

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Friday 17 July 2009

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.K. Sneath)** took the chair at 11:02 and read prayers.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (11:02): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers and question time to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY (CLINICAL PRACTICES) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 July 2009. Page 2949.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (11:03): I support the second reading of the bill. One of the joys of having been in the chamber for a long time is that I was able to go back and recall my contributions on the original legislation in 1987 when the bill was first debated in order to refresh my memory and see whether or not, with the passage of years, some of my views had been confirmed and whether or not some of my views had changed. It is fair to say—I guess with many of us—that with the passage of time it has been a combination of both. In some respects, my own views and the views of society have moved on in relation to the complex and, at times, controversial issues that were canvassed in the original legislation more than 20 years ago. In some areas, the views I expressed at that time remain firmly held—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members will take their caucus meetings outside.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In looking at the 1987 debate, I note that some of the provisions that still exist in the legislation—and will remain in the legislation, even with the potential passage of this amending bill—were as a result of amendments that I moved in the original debate. In particular, I refer to what was the very controversial and vexed question at that stage of the confidentiality provision, which is clause 18 of this bill and which basically provides that a person 'cannot disclose the identity of a donor of human reproductive material except', and there are a number of exceptions, including 'with the consent given in the prescribed manner of the donor of the material'.

Going back over that debate, it was one of the most controversial aspects of the legislation at that time, and it remains controversial when one looks at the debate on this bill in the House of Assembly. This issue and the views of some members in relation to potential changes to the confidentiality provisions were key issues raised during their contributions to the debate. The other area which remains as part of the legislation is the issue in clause 20 of the current act relating to regulations.

Without going over the whole detail of it, the provision that I moved at that time—and it remains part of the legislation today—in essence, seeks to give this parliament greater authority over some of the changes, and that was to institute the requirement that a regulation must be considered by the parliament before it comes into law. Most regulations, of course, once proclaimed by the government become law. They can then be disallowed by the parliament; and you can then go through a process where the government can proclaim, again, a regulation and the parliament can, again, disallow it, and members will be aware of occasions in the past where that has occurred.

Because of the vexed nature of this legislation, there was a long debate at the time, and ultimately this council and the parliament accepted the notion that, because of the controversial nature of some of the issues, this parliament ought to retain some greater authority, some greater power and some greater oversight over the executive arm of government and the other administrative bodies that had been established to try to assist with the ethics of these practices. As I said, the parliament should have greater authority and oversight over those two elements of

the decision making process, that is, the executive arm of government and the other administrative bodies that have been established by the executive arm of government to look at ethical issues.

In looking, as I said, at the debate (and I do not intend today to recreate or reproduce all the arguments of that time), it is fair to say that widely and wildly divergent views were expressed by members at that time. I would have to say that, on this occasion, there has been much less heat, fire and passion in the debate than there was 20 years ago. During the previous debate, for example, I and other members quoted at length from views that were expressed to us by the Catholic Church, the Lutheran Church, other church representatives, academics and interested parties.

It was an issue that, I guess, was new at the time and therefore attracted a number of submissions. I am not sure about other members, but, in relation to this bill, I have received very few submissions. I have certainly received no submissions at all from church or ethics groups. The Southern Cross Bioethics Institute often lobbies us and other commentators on issues like this. Again, I am not sure what the inbox or in-tray of other members has been like, but mine has been noticeably silent on the important issue.

The reality of that is that everyone is generally comfortable with the way this has operated over the past 20 years or so, and therefore there was no cause or need to put points of view or, perhaps sadly, many of these groups have lost interest in a range of these issues or, because it has attracted so little publicity, many of them might not have been aware of the particular changes. Anyway, be that as it may, we can only work with what we have. We have the legislation. I have indicated my support for the second reading of the bill.

At this stage, I am aware of only two amendments coming, not unexpectedly, from slightly divergent directions, that is, from the Hon. Mr Hood and the Hon. Mr Hunter. I am sure it is a comfort to both of them that, on this issue, they are coming from different directions rather than from the same direction. I understand well the issues raised by the Hon. Mr Hood because they were fundamental to the debate in the 1980s; that is, the paramount interest, the primary interest (whatever descriptive words you want to use) in the legislation should be in the interests of the child.

In this bill, the government is intending to change that and, in Mr Hood's view and in that of some others, dilute the primary target of the legislation as being in some way the interests of the child. The Hon. Mr Hood's amendment, in essence, I think is directed to returning us to the original intentions of the legislation. I indicate that, at this stage, I am sympathetic to the proposition put by the Hon. Mr Hood. I will listen to the arguments both for and against at the committee stage of the debate, but I flag that, at this stage, I am sympathetic to the position the Hon. Mr Hood is putting and, unless convinced otherwise, I would be supportive.

The Hon. Mr Hunter's amendment is more complicated. I must admit that I had to have a brief discussion with the Hon. Mr Hunter yesterday to understand exactly what is intended to be achieved by his proposed amendment. I will listen to the argument he puts. I would say that I would probably (although not unexpectedly for the Hon. Mr Hunter) start off from a position of potentially not supporting the amendment, but I am prepared to listen to the argument that will ensue at the committee stage.

It raises an interesting issue, because, going back to the 1987 debate, a huge amount of time was taken up at the committee stage with this whole issue of who should have access to what was then described as 'IVF treatment'. I guess 'morality' is too strong a word, from my viewpoint, anyway—it might be from others—but there are moral issues. There are also issues in relation to cost and which procedures ought to be subsidised or paid for by taxpayers in relation to access to what is medical treatment. There is a complex interrelationship between some of those factors, which, for a number of us, will need to be considered.

In that debate—essentially, the overwhelming view of the majority of members at the time was that it should be limited to married couples—I indicated that I supported access to it for married couples and putative spouses under the then definition of a putative spouse, which I think, in essence, was five years' cohabitation. A number of members, at that time, did not support the extension beyond married couples to putative spouses. Essentially, the overwhelming view was that it was to be available to married couples or, as I said, a male and a female in an ongoing de facto or putative spouse arrangement.

Our legislation, passed in 1987, was intended to achieve that. This is an interesting and illustrative point of what has occurred in the past 20 years. A number of members in both chambers

have referred to the fact that, as a result of a court decision in 1996, the commonwealth sex discrimination act allowing access to IVF treatment (as it was then known) could not be restricted to married couples. I think it is informative to look at that.

I suspect—I cannot say categorically—that, when the commonwealth sex discrimination legislation was passed, no-one contemplated whether this would some time later override a clearly expressed intention of the state parliament of South Australia, that is, that it ought to be restricted to married couples. This is one of the issues that we need to consider and I know we debate on occasions, that is, the federal legislation potentially overriding a clearly expressed view of the representatives of the South Australian community, that is, the South Australian Parliament.

If, with the passage of time, the South Australian Parliament changes its view in 1996 or 2009, that is one thing. The South Australian Parliament votes on it and that is the case. What we saw in this case was parliament expressing a view in 1987 and then the commonwealth expressing a view in relation to the commonwealth sex discrimination legislation and, ultimately, a court decision saying that the commonwealth law overrides the state law. I must admit, I was not aware of this until more recent times, but the minister has indicated that, since 1996, as a result of that decision, IVF treatment (ART treatment, as it is referred to now) has been available to single persons. So, this legislation, in part, seeks to reflect that.

The Hon. Mr Hunter's amendment, as I understand it, goes further than his own minister was prepared to go. I think his own minister indicated he was prepared to move so far, but the Hon. Mr Hunter's amendment says that it does not go far enough and we need to extend it even further to another group of persons. As I said, I will listen to the Hon. Mr Hunter's explanation of that during the committee stage, but I indicate at this stage that I start from a position of probably not supporting it, and I would need to be convinced why we ought to extend its scope.

I do not intend to go through a detailed argument of the other provisions of the legislation. As I said, it has been noticeable that we have not really been strongly lobbied by very many individuals or groups in regard to this legislation. I support the second reading, and at this stage we will listen to the debate on the two amendments that have so far been flagged.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy) (11:20): By way of concluding remarks I thank members for their contributions to this important bill. It is my understanding that members of this council will be exercising a conscience vote on this bill. For some members, assisted reproductive treatment raises some moral concerns, and for others it is accepted medical practice to assist people to have a family.

The bill proposes to amend and update the Reproductive Technology (Clinical Practices) Act 1988 to ensure that it meets the needs of South Australians requiring assisted reproductive treatment into the 21st century; it also ensures that assisted reproductive treatment services in South Australia are transparent and are provided responsibly and ethically. The welfare of the child will, in all cases, remain paramount, and I thank the Hon. Dennis Hood for his amendment.

This bill also proposes to allow for posthumous use of sperm by the surviving partner. I reassure members of the strict requirements under which this will be permitted. First, the sperm must have been collected prior to the man's death and, importantly, the man must have consented prior to his death to its posthumous use. The stored sperm can be used only by the deceased man's surviving female partner. There are also strict national ethical guidelines set by the National Health and Medical Research Council.

