Klynton Wanganeen, Henry Rankine, Tauto Sansbury, Harry Miller and Alwyn McKenzie. As I understand, the deputy members of the board of management include Cheryl Axelby, Victor Wilson, Patricia Buckskin and Michelle Warren. Well, thank you and goodbye it seems.

Under the bill, the South Australian Housing Trust, as I have said, will be dissolved and as an entity it will be constituted by the chief executive. We have a change of function of the Housing Trust. It is important to understand from where this huge shift comes, because it includes the insertion of the words 'supporting initiatives within the various sectors to increase the supply of affordable housing'. It adds under its obligations 'to provide houses to meet housing needs, or to support or promote programs or other initiatives within the private or not-for-profit sector to meet housing needs; to facilitate support for South Australians so as to increase their ability to achieve successful housing outcomes; to provide advice to the minister', etc. This is a fundamental shift between the building, operating, managing

and providing accommodation for South Australians (its historical role) to calling in the other sectors.

There is a major transfer here. When we say that the government's initiative is to privatise the Housing Trust, we mean it, and if there was not any clearer evidence, it is the complete removal of the word 'public' from the obligations and functions of the South Australian Housing Trust. The word 'public' will be non-existent. It is to be deleted in all the relevant sections on function. We have the insertion of this interesting provision, that is, section 5(4) which states:

In conducting its affairs and after taking into account the policies of the government, SAHT should meet its aims and objectives through the most appropriate and effective mechanism available to it (which mechanisms may include engaging or funding other bodies or persons to provide or deliver programs or services so as to result in the best use of the resources available to SAHT).

Would it not be refreshing if the government was honest about it? It is changing the act to make it absolutely clear that not only will it be wanting to look at the resources of the private and not-for-profit sector to meet this obligation but it will have a specific objective in conducting its affairs to achieve that. That is, to harvest, I suppose, the resources that the private or not-for-profit sector might have—whether that be land, other assets or ideas—and to use those resources to provide for public housing as distinct from what it has done in the past.

I do not have any objection to that, but to see that, through this bill, the South Australian Housing Trust will be ripped away from providing public housing and will have its obligations transferred to others makes it absolutely clear as to what will happen. It also has to 'provide financial, and other, assistance in public, private and community housing sectors, subject to the qualification that the provision of financial assistance will be subject to the approval of the Treasurer'. To actually do anything off its own bat—if it is to provide public housing—it has to be done with the approval of the Treasurer. We all know that any government initiative, on the face of it, has to have the approval of the Treasurer to the extent that, if you do not get in at budget time, you do not get your share of the budget and, if he does not tick off on it, then you do not get it.

This is now written into the act; that is, if it does anything itself and uses the money to do it, then the financial assistance has to be subject to the Treasurer. You not only miss out at budget time but you have to make some submission as to why the taxpayer should make any provision for public housing instead of the not-for-profit or private sector, which will have this shovelled on to them when this bill is passed. We will have a whole lot of new ways in which it can provide support moneys via grants, loans or financial agreements for accommodation. We have seen the beginning of this. The Julia Farr Centre is just the opening ambit of the type of community housing deals that we are about to see. The government should at least come clean on this issue. Its pretending that making a public housing entity the wholly owned subsidiary of the minister and his chief executive will do something for affordable housing in this state is a joke.

I now move to the community housing aspect; that is, the South Australian Cooperative and Community Housing Act, which covers an ever-growing area of demand, that is, housing particularly for people with high needs. Historically, this has been to provide accommodation for specific groups in the community, for example, people who may be in an age profile and who are simply unable to access private residential retirement village type accommodation. This is an option

that has been developed over the last 30 years, to be able to have co-op's for accommodation for these persons. I think that, overall, it has been a structure which has helped to provide a home for many people in the community who would otherwise not have had access to it; so, it has done a great job. Again, the government wants to get rid of the board, have no independent structure, and the minister will take over the control with his chief executive officer.

The functions under this bill, to which I will refer later, are again to suck up the resources of the private not-for-profit sector. Anyone who has some spare land, spare cash or a trust fund will be raided to this extent. Not that they will unwillingly want to make a contribution to public and community housing for the aged, disabled and people with high needs in this community. They are not reluctant to do that: they are committed to doing it. There are churches, trusts and charities committed to this and, indeed, a number of these organisations have a very significant charter in housing provision. They are quite sophisticated, established organisations that take that responsibility very seriously, and they are there and willing to help. They are even happy to contribute their land, funding, expertise, management skills or all the application fees required to get assistance from commonwealth funding for rental—all those sorts of things—but they want to have some say, and they want to make some contribution in the decision about what will happen with these assets when they have been used for the purpose for which they have been built.

We all know that accommodation and facilities have a use-by date; they do not last for ever. They may have a 15, 20 or 30 year lifespan of use without requiring significant renovation or have to be bulldozed, and building start again. They want to retain some say in this. I have been concerned to receive submissions from people who have been in these worthwhile organisations, who are prepared to make a commitment to the people in high-need housing, and they have been, I think, poorly treated in the consultation and the determination, ultimately, of how these operations will work.

For example, one group put to me that, in terms of the indentures and deeds to be signed, even if it gives up the land to the government for the purpose of providing community housing development, it is required to accept that it will forfeit the land. They say, 'Look, we are happy to give the land for 30 or 40 years, whatever is required. If we need it for something else in the meantime we will have to pay that back to the government for any money it might put in to make these developments. We are happy to put in the land, but, when it is being used for that purpose for 20, 30 or 40 years to provide for high-need housing, why can't we get it back? Why can't we at least have the benefit of that land back?' Why? Because the government wants it.

Consistent with that great little home equity plan, the government wants to take the benefit of the increased value of the land. That is why. Not only is the government harvesting all the assets that are out there amongst the community groups, the charities and the churches, they want to take it all. The government wants to be selfish about this and make a capital gain out of it. I think that that is unconscionable. It is the type of story I have heard in the member for Schubert's seat; I have heard it in metropolitan areas. These people have said, 'We are willing to help. We want to be part of this. We understand our community responsibility. We are pleased to help. We want to be part of the building of this because we have the expertise and we have been involved with this for a number of years. We are happy to be part of it.' This

government is to make the decisions and reap or harvest all this. It says those groups will not get it back. If, in 20 or 30 years, the government does not need it, it will sell it. However, if in 20 or 30 years a church or charity wants to use it, to build a school on it or make provision for some other service that is important for that church community or charity, why should they not be able to do that?

I am very concerned about the restructure because, again, in this area of the bill, we will see the abolition of the board—it gets wiped out—and it will be under the exclusive control of the minister and the chief executive officer. Let me just say something about the Aboriginal Housing Authority. It will get sucked right into the Families and Communities structure. It will not have any independence. That board will be sacked, they will be sucked in, and they will have a little unit within the department.

In terms of Aboriginal housing in the state, I want to cite a concern I have about this aspect. In the 2005 year, Aboriginal housing had an \$18 million underspend. I was appalled to read about that. It prompted me to make some inquiries about what others have said about funding of housing for our indigenous community. Here is what Mr Brian Doolan, the Chief Executive Officer of the Fred Hollows Foundation, said on 11 December 2006. When he was interviewed on ABC Radio about the poor health of indigenous Australians, he made comments about the ACOSS Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Report at the time, which described indigenous children dying at almost three times the rate of non-indigenous children, a call for health equality for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and the submission that they had made. He described indigenous health as both a scandal and a source of national shame, as far as he was concerned. I particularly want to focus on his highlighting of how important it is that they have a home to live in, that housing for Aboriginal people in these circumstances is critical to their health and wellbeing, and, indeed, even their life expectancy, which, as we know, for the Aboriginal community is much lower than non-indigenous Australians. In the Northern Territory, they currently die at the average age of 46 years.

So, we have a serious social situation; I am sure members of the house are aware of it. We listen carefully when governments make announcements to help remedy the situation and ease the burden for these people. I have only been in this place a short time but I have heard a lot of statements, yet unfortunately not a lot of delivery. He said, and I was absolutely stunned to hear this:

... everyone knows there is a problem with housing in Aboriginal communities. . . there is an overcrowding problem. . . there are not enough houses. . . that leads to health consequences. But last year somewhere around \$150 million was given back by the states. . . given back to the commonwealth government, that was money that was allocated for Aboriginal housing and they couldn't spend. . .

I was staggered to read that: \$150 million, though not all from South Australia, that state governments all around Australia had not spent. If that is accurate, or even half accurate, it is an absolute disgrace to think that money is waiting, ready to be used, and here is the explanation that state governments give:

Very rarely do we hear about how much of it actually gets through to the people on the ground.

He was asked the question, 'Why was it given back?' to which he replied:

Because they couldn't spend it, they didn't have the infrastructure, they didn't have the plan, they didn't have the commitment to the plan and they didn't have the political will.

That is a shameful situation. He exposed, when interviewed here in South Australia, that there is no state government plan to remedy that situation, that all the issues of nutrition and so forth are all a problem, but there is a major problem with the housing aspect and he indicated that it was necessary to remedy this. He said:

In your own state of South Australia. . . if we were to say what's three things you could do in South Australia as a state to address this—

he looked at somewhere like the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands—

you'd say, one, fix up the water supplies, two, fix up the power supplies, three, get the airstrips maintained and functioning so that people can get in and out. . .

He has made it pretty clear that there are some very serious problems here and that there is a scandalous level of health issues that arise out of a number of aspects, including petrol abuse and so forth. But housing is a very significant aspect that needs to be fixed up if we have any opportunity to remedy the situation for the Aboriginal people. To scale down Aboriginal housing into a unit that fits within Families and Communities and not to have the autonomy when it faces such dire circumstances I think is the wrong direction and that it should be maintained independently. It should have a specific role until it is sorted out and until we are actually able to achieve some parity with the provision for non-indigenous South Australians. I think it takes us in the wrong direction to hide it away in a department and give it no external voice, because the board can get sacked and it will simply cover up this problem by lowering the status of this aspect. In any event, that is what we are about to receive in this legislation in the reform of the structure that is being proposed. I propose to address a number of the specific aspects of that when it comes to the committee stage.

I draw to the parliament's attention the proposed changes to the Residential Tenancies Act. The bill proposes to change the links with the Housing Trust and the Residential Tenancies Appeals Tribunal, and I will have a number of questions for the minister to clarify about exactly how that will operate. It appears that the jurisdiction of the Tribunal will change and it seems that we will have a new panel system when it comes to the determination of what happens when we have a tenancy problem. Hopefully, I have made it clear in my address so far that there are a number of problems in the Housing Trust and community housing facilities which attract disputes between tenants, tenants and neighbours, tenants and whole communities, and, as we have seen recently, the residents of a whole street who have put in a petition to this parliament to get relief from what they claim to be an unbearable situation involving certain tenants of a Housing Trust facility.

The government proposes in this bill, though, that there be a new panel set up. As to whether this is going to be exclusive or an option, I am yet to receive clarification but it seems to work on the basis that the panel will give advice to the chief executive officer and/or minister. From memory, the process is one where the panel will give recommendations. There is some kind of appeal to the minister if people do not like the decision and, without giving any published reasons, he can deliver a judgment, and his decision is final. I will have a bit to say about the secrecy aspects of that and the whole question of access to any fair hearing. However, undoubtedly, we will see a concentration of power to the

chief executive and the minister, and I will be interested to know how much time he will allocate per week from his busy schedule to deal with tenancy disputes under the new structure. I will be fascinated to hear the answer to that.

I turn to the amendments to the Development Act, the Housing Improvement Act and the Housing and Urban Development Act. According to the minister's contribution, these proposed changes are necessary to create an environment which will provide affordable housing in this state. In a nutshell, there will be a change of legal and regulatory obligation to local councils to encourage developments and facilitate the approval of developments, which are to include a 15 per cent affordable housing component. Without going into the detail of the proposal, I am, of course, talking about the government's initiative to provide affordable housing to South Australians by proposing that, with any development undertaken in this state over a certain size (I think it was to be about 20 homes), apart from its other obligations of green space and so on, 15 per cent of its dwellings would be some type of cheaper or affordable housing, perhaps smaller, and 5 per cent of those dwellings (within the 15 per cent) are to be for people with special needs. So, presumably, whether that is for the aged, for people with disabilities or for people with mental health issues, there may need to be extra structural obligations to ensure that it is a dwelling suitable for a person with high needs. That is the thrust of the government's answer to providing for people in need, and I make it quite clear that that proposal is one that the Liberal Party opposes.

I was also concerned to learn that there had been what I have to describe as scant consultation and that, at the time this bill was introduced—and even when I came to speak on it on the first occasion that it came before the house last year—my own local council, and indeed a number of neighbouring metropolitan councils, did not even know about it. They had not seen the bill and they had not been consulted on a new local government affordable housing resource kit (which was like a manual) to implement this program. Yet they were—within the knowledge of the government—local councils who would be called upon to accommodate this type of development within their areas of responsibility. The law was going to be changed so that they could do it and, indeed, would be encouraged to do it, and would have the power to do it, irrespective of their obligations under their PARs, yet they had not even been consulted.

When I made inquiries of the Local Government Association, I found that a number of councils outside the inner metropolitan area of Adelaide had seen the resource document. At that stage the LGA had not even seen that, but it called for it, and, as I understand it, it has had a look at it in the meantime. It worries me somewhat, that here we are, imposing a major reform, an obligation on local governments across South Australia, and the very councils that have indicated concerns about this type of proposal—having read about it in the paper—were not shown it at all.

I assume, at this point, that the Local Government Association (being the representative body) took the matter up immediately and tried to make sure that its members knew a bit more about this legislation. I think it is very tardy of any government to bring in legislation—I think a bit sneakily, to avoid scrutiny or objection—with the full knowledge of which councils would object. It is fair to say that I represent an area covering the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council and the Burnside council. I have neighbours at the Mitcham and Unley councils which cover inner metropolitan

regions, which, not surprisingly, have something to say about this.

