

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 27 March 2007

The house met at 2 p.m.

The ACTING CLERK: I inform the house that, in the absence of the Speaker, and pursuant to standing order 17, the Deputy Speaker will take the chair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Thompson) took the chair and read prayers.

HOUSING SA

A petition signed by 254 residents of Smithfield Plains and the northern suburbs, requesting the house to urge the South Australian Housing Trust to demolish vacant Housing Trust houses as soon as they have been listed for demolition to reduce the influx of vermin, vandalism and arson, was presented by Mr Piccolo.

Petition received.

VOLUNTARY EUTHANASIA

A petition signed by 77 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to support the Voluntary Euthanasia Bill 2006 to give South Australian citizens the legal right to choose voluntary euthanasia for themselves within stringent safeguards against misuse, was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I draw to members' attention the presence in the gallery of pupils of Concordia College, who are guests of the member for Unley, and members of the Reynella Neighbourhood Centre Seniors Group, who are guests of the member for Reynell.

QUESTIONS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to the following questions, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 23, 29, 33, 137, 148, 160, 165, 174, 176, 177, 188, 189, 193, 194, 199, 201, 211, 221, 225 (parts 3, 4 and 6) and 228 (part 3).

EMPLOYEE ADVOCATE UNIT

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS** (29 August).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am advised that the Public Service Association (PSA) did write a letter to Mr Bruce Carter, Chair of the WorkCover Board, dated 16 June 2006.

WORKCOVER CLAIMS RATES

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS** (5 December).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am advised that there is no evidence of any meaningful difference in the income maintenance claim rate trends between registered and self-insured employers.

I am also advised that the differences in the statistics reported in the June 2006 Management Performance Report occurs because of the difficulty WorkCover can have in identifying time lost claims within the data sets supplied by self insurers, which require a longer period for such claims to be identified.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee B, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: I am advised that there were nil surplus employees in the Department of Water, Land & Biodiversity Conservation at 30 June 2006.

I am advised that there were nil surplus employees in the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology, Bio Innovation SA and Playford Capital at 30 June 2006.

I am advised that there were 18 surplus employees for the Department of Trade and Economic Development as at 30 June 2006.

Department/Agency	Classification	TEC Cost
Trade & Economic Development	ASO2	\$ 33, 645
	ASO2	\$ 43, 949
	ASO2	\$ 45, 764
	ASO3	\$ 50, 633
	ASO3	\$ 50, 633
	ASO3	\$ 51, 098
	ASO3	\$ 51, 098
	ASO3	\$ 51, 098
	ASO4	\$ 56, 542
	ASO4	\$ 57, 061
	ASO4	\$ 57, 061
	ASO5	\$ 68, 138
	ASO6	\$ 74, 108
	ASO6	\$ 74, 787
	ASO8	\$ 91, 133
	ASO8	\$ 94, 033
ASO8	\$ 90, 305	
MAS3	\$ 95, 741	

EMPLOYEE ADVOCATE UNIT

In reply to **The Hon. I.F. EVANS** (28 June 2006).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am advised that the matter of the WorkCover review into the provision of advice and advocacy services currently provided by WorkCover's Employee Advocate Unit (EAU) was discussed in the meeting with me, the Chair of the WorkCover Board and the Chief Executive Officer on 2 June 2006.

I am further advised that the WorkCover Board has decided to retain the advisory services provided by the Employee Advocate Unit and to continue to fund representation services for injured workers in dispute over workers compensation matters by providing funding initially to SA Unions and Business SA.

I am also advised that the Board requested management to develop a process to consider widening the groups that can provide representation services in the future. How this is taken forward, and whether by competitive tender is a matter for the Board to consider in the future.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Four frauds reported in Volume II of the Auditor General's Report 2003-04 related to FAYS, now known as Families SA, a division of the Department for Families and Communities (DFC). All four of these frauds were still under investigation by South Australia Police (SAPOL) at 30 June 2004. As at 30 June 2006, two cases had been finalised and two were still proceeding through the court system.

I was advised by DFC that in 2004-05 no new cases of fraud had been detected, the minister reporting this to the House in November 2005. DFC's Annual Report for 2004-05 identified on page 58:

During 2004-05, two new instances of employee related frauds were reported. Both matters were reported to the SA Police and internal investigations were performed. As a result of one investigation, improvements to internal controls were recommended to reduce the risk of fraud re-occurring. A second investigation was ongoing at 30 June 2005 in conjunction with SA Police's Anti-Corruption Branch.

It is DFC policy to investigate all losses of moneys or assets from the department. In relation to loss of cash, including petty cash, SAPOL are also notified. In relation to the above two investigations that were undertaken in 2004-05 no fraud was identified and the investigations were mistakenly reported as '...employee related frauds'. No new frauds were identified for DFC in 2004-05.

In relation to the 2005-06 Auditor-Generals' Report, I reported to the House on 22 November 2006 that there were no new frauds detected in 2005-06. I have been further advised that in 2005-06 DFC had one current investigation for misuse of a motor vehicle, and two investigations related to petty cash which were completed between February and May 2006. In these cases it was identified that appropriate management action had been taken.

DFC's Annual Report 2005-06, under the title 'Fraud Management' on page 86, stated:

Three instances of employee related fraud cases were reported in 2005-06. One reported case resulted in an investigation involving Crown Solicitors which has yet to be finalised while the other cases have been resolved internally.

It has now been resolved that none of these cases relate to fraud and that the investigations were mistakenly reported as 'employee related frauds'. No new frauds were identified for DFC in 2005-06.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr GOLDSWORTHY** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: This question is being treated as an Omnibus question for the whole of Attorney-General's Department and will be answered by the Attorney-General.

VOLUNTEERS

In reply to **Mr PISONI** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The results of a recent survey conducted for Government by Harrison Market Research Pty Ltd to standard statistical methods and Australian Bureau of Statistics definitions indicate that the volunteer participation rate for formal volunteers in South Australia has increased from 38 per cent in 2000 to 51 per cent in 2006.

The results show that the amount of time volunteers devote to volunteering has increased from 1.5 hours per week in 1995 and 2000 to 2.31 in 2006. This represents 610 000 South Australians providing an estimated 1.4 million volunteer hours per week.

While the entire focus of the OFV is the promotion of volunteering, in the 2005-06 budget a total of \$484 000 was used to support the volunteer sector through:

- the Volunteer Support Fund (\$150 000) a grants program for community groups with volunteers;
- hosting the Volunteers Day celebration and the State Volunteer Congress;
- providing essential operating funds to Volunteering SA and 2 metropolitan Volunteer Resource Centres;
- the provision of free training to volunteers and scholarships for volunteer management qualifications;
- initiating volunteer recognition awards such as the Joy Noble Medal for outstanding volunteer service in South Australian Government volunteer programs and the Premier's Business Awards for Outstanding Volunteer Support;
- connecting community groups to students who build websites to promote their services through the CommunityWebs program; and
- mounting an annual television advertising and print media promotions campaign in the lead up to and during National Volunteer Week in May.

A similar amount is being spent in the 2006-07 financial year to continue the progress made in promoting and marketing volunteering and to ensure that we continue to provide effective support to the volunteer sector in South Australia.

TRADE MEASUREMENT

In reply to **Mr PISONI** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I have received the following advice:

I can confirm that the figure is correct. There has been an operational change in the Trade Measurement section where a greater focus has been placed on testing products at the wholesale rather than the retail stage. This allowed a much greater number of products and measures to be tested overall.

OCBA does not keep specific statistics on repeat offenders. Last year there was an overall compliance rate of 93 per cent for product labelling and correct measures. Where a product or a measuring instrument does not comply a compliance notice is issued immediate-

ly. This requires the items wrongly labelled to be withdrawn from sale, or the measuring instrument to be withdrawn from use immediately and not returned to use until the problem is corrected. 616 compliance notices were issued in 2005-06. If the business fails to make the correction a warning letter is the next step. Nine such letters were written last year. If a warning letter is ignored, OCBA will then prosecute the business. Last year there was one prosecution for the sale of underweight firewood.

It was thought the estimated result of 2005-06 would be unlikely to be repeated in 2006-07.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr GOLDSWORTHY** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:

Positions with a TEC of \$100 000 or more (between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006)

I refer the member to the Auditor-General's Supplementary Report for the year ended 30 June 2006, which contains the Department of Primary Industries and Resources Audit Report. Note 6 on page 121 provides information on the number of employees with a total employment cost exceeding \$100 000 or \$200 000 for the period between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006.

Positions Abolished

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Primary Industries and Resources SA	N/A	N/A
	No positions abolished	No positions abolished

Positions Created

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Primary Industries and Resources SA	N/A	N/A
	No positions created	No positions created

STATE/LOCAL GOVERNMENT FORUM

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The Minister's State/Local Government Forum has an ongoing state budget allocation of \$250 000 per annum, and it meets every three months during the year.

AGGRAVATED VIOLENCE ORDERS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I have been advised by the Premier's Council for Women (PCW) that no concerns relating to the enforcement of Domestic Violence Restraining Orders (DVRO's) have been referred to it. However, women's safety has been one of the highest priorities for the Government and for the Premier's Council for Women (PCW) over the past year. The PWC has played a key role in advocating for rape, sexual assault and domestic violence legislative reform which includes DVRO's (aggravated violence orders is the term that is used in some other Australian jurisdictions. As part of the Women's Safety Strategy, the Government is undertaking a review of the Domestic Violence Act 1994 which provides the legislative framework for domestic violence restraining orders.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr GOLDSWORTHY** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The Office for Women as of 30 June 2006 has no surplus employees.

DIFFERENTIAL RATES RECOMMENDATIONS PAPER

In reply to **Mr PENGILLY** (Estimates Committee A, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The Office for State/Local Government Relations published a Paper *Recommendations on Differential Rates* on 31 May 2006, and invited comment from all councils, by 31 July 2006.

27 responses were received (25 councils, plus the LGA, and the SA Institute of Rate Administrators). All responses were published on the OSLGR web site.

There were four recommendations in the paper.

Recommendation 4.6

This *Recommendations Paper* does not recommend that councils should be permitted to declare zones specifically for rating purposes. On the contrary, it recommends that when regulations are drafted for the purposes of the new section 156(7), the option to rate differentially according to Development Plan zones should be removed.

This recommendation generated the most responses. There was strong support for the first half of the recommendation, but near-universal rejection, from the respondent councils, of the proposal to remove the option to declare differential rates that differ according to Development Plan zones.

Recommendation 5.5

This *Recommendations Paper* does not recommend pursuing any amendment to permit rates to be based on secondary land uses by a single occupier. It reminds any council that wants to impose rates on any land subject to separate occupation that the Valuer-General provides tenancy apportionment valuations on request.

This Recommendation proved to be uncontroversial.

Recommendation 6.5

This *Recommendations Paper* recommends no change to the land use factors in Regulation 10 of the Local Government (General) Regulations 1999.

Responses to this recommendation were diverse, with no clear theme emerging.

Recommendation 7

This *Recommendations Paper* recommends the LGA consider development of:

- a package of guidelines and/or
 - an extra component in its annual 'Rate Administration—Advanced' training course
- to assist rating officers determine objections to land use decisions.

All respondents accepted this recommendation. Responses highlighted the particular difficulty that councils have in distinguishing between "residential" land use and "primary production" land use, when the land concerned is a hobby farm, or is within a "rural living" development plan zone.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARDS

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee B, 25 October 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have been advised that:

The decreases in operating expenditure from the 2005-06 budgeted amount to the 2006-07 budgeted amount are due to a number of factors:

(a) NRM Boards (formerly Mount Lofty Ranges INRM Group): Operations of the former Mount Lofty Ranges INRM Group were previously incorporated within the Administered Items of the Department. Now that these functions and the associated funding have transferred to the new Natural Resources Management Boards, the operations are reported within the associated Board and no longer form part of the Administered Items of the Department. This is the reason for the decrease in the 2006-07 expenditure budget.

(b) Natural Heritage Trust Program: Part of the Natural Heritage Trust Program, the National Landcare Program, was under spent in 2004-05 by \$2.6 million and the budget for this amount was carried forward to the 2005-06 financial year. This carryover is included in the 2005-06 Estimated Result of \$24.115 million and is the primary reason for the apparent decrease in 2006-07.

(c) Centre for Natural Resources Management: Operations of the Centre for Natural Resources Management were previously separately identified within the Administered Items of the Department. Funding for these operations have now been consolidated within the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality Program.

(d) National Action Plan for the Salinity and Water Quality Program: The expenditure budget for the National Action Plan is dependant on a number of major projects. Funding requirements for these projects have been reviewed and subsequent adjustments are the primary reason for the decrease in the 2006-07 expenditure budget.

VACSWIM

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (26 September 2006).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: VACSWIM is an important Government funded program providing participants with opportunities to develop a range of skills and positive experiences in water safety, confidence and competence in the water, personal survival activities, emergency procedures and basic swimming stroke improvement. A contractor is engaged to manage and organise VACSWIM at locations throughout South Australia.

An agreement was negotiated with the contractor LeisureCo, which commenced in 2002 for a period of three years plus two years. I am advised that the Office for Recreation and Sport (ORS) sought advice from the Crown Solicitor regarding the existing contract for 2007.

In May 2006 ORS was advised by the Department for Administrative and Information Services (DAIS) Corporate Procurement Services that as Minister, I had the right to extend the contract if needed, subject to confirmation from the Crown Solicitor's Office (CSO), which was subsequently received on 24 May 2006.

Based on advice received from both DAIS and the CSO, negotiations commenced with LeisureCo for them to conduct VACSWIM 2007, which they agreed to do. ORS is currently proceeding with the public tender for the delivery of VACSWIM for the period 2008-2010.

In relation to participation rates for the program, I can advise that factors such as marketing, promotion, service quality and locations are subject to constant discussion between ORS and the program managers to review and improve.

The factors that are associated with the number of participants attending VACSWIM include such things as the weather, the negative publicity generated by shark sightings, pool closures and the increasing number of children involved in vacation care programs.

CASH ALIGNMENT POLICY

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The member refers to the cash surplus returned under the cash alignment policy. No program was failed to be conducted as a result of this cash surplus. The cash surplus relates to projects not finalised in 2005-06 relating to the Commonwealth Essential Works program and APY taskforce projects. Examples include swimming pools, a rehabilitation facility and the combined courts and police station. The expenditure for these projects has been carried forward to 2006-07 and 2007-08.

MENTAL HEALTH, LYELL McEWIN

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN** (28 September 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised by the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse that:

Before the last election we listened to country mental health consumers, their families and carers and acknowledged that country people need a central Adelaide location for mental health treatment and services. The link between the Rural and Remote telephone triage service and the Inpatient service at the Glenside campus was seen as particularly important to country people. Rural and Remote mental health services will, therefore, continue at the Glenside Campus.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee B, 23 October 2006).

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: Positions with a TEC of \$100 000 or more between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006.

I am advised:

In relation to the Department of Water, Land & Biodiversity Conservation information relating to the total employee cost can be found on page 1576 of the Auditor-General's Report.

With reference to the Auditor General's Annual Report for the Year ended 30 June 2006, Part B: Agency Audit Reports Volume V, page 1330, the total number of Department and Trade and Economic Development employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more is twenty three. As a subcategory, the total number of employees with a total cost \$200 000 or more is one.

As at 30 June 2006, the Science and Innovation and Information Economy directorate within the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology had four employees with a

total employment cost of \$100 000 or more and zero employees with a total employment cost of \$200 000 or more.

As at 30 June 2006, Playford Capital had four employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more and one of these employees had a total employment cost of \$200 000 or more.

As at 30 June 2006, Bio Innovation SA had three employees with a total employment cost of \$100 000 or more and two of these employees had a total employment cost of \$200 000 or more.

6 (II) (a) Positions Abolished—between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation	Executive Director, Corporate Services	\$170 000-\$179 999
Department of Trade and Economic Development	Business Development Manager, Defence	\$150 000
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology	Strategic Adviser	\$125 000
	Executive Director	\$180 000
	Director	\$148 669
	Director	\$122 906
	Director	\$147 829

6 (II) (b) Positions Created—between 30 June 2005 and 30 June 2006

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation	Director, Corporate Services	\$120 000-\$129 999
Department of Trade and Economic Development	Chief Finance Officer	\$104 917
	Director, Case Management	\$130 000
	Director, Population & Migration	\$130 000
	Director, Strategy Division	\$125 000
	Director, Commercial Division	\$179 283
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology	Director	\$147 870
	Director	\$160 000

CASH AND CASH EQUIVALENT ESTIMATED RESULT

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee B, 25 October 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have been advised that:

Movements in cash and cash equivalents from the original budget of \$31.66 million to the estimated result of \$8.124 million may be analysed in terms of the Cash Flow Statement on page 12.61 of Budget Paper 4, Volume 3. It should be noted that the actual run down in cash and cash equivalents was less than that estimated, with the actual cash on hand at 30 June 2006 being \$11.04 million.

The major movement impacting cash occurred in grants and subsidies, payments for which increased by \$14.7 million. Of this amount, there was an additional \$10 million in water purchases over and above the original budget as part of South Australia's commitments under the Living Murray Initiative *First Step* decision. These amounts were correctly expensed, rather than capitalised. Total water purchases were \$16.1 million, primarily from SA Water and occurred on 30 June 2006. This expenditure was met from existing funds in lieu of the provision of additional appropriation. The funds were drawn down from the Save the River Murray Fund special deposit account.

The remaining run down in cash of \$10.6 million is principally attributed to the impact of additional carryover expenditure of \$5.6 million from 2004-05 into 2005-06 and movements in relevant balance sheet items (eg creditors and receivables) and appropriations received.

The application of the Treasurer's Cash Alignment Policy did not impact significantly during 2005-06.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARDS

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee B, 25 October 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have been advised that:

The Knowledge and Information Division and the Land and Biodiversity Services Division of the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation provide technical and scientific support to all Natural Resource Management Boards.

This is generally on a project basis and often under a Memorandum of Agreement outlining the scope of the works, delivery of the product and the charges for the work.

Following an extensive review, the Government has determined that NRM Boards will now be required to meet the costs associated with technical and scientific support associated with outcomes for which the Board has primary responsibility. This will occur on a transitional basis to be fully implemented by 2009-10 to allow time for adjustment.

NRM Boards develop and fund investment plans for their natural resource management programs including scientific and technical support based on their priorities. The Boards source this support from the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation, from Rural Solutions SA, other government agencies, or from the private sector. Funding for this support may be sourced from the NRM Board levies, Natural Heritage Trust, National Action Plan for Water Quality and Salinity or other similar natural resource programs.

The department will continue to provide technical advice associated with the implementation of programs where Board and departmental business is closely aligned.

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee B, 25 October 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have been advised that:

1. The 'Other' budget line is constituted by grants and subsidies and other intra-government transfers. There are many individual items under this category including payments to the various Natural Resource Management Boards in South Australia, the Dog Fence Board, and Primary Industries and Resources SA – Rural Finance. Substantial further detail may be found within Note 9 to the Department's financial report (refer to the 2005-06 Auditor-General's Report to Parliament, Volume 5, page 1577).

Movements in this 'Other' line will be significantly impacted by National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality (NAP) and National Heritage Trust (NHT) funds and in particular, the transfer from administered lines of the Department to controlled activities.

2. The increase in the cost of supplies and services from the 2005-06 budgeted amount of \$18.8 million to the 2006-07 budgeted amount of \$30.8 million is primarily attributed to the following factors:

(a) The impact of expenditure derived from external revenues (e.g. NAP and NHT). During the latter part of 2005-06, the Department processed journals (approved by the Department of Treasury and Finance) to accurately reflect expenditure

associated with these external programs. This increase in terms of the Department's overall budget for goods and services was in the order of \$14 million;

- (b) Further, carryover requests during 2005-06 into 2006-07 of some \$4.5 million will have augmented the 2006-07 budget (with the exception of those carryovers pertaining to the Catchment Management Subsidy Scheme, which was transferred to the Stormwater Management Authority from 1 July 2006); and
- (c) Other differences relate principally to timing issues associated with major projects that receive NAP, NHT and Murray-Darling Basin Commission funding.

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS** (Estimates Committee B, 25 October 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have been advised that:

The reduction of \$5.912 million between the actual 2004-05 result and the 2006-07 budgeted result may be primarily attributed to the following factors:

(a) The transfer of the budgets relating to the Catchment Management Subsidy Scheme and the Regional Flood Mitigation Program, in the order of \$4.4 million for 2005-06 and \$4.1 million during 2004-05, to the Stormwater Management Authority from 1 July 2006;

(b) Savings arising from modification of the fumigation program and implementation of better application technology under the Branched Broomrape Eradication Program, resulting in a reduction in expenditure associated with that program in the order of \$500 000 for 2006-07;

(c) Reduction in expenditure associated with the implementation of the *Natural Resources Management Act 2004*, much of which was reported during the 2004-05 financial year.

KILBURN ENVIRONMENT PROJECTS

In reply to **Mr HANNA** (Estimates Committee B, 25 October 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have been advised that:

In response to community concern, the EPA (Environment Protection Authority) undertook air quality monitoring, an audit of 15 EPA licensed sites and an odour survey by the EPA in the Kilburn and Gepps Cross area during 2005 and 2006. The odour study undertaken in the region was part of the Kilburn Environment Project and therefore in answering the question without notice it is assumed that the reference to the Kilburn Environment Project incorporates the air quality monitoring, the odour survey and the audit of the 15 licensed sites undertaken in Kilburn and Gepps Cross.

- An estimated \$100 000 was spent on the Kilburn Environment Project.
- An estimated \$10 000 of the \$100 000 was spent on the Kilburn Odour Study.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION

In reply to **Mr PISONI** (Estimates Committee B, 25 October 2006).

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have been advised that:

The increase in "Sales of Goods and Services" revenue in the 2005-06 Estimated Result from the level budgeted for in the 2005-06 Original Budget is primarily attributable to revenue originally being budgeted for in the "Other" revenue line, but being recognised, more appropriately, in the "Sales of Goods and Services" revenue line.

This has resulted in an offsetting variance between the 2005-06 Estimated Result and 2005-06 Original Budget in the "Other" revenue line.

TORRENS BUILDING

In reply to **The Hon. R.G. KERIN** (Estimates Committee B, 24 October 2006).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The Premier has provided the following information:

The capital works statement on page 55 identifies expenditure of \$3.2 million in the 2005-06 financial year for the refurbishment of the Torrens Building to accommodate the stage 1 requirements of the Carnegie Mellon University and a further expenditure of \$355 000 this financial year. Is this \$3.5 million expenditure part of the government's \$20 million commitment to Carnegie Mellon?

The Torrens Building project was funded separately to the contracted support of up to \$19.5 million.

Is there a rental or leasing agreement with Carnegie Mellon whereby the government would receive income from Carnegie Mellon for the use of the Torrens Building?

The lease was negotiated on terms which are essentially the same as those for the other tenants in the Torrens Building. A component of the State's assistance to Carnegie Mellon is to pay this lease, from the \$19.5 million allocation, on behalf of Carnegie Mellon until 2010.

Carnegie Mellon will be responsible for paying the lease after this period.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have been advised of the following:

The appropriation of monies for beyondblue: the national depression initiative was transferred to the Department of Health for the 2005-06 financial year. Prior to this the money was received by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and transferred to the Department of Health as an "administered item".

South Australia remains committed to working with beyondblue and in September 2006 I signed an agreement with the Chairman of beyondblue, the Hon. Jeff Kennett, to continue the partnership through to 2010.

SECOND-HAND VEHICLES COMPENSATION FUND

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: The interest received by the Second-Hand Vehicles Compensation Fund in 2005-06 was \$191 000. The interest earned is added to the fund, and remains in the fund.

AGENTS INDEMNITY FUND

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:

1. The Income of the Agents Indemnity Fund for 2005-06 was \$8.566 million, of which \$8.474 million was interest income and \$0.092 million was other income.

2. The interest income included interest on agents and conveyancers' trust accounts of \$6.216 million, interest on investments held with the Public Trustee of \$2.103 million and interest on deposits with the Department of Treasury and Finance of \$0.155 million. The other income consisted of management fee recoveries (\$0.083 million) and sundry recoveries (\$0.009 million).

In reply to **Mrs PENFOLD** (22 November 2006).

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am advised by the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs that claims made on the Agent's Indemnity Fund in 2005-06, other than claims in respect of Growdens, are as follows:

Compass Rentals, \$1 111.29; Agrarian House P/L trading as PRD Nationwide Realty, \$4 200.00; Charles Barrie, \$195.80; and Property Management Specialists, \$1 874.00.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL CENTRE TRUST

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

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am advised that, in relation to the debt repayment arrangements as referred to on page 42 of the Auditor-General's Report (not page 40):

The current level of borrowings for the Adelaide Festival Centre from State Government is \$27.250 million. The largest component of this is an interest-only loan of \$19 778 130, relating to the original construction of the building. The balance, a Treasury loan of \$7 471 750, commenced in October 1999.

ROXBY DOWNS

In reply to **Hon. G.M. GUNN:** (Estimates Committee A, 18 October 2006).

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has provided the following information:

1. The proposed change to the Regulations will bring the *Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982* into the same exemptions that currently operate for the *Mining Act 1971* and *Petroleum Act 2000*. The intention is to provide a simpler and easier process for operations under the *Roxby Downs (Indenture Ratification) Act 1982* than is currently the case.

2. No. The amendment will provide for the same provisions as other mining operations. The proposed changes to the Regulations will reduce complexity and processing time for clearance incidental to such mining operations.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS** (Estimates Committee A, 20 October 2006).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:

- (i) The information you request is available in the Auditor-General's report, please refer to this.
- (ii) Positions abolished: Nil.
- (iii) Positions created: Nil.

Note: Position retitled:

Department/Agency	Position Title	TEC Cost
Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division	Director, Aboriginal Culture and Heritage (retitle of the position of Chief Executive, Department for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Division)	\$298 990

LAND AGENTS INDEMNITY (GROWDEN DEFAULT) FUND

23. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How much has been paid out of the \$13.5 million Land Agents Indemnity (Growden Default) Fund with respect to claims, what is total value of the claims made against Growden and what is the current balance of the fund?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I provide the following information:

1. As at 30 June 2006, \$4.9 million had been paid out of the \$13.5 million available in Part B of the Fund. A total of \$5.7 million has been paid out of Part A and B in 2005-06.
2. A total of \$16.5 million has been paid in claims as a result of fiduciary default of G C Growden Pty Ltd and associates since the first claim was paid in June 1999.
3. The balance of the Fund as per the financial statements as at 30 June 2006 was \$39.3 million.

SCHOOLS, DAMAGE

29. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

1. Was any state government funding allocated for the provision of potential fire claims, arson attacks and graffiti damage to schools in 2005-06 and if so, how much and if not, why not?

2. What has been the total damage bill from fire and vandalism, respectively, at public school sites since 2001?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: In 2005-26, Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) allocated \$12 million for potential fire claims, arson attacks and vandalism, including graffiti damage, to DECS sites.

Total expenditure for fire (includes arson/accidental/bushfire reinstatement) and vandalism (includes break and larceny, graffiti and other acts of criminal intent) costs at DECS sites for the period 1 January, 2002 to 30 June, 2006 is \$56.9 million.

SCHOOL REVENUE

33. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Why was the sale of goods and services revenue higher than the anticipated \$2.3 million in 2004-05?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Revenue taken from the sale of goods and services for 2004-5 was not anticipated to be \$2.3 million in total, as indicated. Rather, revenue for the sale of goods and services for 2004-05 was \$2.3 million higher than anticipated.

The DECS Annual Report for 2004-05, Appendix N – Financial Overview, states in the explanation of variances to the revised budget:

- Other Sale of Goods and Services revenue higher than anticipated (\$2.3 million).
- The increase of \$2.3 million for sales of goods and services revenue was the result of higher than anticipated revenue from:
 - Distribution centre activities
 - The Asia Foundation
 - Red Cross Instructors
 - International Business Operations
 - Training and development and venue hire.

TRANSPORT PLAN

137. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Has the Transport Regulation and User Management Processing System budget been exceeded by \$3.3 million and if so, why?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Transport Regulation and User Management Processing System (TRUMPS) for administering Driver and Vehicle Licensing is a major undertaking by the Department for Transport Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI).

Changes to the scope of the project through the inclusion of new and significant road safety initiatives such as the Graduated Driver Licensing reforms, drug driving and immediate loss of licence for excessive speed and drink driving offences has meant that the scope of the project has expanded. Consequently, costs and timelines have been adjusted accordingly.

ROADS, SPEED DETECTION

148. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** How will the increase in the number of speed detection hours from 114 000 in 2005-06 to 125 000 in 2006-07 be achieved, how many additional lasers or mobile radars will be deployed, what is the cost of purchasing additional detection devices and what technology will be used?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

During 2007, the South Australia Police (SAPOL) are purchasing additional speed detection equipment for deployment in the metropolitan and country areas. This equipment will include 132 Kustom Signals brand 'Silver Eagle' mobile radar units and 33 UltraLyte hand held speed detection devices. The additional equipment will substantially increase SAPOL's current capability to detect speeding motorists.

The estimated total capital cost of the project is \$737 000, which consists of purchasing equipment, fitting the mobile units to vehicles and training SAPOL personnel.

Kustom Signals brand 'Silver Eagle' mobile radar units have been used by SAPOL for a number of years and feature the ability to:

- Operate in a moving or stationary mode, and
 - Detect vehicles approaching from the front or rear at speeds of up to 209 km/h;
- 'UltraLyte' hand held speed detection devices have been used by SAPOL for the past two years and have the ability to:
- Accurately calculate the distance and time between two vehicle to assist to detect the offence of vehicles following too closely;
 - Detect a vehicle at a distance of approximately one kilometre away.

HOON DRIVERS

160. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:**

1. How many 'hoon driving' prosecutions have been successful and are there any plans to change, enhance or toughen up these measures?

2. What resources does SAPOL have available for patrolling areas renown for 'hoon driving' offences and have any particular local service areas requested additional resources to apprehend offending motorists?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

1. Section 44B of the *Road Traffic Act 1961* (Misuse of Motor Vehicle) was inserted into the Road Traffic Act through amendments contained in the *Statutes Amendment (Misuse of Motor Vehicles) Act 2004* and became operative on 7 February 2005 as proclaimed in the Government Gazette of 20 January 2005, except for impounding and forfeiture provisions which became operative on 2 May 2005.

From the date of implementation 7 February 2005 to 1 November 2006 the following prosecutions have occurred:

Total persons charged	1428
Guilty finding	963
Not guilty	72
Matters still proceeding	393
Total matters finalised	1035
Successful prosecutions	963
Percentage of successful prosecutions	93 per cent

SAPOL has participated in a working group with representatives from the Attorney General's Department, the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure and the Courts Administration Authority to prepare a submission for legislative amendment to enhance and toughen the hoon driving legislation.

It is the Government's intention to fulfil an election pledge to toughen up the current legislation by extending police authority to impound or wheel clamp cars for up to seven days. Legislation will also be amended to allow for the impounding or clamping of vehicles for a range of other offences, including persistently driving an unregistered or unlicensed vehicle and graffiti vandalism.

2. All operational Local Service Area resources are committed to detecting and preventing this type of driver behaviour. Any operational resource may be used and in some cases, specific policing initiatives may be raised from time to time. These operations can involve police from the relevant Local Service Area as well as assistance from other Local Service Areas and specialist areas.

SAPOL relies on information gained from members of the public and its own intelligence holdings. Members of the public are also encouraged to report instances of 'hoon driving' to their local police station or the Call Centre. Calls are assessed and where there is sufficient detail available, the information is recorded as a Traffic Watch Complaint and is allocated to the relevant to Local Service Area Traffic Manager for attention.

SAPOL also has two specific Traffic Enforcement Sections (one located at Sturt and the other located at Holden Hill), which support Local Service Areas.

No Local Service Area Commander has ever requested additional resources in order to adequately enforce 'hoon driving legislation'.

OUTER HARBOR CHANNEL

165. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Has the Government reduced its financial contribution to the Outer Harbour Channel Deepening project and if so, why?

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

The State Government has not reduced its financial contribution to the Outer Harbor Channel Deepening project.

The Government directly funded \$15 million of the project costs as well as contributing the savings generated from the deep-sea grain wharf relocation, estimated to be approximately \$15 million, bringing the total Government contribution to approximately \$30 million. Flinders Ports funded the balance of the total project costs.

This multi-million dollar project, jointly funded by the State Government and the private port operator, Flinders Ports, is pivotal in supporting the State's grain and container export industries. It also offers potential benefits for the State's growing mining industry.

The Outer Harbor Channel Deepening project is a major element of the Government's integrated strategy to revitalise Port Adelaide and reinforce Outer Harbor as a modern competitive export/import hub for the State.

This project will enhance South Australia's reputation as a key player on the international business stage and is a key component in fulfilling the Government's ambitious export target to treble the value of the State's export income to \$25 billion by 2013.

The deepening of the Outer Harbor shipping channel is a good example of what can be achieved when Government and the private sector work in a productive partnership. It is a valuable public infrastructure asset which was delivered within budget and in an enviable timeframe.

MULTICULTURAL SA

174. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** Will the Office have any budgeted involvement in business migration programs in 2006-07 and if so, what are the details?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No.

MIGRANT AND REFUGEE INTAKE

176. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What migrant and refugee intake, respectively, is expected for South Australia in 2006-07 and the next 3 years?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Humanitarian and Migration programs are Commonwealth Government programs and the annual intake for both the programs are set by the Commonwealth.

With the number of visas granted in 2005-26, it is likely that more than 7 000 new skilled and business migrants will arrive in South Australia in 2006-27. The level of skilled and business migrant intake for years to come will be dependent on Commonwealth Government's policy on various visa programs.

The number of Humanitarian entrants is expected to be about 1 400 in 2006-27. Depending on whether or not the Commonwealth changes the total number of entrants under the Humanitarian Program—currently about 13 000 nationally—South Australia is expected to continue to receive about 1 400 a year for the next few years.