Clinics must comply with these guidelines as part of their registration under this bill and also as part of their national accreditation. The Minister for Health in the other place has already indicated that, for a small number of women who end up in these circumstances, few proceed with treatment. It is the case with Sheree Blake which highlighted the issues in the South Australian legislation; however, other South Australian women may have been in the same circumstance but, because they themselves were not considered infertile, treatment under South Australian law was not available.

These women were able to take their deceased husband's sperm interstate for treatment but were unable to obtain treatment in their home state. I stress the stringent requirements in this portion of the bill. I believe there are adequate protections within this proposal to ensure that the welfare of the child is paramount. The required counselling, as well as clinical ethics committee

advice, would ensure that all the social, legal and psychological issues are explored and addressed prior to anyone having treatment.

The bill allows the decision of the couple, which is unlikely to have been reached lightly, to be fulfilled. It recognises the wish of the woman's husband or partner, that he had given specific consent for the use of his sperm after his death, and allows this express direction to be carried out. I take this opportunity to remind members that this amendment bill is not a radical shift in policy; these changes reflect nationally accepted clinical practice and, if passed, will bring South Australia's ART laws into the 21st century.

Access to treatment is still based on clinical need and is restricted to people who appear to be infertile or at risk of transmitting a genetic defect but now includes those at risk of passing on a serious condition such as HIV to a child conceived naturally. The bill will ensure that the regulation of ART in South Australia is responsive to emerging issues and will improve treatments, thereby benefiting those in need of ART for safe family formation. I commend the bill to the council.

Bill read a second time.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 July 2009. Page 2960.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (11:24): I reflected in the past that the Appropriation Bill provides the parliament with the opportunity to review the priorities of the government of the day and take stock of the progress or otherwise on those priorities. This is the Rann government's eighth budget and, hopefully, for the sake of the people of South Australia, it will be its last.

For the first seven years, the Rann government enjoyed some of the best years South Australia has ever seen. Basking in the success of federal Liberal economic management, it has experienced record revenues, huge—in fact, as the leader of the government would say, 'massive'—GST windfalls and a booming economy. Yet in the boom times the Rann government has failed to provide for the future, instead letting its expenses get out of hand—a fact highlighted by the Auditor-General on several occasions.

Despite record revenues there has been little or no infrastructure, no action, no vision. At the end of this government's second term and, with the onset of the global financial crisis, the government should have been able to deliver a budget highlighting a record of achievement. Instead, this budget shows the government to be more like a deer in headlights: now, when the good times have come to an end, it does not know which way to go. Spending federal bailouts has become a cover for a stale government lacking in vision and purpose.

I turn now to the budget and the government's performance in each of my areas of shadow responsibility; first, water security. South Australians remain extremely concerned about water security. It is not a new issue. The government repeatedly bleats that it cannot be blamed for the drought, but our water crisis predates the drought. Let me quote the Premier. In 2004 he wrote a foreword in the report of the water expert Thinker in Residence the late Peter Cullen, which stated:

The water situation in South Australia has become critical...I do believe, however, that South Australians are coming to realise that we now need to act with some urgency...a fresh, bold approach is needed.

So, let us hold the Premier accountable for his own words. That was in 2004; now, five years on, how is the government going in terms of pursuing an urgent, fresh, bold approach on water?

There certainly was not any urgency in the government's investment in water infrastructure. The recently released 2007-08 National Performance Report of the National Water Commission shows that, while the rest of the nation was investing heavily in water infrastructure mid-decade, the Rann government was just sitting around hoping it would rain. In 2003-04, at the same time as the Premier's call for urgency, Adelaide was spending the national average spend per capita on water and waste water infrastructure amongst the metropolitan major water utilities; yet data from the National Water Commission shows that, while the other states increased spending to more than \$200 per person per capita, the Rann government cut its per capita spending to only \$73 per person.

On average, capital expenditure by the major metropolitan water utilities more than doubled from \$1.1 billion in 2002-03 to \$2.8 billion in 2007-08—a 130 per cent increase. However, the Rann government increased its capital spending in Adelaide by only 10 per cent—not even the

rate of inflation. In this year's budget the government is now trying to claim that it has significantly increased capital works expenditure in response to the crisis. This is a crisis that the Premier said we were in in 2004, yet he failed to invest in dealing with that crisis until five years later—and, even then, it is hardly broad based.

In fact, two-thirds of the capital investment announced in the recent budget is in one project: the Adelaide desalination plant. The water from this plant will be able to be distributed to only half the metropolitan area of Adelaide. It is hardly a comprehensive response to the water security challenge facing the people of Adelaide and South Australia. What is more, no new water projects will be delivered before the end of 2010; most projects will come online between 2011 and 2014. So, where is the urgency that the Premier claimed in 2004? The first projects from this budget will be delivered some six years after the Premier's call for an urgent response. Clearly, this government and this budget have failed to respond to the water challenge in a timely fashion.

What of the other point: the Premier's call for a fresh and bold approach? There has certainly been nothing fresh about the government's approach to water security. While the opposition has shown leadership on water, calling for fresh approaches such as desalination and stormwater capture and re-use, in contrast the government has focused on the laziest response: suppressing demand. Adelaide has faced water restrictions since 2003 which, even the Premier himself admits, are punitive. Basically, the public is being punished for the government's failure to invest.

What is the government's attitude to the not so easy options? Let us consider stormwater. This Labor government is chronically sceptical about stormwater. In 1989, the Bannon Labor government released its report, entitled South Australia's Water Future, which estimated that up to 75 gigalitres of Adelaide's stormwater run-off could be captured, treated in wetlands and stored in aquifers. Does that sound familiar?

Now, 20 years later, another Labor government is telling us that, in 2050, it hopes to be able to catch 75 gigalitres per annum. It is 20 years since Labor first said that it would do it. It now says that it will be another 40 years before we reach 75 gigalitres per annum. The telling difference, though, is that the 1989 report suggested that 75 gigalitres per annum could be harvested from the metropolitan area of Adelaide. The Water for Good target of 75 gigalitres by 2050 is actually a target for the whole of South Australia. So, we have to wait 60 years for this government to underachieve compared with its predecessors.

Experts with a proven track record on delivering projects on stormwater on the ground—such as Colin Pitman—are confident that we can deliver a lot more water decades earlier than Labor's half-hearted plan. The government's short-term target of 20 gigalitres by 2014 is less than the output of projects already in operation or under construction as identified by the Centre for Economic Studies published for the Local Government Association.

In terms of investment, less than 3 per cent of the water security investment announced in the 2009-10 budget relates to stormwater. This government is a chronic stormwater sceptic, and it is even worse than previous Labor administrations. It stubbornly refuses to embrace the opportunities, and it is condemning future generations of South Australians to water insecurity and lower economic growth. While Labor's Stormwater Management Authority is focused on flood mitigation, South Australians recognise that stormwater is a resource, not just a problem.

In contrast, the Liberal opposition is keen to establish a water capture and re-use commission as one of its first acts in government. This body will provide leadership and a streamlined structure to bring stakeholders together to fast-track stormwater harvesting opportunities. We have a credible strategy to harvest 89 gigalitres, which contrasts with the Labor Party's long-term ambition to achieve somewhat less than 75 gigalitres.

A properly coordinated and accelerated plan is likely to reduce the total cost of projects by ensuring that harvesting and distribution opportunities reach a critical mass much earlier. South Australia cannot afford to be held back by Labor's stormwater sceptics. Labor's priority in water is demonstrated by its \$2.5 million expenditure in advertising its recently released Water for Good plan. That money would have been better spent on stormwater opportunities.

I remind the council that the Morphettville racecourse stormwater project will cost \$2.4 million and will deliver 512 megalitres of water. If the government wanted a quick hit, \$2.4 million could buy 6.7 billion litres or 2,700 Olympic size swimming pools of temporary water on the River Murray.

South Australians do not need education on the value of water. They get it; it is the government that needs education. The government has also failed on the need for a fresh approach. In 2004, the Premier called for a bold approach yet, on this measure, the government and this budget fail once again.

Shortly after the budget, the so-called Independent Commissioner for Water Security released the government's Water for Good plan, a plan that the government says will guarantee South Australia's water security. But what South Australia needs is action, vision and leadership, not another plan. We have already had the 2005 Water Proofing Adelaide plan, which was supposed to be a 20 year plan to secure Adelaide's water supply. Now, only four years into that 20 year plan, the government has released a new plan—this time, a 41 year plan.

This latest plan includes plans for yet more plans, including a natural resources management plan, a Greater Adelaide plan, several regional plans, two water allocation plans, a strategic water information and monitoring plan, a stormwater master plan and a wastewater master plan. Clearly, the government's cunning plan is to plan to have yet more plans. This is not action: this is just spin. There is nothing bold in the Water for Good report. When it is trying to excuse past inaction, it is putting off action with a commitment to planning.