Let me just explain why: because they have PARs that are pretty strict when it comes to the protection of heritage and the maintenance of certain streetscapes and landscapes in the community. They all have a similar factor; that is, that almost all their entire area of responsibility, their jurisdiction, is built on or is already identified as community or parkland. So, they do not have spare land. They do not have what we call green space. They do not have these open land tracts that may or may not be able to be available for housing in the future.

They have built, basically, on everywhere they can build and they have the opportunity to redevelop as dwellings or structures tire or expire, and that is really what they are limited to, because they are pretty skinflint when it comes to parklands and certainly their communities do not want to accommodate or embrace any reduction of that. I would not ask them to, but I would be concerned if the local councils are expected to accommodate legislation that will require them to embrace dwellings contrary to the PAR which has been determined by the council and which has been signed off by the minister.

It is presented in the second reading speech almost as if we are going to change the law so they are encouraged and given the opportunity to do it, but there is absolutely no question that what is really happening here is that it is imposing an obligation on them to do it. One could argue that it is giving them a protection against complaining constituents, and they will be able to say, 'Look, it is not our fault. State government has imposed this obligation on us. We need to be able to do this. We cannot do any developments unless we have this 15 per cent rule.' It is the idea that they are being given some umbrella of protection against criticism, but they know and I know, and many in this house will know when their councils get in touch with them, that that is not going to be an excuse to the constituent who goes in to the council and complains about this in the future.

The overriding objective here must be—must be—that it is the government's will, in requiring a 15 per cent affordability of development program, that it wants inner metropolitan council areas to do it within their districts. It is some sort of social justice or equity issue, that people out at Salisbury, in the Onkaparinga council district, Tea Tree Gully, One Tree Hill—wherever there might be outer metropolitan land available, where they might have large tracts of land—should not be the only ones who are making provision for affordable housing within their regions. I do not disagree with that in principle, but what I do say is this: the reason that those councils are able to accommodate that very often in the developments that they approve—and they embrace it and they welcome the opportunity—is because they know that to be able to get access to that land, to be able to have permission to build on it, there has to be some quid pro quo.

They do not have a problem with knocking down some heritage site or interfering with the character of a streetscape because they have open land. We find that those councils—and if we move even further out, of course, to councils that cover small country towns—welcome this. They welcome the opportunity. An application comes in, the ink is hardly dry and the council is ready to say, 'Fantastic. No problem. Move in. You have covered all the environmental and other obligations that are necessary to comply with this. We welcome you.' That is great, but you cannot expect that those who do not have greenfield sites, those who do not have open space and a clean plan to start on are going to have the same

capacity to bring their community with them to comply with this sort of affordable housing proposal, because it is not going to happen.

The government was so secretive about not even telling them about this bill, not even showing them the draft bill, and the constituent councils—out of the 68, I think, that we have in South Australia—the very ones that might have raised some concern about this, were not even told about it. I think that is shameful in itself, but what it is important to understand that there is a level of obligation on some of these other councils. They are impeded from this aspect with the obligation to represent their community and understand the character of their area, and they do not have the freedom that these other councils have.

So, it is not a simple exercise of simply saying, 'Well, we will produce to you the Local Government Affordable Housing Resource Kit which will show you how you can go out there and convince your district that you can comply with this and you can accommodate the wish of the government on this program,' because it is not going to work. They are going to take the flak and they know it, and they are concerned about it and, obviously, they have raised some objection to it.

The other thing I want to say in relation to the plan of having a statewide development of affordable housing is this. Every one I have seen who has any understanding of the importance of social housing—that is, providing some sort of subsidised housing—believes that we are way past the concept of providing high-rise, multidwelling, Housing Trust style properties that we had in the past, in the fifties and sixties. We have seen them in South Australia, we have seen them in ghettos around Australia, and probably many members have seen them in what we understand to be quite inappropriate housing ghettos all around the world. We understand that that is not the best way to accommodate and support these people. Many millions of people around the world still live in such accommodation, but it is not the desired way to do it. We all agree with that.

The Liberal Party is not seeking that the government deal with affordable housing by building multistorey buildings in outlying regional towns or by providing it in suburbs that are sitting on the fringe of the greater metropolitan boundary of Adelaide. We are not asking that—no-one is asking that. But, we are asking the government to be realistic and understand that there is a very different standard of structures, rules and thresholds that inner city metropolitan councils have to get over to keep the confidence of their own communities, and it is a far different picture for those councils on the fringe. To highlight what I see as quite a hypocrisy here, as I said the last time I spoke on this bill, I have seen in my own electorate (and there may be instances, as I have invited members to examine, in other inner metropolitan areas) that there has been a massive sell-off of Housing Trust homes.

Mrs Geraghty: And in mine, because your government let the banks off.

Ms CHAPMAN: I do not doubt that for one moment. But, if the government is serious about saying, 'We don't want people to have Housing Trust accommodation in just Murray Bridge, Whyalla, Port Augusta or in the metropolitan area of Adelaide where there have been historically large tracts of Housing Trust accommodation such as Hillcrest (and I mention Hillcrest not to single it out because a lot of it has been redeveloped) where there have been whole suburbs built—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Absolutely. Whole suburbs have been built for Housing Trust development. They have been selling them off at a massive rate in my electorate and in your electorate. So, I find it hypocritical for the government to say, 'We have to have an equitable situation across South Australia. We have to ensure that inner city areas also have accommodation available for people with high and special needs', yet it is selling those areas off. So, in addressing the question of whether we move down the path of the 15 per cent affordable housing across the board in South Australia as providing some kind of equal access across South Australia, the government has failed on every count on social equity and inclusion.

From the point of view of dealing with housing affordability generally, I say at this point that the failure to deal with housing costs, land supply, building costs and development costs—the issues that I have raised in some detail—has created the greatest act of social exclusion this state has ever seen. We are about to exclude a whole generation of younger people in this state, who I have already indicated are leaving in droves, from access to a little piece of South Australia—an opportunity to buy into our state, to have a stake in our state. We have excluded them in every way from gaining that access. I put to the parliament: how could we give a greater connection to South Australia than for us to educate our children, help them into employment, and support them in travel to learn from other places in the world but be able to come back to South Australia to have their families and enjoy the ambience and benefit of this state and the lifestyle that we have enjoyed here? The best way to do that is to give them some chance of gaining access into the housing market and having a little piece of South Australia. The whole housing affordability thrust of this government has been to just completely continue to saturate, squash and suffocate the opportunity for young people to have access to that little piece of South Australia.

This government can rave on all it likes about social inclusion, but it has socially excluded an age group in the community in a manner the likes of which I have not seen in any other generation. We have seen other administrations—Labor and Liberal—throughout the history of this state that have focused on supporting young people coming to this country by way of immigration after the world wars—indeed, before the First World War—and supporting land ownership. And not only young people have been invited here: others have been encouraged also. All we have done under this government is make it harder for our own young people to buy houses, and there is no incentive whatsoever for anyone coming from another state or country to live here. To me, that seems not only stupid but it is also a gross act of exclusion of those people.

I return to the actual program itself. We have had this resource kit distributed—not widely, but it is getting out there—and people have had a bit to say about it. Let us consider the program itself, because one has to ask oneself the question whether, even if parliament is not persuaded that this has some serious problems in how it will work and operate, it will actually do what it is supposed to do. Will it create housing developments of affordable accommodation, both in design and cost and so forth, for people with high needs and who are on limited income? And will this proposal ensure for those in our community who are eligible that that remains available to them and it is not exploited by others who may take advantage of what would be affordable and cheaper accommodation under this program?

I have received notice from the minister of a proposed amendment which I think on the face of it will introduce a structure to assist in removing the loopholes for people who might try to exploit this program and protect the properties covered by the intention of this legislation for those who genuinely need it. I will refer to that matter in due course. I mention here the position of the Housing Industry Association when it came to look at this proposal, and in particular the amendments dealing with this aspect, namely, the amendments to the Housing and Urban Development Administration Arrangements Act 1995 and the Development Act of 1993. With reference to the latter, the Housing Industry Association had this to say:

This last amendment requires all new development plans and any subsequent amended development plans to take into account new criteria, namely, 'to promote planning and development systems that support sustainable and affordable housing outcomes for the community.' Whilst this may seem to be a minor change, it has wide-ranging implications. The amendment itself may appear to be uncontroversial, indeed laudable, but needs to be read in context of the local government affordable housing resource kit—

to which I have referred—

which is a draft document which is proposed to be directed to councils as to how affordable housing might be achieved. This is an extensive document and will have a significant impact on the process of creating new development plans or amendments. The document attempts to achieve the minister's aim of 15 per cent affordable housing, including 5 per cent high-need housing. Part A of this document speaks of the history of subsidised housing and examines the definition of affordable housing in the context of income and rent and mortgage repayments. Part B of the document deals with how councils may set planning policy and the processes by which the new requirements in the draft bill, should it be adopted, may be achieved.

Part C is the most important section so far as the development of the housing industry is concerned in that it sets out a proposed scheme by which councils through their development plans may promote affordable housing by providing a more streamlined approval process for those development applications which meet the 15 per cent requirement. If the development does not meet the 15 per cent requirement, then there is a more complicated planning process by which approval will be obtained. The obvious incentive is to provide the 15 per cent to streamline the process.

Part C also sets out some indicative trade-offs which could be granted by councils in order to encourage developers to achieve the 15 per cent. There are matters such as reduction of minimum of lot size, reduced car parking provisions, reduced private open space, etc. Unfortunately, none of the trade-offs are, in our view, sufficient to encourage developers to proceed down this path, particularly in infill development. Of course, the HIA here is speaking of the developments in those particular councils that I have referred to. It goes on to say:

The great danger, in our view, is that the new requirements written into subsequent development plans will further delay and inhibit the approval process. We can well imagine certain councils rejecting a development application because it doesn't meet the affordable housing requirements, and then with the subsequent lodgement rejecting it on the basis that it doesn't meet density requirements, setbacks etc. The proposals may well have some merit in relation to broadacre developments within the urban growth boundary held by the government and marketed through the Land Management Corporation where the requirements can be made part of the tender process and the pricing structure created to reflect that.

There may also be room for trade-off in LMC land outside the UGB where the release is conditional upon the developer achieving the required percentage. In our view it will be almost impossible to achieve in regard to private infill development for a number of reasons: the land available will simply not be big enough to economically achieve the 15 per cent other than by loading the other 85 per cent. If you add this 15 per cent to the proposed changes to the OH and S requirements of the environmental site audit requirements, then the developer-builder is never going to be able to

produce a product which is below \$200 000. The need to move through what is a difficult planning process in order to achieve the 15 per cent will, in our view, result in increased delays and significant holding charges which will also add to the cost and make the project unattractive.

The object of the legislation might well be achieved in infill developments by private developers if the government is prepared to provide attractive incentives which would offset the cost to the builder-developer. For example, if there were taxation concessions through stamp duty and land tax which remove the aggregation provision, then there would be more transparent partnership of the sharing of the costs of these requirements between industry and the government.

In a nutshell, they are saying that the cost will increase significantly, the cost will go on to the other 85 per cent, it will delay the process, and it will be a problem; and, therefore, if the government want to go down this line, even if it costs the other 85 per cent out in broadacre areas, that really is the only area that you can follow through a proposal. They are talking of a cost of some \$200 000 as being a minimum price to produce a unit or a dwelling or a facility or a tent, whatever it is going to be, in this affordable area, but presumably smaller and with less amenity and fewer bells and whistles on it in the sense of trying to keep the cost down, so it will be a sort of budget-priced accommodation and quite possibly much smaller. I am not saying that is a bad thing because when we look at the profile of the Housing Trust, which I have referred to, nearly 50 per cent of the entire demand and occupancy of Housing Trust accommodation involves single applicants—people who are looking for single accommodation. I do not criticise in principle the provision of smaller budget accommodation, but I do say, as is endorsed by the HIA, that it will not work and it is just going to add the cost to other new home owners. You might try to create a remedy for some, but you will simply transfer the load to others.

More recently, because of the elapse of time and the opportunity for further consideration of this matter, the Housing Industry Association has provided to the minister, by letter of 25 January 2007, its response to the local government affordable housing resource kit. I mentioned that this was a document that was kept secret at the time this legislation was brought in, but appropriately they got some copies of it and had a look at it. The HIA wrote to the minister this year by letter of 25 January, and I just refer to a few aspects.

First, he thanks the minister for at least having a chance to comment on this kit, having been able to get a copy of it and look at it. However, Mr Harding, the Chief Executive Director of this organisation, says:

HIA is opposed to the proposal of imposing ‘up to 10 per cent affordable housing and 5 per cent high needs housing’ as a mandatory requirement for any new developments. HIA is strongly of the view that the proposal is simply a ‘supported accommodation’ levy and will simply operate to pass on the costs of social housing, which should be an all of community cost, to that small section of the community which is purchasing a new residence.

Again, its point is very clear: everyone has to take on the responsibility—all taxpayers, all the community—to help those who need housing, not just the other 85 per cent in every new development who will be called on for the cost of subsidising this. The HIA goes on to say:

A significant proportion of those who are part of this purchasing public are first home buyers and as such are in the least affordable position to carry the burden of what should be, as we say, a whole of community cost. HIA believes this is a particularly relevant consideration in light of the latest figures concerning affordability in South Australia where first home owners are now required to

commit over 30 per cent of their disposable income in meeting the costs of their housing.

This really highlights the point I have raised about the social exclusion of our younger generation, and the HIA makes it abundantly clear. It has had a careful consideration of how it will work, it has looked at the documents, given advice to the government, and said no. The HIA highlights to the minister the concerns that the new requirements will simply further delay and inhibit the approval process, and reiterates to the government in this letter to the minister that there are important things that need to be looked at in reform of this area. It says again that those fundamentals that impact on the affordability of this state are inadequate land release, the dysfunctional planning system that frustrates the development process, and the issue of state taxes. The HIA comes in with its wish list of tradeoffs in relation to taxes, costs of development and so on.