South Australia's Strategic Plan places a high priority on increasing the South Australian population. The Strategic Plan includes these targets:

T1.22 – Total population: increase South Australia's population to 2 million by 2050, with an interim target of 1.64 million by 2014;

T1.24 – Overseas migration: increase net overseas migration gain to 8500 per annum by 2014;

T5.8 – Multiculturalism: increase the percentage of South Australians who accept cultural diversity as a positive influence in the community; and

T5.9 – Regional population levels: maintain regional South Australia's share of the state's population (18 per cent).

WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP

177. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What was the cost of the Women's Leadership Program held in the Riverland in 2005-06 and what will be the anticipated cost of the program to be held in the metropolitan area in 2006-07?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The cost of the Women's Leadership Course held in the Riverland in 2005-26 was funded by TAFE S.A. Regional.

The cost to Multicultural S.A. of the delivery of the Women's Leadership Course being held in the metropolitan area in 2006-27 will be \$8 000. The Office for Women is also contributing \$8 000, to meet the total cost of \$16 000.

The Women's Leadership Courses were initiated in 2002 on the advice of the Women's Advisory Committee of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission (SAMEAC).

One of the Women's Advisory Committee's Terms of Reference is to:

- Foster the development of leadership skills for women of culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds with emphasis on young women.

Most of the leadership courses have been a partnership between Multicultural S.A. and the Office for Women.

To date, six courses have been completed and the seventh course is currently being conducted at the Adelaide Institute of TAFE.

In February 2006, 70 women who had participated in these women's leadership courses were invited to a meeting to share experiences of how the skills gained during these courses had been of benefit and to gauge what further assistance or support course graduates might require.

The Women's Advisory Committee advised SAMEAC that a further Women's Leadership Course should be held in the metropolitan area.

This is the course currently being conducted and scheduled to finish by the end of May 2007.

Multicultural SA, SAMEAC Women's Leadership Courses as at 28 February 2007

- February-April 2002—Introductory Women's Leadership Program (conducted by consultants on behalf of Multicultural S.A.)
- June-August 2002—Introductory Women's Leadership Program (conducted by consultants on behalf of Multicultural S.A.)
- June-November 2003—Advanced Leadership Course (Certificate IV in Business Frontline Management, conducted by Workplace Education Services, Adelaide Institute of TAFE)

- June–November 2004—Advanced Leadership Course (Certificate IV in Business Frontline Management, conducted by Workplace Education Services, Adelaide Institute of TAFE)
- March–November 2004 Mentoring Program (conducted by Workplace Education Services and Ann Darwin and Associates)
- May–November 2005 Women’s Leadership Course (Certificate III in Business Frontline Management, conducted by Renmark TAFE)
- November 2006–May 2007 Women’s Leadership Course (Certificate III in Business Frontline Management, conducted by Workplace Education Services, Adelaide Institute of TAFE).

SCHOOLS, EMERGENCY CLEANING CONTRACTS

188. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How many emergency school cleaning contracts greater than twelve months currently exist?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: As at 2 January 2007, there is one emergency cleaning contract in operation.

SCHOOLS, EDUCATION INCENTIVES

189. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What inducements are currently offered to high school graduates to take up further education?

The Hon. P. CAICA: The Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology is responsible for the delivery of vocational education and training, community education and learning to work programs in South Australia. Life long learning is a key component of DFEEST’s commitment to meet the needs of the State’s Workforce Development. Through South Australia Works, TAFE SA and Traineeship and Apprenticeship Services, DFEEST offers a range of services, transition supports, information and programs that support young South Australians to participate in post secondary school education.

Vocational education and training

VET in Schools is a recognised alternative for students not seeking to further their study pathway solely at university. The VET in Schools program allows high school students to undertake vocational education and training as part of their senior secondary studies. By engaging these students in VET before they exit from secondary school this program provides a clear pathway into further education and also allows students to use any qualifications gained as credit towards further study.

Other VET in schools initiatives include Doorways 2 Construction (D2C) and the Defence Industry Pathways (P2) programs.

D2C is a dedicated program designed specifically for the building and construction industry.

D2C supports the recruitment and induction of young people into building and construction, with over 500 students participating in the program, involving 70 South Australian schools. It provides students with a solid foundation of skill, knowledge and experience, which articulate into a range of vocational training courses and is the introduction for many career pathways.

The P2 program aims to provide a number of training and development pathways in metal fabrication and design which can lead into careers in the Air Warfare Destroyer (AWD) project, and in related occupations. This program provides students with the opportunity to access meaningful, sponsored work placement activities.

TAFE SA offers a range of services to assist students who are financially disadvantaged to undertake further study, including:

- capping of fees to a maximum of \$1 900 per year
- payment of fees by instalment
- fees concessions for those who hold a current Health Care Card
- TAFE SA Equity Fee Assistance.

Career Advice

TAFE SA, along with other training providers, actively promotes courses and career pathways at school careers nights for years 10, 11 and 12 students. TAFE SA has a strong presence at Career Expos and the Adelaide Royal Show and also hold open days and arranges campus tours for groups of school students. These presentations allow students to make informed choices about their future study and career options.

TAFE SA provides career counselling advice through both the 1800 882 661 TAFE SA Information Service and student services officers at each campus.

High school graduates are able to either call the information service or make an appointment with a Student Services Officer at their local campus to discuss their future career options and gain

advice on the most appropriate pathway to help them gain their career of choice.

South Australia Works

South Australia Works actively encourages young people to remain connected to learning and work pathways through a range of initiatives and strategies. A fundamental component of *South Australia Works* is the use of post secondary education and training programs to increase each participant’s skills, confidence and longer term employability.

DFEEST provides opportunities for those who did not complete year 12 to take up further education. Programs such as Learn to Earn, ACE Youth Works and the Alternative Learning Options Program reconnect young people to learning and support them to succeed on education, training and employment pathways. *South Australia Works* in the Regions and the Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program provides learning to work programs for young people disadvantaged in the labour market across the state, while CareerStart SA offers young people employment and training opportunities in the Public Sector.

Traineeships and Apprenticeships

High school graduates who obtain a traineeship or apprenticeship may be eligible for User Choice training subsidies, which subsidise the cost of the training provided by Registered Training Organisations. User Choice training subsidies and travel and accommodation allowances are funded by the State Government.

The Traineeship and Apprenticeship Information Service promotes traineeships and apprenticeships as worthwhile career options via its information hotline on 1800 673 097.

CHILDCARE WORKERS

193. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** What professional development courses are currently available to childcare workers in the area of behavioural management?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Professional development for child care workers is provided by the Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS) and The Gowrie Training Centre, which is funded by the Commonwealth.

DECS provides professional support to child care services that complements the programs offered by The Gowrie Training Centre.

In addition, childcare centres can make referrals to DECS District Support Services to access support for children with challenging behaviours and can also negotiate individual training programs with DECS District staff.

In 2006 the following courses in behaviour management were offered to childcare workers:

- Approximately 97 sessions for childcare workers on behaviour management were run at the Gowrie Training Centre.
- DECS district support services staff and staff in the Learning Links program provided a professional training program, *Maximising Positive Behaviour and Managing Challenging Behaviours*, a skills-based program aimed at providing staff working with young children with the practical knowledge and skills in preventing and managing behaviour issues.
- DECS Family Day Care officers provided in-service training for 43 family day care providers in Behaviour Management, Behaviour Management of Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder and Interacting Effectively with Children.
- DECS Family Day Care provided pre-service training to 129 trainees on ‘Interacting effectively with children’ for potential family day care providers seeking approval to provide in-home care for families.

SCHOOLS, RECOVERY TUTORS

194. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** How many recovery tutors are currently available in South Australian Government Schools?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Currently, the Department of Education and Children’s Services (DECS) has 2 Reading Recovery Tutors who train teachers and support ongoing implementation of programs in schools.

BUS SERVICES

199. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action will be taken to address community concerns about the lack of bus services to Munno Para West, Angle Vale or One Tree Hill?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I provide the following information: There are no plans to provide a mass public transport passenger service to either One Tree Hill or Angle Vale.

The introduction of mass public transport passenger services will be investigated as population growth justifies the investment.

201. **Mr HAMILTON-SMITH:** What action will be taken to address community concerns about the lack of bus services between the Lyell McEwin Hospital and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital?

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

A volunteer driver patient transport service between the Lyell McEwin Hospital (LMH) and the Queen Elizabeth Hospitals (TQEH) was originally introduced with the amalgamation of the TQEH and LMH into the North Western Adelaide Health Service (NWAHS) several years back. Recently, the LMH discontinued the service due to continued extremely low usage of the facility.

There are no current plans to provide a direct public transport service between the TQEH and the LMHS as current information indicates the likely passenger numbers would be very low and not justify the allocation of resources.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

210. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Why did the number of Departmental employees paid in excess of \$100 000 p.a. increase from 200 in 2004 to 409 in 2005?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Department of Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

For reporting purposes, the remuneration amount for employees paid in excess of \$100 000 includes salary, employer's superannuation costs, fringe benefits tax and other benefits such as country incentive payments.

A number of factors contributed to the increased number of Department of Education and Children's Services employees who fall into this category, including the following:

- The department normally has 26 pays in a financial year, however in 2004-25 there were 27 pays and this caused 99 employees to move into the higher remuneration band for the first time.
- The number of employees who received country incentive payments increased.
- Average salary rates increased by 2.5 per cent and this increase moved a number of school principals into the remuneration band for the first time.

EDUCATION, MUSIC PROGRAM

211. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** With respect to Instrumental Music Service Program:

1. How much funding will the program receive in 2006-07 and what changes will be made to improve program accessibility, efficiency and effectiveness?

2. Will lessons be reallocated from existing music programs in schools towards establishing new programs and if so, how will this be implemented and what existing programs will be affected?

3. What will happen in schools where the program has been discontinued?

4. Will the existing program be replaced with a 'fee for service' program and if so, is this allowable under current Departmental guidelines and the Education Act, and how will 'fee for service' tuition be administered in public schools?

5. How will a decrease in program funding affect students studying music at a secondary level?

6. How will a decrease in program funding affect disadvantaged students and school card holders?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Department of Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

The Instrumental Music Service budget for 2006-27 is \$7 502 300.

The Department of Education and Children's Services is currently undertaking an examination of instrumental music programs in schools. The examination is being guided by the following terms of reference:

- To examine school access to instrumental music.
- To examine the availability of the instrumental music program for disadvantaged students.
- To examine the provision of instrumental music in the early years of schooling.
- To examine the general effectiveness of the current Instrumental Music Service.

The examination is currently gathering information from stakeholders including teachers, principals, associations, industry groups, students, parents and interested members of the community.

No decisions regarding the Instrumental Music Program will be made until the examination is completed.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

221. **Dr McFETRIDGE:** Has the Department prepared and submitted timely financial statements in each year since 2003-04 and if not, why not?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I have been advised:

The Department of Education and Children's Services (DECS) has prepared and submitted financial statements in accordance with the required timelines issued by the Auditor-General's Department and the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF).

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

225. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

3. What is the Science Outside the Square initiative and how much program funding has been allocated in the 2006-07?

4. What is the 'Bragg' initiative and how much funding and how much program funding has been allocated in the 2006-07?

6. How much Departmental funding was allocated to the Australian Media Centre in 2005-06 and 2006-07, respectively?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Premier has been advised of the following:

3. Science Outside the Square is one of ten projects of the Bragg Initiative and is a series of science-themed events, designed to be topical, controversial and, interactive, to bring science and scientists to public life and to capture the imagination of a broad audience. Approximately 4 500 people attended Science Outside the Square 2006 spanning 12 events which included two regional locations (Whyalla and Waikerie) demonstrating a keen public interest in science themed events.

The funding commitment of \$1.2 million over three years for the Bragg Initiative, was announced in the 2006-07 budget, and will provide funding for program support for Science Outside the Square 2007 and seed funding to support the other nine projects of the Bragg Initiative.

Approximately \$85 000 of the annual Bragg Initiative budget of \$400 000 is allocated to Science Outside the Square.

4. The Bragg Initiative is the coordination of the implementation of previous Thinker in Residence Baroness Susan Greenfield's recommended science initiatives. The Bragg Initiative is a multi-layered collaboration with the Royal Institution of Great Britain involving sharing and advancing scientific and historic research, public education and science events, projects, communication, health and well-being activities.

The funding commitment of \$1.2 million over three years for the Bragg Initiative, was announced in the 2006-07 budget.

The Bragg Initiative also works on building opportunities to assist in increasing the uptake of science, maths and engineering in schools. This will provide opportunities for South Australian scientists to contribute their skills, knowledge and energies directly to science activities in schools and the public arena. All South Australians will benefit by learning more about science and by being empowered to think about it and contribute to it.

6. The Australian Science Media Centre (AusSMC) was given a one off establishment grant by the Department of the Premier & Cabinet of \$112 000 in 2005-06.

An additional \$6 482.80 was provided by Department of the Premier & Cabinet in 2006-07 to assist with the travel and accommodation expenses associated with bringing members of the National Science Advisory Panel (SAP) for an inaugural meeting in Adelaide in April 2006.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

228. **Dr McFETRIDGE:**

3. What are the details of the \$31 000 expenditure for consultants in 2005-06?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:

3. I have been advised the cited figure of \$31 000 does not refer to the Department of Education and Children's Services' expenditure for consultants for 2005-26.

HICKS, Mr D.

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am informed that this morning in the United States military tribunal, which began today at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, the Australian terror suspect David Hicks entered a plea of guilty to a charge of supporting terrorism. I have a few minutes ago spoken to federal foreign minister Alexander Downer, who has indicated that a stipulation of facts surrounding the case must be lodged by 6 a.m. our time tomorrow. That will be considered by the military tribunal, which I am told is likely to pass sentence later this week, at the weekend or early next week. I am told that Mr Hicks may enter an appeal in relation to any sentence imposed upon him.

However, until he is sentenced it cannot be known what conditions will apply to his sentence. He may make application to serve his sentence in Australia, including in Adelaide. I am advised by Mr Downer that, in accordance with an agreement reached with the United States, the Australian government will support the United States government in allowing Hicks to serve his sentence in Australia. If he applies to serve his sentence in Australia, Mr Downer says the federal government will make arrangements to transport him to Adelaide, if that is the preferred outcome.

Until such time that his sentencing conditions are known, it is not possible to say whether Hicks can or will be held in a South Australian Correctional Services prison. However, conditional to sentencing requirements, at this stage the South Australian government has no objections to the transfer of David Hicks into our state prison system. Obviously we have to comply with longstanding arrangements between the South Australian government, all state governments and the federal government, and also the international obligations of the Australian government.

The transfer would be governed by the International Transfer of Prisoners legislation, as well as specific arrangements between Australia and the United States. While it is not possible to speculate on any other details in relation to this matter, the state government will properly consider an application that is made for the transfer of Mr Hicks when and if it occurs. I will speak with the federal Attorney-General Philip Ruddock to ensure the South Australian government is kept fully informed of developments in this case and of any plans or protocols for Mr Hicks to serve his sentence in Australia.

VICTORIA PARK REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Last year the state government, in consultation with the South Australian Motor Sport Board and the SA Jockey Club, developed a master plan for Victoria Park. This master plan has been out for public consultation for more than three months. The end of public consultation is this Friday, 30 March 2007. The master plan, which includes the construction of a permanent grandstand facility, will, importantly, see the return of more than 5.5 hectares of cement, brick and restricted areas of Parklands for the enjoyment and use of all South Australians. In our view, the master plan is superior to a previous proposal designed by the

Adelaide City Council in 2004, which was six metres taller, \$20 million more expensive and had the building footprint 1 000 square metres larger. The state government requires the support of the Adelaide City Council to grant a lease for the construction of the permanent grandstand facilities on the Parklands.

For more than three months into the consultation period, it became clear that the Adelaide City Council had not formed a clear position on this project. As a result, on 25 March 2007 I wrote to the Lord Mayor to indicate three clear options that are available to the council by the end of the consultation period. They are: council can vote to accept the state government's master plan for Victoria Park in its current form; council can reject the proposal altogether, which would end the project immediately; or, council can advise the state government of a clear indication of its requirements for height, length and style of grandstand that it would support. In that letter I asked that the council consider the options available to it and advise me of its decision by the end of the public consultation period on Friday, 30 March 2007.

Last night the Adelaide City Council accepted the recommendation of the Adelaide Park Lands Authority to reject the master plan in its current form. In accepting this recommendation, the council indicated that it was not involved in the development of the state government's master plan and that it wished to 'go back to the drawing board' and revisit the consultative process.

I find the council's position disturbing given that the council has been working with the state government on this project since the failed 2004 Adelaide City Council's concept development plan. Three separate meetings, which have been documented and minuted over the past 12 months, were held between the Chief Executive Officer and Chairman of the South Australian Motor Sport Board, the Chief Executive Officer of the council and the Lord Mayor, Mr Michael Harbison. These meetings occurred on 11 April, 25 July and 5 October 2006. At these meetings before and after images of the potential building design were shown. In addition, at the meetings full briefings and consultation on all aspects of the proposed design occurred. It is very clear that consultation with the Adelaide City Council has been going on much longer than the last three and half months and, in fact, some of the council's concerns were taken on board during this period.

Furthermore, I have a letter, which I will read into *Hansard*, from the Chief Executive Officer of the Motor Sport Board to the Chief Executive Officer of the council dated 26 October 2006, as follows:

Dear Mal

Re: Victoria Park Master Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to update you and the Lord Mayor in confidence on this proposed master plan. I summarise below the outcomes from this presentation.

The key requests made by the Government to the Adelaide City Council in relation to this master plan are as follows:

The Adelaide City Council to be responsible for:

1. Demolition of all existing walls, buildings, grandstands and sundry structures in the SAJC precinct of Victoria Park, along with the sheds and toilet blocks in Victoria Park.
2. The renovation of the heritage grandstand.
3. The revegetation of the Victoria Park precinct, in accordance with an agreed landscape plan.
4. A financial contribution towards the cost of the new multi-purpose building.

The demolition work outlined above, to take place immediately following the conclusion of the December 2007 twilight race meeting staged by the SAJC, and to be completed by late January 2008. Landscape replanting to take place in 2009.

General agreement was received in relation to the Adelaide City Council undertaking tasks 1, 2 and 3—

and, of course, when it came to the finances—

with further discussion required on any financial contribution to be made by the Adelaide City Council. In addition, we have requested Crown Law advice on the question of whether a ground lease is required, and I will advise further once this advice has been received—

Wait for it! The letter continues:

We have taken on board a number of the initiatives put forward by the Lord Mayor, particularly in relation to the colours, length of the building and other ideas to help resolve a number of local residents' issues. We look forward to working with the Adelaide City Council on fulfilment of this master plan concept for Victoria Park.

Best wishes and kind regards,
Andrew Daniels
Chief Executive.

The position of the state government is quite clear. The council needs to articulate to me by close of public consultation this Friday, 30 March 2007, exactly what its position is in regard to the state government's master plan for Victoria Park. I do not believe that this is unreasonable considering that public consultation has been running for over three months. I await that decision from the Adelaide City Council. The project's future lies in the hands of the Adelaide City Council. As has been demonstrated, the Lord Mayor has been involved with this project for years. His hands are all over it, the council's hands are all over it, and today the Adelaide City Council must demonstrate leadership.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Inquest into the death of Julia Marie Baylis—Coroners Act 2003

By the Treasurer (Hon. K.O. Foley)—

Regulations under the following Act—
Public Corporations—South Australian Infrastructure Corporation

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

State of Public and Environmental Health for South Australia 2005-06

Regulations under the following Act—
Gene Technology—Genetically Modified Organisms

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Rules—
Fair Work—Monetary Claims

By the Minister for the River Murray (Hon. K.A. Maywald) on behalf of the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. R.J. McEwen)—

Regulations under the following Acts—
Fisheries—
Fishing Season
Registered Boat Restriction
Registered Boat
Season Extension.

WORKCHOICES LEGISLATION

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I rise to inform the house that the government has directed the President of the Industrial Relations Commission of South Australia, the Hon. Judge

Hannon, to conduct an inquiry into the impact of the WorkChoices legislation on South Australians. In accordance with section 27 of the Fair Work Act 1994, the commission has the authority to conduct an inquiry on questions that relate to industrial matters upon the request of the minister. The announcement of this inquiry coincides with the first anniversary of the implementation of the WorkChoices legislation and provides a good opportunity to assess its impact on the South Australian industrial and economic landscape.

The commission is the most appropriate and independent institution to undertake an inquiry of this kind. It has the expertise and experience to properly investigate the impacts of WorkChoices on employers and employees in South Australia. This inquiry will provide employers and employees with an opportunity to comment and make submissions on the WorkChoices laws. This inquiry will also give all interested parties within the community an opportunity to voice their opinions regarding the operation of WorkChoices. The terms of reference for the commission will cover issues such as:

- the ability of employers to meet operational requirements;
- the ability of employees to balance work/life commitments;
- productivity;
- job security;
- the impact on young people, women and employees from non-English speaking backgrounds;
- dispute resolution;
- bargaining between employers and employees; and
- termination of employment.

The commission is to provide a final report and recommendations to the government within six months of the commencement of the inquiry. We look forward to receiving the recommendations.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): I bring up the 25th report of the Social Development Committee entitled Fast Foods and Obesity Inquiry.
Report received.

QUESTION TIME

VICTORIA PARK REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Given the Treasurer's ministerial statement, will the Premier rule out his government's moving to sack the democratically elected Adelaide City Council because of its refusal to approve a government plan for the redevelopment of Victoria Park? In Saturday's *Advertiser* the member for West Torrens was quoted as saying that state cabinet should recommend that the Governor sack the council and replace it with administrators if it failed to support the current plan.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am very pleased that the Leader of the Opposition asked that question; I guess it was predictable—certainly we predicted it.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Is that right? We are watching your gradual elevation to high office. During this time while the city council has been looking at one issue, we have been out there winning \$10 billion worth of defence projects and ensuring the biggest mining boom ever, with a whole range of other major housing projects going on, and so on. What

people say about the Adelaide City Council is that they want a yes or no, but what you get from the Adelaide City Council is a continuing 'maybe'.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: You get a yes, then a no.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Or you get a yes, then a no, then a maybe, and then who knows what. Ultimately, what is frustrating the business community and others is that they want to have a city council that is straight with its people. In terms of the future of the Adelaide City Council, I can announce today that the future of the city council will be resolved at the coming city council elections.

WORLD POLICE AND FIRE GAMES

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Premier. What have been the benefits to South Australia of hosting the World Police and Fire Games—in addition to the eye candy provided by the Italian competitors?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I wish I had been given more notice of this question, which is certainly a lot more penetrating than the first question from the Leader of the Opposition. In the spirit of bipartisanship, I acknowledge that the World Police and Fire Games was supported by both sides of parliament. I guess we are big enough to admit it, but it was never admitted by anyone opposite when they were in government. Here is an opportunity for statesmanship and hands across the chamber in recognising that both the former Liberal government and this government were involved in winning and delivering this great outcome.

The 2007 World Police and Fire Games has been amongst the biggest 10 days in South Australia's history, generating a \$30 million boost for our economy. A total of more than 12 000 competitors and tourists here for the games, I am told, gave our hotels, shops, restaurants, cafes and coffee shops a massive boost—and, clearly, a boost for the member for Norwood. Everyone is talking about the thousands of games visitors walking our streets—of course, the South African team was dancing through our streets—visiting our premier tourist attractions and filling our restaurants and hotels.

South Australians turned on a reception that has left many international tourists wanting to return to see and experience more of South Australia. Competitors commented on the warmth and friendliness of South Australians, the superb weather and the charm of our city, and they were impressed by the fantastic organisation of the event and the public support shown by South Australians. Everywhere from Kangaroo Island to the Barossa, the Adelaide Hills and Adelaide's beaches was booming with visitors taking a break from competition.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge in this chamber today the efforts of one of our ministers. He has defied my instruction, or perhaps he has not. Hold them up. The minister has two gold medals! In the lead-up to the World Police and Fire Games, the minister came to me and said, 'Boss, I need time off to compete at the highest level in the police and fire games.' When he said that I assumed for one brief, shining moment that he was talking about the iron-man competition or, maybe, climbing to the top of the Santos building and back with a backpack and other weights—the world's toughest competitor! I was wrong.

I am pleased to say that our minister has won two gold medals for fishing off Port Hughes. I understand that he failed to win a gold medal for fishing off a boat for the largest catch. Right? But he did win the gold medal for fishing off the beach and the jetty—against how many competitors?

The Hon. P. Caica: Seventy five.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, 75 competitors from around the world. The Russians and everyone were there—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: But he was the only one from Port Hughes!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He was the only one from Port Hughes. I know there has been speculation from some of the competitors about how cold the seas must have been, given the slightly frozen nature of the catch, but that is speculation into which I will not enter. Anyway, congratulations. I think all members on both sides will expect the minister to go to Vancouver, British Columbia in two years time to defend his title.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Many tourist operators scheduled extra coach and ferry services to keep up with the demand to Port Hughes. About 70 per cent of people here for the games were from overseas, representing more than 60 countries. In turn, we will see the spin-off benefits for these games for many years to come. I am told that the World Police and Fire Games had more competitors and sports than the Commonwealth Games. It was the largest international sporting event South Australia has ever seen. Australia had great success in games events and finished the games on top of the medal table, winning medals in sports ranging from the triathlon to the tug of war.

I am very pleased that the Police Commissioner, Mal Hyde, participated in the 50-metre swimming event on Saturday. Our Governor—who has won two Olympic gold medal and seven Commonwealth Games medals and who holds 10 world records—was there to hand out 100 medals on Saturday. I also understand that Grant Lupton, the head of the Metropolitan Fire Service, was a competitor in the rugby—although, like me in the cricket last year, he was the equivalent of the 12th man! I congratulate all those involved in making the games such a success.

I take this opportunity to make particular mention of a few people. I have already mentioned the patron of the games, Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, who was a popular and enthusiastic presence at virtually all the games venues. I warmly thank a number of groups: the board of the games, chaired by Bill Spurr, for its overseeing of a mammoth and often very difficult job; the brilliant work by our host police, fire, customs and corrections agencies; the hardworking games staff; the generous sponsors; and, of course, our wonderfully selfless volunteers.

The action is set to continue in South Australia with the Fringe (which is on for another week), the Rugby 7s at Easter, the Oakbank Racing Carnival, the French Film Festival (which I am launching tonight), and the upcoming Cabaret Festival. All this has happened at a time when tourists have even more ways to reach Adelaide with the number of international flights touching down each week climbing to 24, up from 13 at the start of 2003—what a difference a government can make! The recent announcement that Air New Zealand will increase its air services to Adelaide from three to five times a week is also helping more international travellers reach our state from across the Tasman—that has to be a good thing.

Figures released this month also show that a record number of international tourists visited South Australia last year. I am sure that the opposition's tourism spokesperson will acknowledge the record number of international tourists who visited South Australia last week—it is a shame the cameras are off! Hosting major events such as the 2007

World Police and Fire Games gives us a chance to showcase our state's brilliant blend and continues to build our profile as an overseas tourist destination. If the rules can be changed for the Vancouver games to allow volunteer firefighters registered—those who have the British Fire Medal—I will certainly intend to participate in the boxing or tug of war categories.

VICTORIA PARK REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier rule out the government's introducing special legislation to allow approval of the government's plan for the redevelopment of Victoria Park? Last Thursday it was reported that the Treasurer claimed he would consider overriding the council by introducing special legislation to the parliament.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I can rule that out, but I have some other breaking news. I have a letter here signed by 'Liberal Leader', 9 March 2006:

Thank you for your letter dated 19 February 2006 regarding the future of Victoria Park. I appreciate you taking the time to write to me. I apologise for not responding to your first letter directly. As I was aware that the candidate for Adelaide, Ms Diana Carroll, was attending your meeting on 8 February 2006, I was confident that the Liberal Party's position on this issue would be conveyed to the South-East City Residents Association. In accordance with Ms Carroll's speech, the Liberal Party supports the continuation of horseracing at Victoria Park and is opposed to the construction of additional buildings and associated facilities of a permanent nature in the middle of Victoria Park or outside the existing footprint of the South Australian Jockey Club. Once again, I apologise for my delayed response, and please do not hesitate to contact my office should you need any further information.

Yours sincerely,
Rob Kerin, Liberal Leader.

The date there is 9 March 2006.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: That would be nine days before the election.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Just a few days before the election. On 20 December 2006 we see the following:

Opposition racing spokesman Rob Kerin says it's a good design, but he's criticised the government's decision to release the plans for three months of public comment. He also says the government has forgotten the Britannia roundabout.

He goes on to say on 891—just wait for it—breaking news:

There's been an inordinate amount of time spent to get to this stage. A decision's been expected for a long time. I hope there's no more real delays. I think that all the parties need to get on with it. There's sort of been a lot of consultation in the open for a long time anyway.

Then again:

Let's have no more delays and let's see if we can get it up and going as soon as possible.

Then on FIVEaa:

There's going to be work done on the redevelopment which goes right up against the Britannia roundabout.

Then again it goes on, FIVEaa at 6 p.m.:

As far as the development goes, it looks good but unfortunately no redevelopment of the Britannia roundabout. . .

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Here we go:

Dittmar: . . . it looks like we've seen it and you have obviously. . . so it looks like a win-win for everybody. Who are the likely objectors.

Foley: What I was pleased, Rob Kerin came down—the Liberal spokesman on this issue came down to the press conference. . . had a look at the models and in front of the chairman of the board, Roger

Cook, and the SAJC representatives and others, he said, 'Kev, this is a no brainer' . . . so you know I'm pleased that the Liberals are on board.

It is quite clear that one group of the Liberals says there has to be more consultation, but the Liberal spokesman on racing says 'too much consultation'.

DOMESTIC PARTNERS LEGISLATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): Will the Attorney-General inform the house when he expects the new domestic partner laws to come into force?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): At the end of December last year I announced that the state government was going to embark on a public information campaign to alert South Australians to the implications of the Domestic Partners Bill that passed parliament on 7 December. I said then that it was important for the public to be aware of the legal rights and duties the new law gives to both opposite sex and same sex de facto partners, and to other partners who may not be in a sexual relationship but living together on a genuine domestic basis as a couple.

I want to inform members today of the detail of that public information campaign and to announce that I expect that the new laws will come into force on 1 June 2007. From today, people will be able to get information on the new laws and how those laws could affect their lives. First, the Legal Services Commission will be providing a hotline for initial inquiries about how relationships could be affected. If these discussions suggest to the caller that he or she needs to take action to sort out his or her affairs, he or she will be advised to arrange a formal meeting with a solicitor. That hotline number is 1300 366 424. The cost of a call will be that of a local call.

Secondly, the justice department website will have a detailed explanation of the Domestic Partners Bill. That web site address is www.justice.sa.gov.au. Once again, I would urge South Australians to consider arranging a formal meeting with a solicitor if they believe that there are aspects of the legislation that may affect them that they do not understand, they need further clarification, or if, because of the change in the legal status of their relationship, they need to act to sort out their affairs.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Heysen in three years will feel like Peter Debnam feels like today, so get used to it. For example, people may decide that they wish to establish their relationship formally with a domestic partnership agreement setting out living arrangements and assets, including jointly owned property. The agreement could say what is to happen to the property if the relationship ends and the partners separate. It would act as a contract and could be enforced in court. I can also tell members that editorial pieces will be submitted to publications, including the *Law Society Bulletin*. There will be a series of advertisements placed in city and regional newspapers, supported by printed promotional material in the form of a brochure, postcard and poster.

This will be available from 15 April in every South Australian MP's electorate office. I imagine it will be offered also to the member for Stuart, and I expect to see it displayed.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: What don't you have in your electorate?

Mr Venning: An office.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: This information will be in local libraries, community centres, local councils and regular information points. These new laws end discrimination for a small but significant section of our society. The most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics figures, taken from the 2001 census, record that in South Australia there were 77 336 people living in opposite sex de facto relationships. A further 1 062 men recorded themselves as living in a same-sex domestic relationship and 1 237 women living in a same-sex domestic relationship.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Perhaps someone is not telling the truth. The number of people living together in a genuine domestic partnership but without necessarily a sexual relationship is not recorded. Using multipliers to reflect the six years that have passed since the census and that people living in same-sex relationships have been increasingly prepared to declare their relationship—given the support of people like the member for Stuart and the member for Waite—as well as the increasing popularity of opposite sex partnerships outside marriage, it would not be unreasonable to estimate that these new laws could affect more than 100 000 South Australians. With these new rights come responsibilities, and I would urge people to seek advice before the new laws come into force. I intend that to be on 1 June this year.

VICTORIA PARK REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer advise the house why the government has given the Adelaide City Council just five days to come up with a compromise plan for the redevelopment of Victoria Park, when the government has had five years to work with the council and other parties to develop a plan? Will the government extend the council's deadline to come up with a compromise for Victoria Park to allow it to properly work with stakeholders to develop a plan for Victoria Park, in particular to give council the opportunity to take into account the public submissions being made during the government's own consultation process, which does not close until this Friday—the same the day the council is meant to have the design finished?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I cannot believe that the leader would not have altered his question, that he obviously had prepared this morning. Can I say that, by the end of this week, what we are saying to the council is not, 'Give us a final design,' but, 'Just give us some specific parameters—that is, how long a building can you live with, how high a building can you live with and what style of building can you live with?' For that matter, I will even chuck in, 'What colour do you want?'

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Leader of the Opposition says, 'Why didn't we ask that first up?' We did. Let's go through the chronology.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We did—and this is the chronology of minuted meetings between many, many people from government and from council:

September 2004 Adelaide City Council provide to the SA Motor Sport Board its concept plan report for Victoria Park;

On 11 April 2006, a meeting is held between Andrew Daniels and Roger Cook (CEO and Chairman of the Motor Sport

Board), Michael Harbison (Lord Mayor), Mal Hemmerling (CEO) and Steve Ploubidis from the South Australian Jockey Club:

Key issues discussed:

- New designs to be looked at for Victoria Park.