There is nothing in Water for Good which is bold in addressing the urgent issues which face us in 2009 and beyond. We see a recommitment to Labor's focus on suppressing demand in the hope that it will rain, ignoring the changing environment from climate change. Labor's plan makes no allowance for an increase in the water needed as a result of climate change, particularly in dealing with the urban heat island effect.

The Water for Good report highlights the work being done by Monash University, in particular in relation to the impact of the urban heat island effect; that is, localised warming related to an increase in the amount of paved and dark coloured surfaces resulting from urban development. The report states that the resulting higher temperatures can be expected to lead to increased water and energy consumption. The effect of urban heat may be reduced by ensuring that there are sufficient green spaces within urban areas. Some scientists suggest the integration of rooftop gardens and the establishment of within canopy vegetation. Yet, the government wants to reduce water demand as part of this plan by an additional 50 gigalitres over the next 40 years in spite of a considerable increase in our population.

Once again, it is up to the Liberals to show leadership, to come up with solutions, and all Labor can do is plan to plan. It was the Liberals who committed to independent price regulation in our 2007 policy; it was the Liberals who introduced the Third-Party Access Bill in 2006; and, last month, we released a detailed model for Action Now on fast tracking fresh water. It is the Liberals who have a comprehensive strategy to harvest 89 gigalitres of stormwater across Adelaide.

In truth, the Water for Good plan and its \$2.4 million advertising campaign are nothing more than an attempt to distract from the government's inaction on water security and its failure to deliver on the Premier's demand for an urgent, fresh, bold approach. Tragically, it is the electors of the Minister for Water Security's own electorate who are suffering the most. It was the Liberals who first pushed for water for irrigators to keep permanent plantings alive, and it was months before the government reacted. Now we are told that future arrangements are dependent on deals with other states.

The recent budget has not even allocated any funds for a critical water allocation program for 2009-10. South Australia's permanent planting irrigators are left with the same hollow feelings of doubt and uncertainty for their future that they felt last year before the announcement of the program.

I now turn to the local government portfolio. Through partnerships with the state and commonwealth governments and the coordination of expertise and resources, local government strives to deliver services on the ground. While the Rann government likes to criticise, mock and denigrate local councils, the state budget papers show that the financial performance of the local government sector compared with the state government is quite remarkable.

The budget papers show that over the past five years the local government sector has steadily reduced its operating deficit; in fact, in 2007-08, the operating deficit is recorded as a dash. That understated dash shows that the local government sector as a whole has achieved an operating surplus for the first time on record. This is a significant achievement and in stark contrast to the state budget, which is set to go into deficit. While the state government has been squandering its money, the local government sector has achieved its first operating surplus. Not

only that but at the same time the budget papers show that the local government sector has invested a record \$447 million in capital works.

So, while the Rann government has squandered its record revenues and produced little in terms of investment in capital works, the local government sector has eliminated its operating deficit and maintained a strong capital works program. Perhaps members opposite could take a leaf out of the local government sector's books.

It is also interesting to note that the budget papers show that in 2009-10 state government funding for the local government sector will increase by 0.008 per cent despite Treasury estimates of a 1.75 per cent increase in CPI over the 2009-10 financial year. In fact, the local government price index (that is, the real cost of goods and services which councils buy) is closer to 4.2 per cent, leaving the government sector short by over \$3 million. Yet, at the same time, the budget for the Office of State/Local Government Relations (the state government bureaucracy) has increased by almost 3 per cent.

I now turn to the area of disability services. People with a disability are among the most vulnerable members of our community, and they are also among the most creative and enterprising. On the one hand, we have a moral duty to support South Australians to lead a decent life while, on the other, we owe it to ourselves to support South Australians with a disability to make their contribution to the economic and social success of the state.

This budget continues the shameful lack of support of people with a disability and those who care for them. In fact, it is a step backwards from the already poor record of the Rann government. One of the biggest issues facing the sector, particularly in the face of the economic downturn, is funding at both individual and NGO levels.

In speaking to many disability service providers from the non-government sector, one of the recurring themes is the sustainability of those organisations, given the rising cost of employing and retaining professional and trained staff, compounded by the reduction in investment revenue and charitable donations due to the global financial crisis.

Even before the crisis hit, there was concern within the sector as salaries and expenses increased, particularly the salaries of professionals, such as therapists. The cost of providing a service was increasing, yet the total indexation per year was in the area of only 3 per cent.

As part of the new national disability agreement, the commonwealth government has increased the indexation on its share of the disability sector funding to 5 per cent. But, unlike the Howard government, it has not put any conditions on this indexation increase or any requirements for the indexation to be passed on to the service providers.

Unfortunately, the commonwealth contribution goes directly to the South Australian government, and indications are that the state government will refuse to pass on the full indexation to service providers. When questioned about this in estimates, the minister said that the state government was negotiating with service providers regarding the indexation. They sound like mealy-mouthed words. How can you negotiate on indexation which is already intended for the NGOs? Does the government seriously believe that there are any NGOs out there, in the current climate, who will say, 'No, you keep it. We don't need our indexation'?

Organisations like Novita, Minda or SCOSA, to name only a few, provide valuable, effective services to people with a disability and should be supported to do so before they are forced to cut services due to budget constraints. How mean-spirited is this government that, instead of passing on the indexation from the commonwealth, it would grab not only its share of the indexation but use the non-government share to prop up its own services and feed its burgeoning bureaucracy?

South Australia continues to experience distressing waiting lists in disability services. The Minister for Disability admitted in the estimates committees that this budget would only be funding services to people with a disability who are classified as category 1 or 2. Category 1 means that a carer has died and the person with a disability is at immediate risk of becoming homeless. Category 2 means that the carer is threatening to commit suicide or relinquish if they do not get help and the person with a disability is at risk of becoming homeless.

These are scandalous conditions that people need to fulfil in order to receive services. For example, an advocate told me of one of the situations that they are dealing with. The client is a young man with spina bifida with very complicated health issues. His father is in his 60s and is alone trying to support his son. The father has not had respite for some time and the son receives four hours of care per month for recreational purposes.

The father has to threaten to commit suicide before his son would be eligible to get any service, yet the young man and his father are surely entitled to lead a life with dignity. The son has not been able to get out of bed for a few weeks because his wheelchair is giving him pressure sores. He is still waiting for a new wheelchair.

That leads me to what I thought was a shameful admission by the minister in estimates. When she was questioned about whether there was a waiting list for equipment, she stated:

There has been a consolidation of domiciliary care and disability equipment, which means we have been able to provide a lot more equipment in relation to our budget and, in 2008-09, I think we cleared the adult waiting list for equipment.

The reality is that there are still hundreds of South Australians who are waiting for disability equipment. Let me outline some of the stories of people who have had contact with me in recent months. One person has been waiting for seven years for a wheelchair. Another young person has been told that they have to wait a bit longer for their wheelchair, after waiting three years. Another person has been told that they will have to wait six months for a wheelchair cushion. One constituent recently did receive a hoist, but it took 14 months and three assessments.

The reality is that people are waiting for equipment. The minister's statement on the equipment waiting list for adults is either a shameful lack of knowledge of what is happening in this portfolio or a shameful devaluation of those who are waiting. The first step in addressing a crisis is being honest enough to face the reality and state it truthfully.

Another example of Labor's failure to provide essential equipment for people with a disability and give them the support they need is the cancellation of the Statewide Complex Communication Needs project, for people with severe communication difficulties. The SCCN program provided assessment training and technology support services for children and adults living with complex communication needs. It was funded through NovitaTech at a cost of \$900,000 for one year.

The program bundled communications equipment with support such as training, social networking and technology support for both children and adults. Evaluation showed that it was turning lives around. Communication is a fundamental need of people which affects every aspect of their lives. The fact that the government stopped funding this vital service is a reflection on its priorities. During the 12 months that the project was running, the department found the money to establish a new and additional deputy chief executive for the department at a total estimated cost of \$400,000.

In relation to housing, I am advised that Housing SA stock for people with a disability has an 18-month waiting list for people on category 1, whereas two years ago that wait was only six months. In relation to category 2, the wait has increased to six years.

In relation to Disability SA, the disability sector continues to reel from the restructuring announced in 2006. The concept was flawed and the implementation was appalling. There remains significant concern in the disability sector at the lack of disability awareness amongst the leadership in Disability SA. One of the few leaders who had experience in the disability sector was Ms Lynn Young, but many people are concerned that, while she is on leave of absence, it is not proposed to fill that position.

Despite the stress and instability being experienced in Disability SA, the fact is that the Department for Families and Communities thinks that it cannot cover that position. My understanding is that the chief executive of the department is intending to cover that role. I know that there are significant concerns in the sector that that is not a sustainable arrangement, nor does it give the sector the prospect of being able to address the multitude of issues.