Governments can make decisions about which areas of relief they are going to grant, but it seems at this stage that the government is prepared to give no relief to these costs but still expects that small pool of new home owners in these new developments to bear the costs. The HIA highlights just how inequitable this is and makes the point as follows:

Every developer that HIA spoke to in regard to the process indicated that their experience told them that wherever they had produced high density construction in the outer fringes and at an affordable price they had simply not sold. The market was determined by the buyer.

That is a concern in itself, because we have heard the minister announce publicly and in this house that he has had the support of some developers who have come forward and said that this is quite a good idea. Of course, we note that that has come from developers who have had the benefit of land release from the government in some very significant proposals and that these are proposals that have been approved before the application has been granted. It is not really surprising—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: The minister starts interjecting. For those who have gone through a tender process and who have been eligible for the benefits of this, is it not surprising that we have them come out and say, ‘Yes, we have accommodated and affordable housing—’

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: We can go into donors to the Labor Party if the minister likes, but we will not today. What we will do is highlight that when the minister comes in here he gives us the parade of developers who have supported this program, but the HIA, which has actually spoken to a large number of developers, tells the minister in black and white that every developer that it has spoken to in regard to this process has told it of this problem; not only the problem in relation to the 85/15 per cent aspect, but that the properties have not even sold. It is time that the minister understood that there is a problem out there already and simply trotting this out as a magic formula to deal with housing affordability will not resolve this problem.

In relation to the inner city councils, the HIA says that it is naive to assume that inner city local councils will trade off density requirements and set-back requirements for the affordability quotient. That makes it absolutely clear. An example of this is in the Mitcham council, where a recent development was submitted to council in accordance with the development plan density requirements and had to be significantly amended before approval was granted, resulting

in a decrease in density and a consequent \$48 000 a block increase in price. Finally, the tradeoffs being suggested by the kit are simply insufficient to encourage any developer to incorporate the quotient in their development plan applications. The HIA goes on with overseas examples and highlights to the minister the massive costs there are.

It is concerned about the ability of inner city councils to proceed with the proposal in any appropriate time line, and how inequitable it is that they be imposed against the community's wishes. Local governments are going to be in a no-win situation. They are going to get a belting if this obligation is imposed on them, and the poor people who attempt to buy a property within any of these developments, if they are the 85 per cent people, will have to put in a whole lot of extra money to buy their home to subsidise what is there. In addition, we will have a very unhappy series of constituents. We will have the new home owners paying the extra and we will have those in the affordable accommodation having been imposed into that community, and that in itself could be pretty ugly.

We do not want to see a situation where there is resistance in any community to people of special need or higher demand or a situation where there may be some resistance to their having had all the rules broken for them to enable that accommodation, and for them to be unwelcome. That would be an absolute tragedy and truly would be a very unacceptable social situation. The minister has had it in black and white: he has had it absolutely clear as to the problems.

There is another problem, which relates to how you stop people who are not qualified for relief, under the definitions of those who should have access to affordable housing, and how you protect that. I do not mean here the sort of carnivorous, money hungry developers who want to buy up and resell these properties, do some improvements on them and make a huge profit; I am not talking about those; they are easy to stop. What I am talking about here is how do you stop people who are going to live in or have the benefit of these assets but who are not in that sort of deserving category as those we want to define as having access to affordable accommodation because they have a special need. They will supposedly be accommodated and protected by an amendment which has been foreshadowed by the government, and I will go into the detail.

Essentially, I am advised by those who have been looking at the development of this legislation that the amendment to introduce covenants to secure certain commitments is the way, on the legal advice that has been obtained, to go towards protecting this resource of 15 per cent in each of these developments, to be really quarantined against other people coming in and making a profit, and who are not satisfying certain criteria. The criteria proposed for persons to have access to these properties and to be protected under covenant are to be specified in an agreement. My understanding, on the information, again, is that this process would be binding, that it is necessary to have an extra covenant to secure this position, and that the criterion is essentially low to moderate income earners as defined in the local government affordable housing resource kit.

I do not take any issue with the definition of who should qualify for it. What concerns me is ensuring all of the covenant's obligations to restrict the use of this land or buildings that are proposed to be developed, that it only be occupied by a person who meets the criteria, and that there be disclosure of information. So, you really have to jump a number of hurdles in order to have access to and use of this

facility, or to be able to buy it, rent it, or live in it. It all sounds good, but there are certainly some aspects about which I have concerns; namely, how you keep under surveillance these properties to ensure that no other persons are living in it, having the benefit of it, or that they are being sub rented or sub tenanted. The government may say, 'Look, we have that problem already. We have to make sure and we have to send out our officers from the Housing Trust to check that an eligible person who is a tenant and who has been granted access to and use of property does not have other friends living there who are not contributing to the rent. Or, if they do, that their assessable income is taken into account for the purposes of determining what the rent is, that they haven't got other hangers on, relatives or others who are using the property.'

Quite frankly, there are obviously a number of cases, which I am sure other members have had brought to their attention, where it does become a problem, because people who are often in poor circumstances rely on friends and acquaintances and do offer the use of their property for people to stay short and long-term, which is in direct contradiction of their current obligations as tenants in the South Australian Housing Trust accommodation. Be under no illusion, this will not be an issue that will just evaporate as a result of having a new system or of producing these covenants which produce some legal umbrella over those who have access to this affordable housing initiative—at least the 15 per cent of the property that will be available for those persons who satisfy the criteria.

It may be that the government is satisfied that this is the way; it is ironclad, it will have Crown Law advice; it is enforceable and everything else, and it will protect the asset from being used, accessed, abused or profited from by people for whom it is not meant. Even if that happens—and I have some concerns about that—I still say, as the HIA has made it perfectly clear, that it is not acceptable to introduce a program which will add to the cost of all of the houses, and, moreover, make sure that the 85 per cent of other home owners in that development will pay the cost. That is not acceptable; it is unconscionable, and it is something that needs to be considered, because it would not only drive more of our young home owners out of the state, it will create another inequity and a greater problem with housing and accessibility.

In relation to a number of programs, I have commented on the government initiatives that it has announced and promised to do great things in helping the homeless and those who are less able to have affordable housing. Some of them we support; some of them we do not think will be of much use; some of them we think are dreadful. Of course, the Home-Start equity loan rip off of profiting from the poor is in that latter category.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

Ms CHAPMAN: Some of the programs that the government announced include a private rental liaison program to assist people getting into private rental accommodation, and a supported tenancy program to employ people to assist with advocacy and support. Whilst these programs are meritorious, they do not actually produce any more housing; they just help people identify what limited resources may be available to be able to access them. We do not criticise the program per se. To be frank, there is not a lot of point having liaison officers and people to help you find alternative accommodation if

there is not much alternative accommodation to get. The programs are very limited and, although there are government initiatives in this area—and we would not be critical of them—we say you still need a resource at the end from which you can draw for the purpose of accommodating those in need.

I have referred to the common ground project. The delay is very disappointing but, nevertheless, the principle is a good one and it does employ the benefits of those in the private sector to try to assist in that regard. We have talked about the harvesting from the private and capital funding from others, including drawing on the resources of commonwealth rent relief, and trying to identify where the land is out there or where there are capital funds in trusts or charities or church groups that can make a contribution. We have heard of the government's 15 per cent of subsidised housing and developments proposal, and I think I have addressed that matter quite extensively but, in essence, in the end it will not resolve the problem and it will simply shove the cost on to someone else.

I have made comment about the HomeStart equity loans and how dangerous going in that direction is for those who are least able to make a contribution, and who will be deprived at the end of a period of time when they have finished with that accommodation perhaps to move to smaller aged accommodation; they lose the share of the profit, and they end up again being homeless. That idea is a bit of a revolving door.

We have the renovation of homeless facilities and, as we have seen, a classic example of that is to force people in student accommodation to go out and find their own; to put them in a homeless facility while they do up their facility. That is the sort of Adelaide city/Kent Town example that I have identified and which has its own problems. We have had telephone legal advice for those who are homeless; again, admirable on the face of it, but not much point if five years ago there were 800 people sleeping on the streets every night and we still have that problem today. Having someone help them with legal advice may help a very small number stay in accommodation where they have entitlements and for which they need representation, but this is really window dressing when it comes to dealing with those who need supported/subsidised accommodation when there is simply no access to the resource.

One of the areas that I think the government can assist with is the question of land release. That is a matter which I have discussed at some length as to where they can make a difference, and I think it is a matter which the government should revisit. I think another important direction that could be followed is, of course, to abandon this policy of a fire sale of the Housing Trust stock that we have seen. I have made some detailed comment in relation to this issue to date. I was interested to recently see again in the paper not just the sale of actual existing homes—some are renovated, some are not—which would otherwise be very suitable for accommodating those many thousands of people who are sitting on the Housing Trust waiting list, but properties which the government has elected to sell off.

I note that the real estate section of *The Advertiser* on 10 February detailed 21 Housing Trust properties, 19 of which were blocks of land for sale by the government in the areas of Seaton, Royal Park and Osborne. They do not have anything on them at this stage: they are blocks of land. Again, we are selling off those assets and depriving people of the opportunity to build affordable accommodation in locations which, I think it is fair to say, could produce an overall

package in terms of housing at a lower cost, because the land value in those suburbs—relative to others in metropolitan Adelaide—is more affordable for the purposes of development.

We know that this land is suitable because, even when the Housing Trust advertised to sell these properties at, for example, Florey Street, Seaton, it is described as 'Land, land, glorious land. Rare opportunity to acquire vacant land and build your new home in this well-positioned location with close proximity to West Lakes shopping mall and cinema precinct whilst also enjoying easy access to AAMI football stadium and the beach.' Here we have all the amenities which people would like to enjoy and blocks of land at an affordable price within a range, they say here, of \$130 000 to \$148 000.

I would have thought that to retain that resource would be a priority for the Housing Trust, but it seems not; those blocks are on the market. If they have not sold in the last 10 days they are there and available for someone to scoop up, and it does beg the question of the government's priorities when it comes to selling off this land. A third area which I think the government ought to consider relates to the re-investment at least of some of the revenue it earns from property taxes. It earns a significant amount. I have advised the house that something like one-tenth of the total budgeted revenue earned by this government is from property taxes.

I refer to direct taxes on people who own property: land tax, stamp duty on conveyances, mortgages and the like, development costs and so on, amounting to \$1.119 billion out of last year's total revenue. I would have thought that there was an opportunity for some recognition of the very substantial contribution that land owners in this state make toward the revenue of the government, and that some portion of that could be earmarked either for re-investment back into housing that provides a subsidised facility for those in need or, alternatively, to provide relief in respect of some of those taxes so that it gives more people access into the real estate market.

An example may be that for new home owners who were prepared to purchase a property outside the greater metropolitan area of Adelaide, particularly in our rural and regional towns of South Australia, the government might consider abolishing stamp duty on the conveyance for the purchase of that property, and that would do a number of things: it would help to provide affordable accommodation in regional South Australia; it would help to build and support the infrastructure of human resource into regional South Australia; and it would help deal with workforce shortages, and the like, that some of our rural and regional communities are facing.

It is not for me to tell the government what it must do, but I would have thought that, from \$1.119 billion worth of revenue, it could think of initiatives that would put some of that money back into providing affordable housing. That would mean that it is the property owner market that makes the contribution to affordable housing, and that is less than the total taxpayer base. I think that the government must ask itself the question whether it accepts that the whole of the community should be contributing to this responsibility, which historically they have done by virtue of the establishment of the South Australian Housing Trust in the 1930s. Even if the government did not accept that it should remain a responsibility of the broader base (which, clearly, it does not because it is moving into other more narrow bases for contribution), at the very least, that reinvestment from the property revenue could be a very substantial benefit in resolving the problem of housing affordability.

I do not think for one moment, in regard to some of the occupational health and safety requirements, for example, that have been initiated and came into effect in June last year, that you can go through those one by one and say, 'We do not really need that one,' or 'This one has not really been a problem.' I do not propose to do that exercise. I think there are always meritorious reasons for ensuring that there is a safe place of work for people in the building and construction of homes and there is also a place to ensure that the product that is produced at the end of that exercise is something that is safe for the occupier and owner in due course, and one cannot compromise that. But it seems to me that it is important that the government has a full understanding of the financial cost of implementing those obligations, and they are clearly massive, from the information that I have outlined.

There are some other initiatives and ideas that have been taken up already in Australia, and some internationally, which I think have some merit. Let me first go to the government's initiative to ask South Australian architecture students, which the South Australian government did in 2006, to produce innovative designs that could be used to create affordable housing in the future. That is, here is the charter. We have a certain profile of people who need accommodation. Very often they are single. We are not looking for families of mum, dad and four children whom we have traditionally accommodated in the old Housing Trust land developments that I have referred to. We need to have, very often, smaller and more suitably located accommodation that can have energy efficiencies and the like, which, when built from scratch, can be a lot less expensive to both build and maintain than renovating some of the older designs which are really out of date and not suitable for this day and age. I think that was a great initiative.

There has certainly been some publicity around having our young thinkers come up with ideas for this, and it was a great initiative. It is also important that we involve young people in this. I asked all the engineering students at the University of Adelaide and University of South Australia to come up with a number of designs as to how they might resolve the Britannia roundabout traffic hazard that we have had for 50 years. In fact, I was looking at a photograph of the Britannia roundabout the other day taken in 1956 and the same problems were there then, but now we have a much increased number of vehicles going through that intersection. We have a major traffic hazard in that there are 2½ accidents there a week, on average, and we have some major problems with that. I asked the university students what they thought after the government announced the cancellation of an initiative and we were back to the drawing board. I sent all those to the Minister for Transport and I was disappointed that I have not heard a squeak since.