This goes to the leader's question: 'Lord Mayor's requirements'. This is what the Lord Mayor stated at that meeting. He wants a 'smaller building, (smaller than the Troppo design of 2004), and:

- Victoria Park not to become an event park
- Some underground facilities if possible

It was agreed that the South Australian Motor Sport Board would undertake design work and use John Sawley (architect) and Andy Ford (architect).

Mr Pisoni: Why did you back down then?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't understand the interjection. On 25 July 2006, another meeting between Andrew Daniels and Roger Cook with Mr Mal Hemmerling (CEO, Adelaide City Council):

Key issues discussed:

- Images of the potential redevelopment shown—including 'before' and 'after' images and potential building design
- Demolition of the SAJC buildings
- Rebuild of Heritage Grandstand
- Revegetation of Victoria Park

as well as contribution of money by the Adelaide City Council (they were on to discussing how much money the council would put in) and 'ownership issues', the timing of the construction and the Adelaide City Council approval process. This is the level of negotiation, consultation and discussion going on with the Adelaide City Council. On 5 October 2006, a meeting between Andrew Daniels and Roger Cook of the Motor Sport Board with Lord Mayor Michael Harbison and Mal Hemmerling re the proposed development:

Key issues discussed:

- Images of potential redevelopment shown—including 'before' and 'after' images and potential building design
- Ground lease was discussed
- Demolition of SAJC buildings—

and, again, a financial contribution from the Adelaide City Council. Guess what else was discussed? The length of the proposed building. No objections, Mr Harbison, at that meeting about the proposed length—no objections, Mr Harbison—and the timing. On 26 October, we then wrote to the Lord Mayor, and I will repeat where the Adelaide City Council agreed that it would be responsible for the demolition of all existing walls, buildings, grandstands and sundry structures in the SAJC precinct, along with a shed and toilet block at Victoria Park. The council would be responsible for the renovation of the heritage grandstand, and the council would be responsible for the revegetation of the Victoria Park precinct in accordance with an agreed landscape. It still has not reached agreement on how much money it would give for it, but we were going to let that one go by the by.

Lord Mayor Michael Harbison was involved in this process all the way along. The Adelaide City Council was involved all the way along. The chief executive officer was involved all the way along. We agreed on the length of the building based on feedback from Lord Mayor Michael Harbison; that is what I am advised by the minutes taken by those in the meetings. The Adelaide City Council was with us all the way along, and what is more (I give this councillor full credit), Richard Hayward had the courage of his conviction, has supported the project all the way through and he, as

a member of the Motor Sport Board, declared a conflict and did not sit on the Motor Sport Board, but he knew what was going on. Guess who else sits on the Motor Sport Board and gets \$10 000 a year? Councillor Anne Moran. You can't tell me that Councillor Anne Moran was not being told by Michael Harbison. You can't tell me that Michael Harbison did not discuss or show this letter to Anne Moran. If he didn't, I would be very surprised.

What I want to know is how can a council be involved all the way along, get to the very end and then go to water—cut and run? At least if the councillors had the guts to cut and run, they could say, 'We are cutting and running because we are damn scared of a political backlash,' but they should not then try and say that it is the government's fault because we did not consult, that it is the government's fault because we are telling them what they should accept. This design was developed by the Adelaide City Council, the state government and the SAJC, and the Lord Mayor and his councillors should hang their head in shame for the way they have conducted themselves. Members opposite have more positions than the Kama Sutra, to quote a famous South Australian premier—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: He stole the line from me.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—who apparently also stole that from a famous transport minister. This is a proposal that we believe is right for South Australia. This was a proposal that Michael Harbison, the councillors and the staff of the council believed was right for South Australia. All we are simply saying to them is, by the end of the week, for goodness sake, how damn high do they want the thing, how long do they want it, what style do they want it? They can even pick the colour of the damn thing. If they cannot tell us that, come 5 p.m. Friday this project is dead and buried.

VETERINARY AND APPLIED SCIENCE TRAINING

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What action has the government taken to boost support for veterinary training and applied sciences in South Australia?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the honourable member for her very important question and acknowledge her commitment to training and further education in this state. I know that the Gilles Plains TAFE is in her electorate. For the member for Schubert's information, this is about something that came before the Public Works Committee and I know he will be very interested in it. I am pleased to inform members that the \$15 million redevelopment of the Veterinary and Applied Science Centre at the TAFE SA Gilles Plains campus has now been completed. I was lucky enough to visit there this morning, with a small contingent from the media, to have a look at the place in action. I had a chat with the students about how they are finding the facility, and indeed witnessed a minor operation—I am sure the member for Morphett will tell me—it was a male cat being desexed. It is working out there and operating very well at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: It was under anaesthetic. I doubt very much, with the media covering that, whether the footage will make it into tonight's news. Jointly funded by the commonwealth and state governments, this centre will underpin our state's biotechnology, food production and primary industries. This state-of-the-art facility was designed

in response to growing industry demand for skilled technicians in the areas of biotechnology and veterinary nursing. The redevelopment includes an expansion of the applied science and biotechnology laboratories, a new practice veterinary clinic and grooming facility, animal enclosures, specially designed pathology demonstration lecture theatres, as well as simulated workplace environments covering all aspects of the animal care industries.

Our TAFE SA Veterinary and Applied Science Centre leads the way nationally. South Australia is the only state with a dedicated teaching laboratory facility designed to train students in biosecurity protocol and the assessment of biological risks and their control. TAFE SA will offer two specialist courses within the diploma in laboratory technology, in biotechnology and biological environmental testing. These qualifications provide specific training for skilled technicians to support scientists and researchers in the biotechnology industry, and they provide technicians with the appropriate skills to work in emerging research industries that minimise the impact of human activity on our environment.

This centre is the only facility in South Australia offering specialised training for the veterinary nursing and animal industries, and it is the hub of all courses relating to animals and animal handling in this state. The redevelopment will allow for the veterinary nursing program to be offered on a full-time basis with an annual intake of up to 30 students. Approximately 725 students in total will benefit from the new facilities this year, with this number expected to increase by 30 per cent over the next three years. The new facilities will also enable up to 100 additional students to access traineeships and apprenticeships in wildlife parks and zoos, animal welfare organisations, pet shops, and pet boarding and grooming facilities. Lecturing staff includes scientists and veterinarians with qualifications and current industry experience. Their expertise is further complemented with significant input from other industry experts and specialists. This new training facility will also strengthen the link between this facility and the higher education sector. I commend all involved in this project, which is another excellent example of TAFE SA's flexibility in responding to industry's training needs.

MONARCH COLLEGE

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education aware of concerns raised by teaching staff in regard to the online hospitality course offered via Monarch College in India in association with Regency TAFE and, if so, when did the minister first become aware of these concerns? Regency TAFE is associated in delivering hospitality courses including some online. The opposition understands that this includes a relationship with Monarch College in India and it has been advised that teaching staff have raised concerns about the entry standards of the course and the assessment of course-related work of the TAFE courses.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I am not at all familiar with this specific circumstance. I know that I have read something about our association with Indian students and, in fact, we attempt, as best we can, to attract Indian students to South Australia. There are circumstances that I am familiar with about the attraction of Indian students to South Australia. I will need to get back to the deputy leader and the

house on this specific matter because I do not have an answer at this stage. I will get back to the house on this issue.

Ms CHAPMAN: As part of that inquiry, in relation to the hospitality qualifications being offered in association with TAFE, will the minister confirm whether he is aware that two representatives from TAFE, namely Dr Duyverman and a colleague from TAFE SA North, were instructed to travel to India to audit the Monarch College course in late 2006? If so, what were those concerns? Will the minister confirm whether the audit was undertaken and whether a copy of that report will be released? The opposition again has been informed on this issue that not only was the audit undertaken but also the audit report has not been released.

The Hon. P. CAICA: As I mentioned earlier, I am certainly aware of TAFE and DFEEST's association with India and other countries in the delivery of training programs and the attraction of international students. Again, I will have to get back to the deputy leader and the house on this specific matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education also advise if lecturers are refusing, or have refused, to mark any papers from students at the Monarch College (which is in India) due to their concerns about the program and a fear of recrimination? The opposition has again been advised that, due to the level of concern raised by the teaching facility, lecturers have actually refused to mark assignments by students at Monarch College.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I will need to respond in exactly the same way. I will find out that information and provide a full and thorough briefing not just to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition but also to the house and, of course, to the shadow spokesperson in this matter whom we have briefed on these issues on numerous occasions.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

TAFE, REGIONAL

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Can the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the house why, in the past two years, the regional TAFE network has been required to deliver to the government savings of 13 per cent? The opposition has been advised that in the past two years nearly all TAFE savings have been demanded from the regional South Australian TAFE network and that, as a result, savings totalling 13 per cent from that area have been required.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): Again, the shadow spokesperson—and, indeed, I agree, a future leader of the opposition—had a briefing last week on a host of issues that included TAFE staffing levels and regional campuses. I know that he is well briefed and able to ask questions in this particular area. I have made no secret in the past of some of the challenges that are facing the department for which I am responsible. I have not shied away from a lot of the issues that need to be undertaken to ensure that we, as a publicly-funded training system, are able to deliver courses that are relevant to industry's needs and relevant to the people who are undertaking those courses.

It is our intention this year—and again, the shadow spokesperson is familiar with this—to increase the level of training hours during this financial and calendar year. All

three institutes have a responsibility to find savings to ensure that we are able to appropriately manage our budget effectively and, to that extent, all of the institutes are required to find savings, not the least of which will be our outstanding regional institute, which will continue to deliver services of an equally outstanding nature to the students who participate in those courses.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): My question is to the Minister for Housing. How is the government increasing the supply of affordable housing in our community?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): Just last week I was delighted to be asked to launch 10 new properties at Salisbury East that have been built as a pilot project to increase the supply of affordable housing. The housing affordability crisis in this country is real and cannot be ignored. In the absence of a willing commonwealth partner, we are doing what we can in South Australia to find solutions, and the solutions for which we are looking are partnerships with all the available players. This project is an excellent example of such a partnership, involving the state government through its home loan lending entity HomeStart Finance, along with Fairmont Homes Group and Salisbury council. I particularly thank the leadership shown in Fairmont Homes, which has been the first private builder and developer to respond to our call to work together. Gordon and David Pickard, along with Stephen Norris and the team at Land SA, are to be commended for their drive and commitment in assisting their fellow South Australians into affordable home ownership; and this has been a feature of that particular private organisation. The other key player in this project has been the Salisbury council, and I particularly acknowledge its cooperation and the efforts of Mayor Tony Zappia—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Do you really want to go there? I acknowledge Mayor Tony Zappia for his progressive outlook and commitment to making Salisbury a truly livable—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right; apparently there is not a call for the member for Unley's references these days. These are certainly livable homes which are made with high quality materials and which are located within an attractive environment—close to schools, transport, public facilities and right across the road from a terrific park. This will be the first of many partnerships between the public and private sector as we seek to bridge this affordability gap. This project has been broadly welcomed by the community, but of course there was always someone who was going to find a difficulty with it. Of course, it was the deputy leader, who said that the project was appalling. Why?

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is how you were reported; and, no, I did not see a letter to the editor. She said it was appalling because 'it will drive up real estate prices for others'. Of course, there is no explanation about how that would be so and the assertion is complete nonsense. It is interesting to note that she is the lone voice in this debate. I think that members opposite need to come up with a bit more than the ideology of the market to deal with the question of affordable housing. I know it grates with those opposite that we might be trying to find affordable home ownership opportunities for people. It also grates with them that we are

making partnerships with one of the largest developers in this state and that they are cooperating with the state government.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Unfortunately, Mr Day is not a partner. Mr Day's solution is to take a very large bulldozer and drive it all the way through the vineyards in the southern vales, all the way through the green belt to Gawler; and put houses all the way from here to Christendom. What will occur then is that somehow everyone's house price will be driven down—and that will be the solution to the affordability crisis: no planning laws, no green belt and no planning at all. That is the extreme right-wing version of housing affordability. God help us if Mr Howard manages to form another government and he has Mr Day whispering in his ear after the next federal election about how to solve the affordability crisis.

TAFE, REGIONAL

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advise the house how many jobs have been cut from the regional TAFE network in the past two years, and confirm whether he sought advice regarding the multiplier effect of these job losses in regional South Australia? The opposition has been advised that the 13 per cent savings demanded of regional TAFEs has resulted in significant reconfiguration of staffing arrangements and in job losses. These job losses will have significant multiplier effects in local communities, especially those affected by drought where off-farm income is essential.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I start by saying that not one person within the DFEST or TAFE systems has lost their job. We have provided that guarantee to them: no-one will lose their job. Again, the shadow spokesperson—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, as I understand it, the opposition promised to cut 7 000 public sector jobs in the lead-up to the last election.

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Five, was it? I am corrected by my ministerial colleague. The simple fact is that we have made a commitment not to sack people from our organisations. Again, the shadow spokesperson is aware of the review of shared services that we are undertaking at the moment. We intend to provide a far more efficient way of delivering those services.

Although I have not read it in its entirety, I am familiar with a report which has been commissioned by the Public Service Association which deals with the multiplier effect to which the shadow minister refers. As I said, I have not yet digested that material. During the community cabinet meeting, I met with the people at Port Lincoln. Again, I was honest and up-front with them; but, as a minister of this government, I am required to do what is necessary to make sure that we are able to deliver the most efficient services to the people who are undertaking training and further education in this state.

ANZAC SCHOOL PRIZE

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Premier. What is the Premier's ANZAC Prize and who are the inaugural recipients?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): In January I announced that South Australian senior secondary students were being given an opportunity to learn more about the ANZAC legend and the chance to win a study tour of world war battlegrounds this year.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: When do the TV ads start?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I cannot believe that someone who is not only a senior member of this house but has also served his country would attack a scheme such as this. That is how small-minded they are—to attack a scheme that embraces the enthusiasm of young South Australians for their history. I have been impressed by the growing number of young people who attend ANZAC Day dawn services. There is a real interest from young South Australians in our history, as well as a recognition that the opportunities and lifestyle they enjoy today is owed to so many who made sacrifices generations ago.

This new annual prize gives our young people a chance to learn more about the battles fought, the lives that were lost, and the ethics and values of mateship that still exist today. It builds on the work that schools already do to make sure that our children learn about the remarkable sacrifices of Australian servicemen and women and the importance of promoting democratic values and citizenship. The Premier's ANZAC School Prize has been run over six weeks in conjunction with the *Sunday Mail* and the Returned Services League of Australia (the RSL). I am really disappointed that someone who I believe is a member of that association should be attacking this scheme. The prize was open to all students in years 10 and 11, and 57 students from government—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I hope we will not see the honourable member attacking the Governor's Leadership Foundation, or the fact that the Governor will be accompanying these students.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: This is very interesting. I cannot believe this. He is now attacking the kids who go away. The prize was open to all students in years 10 and 11, and 57 students from government, independent and Catholic schools entered. Students entered by submitting a written piece, an audio/video/digital program or a web page explaining what the ANZAC spirit means to them and why it is relevant to young people in South Australia today. The entries were of a very high calibre.

Last Friday I had the opportunity to meet the five successful students who have been invited to attend the government-sponsored study tour in Europe to commemorate ANZAC Day 2007. Those students are: Alannah Williams, a year 10 student from Wilderness School; Ankur Verma, a year 10 student from Mount Barker High School; Elise Ganley, a year 10 student from St Mark's College in Port Pirie; Jemima Nicholas, a year 11 student from St Peters Collegiate Girls School; and Emily Cock, a year 11 student from Birdwood High School.

This year's recipients of the ANZAC School Prize will also have the honour of being accompanied on their trip by Her Excellency the Governor of South Australia, Majorie Jackson-Nelson. The students will research a connection with someone who is buried or commemorated on the ANZAC peninsula and they will help maintain the connections with ANZAC sites and traditions. They will work with the RSL to research history, family, role in service and other significant information that they can take with them to honour the person's service and memory. On their return, the students

will prepare a written diary, a digital photo diary, a video or a story as a record of their research and journey. All entries were considered by a judging panel comprising representatives from the three schooling sectors and the RSL.

I congratulate the successful students. I wish them all the best during their time away and I look forward to meeting them on their return. I understand they will visit the Somme in France, and that apart from France and Belgium they will also visit the Imperial War Museum in Britain and attend services at Westminster Abbey and the ANZAC Shrine at the Australian War Memorial in London. I can assure them and the RSL that at least the majority of members of this parliament support them in this endeavour.

TAFE, REGIONAL

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education confirm if any full-time positions will be cut from the 34 significant campuses within the regional TAFE network over the next two years? The opposition has been advised that, as part of the government's budget-saving requirements and the centralisation of services in the metropolitan TAFE system, close to 50 full-time positions within regional TAFE will be cut during the next two years. This will occur at those campuses that are considered significant within the TAFE network.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): Of course the shadow spokesperson has been advised because he is the best-briefed shadow spokesperson on the other side. I have made it clear that we are undertaking—and will continue to undertake—a review of the delivery of our services. That will mean that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: If the shadow minister wants us to continue to deliver courses which, as might have been the case under the opposition's watch, were not linked to sustainable employment opportunities or industry needs, then get re-elected. That is not what we are about. We are about making sure that we deliver—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: No, that we provide the best possible delivery of service that we can that links to sustainable employment opportunities. We do that by making sure that we link with industry to identify their needs. I also have to make a correction, I understand. The opposition did not promise that they would cut 7 000 jobs or 5 000; I am informed that it was 4 000 jobs that they announced before the last election that they would cut. The department and I as the minister will continue to make sure that we have in the further education field lecturers who are capable of delivering what is needed to make sure that participants are given the greatest opportunity to secure sustainable employment.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Does the minister disagree with the Secretary of the Public Service Association that regional TAFE cuts will result in poorer services in regional South Australia? In the March 2007 Public Service journal, Jan McMahon, General Secretary of the PSA, is reported as saying:

These cuts will hit regional centres and their economies very hard. Already they are battling with the impact of drought, the hardest ever.

She goes on to say that they will also mean poorer services for students, families and staff.

The Hon. P. CAICA: It is safe to say that there are on occasions issues that I certainly disagree with which come from the mouth of the Secretary of the Public Service Association. She has my phone number: she has the ability to ring me, as do her senior staff, at any time to clarify issues that they want clarified. Again, as I have in the past, I encourage her to do that. There is no doubt—and it was clear in the discussions that I held with the shared services people in Port Lincoln—that it is going to have a profound effect on those people when we consolidate shared services. However, the fact is that I gave them an undertaking that the most important thing in this whole event is their welfare and wellbeing, and I am committed to that

HEALTH, SAFETY AND QUALITY COUNCIL

Mr PICCOLO (Light): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the government doing to ensure that South Australia's health system continues to set new standards in safety and quality?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I acknowledge the honourable member's very strong interest in matters to do with the health of South Australians. I know that he will welcome the information that I am giving the house in relation to safety and quality issues. I announced just recently a new South Australian Safety and Quality Council that will be established to watch over our health care system, replacing an existing body that looks after only the public health system. This new council will look after all health providers in South Australia and will have the health and wellbeing of South Australians at its heart. It will report back to the Department of Health and provide advice on our health system. Patient care and safety will be its top priority.

The council will also have the task of implementing a five-year South Australian safety and quality program and will focus on five main areas:

- safety and quality priorities, for example, medication safety and infection prevention.

We all know—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A sore throat requires no medication other than the occasional Tic Tac, I can assure the honourable member! We all know that medication safety is a key issue. If you give the wrong drugs to someone, it is obviously a big problem. The other issues are:

- consumer and community participation, focusing on developing information resources, improved complaints handling and annual reporting on health service performance;
- support for workforce, including credentialling, and quality and safety improvements;
- better use of information management and IT to improve communication between health services, including hospitals; and
- clinical governance—work force responsibility and accountability for health care services.

The brief of this new council is deliberately wide, including looking at primary health care, the private sector and general practice as well as the public sector. The Safety and Quality Council will have a maximum of 15 members with an independent chair, Mr Hans Ohff, who is of course well known to South Australia. It will include two consumers and a number of non-representative members from across the health spectrum. As members would know, Mr Ohff is currently the Chairman of the SA Lotteries Commission and

a member of the John Holland board. Importantly, he is a former managing director and chief executive of the Australian Submarine Corporation, a position he held between 1994 and 2002.

Mr Ohff is well placed to bring the perspectives of the rigours of industrial processes to health care. I should explain to the members of the house that we were particularly keen to get someone from outside the health sector who understood about safety and quality issues, the discipline of safety and quality in a manufacturing setting, and we can transfer that knowledge and skill across to the health care system. The members of the Safety and Quality Council will be announced in early April, with the consumer representation coordinated through the Health Consumer Alliance of South Australia.

WATER SUPPLIES

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The government has approved two new interim measures to help assess and secure water supplies for 2007 and 2008 in response to the unprecedented drought in the Murray-Darling Basin. The first relates to setting an early cut-off date (30 April 2007) for applications to be received to temporarily trade water out of South Australia. The second is the decision to allow licensed River Murray water users to carry over a portion of their unused licensed water from 2006-07 for use in 2007-08.

Setting an early closing date for applications for temporary trade out of South Australia is particularly important for 2007-08, when water availability is expected to be severely limited. Under the Natural Resources Management Act 2004, an application to trade water interstate can usually be submitted up to the end of the water year (30 June), but during the last quarter of each financial year, and specifically for the last three financial years, large volumes of South Australian River Murray water have been temporarily traded interstate to New South Wales and Victoria. Late season temporary interstate water trade from South Australia usually reduces the entitlement flow to South Australia in the following water year from September onwards and reduces the management options available.

The early cut-off date this water year does not affect applications for temporary water trade into South Australia, permanent water trade into and out of South Australia, or permanent and temporary trade within South Australia. New South Wales and Victoria have already announced that they will be stopping some temporary transfers earlier. So, water users still looking to purchase water from interstate should be aware that opportunities for this are likely to be very limited from the end of April this year.

For the first time, South Australia will allow licensed River Murray water users to carry over unused water into 2006-07. Providing carryover of unused water is not normally possible in South Australia because there is usually no mechanism to store water upstream for use in the following year. However, during extremely dry periods, the Murray-Darling Basin special accounting rules are activated, providing an opportunity for South Australia to negotiate the storage of some water for delivery in the next year. The 2006-07

water resource conditions are such that the government is therefore able to offer irrigators the option of retaining some water for delivery next year. Carryover schemes will also operate in New South Wales and Victoria during 2007-08. The temporary South Australian scheme puts our River Murray water users on a level playing field. The conditions on the carryover include:

- carryover water will be supplied in addition to the volumes authorised for use for the 2007-08 water year, which are likely to be heavily restricted;
- the only water that will be considered for carryover is water that licensed users have not used at 30 June 2007, and it can only be up to 50 per cent of the restricted volume of water a licensed water user has been authorised to take this year (2006-07);
- the capacity to move the use of carryover water between licensed users in South Australia will be very limited;
- only metered licensed water users can apply; and
- a written application to obtain and use carryover of unused water must be lodged before 30 April 2007.

The value of carryover determined for each licence holder who has lodged an application will be confirmed as soon as practicable after the end of the June 2007 meter reading. This temporary carryover scheme will enable licensed River Murray water users in South Australia to better manage the limited water they have available to them. I must warn, however, that under extreme climatic circumstances, and if the worst-case scenario for predicted River Murray flows in 2007-08 eventuates, it might not be possible to deliver the volumes of carryover approved from 2006-07 during 2007-08. If the total water resources available are insufficient to meet critical urban, stock and domestic demands, all available water resources will be directed to these critical demands as a priority.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

HARVEY, Mrs I.E.

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

Today I pay tribute to Iris Emily Harvey, who turns 90 years of age. Iris was born on 27 March 1917, is a descendent of the Krieg family from the Barossa Valley and was born Iris Emily Lehman. Her early life was in Renmark and later in Oakbank and Stonyfell, South Australia. At the age of 40, in 1957, she went to Alice Springs. Some would consider her one of our greatest exports. At that time, of course, Alice Springs was a dusty town with no airconditioning and little infrastructure. She established the Territory Business Supplies and the Arunta Art Gallery and Bookshop and other enterprises. She became the postmistress for Alice Springs South and was active in the development of the town.

Today I recognise her 50 years of operation of the Arunta Art Gallery and Bookshop, 50 years this year of operation, of which she has been a pioneer in the development of Aboriginal art and artefacts in Australia. Her promotion of indigenous arts, which some have described as our greatest cultural gift to the international community, has been unique and exquisite. She has, of course, over 50 years, followed the many styles of indigenous art that has made a contribution to this vast gift to the world community.

Fifty years ago she supported and established, in fact, her Arunta Art Gallery in recognition of the Aranda people, and those who were in the Hermannsburg mission area, including

Albert Namatjira and other famous watercolour artists of that era. So involved was she in the development of this era, with other artists, including Claude Pannka and the like, she could name the children of Albert Namatjira, tell you who they married and what they did. Enos, Oscar, Ewald, Keith and Maurice were all, of course, very involved in the development of watercolour art in this field.

What was important to recognise was not only the opportunity that she gave a number of artists in the indigenous community, in addition in later years to the broader non-indigenous community, but always strictly Australian artists, was to support and develop their skills, to provide a rewarding life in art, to provide an outlet and display for their work, to provide the very art supplies that they needed to undertake their work, whether it was in painting, beads, sculpture or wood carving and the like, but also to provide picture framing and presentation services.

She was loyal to the 'Australian made' ethos and one would never find, in 50 years, any artefact like a boomerang with a sticker 'Made in Hong Kong', because she was staunchly Australian and staunchly protective that what we produced as indigenous art was genuinely Australian. Some would say she was old fashioned in her business operation, to the extent that there is not a computer to be seen in the shop, never has been and never will be.

I recall her fiercely defending those in the indigenous community, and recall an occasion in the 1990s when Alexander Downer, the then leader of the opposition, visited the Northern Territory. He made what could best be described as fairly inane and inconsistent statements on indigenous matters, for which I received communication to say, 'You can tell that young Alexander, if he wants to come up to this territory he better get his facts right and I will be happy to provide him with some counsel.' Furthermore, having known Sir Alec Downer, his father, she described that he, of course, never would have made that mistake.

She was respected for her views in reciprocity of obligation amongst the indigenous community and took the view, on very practical matters, that if you give people sit down money, whether they are black or white, then that is exactly what they will do—sit down. Amanda Vanstone, after her work with the indigenous affairs portfolio, of which she has been widely respected, once described Iris as, 'She is not a gem, she is a diamond.' Women's liberation came and went during this 50 years, but she clearly had broken through the glass ceilings a decade before. She is a woman of style, substance and strength and today I wish my grandmother a happy birthday.

I briefly conclude by congratulating the coalition on the swing that occurred in the New South Wales elections. My cousin, Leslie Williams, was an unsuccessful but strong candidate for the National Party. She had a 3.6 per cent swing in her favour for the seat of Port Macquarie, with 75 per cent of the vote counted, and that is a very substantial contribution to the National Party and coalition effort in New South Wales, and I look forward to supporting her next time.

Time expired.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): Last November I was very pleased to attend with minister Paul Holloway and members of the business community from South Australia the signing of two important agreements in China. The first took place at Shandong University in Jinan in Shandong province,

and it was the signing of an MOU between University of Adelaide and Shandong University to establish a Confucius Institute at the Adelaide University. The MOU that they signed agrees to:

- support the local teaching of the Chinese language, train Chinese language teachers and certify Chinese language teachers;
- host academic and cultural activities on China for the South Australian community;
- provide advice and support to South Australian business; and
- actively participate in the Confucius network both nationally and internationally.

The second agreement was signed a couple of days later in Beijing between the University of Adelaide and the Office of the Chinese Language Council International, known as Hanban, giving the University of Adelaide the right to establish a Confucius Institute in Adelaide.

A couple of weeks ago the Confucius Institute at the University of Adelaide was launched by foreign minister Alexander Downer in a crowded Elder Hall in the presence of the Ambassador Designate of the People's Republic of China and other dignitaries. Documents were signed by Vice-Chancellor Professor James McWha on behalf of the University of Adelaide and the President of the Shandong University Professor Zhan Tao.

The University of Adelaide is now proceeding to appoint a director and a board to get the institute up and running. Shandong University has agreed to send teaching staff to Adelaide to assist with teaching at no extra charge; it will also assist in curriculum development and the development of local resources, teaching standards and academic research of Chinese language and culture. I understand that Hanban will grant the right to establish around 100 Confucius Institutes around the world. Australia will establish five, ours being the third to be established. I also understand that about 50 or so are currently getting started. They have all been established in the past one to two years.

Each Confucius Institute is a partnership between an institution in China and one in Australia. The partnership between Adelaide University and Shandong University is particularly propitious because Jinan, the city in which Shandong University is situated, is the birthplace of Confucius. So, this particular Confucius Institute is partnered with the birthplace of Confucius himself. The arrangement will also strengthen the ties between Shandong University and South Australia, and it was significant that the signings in China last year took place during the celebrations of the 20-year sister state relationship between South Australia and Shandong province. I look forward to the institute getting up on its feet and doing some very good things in terms of developing close ties between the South Australian community at all levels and China. I congratulate all those people on both sides of this agreement on the work they have put into establishing something which will be of considerable importance into the future.

NATIVE VEGETATION COUNCIL

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Over the course of the last few weeks, I have raised some issues relating to the Native Vegetation Council in South Australia. What at first appeared to be something of a simple exercise has uncovered a hornet's nest and, if the amount of material that is coming into my office is any sort of indication, I think that we have the

semblance of a totally fraudulent operation. I have spoken to the Presiding Member of the Natural Resources Committee, and I hope that he will pick up on some of these issues.

One of the most important matters that I seem to have uncovered is that, to all intents and purposes, the council has been acting illegally for a number of years insofar as the guidelines that it gives out to residents of South Australia to operate under are, in fact, illegal. I say that because, under the 1991 act, guidelines are meant to be put out for public consultation. They are meant to go to local government and to a number of other interested people, and then they are to be gazetted. The act quite specifically states that these guidelines must be gazetted but my sources suggest the guidelines have never been gazetted. This goes back a considerable period of time—back to 1991—and covers a number of governments, I have to say.

The information that I have found so far is that any people who have actually been prosecuted or taken to task by the Native Vegetation Council in the period since 1991 have—

Mrs Redmond: They might be entitled to a refund.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, they are entitled to a refund if it is correct, and, if it was taken to a High Court challenge, the High Court challenge would be ultimately successful. There are a couple of cases that I would like to mention. My colleague the member for Stuart actually named an officer of the Native Vegetation Council—I think he termed him a scoundrel—that officer being Mr Craig Whisson. Time and time again Mr Craig Whisson's name comes up, and, time and time again, allegations are made to me that not everything that is being done is kosher. In fact, there is an undercurrent of things going on that I believe needs to be looked at in an inquiry. As was put to me yesterday, the Fraud Squad ought to be brought in. The operations of this outfit are highly suspicious if indeed these guidelines have not been gazetted. People have been prosecuted and people have been forced to pay money to the Native Vegetation Council—therefore the government. I think these things need to be looked at.

Mrs Helen Marr from the West Coast of South Australia is one case in question. I am quite happy to make this material available to the relevant committee to look at. Another case involves Mrs Sally McKay of One Tree Hill within the Playford City Council. In both these cases information has been lodged with me, and I have received other information from across the state of South Australia. I do not intend to let this matter rest. I intend to continue to uncover these things, and I encourage the people of South Australia to come forward and raise these matters in parliament.

If it is proved that the Native Vegetation Council has acted illegally, I believe they should all be chucked straight out the door and we need to start again. My sources tell me that they have gone back through the state *Government Gazette* for time immemorial and these guidelines have never been gazetted. So, I urge the government to pick up on this. As I said previously, I will continue to raise these matters. I do not think it is fair, decent or honest for the residents of South Australia to be taken to task, bullied, bulldozed and pushed around by bureaucrats who are not acting according to the law of the land. I seek to have these matters redressed as soon as possible. I also ask that the government invite these people to appear as witnesses before the relevant committee, and to take the matter further.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Before calling on the next member, I remind the honourable member of standing order 118 about debates in the same session that

have been referred to in the grievance debate. I gave the honourable member latitude, because his motion talks specifically about Kangaroo Island rather than the entire state. I call the member for Ashford.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): Today I would like to discuss two items. First, I refer to Community Information Strategies Australia (CISA), which grew out of the South Australian Council of Social Services. My first contact with CISA was quite a long time ago when I wanted information about grants in the community sector for community organisations. I was impressed always with the professionalism of both SACOSS and CISA. Later I went on to discuss the big issue of the digital divide and, as we know in this place, it is becoming more obvious that people's access to technology and their ability to use technology is potentially another form of inequality. CISA concentrates on helping the community sector (which often is underfunded or poorly funded) to ensure that technology is available to them; and CISA has been involved in many different programs. The most recent one was launched under the portfolio of minister Hill; and I commend him for his foresight through the Arts SA program in recognising that access to information technology by organisations is important.

The new program is called the DonorTec program. It aims to assist a wide range of charities and non-profit organisations by providing donated current software and hardware for a small administration fee, in conjunction with donor partners Microsoft and Cisco. The DonorTec program is delivered in Australia by CISA—so it has a national responsibility—in partnership with TechSoup in the US (a partnership that has been in existence for three years). Both CISA and TechSoup are non-profit organisations. I put on record the fantastic work that CISA does and also compliment them for helping organisations that otherwise would have little chance of getting or accessing the technology they need.

The other area I want to speak about today concerns the debate with regard to Australian drug law reform. I am raising this issue because I feel that at present it seems to be a one-sided debate. People in the other house—not so much in this house—claim to be experts in this area. I think some of the information that has been circulated probably needs to be challenged. In saying that, I compliment minister Gago for the work she has been doing in relation to drug and alcohol issues in our community.