Recently, I have had a number of contacts regarding the fact that there are hundreds of contracts for services for people with disability which are not being renewed. In other words, there has been a delay in the renewal of contracts post 1 July. I call on the government to urgently identify what the problem is and resolve it. People with disability do not need the insecurity of not knowing whether their support worker will be funded to turn up when needed.

In terms of support workers, I know that there is growing concern in the sector about the need for both appropriate remuneration and training, and the need to increase funding. I have had concerns expressed to me by people with disability and those who are caring for them about increases in salaries for disability support workers which are not being funded. The people with a

disability are being forced into the situation where they have to choose between losing a valued worker or reducing their support hours.

Before moving on to the issue of education, I would like to touch on the matter of individualised funding within disability services. Individualised funding is a support model which has evolved over three decades in countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States. By allowing people to choose which services and supports best suit their individual needs, individualised funding empowers people with a disability to shape their future and to participate in and enrich their communities. This contrasts with the government's 'one size fits all' approach. This budget is a continuation of the government's bureaucratic and centralised decision-making process.

The opposition believes that people with a disability and those who support them understand their support needs better than politicians or bureaucrats. We believe it is time for the government to put the people who use the support in control of their own lives and, on that basis, we have committed to introduce individualised funding.

Despite minister Weatherill's request to the Disability Advisory Council to investigate the opportunity of individualised funding in February last year, it was not until this budget 16 months later that we were to see any action. There was a passing reference to individualised funding in the budget paper, and it was only in estimates that the government, under questioning, was to reveal that there will be a pilot of individualised funding later this year.

The opposition believes that the pilot may not even be necessary. After all, this concept has been well and truly tried interstate and overseas, and it may well have been better to take a dynamic approach to implementation, as a number of South Australians are already receiving what would be described as individualised funding.

There is concern in the sector, too, that there was no consultation with the community regarding the design of the tool. I have been contacted by service providers who, until estimates, were not aware of the trial, the scope of the trial or, in particular, the resource allocation tool that will be used. One can only assume that the government has a sceptical approach to individualised funding and is striving to slow down progress towards it so that it can protect its centralised approach.

I would now like to move onto the issue of education for people with a disability. Disability impacts on the full range of life domains, and education is a particularly important area in this regard. First, people with a disability are entitled to a full education and, secondly, education can often ameliorate some of the impacts of disability, particularly an intellectual disability.

My colleague the shadow minister for education, David Pisoni, and I have been meeting recently with parents and school boards who either care for a person with a disability or have a responsibility in this area. We have been concerned at what seems to be a falling level of service provided by the education department in this area.

One group the education department seems to be having particular trouble coping with is children and young people with autism. Following a rally on the steps of Parliament House recently, some parents provided me with stories to help me understand the issues they face in terms of education. I would like to quote some excerpts from their letters now. For the sake of privacy, I have changed the names of the children.

One of the recurring themes in the letters is instability in education service delivery. Whereas a family normally expects a child to take their primary education in one school and their secondary education in another, through a range of factors a recurring experience of people with a disability is that they are shunted from school to school and from arrangement to arrangement.

One of the issues highlighted in the material was the need for early assessment and intervention. The stories recur, just to highlight the fact that people are waiting one, two, three years for an assessment, let alone for a service delivery to be planned. One of the disturbing elements in the letter is the need for support and training of teachers to deal with students with autism. I quote from a letter from a mother, whose son I shall call Joshua, as follows:

My son Joshua...has...autism. He does not have an Intellectual Disability but has low adaptive functioning with splinter skills and gaps in abilities. He has high anxiety levels and easily triggers into a state of fight or flight. He requires routine, structure and adjusted curriculum.

Joshua started mainstream school with four hours a day funding for a teachers aide. A great deal of thought and planning went into his transition to school, and he was placed in a class with a teacher who had a good

understanding of autism. Joshua gradually worked up his attendance from one hour a day until finally, by the last two weeks of term 4 [of kindy], he was attending full time. Joshua would meltdown at least once a week invoking a 'take home'—

that is where a child needs to return to their home—

and was unable to keep up with other children unless his teacher's aide was with him. Joshua struggled with group time/floor time, noise levels and other sensory issues..[but] Joshua did enjoy the social aspect of school, and the other children were kind to him.

I pause here to highlight that, in spite of the fact that Joshua continued to be a challenge in the school environment, clearly, the family appreciated the support given, and it was a successful, sustainable arrangement. The letter continues:

Joshua was not transitioned properly to Year 1. The teacher he was placed with made it clear that she was unhappy. The teacher did not 'believe' in autism and came up with three alternative diagnoses—the final one being that he was possessed by demons and required an exorcism. Joshua spent his entire school day on a desk outside the classroom playing with lego under the supervision of the teacher's aide. He began to be bullied during non-structured times. His stress levels and anxiety levels at home rose dramatically, and at this age [6], he began to play out ways to kill himself....One day he signed in Makaton (a sign language used by many ASD children) that he needed to go to the toilet. The teacher asked him to sit down, put his hand up and ask properly. He wet himself. The teacher became upset and accused him of 'being defiant' and as punishment left him in his urine soaked clothing for the rest of the day. At this point, I removed Joshua from this school and looked for alternative schooling options.

By way of a footnote, Joshua's mother did indicate that that experience was not in a South Australian school. However, it is consistent with the other letters and stories I have heard, and I use it because in the one letter it contrasts the impact that a well-trained and aware and sensitive teacher can have on the positive education experience of a person with disabilities. The mother of a girl I will call Emma says:

As parents, we were told that we should be grateful for the services we were receiving. We were asked if we ever disciplined her. At one point, I watched as she was assaulted by a teacher, who grabbed her by her schoolbag and dragged her through a doorway, making her fall to the ground. This incident occurred because the teacher in question did not understand anything about autism and did not realise that opening the door in the morning was one of Emma's rituals. If this teacher had some basic training in autism this incident would never have happened.

I reiterate the point that it is extremely important for teachers to have appropriate support and training so that they are able to provide support to a child with autism in their class.

Another recurring theme in the letters is the need for well-developed and well-maintained strategies. Many parents tell me that they feel that the NEP, which I understand means negotiated education programs, are not about developing education services for their child: it has become a process whereby the Department of Education and Children's Services is shunting the onus back to the parents to justify their child's right to access education and to be provided the resources they need to be in a school environment. I quote from a letter from the parent of a boy I will call Anthony. They say:

Since starting at the DECS school it has been as if Anthony has been on a rollercoaster. He has achieved success but has also experienced extreme levels of anxiety which have affected his health. Anthony's extreme levels of anxiety have been brought on by the implementation of inappropriate strategies by the school. In 2007 when Anthony was in year 4 Anthony's anxiety levels were so extreme that he was only attending school on a part-time basis.

The school has failed to gain an understanding of Anthony's anxiety and the impact that this has on his wellbeing and ability to participate in school. As a result, the school has implemented strategies that are inappropriate for any student with an ASD and severe levels of anxiety. When developing strategies and the approach to be used for Anthony, the school has failed to consider advice from medical professionals who have worked with Anthony for several years.

When there have been strategies in place and they have worked for Anthony, the school has failed to carry them over to the next year level and this has been done without any consultation with myself or my husband.

This year Anthony was placed in a year 6/7 class. However, a decision was made by the school that the approach taken to Anthony's support at school, which had worked so well in 2008, would not be continued. The decision was made outside of the NEP process and without any consultation with us or any explanation to us or Anthony. As a result a number of strategies that had been successful in 2008 were no longer being used. Anthony's anxiety levels began to increase during term 1 which affected his health and Anthony's anxiety levels then meant it was difficult to get him to school on a daily basis.

Certainly, without doubt, maintaining a student with autism in a mainstream school is often a challenging task, and I appreciate that it produces challenges not only for teachers and support aids but also for other students. I think it is important for us to appreciate the positive impact that a

mainstream education experience can have on a child with an autism disorder. I will quote a letter from the parent of a boy who I will call Jake. The letter states:

As part of autism is a social disorder, Jake needed to learn to socialise. Now that he was paying attention to the world around him he needed other children to watch and learn from and the opportunity to practise his new found imitation skills. Jake started kindy at the local mainstream kindergarten. Jake went to kindy two sessions a week and was provided with a support worker one on one whilst he was there. I agreed to Jake going to a special small class in a mainstream school for his schooling. Jake was to start in the new year, he would start off going to school for two hours on a Tuesday and two hours on a Thursday. He would also go swimming with a class on Wednesday. His hours were increased by one hour on the two mornings he came, so all up, not including swimming, he spent six hours a week at school for the whole year.

That shows the flexibility that schools are delivering in order to try to provide appropriate access for students with disability. I appreciate that that often involves schools putting in additional resources. I will return to the letter from Jake's parents which, unfortunately, does take a more negative turn. It continues:

After a year of fighting and meetings, we agreed that he could no longer continue to only go to school six hours a week. It was unacceptable. After hearing Jane Lomax-Smith stand up and say, 'Every child has the right to an education,' we questioned where Jake's education was, but the only solution that could be offered was a special school placement.