So, the important thing to do with these initiatives when we ask young people to come up with ideas is that we actually follow them, look carefully at them and adopt from them any great initiatives they might have, not bury them in some filing cabinet never to be seen again. It was a great initiative, minister. I wish your colleague in transport would have followed through on some of the initiatives in transport and road reform but, nevertheless, it was quite a good idea.

Most recently, we have also seen publicity surrounding younger couples, generally, who have acquired properties that have had a previous alternative use, and this has been seen in areas in metropolitan Adelaide, particularly, where people have acquired old churches and old warehouses and renovated them. They have obtained permission through their

local councils to sometimes change the use and develop the properties. In fact, in today's paper I read about a lighthouse and a fire station, which were listed on a new website which is a potential resource for people to share interesting ideas with respect to providing new accommodation for the current generation. I am talking about single people or couples without children who have not necessarily looked for standard suburban homes that previous generations have historically known. They are great initiatives, and it is very important to be able to follow them through. I think the Real Estate Institute was behind the new website, to enable agents to list properties free of charge that are accessible to the public, who can take up these initiatives. This means that we can think outside the square a little and try to identify where there are other opportunities that have not been explored to date. I wish the Real Estate Institute good luck with that initiative. We thank it for bringing that to the attention of the public.

I now want to talk about what has been happening overseas. A few months ago I was in London, where I learned of some interesting initiatives. They are looking at the modern phenomenon of making sure that, when one starts with green space, one ensures that a certain area of open space is kept. We all understand that, with respect to issues such as obesity, children, planning safe suburbs where people are not mugged, and so on, we need to look at planning as being very important. We need open spaces, accessible transport routes, safe environments in which to walk and live and, where possible, energy efficient accommodation and design which reflects the advance in understanding of how accommodation should be a secure place and a home for people to live in but also to fit in with current expectations, that it be tastefully and appropriately blended to the environment, without causing hazard either to the environment or to precious resources such as water and energy.

Recently, I noted with some interest an article published by the national magazine *Urban Land*, which identified a number of other quite innovative ideas overseas. One was about Sweden, where they had what we would describe generally as the ghetto type approach. They have built these rather ugly buildings, which are 30 or 40 years old. They are dog boxes, in the sense of open space for family living. However, if they are properly renovated—walls knocked out and new kitchens and bathrooms—one can create an environment that is still high-rise living.

Although it would not be something that I would rush into if I had a choice, plenty of people, especially the younger generation, are quite happy to live in high-rise developments. It is not something which is foreign to them or which they find offensive. They find it convenient. If it is close to transport, work, amenities, social facilities and so on, they are quite happy to live in high-rise accommodation. However, they want something which has a modern feel about it and something of which they can be proud with respect to the environment. There has been very significant renovation of facilities in Gardsten in Sweden. This involved an old 1970s development, which consisted of 10 buildings—it was a massive development—and it has been a splendid renovation. Garden balconies and the like have been established, along with water and energy efficient facilities and opening it up with glass access and so forth. It is a magnificent development.

Italy is also facing major costs in relation to property prices, and the cost of renting a small flat is the equivalent of something like \$600 a month. It is very expensive. They are

looking for alternatives and they are also looking at major redevelopments of previous facilities. There has been a real push, it seems, to make sure that renovations that are carried out result in buildings being much more energy efficient and much less costly to maintain. These buildings are maintained at a reasonable height, and savings are able to be made on the cost of living in them, which makes it more affordable.

I think this is an area that we should look at, not the every now and then occasional pilot program of putting in a couple of solar panels on Parliament House or some ad hoc thing; I am talking about something universal or across the board, a completely new redevelopment. If the housing costs are at a parameter which leaves little margin for improvement, then we need to at least look at the maintenance and energy costs and restructure them so that the day-to-day or weekly living expenses are able to be minimised. That is another way of making things more affordable.

In Bordeaux, France, they have gone for large-scale developments. For example, they had a 1 550 home development, of which 500 were defined as low cost, plus four acres of parkland, two primary schools, a secondary school, a gymnasium and local retail units, all in one unit. The government might say, 'Well, that's what we're doing. We are setting up developments so that we have a proportion of low-cost accommodation.' The difference is that in France they are not trying to reproduce a development in a built-up area. They are not that silly. These people are saying, 'We need large accommodation. We are going to make it decent accommodation, and we are going to add the facilities to it.' They are not so silly as to try to rip out the heart of Paris and rebuild it where it is simply inappropriate and unaffordable. They have done some tremendous work in France and introduced new transport routes that go with the housing developments. I think that is also worth exploring.

There are some areas in Paris where parcels of land have been sold off to develop more concentrated accommodation. The replica here would be that instead of selling off 11 Housing Trust homes in Hazelwood Park, they could sell off six or seven and make sure that they have some affordable accommodation by having smaller dwellings on the remaining ones, and staying within the PAR requirements of either the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters council or the Burnside council. They could still produce accommodation and benefit from it, and I would urge them to consider that type of model.

What has been done in Germany is probably even more of an initiative. Overseas investment in German housing development has been encouraged, and I think that is something that needs to be explored. It may not be that everyone is rushing from overseas to buy up property in Australia, but there is an example of overseas investment next to my property on Kangaroo Island. A couple in France invested in the acquisition of a piece of farming property next to me. They purchased this property over the internet. They did that because they saw Australia as a safe and secure country. In the event that there was further difficulty in Europe, they saw Australia as a safe haven. They saw it as an investment in the future for themselves and their family to buy a piece of Australia, rent it out in the meantime and, if they need it, to be able to live in it. That is nearly a one million dollar investment in South Australia by one couple in France. So I think it is worthwhile looking at how we can package Australia to the world for investment in housing, whether for occupancy or rental accommodation.

There are some issues in relation to foreign ownership, but that is not one of them. Unlike Tokyo, where I think it is very difficult for any non-Japanese person to actually buy into the country, we make some provision—although there are some restrictions—to enable that to happen. So, let us look to the rest of the world and offer South Australia, in particular, as a means of assisting us with the development of housing.

Belgium has gone down the public/private partnership model for subsidised housing. That is pretty embryonic and I think it is something that we can have a look at. To some degree, it is a bit like the government's proposal to build a new prison: they are going to sell off all the assets at Yatala, and so forth, and rebuild a new prison in the member for Hammond's electorate under a public/private partnership. Somebody else puts the money in, they build the facility, lease it out, provide the service, and the government pays an annual fee. The government has shown some initiative but, when it comes to housing accommodation, it seems to be blinkered and just goes down the line of getting private people to pay rather than looking at some of these other options.

The other area, again in London—but not attempting to rush into Mayfair and try and buy up blocks there, or where there are already built up areas—is where they are looking at what they call 'mixed use blocks', where you have a mix of types of accommodation available. So, they are not all double-storey three-bedroom apartments, or they are not all of one particular design, but you actually have a variety; you can have family living, singles living, young people, some mature age sections, and that seems to be something that they are looking at.

Interestingly, in London I did look at a number of estates. Sadly, when I was looking at the juvenile justice area I would have to say that some of the housing developments that people were living in, and particularly where they have a large number of people who have emigrated from other countries without much funding, are what I would call pretty appalling accommodation. Some of the initiatives that are being undertaken in England I think are worth having a look at. I think that the government should open its eyes here and understand that there are answers out there.

It is not for me to tell it what to do but I think that at the very least it is my responsibility, in opposition, to alert the government to the fact that it is happening, that there are some opportunities out there and that the direction it is proposing to take at the moment is the wrong direction and will only exacerbate the problem. We will have more and more people who will be in need of affordable or subsidised housing, with less resource to do anything, and a bigger problem to solve. So, with those few comments, I will conclude my contribution.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am speaking tonight in relation to the government's affordable housing bill. I make an initial comment about the names given to legislation these days. This legislation is a bit like the fair work bill, in the sense that it makes more sense, really, if you give it the opposite name to which it has, because it is really about unaffordable housing. It is about a terrible problem that we have in our community. Before I get to the bill, I think we cannot really deal with the content without talking about the sort of people who are suffering in our community under the current state of the law and the current state of public housing.

Like many other members in the house, I see a lot of people who deal with the Housing Trust and are aspiring to

get into Housing Trust accommodation. These days, of course, it is really only welfare housing. It is a far cry from the public housing that I knew when I was a boy. My parents, who had very basic jobs when they were newlyweds, were able to qualify for a Housing Trust home. It had fairly typical sickly green coloured paint—the timber framed home at Hectorville in which we began.

Times have changed, and these days you really have to have some sort of severe personal issue to qualify for category 1 housing; for example, some serious health issue, a disability, perhaps severe poverty because of being a single parent and having some problems as well, or perhaps having suffered from domestic violence. Category 1 applicants are on waiting lists for at least six months and up to 18 months. I am talking about people in my area, down in the Marion region. In terms of the next category down (category 2), as I understand it, there are very few even being placed and, in categories 3 and 4, they are simply not being placed at all.

The state of the Housing Trust can also be determined from looking at the statistics. I must say that the minister has been quite candid during his second reading explanation in terms of the state of the Housing Trust. The minister himself has acknowledged publicly that the Housing Trust is looking at losing up to 10 000 more homes unless something is done. We have seen a decline of public housing stocks from over 60 000 a decade ago to around 45 000 now. The Housing Trust is said to owe about three-quarters of a billion dollars to the federal government in terms of housing loans. Those loans go back a long way and they are due to be repaid over the next 35 years or so. This means that the state government contributes something in the order of \$150 million a year to the Housing Trust but, essentially, all of that money goes straight out the window to repay the federal government debt. Essentially, the Housing Trust has to be self-sufficient. This is no natural law, no inevitable fact, but due to the fact that there is a faltering government commitment to supporting public housing.

The facts are also well described in an article, which I found enlightening, in the Autumn 2005 edition of the *SACOSS News* from the South Australian Council of Social Service. The article was by Wendy Malycha about public housing in which she stated:

Government funding (from the Commonwealth and the State) has fallen by 55 per cent in real terms over the past ten years, from over \$136 million in 1992-3, to about \$75 million in 2002-3. At the same time, rental income reduced by almost \$14 million, or 24 per cent in real terms. In previous years, the SAHT had a reasonable proportion of working families paying market rent. The move toward targeted social housing and the emphasis on housing those most in need has resulted in greater numbers of people who are eligible for rebates. The second reason is the decline in value and usefulness of its housing stock.

The problem I am talking about affects people like those who visit my electorate office, some of whom are desperate for Housing Trust accommodation. One of the stories I heard recently was from a pregnant teenager who is sleeping on the couch of her grandparents' two-bedroom unit, with her mother and her sibling in the spare room; that is, three generations in that two-bedroom unit. In the midst of this, the grandmother is trying to support her husband through his cancer treatment, and obviously it is an unsustainable housing situation.

Secondly, another constituent I had suffered from ill health and was forced to endure the winter trips to the communal bathroom in the caravan park where she was living because she was not able to afford private rental accommoda-

tion in more substantial housing. Again, I have met people who are sleeping in cars, and usually that is only in the short term because there they have a friend or family member somewhere who they can stay with for a short time, but they can spend months and months on the merry-go-round of couch surfing, staying in cars and sneaking into public toilets for a quick wash to try to maintain some sort of personal hygiene before getting private rental or Housing Trust accommodation.

Another case that I dealt with last year involved a woman who needed to move urgently after her 14 year-old daughter was threatened with a knife by her adult neighbour. She was in Housing Trust accommodation but wanted other accommodation because of this severe neighbour dispute. She applied to relocate under the category 1 waiting list and faces a waiting period of at least six months. It is all very well for criminal charges to be laid against the neighbour for the alleged assault, but we know that the fact that there might be a charge before the courts is very little protection for someone who faces that sort of threat. So, the issue of waiting for public housing is a severe problem in our society. It is causing a lot of suffering on the streets, yet the sell-off of Housing Trust properties continues. I think that the minister has acknowledged some of the difficulties, but I really question whether this legislation will provide the substantial turnaround we need.

The legislation does provide a bit of restructuring of the way we administer public housing and a couple of measures to assist some people into homes. Before I turn to the bill itself, I would like to ask a couple of questions, which the minister might be able to answer when responding to the speeches at this stage; on the other hand, he might bring back the answers to the House of Assembly later on. One question relates to policy, and it is probably the single most frequently asked question I get from Housing Trust tenants, namely, 'Why does my Housing Trust rent go up so promptly and by so much whenever my pension increases?' I am sure that the minister would have had many letters, with even his own constituents contacting him about that.

There is a feeling amongst aged pensioners that they can never really get ahead because, whenever they get the occasional pension increase, they find that their Housing Trust rent goes up almost before they can bank the cheque from Centrelink. So, they can never really get ahead, especially when inflation means that those Centrelink pension increases are largely illusory anyway. Perhaps it would be possible for Housing Trust increases based on pension rises to be delayed for a period—say, for a year or two—at least to allow people without savings to put a little bit away in the bank.

I also have a question arising from some figures in the Housing Trust annual report. On page 15, a figure is quoted for new household allocations to trust housing. The latest figure I could find was 3 657, being the actual figure for the 2004-05 financial year. That figure includes allocations to programs such as the Supported Tenancy Scheme and the Disability Housing Program. For the sake of public transparency, what I would like to know is: how many of those allocations are new placements, rather than people moving within existing Housing Trust accommodation? How many are people who are coming off the category 1 waiting list to get into public housing? How many are coming off category 2 to get into public housing? How many are going to the Supported Tenancy Scheme? How many are going to the Disability Housing Program? I suppose each of those

statistics might mean some overlap because, after all, a category 2 person might be going into a house as a result of the Disability Housing Program. If the minister can provide some further information, it would be appreciated.

The bill itself contains some changes to governance in terms of how we provide for public housing in South Australia. I can only reserve judgment on how effective those changes will be in terms of managing the public housing issues, but I make the point that, on the face of it, it would seem to be a less democratic model without the current boards. There seems to be no official way in which members of the community, consumers and tenants can make their point known at the highest level, so I am concerned that it becomes more of a top-down management approach without sufficient input from those who need to use the system.