I received a newsletter recently from the Australian Drug Law Reform Foundation and Australian Parliamentary Group for Drug Law Reform. This organisation has been talking about the fact that the so-called harm reduction policy in Switzerland is working, rather than criticising it. Some time has passed since its implementation in the 1980s and this program is starting to show some big differences in Switzerland. The four-fold policy combines prevention, treatment and harm reduction with law enforcement to provide a multi-disciplinary approach to reducing drug use and harm to users. Recently, in *The Lancet* (No. 367) there is an evaluation of the Swiss drug policy that investigates the incidence of heroin use and also ways in which there has been a proper preventative program. In brief, the study found that of those who left treatment in Zurich from 1991 to 1993, 33 per cent never re-entered treatment; 66 per cent rejoined treatment within 10 years, with only 1 per cent returning after a decade.

Time expired.

HARMONY DAY

Mr PISONI (Unley): I take this opportunity to inform the house of the growing success of Harmony Day and to endorse further the importance of a bipartisan message to achieve the best outcomes for our multicultural community in South Australia. Harmony Day was established as a national event by the Howard government. It began in 1999 and it occurs on 21 March each year. The day celebrates Australia's success as a diverse society united by a common set of values. Since 1945 more than six million people have settled in Australia. In the 60 years of post-war migration, Australia's population has jumped from six million to approximately 20 million.

Between us we now speak more than 200 languages, including 45 indigenous languages. Our most commonly spoken languages are English, Italian, Greek, Cantonese, Arabic, Vietnamese and Mandarin. Australia has a proud history and it is proud of its record. Let us look at Australia's humanitarian program over the last 10 years in particular. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) estimates that there are 19.2 million refugees and others of humanitarian concern in the world. The UNHCR coordinates international efforts to address the plight of refugees and displaced people. Australia is a leading contributor to these efforts.

Every year Australia funds humanitarian, emergency and refugee programs. It aims to promote peace and security and improve conditions in source countries. Australia's aid budget this year is around \$3 billion. Australia offers humanitarian resettlement to those most in need through its off-shore humanitarian program. Australia is one of only 10 countries in the world with an established resettlement program. It sits within the top three resettlement countries with the US and Canada, and we are now second. Australia has a long and proud record of helping refugees from around the world.

Since the Second World War, in response to humanitarian crises and changing resettlement needs, Australia has accepted large numbers of refugees and people in humanitarian need, and 675 000 people have been resettled in Australia. Those examples include around 170 000 persons from Eastern Europe who arrived in Australia in the years following the war. Other situations that have led to large numbers of refugee arrival in Australia include the Hungarian uprising in 1956; the Prague spring of 1968; the Lebanese civil war in 1975; the Vietnamese conflicts extending into the late 1970s; and the Balkan crisis in 1991.

Since the mid-1990s we have seen a significant increase in resettlement of refugees from Africa. Australia continues to resettle people in vulnerable situations around the world based on priority regions identified with the UNHCR. In future, Australia is expected to settle more refugees from Asia. For the third year in a row Australia's humanitarian placements are set at 13 000. Last year around 1 400 people were resettled in South Australia, most of whom came from Sudan, Afghanistan, Liberia, Burundi and Iraq. When they settle in South Australia these refugees are excited by their future.

At the Migrant Resource Centre on Harmony Day I was pleased to meet many of our newest community members who told of their stories of life as they see it in their new home in South Australia. The main focus of the day was a forum entitled Young People and the Law. We heard from five speakers representing the police, the Youth Court and

members of our newest communities. I was particularly impressed with the presentations from the youth reference group member Daud Harun and Saffiah El-Attar from the Young Women's Action Group. It was obvious that they were very much involved in our community, but they both highlighted that work was still to be done in their communities and in the wider communities towards a mutual understanding.

I thank the Howard government and the Department of Immigration and Citizenship for giving us this special day to celebrate Australia's success in bringing communities together to contribute to and to share and promote our Australian values. To illustrate how a multicultural Australia has evolved and enhanced our lives, I would like to quote James Allan of the University of Queensland in *The Australian* last week, where he said:

If there's anybody out there who prefers a processed cheese sandwich on white bread to a Thai green curry or an Indian aloo gobi, I haven't met the person.

REAL ESTATE INSTITUTE

Mr RAU (Enfield): I want to make a few remarks today about the real estate industry, which has been occupying my attention since 2002. As we know, very positive moves are taking place legislatively, but I will not dwell on them. What I would like to say, first of all, is that I do get around the place and talk to a lot of real estate agents, and I have a pretty good relationship with many of them. Many of them ring me from time to time and raise issues of concern. Most of them, I have to say, are welcoming the thought of legislative change to support those in the industry who are doing the right thing and making it more difficult for those in the industry who wish to continue doing the wrong thing, and I applaud those individuals.

The Real Estate Institute has recently provided me with a copy of a paper which in many respects is a critique from its perspective of the legislation currently in another place. I will raise briefly a couple of matters that come from the paper that the REI is presently circulating. First, the REI is not happy with people registering as bidders at auctions. I say on this point that, if a person is going to an auction with the intention of purchasing a property, they are going to wind up putting their name on the contract if they are successful, so they are expecting to go there to reveal themselves sooner or later by means of signing a contract to purchase a property. It should not bother them one iota the fact that their name is known and recorded by the auctioneer in advance, whether or not they get the property, because that is not disclosed to everybody and it is an important check and balance in the event of that auction being identified as suspect for some reason or another.

The second point the REI is on about is limiting vendor bids to only one, and I think there is some merit in its arguments, but I note that the present proposed scheme operates successfully in Sydney. The one that most concerns me is that the REI asserts that it presently has the right under the law as it stands to lodge a caveat against a property in order to secure fees which are unpaid by a vendor, and it wants the present circumstances to continue. I have news for the REI: it is presently illegal for it to place a caveat on a property in order to secure fees. I refer the parliament—and the REI if its members care to look it up—to section 80F(1) of the Real Property Act, which states:

A person claiming an estate or interest in the land to which an application under this part relates may at any time lodge a caveat with the Registrar forbidding the granting of the application.

Now, the important wording there is 'claiming an estate or interest in the land'. The fact that a person acts as a real estate agent for a vendor gives that person no more estate or interest in that land than the Jim's Mowing fellow who mows their lawn, and some people out there are wrongly placing these caveats on properties. The fact is that, if they are slipping through the net, the Registrar-General is occasionally making a mistake and allowing these things to be lodged, and it is entirely appropriate and it should be made explicitly clear to these people that they should not do it and there should be a penalty for doing it.

The other thing, of course, is that the Real Estate Institute is not happy about having to release information about the rebates agents get from advertising. My view on this, for what it is worth, is that disclosure is the important thing. They do not have to pay them back, they do not have to pass them on, but they do have to tell the vendor what they are doing. Finally, the institute says in its paper that it would like to see a real estate board. With the greatest of respect to the REI, I could not agree more. I think it is a great idea, but that might be a reform for another day.

Whilst I am on real estate, I would like to refer to a letter that underlines the fact that we need this reform. I received this only yesterday from someone saying that they had a case in Kings Park of a property advertised at \$800 000, of 1 423 square metres, which sold for \$1.23 million; and another property in Unley that was advertised for \$800 000, which sold for \$1.2 million, being 1 683 square metres. Anyone with half a brain could work out that properties that big in that area are not going to be selling for those prices. There are other examples given here, so there is still bait pricing out there in the market place.

Time expired.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (STORMWATER MANAGEMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 14 March. Page 2069.)

Mrs GERAGHTY: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum having been formed:

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am going to move to reject the amendments, but there is one that I am not clear about, so I will move that we report progress until there is a bureaucrat present.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

SUPPLY BILL 2007

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 March. Page 2105.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I am happy to speak to the Supply Bill but, if the government could get its act together, it would be—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! The member will speak to the Supply Bill.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: We have come prepared to speak on the stormwater management bill.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite will resume his seat. The house has just passed a motion, and the member had the opportunity to speak then: he chose not to; he sat in silence. We are now on the supply debate. Please debate supply. The member for Waite has the call.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Would you like me to call a quorum, sir?

The ACTING SPEAKER: You are a member. You can do whatever you like.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You have forced this upon us. I will address supply, and one of the first things I will address is the need for the resources of the budget to be used for the government to competently run the affairs of the house. The minister responsible for the running of government business has turned up without his bureaucrats, and he has rushed off. He wants to bring the Treasurer here now to bring on the Supply Bill. If the government could just get a grip of the affairs of the house, it would help everybody in this place. It does not reflect well on the house, and it does not reflect well on the government.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Then maybe you should have voted no.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The opposition will address the question of supply, and this is another issue that concerns us. This bill has again been rushed in at fairly short notice. It is probably one of the most significant bills the government has to deal with, and it is essential if public servants are to be paid and public expenditure, undertaken in the period between the start of the next financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill, is to be made.

We are not at all happy with the manner in which this has been brought in. However, we will deal with the issues before us. The amount sought is \$2 billion. Last year, the amount was \$3.1 billion. In the previous year, it was \$1.7 billion. Members will recall that the significant increase last year was attributable to last year's Appropriation Bill not being introduced until 21 September 2006. We sincerely hope that the government will adhere to the newly arranged schedule to introduce the Appropriation Bill this year on 7 June 2007 and that some normalcy will be reintroduced into the budget process.

There are a lot of missed opportunities and broken promises in this budget and linked to this Supply Bill. State finances continue to benefit from the GST deal, which Labor opposed, and debt reduction due to ETSA privatisation (as noted in Standard and Poor's), which Labor opposed. I will return to that point. Keeping in mind that this government, this Premier and this Treasurer are the highest taxing in South Australian history, revenues, taxes and charges have simply hit record levels. State budget figures show that the Rann government is the highest taxing government in the state's history, as I have mentioned, and that taxes, combined with GST payments handed over from the federal government, make this the wealthiest government South Australia has ever had. One only needs to look at government revenues and expenses. I seek leave to insert in *Hansard* a statistical table, which shows those figures.

Leave granted.

General Government Revenues and Expenses
Source: State Budget Papers (\$'millions)

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07 (est)	2007-08 (est)	2008-09 (est)	2009-10 (est)
Revenues	8 538	9 346	9 955	10 592	11 242	11 404	11 796	12 105	12 470
Expenses	8 713	8 898	9 570	10 368	11 040	11 395	11 690	11 939	12 290

Tax Collections
Source: State Budget papers (\$'millions)

	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07 (est)	2007-08 (est)	2008-09 (est)	2009-10 (est)
	2 193	2 431	2 806	2 941	2 979	3 142	3 206	3 317	3 434

GST Gains from Tax Reform
As at 20 December 2006—Commonwealth Treasury figures (\$'millions)

2003-04	99.3
2004-05	175.2
2005-06	135.0
2006-07	195.0
2007-08	290.0
2008-09	380.0
2009-10	415.0
Total	1 689.5

State Public Sector Unfunded Superannuation Liabilities
Source: State Budget Papers (\$'millions)
As at 30 June

1999	3 909
2000	3 543
2001	3 249
2002	3 998
2003	4 445
2004	5 668
2005	7 227
2006	6 146
2007 (est)	6 468
2008 (est)	6 521
2009 (est)	6 562
2010 (est)	6 592

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: If we look at the figures, we see that the budget has hit a record \$12.47 billion. Just five years ago, when the Liberal government was last in office, the budget was \$8.5 billion. It has been an extraordinary increase in the growth and size of government. Labor's first budget in 2002-03 broke a key election promise by introducing new taxes and charges and increases in existing taxes and charges, including the introduction of the gaming machine supertax and the River Murray levy, and increases in stamp duty on conveyances and regulated fees and charges.

The latest 2006-07 budget numbers show that the Premier and the Treasurer will collect \$2.9 billion more in revenue (\$11.4 billion) than the former Liberal government, which collected \$8.5 billion in its last year (2001-02). What has happened to the money? You might well ask, Mr Acting Speaker. Where is the dividend for South Australians? What have they done with the extra \$2.9 billion per year they have received? We have not seen \$2.9 billion worth of improvements in hospitals, schools and police services.

The fact is that, as fast as they have swallowed the cash from property revenues and GST, they have let out their belt. You would think that, five years ago, a smart government might have said to itself, in the face of extraordinary windfall

revenues, 'Why don't we hold the costs of government as best we can to inflation? We will use the windfall cash gains to build infrastructure, to build a future for our children and to make some of the major long-term investments that are needed for this state to grow and prosper at the same pace that other states are growing and prospering.' However, the government did not do that. The cash it received has vanished. It has vanished in a range of ways, and I will get to that later.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It must have really hurt when you got slaughtered in that election. It must have really hurt. It was so unfair.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: That brilliant genius, the Minister for Infrastructure, talks about the last election. It might not be lost on him that, when you have \$2.9 billion of extra money to spend (I see that he is fleeing from the chamber), you would look awfully good while being perfectly incompetent—and he would know quite a bit about that, because he has been responsible for mismanaging hundreds of millions of dollars of that money. It is the talk of the town, and rapidly becoming the talk of the country. Come right back, I have some more for you. Below is a table indicating cumulative actual revenue growth since 2001-02. I seek leave

to have inserted in *Hansard* a further statistical chart.

Leave granted.

	Actual general government sector total revenue (\$'million)	Revenue increase over 2001-02 base (\$'million)
2001-02	\$8 538	
2002-03	\$9 346	+808
2003-04	\$9 955	+1 417
2004-05	\$10 592	+2 054
2005-06	\$11 242	+2 704
2006-07	\$11 404	+2 866
Total		+9 849

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The cumulative growth chart that I have tabled shows that between 2001-02 and 2006-07 annual government sector total revenue has grown significantly to \$11.404 billion. It also shows that the revenue increase over 2001-02 is \$9.849 billion. That is a striking figure—that is \$9.84 billion of extra revenue over the cumulative period, money that one might not have expected it to have but which this government did have. The Treasurer, over the five years of this government, has enjoyed a cumulative \$9.8 billion of additional revenue over and above what the last Liberal budget had, or an additional budget full of money to play with.

I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a further chart which is purely statistical as another way of showing that the Treasurer (the member for Port Adelaide) has been awash with money.

Leave granted.

General government revenue windfalls		Total general government sector revenue, difference (windfall) between budget and actual (within each year)	
	Windfalls to Liberal government		Windfalls to Labour government.
1998-99	+\$218 million	2001-02	+\$397 million
1999-2000	+\$84 million	2002-03	+\$528 million
2000-01	+\$256 million	2003-04	+\$794 million
		2004-05	+\$595 million
		2005-06	+\$521 million
Windfall	+\$558 million		+\$2 835 million

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: You will see from the third chart incorporated in *Hansard* that total government sector revenue, that is the windfall between budget and actual receipts, has been extraordinary: \$558 million of sheer windfall from 1998 through to 2000-01. Compare that with the total general government sector revenue or windfall the Labor government has enjoyed since it came to office from 2001 to 2004-05. When you add up the windfalls, the total is \$2.835 billion, almost six times as much in extra revenue than we enjoyed when we were in government.

I just say to the house, it is easy to look good when you have that sort of money coming in—it really is. You can throw money at your problems. If the house could just reflect on the challenges faced by the Liberal government under Premier Brown and Treasurer Baker back in 1993 when this lot gave us \$11.5 billion worth of debt, when the current Premier, as a senior minister in the Labor government that wreaked that havoc on South Australia, was chief engineer of the HMAS State Bank, when he got up and talked about Tim Marcus Clark in glowing terms, a wonderful bloke—that's his business judgment.

Not only that, they gave us \$300 million in the red per annum in recurrent terms. They were not even running budgets properly; they were running significant deficits. That is what Premier Rann, when he was a senior minister, delivered. This Treasurer was an adviser to that government that delivered chaos, and that is what they gave South Australia. So far it has not been repeated. Why not? When you look at these revenue figures you can see why. They are awash with money. They have managed to keep us out of the red—miraculously. They have won lotto every year for the last five years and despite that they have still managed to keep us out of the red. Well, I am shocked.

The Treasurer gets up and crows about how he is balancing the budgets and, 'Gee, the Liberals had difficulty doing that when they were in government.' Well, hello, have a look at the debt figure we inherited, have a look at the mess you gave us. You are dead right we had trouble balancing the first few budgets. The Treasurer is standing on thin ice when he argues that he is doing a good job, because he is balancing the budget in buoyant economic circumstances. When there are \$2.835 billion worth of windfall revenue gains over the five years of this budget and he says he is balancing the budget, I just say, well, four monkeys in a VW could balance this budget. Blind Freddy could do it with one hand tied behind his back, so I would not crow about it too much.

The Rann government has consistently massively underestimated its revenue collections every year. Over the last four budgets the Rann government has actually collected an average \$610 million per year more than they budgeted to collect. That is how good times have been. To be crying poor, to be even remotely suggesting that budget conditions are tight and money is short in these economic times of the last five years simply defies reality and beggars belief—it is absolute nonsense. Having been a member of a cabinet where money was tight, I say to the Treasurer's cabinet colleagues that, if they swallow that line from the Treasurer, they need to be born again—and the same applies to the caucus.

Let us talk about tax. Tax collections under Labor from 2002-03 and onwards have been extraordinary: \$2.193 billion in 2001-02; \$3.434 billion (estimated) in 2009-10. That is an extraordinary increase in tax. The Rann government is the highest taxing government in South Australia's history. Taxes are up by 43 per cent, or \$943 million, compared to the last year of the former Liberal government in 2001-02. Tax and revenue collections continue to rise, but no financial relief for long-suffering families and businesses is provided. There is no stamp duty relief for struggling first home owners and no extra concessions for financial assistance for older South Australians. There is no payroll tax relief of substance. The South Australian payroll tax threshold of \$504 000 remains the lowest of all states and territories in Australia. Payroll tax collections in 2006-07 will be 40 per cent higher than in the last year of the former Liberal government in 2001-02. Payroll tax collections are predicted to increase by almost \$200 million per year by 2009-10.

This is the mystery, smoke and mirrors of some of the gloss and spin linked to the budget when people are told they are getting tax cuts, and then you look at the total revenue coming in and you see it is extraordinarily larger and the take is much greater. But we are still being told that we are getting tax cuts. I suppose it is all a question of definitions and how you spin the words and the rhetoric. Try to convince a business out there that they are getting a terrific deal with payroll tax. Find a business out there that is sending thank

you cards for their savings and tax cuts, and I will show you *Snow White and The Seven Dwarves*.

The government claims in the budget that 'over the next five years a further \$296 million of taxes will be cut, taking the total amount of tax relief since coming into office to over \$1.57 billion by 2010-11.' This claim is abject nonsense—a complete furphy. The \$296 million figure is a revised number on the tax relief package that was announced in the last budget. That tax relief package was forced by Peter Costello, the federal Treasurer, as a result of the GST negotiations with the commonwealth, which were originally negotiated by the former Liberal government and which Labor opposed. Most of the land tax relief only starts to kick in from 2009-10. There are no meaningful tax cuts of any shape or size.

The Rann government is the first government in South Australia's history to collect more than \$1 billion in property taxes—in fact, \$1.194 billion in 2006-07. That figure will go down as a testament to this government's achievements. Conveyancing stamp duties in 2005-06 were \$116 million—24 per cent more than budgeted for—another Rann broken promise. Land tax relief packages announced in early 2005

have been ineffective—collections are continuing to rise. Total land tax collections increased from \$256 million in 2005-06 to \$342 million in 2006-07, even after the rebate and relief package. In fact, when you scroll through government revenues and look at tax, you see that, in the life and times over five years of this government, payroll tax is up by 42.1 per cent.

This is straight from the budget papers. Taxes on property are up 57.6 per cent. We have heard a lot of spin about cutting taxes on gambling and gaming, but they are up by 35.7 per cent. Taxes on insurance are up by 28.8 per cent. Motor vehicle taxes are up by 22.6 per cent. Total taxation is up by 42 per cent. When you look at the structure of those increases over five years, you can see that this government has been working away, raking in the money off farmers, people in remote regional towns, hard-working factory workers and office workers in the city—and off families at every opportunity. It has been a gluttony of tax increase. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a further table, which is purely statistical, showing that rate of increase.

Leave granted.

Taxation—South Australia (State Budget Papers)

	2001-02 (estimated result)	2002-03 (estimated result)	2003-04 (estimated result)	2004-05 (estimated result)	2005-06 (estimated result)	2006-07 (budget)	% Increase Under Labor
Employer payroll tax	591.3	645.1	712.1	740.6	794.6	840	42.1
Taxes on property	727.5	795.1	1 046.4	1 104.6	1 121.4	1 146.2	57.6
Taxes on gambling	307.9	335.3	377.1	400.9	399.3	417.7	35.7
Taxes on insurance	224.8	253.2	273.3	281.8	283.8	289.6	28.8
Motor vehicle taxes	320.5	340.0	369.2	383.0	382.5	392.8	22.6
Other taxes	0.7	3.8	4.6	5.4	0.0	0.0	-100.0
Total taxation	2 172.8	2 372.5	2 782.7	2 916.2	2 981.6	3 086.2	42.0

Source: State Budget 2006-07, Budget Paper 3, p. 3.9.

State Budget 2005-06, p. 3.12, State Budget 2004-05, p. 3.12, State Budget 2003-04, p. 3.7, State Budget 2002-03, p. 4.13.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Let us talk about the GST windfall in more detail—that is, the windfall over and above what we would have received had the old federal-state funding system been retained—the one that Labor wanted to retain when it opposed the GST. The Rann government is collecting an extra \$1.69 billion in GST over the seven-year period from 2003-04 to 2009-10, which is above and beyond what it would have collected under the old pre-GST funding deal. The annual 'GST benefit' to the state budget will steadily increase by over \$400 million per year until 2009-10. All the GST that is collected comes back to the states—it is a bucket of money flowing straight into the Treasurer's and the Premier's pockets.

The latest commonwealth figures on GST gained from tax reform make this clear. It was \$99.3 million in 2003-04; it is projected to be \$415 million by 2009-10. Today, in 2007-08, it is \$290 million. These are massive figures. The total seven-year windfall will be \$1 689.5 million—and the Treasurer says times are tough. He says that he is struggling to make ends meet and he is proud of the fact that he has just managed to balance his budget. We can just sit back and laugh and scoff.

Government cost blow-outs and wrong priorities have characterised this government. I cite the example of the Port River bridges. We have had the saga of the cost of opening bridges—an extra \$100 million over the life of the project.

The tramline extension from Victoria Square along King William Street to North Terrace is another example at \$31 million. That is the absolute top priority on this government's list of priorities and the very first project that it will deliver.

For the Thinkers in Residence program \$1.4 million has been allocated for a three-year extension of the program. Of course, there is a blow-out in the number of full-time equivalent public servants to 7 750 over four years. Labor budgeted for just 1 135 extra, but the actual increase was 8 885. They just lost control of it. Obviously, we on this side of the house support those numbers as they relate to extra police, extra teachers and extra nurses, but the total of these might be just more than 1 000 full-time equivalents. That is well short of the 8 885 increase. The cost of the blow-out is more than \$500 million per year—or more than \$2 billion over four years.

Here is one of the key ways in which that money has been frittered away—and there are many others. I refer to the Independent ministers' offices. The members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey were brought—or should I say bought—into the Labor cabinet on hefty salaries with ministerial staff, offices and chauffeur-driven cars.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I rise on a point of order, sir. I think the honourable member, by the cunning use of the words bought and brought, reflected in a most unparliamentary

tary way on the member for Chaffey. She is not in the chamber at present so she herself is not in a position to take a point of order. Sir, I ask you to rule that this is out of order and the honourable member should withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): The word 'bought' is not necessarily unparliamentary, although I would suggest that the member is imputing an improper motive to the members. I invite him to withdraw if he wishes.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Is your ruling that it is not unparliamentary?

The ACTING SPEAKER: It is not unparliamentary, but I have invited you to withdraw.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for inviting me to withdraw, but I will explain so there is no misunderstanding. Obviously, the offer of a ministerial appointment is one which many members on both sides of the house seek when they are in government. It is an attractive proposition for many members—and that is simply the point I was making. I am making the point that that has cost the taxpayers extraordinarily. I am also making the point that this Rann government's cabinet has grown to 15 from 13. Once we had 10 ministers: now we have 15. That is a lot of money. One asks whether a budget this size needs to be managed by 15 ministers. Some \$2.5 million per year or \$10 million over four years is an extraordinary amount of money for an additional two ministers. Those additional two ministers, of course, are the members for Mount Gambier and Chaffey. It is taxpayers' money we are debating with this measure.

The Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment stages 2 and 3 have seen a cost blow-out from \$60 million to \$317 million and project completion has been delayed until July 2011. In relation to the Northern Expressway project, the costs have blown out from \$300 million to \$550 million officially. Now we have had revealed another secret plan to complete the job properly and put a western extension to the Northern Expressway, out from where it presently hits Port Wakefield Road to hook up with the Port River expressway, possibly at the cost of another \$200 million or \$300 million. It is quite clear that the true cost of the Northern Expressway might have been closer to \$850 million, if the two component parts of it that were originally promulgated in the government's 1994 directory were delivered. In order to cover up a much larger blow-out, the Minister for Infrastructure talked it down to \$550 million. This is money that is coming out of this budget and this Supply Bill. This is money that ultimately will have to be funded out of one Supply Bill or another. Taxpayers have every right to be concerned about it.

In relation to the South Road projects, the Anzac Highway underpass has blown out from \$65 million to \$140 million budgeted. The minister says that he will deliver it for \$118 million—and I really hope he does! He has said, 'Why don't we have a bet on it? By the way, I will control all the information and all the figures, and I will do all the sums and tell you whether it was \$118 million or \$140 million. You trust me, you just believe me whatever I tell you is the final figure.' I will not be trusting one figure I ever hear uttered out of the mouth of the Minister for Infrastructure—and I certainly will not be taking wagers with a fall where he controls the facts and figures. I sincerely hope he delivers it for \$118 million. When one comes into the parliament and says, 'We are budgeting \$140 million,' that is the budgeted figure and that is the figure on which we provision. If the Minister for Infrastructure wants to have bets, let us make it

\$1 000 per \$1 million and let us make it \$1 000 for every million over \$65 million (the original budgeted cost for the project). Silly nonsense such as that is not worth pursuing.

Other points in regard to the Supply Bill need to be noted. The Premier's and the Treasurer's hypocrisy on the issue of Public Service job cuts is absolutely stunning given the promises they made during the last election campaign. During the election campaign, Mr Rann referred to the 'sacking' of 1 571 public servants in the budget on top of the 222 public servants who accepted separation packages in June. When we were proposing to do it, we were sacking people: when they are proposing to do it, different language suddenly emerges. They must have woken up the morning after the election and thought, 'Gee, the Libs nearly got us on that one; we had better go through the Public Service and swing the scythe and hurl the axe to get rid of a few.' They certainly did that.

Of course, it means that, in effect, the government wants to remove 2 000 public servants who will lose their jobs contrary to the promises that both the Premier and the Treasurer made during the election campaign. They were holier-than-thou during the election campaign, but now it is a different story. Both the Premier and the Treasurer need to answer the obvious question: why has it taken almost five years to start to take action on these blow-outs? Why did they get into the position where they had so many public servants above and beyond that for which they budgeted? The Premier promised no cuts to the public sector and, in particular, that key areas such as health, education and police would be quarantined from any 'efficiency dividend'.

The 2006-07 budget requires all agencies to deliver efficiency dividends. Now, I am sure the house expects to see the full impact of cuts in last year's budget to come to light in future years as undetailed elements of the budget impact on the public sector and the community. Estimates of savings in shared services reform cannot be believed. Let us talk about the credit rating. It was the former Liberal government that ensured that the AAA credit rating was within reach. Debt reduction and negotiation of the GST deal is providing the state with growing GST money and financial flexibility.

Standard and Poor's itself acknowledges that these measures were the most significant contribution towards the AAA rating; yet, the actual announcement and the delivery simply fell into the laps of the Premier and the Treasurer. The hard work was done by doing exactly that which they opposed—privatising our electricity assets to pay off the debt they delivered personally when they were involved in the Bannon and Arnold governments. Much has been said of the unfunded superannuation liability the taxpayers now face as a result of this government's fiscal mismanagement.

Budget papers show that at June 2001 the general government unfunded liability stood at \$3.2 billion. Under Labor the unfunded superannuation liability blew out to \$6.1 billion in June 2006 and is forecast to increase over the forward estimates. State public sector unfunded superannuation liabilities should be and should continue to be a primary cause of concern for taxpayers. Moving to net debt, budget papers show that the former Liberal government reduced Premier Rann's and Treasurer Foley's State Bank debt from \$11.6 billion in 1993 to \$3.2 billion by 2001. I seek leave to have inserted in *Hansard* a further purely statistical table.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Is the table statistical in nature and less than one page?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, it is.
Leave granted.

Net Debt State Public Sector
Source: State Budget Papers (\$'millions). As at 30 June

1993	11 610
1994	10 550
1995	8 844
1996	8 432
1997	8 170
1998	7 927
1999	7 658
2000	4 355
2001	3 223
2002	3 317
2003	2 696
2004	2 285
2005	2 126
2006	1 786
2007 (est)	2 220
2008 (est)	2 509
2009 (est)	2 640
2010 (est)	2 837

WorkCover Unfunded Liability
Source: WorkCover Annual Reports (\$'millions)

June 1997	June 1998	June 1999	June 2000	June 2001	June 2002	June 2003	June 2004	June 2005	June 2006
110	79	29	22	56	192	591	572	647	694

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The table shows that net public sector debt reduced exponentially in the time and life of the former Liberal government as I have mentioned, and that in recent years it has started to grow again. The state public sector net debt as at June 2006 is \$1.8 billion but is forecast to increase to \$2.8 billion by June 2010. I want to make a comment about debt, because I have heard the Treasurer and other members of the government talk about the fact that there is good debt and bad debt, particularly in the context of infrastructure development.

Also, I have heard calls from industry for borrowing to fund infrastructure. Now, at face value, that seems a reasonable proposition. Why not borrow \$1 billion to build roads across the state, one might argue? Why not borrow \$500 000 000 to build essential water infrastructure, such as a desalination plant, or further improve water infrastructure for the people of Eyre Peninsula (represented by the member for Flinders) who have desperate problems with the quality of their water? Why not electrify our rail system by borrowing hundreds of millions of dollars so that it can be?

At face value, that all seems reasonable but, of course, if you are borrowing to do those things, that frees up the Treasurer to spend all his recurrent revenue on election promises, doesn't it? He can spend his recurrent revenue on other lower priorities or on wasted and wrong priorities—on recurrent expenditure, on paying off the unions, or in a range of ways by giving in on any number of obstacles which treasurers and cabinets face on an ongoing basis. With respect to any range of budgetary obstacles they can face, you can throw money at them if you have gone out to borrow the money to build the infrastructure. It is a much tighter discipline to have to save from your recurrent incomes to build that infrastructure.

It is a little like saying to someone, 'Go to the bank and borrow \$200 000 to build on that extra room at home, and spend every dollar you earn on gambling, good food and wine or on holidays, because you can build on and you can spend everything you are earning.' It is a fool's paradise, because

ultimately you need to repay that debt by finding money from somewhere. You must have a plan to get rid of it. Yes, an argument can be constructed that one needs to borrow to build infrastructure and that that is so-called good debt, but it can also very rapidly become bad debt.

If any member in this house can talk about that, it is the Premier, because he was there when he cranked up \$11.6 billion of it; and so can the Treasurer because, as a senior adviser, he was there pulling the levers behind the doors, making it all unfold. This government is an expert on the subject of debt. It is a real over-achiever when it comes to debt. I look with caution at the figure that shows us that another \$1 billion of debt is due to be cranked up before the next state election; indeed, I look at it with concern. I sound the bell of caution to those stakeholders who may see it as an easy way to get what they want, simply because this government has failed to exercise fiscal discipline and budget discipline and provide for that infrastructure from the billions and billions of dollars of windfall gains that they have had come in as revenue—which I have spelt out earlier in my address. General government net debt was minus \$119 million in June 2006 and is forecast to increase to \$821 million by June 2010. Look at that figure with concern.

WorkCover's unfunded liability has also been a subject of debate. Under the Libs, WorkCover's unfunded liability was reduced to \$86 million by March 2002. Under Labor it had blown out to \$694 million in June 2006—a figure which is about \$460 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. As the government is no doubt learning, if you let this system go, if you let this system get away from you, it races and bolts away. It is like a horse coming home to water, and there is no holding it back. That is what you have begun to do and the results are already unfolding. When one looks at the statistics on the growth in WorkCover's blow-out, spectacularly from 2002 to 2006, up from \$192 million in their first year to \$591 million, and then settling up to June 2006, \$694 million, as I have just mentioned, it is a scary figure. You cannot explain it away as easily as you have

attempted to in this house. It is a concern which is going to increasingly focus the house's attention. Quite apart from that, South Australia, in the face of the debt, still has the highest WorkCover levy, set at 3 per cent, of any state in Australia. That is a figure of which the government should be ashamed.

The budget simply is not getting the results it set out to get. The Rann Labor government claims that the former Liberal government never balanced a budget. As I have explained, firstly they are simply wrong, but, secondly, they do not want to talk about the reasons why doing a budget in 1993, through to 2002, were tough. They do not want to talk about it because they were the cause of the problem. The former Liberal government cleaned up Labor's State Bank mess, as I mentioned, a debt of \$11.6 billion and an annual deficit of more than \$300 million. The budget papers under the former Liberal government reported the cash result for the 'non-commercial sector'. It should be noted that the federal government still uses the cash result as the headline measure in its budget performance. But that is not good enough for Labor.

Over the last five years of the Liberal government the budget was balanced, with very small surpluses in most years, offset by very small deficits in two years, on that 'non-commercial sector' basis. Whilst the reported cash result for the last Liberal budget in 2001-02 was a surplus of \$22 million, in fact it was really \$292 million. As pointed out by former New South Wales Auditor-General, Tony Harris, the Rann government after the 2002 election used what he described as 'an accounting fiddle' by deferring until 2002-03 \$270 million worth of budgeted dividends from the South

Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) and the South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC) due in 2001-02. The Rann government was trying to create a 'black hole' in the last Liberal budget result, and improve its first budget result by 2002-03. It was classic smoke and mirrors, exposed by the financial press and something of which the Treasurer should not be proud.