Jake is now in his fourth year at special school. His goals for this year are not much different to his goals for the first year he was there. In four years Jake has never seen a speech pathologist at school, and only in his first year at the school did he have one-on-one communication lessons. In three years Jake has done less academic work than he did in the year he only went to school for six hours a week. He has been taken shopping in a wheelchair, he has done cooking and watched others make recipes with food he is unable to eat. He has done three or more music lessons a week. He has done fitness and he has spent countless hours swinging in hammocks, swings and swinging chairs. He is kept happy, as long as he is not upset, that is what matters, and he is baby sat!

In the first three years there were six children in his class, so he had a little opportunity to socialise. The children all said good morning to each other and shook hands and exchanged photos of each other. This year there are three children in the class and Jake and a much older boy and a higher functioning boy, who is being transitioned to another school. So Jake is alone now without any academic learning and without any socialisation. I used to say, 'Well, at least he is happy there and they don't send him home.' This year he is NOT happy, and this year they have started sending him home.

At the end of last year the guidance officer assessed Jake again. Her recommendations were special school. This school doesn't want him there any more, I don't want him at this school any more or, importantly, he doesn't want to be there any more, yet there are no places in any other special schools and this is the only recommended place for him, so where does he go? And if he goes to another specialist school, how will it be any different from where he is? What will he learn? What will he do?

Again in estimates we saw another Rann government minister who does not know what is happening in her portfolio when minister Jane Lomax-Smith suggested there were no waiting lists for special education. As I indicated earlier, I do not underestimate the challenge that autism presents as an education task. In that regard, I quote again from the letter from Emma's mother:

Emma's school placement failed because she experienced an extreme sense of distress. Children with autism and Asperger's syndrome have many sensory processing issues. Emma was sensitive to sounds and found the sound of the airconditioner at school to be unbearable. The anxiety caused aggression in speech and toileting. After six weeks both we and the school agreed that the placement was untenable and we decided to move Emma back to kindy for another six months.

When Emma went to a DECS' school she was not included in many of the regular school classes. She could not cope with music, phonics, Italian or computing because her sensory processing problems caused her significant distress. She did not join in the school plays, she found assemblies and excursions difficult and had difficulty socialising with other children. Her sensory distress would often lead to meltdowns. The school policy for dealing with extreme behaviour was to remove all others from the room and leave her in the room alone. This was an occupational health and safety procedure but it ensured exclusion rather than inclusion.

The letters were not without their success stories, and these stories should offer hope not only for people with autism and their parents but also for educators who make the effort to provide them with an education experience. One of those success stories was Abbey, whose mother wrote:

Abbey is now 10 years old and we are very proud of her progress. I cry every day now but it is a different cry. This cry is a happy and 'I can't believe' cry. But after this long educational history of a five year old child's battle to go to school we are very happy with our choice. She is in a good place. I drop her off every morning and go to work happy that she is in good hands, not getting bullied at school and is safe because she cannot get out of the school ground and no-one can get in because the staff in this school know every student, every parent and everyone who is meant to be in the school. I wish this happiness on every parent, and we all deserve this because a child is the most precious thing we have in life and we need to remember we were one once and we would have hated this behaviour to have happened to us and our parents.

Reflecting on the stories of the families of children with autism, I would like to read a letter from Amanda Tulloch-Hoskins, a representative of Parents Assisting Kids with Autism, commonly called PAKA. The letter states:

Dear Mr Wade,

We recently had the opportunity to discuss with you our concerns regarding the state of the education system as it stands in South Australia for children with autism spectrum disorder. The Department of Education and Children's Services in South Australia has a policy of inclusion for people with disabilities in public schools. This policy is failing our children on the autism spectrum. Inclusion policy can only succeed if support services are properly funded, support staff and teachers are correctly trained in autism support strategies, service providers are adequately supported within schools and children receive adequate support during school hours. In South Australia in 2009 this is not happening.

The New South Wales Department of Education and Training (DET) manages an autism specific education plan in conjunction with Aspect (Autism Spectrum Australia) and the Catholic Education Office in New South Wales. Aspect manages six autism specific special schools in New South Wales; 68 satellite classes, or special small classes, are then run in DET or Catholic education schools around New South Wales. These classes are fed from the Aspect main special schools. As children in the Aspect schools are deemed developmentally ready to move into a more mainstream environment, they are transitioned into a satellite class. The satellite classes allow for the children to share some time in the mainstream environment while being provided with an autism specific education space.

I pause to indicate that the letter then references a URL for Aspect, which is www.aspect.org.au. The letter continues:

This system does not exist in South Australia or indeed any other state in Australia, although other states have different ways of managing the education of young people with autism spectrum disorder. In order to fully illustrate how the current South Australian policy is not working for our children, please find enclosed some short case studies.

I pause to indicate that these are the case studies from which I quote. These are the family experiences of PAKA members, and they include that of a family who has not had experience of the mainstream public school system. Their experience has been quite different and extremely positive. The letter continues:

Our aim in sending you these experiences is not to blame specific schools or teachers. These are examples of a system-wide problem: if staff and schools are not coping, it is because there is a system-wide problem, and the people who are meant to implement this policy are being unsupported.

Further, we are not necessarily advocating for a NSW-style system. Many parents have views about what sort of Autism Spectrum-specific system would encompass the needs of our children. While it is the view of the PAKA parents that an autism-specific school is the best option for our children, our central position is that parents should have the option of real choice when it comes to the education of their autistic children. It is time to move away from an inclusion policy that does not support autistic children, neurotypical children, families or school staff. It is time to move toward a policy that offers the choice between autism-specific schools, satellite classes in mainstream settings, and properly funded and supported places in mainstream public and independent schools.

As parents, we advocate. We have voices. But it is our kids who have to live it every day. Very often, they do not even have words to tell us what is happening to them. They need to be protected. They need a system that works for them, not in spite of them.

Yours sincerely

Amanda Tulloch-Hoskins

Parents Assisting Kids with Autism (PAKA)

I indicate that I know the government is cocky about its chances of re-election in 2010. I know it thinks that it has bullied the disability sector into silence, but I perceive a growing anger at the burgeoning waiting lists, the continual insensitivity and the lack of real choices for people with disability. The government ignores this at its peril.

In conclusion, these failures I have highlighted in the areas of water security, disability, local government and so on are just part of the overall story of the failure of this government over the past seven years. This budget is the conclusion of the Rann government's eight years of failure and eight years of wasted opportunities.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (12:12): Hear, hear! I commend the Hon. Stephen Wade for his contribution with which I could not agree more. Indeed, this budget is the culmination of nearly two terms in office and, once again, demonstrates the complete failure of the state's Treasurer in regard to any fiscal responsibility. Effectively, he has had his budget bailed out and funded by the federal government in its wilful disregard of any established practice in terms of fiscal conservatism

and has splashed out money left, right and centre, and future generations will be funding this into the future.

The state government's budget is really half a budget. Some \$750 million of cuts will not appear until after the election—most convenient for Mr Foley—and I do hope that the community and the media in this state will keep the Treasurer on his toes in terms of ensuring that we get some sort of answer about exactly what it is he intends to do.

There were a couple of areas in the budget where my colleagues from the House of Assembly sought some commitments from various ministers about which programs would be cut. Those ministers gave a commitment that, 'No, no, no; none of our programs will be cut,' so it will be interesting to see whether that turns out to be the truth in the future, once these cuts emerge.

As I said, this budget has been bailed out by the federal government, with some \$2.9 billion in special purpose payments. The state tax revenue will increase by \$48 million, and GST grants are up by \$2 million.

I think the Treasurer has rather sneakily sought to portray in the lead-up to this budget that there would be a reduction in some of those revenues coming from the commonwealth. In fact, some of those have increased. Overall, commonwealth grants are up by \$858 million, so, in net revenue terms, this government has been far better off.

Unfortunately, its unfunded superannuation liability has blown out from \$5.1 billion in 2006-07 to \$9.8 billion in 2009-10. We need some answers from this government about how it is going to manage that debt into the future, because it has made no effort whatsoever to rein it in.

We are the highest taxed state in Australia. If one examines the tax revenues over several years from 2001-02 to this budget, one can see that we are taxed more severely than other states—by 12 per cent over the national average.

Land tax is an ongoing issue for many South Australian families, particularly those from migrant backgrounds who have seen real estate as a very solid way to invest in their future. It has increased by an extraordinary amount—292 per cent, in fact—and the number of land tax payers has almost trebled during this time, from 69,000 to 188,000. These costs are passed on to residential and commercial renters, so it impacts on some people who may be on low incomes also.

In terms of our Public Service, there has been a massive increase also. We have 16,400 more public servants than this government promised, and I note that it has made some sort of commitment to cut that number by 1,600. Again, one is not sure where that will occur, so we are in the dark about a number of these things. The so-called fat cats (which I note is a moniker that was invented by the current Premier) have increased from 782 to over 4,000.