The provision of a set amount of housing in new developments for public housing is another area where one can only reserve judgment. It is difficult to imagine exactly how developers are going to approach the task of providing a minimum level of public housing, or high needs public housing, as defined. It is unclear how the government will police that requirement, and it is unclear how the government will see that the public housing provided and the opportunities provided under such a scheme will be adequate and how they will be affordable. It would seem a long way from the bare content of the legislation to seeing new public housing estates on the ground.

Finally, I turn to the scheme which has recently been promoted by the government which allows the purchase of properties with a higher than usual up-front contribution from the housing agency to encourage housing purchases by low income people. I must say that I am indebted to Shelter SA for the forum it ran on the State Housing Plan and affordable housing in particular. Some useful figures were provided by Mr Fagan-Schmidt, Director of the Affordable Housing Innovations Unit. I have had a look at those figures and, without going through all the detail here, it seems to me that the amount a person on a very low income would need to borrow will still put them in extreme difficulty. For example, if the household income is \$500 a week, it will be difficult to cope with a purchase price of \$150 000 or \$120 000, even if there is a greater contribution than previously allowed by the housing finance agency.

The new scheme has the great jeopardy of taking the capital gain of the property from the purchasers once that property is finally sold. The minister might be able to enlighten me about how this works but, as I understand it, even if the purchaser makes capital improvements to the land by putting on an extra room or a pergola, or by beautifying the place, at the end of the day, when it is sold half the capital gain goes back to the finance agency.

I suspect that, if purchasers under this scheme were to get independent financial advice, they may well be told to steer clear of the scheme, because there is the potential for a lot to be taken away from them at the end of the day. It is probably a good scheme if you know you are going to stay in the house for the rest of your life. Certainly, in my parents' or grandparents' time, that was reasonably common, but it is not so common these days. The need to move to get closer to schools or health care, I think, is probably a motivation for moving more than it has been for a long time. I can just imagine people moving after five or 10 years and losing a lot of what they otherwise might have been able to achieve under a different scheme of home purchasing.

Finally, I will quote a person for whom I have great respect, someone who has over many years in South Australia worked for those in need and those who are vulnerable. I hope Sister Michelle Madigan will not mind me quoting this letter that she wrote to the Premier of South Australia in 2002. She referred to her disillusionment with the Labor government, especially in relation to housing. She wrote:

It was very distressing to learn that Labor, since the budget, is continuing the privatisation of so many of the public houses, an active policy of the previous government. This was your first promise as on your card enclosed (the fridge magnet of the state Labor Party promises which we were invited to keep and return if the Labor government failed to keep to its promises) 'no more privatisation'.

Time expired.

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): I rise to speak in support of this bill. As most members of the house will know, in the past I have worked with our most vulnerable community members, particularly those with disabilities and in the aged care sector. During that time it became fairly evident to me that housing is the basic need that everybody in this category needs. They need to be safe and secure, and the South Australian Housing Trust has long led the way. This new bill will provide a legislative framework with more accountable and effective housing governance. It will set up a system that will address the emerging needs of our community and provide affordable housing for future generations.

More importantly, it will enshrine in legislation the government's ongoing commitment to ensuring that a proportion of all new developments will include affordable housing so that we do not have the ghettos and the council housing estates that we see in other countries. This government will create a new South Australian Affordable Housing Trust as a division of the South Australian Housing Trust. This will revitalise the South Australian Housing Trust and provide a forward direction for the government's housing services arm, Housing SA, and a single access point for all services, for which Housing Trust clients have been asking for many years and which will be provided by this government.

It will also enable the housing minister and the chief executive of the Department for Families and Communities to replace the existing boards, including those of the South Australian Housing Trust, the South Australian Community Housing Authority, and the Aboriginal Housing Authority, and be responsible for the way that housing services are delivered. This will connect housing services with other areas of DFC, such as disability, family support, community services and ageing, easing access to essential services for those most vulnerable in our community, because these vulnerable community members include 65 per cent or 350 000 lower income renters who are in housing stress. By this I mean that they are paying more than 30 per cent of their income in rental costs.

All over the Christmas period the media were telling us that the proportion of first home buyers and younger home buyers has been declining for over a decade because property is so expensive that they cannot afford to get a foot in the door. The ABS estimates that the demand for private rental property is likely to continue to intensify and that by the year 2021 the number of households in Australia is likely to be between 9.4 million and 10 million—an increase of between 38 and 46 per cent from the 6.9 million households recorded in 1996.

It is a sad indictment of the current system that people living in a household earning the lowest 60 per cent of incomes are able to afford only one in seven homes on the market and that people earning the lowest 40 per cent of household incomes can afford only one in 20. What is even more disturbing is that for every three low income renters there is just one low cost rental property available to them.

When I and most of my co-members in this place were starting out, a home cost the equivalent of about three times the average household income. For my children and for others in their twenties wanting to marry, settle down and have children, the costs are currently six to nine times the average income. That is outrageous. I do not know how I am ever going to get them to leave home at this rate; I do not know how we will manage.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Ms SIMMONS: I do love them being at home, you are quite right.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Ms SIMMONS: They are 20 and 24. The key is that, through the new Affordable Housing Trust, the government is working in partnership with the private sector, developers and builders, etc., as well as the community and non-government organisations, to increase the supply of affordable housing. Through the Metropolitan Planning Strategy and the Housing Plan for South Australia, a 15 per cent planning target has been set to include affordable housing, including high needs housing, in all new significant housing developments.

In addition, the Affordable Housing Trust is working with local government on a local government resource kit to assist councils with their development plans and to ensure that affordable housing is part of their planning systems. Some of the issues brought up by the member for Bragg will probably be dealt with in this kit. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): I rise to support the Statutes Amendment (Affordable Housing) Bill 2006 not only because it is government policy that will positively impact on my electorate of Napier but also because I have first-hand experience of the positive benefits that can flow from widespread access to affordable housing.

As a very little boy and into my early teenage years, I was fortunate to grow up in a war service home in a place called Miranda on the southern outskirts of Sydney. I say fortunate, because probably the only other option available to my parents at the time would have been a succession of rooming houses around Sydney—not a way to raise a young family. I remember accompanying my mother to the local post office to make the weekly payments on the home and standing in the queue with our neighbours who were doing the same thing.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member on my left will please cease his interjections.

Mr O'BRIEN: This was government in action dealing resolutely with an issue that, if left unaddressed, would have blighted the lives of parents such as mine and the families they were raising. The federal government has now largely deserted the field when it comes to the provision of affordable housing and, in the process, has compelled (under considerable duress) the states to follow suit. This compulsion has taken two forms: the denial of adequate federal funding to the states for the construction of new public housing, and the compulsion of repayment of federal housing loans to the

states that has forced state governments to sell down their existing stocks. By way of illustration, in 1993 there were approximately 63 000 rentable Housing Trust properties in this state. By 2002, there were just over 49 500 of these properties. I have selected the period of the previous Brown/Olsen Liberal government because they carried out this process with an ideological fervour and determination that exceeded the financial necessity of loan repayment.

In this period, around 2 800 properties were transferred to other social housing agencies, such as the Aboriginal Housing Authority and community housing organisations. Doing the maths, this means that over 10 000 properties were lost from the social housing system during the life of the previous Brown/Olsen Liberal government. I will return to discuss the impact of this set off of public assets on my electorate of Napier a little later. As members would be well aware, my electorate has the highest concentration of public housing in the state. The question I would like to ask at this juncture is: what have been the consequences of federal government policy on affordable housing in Australia? This can be answered in the most straightforward manner by answering the question: does Australia and South Australia have a crisis in housing affordability? The answer is an unequivocal yes. Australia and South Australia both have a crisis in the provision of affordable housing.

According to the Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey, the most pervasive housing affordability crisis is in Australia with an overall median multiple of 6.6. This is the multiple of median house price to median household income, and is a fairly straightforward way in which to determine housing affordability. Anything above 5.1 is considered severely unaffordable, and that is where Australia sits—severely unaffordable. The National Housing Affordability Forum that met in Old Parliament House in Canberra in July last year put forward a list of statistical evidence that reinforces the conclusions of the Demographia International Affordability Survey.

During the last decade or so, average house prices relative to income have almost doubled. The proportion of first home buyers has fallen by about 20 per cent. Average monthly payments on new loans have risen by about 50 per cent, which equates to a \$500 a month rise. The proportion of low rent homes has fallen by 15 per cent, and opportunities to rent public housing have fallen by at least 30 per cent. The forum concluded that, as a result, at least three-quarters of a million low income households are paying housing costs which exceed the commonly accepted affordability benchmark of 30 per cent of income. In addition, many households have had to accept unsuitable housing in order to avoid having to meet the unaffordable rental or mortgage repayments. This point made by the forum bears examination. How are the three-quarters of a million lower income—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'BRIEN: How are the three-quarters of a million lower income households making ends meet? How would my parents, if they were starting out today, be faring without the sort of government assistance provided by the war service homes scheme? With no hope of home ownership and high rentals, families are getting by with substandard accommodation that probably does not shape up in terms of its physical fabric: does it meet family needs in terms of numbers of bedrooms or proximity to employment and public transport? Families are getting by by taking a long-term caravan park residency, getting by living with parents or friends under one

roof or in a shed in the backyard, or getting by by taking up temporary digs in boarding houses.

It is not much of a way to start off in life with a young family or a not so young family. These people may not be sleeping rough and, for this reason, the housing affordability crisis may not be so readily apparent, but it is a crisis all the same. Various reasons have been given for the crisis in affordability. Perhaps the most credible analysis of the various factors currently at play is given by the Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA) in its submission to the Productivity Commission inquiry on first home ownership. First, the reasons the RBA does not believe have contributed to the crisis of affordability.

The RBA does not believe that it is due to a persistent shortage of supply of houses relative to underlying demand for new houses. Unlike the Liberal candidate for the federal seat of Makin, Bob Day, who claims in his booklet *Home Truths* that rising house prices are the fault of state and territory governments through their planning policies and land agencies such as the Land Management Corporation, the RBA finds that there may be mismatches between underlying demand at the micro level for particular types of housing—for example, detached houses versus apartments—but, at an aggregate level, these factors do not appear to be the main reason for the rapid increase in dwelling prices over the recent couple of years. Bob Day's dream of a metropolitan Adelaide sprawling over the distant horizon gets no support from the RBA, nor does the RBA believe that state government stamp duty on property transfer has been a cause.

Instead, the RBA puts the current crisis in housing affordability down to 'an unusually strong desire by existing property owners for further exposure to residential property, either in their home or in an investment property.' The RBA summarises the key structural characteristics of the Australian housing market that distinguish it from markets in other countries studied by the RBA as follows:

- a high proportion of individuals owning rental properties;
- a high and rising proportion of lending for houses directed to households for investment purposes;
- plentiful availability and variety of credit available to investors;
- an active property investment seminar industry; and
- a tax system that is viewed by investors as assisting property investment.

I might add the privatisation of the public housing sector. With full purchase and full rental public housing steadily shrinking as a proportion of the total housing market, this sector can no longer provide the countervailing force on price pressure on the private sector that it once did, nor can it provide the support it once did for those unable to enter the private sector housing market or, equally, and tragically, those forced out of the private sector by foreclosure. Delinquencies in the non-conforming housing sector have hit record levels in the final quarter of 2006, according to credit rating agency Moody Investor Services. Non-conforming loans are usually taken out by borrowers with impaired credit histories, that is, families and individuals most in need of assistance.

In talking of the privatisation of the housing market, I made mention of the previous Brown/Olsen Liberal government's sell down of over 10 000 Housing Trust properties during its time in office. It is probably worth adding that the sale of these properties was neither strategic nor aimed at providing home ownership opportunities to existing tenants. A classic example was the sale process in the Playford

Council area, the site of the upcoming Playford North Urban Regeneration project—a project, I might add, that the former mayor (Marilyn Baker) and I fought hard to secure. As a result of non-strategic sales in the past, which saw properties in the Peachey belt being sold in the late 1990s for less than \$30 000, the DFC will be required to purchase back some of these properties to assemble the necessary parcels of land for the project, at an average cost of \$110 000.

I now turn to the bill before us, because this piece of legislation attempts to do two things: first, it accepts the fact of the profoundly damaging financial constraints placed on this state by the federal government in relation to funding for public housing; and, secondly, it seeks to positively and creatively deal with this reality.

In March 2005, the Housing Plan for South Australia was released. The plan has three core objectives: first, to make affordable housing available to more people; secondly, to provide quality housing for those in greatest need in our community; and, thirdly, to renew and reinvigorate neighbourhoods. This bill provides the legislative framework for an effective and accountable government structure to meet these objectives. The aspect of the bill of most interest to me is the new division of the South Australian Housing Trust—the Affordable Housing Trust. Both trusts will work in a complementary fashion, with Housing Trust assets providing higher subsidy services to those most in need, while the Affordable Housing Trust will focus on market-based solutions. The approach of the Affordable Housing Trust will be that of working with industry and community partners in working out innovative solutions to the housing needs of low to moderate income earners.

This approach includes the ability to provide grants to the not-for-profit private sector where value for money, probity and transparency is demonstrated. The Affordable Housing Trust will also work with local government and planning authorities to provide the legislative and policy frameworks to encourage developments that include affordable housing targets of 15 per cent affordable housing, including a 5 per cent high-need component. From this it follows that the Affordable Housing Trust will be an innovator, an instigator and a driver of collaborative public and private sector solutions to housing affordability. An early indicator of this approach is the recently announced HomeStart Breakthrough loan, which allows purchasers to increase their borrowing power by up to 35 per cent without higher monthly payments. My understanding is that South Australia was the first state to introduce this highly innovative approach to assisting first home buyers into the market by taking an equity position in their properties, although Western Australia has announced a similar scheme in the past few days, and I believe has erroneously claimed it as an Australian first.