One also needs to look at the non-commercial sector underlying cash result over that period, and graph, to see the full impact of what I have just said to the house. With this adjustment that I have just mentioned for the 2001-02 result there was actually an accrual surplus for 2001-02 for the 'general government sector', now used by the Rann Labor government. How convenient when you want to reinvent the books to just change your accounting basis. You know, it is the oldest one in the book. Labor's claims about Liberal deficits are based on Labor choosing a different budget sector, the smaller 'general government sector' instead of the 'non-commercial sector', and, on Labor choosing a different budget result measure, accrual not cash. This has not been lost on the accounting companies and other financial institutions in Adelaide. Everybody knows the game. It just supports the claim that the government is so much about spin and so little about substance that it seeks to obscure the true figures and the true facts linked to its budgets, and linked to this bill. Labor's budget for this year and the three years to follow is actually in deficit, on two out of the three accepted budget result measures—cash and the net lending borrowing measure. Cash deficits over the next four years will total \$846 million. One sees this clearly with the table that I now seek to have incorporated into *Hansard*, which is purely statistical and on one page, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Leave granted.

General Government Sector Results. Adjusted for SAFA/SAAMC 2001-02 Source: State Budget Papers (\$' millions)												
	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07 (est)	2007-08 (est)	2008-09 (est)	2009-10 (est)
Net Operating Balance Surplus/(Deficit)	-208	-330	-297	96	178	385	224	202	9	106	166	180
Net Lending/(Borrowing)	-227	-471	-399	146	144	424	119	83	-207	-301	-207	-223
Cash Surplus/(Deficit)		-239	-108	220	388	522	193	187	-194	-259	-186	-207

Non-commercial Sector underlying cash results. Adjusted for SAFA/SAAMC 2001-02 Source: State Budget papers (\$' millions)									
	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02
(Deficit)/Surplus	-301	-239	-101	-57	48	-55	-25	21	22

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The figures clearly show a considerable change in general government sector results. In fact, in 2002 Labor said the net lending borrowing measure was the way budget results should and would be measured under Labor. However, now that this measure has slumped into deficit, (in fact deficits totalling \$938 million over the next four years), the government has discarded this measure and says it will now use the net operating balance measure. How convenient.

I draw the house's attention to an article that appeared in *The Advertiser* of 28 February, entitled 'State to get extra \$69 million in GST funds.' It confirmed what I am saying to the house, that GST payments to South Australia will rise by \$69.3 million this year alone under new recommendations for the annual commonwealth revenue carve-up. Of course, this is not a benefit confined to South Australia. New South Wales is to receive \$277 million extra, a total of

\$14.89 billion; Victoria gets \$64 million, a total of \$11.241 billion; Queensland gets \$166.4 million less, to \$10.119 billion; Western Australia gets \$271.6 million less, to \$4.79 billion; and South Australia gets \$69.3 million extra, to \$4.59 billion. And so it goes on. Queensland and Western Australia are going down and South Australia is going up. How good does it get? It does not get much better than this.

There would not have been an easier five years in the history of this state for any member to have become Treasurer. It could never have been any easier. Quite seriously, there has not been a single challenge to any budget in the last five years that any treasurer around the states or any past treasurer of this state would consider to have been significant. It has been a breeze: nothing but a breeze. The context in which the state economy finds itself is most relevant to this budget, because it is this budget and this bill that we look to to keep the machinery of government going so as to sustain that

economic growth. I know that the government talks about spinning up the good news, but it is not all good news. It is not all good news when you compare our performance to that of the other states with which we must compete.

The ABS figures for January 2007 show that South Australia's trend unemployment rate of 5.5 per cent is the highest on mainland Australia. The seasonally adjusted headline unemployment rate of 5.7 per cent is the equal highest in the nation. During Labor's term, employment opportunities in South Australia have increased at a lower rate than in the rest of Australia. The government is out there saying, 'Look: employment growth's increased: aren't we great!' They just forget to tell you that it is two or three-fold elsewhere. Again, it is just smoke and mirrors. Since March 2002, if we had kept pace there would have been 18 639 extra jobs on top of what we have had.

In fact, on 9 February 2007 the *Australian Financial Review* stated that 'only South Australia has failed to benefit from the jobs boom'. We have the spin and then we have the reality. South Australia's youth unemployment rate jumped to 39.3 per cent, the highest in Australia. It is consistently above the national average. Business SA is quoted in *The Advertiser* of 9 February 2007 as saying that 'the unemployment rise was reflective of business losing confidence in the state'. The economic growth figures tell a similar story. ABS figures for 2005-06 show that South Australia's overall growth in gross state product during the four years of Labor from 2001-02 to 2005-06 was 9.2 per cent, compared to an Australian growth of 13.3 per cent. We are behind the nation.

South Australia's growth was the second worst of all the states and territories. During 2005-06 our growth was 2.2 per cent, compared to an Australian growth average of 2.8 per cent; again second worst. The mid-year budget papers show that South Australia's growth forecast for 2006-07 is 1 per cent, the lowest forecast for all the mainland states. Let us be truthful when we tell people how we are faring. State final demand figures revealed by the ABS for September 2006 show that South Australia experienced below average economic growth in trend terms for all states and territories over the year to September 2006 (as measured by state final demand) at just 1.8 per cent, compared to an Australian growth of 3.4 per cent.

South Australia's growth in the September quarter 2006 was 0.7 per cent, compared to an Australian growth of 0.6 per cent. ABS figures for exports show that, under Labor, South Australia's exports have fallen by 1.7 per cent, from an annual figure of \$9.1 billion for the 12 months to March 2002 to \$9 billion for the 12 months to December 2006. This is compared with a national increase over the period of 35.7 per cent. Under the Liberals, exports more than doubled from \$3.8 billion to \$9.1 billion. Since March 2002, South Australia's share of national annualised exports has fallen from 7.42 per cent to 5.48 per cent and is continuing to fall. By destination, the collapse since March 2002 has been to the markets of the Middle East, the USA, Japan and, to a lesser extent, New Zealand. The main gain is to the Asian countries and, to a lesser extent, China.

By commodity, wheat and road vehicles, parts and accessories have collapsed since 2002. We are all aware of the dire circumstances that our motor vehicle industry faces, both Mitsubishi and Holden's. This has been offset to some extent by metals and metal manufacturers. The government is putting great hope in this sector and enjoys our full support, but let us not forget those core services and manufacturing businesses that are also vital to our economy. In retail trade,

ABS figures show that over the past year to January 2007, compared to the previous year to January 2006, South Australia's growth was the third worst in the nation: 5.4 per cent compared to an Australian growth of 6 per cent.

As to motor vehicle sales, the latest ABS figures in January 2007 show nine consecutive months when the change in the number of new motor vehicles in South Australia has been worse than the national average. Compared with the previous year to January 2006, South Australia's growth over the past year to January 2007 decreased by 4.6 per cent, compared with an Australian decline of 1.8 per cent. In prices, the news is also worth noting. ABS figures in the December 2006 quarter show that Adelaide's CPI is currently 3 per cent per annum, and Australia's is 3.3 per cent. Since March 2002, Adelaide's CPI has increased by 15.3 per cent; nationally, it is 13.8 per cent. The days of lower CPI increases in South Australia seem to have had their sunset during the life of this government.

Capital expenditure figures provided by the ABS show that, in the year to December 2006, private new capital expenditure in South Australia increased by 6.5 per cent, compared with the year to December 2005, but that this state's increase was the third worst in the nation, across which there was an average increase of 13.9 per cent. So, we have 6.5 per cent growth in capital expenditure here and 13.9 per cent increase across the nation—almost double. As a percentage of national new capital expenditure, South Australia had a high 7.9 per cent in September 2003. At December 2006, it was 6.3 per cent and on a downward trend. On 21 November 2006, *The Advertiser* stated that the latest BankSA Trends Report for November 2006 found that business investment in SA was lagging, as 'investors look for better returns to the north and west' because of the mining boom.

The latest ABS figures show that, in regard to construction work, in the year to December 2006 construction rose by 1.5 per cent compared with the year to December 2005. South Australia's change was the second worst of the states. Nationally, there was an increase of 7.5 per cent; ours was 1.5 per cent. Since March 2002, this state's share of national construction work has fallen from 5.6 to 5.1 per cent. A picture is forming, showing that, despite all the government spin, our performance relative to the other states, and our share of the national economy on a range of measures, continues to decline. In many respects, the fundamentals appear not to have changed.

Let us talk about confidence. The latest BankSA State Monitor in January 2007 shows that business and consumer confidence increased since the last report in July 2006. However, the report notes that the business index is still at the third lowest level for the business sample in the past five years. BankSA research shows that more than 70 per cent of the surveyed businesses have not created any new jobs in the last three months, nor plan to do so in the coming three months. In fact, 63 per cent of businesses said that they had experienced a downturn in turnover or were worried about a possible downturn.

The latest quarterly Business SA survey of SA business expectations for December 2006 shows only the third consecutive fall in confidence, but the confidence index has now sunk to the lowest point (and I emphasise that) during the Labor term of government. Respondents were once again concerned with rising business costs and the risks that these present for the future economic outlook of South Australia. The latest NAB Monthly Business Survey for January 2007

shows that business confidence in South Australia is the lowest of all mainland states and is on a six-month downward trend. Business conditions in this state are rated as the second-best of all mainland states. The latest Sensis Business Index Report for February 2007 shows that business confidence in South Australia improved strongly in the last quarter. However, profitability, employment expectations for the coming quarter and plans for capital expenditure are the lowest in the nation. As to independent commentary, the latest Access Economic Business Outlook Report of December 2006 states of South Australia that:

... we applaud the state's achievement in recent years, but... they were insufficient to halt the long trend to see a shrink as a share of the national economy and national population, and we expect the future to be at least as risky as the recent past.

We are surviving and we are staying alive but, relative to other states, we continue to shrink. That is the independent commentary on our current performance. So, it all gets back to this bill, this budget and this money we are being asked to approve today.

I have talked about how the government is the highest taxing government in the state's history, and this has an impact on the performance of the state economy. I have talked about the problems of state-public sector net debt. I have talked about the risks of borrowing to build infrastructure, attractive though that may seem, and I will talk now about infrastructure and the minister's continued obstinacy on calls from this side of the house for a 20-year infrastructure plan.

I remind the house that this budget will be called on to fund a very shallow infrastructure plan from this government—in fact, it is nothing more than a discussion paper with a five to 10-year window that lists all the projects we would like to do one day, but it does not prioritise them in any meaningful way. It does not determine how much they will cost, what will be done, when it will be done, or how it will be done. It does not do any of those things. There is no overarching framework for infrastructure—little wonder that an increasing number of stakeholders are calling for the government to get moving and to put some of its budget funding and windfall revenues into infrastructure.

The Economic Development Board in its publication *A Framework for Economic Development in South Australia* said:

First, the state needs to coordinate forward infrastructure planning, taking a medium to longer-term outlook to ensure fairer and better outcomes for all parties.

That was on page 96 of its report. The South Australian Freight Council, in *South Australia's Freight Transport Infrastructure*, said this:

The SAFC has released this position paper, including prioritising the state's top nine projects to clearly and objectively identify the infrastructure requirements of the state and support the emerging business and community demand for freight movement over the next 20 years.

That can be looked up on their website. Mr Peter Vaughan, CEO Business SA, in his address to the South Australian Infrastructure Summit in 2005, said this:

I was pleased to see that the government has taken a 10-year approach to guiding new infrastructure development in South Australia; a 20-year plan would have been better, but 10 years is certainly better than the way it is currently done. This longer-term approach will assist business to understand the state's infrastructure priorities and direction.

The RAA in its report *Backwater to Benchmark* said this:

Backwater to Benchmark documents the road infrastructure investment that the RAA believes is needed over the next 15 years to ensure that South Australia remains a great place to live, visit and do business.

Engineers Australia, in its South Australian infrastructure report card, said this:

The report highlights the strategic planning for infrastructure needs to incorporate long-term 20-year plus schedules of works and budgets.

That group also said:

The development of the above plans is encouraging; however, long-term commitment to projects over a 20-year period and a focus on strategic local roads needs to be included.

Mr Steve Shearer, Executive Director, South Australian Road Transport Association, at the South Australian Infrastructure Summit in 2005, said:

Any government that fails to ensure that it provides a comprehensive road transport infrastructure that is fit for purpose today and 30 years into the future is acting negligently.

By any measure, all these people are implying that the government is acting negligently by not having at least a 20-year infrastructure plan. Why are they the odd people out? We have even had the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy, this very week, come out publicly and call for a 20-year infrastructure plan to support growth in the mining industry. When will this government get the message that the people of South Australia want this budget and this bill to provide moneys for long-term investments for the future? Not for just tomorrow, not for just the next election, but for our children and for our grandchildren. That is what statesmanship is about. It is not about the next election, it is about our children and their future.

I have talked about WorkCover liabilities. These too are vital for business to grow and prosper and are another reason why our share of the national economy is declining. I have talked about our AAA credit rating and our unfunded superannuation liabilities, all of which again form part of the business environment within which we expect business to grow and prosper. I have shown, from the information I have provided to the house, that adequate stimulus is not being provided.

In conclusion, the opposition will obviously agree with the Supply Bill and look to see its quick and prompt passage through the house. But I am sure, Madam Deputy Speaker, that you will be hearing from members on this side of the house about funding shortfalls. The reality is—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes; all of them; every one of them.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Attorney-General can quip. If he would like to contribute to the debate, I would be interested to hear what he has got to say. The reality is that he and his colleagues have had more money come in over the last five years—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You are hopeless.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Attorney says that what I have had to contribute is hopeless. I would suggest he looks at the facts and figures for business and the people of South Australia before he makes such silly remarks. The reality is that, with the billions and billions of dollars of windfall tax gains that this government has received, and with so little to show for it, this government has some explaining to do. You can get away with this sort of fiscal recklessness when times are good.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Five balanced budgets; a record majority. How old will you be in 2014?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Attorney wants to get into a debate. The Attorney wants to crow about the last election result, he wants to say the government is answerable to no-one because it had such a good election result and therefore it does not need to answer any of the concerns being raised by stakeholders or others in the house about its fiscal mismanagement. I just say to the Attorney, if that is his view, that is an arrogant view.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You are the only Liberal ever to go to preferences in Waite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Well, he wants to crow again about preferences and election outcomes and all sorts of issues like that. Again—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Why don't you look after your electorate?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Here we go, he wants to enter into a debate. What he does not want to talk about is the government's fiscal mismanagement. What he does not want to talk about is where the billions of dollars have gone. What he does not—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What about your neglect of your own electorate?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Here he goes; he is going again. I love it when the Attorney-General interjects. He usually comes up with the most inane, baseless, stupid comments, and there is rarely an opportunity to respond. It is delightful to be on my feet so I can just remind people when they read *Hansard* what a goose we have as an Attorney. No; sorry, I take that back. I do not want to refer to the member as an animal, although perhaps if I called him a wily fox or a clever owl or something he might not take offence, but I would not want him to bound about. All these interjections are pointless and I just encourage him—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So, why did you almost lose your seat? What is it about you that your electorate rejects you?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Here we go again. Can you get a grip of the Attorney, please, Madam Deputy Speaker?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney, please come to order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am hoping to wrap up. If the Attorney will just button his lip, we can wind up. The simple point that I have made is that the government has had billions of dollars of windfall revenues over the last five years. However, our share of the national economy has continued to wither on the vine. There have been improvements. We have gone forward, but it has been at a snail's pace while other states have galloped forward. Not only that, there is little to show for the windfall gains in terms of infrastructure investments, just as there is little to show of a meaningful measure in health, education and, frankly, law and order.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Five years of declining crime rates, what about that?

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, but they are not all declining, Attorney, if you would like to read them. As you yourself have acknowledged, in good economic times that tends to happen. It is the bad economic times that tend to bring out the worst when it comes to law and order statistics. The fact is you have enjoyed the best of times and, as I have said, four monkeys in a VW could have run a budget in these buoyant economic times. Instead, we probably have 15 monkeys in a VW, but I had better take that back before—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: On a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker, the member for Waite has referred to ministers in this house as animals and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I am terribly sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker, I will withdraw that instantly, and I will get back to my generalism that four monkeys in a VW could have run this budget, and I think it is true. I will not hold up the house any longer.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How come you almost lost your seat? Can you explain that? How did that happen?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I think I have made my points. You will never get Waite. I will just say this to the Attorney, as he probably found in 1993, when there is a swing on, there is a swing on, and everybody cops it. You will get to learn that again one day, Attorney. What was the swing in your seat in 1993, by the way?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: 6 per cent.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Very interesting, 6 per cent. I think the government needs to get its fixed costs down before the economy turns and its revenues start to diminish, because the real concern that I have is that it has so cranked up its fixed costs, particularly in regard to the size of the public sector, that, when the revenue fails, unfortunately perhaps not this government but another will have to clean up the mess they have created yet again, as they run the state progressively into debt and as they struggle with the increased costs that they have ratcheted up during good times. Just like any other business when they have frittered away the income from those good times, they have ratcheted up their fixed costs. They will not be able to deal with it, they will run up their debt and their budget and they will turn their budget into deficit. There will be a period of several years of pain and agony like last time as they realise, and as the public of South Australia realises, that they have been an incompetent fiscal government. Then they will get turfed out like they did last time and we will have to come in yet again to sort out the mess they have created during a buoyant economic period. We will then have to go through a process of rebuilding and restructuring in order to sort out the state, just like we had to do last time, and just like Liberal governments have to do all the time when Labor raids the treasury bench.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): In 1984 when my family and I moved back to South Australia from Western Australia, we had been through some pretty horrendous financial experiences when a company I was working for went broke and owed us a lot of money, so we came back here and we lived in a tin shed for 18 months. We were paying 17 per cent on the mortgage and 23 per cent on the overdraft. We thought that things could not get much worse and, for us, they did not because of a lot of hard work. But for this state, things went backwards rapidly and they culminated in the State Bank disaster in the early 1990s, and we all remember that. In this house, we remember it well.

Some young people out there who voted in the last election and who will be voting in forthcoming elections do not remember it, but I guarantee that I will be making sure they know about the parlous condition that this state was left in by the state government in 1993 when there was an \$11 billion debt, and the current Treasurer and Premier were there. The Premier had his feet under the cabinet table and I think the Treasurer was an adviser at that stage; he might have been a member of parliament, I am not sure. But they were there and they were playing the political games. They

thought they were the masters of the universe, but we saw what happened when it imploded on them, and the State Bank disaster will be there as a badge of shame for them for the rest of their political lives. They can never ever forget that. If the Attorney wants it, I can give him a copy of an election poster from that time. Randall Ashbourne wrote a wonderful story about the disaster that this government had left the state in; 'Never Again' are the words on the poster, and it will never happen again with the opposition watching as closely as we do. We remind the government of where it has been and where we are going.

This government is awash with funds, and we have heard from the member for Waite that it has billions of dollars more from the GST, which Premier Rann and the Treasurer opposed. Standard and Poor's pointed out very succinctly in a number of reports why we have the AAA rating here in South Australia: it is because of the way the debt was reduced by the Liberal Party. While the Treasurer will not ever admit it publicly, he knows that privately he supported the sale of ETSA because it was the only way that debt was going to be reduced. I wish he had the courage to come out and say that it was an unfortunate thing that was forced upon this state. Let us never forget what else was happening at that time. The national electricity market had been foisted upon us by the then Labor federal government. The extra \$2.9 billion that this government is getting above what the last Liberal government had when in government equates to the whole education budget. I think it is the second-biggest budget spend after health, and so it should be. In fact, it should be more.

We are not seeing real increases in the education budget. If we look at real spending, we see that it is below the education CPI (we cannot judge it on the normal CPI; there is a health sector CPI and an education sector CPI). Spending in the education budget is going backwards. The minister comes in here and says that there is a 40 per cent increase in spending per student, but we have to remember that there are many fewer students. I think 1 400 students shifted from the state to the private sector last year, and that needs to be examined. It is interesting to see the federal Labor opposition's attitude to funding state and independent schools. Things are moving very quickly.

I am continually amazed at the opportunities this government has had with the extra funding yet we have seen little, other than a lot of posturing and rubbery figures. This government, with the increases in taxation in this state, is now the highest taxing state government. We hear that all the time but it is a reality—yet this state government has not given any relief, other than some very marginal relief in payroll tax (which was an initiative of the Liberal government). I would love to see payroll tax completely abolished; it is a disincentive to employment. I am not the treasurer (I do not claim to be) and I do not know the total costing, but I know from talking to friends and family and others in business that they have particularly engineered their businesses to stay under that payroll tax threshold. I am sure that is the case in many other businesses, so payroll tax relief—if not the complete abolition of payroll tax—is something this government should be investigating.

There is no stamp duty relief for struggling first home buyers. Personally, I would like to see home mortgages becoming tax deductible. I know that it is a federal issue, but I believe it is something at which governments of both persuasions should be looking. There is a cost, but economic times are good and, as we are looking at ways of getting

people (particularly young people) into their first home, I think the mortgage on a first home should be tax deductible. However, that is an argument for another day. Property taxes have certainly gone up, and the disincentives to buying property these days are a significant consideration for property buyers—whether it is your first home, your only home, or an investment property. Conveyance stamp duties have risen 24 per cent more than budgeted and the government is collecting more than \$1 billion in property taxes this year. That is huge money.

There is no significant land tax relief. I have business owners in Glenelg who have come to me and said, 'What can we do? We are paying over \$1 000 a week in land tax,' and this applies particularly to hospitality businesses. In fact, one of them is paying \$1 200 in land tax. Obviously, they are not paying it on a weekly basis, but that is what it works out to. It is a significant impost, a significant disincentive to stay in business. We should be looking at that because the experience industry—tourism, arts, sport and recreation—is a big future for South Australia, and when a business is paying such big dollars just to stay in business you really have to scratch your head and wonder where the state is going.

We have seen mismanagement in the past with the State Bank and we are seeing blow-outs now. The thing about the Liberal policy on reducing Public Service numbers is that we were honest about it. We said that we would try to reduce Public Service numbers—not sack public servants, as has been portrayed by those on the other side. We would have offered TVSPs to try to reduce numbers by 4 000—and why wouldn't you do that, when the government actually budgeted for an increase of 1 135 extra public servants and ended up with an extra 8 885? That is a total increase of more than 7 500 above what was budgeted—and with that comes wages and all the ongoing costs, with a blow-out of more than \$500 million a year.

I have no problem with spending on extra teachers, extra SSOs, extra support staff. Just this morning, in the paper, we have read about the pressures on teachers; they are having to become de facto parents. That should never have happened. The Social Inclusion Board should be getting out there in the community and determining why teachers are having to take on these loads, why they are having to feed kids in the morning, why they are having to look after all their social welfare issues. It is an indictment that both sides of this house need to think about in terms of where we are going and the way communities are operating—or not operating—these days.

The member for Waite has gone through the other budget blow-outs involving transport and infrastructure, so I will not go over them again, but there are certainly other areas where we have seen cost blow-outs. We have the State Bank mark 2 (as some are calling it) on the horizon—WorkCover's unfunded liability. I am not an accountant or the Treasurer: I am simply reading from some figures that have been provided to me—and I have no reason to disbelieve them because everyone I speak to out in business, who has anything to do with WorkCover, assures me that it is becoming a serious issue for this state. If the unfunded WorkCover liability is nearly \$700 million as of June last year, and rapidly heading north towards the \$1 billion mark, that is a significant concern for every South Australian because, on those figures, it is about \$460 for every man, woman and child in this state. The government needs to look at that seriously, and not come in here with bluster and bluff and rubbery figures.

The performance of the former Liberal government is knocked by this current government, but you need to look at the history in real terms—not moving the goal posts, as we see happening all the time. The Rann government claims that the former Liberal government never balanced a budget: that is wrong. The former Liberal government cleaned up the Labor government's State Bank mess, as I have said—and let us not forget that was a debt of \$11.6 billion, involving an annual deficit of more than \$300 million. For the last five years of the Liberal government the budget was balanced with very small surpluses in most years—yet where did we start from? They were offset by very small deficits in two years; not bad considering we started with an \$11.6 billion deficit—and we certainly were not getting the GST windfall that this government has received.

As the member for Waite noted, the former New South Wales auditor-general, Tony Harris, pointed out quite succinctly that there was an accounting fiddle with South Australian Government Financing Authority money to make it look as though there was a black hole in the last Liberal budget. That was not true, but that's politics. When we see that in the New South Wales election some \$116 million was spent on advertising to promote the Labor government—\$100 million of which was public money—we realise that Mike Rann's government has a long way to go. Members opposite are spending big bucks on promoting themselves and Mike Rann (as Premier) has said, 'Every time you see the face of a politician in an advert or on a TV commercial you know it is pure politics.' That is what we are seeing here and we expect to see more of it. We are seeing it already in some areas, but we can expect to see a lot more of it over the next few years.

I want to talk about my portfolio areas of education, arts and Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation. We know that the education budget at \$2.9 billion is the second biggest spend by this government. It is a huge spend. The minister keeps saying that it is a 40 per cent increase per student on what was spent under the former Liberal government. I have asked her to justify that, but we have not seen the justification in here. School governing councils are telling me they are seeing about a 5 per cent increase in spending. Also, we are seeing cuts of over \$170 million in education spending and in some areas where schools are vulnerable they are finding it very hard, indeed. The government says in its budget papers that it is spending \$216 million on the Education Works strategy. It is not spending \$216 million: it is expecting \$134 million in private investment and \$82 million in government investment over four years.

The PPPs have not yet been finalised. If one reads the New South Wales Auditor-General's Report on their PFPs (privately financed projects) there are significant concerns. We have seen the PPPs in police stations here and, if one looks at the costings, there have been blow-outs. PPPs are privatisations of schools. Those schools will be privately owned. They will be on land that is owned by private developers. This is privatisation—something which this government seems to abhor. If we are getting better schools and facilities—and I would not object to some of the rundown schools being rebuilt or even closed as a result of proper consultation, not the type of consultation we have seen under this government—that's fine, but let us do it so that we get the best value for money. What is the cost of the money that these private investors will be putting in? I guarantee it is far less than the government could borrow if it went out and did it.

The \$56.2 million over four years budgeted to upgrade school infrastructure is something one needs to look at to see how and where it is being spent. Certainly, in 2006-07 it is only \$11.8 million, and only \$7.3 million is for actual school infrastructure. Some \$2.9 million has been allocated for the commencement of 10 new trade schools. The new woodwork and metalwork centre, the new technical studies centre, at Nuriootpa High School is costing \$3.1 million. Where is the other money coming from? We have heard criticism in this place about the Australian technical colleges. Well, when I went to Parachilna on Friday for the Isolated Children's Parents' Association meeting I had a presentation from the principal of the Spencer Gulf Australian Technical College, and this is working in synergy with DECS schools.

It is not pulling people out of DECS schools but, rather, working in collaboration with them. Why? It is to give jobs to kids. We know that the employment rate for young people is about 40 per cent. It is an absolute shame on this state. We should be doing everything we can, whether it be working with private developers and getting the best value for money or working with the federal government-funded Australian technical colleges, to get jobs for kids and to keep them in school with the best resources and the best funding we can.

Some \$1.5 million has been allocated in the 2006-07 budget for 10 new children's centres. I have spoken to Dr Fraser Mustard and I am really impressed with him. He has a lot of information and a lot of good philosophies, as well as some good biologies, physics and neurobiology, and some good policy proposals for both sides of this house. Certainly, early childhood development centres should and will be promoted by the Liberal opposition; and I hope they will be promoted and funded by this government.

The big question is about the way in which this budget is being managed. Where has the money gone? People keep asking me, 'If this government has so much money, why do we have cuts in the small schools program, the aquatics program, the instrumental music program and the Be Active Let's Go program? Why are we cutting district support officers from 18 to three to manage 700 sites? Why are we cutting the special reading teachers program? Why are we cutting the gifted children's policy adviser?'

Former minister White opposed these programs. Minister Lomax-Smith will walk out of cabinet over the Parklands but she will not walk out of cabinet over cuts to education. Where is her devotion to her duty? Minister White opposed them and would not let them get through cabinet—but not this minister. We need to ask where education in this state is going. Greg Smith said that there was \$1.6 billion worth of budget cuts last time. We have seen only half that. We will see more cuts in the budget in a few weeks. We will see more schools closed. This government has a track record of closing schools. When they were last in office they closed 63 schools and over 1 200 teachers and SSO jobs went. That will happen again. Greg Robson, a director of the Department of Education and Children's Services, has said already that he cannot guarantee teachers' jobs with the development of the new megaschools—Jane's jungles, as we are calling them.

I will mention briefly the arts portfolio. There are some 16 000 employees in the arts. We need to be spending money in this area because it is vital. Members of this place should read my speeches on development of the North Terrace precinct. I want this government to spend on arts infrastructure. I want to see a Guggenheim museum or a similar development on North Terrace; a cultural centre; contemporary arts facilities; expansion of the Convention Centre; a

national children's museum; and a national space museum. It is the perfect place for it. We should not build apartments and other things from developers' wish lists. The money needs to be spent. The cost of not spending that money is something this government needs to consider.

I am really pleased to have the portfolio of Aboriginal affairs and reconciliation, because it is one I have been passionate about for many years since I first started teaching at Port Augusta High School and got to know some of the Aboriginal kids and their families, as well as some of the challenges they faced and the opportunities up there. There are significant issues and there are huge opportunities. Yesterday we were given a presentation by ETSA, which will help develop an apprentice training school at Port Augusta with the aim of training indigenous employees in its various departments.

Health, education and social welfare are significant issues for Aboriginal communities in South Australia. I hope that, through the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, this government is serious about progressing those issues. As the shadow minister, I am more than happy to work with the minister in this area to make sure that we not only progress the issues but also grab the opportunities because, certainly, they do deserve it. With those few words, I support the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: This will be good!

Mr PISONI (Unley): I acknowledge the Attorney-General revving up, getting ready to interject and correct me on my English as I speak to the Supply Bill. I can imagine what it must be like when he is doorknocking his electorate and people tell him of their concerns. Just imagine what it is like if they use the word 'less' instead of 'fewer' in their description of what they want to do about police presence. Can members imagine his barking back at them, 'Fewer, fewer, fewer' or 'less, less, less'. You can just imagine the sight it would be. Anyway, thank you for that, Attorney-General.

The Rann government is the highest taxing government in South Australia's history. Taxes are up by nearly 45 per cent or close to \$1 billion compared to the last year of the former Liberal government. Tax and revenue collections continue to rise, but there is no financial relief for long-suffering families and businesses and no stamp duty relief for struggling first home owners. It is getting more difficult for young Australians to enter the home market. The first home buyer now pays more in Rann government stamp duty than they receive from the generous Howard government's first home owner's grant for the average home.

The first home owner's grant is \$7 000, and stamp duty on the average home valued at around \$220 000 comes in at about \$9 000. They must borrow an extra \$2 000 from the bank to buy a home even though they have received a \$7 000 first home owner's grant. There are no extra concessions or financial assistance for older South Australians, and there is no payroll tax relief. South Australia has the highest payroll tax in the country and the lowest threshold. We are seeing our manufacturing industry hammered by competitors and, in particular, it is being hammered by products coming in from China and outsourcing to China.

Payroll tax collections will be 40 per cent higher this year than in the last year of the former Liberal government. Do not forget that, in this state, payroll tax kicks in at \$504 000, which includes, of course, superannuation contributions to staff and payments to directors. Small family companies

employing as few as five or six staff are writing out a cheque to the state government for \$5.50 for every \$100 they pay to staff. We had the loss of 600 jobs at GMH a couple of weeks ago and here we have the Premier calling for the federal government to reduce its tariff reduction plans for the car industry (plans that were put in place by a former Labor government, I must say) to reduce tariffs to make them world competitive and to make them as efficient as possible.

The Premier (Hon. Mr Rann) was telling us that the quick fix for our motor industry would be to reduce the tariff regime, but Mr Rudd does not agree. Mr Rudd said, 'No, that can't be done; that won't be done.' We have Mr Rann saying it should be done and Mr Rudd saying it won't be done. If the government wants to make a difference to our manufacturing industry, if it wants to help, it will remove this reverse tariff on our manufacturing industries—a cheque for \$5.50 for every \$100 on your payroll is written to the state government. One must consider that manufacturing consumes enormous amounts of labour.

This is an unfair tax. It is a tax on innovation and a tax on jobs in South Australia. What is interesting is that, not long ago, I was fortunate enough to visit a constituent's business. He is an electrical engineer and he showed me the work he is doing. He identifies robots which he purchases from Japan and which he then programs to do unskilled labour. A locally-owned irrigation company was recently bought out by an international group, and an ultimatum was given: 'reduce costs or we will be going offshore.' Of course, labour is a significant cost and payroll tax is a big part of that labour cost—remember, a cheque is written to the state government for \$5.50 out of every \$100.

Consequently, a \$500 000 investment of a conveyor belt configuration was built. Cameras and robots were purchased and they were programmed to put irrigation pieces together 24 hours a day, work that 20 unskilled people would otherwise do. So 20 unskilled workers were gone, and it is unfortunate that they had to move to this. However, the upside here, of course, is that we were seeing smart business practices and smart businesses keeping our manufacturers here in South Australia, even though there was a cost of losing or shedding staff in order to do so. That is happening throughout the manufacturing industry. One way that we can relieve this, of course, is to substantially reduce the tax on employment that we have with payroll tax.

This government claims in the budget that over the next five years a further \$296 million of taxes will be cut, taking the total amount of tax relief, since coming to office, to over \$1.57 billion by 2010-11. This claim is a furphy, as \$296 million is a revised number on the tax relief package that was announced in the last budget. The tax relief package was forced by Peter Costello as a result of the GST negotiations with the commonwealth which were originally negotiated by the former Liberal government. Most of the land tax relief only starts to kick in in 2009 and 2010.