The Hon. P. Holloway: Actually, Clyde Cameron used it in 1975. That is where it came from.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: So, it was one of your Labor people. Debt is something like \$6.7 billion. I have mentioned the unfunded superannuation; and, of course, there is always WorkCover, which has a massive debt these days of \$1.4 billion. That is an extraordinary amount, considering that our last Liberal government was so diligent in reducing it to something like \$281 million—and South Australia continues to have the highest WorkCover levy rate of all the states which, of course, is something that impacts on all employers.

I will make some reference to the infrastructure broken promises, which are extraordinary. The major one, from my personal point of view, is the prisons project. We were all hopeful that the prisons would be rebuilt, particularly the women's prison, which is a disgrace and continues to be so. That has been cancelled, and I think that will hurt the credibility of South Australia in terms of future infrastructure projects because a number of the consortia that were bidding were not advised until the Treasurer had delivered his budget. In fact, there had been discussions with some of those consortia in the week prior to the budget and they were given the distinct impression that they would be continuing.

We have had the Mount Bold reservoir expansion which was front page in the budget a couple of years ago, which has since disappeared into thin air. The \$500 million prisons PPP has been cancelled. Tram line extensions have disappeared from the budget, and the Upper Spencer Gulf desalination plant has disappeared. The South Road, Port Road and Grange Road underpasses have disappeared. The AAMI Stadium upgrade money has also disappeared. I think,

in terms of major infrastructure, this government cannot be believed when it says anything about what it intends to do. It does so with the cynical purpose of getting today's headline but not with any intention of following it through.

Along with the prison project is the shame that James Nash House will not be rebuilt. The distinct impression of the people who have worked at James Nash, going back probably three years ago when I visited them, was that there was ample space on that site to rebuild, and it was their impression that it would be rebuilt to modern standards on that existing site.

James Nash House has 30 beds; there are 10 beds in the overflow at Glenside—that is the way it operates at the moment. The waiting lists for it are constant and, as we have seen recently with the intersection with the correctional services area, there is not enough space for people who need to be detained within the system with obvious and sometimes tragic consequences.

With the rebuild of Glenside, which has also been delayed by some two years, those 10 places at Glenside will no longer be available, so we will be back to 30 beds instead of 40. This area of forensic mental health is in dire straits, and that is with the current capacity. The capacity is in desperate need of being increased, and that is one area where I think we will continue to have problems. It is pointless to blame the Parole Board for that because it does not supervise people who are on licence—that is, supervised by people who are in community corrections—and they are vastly under resourced. So, I think this is one very challenging area where the government ought to be providing additional resources, both in bricks and mortar and services.

The Women's and Children's Hospital is also in dire need of infrastructure funding. Some of those wards at the children's hospital are disgraceful and have been neglected, while the government is on its frolic of fantasy to rebuild the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital, parts of which are already world class, at a new site. The Environment, Resources and Development Committee recently had the privilege of going to that site. It is a terrific site, but one wonders why one needs to shift the existing infrastructure from where it is now—collocated with the teaching institutions and our research facilities, where the clinical aspects of our hospitals are combined and can produce a greater body of knowledge in terms of understanding diseases and so forth—and why that should be shifted to another site on the other side of the city. That site could be put to many uses, but a hospital should not be one of them.

The rebuild of the Magill Training Centre has also been cancelled. My understanding is that the previous Liberal government had made a commitment and provided the funds for that to be rebuilt at the Cavan site, which would make some sense. This government, which claims to have some sort of interest in social justice, has no interest when it comes to our juvenile detainees.

Under the watch of this government, the maternity services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and Modbury have closed. In terms of 24 hour services within mental health, we have fewer beds, particularly for people who have very complex needs. Those people had been accommodated at the Glenside campus—people who may need to be in hospital for a period of months to determine whether, in fact, their medication is working. Some people who have had a mental illness for a long time obviously take a long time to show some sign of recovery. So, that is a very important service. Those people now are accommodated in our metropolitan hospital system where it is far more disruptive and very much more difficult to monitor the impact of whether their medication and other treatments are working. So, I think it is a shame that we do not provide a proper and full service for people in that situation.

The government has also broken promises on breast cancer. It had promised \$2.6 million for new screening services in the country, and in June last year it announced that it would replace mobile breast screening units, but, again, that has disappeared from the budget. That is yet another indictment of the way this government treats people in the country. We know what it would like to do to the country health system, and now country women will not have the service which they were promised and which they deserve.

At a federal level, the Rudd government has attacked the Medicare safety net, changing things which will affect women's health choices—including IVF treatments, all obstetric services, and some ultrasounds related to pregnancy—because it has changed the cap. Obviously, that will be to the detriment of many women. So, one would have to question whether this government is interested in the next generation and its health.

I would like to refer to some of the portfolio areas for which I have responsibility. Early childhood development is an area that is very much in vogue, and for good reason. Early childhood services are defined as those for zero to eight year olds, so it covers a very broad range and

encompasses child care, early learning centres, kindergartens and the early years of primary school. A lot of funding has been released for improving services for this age group, and I think this is very important, but one area that has been neglected in the Building the Education Revolution is that of preschools.

I note that the Preschool Directors Association has been calling for more of those funds to be spent in facilities which cater for the early years because that is when the impact is greater. I think most people would agree with that. Indeed, we have established that primary schools and preschools are areas in which there is greater demand on services, as more parents and families take up those services on behalf of their children, so I believe this is an area that ought to receive more attention.

This government has a program of establishing what it calls children's centres. In principle, this is something one would not oppose. These centres provide a whole lot of services on the one site, including preschools and various sorts of child care services, and, depending on the local need, they may provide occupational therapy, social work or other sorts of services. However, in the government's rush to establish these centres and fulfil commitments made in its announcement, some of the existing services have been rationalised under the one roof and have been cut.

One of the new ones which will come on stream is the Il Nido Centre at Paradise. For that to take place, the Campbelltown preschool will be merged with it. So, one service that has been lost there is the occasional care service that was based at the Campbelltown preschool. Some people may not think that is very significant, but I believe that when these little preschool centres and kindergartens are amalgamated into one it creates impacts that the minister, and indeed the department, may not have thought of. That is, if there are smaller services and fewer kids there is greater community involvement; parents are more likely to walk if it is not as far, kids get to know each other, and I think there is a much greater safety aspect to it. With a larger centre there is more likelihood of bullying and other sorts of issues.

I think it is also a concern that our super schools are being sold as a great new service where you can have whatever you want but, in actual fact, there will be a larger number of kids, and the ones lost in this will be the smaller schools where kids are able to walk to school. I think there are some in the electorate of Enfield, in particular, where families will be greatly disadvantaged by having to attend a school which is across a main road and not easily accessible.

There is also an issue in terms of increased training for people working in the area of early childhood. I think, in principle, people would support that more highly trained people are needed to work in this area, but it is a lot like aged care: it is quite difficult to get people to stay for long and, over time, they tend to drift off.

Those who may be engaged in Certificate III or IV training see it as a stepping stone to other things, such as teaching courses at university, so a lot of centres have trouble keeping their staff. While I think it is a laudable aim to say that people working in those centres should be more highly trained, I think that, in reality, it means that many centres will struggle even more to keep their staff.

I also have some concerns that the Universal Access Program is very much focused on the state government sector. Indeed, South Australia has a history of the state government, through its kindergartens, being one of the largest providers of early childhood services for several decades. There is nothing wrong with that, but I think we ought to have diversity in the sector. I think there are a lot of people in the Catholic and non-government sector who are doing things which are very innovative and of very high quality and, in that, I include the Montessori preschools which, generally speaking, fall into the non-government or private sector.

I think there are concerns that the \$65.1 million over four years (which is one of many gifts from Mr Rudd to the state) has been exclusively focused on the state government sector to the detriment of the innovative places in the independent sector where parents may be enrolling their kids. I also note that the budgeted target for the number of students in reception to year 2 in this budget is less than it was in 2007-08; that is, in 2007-08, the number of children enrolled in those years was 40,570 and, in 2009-10, there will be 39,635 children—that is what the government expects.

The aged-care sector was successful in lobbying the government to provide it some land tax relief. In most other states in Australia—in fact, I think in all other states—the private aged-care sector was the only one being levied land tax. I am pleased to see that the Aged Care Association

(led by the Chair, Dr Prabhash Goel, and the CEO Mr Paul Carberry) successfully lobbied this government that it be provided land tax relief of \$1.5 million.

This sum is not a lot to the government, but it certainly makes a big difference to them, particularly when one looks at the structure of what aged-care providers can charge residents. It is one of the most highly regulated sectors in our community because there are limits on how much can be charged—in terms of not just daily rates but also bonds and so forth that may be requested of residents. I think that is a positive step.