Similarly, the Equity Start loan for social housing tenants flagged in the March 2005 Housing Plan for South Australia is also indicative of the innovative approach which the Affordable Housing Trust will bring to bear on the issue of affordable housing. Equity Start is a loan product delivered through HomeStart Finance which allows social housing tenants access to a no interest loan component of up to \$50 000 to increase their borrowing power. Tenants can purchase the social housing property they live in (provided it is for sale), another social housing property on the sales list, or use the loan to purchase a property on the private market. Over 500 loans have been settled across the state. Due to the high concentration of social housing in the Elizabeth area, there have been 144 applications by residents in the Elizabeth

region and 36 loans have been settled for properties in the area.

As is said, the proof of the pudding is in the eating and the first few bites, as indicated by the take-up of the Equity Start loan in my electorate of Napier, indicate a strong and positive ongoing impact for this legislation on opening up access to affordable housing. I strongly commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): I thank members for their contributions on the second reading. I begin by responding to the points that have been made by the lead speaker for the opposition. I think we are agreed on one matter; that is, there is a housing affordability crisis in this nation and, indeed, also in South Australia. The dimensions of that crisis are not just dimensions which bear on the social equity considerations of the citizens of South Australia. It is not just about people having a roof over their head and an affordable place where they want to live but it also goes to the question of the prosperity of this very state—our capacity to attract and retain the sorts of people who will drive our economy, as well as having the most livable and enjoyable place to live in the nation.

It is those matters on which we are agreed. This bill reflects a part of a process that is already well underway. The State Housing Plan that this government has put in place has been dealing with these questions for a number of years, and we come to this point in the process and we approach the parliament for permission to take these matters a step further. Indeed, in many respects the bill is about unleashing the energy that already exists within our current social housing system in order to allow us to take the next step to move forward—those \$5 billion worth of assets, which are locked up in our housing system and which belong to a policy environment and a set of federal policy parameters that belong to another time, mean that when we look at the situation that confronts us today we need changes to be made to take the next step. I will explain that in more detail in a moment.

Before we address the question of affordability and how we move forward, one has to have an analysis about what is the cause of the affordability crisis. Predictably the opposition blames the states because the states have Labor governments. The truth is somewhat different. I think it is instructive to look at the findings that have been made by the very bodies that would generally be regarded as authorities on this matter—bodies such as the Productivity Commission. The Productivity Commission in its first report into first home ownership (commissioned by the present federal government) observed that ‘the dominant source of the widening escalation in price has been a general surge in demand above the normal increase associated with population income growth to which supply was inherently incapable of responding’. In other words, the dominant source of the affordability crisis (as observed by the Productivity Commission) was demand-side factors—and remains demand-side factors.

The other observation that the Productivity Commission makes is that ‘demand was overwhelmingly from existing owners, not from first home owners’. Importantly, and more recently, the former Reserve Bank governor Ian Macfarlane said that demand fuelled the affordability crisis because we returned to low inflation and interest rates were halved. People could now borrow, if they wished, twice as much. There were a whole lot of incentives in the system, which meant that they borrowed twice as much. The incentives were mainly tax incentives—and these are federal government tax

incentives—so they borrowed the money and drove up house prices. Now we cannot get a more definitive analysis than that of the outgoing Reserve Bank governor who did not owe anything to anyone; so he told it as he saw it.

The Productivity Commission was specifically set up to analyse this question of the affordability crisis. Indeed, the Prime Minister in 2004 said:

We have to be realistic about this issue. People who own their own homes are not complaining that they have become more valuable. I don’t get people stopping me in the street saying, ‘John, I’m angry with you because the value of my house has increased too much.’ They are not saying that.

The Prime Minister was content to take the political benefit associated with the increased equity in the homes of Australians in 2004. Four interest rate rises later and in 2006 he was then saying it is the fault of the states. The analysis had switched completely. It was not a demand-side notion: it was a supply-side issue. It was inadequate land release and state taxes and charges. It lacks credibility. It was a political response to a crisis. When the bloke was fitted up with the reality of the pressure that emerged after four interest rate rises, all of a sudden he pulls out the lie.

This is consistent form for the Prime Minister—when his back is to the wall, he completely flips his position. That is what we have been dealing with at the federal level. It is not as if the states have said that it is entirely a matter for the commonwealth. Since 1945 there have been joint commonwealth/state responsibilities in relation to housing. We have never suggested that we had no responsibility in relation to housing. Indeed, our State Housing Plan is replete with references about the need for partnerships between the commonwealth and the state; and if, indeed, the State Housing Plan stands for anything it is this notion of partnership between the commonwealth and the state.

True to that analysis, we sought partnerships with the commonwealth—and in due course I will explain what sort of response we received to that. But the commonwealth has not been receiving this word from only state Labor governments; it has been receiving it more broadly from across a very broad range of the community. It has had the Productivity Commission itself making a series of recommendations about how to address the question of affordability in this nation. Treasurer Costello rejected every recommendation of the Productivity Commission report.

We then have Malcolm Turnbull (the next big thing), probably even before he was a member of parliament, chairing the Menzies Institute inquiry into affordable housing home ownership. He makes recommendations about a range of things, including shared home equity loans. What was the commonwealth government’s response? Rejected; not interested.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He is the next big thing, though. He is the next Prime Minister, we are told. The third initiative we receive is that almost every major sector with an interest in affordable housing in this nation—the HIA, the Property Council, superannuation funds, unions and ACOSS (almost every sector that may have an interest in affordable housing)—is to come together in a national affordable housing forum chaired by Professor Julian Disney. That forum called for some basic things: a national affordable housing policy; a national housing minister; and a national collaboration between commonwealth, state and local government around affordable housing.

It put those things to the commonwealth government—rejected. State and territory ministers go to national housing minister meetings and work up proposals around a national action plan for affordable housing. A range of propositions are developed—revenue neutral—asking the commonwealth to spend only what it does at the moment but to spend it more wisely and in collaboration with the states and territories. The commonwealth government's answer? Rejected. This is what we have been dealing with, all in the context of a 31 per cent decrease in real terms of contribution from the commonwealth to the state in terms of its Commonwealth/State Housing Agreement.

This is the equation: we have falling contributions from the commonwealth (falling revenue), and we have an expectation by the commonwealth that we will pick up the highest need people who, of course, cannot pay market rent. So, we have an increasing number of those people coming into our system who are on Centrelink benefits and who cannot pay market rent. We have, of course, an increasing complexity of those clients, so our costs go up. We have an increasing age of our public housing stock, so our costs go up. In that context, we are put in this invidious position of having to chew up our Housing Trust stock simply to make ends meet.

This unresolved equation is what we were left with when we came into government—a slowly dying public housing system; a Housing Trust that was simply chewing itself to bits to exist; and a program of selling off, willy-nilly, assets without any thought to the long-term consequences. We are facing this absurd situation in the member for Napier's electorate. We are now attempting to assemble land parcels to carry out a much needed urban regeneration in Playford North, and we are buying back houses that were sold for ridiculously low sums of money by the previous government simply to assemble a parcel of land to allow us to carry out an urban regeneration project they must have understood was always a necessary and important part of dealing with issues in the Peachey Belt and those associated areas. So this was the legacy. The legacy was consistent with the Liberal philosophy—take your hands off the wheel, let the market rip, and somehow expect that this housing affordability crisis would resolve itself. Or, of course, if you belong to the Bob Day school of planning, you get rid of all the planners and let the market rip and they go tearing through all of the farmland on the fringes of society, tearing through the vineyards in Willunga and tearing through the green belt between Munno Para and Gawler, and this sprawl would somehow solve the affordability crisis.

I do not want to live in Houston: I want to live in Adelaide, and we have something valuable about our urban form. We do not think that the solution to the affordability crisis is simply locating the poorest people in our community on the outer fringes of our suburbs, without services and sacrificing every amenity and environmental value that we hold dear in this state. But that is what was on offer at the last election. The one thing that shrieks louder than anything else is that the opposition is very good at defining the problem but it does not have one sensible solution. It does give us some gentle but begrudging praise for promoting such things as the common ground project whereby we seek to enter partnerships with the private sector to create new innovative forms of affordable housing. The very constraints to getting on with it are the things we are seeking to deal with by this bill. If the honourable member took the time to understand what we are doing here, it is to take the existing asset base of the Housing

Trust and allow us to convert that, in proper cases, to involve investing in partnerships with the private sector and the community housing sector in a way that we are not permitted to do under the existing structure of the South Australian Housing Trust.

The assets of the South Australian Housing Trust at the moment are required to be applied to the benefit of the corporation—the corporate interest. This bill will allow us to take a broader view of that asset base and apply it in the most propitious way to drive an increase in the supply of affordable housing. And it would not necessarily be using the traditional methods—those old and valuable methods which have served this state well but which, in the environment in which we find ourselves at the moment, are not the most effective ways of getting the greatest level of return for the assets that we have. I would like to be able to say that millions more dollars will be cascading from the commonwealth, but I have to deal with the reality of what I find, and at the moment I am not prepared to sit and watch the social housing system slowly decline and die. I want to take those assets and apply them to the most effective way of increasing the supply of affordable housing.

I want to give some examples of the things that are happening at the moment. This bill is not a beginning: it is to allow us to take the next step in something that is already succeeding. I want to talk about some of the things we are already doing through the Affordable Housing Innovation Program. Through an expression of interest process to seek partners for affordable housing initiatives, 11 capital projects received funding approval. This involved partner organisations committing to constructing 137 houses (134 in the metropolitan area and three in regional areas) and a 14-bedroom residential facility, equivalent to two four-bedrooms and two three-bedrooms, at a total cost of \$35.864 million.

The investment profile for the 11 capital projects is as follows: the affordable housing fund contribution, \$16.692 million (or 46.5 per cent of the total estimated project cost); partners' equity, \$14.224 million (or 39.7 per cent of the total project cost); and borrowings, \$4.945 million (or 13.8 per cent of the total project cost). We are leveraging our assets of the 46.5 per cent to get the 100 per cent. We are almost doubling the bang for our buck that we get out of the public investment. We are asking the parliament to give us permission to free up this stock of assets through the very partnerships for which the honourable member was applauding us, with the common ground project and the community housing sector, to allow us to pursue more of those partnerships to drive more affordable housing options.

Having said that, I do not want to create the impression that we do not want a substantial and viable publicly held asset in the public housing system. I do not think it could have been put better than what was said by the member for Napier, who talked about the highly subsidised end needing to be held there for a certain group of people, and the partnerships driving a further supply of affordable housing for the next dimension of our client base. There will always be an important role for directly held public assets. It is particularly important that we are able to have a critical mass of well placed, well designed and well located accommodation in a network that allows us to run an effective social housing system.

I want to contrast the approach that we are taking with the approach that was taken by those opposite. What we saw during the life of the previous government was no stated plan to grapple with this question: just 10 000 houses disappear-

ing, with no obvious explanation about where it would end. What we also know now, after having had a good look at the books, is that \$37.2 million was taken from the South Australian Housing Trust and used to prop up the health care system. So, one of the first acts that we engaged in when we realised that was to retrieve that money and put it back into the social housing system. When one compares relative commitment to the social housing system, one only needs to look to that history.

I want to address the question of the 15 per cent affordable housing target, which has come in for some criticism by those opposite. I think it is fair to say that the way in which it has been characterised by those opposite is that the 85 per cent will somehow pay for the 15 per cent. That is simply not the approach that we are seeking to take. If we wanted to go down that path, we would just strike an affordable housing levy. That would simply be added on to the cost of homes and would be used to fund an affordable housing system. We are not going down that path. We are seeking to engage with developers, through a process of partnership and negotiation, to reach an accommodation where we can include this 15 per cent element.

We think that the design of housing—the footprint of housing—has a critical effect on its affordability; that is the first step. The second step is that we want to build incentives into the system—density bonuses, which unlock value for developments. We want to remove disincentives, working with councils to remove restrictions which might bear on the question of the affordability of a project but which still preserve neighbourhood amenity: issues such as setbacks, smaller housing forms, smaller blocks and easier ways of developing affordable housing.

We also have the vehicle of the Affordable Housing Innovations Fund, through which direct financial resources can be made available. Finally, we have the vehicle of HomeStart finance, which can facilitate guaranteed take out of a development, which can reduce sales costs, risk and developer finance costs. Through all those mechanisms, we believe that we have much that we can bring to the table to essentially make the affordable housing component of this development a commercial proposition. That is the feedback we have been receiving from developers. Indeed, this is happening in practice. We have seen recent land releases at Seaford Meadows and at Northgate, where the 15 per cent affordable target has been incorporated.

We are also seeing in more recent private sector land releases, the Cheltenham Park redevelopment and also the Buckland Park redevelopment, where developers are agreeing to and facilitating the 15 per cent affordable housing component within those new developments. I think that the real objection to the 15 per cent affordable target from those opposite is that private sector developers are cooperating with the Labor government to achieve this, something that they did not have the wit to think about when they were in government. They simply do not understand that private sector developers are prepared to enter into partnerships with Labor governments. It is no good blackguarding people who support our plan. It is no good blackguarding them and suggesting that they are somehow Labor stooges. These are well-respected developers who understand that the long-term prosperity of this state lies in ensuring that we have balanced estates where affordable housing is accommodated alongside other forms of development.

Let me address this furphy about privatisation by saying that the essence of what the opposition puts is the privatisa-

tion option. It suggests that this should be a market-driven system, that it is basically a matter for the market to address the question of housing affordability. This is national Liberal Party policy, it is local Liberal Party policy. The difficulty is that there is not a place on the planet that you can point to where the bottom 40 per cent of income earners are provided with effective affordable housing without a market intervention. The question really becomes: what form of market intervention? We have had a form of market intervention in the past where there has been essentially the provision of direct supply through the public housing system. Indeed, interestingly enough, it was not a Labor government that introduced that system. The South Australian Housing Trust was a creature of the Butler government and developed further by the Playford government.