Land tax is another interesting one. The history of land tax goes back to the motherland in the UK, and it was really set up to stop the commoners, if you like, from joining the aristocracy in terms of owning property, and it was a barrier to stop them from owning property. I believe that is what is happening today. The classic example in my electorate concerns a Greek gentleman in his late 50s who had been working in a cardboard-box factory all his life, and this included working the afternoon shift, which gave him a few extra dollars. Several years ago he was wise enough to purchase an investment property in the electorate, and he was

paying that off while he was renting it out. For many in the community, owning property is a sense of security and a sense of securing a person's future in their retirement so they are not relying on government handouts and pensions when they have retired and are no longer working. This gentleman was doing well, so he decided to lash out and spend \$50 000 on a shack, and his land tax went from \$600 last year to \$1 200 this year because he spent \$50 000 on a shack. So shame on him, shame on him for going out there and enjoying some of the rewards of his hard work.

It is about time that we stopped being embarrassed about our success and about those who are successful in this society. That is what land tax does: it punishes those who make a success of themselves, as well as those people who make sacrifices in their younger life in order to become self-sufficient and secure in their later life and live individual lives over which they have control. But the Labor Party does not feel comfortable with that; they do not like people being in control of their lives. That is why for many years they allowed compulsory unionism to run rife through the industry.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Which industry is this?

Mr PISONI: All industries. The Attorney-General asks me for an example, and I will give him one. When I was a young apprentice one of my mentoring tradesmen must have been quite taken, I think, by my attractive good looks and suggested that I sign up to a modelling and casting agency, and I was fortunate to be chosen for a couple of TV commercials and as a movie extra. However, I could not participate without joining the union.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Which union was that?

Mr PISONI: That was the media union. I am not into the factionalism and the name changes. The unions change—they go from left to right. The gasfitters union was the Duncan Left, and now it is the right wing. Is the transport workers union the right now? Does the Attorney-General agree with me that that is what has happened? They are very ideologically based too, aren't they! Where will I get my preselection from this time around? The left or the right? Hang on, let's shift it around. Let's take the left union to the right union.

Mr Griffiths: It's a raffle.

Mr PISONI: That is where the vacancy is. There is an upper house vacancy over here for somebody from the right; I want that; let us convince the members to shift from the left to the right! I am sure that Mr Wortley is enjoying his position in the upper house, using that formula—and congratulations to him. I certainly enjoyed the time I shared with the Hon. Mr Wortley on the Prospect council. We both fought for a very strong cause on that council, and that was the banning of burning in backyards. I must say that we were successful in the end in putting that ban through. I can stand proud in this chamber, knowing that the Hon. Russell Wortley and myself were responsible—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Here we go! Thank you, Attorney-General. It must pain you so much to deal with so many working-class people in your electorate, to listen to them and correct their English. I have a strong admiration for you, and I know how passionate you are about politics and how you will put up with anything to stay here. I understand that. The point I was making earlier is that I think I made four appearances when I was moonlighting as a movie extra and as a model. But for seven or eight years the union chased me for membership—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So your career came to an end because you wouldn't join a union: is that it?

Mr PISONI: My career came to an end because I realised the limits of my abilities as an actor and as a model. However, I must say it was a very pleasant way to meet people. I kid you not: they were chasing me for seven or eight years. They were sending me nasty, intimidatory letters threatening legal action if I did not pay up my \$60 or \$70 that it was at that time—which was a substantial amount of money. As a first-year apprentice I was earning only \$60 a week.

It was also the first time—and I do not think that I have been there since—that I visited the Adelaide Club. It was a set, and I was there at 6 o'clock in the morning when we were getting ready for a scene. It was *Robbery Under Arms*, where I was a barrel roller, and it was a great experience. Getting back to property taxes, the Rann government is the first government in South Australia's history to collect more than \$1 billion in property taxes. We are looking at \$1.194 billion in the 2006-07-year. Conveyancing and stamp duties collected in 2005-06 by the Rann government were 24 per cent higher than budgeted for, at \$116 million. We would argue that this is another broken promise of the Premier.

With land tax, the land tax relief packages announced in early 1985 had little effect and collections are continuing to rise. What businesses do when a situation changes is adjust for the changes, but not land tax. We have seen enormous increases in property values in the last four or five years, and home ownership in South Australia has gone from costing just over two times annual salary for the average house to five times annual salary for the average house, which of course means that properties are costing a lot more. Investment properties are costing more. We are seeing a shortage of rental properties because people in the rental market are selling their properties to owner/occupiers who can afford them, so we are seeing bidding now for rent. Property tax is a severe impediment for people who wish to be independent and those who see property as security.

We have seen a very large GST windfall with this government, and this is a GST that was bitterly opposed by the Labor Party, both federally and state. There are some great lines in *Hansard* from the then opposition leader, the member for Ramsay and the then shadow treasurer, the member for Port Adelaide condemning the GST, saying how terrible it would be for working families, how terrible it would be for the economy and how unfair it would be for the states. Of course, what we are seeing is an extra \$3 billion a year on the budget. The Rann government is collecting an extra \$1.69 billion in GST over the seven-year period above what it would have collected in GST on the figures that were collated and worked upon when this deal was being sorted out. So, it is a bonus over and above the budgeted and estimated amounts.

The annual GST benefit to the state is steadily increasing at over \$400 million a year, and by 2009-10 all the GST collected comes back to the states. Where we saw the Premier and the Treasurer telling us what an awful thing this was and pleading that it not go ahead, we now see them rubbing their hands. It is the major contributor to the government's budget and gives the government the flexibility it needs to run the state—and all that extra money for television advertising. How often do we see the Premier's face on TV, not actually telling us what the issues are but telling us that he is here for us, he is doing this for us? And it is all paid for by GST money.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Is he a member of Actors Equity, says the member for Morphett.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He is a member of the Media Alliance.

Mr PISONI: It should be Actors Equity. The Attorney-General says that he is a member of the Media Alliance, but it should be Actors Equity because he really does put on an act for the cameras every time they are there.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Actors Equity is part of the Media Alliance; there was an amalgamation.

Mr PISONI: Amalgamation, was there?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes.

Mr PISONI: I cannot keep up with the internal politics of the Labor Party. I try, but it is a difficult job. Of course, I will support the Supply Bill but, in saying so, it should be noted that the government is in the position that it is in today, to have an increased budget at a comfortable budget expenditure, because of the hard work of the previous state Liberal governments in fixing up the mess of 1993. I recall that the Attorney-General was so embarrassed about the mess that he did not even have the Labor Party logo on his election posters for the 1993 election. And it worked for him: the independent member for Croydon. On that note, I commend the motion.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): It is really nice to see you gracing the chair, Mr Acting Speaker. We have seen a great deal of you in the media of recent times. Obviously, you are positioning yourself for greater things. And we are waiting with bated breath. Tonight we are talking about appropriating some \$2 billion from general revenue towards the services of the state, and I am pleased about that. What I am not happy about is that in my constituency the Minister for Education and her boffins are going to take the school bus away from Spalding and they are interfering with the administration of the School of the Air in Port Augusta, which I really think takes the cake. It has been a very well-run organisation with hard working, dedicated people, and it has provided a great service. As to the latest technology, I do not know whether you have been there, Mr Acting Speaker, but it is really worth while seeing how they have upgraded the technology so that the teachers can actually see their students on their isolated stations. It is really first class. I cannot understand for the life of me why they have downgraded the position to a deputy principal.

A small amount of money is involved in relation to the school bus at Spalding, when people in those rural areas are really suffering. There is a great deal of stress in that part of South Australia due to circumstances beyond people's control. Why put more stress on them? Surely, it is a small ask to have a school bus to take children to school, to take them home and to use on excursions. It is really not a big ask when we have a government that is not short of money. I think that it is pretty mean and miserable.

The next issue of concern to me is the changed arrangements at the School of the Air and in relation to how hospital boards will operate. It is very difficult and unfortunate, because I believe that local communities have supported their hospitals and have been a great deal of help to them. If they lose their association, by not having effective involvement with the hospital through those boards, we really are going down the wrong track. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MONARCH COLLEGE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): In response to a series

of questions asked by the deputy leader during question time, I have been advised that Monarch College in India is licensed to use TAFE SA learning materials for the Advanced Diploma in Hospitality Management. The program for which they use the materials is delivered in India. The college issues its own qualifications, not a TAFE SA parchment. Graduates who have successfully completed can be recommended to TAFE SA to enrol in the TAFE SA degree in Hospitality Management online.

Last year, the first cohort of students from Monarch studied the degree online. They received mentoring from Indian teachers, as well as the standard online assistance provided by TAFE SA. There was a problem in this first year, in that Monarch attempted to inappropriately fast-track some students through sections of the award. This meant that some students were not meeting course requirements. By way of example, an instructor teaching Information Technology Management failed some students on the first marking of a paper. The students were able to resubmit in response to a new question; this is usual practice. I have been advised that these papers were submitted to the institute's academic committee, which adjudicated them as having passed.

I am also advised that TAFE SA sent Dr Hank Diverman, a senior manager and a colleague, to Monarch to work with the Indians to resolve the problems. A detailed report has been lodged with TAFE SA and an executive summary is being provided to the TAFE SA academic board. I have been further advised that the problems have been resolved. The first students successfully completed the degree, and their results have been accepted by the TAFE SA academic board, which is chaired by Mr Graham Brown from UniSA.

This underscores the fact that our quality systems are in place and that they work. Through these systems, TAFE SA was able to identify problems with the delivery of the degree course to Monarch College students and was able to act effectively to resolve these problems to the satisfaction of all parties.

[Sitting suspended from 5.57 to 7.30 p.m.]

SUPPLY BILL 2007

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Prior to the dinner adjournment, I was making a few comments in relation to the difficulties that people are having with respect to the cutbacks in school bus services. I received an interesting letter a few days ago from the Brinkworth Primary School, and this reflects what is happening in a number of areas around South Australia. The letter states:

Please find enclosed copy of a letter to Chris Robinson, Chief Executive, Department of Education and Children's Services, referring to a safety issue concerning our local school bus route. Also enclosed are various attachments associated to this letter for your perusal. We are seeking your valued support regarding this matter, as there have been quite a number of cutbacks within country communities along these lines. As a school, we feel as though all of our lifelines, in particular, our school bus route, have been slowly cut back to a point that has become a burden to the department instead of an asset. In previous years our school bus route has been shortened by some 20 kilometres, and when we asked for 2.5 kilometres, going through the correct channels, the request has fallen on deaf ears, even when there is a safety issue involved.

I put it to the Minister for Education and Children's Services that there is a need to maintain these services and, for

goodness sake, they should not continue to make life as difficult as they possibly can for people in rural areas. That just reflects what is taking place—and I have also mentioned the great concern and difficulties with respect to the Spalding school.

I am pleased that the Minister for Health is here, because I want to make one or two comments about the new proposals for country hospital boards. I had no problem at all when the minister decided to get rid of regional boards. I publicly supported the call. However, I am concerned that he got rid of the boards, but he may have kept the bureaucracy. We do not need to keep the bureaucracy if we do not have the board. I truly believe that there is a very real need to maintain effective local involvement and representation in relation to local hospitals.

Any changes that are made must have the support of the members of the local communities, because they feel that they have ownership of those hospitals, and they have done a great job in supporting them. In many cases, they built the original hospitals, and they still want to be involved. Unless they have a feeling of ownership and are in a position to influence many of the decisions, not only will they feel let down but they also will not want to be involved. It is very important that the minister's boffins down in the bowels of government do not get their hands on the control and pull all the shots, because these people (as well meaning as many of them are) are occasionally misguided and insensitive to local needs.

The next matter I want to talk about is the urgent need in Port Augusta and other places for a safety house. Some action has to be taken to ensure that vulnerable young people are not roaming the streets at 2 o'clock in the morning out of control, certainly in harm's way and causing real problems to those communities. The police have a difficult role if they have to collect them. Where will they put them? The parents are not prepared to look after them and guarantee that they will stay at home. If they do not beat the police back onto the street, there is a need for a safe house where they can be properly looked after.

In Ceduna, Port Augusta and other places there are facilities where intoxicated people can be taken. There will be a cost involved, but I believe that the cost will be far more in favour of the taxpayers than our doing nothing, because these young people will end up in the correctional services system. If it is good enough to take intoxicated people off the streets, we must ensure that we also take the young people off the streets and ensure that they do not get in harm's way. It is very important that the ongoing spate of vandalism and other antisocial activities is controlled. The other very important thing is to ensure that these young people go to school and are given an education; otherwise, they have no future whatsoever.

My colleague the member for Finnis again raised the matter of the difficulties being created by the insensitive attitude of the Native Vegetation Council and some of its employees. It is clear that the time is long overdue for a complete shake-up and a refocusing of that organisation. This is the time of year when we should be engaging in controlled burn-offs and hazard control. If we take those precautions now, we will protect ourselves for the next summer. We used to do it 25 years ago, but we are not allowed to do it now. When these fires get going, they create chaos and disrupt the whole community. Common sense has gone out the window: it is absolute nonsense.

It is no good that people with academic qualifications and no practical experience or financial involvement are making ill-conceived and foolish decisions. They have been advising ministers for a long time. Most of them do not want change, because they have built up their own empire and bureaucracy. Many of these decisions should be made by the local councils. At the end of the day, we have to be careful that they do not become bureaucrats too—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We have to be careful that they do not.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Tell us more about these bureaucrats from local government.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: As I said to my good friend from Goyder, he is now a member of parliament and not a bureaucrat, and he has to think like a member of parliament.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: A constituent of mine, and a very good CEO he was, too. He was fortunate he had a good local member of parliament to help him.

Mr Pengilly: His wife leads him the right way.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am sure she does. We are all fortunate in that area, I am sure. We have long-suffering members of our family who have supported us over a long time, and who travel the length and breadth of this state. As to the particular changes to that organisation, we have to put some power back into the hands of sensible local people. It is just like what is occurring with the Natural Resources Management Board. Those organisations will distinguish themselves for two reasons. Obviously they have been starved of money by the government, therefore the Sir Humphreys have got on to them and want them to increase the take from the community. In my view, the only people who should impose taxes and charges are elected officials, because we can get rid of them: we cannot get rid of appointed people, and they are insensitive and unwise.

I firmly believe the time has come that all these positions should be elected, and I am looking forward to these people coming before the Natural Resources Committee with their proposals. I am aware of correspondence from a number of councils around the state which are very unhappy, particularly the Whyalla council. It will be interesting to see whether the member for Giles supports her constituents getting whacked \$105 per assessment—\$105. The mayor is very cross about it. He also happens to be a member of the board.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Yes. Nevertheless, I want to know what they have actually done, what they propose to do, how many people they have on their books and various other things, because we will go through a very challenging process.

I sincerely hope that, when the government brings in its budget, sufficient funds will be allocated to upgrade and improve rural roads. The road to Marree is very important, as are a number of others around the state. There is a need to put more money into road maintenance. There is a need to ensure that the services at our local schools are maintained. Schools are being well and truly treated by the commonwealth government, and the commonwealth government is supplying very large amounts of money for road funding and in other areas, but there is a need for the states to match it. I support the appropriation and look forward to furthering my comments during the budget discussions.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I wish to speak briefly on the Supply Bill, which I understand is looking to appropriate some \$2 billion. As a new member of the house, the last 12 months have provided me with an enormous opportunity to learn about the scope of services that government provides. Anybody who has actually worked in industry for a while knows that the resources available to government, no matter at what level, are insufficient to actually carry out the desired outcomes for all communities, and that is a frustration we all live with. That said, I have been pleased to gain an appreciation of many of the areas in which public funds are being used, and I recognise the endeavours of the Rann Labor government. It is important to recognise those endeavours—not results but endeavours. Frustratingly, however, I have also had the opportunity to be advised about the many areas in which financial support is desperately required but is not being provided. We in this place have to recognise that it is not our money. It is actually the money of the 1.5 million people who reside in South Australia. As such, every dollar has to be spent to ensure the greatest possible return on that investment.

I wish to talk briefly about a few issues. First is the unfunded superannuation liability. The fact that it has risen from \$3.2 billion in 2001 to \$6.1 billion as at June 2006 and is expected to hover in the region of \$6.5 billion for the remainder of this decade is beyond belief to me. Between June 2004 and June 2005 alone, the level of unfunded liability rose by \$1.559 billion. Indeed, I ask myself the question: what has been the effect upon the unfunded superannuation liability from the increase in public servant numbers? The 8 000 people additional to what was budgeted over a four-year period from 2002 to 2006 must have had an enormous effect upon the financial position of the state.

Secondly, I raise the issue of WorkCover liabilities. Again under the stewardship of the Labor government—

Mr Koutsantonis: Be honest, be honest.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am. The unfunded liability of WorkCover has blown out to nearly \$694 million as at June 2006, or \$460 for every man, woman and child in South Australia. That has resulted in the WorkCover levy for South Australian employers being higher than in other states, which in turn makes it very difficult for our state to compete nationally. How are we meant to be competitive and to attract business here when we have levies that are far higher than other states?

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: No, it works far better than what you did. That made \$100 million difference, not \$600 million. Questions are continually asked of the minister, but he refers to the new board all the time. I find that interesting. He always says 'new board'. I am advised, however, that this new board has been in place for five years, so what is going on? Things have to change. The South Australian community will not accept the excuses any more. Simply put, they want action, action that will ensure that this liability does not become a choke around the neck of the Australian economy, as Bank SA did in the early nineties.

I wish to speak briefly on regional infrastructure. The regions and the need for them to be recognised is one of the main reasons I sought the opportunity to become a member of parliament. The regions desperately need infrastructure and investment if they are to have a future. As such I was particularly pleased in January this year when Iain Evans, as leader, gave me the opportunity to take on the regional development portfolio as part of my shadow responsibility.

Regional South Australia is crying out for the infrastructure investment that needs to occur to ensure that our future is a positive one. Investment in roads, water, electricity, telecommunications, education, hospitals, aged care, social services and supported accommodation for the intellectually and physically disabled are all vitally required if the future of the regions is to be a positive one.

Our road network is failing. With the lack of commitment to road maintenance, translating into an additional 200 kilometres per year of roads controlled by Transport SA falling into disrepair, something has to happen. In my electorate, people speak to me every day about the poor condition of the roads in our state network. On Yorke Peninsula many of the roads were built probably 70 years ago when the weight of vehicles that travelled on them was very different. One key road for me is the Minlaton to Maitland road.

It is about 44 kilometres in length, but it is like being on a roller coaster; it is continually up and down and the shoulders are very thin. For truck drivers who drive on that road it is just a nightmare. The visitors and grey nomads with their caravans, who contribute enormously to the economy of the state, just think they will not drive on Yorke Peninsula. Yorke Peninsula has 530 000 visitors per year, spending about 1.9 million nights in the area. To ensure it gets maximum return from the tourism market, it needs a better road network. I am advised that it is predicted that transport movements will increase by 40 per cent over the next 20 years. For regional South Australia this actually equates to road transport, because that is all they have. Additional dollars must be committed, and I hope this will be a feature of the next budget. Indeed, the recent report on infrastructure needs by the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy and the apparent support of the Treasurer, if I have read *The Advertiser* correctly, for future budgets to include money to build the required projects is welcomed.

Water supplies in regional areas cannot meet the needs of developing those regions or, in some cases, the peak holiday times. I am aware of various situations during holiday periods when all the properties are occupied and farmers in the adjoining areas are finding that suddenly they have no water for their cattle and sheep. It is getting to the situation where people on the farms and in some towns are turning on taps and no water is coming out. We have to do something about it. Minister Maywald recognised this issue earlier in the year during a cabinet meeting in Port Lincoln and she resolved after that to hold some form of community forum. I believe that was by invitation. I know that some members have communicated to me that other people should have been invited but, hopefully, the outcomes from that will actually be a stimulus for what needs to occur on Eyre Peninsula and other regions in South Australia.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: We live in hope. As a state we must invest in the use of alternative technologies to provide our potable water. Desal technology is used on Kangaroo Island, so why not the Yorke Peninsula or Eyre Peninsula, or even metropolitan Adelaide, as per our announcement in January? I was proud of that because it showed that we had a vision. Our vision was to ensure that South Australia did not have to live with water restrictions. That is what the vision of the government needs to be. It is ours, and we hope from 2010 to be able to make it one of our policies that actually works. This technology has to be a feature of the next budget and future budgets, and we all live in hope and keep our fingers crossed.

Broadband technology access is not just a desire but it is a requirement, especially for those who live in the regions. The current South Australian broadband fund is a vital component of community based applications being lodged with the Australian government. As a resident of a region that has benefited from these funding options—both state and federal—I am also aware that many other regions are desperately in need of support for their programs to make their visions of an up-to-date telecommunications technology become a reality. The 2006-07 budget identified that the Rann government will collect \$2 900 million more than did the former Liberal government of 2001-02. Making this figure even more amazing is the cumulative windfall of revenue increases above the 2001-02 base to the government over the past five years, amounting to \$9 849 million. That is equal to an additional budget for a full financial year of the early 2000 period. When I tell people this, they ask me what it is being used for and what the tangible benefits are.

People question the \$100 million additional whole-of-life cost of the Port River opening bridges. People question the \$31 million being spent on the tram line extension, the blow-out from \$60 million to \$317 million of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment, as they also question the Northern Expressway project which has blown out from \$300 million to \$550 million without even factoring in what the cost of the Port Adelaide road component will be. As mentioned by the member for Waite earlier today, that could be in the region of several hundred million dollars. People also ask me why the Rann government wants to try to save \$2 million by closing, potentially, eight of the 11 aquatics facilities used by schools across South Australia. Remember, saving this \$200 million will come at the cost of 200 direct jobs—

Mr Koutsantonis: \$2 million?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, \$2 million; I think that is what the saving is. I do not think it makes economic sense; it is economic rationalism gone mad. Presumably, it is all in the name of trying to protect the AAA credit rating. ‘Tax relief’ are also two words used by many of the people to whom I speak and who are sick of continually paying enormous sums with no financial relief for long-suffering families and businesses. South Australians are sick of paying high stamp duty costs on property transfers. They are sick of paying payroll tax, which has the lowest threshold of all states and which will in the 2006-07 year be collected to a level 40 per cent higher than that of the last year of the former Liberal government. They are also enormously frustrated by the WorkCover levy costs. They want to make sure that South Australia is competitive. To be competitive it has to review all of these levies to ensure that we do far better than other states and that we attract people to come and live in South Australia again, otherwise our population will not grow. The South Australian Strategic Plan identifies the 2 million population target by 2050. That needs an influx of 10 000 people per year to achieve that.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Unley interjects, asking where the water will come from. It is all linked together, isn't it? It is a crazy situation. Public Service jobs are often referred to and, indeed, the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, today in answer to a question in question time, referred to the policy that the Liberal Party took to the 2006 election of reducing Public Service numbers by 4 000. Our intention was to do that through attrition predominantly, but we were bagged everywhere we went. The government came out and took a

very strong line in the media with that, but the Premier and the Treasurer made a promise not to reduce Public Service numbers. That is okay, I can live with that. People voted on the basis of that, but when we come to the 2006-07 budget, what happens? Public Service reductions. There are actually 1 571 of them. If you add those to the 222 people who accepted voluntary separation packages by June 2006, suddenly we are very close to 1 800 public servants being sacked. The government went to the 2006 election promising no job cuts, and it gave a particular emphasis to the key areas of health, education and police, with all of these being quarantined. Again, what do we find? Yes, efficiency dividends must be created by all departments across all areas.

Some of my colleagues here today have recounted stories involving unions. I have a couple I wish to put on the record. When I left school and started working in January 1979, a condition of my employment was that I had to become a member of the Australian Services Union. I did that readily and I kept my membership in place probably until about 1996 but, in the end, I just gave up out of pure frustration. By that time I was the chief executive officer of a regional council involved in enterprise bargaining negotiations between the union, the employees and the employer. The employees were advised by the union to accept the 2 per cent pay increase for a two-year enterprise bargaining agreement. Now, admittedly the council had made that on the basis that it was in a severe drought period, funding restrictions were very difficult to make, and it was hard to send out rate notices to people to get income that was needed to pay their employees extra; but for a union to accept (basically without fighting) only a 2 per cent increase over two years, I just thought was disgraceful. I was still a member of the union then, so I had two hats to wear: one as being the negotiator but also one as the employee who would actually benefit from that.

Mr Koutsantonis: Which union was it? The ASU?

Mr GRIFFITHS: Australian Services Union, yes. Immediately upon that decision being reached I wrote a letter of resignation.

Mr Koutsantonis: Which year was this?

Mr GRIFFITHS: 1996 or 1997.

Mr Koutsantonis: Ralph Clarke; get stuck into him.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Pin the blame on any person you like. But it was an example of, I thought, the way that unions just do not really care about the people they are meant to represent. My other little experience is with the Australian Workers Union.

Mr Pisoni: Was Ralph secretary then? No; he was gone by then.

An honourable member: It was John Gazzola.

Mr GRIFFITHS: No; I don't think it was John, either. It will come to me. I will think of it one day and we will talk about that.

An honourable member: Obviously a very memorable person.

Mr GRIFFITHS: He was. He held some other job that gave him a bit of extra money. He was a nice guy, but did not know how to actually work on people's behalf. My other experience was with the Australian Workers Union. I had left the ASU by this time, obviously, and was still working for the same council. It came up to enterprise bargaining negotiations for the outside employees of council, and the council had deemed that the situation should be fair for all parties. EB negotiations had basically given away everything that was worth while, and people were getting pay rises and not necessarily creating efficiencies to justify that. It had to be a

win-win situation, but the council at that stage decided that they wanted to ensure that the enterprise bargaining agreement included an allowance to keep them at 4 per cent above the award rate, because the award rate was, with the other EB issues, negotiated out. The union would not accept that.

The council was trying to be fair to its employees but the union just said, 'No; it is too hard, you are involving a third party, we are not prepared to do that,' but it would have always ensured that that safety net option existed for the employees. So, unions do not work—as some members on the other side of the house believe—all the time to try and advantage the people who are members.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: They do not believe that, says the member for Unley. I do support the bill and look forward to the Treasurer presenting his budget in June to the people of South Australia. I do sincerely hope that it delivers all that South Australians actually need, because their needs are immense. The challenges facing this state over the next five to 10 years are worthy of a budget that actually ensures that the future is a positive one. I doubt if the last one delivered that, and the way things are going I doubt if the next one will deliver it either.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I have sat patiently and listened to the bile and vengeance poured out by members opposite, who claim to be anti-higher taxes and then despair at the government not spending more. It seems to me that they have two opposing arguments. One is that they claim that we are the highest taxing government in South Australian history, and they say the figures prove it. My counter to that is that we have used—other than the pokie super tax on the wealthy pokie barons—the same formula for increasing taxes that the Liberal government used. Therefore, had, by some miracle, the ramble opposite been elected in 2002 and re-elected in 2006, the taxing regime that we have in place now would be the same, if not higher. I will explain why it would be higher.

This is the first government, since the introduction of land tax, that has actually cut land tax and increased the tax-free threshold; things that they obviously want to forget and omit from their speeches. But then, in a gross act of hypocrisy, they applaud the benefits of the GST, the largest tax increase foisted upon the Australian people since federation. It has raised more money from the pockets of ordinary men and women of Australia and their families than any other tax in Australian history. So, on the one hand they say to us, 'Taxing is bad; don't tax so much' and then they get up and say, 'But the GST is a great tax; we are raising all this money.' So, when they say to us that South Australia is the highest taxing government in South Australian history, you can say that about every successive state government since federation, and the same can be said about federal governments.

This Howard coalition, this Howard government, is the highest taxing federal government in Australian history but, of course, that does not bother members opposite at all. I have always found these arguments to be a little unfair, especially given that other than the pokie super tax, which we increased, and lowering land tax, we have used the same formula put in place by Stephen Baker. Of course, they all sit there with their jaws dropping to the ground, 'That is not true.' Well, it is true. It is exactly the same tax regime that lot opposite would have had.

I remember—because I have been in this place a lot longer, I think, than almost everyone on the other side, other than the member for Flinders—a front page that *The Advertiser* ran with the then treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas. They generated, through a computer program, Rob Lucas in a sailor's uniform and they called him 'Captain Sensible', because he had a surplus of \$1 million.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Here it is; State Bank. What is next? Are you going to bring up something else from World War II or the Depression? That was a long time ago. It is this government that has changed our spending priorities in order to balance the budget, rectify our AAA credit rating and increase money to services that are important to South Australians; that is, health, education and police. We are the ones who have increased police numbers. We are the first government to recruit against attrition and increase police numbers. We have opened new schools, not closed them. How many schools did the opposition cut? I think they closed 63 schools.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: 63. Then there are our hospitals, and I have often found this fascinating with opposition members, who always claim that we have simply carried through their projects. If they only had another four years! The first eight were very tough. I mean, they had to knock off a popular leader who won them 37 seats, and then scrape home with a minority government. So, that was very hard; it took up all their time for the first eight years.

If they had only had four more years, we would be living in the land of milk and honey! Unfortunately, they lost, and they lost because one of their own ratted on them, and that has always bothered them. That is fine by me. From what I can tell, only one member opposite is moving forward, and that is the member for Goyder. He is the only one looking to the future. He is the only one who is young enough to be around to form a government. The rest of you will be well off into retirement by then, and I know that bothers members opposite. I will be visiting them in their nursing home, wearing gloves because of all the golden staph everywhere and helping to spoon feed them with baby food. I will be there visiting them when Premier Griffiths takes over and the rest of you will have gone off. Let's face it, the way you are acting, with the irresponsible nature of your promises and pledges, will not get you elected. Just recently, the member for Waite said that we are not spending enough on our transport plan and that he is going to come back with—

Mr Rau: He's got a plan.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: He's got a plan. The member for Enfield came up with a very good analogy: he has a plan for a plan. His plan is that he cannot come up with a comprehensive transport policy, although he says that it is about \$100 million, but he cannot give us specifics because he is not in government. So, his plan is, 'Form a Liberal government, I will become transport minister and then, after 12 months, I will have a comprehensive plan.' If that is your platform for government, we are in serious trouble in this state. I have always believed this: to have a strong government, you need a good opposition. I have to say that, other than the member for Goyder, I would not feed the rest of you. Other than the member for Goyder—the only one showing any promise, the only one they are all worried about on the front bench—

Mr Pengilly: He won't even vote for himself.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly. He is a shy, humble lad. He is not pushing his own barrow, but greatness will be thrust upon him, and I hope that I am here to see it. I have to say that, looking around the place, there is not much to choose from. It seems to me that, other than the member for Goyder, the majority of the Liberal opposition is obsessed with Labor Party factional deals, Labor Party unions, what is going on with us internally and federal elections. Very few of them are actually concentrating on what is going on in this state or formulating alternative policies. Very few of them are making considered promises or policy statements. All they are worried about is what the Labor Party is doing and, as long as they are looking inwards, it is good for us.

I have never seen a worse opposition, but there is hope, and the hope is the member for Goyder. It is just a matter of time. I predict that the member for Davenport will last maybe two years, if he is lucky, before you knock him off. It will then be a fight between the member for Waite and the member for Bragg. The member for Bragg will not get any votes because no-one on the other side likes her very much. The member for Finniss will vote for her because it is a deal: he got her mentor's seat, so he has to return the favour. I do not know which side of the faction the member for Unley is on. I cannot quite tell whether he is—

Mr Rau: He's moist.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: —moist, wet or dry. It fascinates me, but I do not spend much time worrying about the Liberal Party because I am more concerned about what this state government is doing for the people of South Australia. When I look around my electorate and see the infrastructure investment we are pouring into the western suburbs, which has been long overdue, I see the QEHL, the Bakewell Bridge and the South Road underpasses. This government is treating the western suburbs with some respect, as opposed to the former government, which closed schools, ruined our beaches by building groynes no-one wanted and gave away our land for \$1 for some development so that millions of dollars could be made.

This government has opened up the state to mining. We will become world leaders in exploration in this state, and that is because of this Premier's bold and aggressive plan to open up our state to investment. What do members opposite say? 'Well, if we had had four more years, we would have done that, too. That would have been our idea.' It sounds so pathetic. What I would like an opposition to do is to get up and say, 'This is my plan.' For example, Victoria Park: what is your plan? In question time today, we heard the Leader of the Opposition get up and say, 'Why have you done this? What are you going to do next?' What is your alternative vision? What would Premier Iain Evans do? How would he get the project up? What is his solution? 'Oh, I would put someone nicer in charge, someone who would talk to the council and reason with it.'

Mr Rau: Like you.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes—like me. I am a reasonable bloke. I am a good negotiator, I think. I would do well. I believe in teamwork. I believe in the team—as long as we do it my way, it is no problem at all! In the last two weeks, the opposition has had a beautiful opportunity to do something about Victoria Park and come out with an alternative vision. Instead, what does it do? It sits on the sidelines. It does not know what to do. Its former premier and leader, who took them to two elections, says, 'It should be built immediately, and it's fine.' Other members are saying, 'No, no, that's not what we want,' and criticise us about an alternative vision.

I have to say that what we have done is perfectly okay. We are a broad church. We can have dissent within our ranks. I always hear Liberals say, 'We are the Liberal Party. We don't bind anyone on anything.' But you can't get a definite answer from the Leader of the Opposition, the alternative premier of this state, on what his plan is. What is his plan?

Mr Rau: He is going to ask the member for Waite.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And when you ask him what his plan is he says, 'Make me a minister and I'll give you one in 12 months.' And you want to be the government! I have to say that, if I was a backbencher in the Liberal Party, I would be saying, 'You've got six months left and then out of the way and give someone else the opportunity to lead.' There are plenty of leaders back there. The member for Unley has a little spark in his eye. He could do it. He reckons he is up to it. I can see a bit of a spark, a bit of a glint, in the member for Hammond's eye as well. Someone who has lightning coming out of his eyes is the member for Goyder. He is someone who has the itch. I do not know about the member for Flinders. I know that she is retiring after a long period of service. I think she came to the parliament in 1985.