The private child-care centre could also do with some relief. Some child-care centres, particularly those operating on private school campuses, are funded, really, by the parents, and the schools and the centres do their best to keep the charges down. One thing that they cannot avoid passing on is the land tax fees that they are required to pay. So, I think that is something that would be good to see in a future budget.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: In a Liberal budget.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In a Liberal budget, indeed. I turn now to the matter of gambling. We had to squeeze it out of the minister that this government has welshed on its decision not to pursue further the second tranche of the reduction of electronic gaming machines to 3,000. That was an initiative of previous minister Paul Caica, and, indeed, Carmel Zollo, as minister, provided me with a briefing on that bill, which, from what I understand, is ready to go. During Responsible Gambling Awareness Week in May we asked the government where it was, and gave it a slap around the ears for not having introduced the bill yet, and there was a stunned silence.

Estimates has at least provided us with the opportunity to squeeze it out of the current minister that Mr Rann needs the money from these machines—not put in those terms of course. Having lamented the impact of gaming machines on our community and writing personally to each and every member of parliament urging us that this was a most important piece of legislation, he has quietly let it slip off the agenda.

There is a view, I think, within government that it is not just the reduction in the machines, but, certainly, the number of venues may have an impact on problem gambling numbers. I think there are a number of venues that would like to have traded their machines, but \$50,000 was not enough for them to exit the industry.

There is the concept that if you have fewer venues and venues which are better staffed then you are more likely to be able to detect people who have problem gambling issues. Certainly, some research is being done by Dr Paul Delfabbro in terms of being able to detect when somebody may have a problem, not just that they are seated by the machine for hours on end but that they obviously have anxiety issues, and that research should advise us well in the future about how to assist people and provide intervention at an earlier stage. But I do think it is a shame that this government, having shouted from the rooftops about how important this was, has quietly let it slip. It is yet another broken promise that we will continue to remind the electorate about.

In terms of the inspectorate, which is under the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, this is an ongoing issue that has been raised continuously by the opposition. In fact, in the two estimates committees prior to the most recent one, the member for Davenport, now shadow gambling spokesperson, raised it with the minister. The government advised us that it undertook a review of compliance functions in 2007, and that report was completed in February 2008. But I suspect that nothing has really changed. My advice is that the inspectorate rarely does any out of hours work. One must wonder why that would be, given that it would certainly be outside office hours when issues of breaching either liquor or gambling laws would be most likely to take place, with a number of them basically checking the machines in the casino. I think that is an area that needs a great deal of reform to ensure that it is not just the SAPOL compliance officers who are ensuring compliance but also other people who are employed by the office.

It is true to say that during difficult economic times people tend to gamble more in the hope of gaining a windfall. I would certainly like to see the government ramping up some of its preventative measures and providing some higher quality community advice messages, rather than some of the ones that it has at the moment, which I think are rather lame and certainly do not translate into other languages and cultures terribly well.

In the consumer affairs portfolio I think we are seeing a lot of movement towards the commonwealth. Within a couple of years I think most of what it has been conducting will be done

nationally, and that is including trade licensing, business names and consumer credit. So, that is an area that I think is increasingly becoming a national issue.

In terms of other compliance issues, I think the office could do a much better job by being proactive, and rather than relying on complaints from members of the public it could be more proactive in some areas. In respect of one of the bills that we have before us, obviously I cannot refer to it but we discussed it in debate yesterday and suffice to say that I think more could be done in that respect.

I commend its work in terms of checking pricing, issuing recalls and checking stock. We saw the minister recently on TV because there was a blitz on baby products to ensure that they comply with safety standards. I think those are commendable activities that should be continued.

In relation to the status of women, I listened to all of the estimates for which I have portfolio responsibilities and I think the performance was lamentable, to say the least, in terms of answering questions about the government's target of board and committee chairmanship. The minister advised, I think, that her board figures were something like 38 per cent in November 2008 and by June 2009 would be closer to 45 per cent, and I commend her for that.

The minister has taken on notice the other ministers' figures, and I suspect that the government did not have those figures, quite deliberately, in front of them during estimates because in previous estimates we have discovered that some of the ministers' (mostly the bully-boy four) portfolios have been pathetic, to say the least, and have, in some ways, gone backwards.

I think the government needs to be transparent about this. If it is going to have it as one of its targets in the State Strategic Plan then it needs to at least provide these figures during estimates and have them much more readily available.

The Premier's Council for Women was also the subject of discussion during estimates. I appreciate that the Office for Women, indeed, does not have a large budget and so must tailor its activities to those things. I note that the Premier's Council for Women sets its own priorities rather than taking terms of reference from other portfolios.

If it is interested in the area of work/life balance then it ought to be taking more interest in one of the targets, which, under questioning, we were advised is in minister Weatherill's area, and that is the public sector target, which is that, by 2014, 50 per cent of public sector executives should be women.

I understand that the Office for Women has been involved in providing leadership training for a number of women, with the aim of getting them on boards. I would also like to see it taking a greater role in terms of the public sector targets, because I see those areas as being inextricably linked. Research from organisations that study this issue is very clear that women need to be progressed into executive roles and receive the relevant training to enable them to take on those executive roles, if they wish to progress to become board members and, indeed, chairs.

I do not propose to say much more than that. Suffice to say that this is a budget which has let women down in a number of areas which I have outlined. It is an area where women, naturally, take a very strong interest. It is a very disappointing budget, given that this government inherited from the Liberal Party a very healthy budget which was in the black. After many years of our very hard work keeping things on a short leash, this government has splashed cash left, right and centre in the good years, and now that it finds itself in a difficult position it is not funding things which deserve to be funded and which, I would have thought, are part of the core business of any Labor government.

On behalf of the women of South Australia and on behalf of many families, I state that we are disappointed, but I will not hold up the second reading of this bill.

The Hon. C.V. SCHAEFER (12:46): This will be my last appropriation speech, you will all be pleased to hear. It is the eighth Labor Party budget that I have had to suffer. It will not take me very long to discuss what is in this budget for rural and regional South Australia because, basically, there is nothing.

One in five people in South Australia are employed, either directly or indirectly, by primary industries, and yet minister Foley could not bring himself to mention the words 'rural, regional or primary industries' in his 45-page budget speech.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: AAA; it's all about Adelaide.

The Hon. C.V. SCHAEFER: Yes, AAA, as my colleague says, it's all about Adelaide. There was not even a mention. The Hon. Bernard Finnigan, who lives in Mount Gambier, appears to be amused by that. I must say that it depresses me that rural and regional South Australia matters so little to this government and this Treasurer that it did not even rate a mention.

This budget continues with Labor going down the same path over many years. This time, for a change, the South Australian Farmers Federation has come out and voiced its displeasure and alarm at the budget cuts that South Australia must again suffer. We continue to add up the number of roads which are in disrepair in South Australia. Health has been ignored in South Australia after the government tried to unsuccessfully close most of the small country hospitals. It has, in fact, continued to cut back health care funding in South Australia to such an extent that, eventually, it will have its way—it will close most of the small country hospitals.

Rural schools have had a huge shot in the arm thanks to the federal Labor government but, again, their spending power has been ratcheted back in the vicinity of 25 to 30 per cent, because that is the loading that city-based contractors are putting on erecting projects that have been approved for country schools.

An example is Cleve Area School, where they may not be able to construct the hall they had the plans for simply because the loading by contractors—and, I repeat, city-based contractors—is so high in the country that they will not be able actually to erect these Taj Mahal halls. The centralist view of this government has again come to the fore. There is no call for local tenders, and local tradesmen who desperately need the work in these times are being left out of the federal government's spending spree.

Having been decimated every year since the Labor government came to office, PIRSA will again suffer 75 job losses, almost all of which will come from rural and regional South Australia. We all know that extension services in PIRSA no longer exist. Rural Solutions, which has tendered out its services, has endeavoured to keep up some of those services, but it, too, is suffering mammoth budgetary cuts and losses of personnel.

The publications office, which was located in Roseworthy and which was an excellent source of reference material for farmers and professionals alike, has been closed—just summarily closed. When I asked about that in the Budget and Finance Committee, the reply was, 'Well, it was mostly being accessed by agribusiness, so we closed it. It had more agribusiness people than farmers accessing it, so we closed it.' Well, that is because agribusiness is endeavouring to provide the services the primary industries department no longer provides.

The government has denied that it is going to close the offices at Wallaroo, Streaky Bay, Keith and Loxton. However, I have a leaked document in my office that clearly indicates that those offices are for the chop. There may still be a shopfront there, but the expertise and the people needed to deliver services to rural and regional South Australia will not.

We have a government that has subsidised and given free public transport to Seniors Card holders in the city, and that is very nice. At the same time, we have a country taxi service that has been bullied and is in disarray, with no public transport outside Adelaide. We have \$1.7 million cut from SARDI's budget—\$1.7 million less in research, for plant research, marine biology and so on.