What the latter day Liberals have forgotten is what their forefathers understood, and that is that the market alone does not deliver the needs of our citizens. All we are doing now is using intelligent, modern means to achieve what those before us always understood. If Playford had had a HomeStart, he would have used it. The reality is that he had the wit to realise that the prosperity of this community does not lie solely with throwing your hands in the air and saying that the market rules. That has never been Labor philosophy and those opposite should know it has never been the philosophy of those who have come before them, who have understood the needs of this state.

So let us just drop this furphy about privatisation. We are about intervening using intelligent means, using what we have at our disposal: HomeStart Finance; the planning system; and our stock of assets, \$5 billion worth of assets, a large proportion of which were grown substantially during the period of the Dunstan government and, indeed, the Whitlam government's largesse through the South Australian Land Commission, and built on by the Bannon Labor government. That is the legacy that we continued from the Playford government. We believe that in that spirit we continue, because we understand the crucial relationship between affordable housing and not only the needs of our citizens but the prosperity of our state.

I also want to correct a few small errors that have crept into some of the debate. The suggestion that the LMC charter is confined to matters of making a profit is simply incorrect. The LMC charter has a number of important elements to it. In addition to, obviously, conducting itself on a commercial basis, it also has an obligation to exercise its functions having regard to the social, economic and environmental priorities of the government of the day—I do not have the precise words. So, it is simply wrong to say that the LMC is bound to pursue a profit motive. It indeed has to respond to government policy, and government policy has included the 15 per cent affordable housing target, and indeed in almost all recent land releases it has pursued that policy agenda.

It has somehow been suggested that the councils have been left out in the cold here. Nothing could be further from the truth. We have acknowledged that councils are a crucial partner with us in this exercise. Because we have placed so much store on the planning system in particular, we have understood that it is councils' development plans that will need to be amended to assist us to facilitate at a local level the provision of affordable housing. It is for that reason that we have gone through the process of not only detailed consultations around the Housing Plan with the Local Government Association but also with the Local Government Association

about the development of development plan policies which can be incorporated into local development plans.

Indeed, as we began preparing our kit on affordable housing for the assistance of councils, we had a number of councils who were very keen to see our draft proposals and approached us directly. It was those councils that received copies of the draft affordable housing kit. The rest of the councils we sought to engage by providing them with a specific presentation, at which we gave them detailed information. So, far from anyone being left out, we are systematically working our way from council to council. Indeed, at community cabinet just last week we were approached by the Port Lincoln council to have discussions about driving affordable housing initiatives within their town.

Members opposite do not like this agenda because they hate to think that it might succeed, because they hate good news, but this is already happening. People are responding to this agenda and they are wanting to find ways of making it work. I suppose our plea to those opposite is: you really need to get on board and try to make this work, because it is an important agenda. I find it hard in the current environment to imagine that an opposition could walk into this place and oppose an affordable housing bill which seeks to increase the supply of affordable housing in a way that they cannot suggest will not make a positive contribution to that agenda. They might have their doubts about it but they do not have any alternatives.

We are the government, and we have come forward with an affordable housing bill. It unlocks the very sorts of partnerships that the honourable member opposite argues are good things, or for which she gives us some grudging praise; that is, the common ground project and partnerships with community housing associations. Our clear advice is that we need this bill to enable those partnerships to continue further. It was also suggested there was a fire sale of Housing Trust assets. I think the member for Napier has comprehensively disposed of that issue.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, when I look at the statistics, I think we just accumulated houses during the Dunstan and Bannan governments. To the extent that we sold them, it was part of a sales program that was exceeded by new construction, but I will check that. I will stand to be—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Of course. The Housing Trust has been selling houses from its inception. It is not a new thing. In fact, that is how my parents got their house. The 'rent to purchase' scheme was actually how many young families got a start. So, this idea that the Housing Trust selling Housing Trust assets is privatisation completely misunderstands that the Housing Trust has always been a major constructor and seller of houses in the market, but to people who would otherwise have been locked out of home ownership. That has been one of its great contributions to this community. I hope that in the committee stage we will be able to persuade those opposite to take a more constructive approach to this bill. It is a genuine offering to increase the supply of affordable housing.

I want to deal with two other points while I have the opportunity. I wish to clarify the amendment to include the public appeals process which, under the South Australian Housing Trust Act, is actually just legislating an existing process. It is doing no more than putting into legislation that which already exists. It is an administrative mechanism that has been in place since the early 1990s—an independent

process that was a requirement of the Housing Agreement Act 1991. It is nothing new and it does not disturb any existing arrangements.

The Residential Tenancies Act amendments provide for any subsidiaries of the South Australian Housing Trust and for the regulations to enable tenants, with certain agreements relating to land owned by the Housing Trust or a subsidiary, not to be excluded from the provisions of the act, including access to the tribunal. It is really a consequential measure because, as these new initiatives come on line such as rent to buy and other new initiatives, our relationship with the tenants will change somewhat and it is important that they are not excluded from the scope of the protections that would otherwise exist. I think they address many of the matters that have been raised.

A number of questions were raised by the member for Mitchell, but several of them require some statistical information that I will attempt to respond to when I have the opportunity. He raised a question of the tenants' input into the act. There is a public housing tenants association that will remain in place; there is no intention to disturb that. It is not a legislative matter in any event. I think he also raised questions about the Breakthrough loan and potential issues around that. The Breakthrough loan has been very well received despite the criticism of the deputy leader. It is seen as an unalloyed good idea. It really shares the equitable growth of the value of the property to allow somebody to buy in the first place. It is not compulsory: it is a voluntary scheme. People only engage it if they need to.

The member for Mitchell's concern was what would happen to capital improvements. Capital improvements will be deducted. So, if somebody makes a capital improvement, that will not be enjoyed by HomeStart Finance: that will accrue to the benefit of the person taking out the loan. With those words, I commend the bill to the house and I thank members for their contributions. I will address the remaining matters, if I can, during the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Ms CHAPMAN: In new section 3(1), the definition of 'board' is to be deleted and replaced by 'Chief Executive', who is the chief executive of the department. Is there any proposed increase in the salary or benefits payable to the chief executive as a result of taking on this role and, if so, how much?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Ms CHAPMAN: With the insertion of subsection (3), the constitution of the South Australian Housing Trust will now be the chief executive. If that position is the entire SAHT entity, I wonder why in subsequent clauses reference is made to the 'SAHT or the Chief Executive'. For example, on page 8, clause 12(1) provides 'SAHT or the Chief Executive'.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It may be that in certain cases it is necessary to talk about the chief executive in the role of the Chief Executive of the Department for Families and Communities. That is a separate role but, on the occasions when it is referred to, it is intentionally referred to in her role as Chief Executive of the Department for Families and Communities.

Ms CHAPMAN: So that I understand the structure, under the current regime, when the SAHT is constituted by the chief executive, is that to be Mr Downie or Ms Vardon?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is Ms Vardon for these purposes.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

Ms CHAPMAN: Clause 7(1) amends section 5(1)(a) and inserts paragraph (v), which provides:

(v) supporting initiatives (within the various sectors) to increase the supply of affordable housing;

I will come shortly to other substituted clauses relating to obligation. What do you say are the initiatives that are to be supported?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think that it is really any new affordable housing initiative that involves working with somebody who is not government. What is contemplated at the moment is that one would provide affordable housing through the vehicle of direct public housing. We might be satisfied that a grant, for instance, to a particular organisation might cause the creation of an affordable housing initiative. That is a new disposition of the assets that needs some legislative basis, and that is why it is expressed in those terms. It is a very broad description of any contribution that might drive an affordable housing initiative.

Ms CHAPMAN: In subclause (2), though, there is this provision, as follows:

to provide houses to meet housing needs, or to support or promote programs or other initiatives within the private or not-for-profit sectors to meet housing needs;

So, I am just a bit puzzled as to why we need both if they are clearly the same thing.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: ‘Supporting initiatives’ is a much broader concept than the matters that are contained later, which talk about providing houses on the one case or supporting programs on the other case which meet housing needs. I suppose what we are trying to do is to give us the broadest possible remit for making a financial contribution in a way that will drive those initiatives. I suppose we did not want to define it narrowly, having regard to what we presently understand are the ways in which that could happen. Paragraph (b) is a bit more traditional in that it talks about providing houses and then providing support programs which, I suppose, are the slightly more traditional means of doing that.

Mr HANNA: My question is about the stated function of the Housing Trust ‘to facilitate support for South Australians so as to increase their ability to achieve successful housing outcomes’. I ask how that sits with the government’s decision to abolish the rent relief scheme?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Support in this context is about support for someone’s needs; I do not think it is financial support, necessarily. I suppose it is broad enough to cover financial support, but what is contemplated there is support in its broadest sense. It is acknowledged that the social housing system is undergoing a change whereby one of its roles is as a high needs housing provider, and one of the things it does as a high needs landlord is support its tenants. Indeed, that is one of the drivers for the increased costs associated with providing for those people. To a certain extent, it catches up with the existing reality, that is, the Housing Trust, or Housing SA, as a high needs housing provider, provides support, and that support goes beyond financial support. In fact, by definition, there is a subsidy for

people who are receiving a Housing SA house. So, it is beyond the financial support; it also contemplates other forms of support that makes a difference between someone having or not having a successful tenancy. What I have in mind there is the Public Tenancy Liaison Service, which is a service that is provided to ensure that somebody is able to effectively carry out the duties of a tenant.

Mr HANNA: The function that is to be included in this legislation regarding advice to the minister is something I question. I do thank the minister, in his reply to the second reading speeches, referring not just to the tenants association (I forget the exact title) but also to the public tenants advisory group, or whatever it is called, for the assurance that that group will continue. However, in terms of Housing Trust advice to the minister, what is contemplated there? Are we talking about policy people working away in a back room? What I am really interested in is how ideas generated by public housing tenants or advocacy groups such as the tenants association will actually reach the top of the tree because, all too often, those good ideas are filtered out in the bureaucracy.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What we are seeking to do, as a part of that process, partly as a consequence of the Housing Plan and these reforms, is to create the notion of a single housing system—a continuum. Rather than just say the state government is responsible for public housing, the Housing Plan was seeking to take a more comprehensive view of what the state’s housing needs were. At one level we had the highest-need housing, so the most supported forms of accommodation, through to market-based housing. We sought to change our advisory structures to reflect that. We did have specific advisory arrangements, as you say, more in the nature of consumer councils like the public housing tenants arrangements (the precise name of which escapes me at the moment), but we have recently set up a new body which seeks to provide overarching advice which collapses down a number of existing bodies. We used to have community housing advice and other forms of housing advice that came to us, but we now have a strategic housing advisory council which provides advice really across the A to Z, if you like, of housing.

Another related advice comes both to me and the planning minister, that is, the Housing and Urban Development Advisory Committee, which I think is enshrined in regulations of the parliament. They are the two major bodies that provide advice to me concerning housing issues, and that is not to forget the consumer-based bodies such as the public housing consumer association and also arrangements that were set up concerning Aboriginal housing with the Aboriginal Housing Advisory Committee.

Mr HANNA: I am a bit puzzled by the new subsection which refers to the Housing Trust meeting its aims and objectives through the most appropriate and effective mechanisms available to it. I question that because, for one thing, it is not likely to use mechanisms which are not available to it. I also question what is contemplated there. Are we talking about public/private partnerships, some sort of joint venture with private corporations? I am not sure. I would also like to know whether the minister has sought the views of the Public Service Association in relation to this particular aspect.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is really the essence of what we are talking about. The assets of the corporation at the moment are to be applied for the benefit of the corporation. The existing pool of assets is very much limited to the corporate interest, if you like, as defined. The

sort of provisions it replaces, it needs to be understood, are managing public housing assets so as to ensure acceptable rates of return and protect the value of assets over the longer term.

The nature of the provisions that it seeks to replace are very much about the Housing Trust as a public housing provider. What we are saying is that the assets now of the corporation have to be applied to the outcome of affordable housing, but not necessarily through the mechanism that has traditionally been applied. We are not seeking to limit ourselves about how we would do that. The things that come to mind are things like the common ground project, partnership with private interests that make philanthropic contributions, partnerships with the community housing sector. At the moment (and one of the things the community housing sector grumbles about) we can provide it with assets but for any capital growth we issue a debenture which basically equates to that capital growth. So, in a sense, we protect our asset; we give it to the community housing sector but it cannot enjoy the benefit of any capital growth. It argues that that constrains its capacity to go out and use that balance sheet to invest and grow. It is a bit of a limiting factor on building partnerships with the community housing sector.

I do not think we have consulted with the PSA specifically about that clause but we are in consultation with it in relation to general issues on the effect on its members, and it is not contemplated that this will have any particular impact on the PSA or its members.

Ms CHAPMAN: I take it that, apart from the boards all going, there is no proposed reduction in any of the staff who currently service these three entities.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is right.

Ms CHAPMAN: I know that we are removing 'public' from this provision in relation to functions, and this really means that the chief executive, in advising you on all these things or carrying out these functions, is providing for housing generally as distinct from public housing. So, if you say that they are not restricted to building Housing Trust homes, for example, or they can go into partnership, they could invest money in a private development that might help them to do feasibility studies or anything else that would help them. You can go into the business of housing itself apart from the provision of public housing as such.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes; subject to that limiting factor of the approval of the Treasurer.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am interested in the 'approval of the Treasurer' clause, which basically provides that financial assistance, etc., can be provided. As I understand it, the chief executive of what will now be the SAHT will be able to allocate funds. Why is it necessary to have it subject to the approval of the Treasurer? Will you not actually have a budget allocation other than for the employment of the department, and will all other funding have to go through direct application to the Treasurer for his or her consent?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is more that, once the constraint about the corporate interest and the provisions there were taken away, we were persuaded that there had to be some check and balance on exactly what that money was being applied to. It really is providing a very broad scope, because we are defining these other initiatives in such a broad fashion, so it is sensible to have some form of financial framework around that.