Mrs Penfold: 1993.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry—she came in 1993, and I think she has announced her retirement. So there will be a chance for the Liberal Party to put in someone young—maybe a future premier or future leader of the opposition, someone who can compete with the member for Goyder, seeing as there is only one natural heir. Perhaps it will bring in someone who is a bit of a go-getter. I will wait and see, but my bet is that it will be someone over 60, a farmer, and someone who has no leadership aspirations at all. It will be whoever's turn it is next, because the Liberal Party treats the Eyre Peninsula like its own playground and puts up whoever it wants. I bet it will not put anyone up who could be a premier, although I hope it does; the Liberal Party has a responsibility to get ready for the next generation because in 12 or 20 years it might form a government.

Mr Griffiths: A bit sooner than that.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The honourable member says, 'A bit sooner than that.' That is the first time I have heard the member for Goyder say that the Liberal Party can win the next election. When Iain Evans was asked whether the Liberal Party could win, he said he was targeting three seats. I can count, and I can tell you that you have to win a lot more than three seats to form a government. The member for Goyder knows exactly what has to be done to win; Iain Evans wants to win Light, Mawson and Norwood. That's it; he'll stop there. Who does that remind you of? It reminds me of Peter Debman: 'We can't win this election, we are buggered. Please vote for us as a protest.' I cannot believe it. The only bloke who knows how many seats the Liberal Party needs to win is the leader in waiting. I believe the opposition should put him in now, get it over and done with; knock off Hamilton-Smith, knock off Evans, and put him in charge now. Blood him for four years and give him a go; give him two shots at it, guarantee him two shots. The opposition will not do that, because working in the Liberal Party is like working with the most treacherous, deceitful lot of people. John Olsen said that the only ones you could trust in the Liberal Party were the ones who said they were not voting for you—and he should know.

I have a fear for those in the Liberal Party (because I do have a great deal of concern for them) that the old animosities are resurfacing. Just look at who is leading the Liberal Party today—Stan Evans' son. Now how do you think those little

old ladies with the blue hair in Burnside feel about that? What does the party executive think about Stan Evans' son running the joint? I can see the member for Finnis smiling; he knows exactly what I am talking about.

Mr Rau: He's still got an LM sticker on his car!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I am sure that if you walked into the office the old LM stickers would be up there. Then, of course, you have the member for Bragg—another famous daughter—and there is Dean Craig Brown's protegee, the member for Finnis. Then, of course, you have the conservatives. The member for Hammond is a conservative and, in the upper house, David Ridgway has his eyes firmly on Rob Lucas's position. So he should; he deserves it, he works a lot harder than Rob Lucas. I cannot think of one thing that Rob Lucas has done other than win us the election a year ago when he decided, 'I cannot pay for all these policies; what will I do? I know, I'll sack 4 000 people'; when he said, 'I've got a great land tax policy. I'll give you the costings but I can't give you the policy. I'll tell you how much it costs, but I can't tell you how much you are going to save on individual houses.' That is the Liberal Party's land tax reform package: 'I can tell you that you will be better off, but I can't tell you, if your property is worth this much, how much you will save. But trust me, I'm Rob Lucas; I'm the guy who sold the TAB for less than what it makes in a year.' That is who Rob Lucas is.

The only person getting up and offering an alternative for the Liberal Party is the member for Goyder. The rest of the members of the opposition just get up and read pre-prepared statements about what an awful government we are when, in fact, they know they are sitting back and watching our state finances grow. We are spending on infrastructure, spending on our priorities, and the opposition knows that the people of South Australia are happy with this government. Our Premier is the most popular in the country. The Liberal Party knows it has a fight ahead of it; it is stuck with three deadbeats at the front and it is not quite sure what to do. The Liberal Party president knows exactly what he thinks. What did he say? The other day in the bar the honourable member was telling me what the party president said about Iain Evans; what was it? He said something derogatory about Iain Evans and then Iain Evans, when asked if the president had his full confidence, said that he did. In our party our Premier runs the show; it starts and ends with him. If our party president attacked our Premier he would be sacked within 10 minutes. Your lot do not have the courage; your lot cannot stand up for your own leader. No-one wants to be standing next to him because you all know he will not make it to the next election. I can see you smiling; you know what I am saying is the truth.

Mr Rau interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Enfield reminds me of something that former prime minister Paul Keating said: 'Never cuddle a mug because they will die in your arms.' That is why no-one is going near Iain Evans. I notice that the father of the house has just walked in. He has seen it all before; he has seen premiers come and go, and I suspect that in a quiet moment of reflection, when he leaves this place and is asked what were the seeds of the 2002 defeat, I think the honourable member for Stuart will look you in the eye and say, 'Well, I wouldn't have said this while I was in parliament, but when they knocked off a bloke who won 37 seats in the biggest landslide in Australian history—without a gerrymander—perhaps that was the seed of our defeat, our own internal divisions.' Perhaps he would say that.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: There you go; he will do it before leaves. That is a promise. I have a great deal of respect for the member for Stuart, and I can honestly say that he is not factional. I am not sure that he turns up to state councils and preselection ballots and interferes elsewhere—he has just been around long enough to see premiers come and go.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: There you go, they have endorsed him again. He deserves praise for that, and good on him; he won fair and square.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I will not answer that. It is nice to see members of parliament choose the time of their own exit.

An honourable member: Clean bowled him.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Well, 300 votes is not exactly clean bowling him, but good luck to him; he did very well. The lowest swing in the state, and he deserves credit for it. Too bad some of his colleagues cannot say the same. Members may remember Robert Brokenshire, Joan Hall, Joe Scalzi, Angus Redford—who else did exceptionally well? The member for Unley got pushed to preferences in one of the state's safest seats; the member for Morphett got pushed to preferences in one their safest seats. The list can go on and on. Where is Malcolm Buckby these days? My advice for the Liberal Party is: put the divisions of the past behind you.

I know it is hard, but back the member for Goyder. You will do it eventually anyway, and you know it. Back him: make him leader. Blood him. Give him the experience, let him have one election to lose and then you will see some results. But the rest of you, your current leader thinks that he is going to win three seats. That is the difference.

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I support the appropriation from the consolidated account for the financial year ending 30 June 2008 of \$2 000 million to provide for the first three months' expenditure of the 2007-08 financial year until the budget receives assent. However, I point out to the taxpayers of South Australia that the Rann state Labor government will go down in history as a government of missed opportunity and broken promises, providing media gimmicks and expensive, depreciating, non-income earning liabilities, instead of providing the much-needed infrastructure assets that would provide long-term jobs and income and billions of dollars in multipliers from the mining, manufacturing and tourism industries stimulated by such activity. The Labor coalition state government conveniently forgets that the previous Labor government technically bankrupted the state.

When the Liberal government assumed office in December 1993, the state's income did not even meet the interest payments on the \$11.6 billion of state debt. Any business in that position would have been declared bankrupt unless it could very quickly liquefy some assets. It is an indication of Labor's ineptitude and absolute lack of financial management that continues with the current Labor government, a government that contains many of the same players who put the state in that mess, including the Premier. One has only to look at the WorkCover debacle to realise that nothing has changed and the state is again going down the tube under this Labor government. The former (Liberal) government paid off the WorkCover debt, bringing it down to under \$100 million, only to see it heading up again towards a billion in the few short years under Labor.

The Liberal government set about returning South Australia to a viable financial position. It is a wonderful success story set amid straitened circumstances, when every cent that was spent had to be factored into the debt that existed. Despite the funding handicaps, infrastructure began to improve. At the time, Kangaroo Island was in my electorate. School maintenance was so limited under Labor that a set of steps at one school were not used because they were considered dangerous. At Kimba, a classroom was so affected by white ants that it had been closed for years. There were limited options for the Liberal government to reduce the \$11.6 billion in debt. One of the most significant was the long-term lease of ETSA. Standard and Poor's noted the Liberals' incredible success in reducing what was a crippling debt holding back the progress of our wonderful state.

Labor opposed this economic strategy. Labor ministers still hope that, by propounding their opposition to this Liberal initiative, attention will be turned away from their own economic failure to capitalise on the very much improved financial position that they inherited from our Liberal government. However, the sound financial management under the Liberals meant that, when the Labor coalition government again gained power, it had a state that was financially viable, with the debt reduced to only \$3.2 billion in 2001, and the federal government's GST paying taxpayers' funds directly into the state's coffers. This brought immeasurable opportunities to invest in infrastructure along with other community necessities, specifically health and education.

One of the Labor coalition's early decisions was to cut funds for outback road maintenance, reducing the number of teams and therefore the work they were able to undertake to keep isolated roads in a useable condition. Shortly after this reduction, a Swiss couple and their child were killed in a vehicle roll-over on a corrugated road in the north of our state. Corrugations on dirt roads are something that even the majority of Australian drivers never encounter, let alone tourists. It is not widely understood that corrugations can be fatal, as in this instance, by causing vehicles to roll or leave the road, or both. As a writer in *The Advertiser* letter columns put it:

Many roads are in a shocking state of disrepair and something needs to be done urgently if we are to act on lowering the road toll and begin being taken seriously as a state that promotes tourism.

The Labor coalition is squandering its opportunity to continue the Liberals' work of building state infrastructure. I am proud that two of the longest unsealed rural arterial roads in the state, the Kimba-Cleve and Lock-Elliston, were sealed because of the decision by the Liberal Minister for Transport, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, to support them. Many people often stated that they had not expected to see these roads sealed in their lifetime. When I first broached the sealing of the roads, I was told by some that it was impossible, but it was done, as were numerous local roads of economic and tourism importance that could not have been sealed by the small regional councils. But that is the Liberal way. Both categories of local roads of economic or tourism importance have been scrapped under the Labor policy of population-based funding that requires road funding to be spent only on the criteria of where the most people live.

Members should contrast the Liberal record with that of Labor's folly over the 12 kilometres of dirt road connecting Lucky Bay to the Lincoln Highway. Lucky Bay is the docking point on Eyre Peninsula of the Wallaroo-Lucky Bay ferry, which carried 20 000 people and nearly 800 vehicles in its first three months of operation, saving tonnes of

greenhouse gases as well as significant wear and tear on the 300 kilometres saved on the road trip between Cowell and Adelaide. Other benefits include reducing freight costs and enabling regional people to access health, education, business and cultural activities in their capital city, Adelaide.

In 2006, Franklin Harbor District Council applied for \$900 000 of federal funding under the AusLink Strategic Regional Roads Program, to be matched with \$900 000 from the state government and a \$135 000 contribution from council. The major factor in council's application being unsuccessful was the failure of the Rann Labor government to confirm its matching funding in writing. So, a \$900 000 gift to the state was lost. We are now moving into winter with, hopefully, a significant rainfall. However, this unsealed road remains potentially dangerous. This example is typical of Labor's missed opportunities.

John Spoehr, Executive Director of the Australian Institute for Social Research, told a conference that infrastructure spending tended to make economies more productive. He said that the golden rule in relation to it is that those countries that have strong investment in infrastructure are generally more productive than those that have a less than average spend on infrastructure. Hopefully, this Labor state government will hear, understand and act on Mr Spoehr's advice. Every aspect of infrastructure has been run down by Labor—water, power, rail and ports, as well as roads. It was a daunting task that the Liberals faced while bringing the state back into the black—and now we have to watch Labor again squander the gains made.

We have been working on renewable sources of energy and desalination for more than 13 years, starting before my election to parliament. In part, through the work I was doing with private companies, we now have two wind farms on Eyre Peninsula—one at Mount Miller and the other at Cathedral Rocks. In fact, the whole of the wind farm industry traces back to the early support I gave to Babcock and Brown, who started on Eyre Peninsula but transferred to Lake Bonney when I was the only member of parliament of any party in either house to support it. When they wanted someone to launch the Lake Bonney project at the Millicent Town Hall I was the politician invited all the way from Port Lincoln to attend.

This state government is handicapping the potential of wind energy by its lack of support for the necessary powerlines to link turbines into the grid. We could have many more wind farms pumping power into the state and national grid—reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving the environment—but the infrastructure must be upgraded to cope with the extra power. What is more important to South Australian taxpayers: a \$30 million kilometre of extra tramline that will reduce traffic in the city of Adelaide to a snail's pace or 1 000 megawatts of wind energy on Eyre Peninsula providing a substantial reduction in carbon dioxide emissions that will have a positive impact on the climate of this state and, therefore, the whole of the nation?

Wind farms work well in conjunction with desalination plants. Nowhere is Labor failing more disgracefully than in relation to the issue of water in this state. Private desalination companies have battled—to date, unsuccessfully—to build plants in regional areas in South Australia. Had this government given just a little support then I suggest that at least Eyre Peninsula's water shortages would be a thing of the past. The high levels of chlorination (from which the health risks are unknown) and the calcium-blocked pipes and water softeners costing farmers and householders millions of dollars

would be only a bad dream if private enterprise desalination plants had been or were being facilitated. Instead, Labor squandered funds on a feasibility study for a desalination plant at Tod Reservoir.

Labor's water minister made the breathtakingly stupid decision to extend the pipeline from Iron Knob to Kimba at a cost of \$48.5 million to deliver a paltry 1.4 gegalitres of water into the Eyre Peninsula system from the ailing River Murray. I wonder how the constituents, irrigators and small businesses in the electorate of the Minister for the River Murray feel about the decision to further draw on this already stressed resource. At full capacity the pipes, supposedly, will deliver 2.4 gegalitres if a desalination plant is built at Whyalla some time in the future after 2012—if ever.

The cost of \$48.5 million is estimated to be \$9 billion over a 75-year lifetime of the pipeline, given an interest rate of 6 per cent. What appalling incompetence which led to our current water minister saying that we must drain lakes (irrespective of the ecological and/or environmental consequences) because South Australia's water allocation from the River Murray is all but used up. What a lost opportunity cost when this \$9 billion could have provided recurrent funding for the disabled, health, education or even urgently required infrastructure. This is only one of the many opportunities missed by this union-run government, which has become known for its lack of vision, impractical decisions, cronyism, hypocrisy, and contradictory statements and actions.

Labor strenuously opposed the introduction of the goods and services tax, yet it is the billions of dollars pouring into this state in revenue which provides this Labor government with the means to lift the whole of this state. Instead, GST revenue is being squandered and opportunities again lost. I was amused to read a report in today's *Advertiser* that the Treasurer is hinting at a spending spree. He reportedly signalled that there would be funding in the June budget for infrastructure related to the Olympic Dam mine expansion. The hypocrisy of Labor has to be experienced to be believed. The Premier strenuously opposed the building of a repository for radioactive waste—the total for South Australia amounting to about the size of an average room in a house—because, supposedly, it was too dangerous to contemplate. Yet the Premier is falling over himself to promote an expansion of uranium mining, even getting into the position of national President of the Labor Party where he hopes to change Labor's farcical and contradictory three mines uranium policy, touting the wonderful example of Roxby Downs mine that in an earlier time he called a 'mirage in the desert' and tried to prevent; I understand he even wrote a book on the subject.

Hopefully, the Premier and the Treasurer will also realise that ore from mines has to be carted by road, or preferably rail, and exported through ports. Despite the flood of revenue from the GST, this Labor government still demands that the federal government pick up the tab for most major projects. One could hope the Treasurer's sudden interest in infrastructure will include rail and something of value. However, since Labor took office two sections of the Eyre Peninsula rail line have been closed. The federal government invested \$10 million towards maintenance and the state government put in a measly \$2 million, then the state government said that if farmers wanted rail to cart grain to ports for export they would have to come up with the extra. So, once again, farmers were hit for what is a government responsibility and for which farmers paid in freight rates to state and federal governments in the past when the Eyre Peninsula line was

one of the few profitable lines in the country. Imagine the outcry if people living in the suburbs of Adelaide were told that if they wanted a bus system they themselves would have to pay for it.

Eyre Peninsula is on the verge of a mining boom as private companies undertake feasibility studies prior to starting mining. It would be better for the environment and it would reduce wear and tear on the roads if ore could be transported by rail. The Eyre Peninsula rail highlights the lack of vision and forward planning by the government. Some of the proposed mines contain iron ore which could be railed to Whyalla for processing and shipment. I have been unsuccessful in pointing out the advantages in joining the stand-alone Eyre Peninsula rail division to the national network through Whyalla. It would have been a much better use of the \$48.5 million that was spent on the pipeline along the same corridor, perhaps combined with the equivalent money currently being spent to fit out SA Water's new offices in Adelaide. Investing \$100 million would bring about a return on investment instead of a long-term cost over 75 years of about \$20 billion.

Then there are the broken promises, and one of the most brazen of these is Labor's population-based funding policy. I mistakenly believed that all state governments governed for the whole of the state and its residents, because that is what a Liberal government does. However, that is not so. It depends on how many people live in a particular area. For instance, it does not depend on the fact that each person needs to get to a shop to buy food and a city to access health and education facilities but, rather, that the closer people live together, the easier the government should make it to buy food and access health and education facilities, in addition to providing so-called numerous free events for their entertainment. That is the stark way in which Labor's population-based funding works.

This is very apparent in health services in country areas. During the term of a previous state Labor government, the Premier was made aware of the unpopularity of and loss of votes in closing country hospitals. Population-based funding takes care of that. His government simply cuts the funding and services to rural and regional hospitals on the basis that the population is not there or the skills are unavailable. The latter has a lot to do with the short-term contracts that discourage government employees to plan their lives in the country. A vindictive person might hope that the Premier and his ministers could be relocated somewhere in the vast country areas of South Australia and have to suffer because of the reduction in health and other services that they are engineering.

Mr RAU (Enfield): After listening to the contributions so far, I am wondering whether we have a full moon or something—particularly the last contribution, with all due respect to the honourable member. We heard about what the Labor Party is doing or is not doing for rural and regional South Australia. I would have thought that the honourable member would not lead with her chin in that respect because, if members really want to know someone who has torn the stuffing out of rural and regional Australia, full stop, it is the current federal government.

Let me give a couple of examples. First, there is the obsession that the federal government has with free trade. Look at where that has led us. The federal government has gone down the track of signing a free trade deal with the United States, and the consequences of that for the wheat

farmers (and I think the member for Flinders has a couple of them in her electorate) and the barley farmers (and I think the member might even have some of them) has been tragic, because the single desk in both of those arrangements, which was a marketing scheme designed by conservative governments in the past to support rural communities, has been completely destroyed.

In the case of wheat, the federal government handed it over to a bunch of spivs, who have now caused so much trouble that the single desk marketing arrangements are finished. In the case of barley (and I have said this here before), we have Mark Vaile stepping down from the plane at Canberra airport looking for all the world like Neville Chamberlain, waving this bit of paper around—peace in our time—this free trade deal, and it turns out to be a complete sell-out for rural Australia. The federal government has presided over the greatest depopulation of rural Australia that has ever occurred. How some of the rural members of the federal government can get away with being re-elected year in and year out after what they have done to their communities entirely baffles me. They must be very dedicated souls to keep voting for the conservative parties.

What I really wanted to talk about, now that I have devoted a little time to the full moon, is the great things that the state government is doing. I would like to touch on a couple of things, the first of which is the mining industry. The mining industry in South Australia is experiencing an exploration boom at the moment. This is being driven by demand around the world but, in particular, in China and India. This government is seeing to it that that exploration boom is transformed into a mining boom. This is not just about a Roxby expansion, it is about a multitude of mines around South Australia, and in the next 15 or 20 years, with the sorts of management plans that are in place now, we will see the economy of South Australia transformed in much the same way as has occurred in Western Australia.

The second aspect that is very significant and very important is that the alternative energy opportunities existing in South Australia, in particular, for geothermal power—which everyone would have to agree is probably the most benign source of power we could possibly hope to have, where we are just taking advantage of hot rocks and using that to generate electricity—could have enormous consequences for the economic viability of South Australia. I ask members to just think about this. At the moment, the Roxby plant already takes a huge proportion of South Australia's generated electricity just to run the mine and for the process of refining the minerals that come out of that mine. Imagine if that and its expanded version in years to come were able to be fully supplied by geothermal power—which is not that far distant—from that mine. Just think what that would mean in terms of the reduced demand on coal-fired sources of power in South Australia; think what that would mean for the overall cost to the consumer of a range of products; and think about what it means for the greenhouse problem and for the future economy of South Australia.

The opportunities at the moment in this state for future development of that type, which could be beneficial not only from the point of view of exports but which would also be very clean and very green (and I apologise for that platitude, because it is something that is used far too often; but geothermal power, I think, fits properly into the category of clean, green power) is a tremendously exciting opportunity. I think the government has spent some time and effort in supporting the exploration and the development of pilot

plants. Members may know that there is already a plant going in, I think, for the Honeymoon mine to assist in production there, which is using this geothermal technology. If that starts working in the way in which it is envisaged, we are looking at a very exciting opportunity in terms of available, inexpensive and clean power to drive these industries. That would be a tremendous boon for South Australia.

The second area that I think is really important is education. South Australia is actually getting focused on the importance of education; not just in the traditional sense of having something to do between the time you are born and the time you start working, but in the sense of, first of all, providing an opportunity for export income and putting South Australia into a place where it attracts foreign students. Also, there are the first signs, under this government, of the government seriously tackling some of the problems that have crept into the education system over the years.

To mention just one which is perhaps an exaggeration—nonetheless, I think, not unreasonable—is that members would be aware that there has for some time been a philosophy underpinning education which basically says that in English, for example, it is equally valid to critique Shakespeare or Bart Simpson. I think we are getting to the point now where people realise that that is nonsense, and we are starting to move back to an education system which actually deals with important basic things like people being literate, people being numerate, and there are very positive signs coming up that the government is actually going to press forward to get parents the sort of information they need about how their children are going, and not pander to those who say, 'Oh, well, look, we don't want to tell them how they're going because they might be upset,' or, 'We don't want to put a mark on their report card because the poor dear might not be able to understand it.' So these things are all moving forward.

The government is also committed to cutting red tape in South Australia by 25 per cent by the year 2008; a tremendous step forward in terms of making it easy for people to do business in South Australia. These steps, when they are all accumulated, mean a tremendous difference in the opportunities available for South Australia, and they mean that South Australia becomes a more attractive investment opportunity for people who want to get involved in working in the Australian market.

What have we been hearing from members of the parliament sitting on the other side about all of these initiatives? I would like to be able to quote in depth the member for West Torrens because he basically said it all when he targeted the member for Waite. The member for Waite comes into this chamber alternately swinging about governments wasting money, and then with the next swing he says, 'Why don't you spend twice as much on my pet project?' which incidentally he has not even worked out the costings of; does not know where it is going to go. If you are going to be involved in placing yourself in the position of an alternative government, you have to put up something, you have to take a risk, you actually need a plan, and you have to be prepared to have that scrutinised. People keep saying to me that opposition is very difficult. Well, perhaps that is true, but that is not an excuse for not doing anything; that is not an excuse to do nothing. You have to be there and you have to be doing something about it.

I will give the member for Waite his due; he does actually have a swing. Here he is! I am talking about the member for Waite and I am very pleased to be able to engage him in this.

The member for Waite reminds me of a scene—I think the best scene—of the Terminator movies where Arnold Schwarzenegger comes through the time machine and he arrives in the buff, so the speak, outside a pub—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order!

Mr RAU: —and he turns up outside the pub and a chap comes out of the pub, and what does he say to the bloke? He says: ‘Your clothes, give them to me’, and then he jumps on the motorbike—which is another thing he has in common with the member for Waite—and roars off into the distance. I give the member for Waite 10 out of 10 for having a go—I really do. We heard a lot from the member for West Torrens about the member for Goyder, and I do not disagree with a word he said about that, but I think he sold the member for Waite a bit short, because the member for Waite does have a go, he has a go every day, and even if what he is doing might seem to some a little ridiculous, at least he is having a go, and I think he needs to get points for that.

The member for Kavel, however, is more of a quiet achiever; he just moves on quietly and, if you are running a book on it, he might be one of these dark horses in the leadership stakes; he might be somebody who creeps up on the inside rail. He is making a quiet move, and I wish him well in that. As for the member for Finniss—the bloke with the LM sticker still on the back of the car—it is good to have people like that still in the parliament, and he is not the only one. But this is the problem, is it not? Remember years ago when they had the Liberal Movement and there were guns at 20 paces almost? The same thing is happening now.

I cannot put it as well as the member for West Torrens, but it is there for everyone to see that they really do need to get focused on the main game and not argue about what we are doing by the sort of contribution the member for Flinders put up. Her speech is very highly charged with emotion, but does not really say a great deal, except that she did take a trip down memory lane and hopped into the time tunnel. I was expecting her to tell us at one stage about Harold Holt being taken by a Chinese submarine, but she never got to that bit. Perhaps if she had another couple of pages we might have covered that particular bit of mythology. The only thing we got from her was that the union movement apparently runs what is going on here, and we have to go outside to get our instructions. I think the member for West Torrens in his contribution missed one point, and that is when you are trying to actually find something in the media which—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Enfield has something to say.

Mr RAU: When you are trying to find something in the media that gives you a fair reflection of what is going on on the other side, I think you have to pass through a lot of the shows—the Simpsons and a lot of the Terminator movies—and where do you wind up? You wind up with South Park. That is where we are. We have got Kenny—we have got all of them. We have the chap with the hanky on the finger. It is all happening over there. I am just waiting for Saddam Hussein to come out, but I do not need to canvass that too much. Let us get back to supply. This government, I have to say, gets it 90 per cent right 90 per cent of the time. That is 100 per cent better than you chaps are offering. So, I think you need to give the government credit occasionally because it gives you more credibility; it gives you credibility when you do not just stand up and talk about the State Bank, or the

great flood of 1956, or the year that Carbine won the Melbourne Cup.

Let’s move on from these things and try to get into contemporary things. The people out there are interested in what you will do today and tomorrow or, in your case, perhaps in 10 years. They are interested in the future: they are not interested in the trip down memory lane. When you are addressing these issues—and I can see the member for Kavel itching to get up and have a crack at it—give the government at least some credit where we have done the good things and the hard things. Give us some credit for that and your credibility will go up, too. The people reading the paper will say, ‘Goodness me, these chaps are not all negative. They occasionally have a positive thought.’ It will really impress them; honestly, it will. You blokes would be surprised. You will find people stopping you in the street, saying, ‘You blokes are improving. You are actually giving credit where it is due.’ Just try it; you will love it. Your electors will love it. You might even come back again next time.

Before I finish, I want to say to the member for Finniss that I appreciate his hospitality when my committee was in his electorate last week. He was an absolute gentleman. He took us around and introduced us to his constituents. He showed us some very important parts of his very attractive electorate, and it was generous of him to give up his time. I hope he has the opportunity to do it again for the committee in other parts of his very beautiful electorate.

Mr Pengilly: Very soon.

Mr RAU: That is the sort of positive bipartisanship that we are hoping to see coming from the other side, this hands across the water stuff, and I am looking forward to the next few contributions because I have a feeling they will be positive from now on. I do not feel that they will be full of that negative stuff we heard from the member for Flinders. I am just going to sit here for the rest of the night and I will enjoy what is coming.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): That was a pretty hard act to follow. We have had a pretty good night having a crack at this side, so it is probably worth spending a couple of minutes having a look at things from where we sit. The member for West Torrens would love to be a minister. He cannot quite make that jump down to the front row. We have the member for Enfield sitting up the back—one of the brightest boys in the house—and he cannot get down to the second row, let alone the first row. The member for Lee, the Minister for Industrial Relations, has the member for West Torrens right behind him all the time, so I am sure he feels very comfortable with that! Then we have a selection of people on the back bench who are here until 20 March 2010, working very actively to make sure they enjoy the next three years and then we will say, ‘Farewell, adieu’, and perhaps the member for Light can then sell all his shirts instead of putting up for auction just the worn-out ones. Whether they are clean or unclean is irrelevant.

Let me tell members opposite that we are a very cohesive group. The member for West Torrens is not quite sure about that, but let me tell you that we are. We are a very happy, united group and we are very keen to get on with it, and we are looking forward to 20 March 2010. I am looking forward even more to being back very soon afterwards sitting on the other side, having a look at a few faces over there who have been giving us curry. I do not think that the member for Enfield will be a minister by then, either. I do not know what

he has done wrong, but I think he is doomed to sit up the back.

Mr Rau: Are you going to join us?

Mr PENGILLY: I would be quite comfortable sitting on the back bench on that side. I would rather be on the front bench, but a young fellow like the member for Enfield in the prime of his life who is absolutely full of talent and ability is getting shafted year after year. He cannot get down to the front bench. The member for West Torrens is leading—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Can I bring the member back to the Supply Bill.

Mr PENGILLY: The member for West Torrens is leading the charge on Victoria Park in *The Advertiser*. What a wonderful job the member for West Torrens is doing.

Mr Pisoni: Minister for the City of Adelaide.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: What really entertains me with the member for West Torrens is his ability to get up and absolutely castigate and completely rip into our side of the house without even mentioning the Supply Bill, which I thought we were actually here for tonight. I am waiting to hear the contribution from other members opposite. I am sure that the member for Light has a fresh shirt on for tonight, otherwise he will bring one along tomorrow that is already worn and might not be clean—

Mr Pisoni: I know where you can buy one.

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, we should be able to get one. We will have a whip around. The body language on the other side during some of the performances in here in question time was well worth watching, so I suggest to the members for West Torrens and Enfield, if they want to get down to that front bench and if they want to be ministers, come over and join us in question time and have a look at the body language and what goes on at the front. Have a look at the looks behind, the squirming and the heads down and God knows what else. It is an entertaining hour in the afternoon. I look forward to getting on to the Supply Bill but I do not think, after the generous contributions of the members for West Torrens and Enfield, that we really should let them get away with it for nothing. I am hoping that a few of my colleagues might pick up on it and perhaps expand on the issue in due course.

As I said, I support the bill, but a few issues need fleshing out. Before I get on to certain matters involving my electorate, in my shadow portfolio of tourism I would like to talk about some tourism issues. I sincerely hope that the government puts some money back into marketing instead of ripping it out this year, and that it gets marketing back on the front foot. I am sure that the Treasurer, despite his haste to get the grandstand built at Victoria Park and everything else—and with his generous and magnanimous nature—will be wanting to get more people to come here and will put money into the tourism marketing budget. I am sure, too, that the member for Adelaide will come around and start being the tourism minister and actively support these things and get on with the job. So, I am looking forward to that. We have \$31 million in the ‘Rann tram to nowhere’. We have a few things in the bush, in the suburbs and a few things in the hills and other places that the money could go a long way towards improving.

Rather than destroying North Terrace and causing complete chaos now and around Easter—and we have heard what the major hotels have had to say about that in the past few days—I would like to think that the Minister for Transport would take some of this on board and go out and have a cup of coffee with the hotels, communicate with them

and work through these issues so that we can have some semblance of order on North Terrace until the weather cools down and the crowds are not there.

That leads me back to the tourism marketing budget. We need money put back into the marketing budget to get people here to see Adelaide and South Australia during winter when the hotels and restaurants still have to employ people. South Australia in the winter is a delightful place. It is not cold, let's face it. Compared with what we have seen in Europe on TV lately this is not cold. That is an absolute must. They may even want to come through the seat of Mawson, through the Vales and down to the South Coast. If the Minister for Transport could really get into this Southern Expressway and finish what we started—we have got the land, we need the money, the Minister for Transport should be able to come right in on song there and fix that road up, duplicate it. When the minister has finished with the Southern Expressway he can do the Adelaide to Victor Harbor road, because the RAA is loud and strong on the Victor Harbor Road, and we have heard them ad infinitum. Perhaps he could fix up the hotchpotch on South Road where the Victor Harbor Road turns off. That is once we have fixed up the South Road/Anzac Highway underpass. If we can get the cost right for that then we can go on and do a few more jobs.

The other thing that I would like to see the government do in the forthcoming financial year is put more money into assisting local government to get on with what it does best. Instead of regularly whacking councils around the ears with gay abandon and really giving them a hard time, picking on them and generally making life uncomfortable for local government, the government should get behind them and give them some more resources instead of loading on things.

I refer to the NRM boards and their levies, and I think my colleague the member for Stuart raised it a while ago. One of the reasons the NRM boards are having to raise their levies is because they are getting screwed for money by the state government. The poor old ratepayers are going to cop it in the neck from the councils. Councils are getting the blame for having to raise additional revenue and it is going straight to the NRM boards. I turn my attention back to the member for Enfield in his other capacity, and I am very grateful that he is grabbing hold of this by the scruff of the neck. I hope he does what he says and gives councils a fair go and takes the NRM boards to task. Perhaps he might like to take the Treasurer out for lunch and suggest that he put some more money into the NRM boards out of the state government coffers. That is after the Minister for Transport has finished with the Treasurer and gets a bit more money to do a few other jobs around the place.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: The bridge to Kangaroo Island.

Mr PENGILLY: Absolutely. I will invite you over. I turn to a few issues in my electorate that need funding, and I have spoken about them before in this place, and that is the South Coast TAFE, or the Victor Harbor TAFE college, which was on the agenda for the budget in 2002 until the government changed and it was knocked off. I think it is a travesty of justice that this is not going ahead. We have the mechanics to put that TAFE college into place by selling the land where the current TAFE is and putting the new TAFE down on the land adjacent to the police station. That is a great way of doing it and finding considerable amounts of money to get on with it.

The member for Springfield is leaving, but I hope he has taken—sorry, I beg your pardon, I retract that.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PENGILLY: I withdraw that remark. The South Coast or Victor Harbor TAFE is absolutely critical. We are five years down the track and it is no closer. So I urge the government and the minister responsible for that area, Mr Caica, to pick up on it and do their best. In fairness to the minister, he and I have discussed it on numerous occasions, but it really has to be crunched and pushed through.