We would not expect that the Treasurer would tick off on every proposition; it would probably be for new initiatives. No doubt we will form a memorandum of understanding with the Treasurer about what sorts of things he would be interested in—and I presume they would be, perhaps, a new financing model that was unprecedented. We do not imagine that well worn paths, such as the direct building and construction of public housing, are something that would require approval; it is, perhaps, for some of the more innovative processes where you would want a financial framework surrounding them.

Ms CHAPMAN: Provided you can convince the Treasurer, and because there is a provision to allow the assistance into private housing sectors, I take it that you could actually go into the business of development of private housing yourself as a government enterprise, to invest on your own—that is, acquire property, or go into the development of a parcel of land, yourself and sell it off as a developer. Is that correct?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Ironically, that is what the Housing Trust always did. In a way this is back to the future. We have actually forgotten that there is money in affordable housing. The Housing Trust proved that. The Housing Trust actually never had a cent of public money when it started off. It started off with a government guarantee. It did not actually lend to people on government pensions—there probably were none back then, anyway, back when it started. They lent to low income workers who paid a market rent, and the surplus was reinvested. The trust grew a business. There is money in affordable housing; it is just that there are not a lot of developers who actually get into that business. If you criticise us for being a developer, well, that is always what the Housing Trust has been to a certain extent. It has always used private contractors to do that.

Mr Hanna: Surely the Liberals aren't criticising you for that?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I am a little bit confused here; we are crossing backwards and forwards. I think it is true that one of the things that sustained the Housing Trust was that, essentially—using the contemporary parlance—its government business arm cross-subsidised its loss-making, if you like, welfare housing arm, to coin a phrase—and we still do that today. Our Better Neighbourhoods program, which is largely a redevelopment program of existing estates, captures developer profit and reinvests it to finance the redevelopment of the balance of the project. It is not unusual for the Housing Trust to be a developer. It really is a developer.

Housing SA will continue to be a major redeveloper of land because so much of its estates are in need of regeneration. The first major regeneration project was in Mitchell Park—recently commenced by a Labor government, recently completed. It is one of the great success stories and it led the way to a lot of urban regeneration. It will continue to play a very major role as a developer, essentially.

Ms CHAPMAN: The only difference, minister, is, of course, that the Housing Trust, when it did start, as you quite rightly point out, made profit out of the income it generated from some of its stock and it reinvested that back into the development of other stock. But, that restriction will no longer apply. Your position now, under this new structure, is one where, provided you have the Treasurer's approval, you can go into the business of making money out of a development, as does a private developer, and there is no restriction on how those proceeds are applied. Is that the position? That

is, there is no obligation on you to regenerate that income back into public or welfare housing.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think we do have to. I think the act contemplates that the moneys have to be applied to the purposes of the act. The only relief, if you like, on what we can do with the asset is that we are now not constrained to just apply it to public housing; we can apply it to affordable housing objectives. That is the first thing. The other thing which is a complete answer is that the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement would not allow us to convert those assets in a way that sent them off to some other purpose. It could not be spent on health, dare I say it. It has to be applied. That is why we had to retrieve the \$37.2 million that your predecessors squirreled away in the health department. Basically, the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement obliges us to spend the money on housing.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

Ms CHAPMAN: Clause 9 abolishes the boards and introduces specific management duties. These are the new duties that apply to the chief executive of the SAHT. Section 2E provides that he or she will undertake all these things, including that the minister receives regular reports on the performance of the SAHT and any subsidiary. Obviously, as chief executive, in any event, he or she has an obligation to report to you as minister. What is intended there? Are there to be some sort of monthly or weekly financial accounts submitted to you? What is likely to happen?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is really the same as the current act. We receive regular monthly reports, so that provision remains the same. There is a slight change but, for all intents and purposes, it is the same as in the existing act.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11.

Ms CHAPMAN: We are back to this question of the SAHT being a chief executive officer. New subsection (3) provides that, subject to a direction of the minister, the membership of a committee—and this is on the advice given about the establishment of committees to promote initiatives—will be determined by the SAHT. Do I understand that the chief executive must establish these committees, including the advisory committees, to the minister, and that he or she picks who is on them?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The trust is constituted as the chief executive, so it is the chief executive who determines it for those purposes, yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 and 13 passed.

New clause 13A.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I move:

Page 8, after line 22—Insert new clause as follows:

13A—Insertion of section 21A

After section 21 insert:

21A—Covenants to secure certain commitments

(1) SAHT may, as a term of an agreement with another party that involves the provision of financial or other assistance or support in the public, private or community sectors, require that an instrument of covenant be registered under this section in relation to specified land.

(2) The covenant—

(a) may do 1 or more of the following:

- (i) restrict the use of land and buildings;
- (ii) require that land only be occupied by a person who satisfies criteria specified by the agreement;

(iii) require the disclosure of specified information to—

(A) SAHT;

(B) a person who occupies land;

(C) a person who is seeking to occupy or acquire land;

(iv) make provision for any tenancy or other agreement relating to the occupation of land;

(v) provide for the management, preservation or development of land;

(vi) provide that land may only be sold to a person who satisfies criteria specified in the agreement, and otherwise regulate or restrict the sale of land;

(vii) make provision for other matters that are contemplated by, or necessary or expedient for the purposes of, the agreement (whether in the form of a positive covenant or a negative covenant); and

(b) may be registered and have effect under the terms of this section so as to bind subsequent owners of the land despite the fact that the covenant does not benefit land of SAHT.

(3) The Registrar-General must, on an application of a person who is a party to an agreement under this section, register a covenant under this section on the relevant instrument of title or, in the case of land not under the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886*, against the land.

(4) A covenant, once registered, is binding on any person who is for the time being an owner of the land in relation to which the covenant is registered, whether or not the person was the person with whom the agreement was made or who effected the registration of the covenant (and despite any other Act or law).

(5) An owner of land may, with the consent of, or at the request of, SAHT or SAHT may, after consultation with an owner of land and in accordance with any relevant terms of an agreement under subsection (1)—

(a) vary a covenant by registration of an instrument of variation; or

(b) discharge a covenant by registration of an instrument of discharge,

(with registration being effected in the same manner as the original registration of the covenant).

(6) The Registrar-General may, in connection with an application to register an instrument under subsection (3) or (5)—

(a) require the application to be made in a manner and form determined by the Registrar-General; and

(b) require the application to be accompanied by such information or other instrument specified by the Registrar-General; and

(c) require the payment of a fee prescribed by the regulations.

This is a government amendment in relation to the statutory covenant. It reflected on the question of whether there is adequate capacity in the current arrangements to secure the ongoing use of a particular piece of land or building for affordable housing purposes in the longer term, and the advice is that we need to strengthen the existing capacity. The way to do that is to register a statutory covenant on the title through the usual processes, through our system of land registration. It may be that the price of a house may be restricted so it always remains affordable, which would avoid the risk of a once-off windfall gain for a first owner, or it requires that the land may only be occupied by a person who satisfies certain criteria. Apparently, statutory covenants are common instruments in the Eastern States, used by government and local government to secure certain outcomes from negotiations with developers.

Ms CHAPMAN: The proposed covenant procedure may require the disclosure of specified information to SAHT, a person who occupies land or a person who is seeking to occupy or acquire land; that is fairly clear. What about the

neighbours of the subject property? Are they entitled to be informed about specific information, namely, that this is an affordable housing block that will be next door to them, or are they excluded from getting that information?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There is no provision here for neighbours to be advised of this covenant although, because a land title is an open title, it remains a publicly viewable document.

Ms CHAPMAN: When a development is done under this proposal, with the 15 per cent that may be for affordable and/or high need accommodation, who is proposed to be on the title that will be able to be inspected by anyone else proposing to buy property?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The nature of the covenant would be on the title. It would be on the face of the title.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is the minister saying that, before the 85 per cent are offered for sale, there would be a covenant already registered on the other 15 per cent before the property is made available for sale?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I do not think that we are proposing to prescribe a time when the covenant is on the title, in the same way as we perhaps do not identify in any particular way the existence of, say, a Housing Trust house within a particular development. There would not necessarily be any particular process that would exist to identify a house that was held or owned by either community housing or a public housing landlord.

Ms CHAPMAN: Who will be on the title? Apart from having a covenant registered over it, who will be on the title as the owner?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That would not have anything to do with the covenant. Whoever was the registered proprietor would be the owner on the title. If the registered proprietor was an individual, it would be the name of the individual who purchased the property.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there any obligation under this covenant procedure for that to be identified on the title?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: A registered proprietor is—

Ms CHAPMAN: No, the covenant.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, the covenant in its terms would be registered and would be explicit on the title of the property.

Ms CHAPMAN: Essentially, anyone who wants to acquire a property in the development could go to the Lands Titles Office, conduct a search and identify within the development which units, houses or dwellings are under the subject of this covenant.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 14 to 17 passed.

Clause 18.

Ms CHAPMAN: This clause introduces a new appeals procedure through a panel and there will be a reviewable decision which, through a certain process, has access to this panel. I have a number of questions, but essentially, if a decision is made by the chief executive (the SAHT)—subject to his or her delegation powers—as to who is and who is not allocated a house about which there is some administrative determination and their application for rental assistance is rejected, for example, then they are able to seek that that be reviewed by the panel, which the minister proposes to appoint—the Housing Appeal Panel—as I understand this clause. The areas excluded from consideration by the panel

are: ‘a complaint about a policy of the government, the department or SAHT (which, of course, is the chief executive) as compared to a complaint about whether or not such a policy has been complied with or implemented’.

I assume that means that, if there is a certain policy that rent assistance only be made to persons who qualify under paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), and as a matter of policy someone wanted to object and thinks there should be some other area of provision, they cannot complain about that but they can complain if they say, ‘I have been unfairly excluded from paragraphs (a), (b) or (c)’. Then we have a complaint about the manner in which a member of the staff of the department has acted or behaved. I take it that the remedy for that aspect is through the Ombudsman’s office? Is that where they go?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there any procedure where someone can complain to the chief executive officer about the conduct of a member of staff or do they have to go straight to the Ombudsman’s office?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think that would be the subject of the internal customer service complaints mechanism.

Ms CHAPMAN: Does this not exclude access to that?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No; this is not really an internal complaints mechanism. It is an external complaints mechanism. This implies or contemplates that internal processes will occur even before this process gets going.

Clause passed.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a question in relation to new section 32C, which is the internal review.

The CHAIR: That is part of clause 18.

Ms CHAPMAN: I seek leave to ask a question on that aspect because it follows on from a question I asked about the other matter. New section 32C provides:

(1) The Chief Executive must establish a review system within the department so that a person who is directly affected by a reviewable decision may, at first instance, apply for an internal departmental review of the decision.

Is that what you are talking about; or is that another process they have to go through before they get to the review panel?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is really saying that before they can access the external review process set up by the act they have to go through an internal review. There is no corresponding external review for complaints against staff—that exists with the Ombudsman—so there is an internal review process that is just part of the ordinary course of the way the department deals with any complaints concerning it. I think your observation is accurate.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to new section 32D, having gone through the internal review process, the chief executive and then the review panel, the ultimate appeal rests with you, minister. New subsection (6) provides that, after taking into account any recommendations put to you by the panel for their decision, you can confirm, vary or impose a new decision but you do not have to conduct a hearing and you do not have to give any reasons. Is that right?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is right. What happens is that the panel comes up with a recommendation and it is really endorsed unless there are cogent reasons for departing from that recommendation.

Ms CHAPMAN: Who or what process currently hears this appeal process or provides this appeal process? How many of them do they hear on average a week or a month?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is called the Public Housing Appeal Panel and last financial year it heard something in the order of 385 appeals.

The CHAIR: The chair has been extraordinarily indulgent in allowing questions in excess of three on a clause and three questions after the clause has been agreed to. Can we use this moment to get ourselves in order and indicate the next area of interest.

Clause 19.

Mr HANNA: My question is about the obligation for the annual report to be prepared and brought to parliament. What do you do if the report does not come to you in time? I know of another minister who seems oblivious to the fact that reports are not brought to the parliament on time. In fact, every minister should be conscientious about that sort of thing. However, the question is: what do you do if you do not get your annual report when it is due?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think you get very angry and stamp your feet. I think that if it was a matter of heightened interest to you, you could include it in your performance agreement with your chief executive and hold him or her accountable. These are proper matters to which ministers should attend. Obviously, it is a matter for the parliament, I suppose, to seek to hold the minister to account and therefore his administrators.

Clause passed.

Clause 20.

Ms CHAPMAN: This clause gives the minister the right to delegate functions or powers to specified persons. What does the minister have in mind here, and is it proposed that his delegation power of appeal be delegated to anyone and, if so, to whom or to what body?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Apparently I can delegate my power of appeal, which is tempting, I must say.

I do not delegate that. I find it a useful way of finding out what is happening, because you get a very detailed analysis of what is happening. It would be possible to delegate something of that sort, but I have not chosen to.

Clause passed.

Clauses 21 to 32 passed.

Clause 33.

Ms CHAPMAN: This clause appears to transfer all the obligations to you, minister, from the authority in terms of keeping and maintaining records and registers and, as I understand it, undertake inspections. Why is this role not transferred to the chief executive officer?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is because either the department or minister has taken to itself the administrative and departmental type functions, whereas the asset relations functions reside in the hands of the South Australian Housing Trust constituted by the chief executive.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am not sure that I understood that. You, minister, will take on this responsibility—this is the register of all the assets? What is the penalty if you fail to keep the register or to undertake the inspections? Anything?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think just the ordinary embarrassment that exists associated with not complying with a statutory dictate.

Ms CHAPMAN: Are you required to give yourself a report or give a report to the chief executive who then gives you a part of the annual report to table in the parliament on this issue?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I might have to get back to the honourable member about that.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 21 February 2007 at 2 p.m.