I have spoken about the Victor Harbor Road. I now turn my attention to the need for some money for infrastructure on the Western Fleurieu to deal with the issue of lack of water down through Rapid Bay, Second Valley and Cape Jervis. These are rapidly growing areas that do not have substantial infrastructure. The water has been turned off in Rapid Bay. It is an appalling state of affairs. I acknowledge that it is user pays but it has to go in there before they can start paying. We have water down to Normanville but from there on down there is nothing and it is actually slowing down and obstructing development in the Western Fleurieu, where there is a great demand for housing.

I mentioned Cape Jervis, and I refer to the \$5 million a year that is spent on wharfage from the ferry operation between Penneshaw and Cape Jervis. That is another long-term festering sore for the community and the tourism industry, which are being slugged for this \$5 million wharfage. It is impacting on primary production, tourism and the residents of Kangaroo Island, and it really needs fixing once and for all. It needs wiping off the face of the earth. It is a travesty that it was put in there and it should be removed.

While I am still talking about the Kangaroo Island part of my electorate, I return to the subject of roads there. The Kangaroo Island Council is severely deficient in having enough revenue to do even the most basic road construction, let alone keeping up the maintenance and new construction of roads. So, I say to the government, bite the bullet, put back in place a Premier's infrastructure fund and fix up and make that highly visited place much more successful in allowing people to go up and down the roads there.

Country health is another issue close to my heart, having been involved in it for many years. I believe the destruction of the country health and hospital boards is an enormous backward step for the people of South Australia who live in regional and country areas. I just do not understand, for the life of me, how the minister and the government can detract from that most important area and put the control centrally back into Hindmarsh Square. I think it is going to be an appalling mess before it is all finished, particularly given the fact that in many cases the local communities actually own the structures. The idea of advisory committees is an absolute sob, it is a nonsense and it just does not work, and really they are being effectively neutered from having any control over and say on what is going into health units around rural South Australia. I say to the Minister for Health and the government, you have got it wrong; acknowledge that you have got it wrong. The previous minister for health was a strong supporter of country and regional boards. What has happened since the former minister was in place is a crying shame. I intend to raise this issue on regular occasions.

A couple of other roads in my electorate are desperately short of maintenance and funding. The Goolwa to Mount Compass road is rapidly developing into a goat track and is rivalled only by the Yankalilla to Victor Harbor road. Both these roads are heavily trafficked but are receiving little or nothing in the way of major overhaul and upgrade. Mickey Mouse amounts of money are being spent on them, but they

are nowhere near adequate to do the job or for what is required in the future.

The issue of electricity also inhibits the Eastern Fleurieu, down through Goolwa and Victor Harbor and around the Waitpinga area. Whilst acknowledging that some work has been done to provide a more assured power supply on Kangaroo Island, the infrastructure at the western end is sadly lacking. I would like to think that, when the infrastructure minister visits Kangaroo Island, I can show him around and we can get on with it. I am also concerned about the lack of funds being injected into community housing. The fact of the matter is that all community housing capital expenditure over the next five years is going into the metropolitan area. The only projects that are currently in place have been completed. It is simply unjust and unfair that people living in country and rural areas will not be able to do anything about community housing funding for quite a considerable length of time.

The government waxes lyrical about health, education, crime and heaven knows what else. Throughout my electorate, particularly around the Goolwa and Victor Harbor area, we have a problem with crime, and it is on the increase. Modern transport methods make it very easy for people to sneak in somewhere at two o'clock in the morning and be over the Victorian border by daylight. I urge the appropriate minister to look at this issue and put more resources into the police. Kangaroo Island needs another officer, as it is getting to the stage where someone is always on call. They want to go and move on, and that is a crying shame.

The schools around my electorate need urgent money for upgrades and maintenance, and it is simply not forthcoming. While my predecessor, the Hon. Dean Brown, successfully got the Port Elliot Primary School redevelopment done (it will be finished and fully functional by the middle of this year), a host of schools still need enormous amounts of money spent on them. I urge the government, in its wisdom (or lack of wisdom and foresight), to get busy and put some money into these rural and regional schools.

I need to return to a few things that are happening within the government that get pushed to one side, duckshoved and jumped around. Perhaps the worst of all these is the unfunded liability in WorkCover. When we came out of government in March 2002, it was running at \$86 million. It has now blown out to \$694 million. We are getting unsatisfactory answers from the minister, and I am terribly concerned about this lack of control and effort to fix up the WorkCover unfunded liability and that it is not being taken seriously. It could be that the member for West Torrens or the member for Enfield very shortly might fall into the position of being the appropriate minister. We are running a bit of a book on who will be first. I reckon you are about lineball at the moment, member for Enfield, but I think that the Victoria Park outburst on Saturday by the member for West Torrens probably put him just in front. At this stage, we have a few extra dollars on the member for West Torrens. The member for Enfield has to get out there and push himself into the paper a bit more at the weekend so that he really gets the bounce and gets back up there. That is a little bit of advice from this side, as there has been plenty of advice from the member for West Torrens and the member for Enfield on how we should do it.

Mr Piccolo interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Now the member for Light is having a crack. He has three years left, less a few days, so he really has to try to get some influence quickly. Leave the poor old Light Regional Council alone and start working the electorate. I do not know whether he even looks like getting down from the

back bench; at least the member for Enfield has a show. We are looking forward to the member for Enfield and the member for West Torrens continuing this great battle to see who will get there first. I support the bill, and it is imperative that it goes through. I rest my case.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Perhaps the member should look at the contribution before his and see how members concentrate on supply. I know that he is a new member, that he is learning and that it is his first contribution to the house, but he should look to other members who have been here a bit longer on how we focus on supply.

Mr PISONI: On a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Do you have a standing order number?

Mr PISONI: I do not have a number.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Then sit down. The member for Mitchell.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am speaking in support of legislation that will give the government some more money to spend before the budget is passed later this year. I want to focus on one very important area where more money needs to be spent. It is an issue that has been raised before, but it needs to be raised again because of continued dissatisfaction. I refer to the bus services in the south-western suburbs of Adelaide.

Last year, Torrens Transit came up with proposals for varying the bus services in the region around Marion Road, South Road and around those suburbs. The government approved the changed bus routes. The biggest change affecting my constituents adversely is probably the deletion of the MA1 and MA2 bus routes. They were fully accessible services—that is, disability accessible—and they were of particular benefit to the people who live around Clovelly Park, Marion and Mitchell Park who wanted to get to Bedford Industries, the Flinders Medical Centre or the Daw Park Repatriation Hospital. There are quite a number of those people, and scrapping this service has meant that many of them have had to catch two buses to get to their employment at Bedford Industries or medical appointments at either the Repat or Flinders Medical Centre.

For most of us sitting in this chamber (including the Minister for Transport, who is here listening to this) it seems no big deal to catch two buses to get to a medical appointment, but when you are in a wheelchair or are vision-impaired it is more of an ordeal than most of us can imagine. The focus of the bus changes was to bring all the buses into the interchange at Westfield Marion on Sturt Road and for them to then take off to their final destinations; however, the MA1 and MA2 (as they existed up until last year) fulfilled the needs of so many people going to Flinders Medical Centre and so on.

The problems faced by people with disabilities—particularly those in wheelchairs and the vision-impaired—has been exacerbated by the fact that there have been problems in not being able to get disability-accessible buses. Even when people have phoned Torrens Transit to book and make sure that the bus they are to catch the next day will have the ramps that enable them to board with a wheelchair, the commitment has not been kept and people have been left stranded at bus stops. This has become very dispiriting for a number of people who have contacted my office, people who have wondered whether they are better off staying at home rather than going out shopping or doing constructive things with their lives despite their disabilities.

I want to be fair to Torrens Transit and give some response to them. Last November, manager Neil Smith wrote to me and confessed that the success rate for providing disability buses on routes where disability-accessible buses were promised was 97 per cent. Now, in many walks of life a 97 per cent fulfilment of a promise is pretty good but, when it comes to the number of people that Torrens Transit carry per day (I think it is in the order of 120 000), 3 per cent of those people not having access to disability-accessible buses when they expect it is actually a considerable inconvenience to people who deserve better.

I would like to refer to some of the correspondence (and it is only a fraction) that I have had from constituents about the bus changes—which again, I stress, were approved by the Labor government. Vicki from Mitchell Park is vision-impaired, and has been critical of the decision to scrap the MA1 and MA2 services. She had to stop volunteering at the place where she used to spend her time because the new service was just too inconvenient. I pay tribute to John of Seaview Downs who has been a mental health advocate for many years, and I know that he uses the buses himself. He has been inundated with stories of people with disabilities who have been inconvenienced by the lack of disability-accessible buses.

To take a different example, Deborah, formerly of Morphett Vale and now of Dover Gardens, has found that even though Dover Gardens is so much closer to the city (where she works) it was easier to get there from Morphett Vale. From Dover Gardens, even though it is only one suburb from Westfield Marion, she has to catch a bus to Westfield Marion and then change to get another bus into the city. Craig of Seaview Downs had a similar story; he reported how the bus getting into Westfield Marion was scheduled to arrive only one minute or so before the express bus to the city left, and two out of three times he would miss that bus and would have to catch the slow bus full of school children and wind his way into the city. The difference in time was enormous, not to mention the inconvenience issue with a bus full of school children with their school bags.

I also want to mention Chelsea of Seaview Downs, who contacted me because she was concerned that she would lose her independence. She is another young woman—a very bright young woman—with vision-impairment and getting around, going to the shops, and visiting people is a very important part of her life. To find that there are buses that will not stop for her is a very serious problem; to be able to get to a bus that goes where she wants to go without having to change buses is a serious issue.

I would also like to mention correspondence I have received from Hailey of Sheidow Park. In many ways Sheidow Park and Trott Park have been the poor cousins of public transport and other public infrastructure in the south-west suburbs, because they grew up at a time when the State Bank disaster was on the horizon and public funding for necessary services became much more limited. They have never really caught up with the services that are enjoyed north of O'Halloran Hill, and Hailey was concerned that the best way for her to get into the city was to get across to the train at Hallett Cove rather than being able to catch a bus directly to the city. There was also a gentleman from Lander Road, O'Halloran Hill, who wrote saying that he wanted buses to either Marion shopping centre or into the city at least once every two hours.

There was also Sharon, who wrote to me from Seaview Downs. She gave the example of her two adult sons who both

work shift work. I understand that bus services to some extent need to cater for the highest demand services, but we need to remember that increasingly we have a flexible workplace and we have businesses and service centres that operate at all times of the day and night. We do not have a nine to five culture any longer. When you have people starting work at 7 a.m. or even earlier, you need an adequate public bus service to enable them to have a decent working life without having to spend their money on car transport. In the case that Sharon provided to me, I found that seriously longer times are required to allow for the transport in and out of the city, both early morning and late at night.

I can provide other examples. Michelle was a woman from Dover Gardens who was very specific in her complaint to me. She used to catch buses from Dover Gardens and was able to catch one bus to get into the city. The trip used to take approximately 45 to 50 minutes but it now takes between 1½ and two hours, due to the transfer time at Marion, particularly in the middle of the day when the wait at Marion is about 20 minutes. I know you cannot keep everyone happy, but I have been really surprised at the volume of complaints that I have had about the new arrangements. The other issue that Michelle raised is that, when she comes back from work and study in the city, there are not sufficient connector buses to get back to Dover Gardens. There are ample buses going to Westfield Marion, and I acknowledge that—that is a good thing—but if you are then going to rely on connector buses from that interchange to the final destination, obviously you have to have as many buses going out from Westfield Marion as there are coming into it.

Michelle has been concerned about walking through the suburb of Dover Gardens at night, because there simply is not a bus service. This situation has been exacerbated by the recent government decision to axe the Wandering Star service, a service that was able to take people home late at night to their door. Typically, young people in nightclubs in the city could make the decision to go home by public transport, because they knew they could get home reliably and safely. I am seriously concerned that the axing of that service will lead to an increase in sexual assaults and people choosing to take the risky behaviour of driving while inebriated.

As I said, families contacted me whose children worked at Bedford Industries. Where they have been self sufficient and independent enough to catch a bus to Bedford Industries, it does make it that much more difficult when a change of bus is required. I have truly only recited a fraction of the complaints that have come to me in relation to these new bus services, and I want to conclude with two things. First, we need to remember that it was the Liberal government that privatised the bus services and gave them to these private companies who are in it to make a buck, more than anything else. That is not to say that the Labor government is without blame, because it had the opportunity, when it got into government, to take back metropolitan bus services under the wing of government and run them so that they delivered the services to the people that the people deserved, particularly those who had disabilities such as vision impairment or immobility in their legs.

To be fair, I finish with a reply from Neil Smith, the Manager of Torrens Transit. He wrote back to me about the various concerns that I had put to him and said:

In regard to the broader issue of the replacement of the Marion access service, the reaction has been as anticipated. A small number of passengers who are now required to change buses would prefer

the old pattern. On the other hand, a much larger group of residents now have access to Marion and usage of the new services is growing steadily. There appear to be no major issues relating to Bedford Industries employees. The level of complaint is not high for a set of changes of this magnitude, and we remain confident that the changes have increased the accessibility of public transport for the community as a whole.

I suppose that, if I were to rebut that, my simple point would be that the provision of public transport should not just be for the majority, for those who are able-bodied and who tend to catch buses between 8 a.m and 6 p.m. The point of public transport is that it must also cater for those who have some difficulty in owning a car or driving a car, and they can only be catered for if they are provided with bus services that, first, go outside the regular times and, secondly, are accessible to people with disabilities. I want to underline that this whole issue needs to be revisited and I urge the Minister for Transport to look at renegotiating the routes provided by Torrens Transit, because there are too many unhappy people at present in the south-western suburbs.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I am pleased to support the passage of the bill, which I note is a lot smaller than the amount in last year's Supply Bill, but that could be because the government this year has got its act into gear and will be introducing its budget in a more timely fashion than it managed to do last year. I seem to remember last year commenting on a number of issues that remain the same for this government. First, it still has far more money coming into the coffers than any previous government had. It does not have the massive debt. I accept what the member for West Torrens said in his contribution that the State Bank is now old history when people aged under 30 do not know what one is talking about when one talks about 'the State Bank'. I remember it; I remember the interest payments costing this state \$2 million a day. I think it will be a long time before this state really recovers from what that cost us in terms of the development of infrastructure and maintenance of programs. Where once we led the country, now, sadly, we are falling very much behind.

In addition to having no debt (to speak of) at this stage—although I note the government is getting itself into slightly more murky waters financially in recent months—property taxes have skyrocketed because property values have gone up. Indeed, there are blocks of land in Stirling coming up at about \$500 000—and that is extraordinary for a block of land. Admittedly, the blocks of land are a little bigger but that is an extraordinary amount of money to get the land, let alone build a house. No wonder people are starting to recognise the issue of housing affordability. Property taxes have meant an enormous windfall for this government, along with the GST windfall. This government is extremely wealthy in terms of the money it has. Unfortunately, it seems to be this government's habit to waste money in extraordinary and unwarranted ways. The spending of money on the tram extension springs instantly to mind because it is completely unjustified, unwarranted and unwanted. It will provide very little assistance because we already have a free bus service operating more than adequately. I dread to think what the dreadful trams will sound like as they take the bend from King William Street into North Terrace. I know in Melbourne they make an awful racket as they go around the bends; they are just appalling things. Nevertheless, the government is determined to push on with it, as it is determined to push on with a range of things. Another wonderful example of money

it wants to waste for political purposes only is the opening bridges at Port Adelaide.

The government has engaged, without being able to tell us what they are doing and without seeing any real improvement in things happening on the ground, an extra 8 000 public servants on staff. It seems that in every department—or certainly those I look at in the budget—there are massive increases in the number of public servants earning over \$100 000. We are creating this top-heavy Public Service. It largely comes down to the fact that this government has major philosophical differences from we on this side of the house. We actually like to promote private enterprise, encourage free enterprise and encourage volunteers. This government talks a lot about volunteers, but the reality of the way in which it approaches things is that it wants to build big bureaucracies. This government recently got rid of the Julia Farr services, the Independent Living Centre and the Intellectual Disability Services Council in favour of Disability Services SA. That will be nothing but a massive bureaucracy with extremely highly paid public servants. It will not be as efficient and effective as little NGOs in the community doing specialist jobs.

In response to the Layton report this government commissioned its workload analysis of the then department of FAYS. The people originally commissioned to do that work could not come to a conclusion after a few weeks of attempting to do the task they had been set. The consultants came back and said, 'We can't do this because the department is so dysfunctional and the problems are so deep and systemic that we cannot possibly do the task we have been engaged to do. All we can do is point out the major problems.' When an organisation is so big that it gets that sort of report card from an independent consultancy that is engaged to try to help resolve the problem, then it is necessary to rethink the way it is done. This government tends to want to keep everything in a huge Public Service bureaucracy. For example, they took away the licence for the independent organisation (which cost them about \$60 000 a year and which was organising the adoption of children from overseas) and replaced it with a Public Service department that costs them more like \$460 000 a year. There is no saving there. That is where the money is going. It is not going towards providing the services we need in the community.

I personally am in favour of small government—the smaller the better. In fact, I am reading an economics book written in the 1950s entitled *Small is Beautiful*. The idea is that you aim to keep your governments small. You aim to set up frameworks but you aim to let people decide how they want to live their life and how they want to run businesses, as far as you possibly can. My view is that governments should set up frameworks and provide the services that are necessary for those who cannot provide for themselves. I do not think there is any dispute on either side of the house that we need to provide those services. The problem is that this government is so busy creating huge bureaucracies that it is not getting the services into the community.

Up in the Hills at present we have an absolute crisis caused by Transit Plus deciding to change the buses. The member for Mitchell just talked about the need for better bus services. Like me, he may have been sold a pup. Certainly, they came out talking about this new bus regime as though it was going to be an improvement. The reality is that thousands of people are being dramatically inconvenienced. Instead of improving our public transport this government has moved the deck chairs on the *Titanic*. They are not increasing

funding. In fact, I have been to a number of public meetings where the people from Hills Transit have made it very clear very publicly that the problem is that they have not had a real increase in funding. That means that, if you want to increase services somewhere or put a new service somewhere, obviously without new funding you have to take the funding from somewhere else; and that means decreasing a service or getting rid of a service that exists somewhere else.

So, rather than an improvement in services, we have a depletion of services. What surprised me most of all, when we had a public meeting about it in Aldgate, was that it transpired that they did not have any facts and figures on which to base their changes. When they came to see me prior to announcing the changes to the bus service they said, 'The removal of this service will only affect six commuters who catch it,' and so on. It turns out that they did not conduct any surveys, or even ask the drivers, to find out any of this information. They just seem to have made up the figures, and they said that it would only affect one person, or two people, or half a dozen people.

I used to catch the bus far more often when I worked more regular hours. I have not caught the bus regularly for some time, but I like to catch the bus. I was aware that the bus for my area went around the district and, basically, straight down the freeway. However, it will now be necessary to go around the area and then change buses at the Crafers interchange. That is not a problem on a day like today—a beautiful, fantastic autumn day in Adelaide; it is no great problem. However, if it involves a mother with a child or someone with even a slight disability getting on and off a bus, if someone is at Crafers in the middle of winter when it is sleeting, or sometimes even snowing, when it is pelting with rain and freezing cold, getting on and off buses when previously we have not had to do that is just creating problems where none previously existed.

This government seems to have its priorities all wrong. It has created big bureaucracies and talked about how wonderful it thinks volunteers are, but all the time doing things which subvert volunteers and small organisations and prevent them from really obtaining the necessary funding to do the fabulous jobs that they are doing out in the community. It puzzled me, when I went to the first volunteers summit, that who should be there but Janet Giles from the UTLC (which, I think, is now called SA Unions). If there is a volunteers pact that is to be signed with the government, what are the unions doing there? It is not about the unions. It should be simply a pact between the government and the volunteers. However, the unions were signing the document. That has always made me suspicious, because we all know that the reality is that unions do not want volunteers; they want everyone to be employed and on union-based awards. I am highly suspicious about the way in which this government approaches that whole issue of volunteers, notwithstanding the Premier's bleatings about it from time to time.

This government is also wasting money on these super schools. I have seen the reports indicating that all the parents are in favour of it, but I have not seen the questions that were asked, and I do not know whether anyone asked, 'Would you rather we spent the money on a super school or that we put money into refurbishing and properly servicing and supporting the small schools that you already have?' I know that, in my area, people deliberately choose to send their children to a small school, for the very good reason that the nurturing and pastoral care they receive in a small school will be much better for them in growing up as citizens and as part of the

community. That is just as important a part of what they learn at school as their reading, writing and arithmetic lessons.

I have no doubt that the government intends to establish more than just this one super school in the north, and that its plan is ultimately to rid us of all the wonderful little schools that I have in my electorate in favour of massive schools. It is not stopping to reflect on what blind Freddy could see; that is, that it is creating social problems for the future. This government wastes money incredibly, when there are huge needs in the community that should be being met.

I have already talked about the issue in my area at the moment with respect to the need for transport for all the commuters and the young people who want to travel to the city for entertainment and things such as that. The Wandering Star service has been cut, along with a range of other things. However, in my portfolio areas, I see massive underfunding. Anyone that you talk to in the disability sector, in particular, will tell you that there is still massive underfunding. We still rank well below the average and, on a lot of indicators, we are at the bottom of the heap compared to all the other states in terms of the level of funding we provide for the disabled.

If a government, which is the wealthiest there has ever been and which supposedly has a social conscience, fails to deliver when it has all this money coming in, when can these people, who are our most vulnerable, expect to receive the services that they need and deserve? If you talk to any one of them, they will tell you that the needs are huge, particularly in the area of transport. There is not a sufficient number of Access Cabs, there is not a sufficient number of vouchers for people to use them and they are not allowed to be used in the most appropriate way. For instance, if someone has a certain number of vouchers that they are allowed to use for an Access Cab, we have asked: why could we not combine them? If someone still only uses the same number of vouchers but combines them and does one trip, because they live at Clayton, way out of the metropolitan area, going 30 kilometres out of Clayton and back is not a very useful trip. However, without taking any more vouchers than anyone else, but being able to combine them and have one trip to Adelaide every year, or every six months, would be a useful way to approach it.

The government has a very narrow view of what it will provide, and it will not even build in flexibility, which is one of the key things that people in the disability community need to enable them to participate more fully in the community. That is what the government says it wants, but it is not reflected in the way in which it runs its policies in terms of helping them to achieve that outcome.

Another area is accommodation for people with disabilities. There is no point in allowing some of the community housing organisations to acquire land and build houses on properties ready for people with disabilities to live in if the government is not willing to provide the services that those people need to enable them the freedom to live there. I have said before in this chamber that I cannot imagine what it must be like to have to raise a profoundly disabled child. For the last 50 years or so, we have been encouraging people who have profoundly disabled children to raise them at home. We do not expect them to be left in institutions any longer. However, the reality is that those children who were taken home 50 years ago are now 50 year olds, and older.

So those parents are left in a situation where the biggest concern in their life is: 'What is going to happen when I am too old or too frail, or I die and my child cannot be looked after by me because I have done it for 50, 60 or 70 years?' I

remember one case we came across some years ago on Yorke Peninsula: the man was in his 90s and his son was 73, and no-one even knew this pair existed because 73 years ago we did not have all the systems in place, so this man had slipped through the net, and here was this old father in his 90s who was really afraid to die because he had no security about what was going to happen to his son when he was no longer there to look after him.

Now, I think that is an abhorrence for us to have a community where that could happen. The people concerned have done such a service to this state and to our communities by taking these children home and raising them. As I said, these are parents who have given birth to profoundly disabled children and, probably even more remarkable, parents who have adopted or fostered profoundly disabled children and done it for years and years with no break, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with very little respite—maybe a day off every six weeks—no weekends as such. We should be saying to people in that circumstance: 'When you get to the point when you feel that you just cannot keep going, just put your hand up and the help will be there. We will guarantee that your child will have the care, the support, the ability to decide where to live,' whether it be in some small institution or whether it be in community-living settings, because not everyone wants to live out in the community.

Another thing that this government wants to do is push everyone out into the community, but not every parent or every disabled person wants to live out in the community, and I believe that we should be aiming for every person and every family to be able to choose what best suits them when mum and dad are no longer able to keep them at home, or when the young person simply decides they are ready to leave home. Just because they have a disability, even if it might be quite profound, does not mean they do not have the same longing for independence that we hope all our children have one day. They are just a couple of issues that this government has failed to address.

I heard the member for Flinders talking, and she certainly raised some very valid issues about the lack of road maintenance. We are spending all this money on trams and opening bridges and other things that really are not necessary, instead of putting money into badly needed—and sadly neglected for many years—road maintenance in the hills and in other areas of this state. We really have an appalling backlog of road maintenance that needs to be attended to in this state, and this government has been neglecting it in favour of being able to say: 'Oh, we are doing the tram extension,' or 'We are opening bridges out at Port Adelaide.' They will do anything to have some bright, shiny new button, but there is really no glamour in road maintenance. However, I believe that there are a lot of votes in it, because people actually do expect to notice the roads and the state of the roads.

I am all in favour of improving our public transport system, but remember that in Melbourne where they have this massive bus, train and tram system they are hopeful they will get to 15 per cent of journeys being on public transport by the year 2020, and that means 85 per cent of journeys are not on public transport, and that means a lot of them are going to be in private cars and, to that end, people do notice the state of the roads. I often hear people comment when they go to another state: 'Oh, the roads are so good.' So people do actually take notice of things like the state of the roads in assessing how well a state is doing and how much one would like to live there. The whole essence of what this government does is that it bleats about things that are really unimportant

in favour of spending real money on the things that are important.

Time expired.

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition):

When the budget was announced by the Treasurer in September 2006, he said:

Borrowing levels are forecast to increase over the next four years to fund the significant infrastructure spending included in this budget. Debt levels will remain low . . . However, net debt is only forecast to be \$689 million by June 2010.

That was enough to raise concern for anyone who reads that, because in the same speech he said:

This budget incorporates \$695.1 million over four years in a cost-saving and reform package resulting from a comprehensive review of government spending priorities.

It was detailed in the report that by 2009-10 there would be \$53.9 million in specific agency measure savings in Education and Children's Services, \$16.5 million in Health, \$11.4 million in Families and Communities, \$10 million in Justice, \$9.5 million in Transport, and \$51.8 million for the quarter per cent per annum efficiency dividend across agencies.

The position is clear that here we are nine months into the first financial year of the four-year forecasts; that we have had the disclosure in the past few days that the government has failed to meet any of the cost-saving initiatives as budgeted, notwithstanding that following the 2006 election the government had engaged Greg Smith to review government expenditure across all agencies. Members will recall that we had the promise that the 2006-07 budget included expenditure savings totalling \$277 million in 2009-10. Clearly, the government reform in this area and the savings—particularly through the initiatives of shared services—have failed or are failing already. So my fear is that our debt level will not have increased to \$689 million by June 2010: it will, in fact, be much greater because that figure relies on these other savings taking place.

We know why. There is an expenditure forecast for infrastructure spending because the government appears to be hellbent on proceeding with an extra \$100 million for opening bridges at Port Adelaide, \$31 million for trams, \$33 million for proposed developments at Victoria Park and \$17.5 million to buy back Modbury Hospital, all of which is expenditure which has raised considerable questions as to the benefit that flows from it. So, that is the course we are following and the problem we face in addition to other sleepers in the explosion of debt that are developing under this government.

Probably the most pronounced is in the area of WorkCover unfunded liability which, in all expectations and even from WorkCover's own annual report, could reach a staggering \$1 billion. That is one-third of the State Bank liability which we were left as a legacy of the Bannon/Arnold administration and in five short years we are up to some staggering levels of debt with no real expectation that that will be relieved.

In supporting the Supply Bill for 2007 to facilitate the continued functioning of government services, it is not without concern that I note that the government is not seriously addressing the management of the \$11 billion budgets that are now annual expenditure for government and which are only likely to continue to increase. Although a member state of a nation experiencing a period of financial growth, thanks to the Australian federal government, careful budgeting at that level and policies that promote advance-

ment, South Australia is slipping behind at an alarming rate. I ask the government to consider some of the areas for the forthcoming budget, and it is not just a question of spending or the provision of services, but how that may be appropriately funded.

In housing, particularly public housing for South Australia, I support the government in initiatives that involve the private sector, community organisations, local government, charities, trusts and the like in joining in partnership with government to help support community and public housing, although I was devastated to hear the government's announcement that it would sell off 8 000 homes owned by the South Australian Housing Trust. A bill has passed to hand all the governance and control of public housing to the minister and his CEO, and we are on the way for a major sell-off. That, in itself, would not be of concern if the government had promised that there would be a reciprocal and, at least, a balanced amount on the other side of the ledger, but I fear, as is clear already, given the level of commitment to community housing, and even other housing affordability projects, that we are going to have an ever-diminishing supply of housing, more homeless and a continuing crisis in that area.

Of course, there are aspects at the state level that could improve that, and I ask the Treasurer to take into account in his budget that of the \$1.1 billion that is raised—that is, one-tenth of the state annual budget—from property taxes, largely land tax, stamp duty and the like, some consideration ought to be given to a significant allocation of funding for public housing, if there is not going to be relief on that side of the ledger. I do not criticise state government members seeking to have extended support at the federal level, whether it is in capital grants, rent relief or the like, but I do say that is not something that can be relied on exclusively. It is unacceptable that it is trotted out as a repeated excuse. The South Australian government has its obligations and it has failed in that area to date. It is introducing policies that are dangerous for safe and secure housing of the 30-odd per cent of South Australians who cannot afford and will never be able to afford independent, private purchase or rental at the commercial rate of housing within the existing supply. That is a very serious matter: the dignity, safety and capacity for people to have secure employment is ever diminishing in this state.

As to mental health, a very clear message has gone out not only from Commissioner Cappo but also from the AMA, which has endorsed other reports, that suggests \$50 million recurrent expenditure on mental health is an absolute requisite. I ask the government to listen carefully to those submissions in order to understand what a serious state we are in. That requires not only community supported services and accommodation for those who are resident in the community but also a full redevelopment of the Glenside campus of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and additional supported accommodation, whether it is on that site or independent of it. The government has made a small start in the announcements it has made, and we expect to see those reflected in the budget but, to date, that has been grossly inadequate—a one-off \$25 million funding for community support services has all but evaporated. Clearly, that message must get through otherwise we will have a serious health crisis pending. Here, I refer to the \$17.5 million alone in the buyback of Modbury Hospital. Why not at least leave that in operation until 2010 and allocate that saving to real service coalface delivery?

When I speak of health services, I was interested to read in the submission by the AMA Dr Chris Cain's covering

letter in which he acknowledged that the funding for health that had been announced last year was really only sufficient to cover existing services. As I wrote to him recently, how the wheel turns in his acknowledgment of how serious that situation is unless there is an allocation of funding.

It seems that we have moved into an era when capital funding in health—whether it be for development of property, in particular public hospital assets, or the provision of hospital equipment—has all but evaporated for country resources and country people, who make up one-third of the population of this state. It is a very expensive option for them to come to the city to use city services, and I despair at the lack of support that they were given in last year's budget, and that needs to be remedied.

I continue to support the government's announcements, at least, that they will look at primary health care and support. I am very disappointed to see that the only two GP Plus centres, as they are to be known as, are the Aldinga site, which is really a consolidation of existing services in the Aldinga area, and the Woodville site, which in reality is just a transfer of a sexual advisory service from Kensington to Woodville, and that there is really no new additional service for those GP Plus centres. We are still waiting, of course, for Elizabeth and Marion. We have a promise of 10 and it will be a decade before they are even rolled out. So, yes, lots of good words, lots of encouragement, lots of direction which is applauded by a number, but the rollout of these services is despairingly slow.

I also note that after five years in power the Rann government has not increased pensioner concessions, even though those on fixed incomes are finding it increasingly difficult to squeeze a living out of their allowances. The cost of living has increased significantly in that time, through a combination of rising petrol and food prices as well as the increasing cost of electricity, water, sewerage and council rates, but pensioner concessions have not increased in line with those. For those on pensions, the commonwealth has regular updates and increases. We all know it is a low base of income, and those in the community who are on fixed incomes, like the pensioners, are hardest hit. There really must be some relief after five years of there being no increase in those pensioner concessions. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

DEVELOPMENT (ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

BARLEY EXPORTING BILL

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

No. 1 Clause 23, page 9—

Delete clause 23 and substitute:

23—Review and expiry of Act

(1) The Minister must, within 2 years after the commencement of this Act, cause a review of the Act to be undertaken and the outcome of the review to be incorporated into a report.

(2) The Minister must, within 6 sitting days after receipt of the report, ensure that a copy of the report is laid before each House of Parliament.

(3) This Act will expire on the third anniversary of its commencement.

(4) On the expiry of this Act, the amendment made by Schedule 3 of this Act to the *Essential Services Commission Act 2002* is cancelled and the text of that Act is restored to the form in which that statutory text would have existed if this Act had not been passed.

STATE LOTTERIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

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

No. 1. Clause 6, page 4, after line 27—

After proposed subsection (4) insert:

(4a) The Commission must, on each ticket in a special appeal lottery, specify the proportion of the net proceeds of the lottery that is to be paid to the beneficiaries of the lottery.

No. 2. New Clause, page 7, after line 28—

After clause 12 insert:

13—Review of effect of special appeal lotteries

(1) The Minister must cause a review of the operation of section 13AB of the *State Lotteries Act 1966* (as inserted by section 6 of this Act) to be undertaken as soon as practicable after the second anniversary of the commencement of section 6 of this Act.

(2) The person undertaking the review must present a report on the review to the Minister within 6 months after commencing the review.

(3) The report—

(a) must address the effect (whether detrimental or otherwise) of the conduct of special appeal lotteries on the fund-raising activities of each beneficiary of the lotteries; and

(b) if the person undertaking the review receives any submissions from beneficiaries of special appeal lotteries—must include a response to each submission.

(4) The Minister must cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 6 sitting days after receiving the report.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.58 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 28 March at 2 p.m.