So, rural and regional South Australia has been asked for a long time to stand on its own two feet, but previous governments believed that one of their obligations was to put some money, even if it was to be matched, into research and development. That is not happening, so primary producers are being squeezed from both ends. They are asked to be more productive and they need to be more productive to stay in the game, and yet they get absolutely no assistance from this government until they look like they are going broke.

I commend the government for continuing to put in its share of drought funding, but how long did it take it to work out that the Riverland is in a state of collapse? That is the only way I can describe it. How long did it take it to offer any sort of resettlement package to those people? How long did it take it? It took it four years. Four years ago, I was saying that it should be doubling the advice and rural financial counselling that was available up there. The then minister, Rory McEwen, told me that I was an alarmist, and I did not know what I was talking about. Well, I did know what I was talking about, because I had been up there—and the situation has become worse and worse since then.

We know at a glance, really, why this government is starving rural South Australia to death, and it is because the government has no money, and it has no money not because of an

international budgetary crisis but because the government, in fact, went into it going broke. The government has no idea about how to run a budget.

The two areas that concern me most of all are unfunded superannuation, which is running at close to \$1 billion in a state that has a small turnover, anyway; and we have unfunded WorkCover liabilities running at \$1 billion. The figure that sticks in my mind in relation to superannuation is that it had an unfunded liability of \$64 million when we lost government, and it has escalated to, give or take, \$1 billion in eight budgets. If you ask someone in the passage, 'What's going to happen?', they say, 'Oh, you don't have to worry, because everyone is not going to make a claim at the same time.' Well, I wish I could go to my bank and say, 'I owe a couple of billion dollars, but don't worry because my creditors are not all going to ask for the money at the same time.' That is why this state is in the parlous state that it is in now, and the reason people in rural and regional South Australia are the forgotten ones is that there are not too many votes there.

It is interesting to note from a press release from my colleague the Hon. John Dawkins that the Rann government did not spend all of the regional infrastructure funding it had budgeted; in fact, it spent about half what it had budgeted. It has gone backwards by \$2 million a year since we lost government. Why did the government not spend it? Aren't there any infrastructure projects outside the city? Of course there are. The reason the government did not spend the money is that it does not care. The government does not go out to rural and regional South Australia and say, 'Hey; we actually have an infrastructure fund here; would you like to apply for something?' No; the government does not do that, because it can squirrel that away and eventually it will go back into general revenue. An amount of \$2 million might not make a difference to this government, but it makes a lot of difference outside metropolitan area.

As well as that, we are all being slugged in additional taxes. However, if you happen to live outside the city, you are slugged more. 'If you own a car, pay for water, pay rent, catch a bus or use any government services, you will face above inflation increases,'—and that is a quote from Martin Hamilton-Smith. I do own a car, and I drive a lot further than I would if I lived in the city. I will actually pay more in fuel, more to travel and more in tyres than someone who lives in the city—and I will not have any choice because there is no public transport.

I made a mistake when I said that unfunded superannuation had hit \$1 billion: I beg your pardon, it has actually hit \$9.8 billion. Against that, the government hired 1,485 extra public servants over and above what it said it would hire, and now the government is telling us how tough it is because it is going to get rid of 1,600 of them. In fact, there are only about 200 for them to reach line ball.

The final issue that concerns me is that this government has failed to recognise the impost of land tax on South Australians generally. It is seen as an issue for suburban dwellers only, but, in fact, it is an issue for people of migrant background who have always chosen to put their superannuation, their pension, into property investment because they can see it and look after it. They are being penalised dreadfully in suburbs such as Norwood. A lot of older people still own a beach property, so they are being slugged. If they happen to have children going to university and they live outside Adelaide, there is a good chance they have borrowed money to buy a unit and they are being slugged—not just slugged, but it is up by 700 and 800 per cent.

This government has failed to lower land tax at a time of massive growth in the value of properties. We know that the value of these properties has risen, but the government could have just as easily dropped the threshold so that people are not being robbed blind. Again, Treasurer Foley in his infinite wisdom said that it only affected the property rich. Well, some of these places cost those people \$10,000 and \$15,000 when they bought them. They are not cash flow rich.

This government has seen to it that they never will be, because they are being robbed and we are not seeing where it is going. We see a tramline from somewhere to somewhere which cuts through two lanes of traffic and does very little for anyone. Supposedly, we are seeing a grand hospital, although I have been told by a member of the Labor Party that no costing has been done on remediation of the soil on which they will put the 'Marj Mahal'. Everyone knows that the one place that is most polluted over a long time is a rail yard, yet that cost has not been factored in.

I cannot see that rural and regional South Australia, which is my passion, can survive too many more Labor budgets, and I am not sure that South Australia will see anything for its additional charges and taxes, either. It gives me no pleasure to support this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

[Sitting suspended from 13:03 to 14:18]

BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CENTRES

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:19): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I was asked a question on Wednesday by the Hon. John Dawkins in relation to payments to business enterprise centres (BECs). I can inform the honourable member that I have been advised by my department that there has been no delay in payments to BECs. In terms of the funding agreement between the Minister for Small Business and each of the BECs, the payment of the funds will be in instalments of \$150,000 at the beginning of each financial year during the term of this agreement but not before receipt of a valid tax invoice.

Valid tax invoices for all the BECs have been received by DTED. All BEC invoices have been approved for payment. All invoices have been paid except for one, which is currently being processed and which will be paid within the next few days. This timing is consistent with the terms of the funding agreement. I was asked on Tuesday in a supplementary question from the Hon. Mark Parnell about access to technical documents on the plan4adelaide website. I can inform the honourable member that those documents should now be available online.

The technical papers are not intended to form part of the plan and they are not part of the South Australian planning strategy. These papers have been used to inform the decision making process that has led to the plan for Greater Adelaide, but not all information contained in the technical papers has been incorporated into the plan and therefore are being provided to the public for information only.

QUESTION TIME

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE UNITS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:21): I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about domestic violence units.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My office has been in contact with Mrs Toni Castley of West Coast Security Telephones & Data, who has the only contract in South Australia from the SAPOL Family Violence Investigation Section to coordinate, supply and monitor domestic violence units, which, for the benefit of members, can be activated if a person is under duress.

The activation sends a signal to the security control room, which immediately contacts the Police Communications Centre to dispatch a control unit to attend the situation. If SAPOL assesses an individual or her children to be at high risk of domestic violence incidents, SAPOL directs them to West Coast Security for assistance. West Coast Security currently monitors almost 80 units throughout South Australia.

This company has made the system more cost-effective where it can by, for example, loaning out older machines for free and simply charging for the monitoring. Mrs Castley has advised my office that some women have had to decline the monitoring service simply because it is too expensive for them.

The member for Flinders wrote to the minister on 19 May and asked whether the minister could advise whether any government or non-government agencies can assist victims of domestic violence with the initial cost of purchasing such units. The response was that the Department for Families and Communities has a component of funding for safety measures to enable women and children to remain safely in their homes.

Given that SAPOL has already assessed these women and children as at high risk of domestic violence, will the minister ensure that there is some funding to enable people to access domestic violence units, if they are assessed as such?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises,

Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy (14:23): Indeed, I am aware of these domestic violence duress units. I think there was a report in the paper not very long ago. When I read that report, I asked for a report back to me on the scope of use of these units, their cost-effectiveness and how effective they are under which particular circumstances. I have requested that information and am awaiting that.

I have been advised that DFC will provide some funding for these units. I am happy to take that part of the question on notice in terms of the actual amount and bring it back to the chamber. As I said, I am happy to do that in light of the inquiries that I have already made about the current use and effectiveness of these units.

The other aspect is that, currently, the state government has invested around \$800,000 in a public campaign focused on enhancing respectful relationships, and that is particularly focused on younger people. There is a particular group of younger men that we have identified amongst whom there is a reasonably high risk of violence. I understand the campaign is focused on that demographic. As I said, that is a mainstream general public campaign, and it is about to commence fairly soon. Also, we have set aside some grant project funding for others who might have trouble accessing those mainstream messages, particularly indigenous groups, refugee groups and other ethnic groups. We have set some money aside to ensure that the message about respectful relationships is portrayed in relevant ways to other cultures.

Of course, the domestic violence legislation is well under way and, as I have reported in this place before, that looks at changing our approach to domestic violence in quite a different way. At the moment, where there is an incident at a residence, the police go out and intervene, and it can result in removing the woman and children from that household and placing them in a safe place. The model we are looking at, in fact, removes the perpetrator from the house and leaves the woman and children in their home.

We have also looked at a range of strategies around ensuring that when we do that we make sure that the home is left safe. That might mean, for instance, putting new locks on the doors or putting outdoor sensor lighting in place. If stalking has been happening, it might mean pruning and cutting back bushes and shrubbery around the house so that visibility is easier. It could mean a wide range of things but, certainly, we have looked at ensuring provisions for securing the woman in the house.

As members can see, we are approaching this most important and serious issue in a range of different ways to ensure that women and their children who suffer from domestic violence are kept safe.

30-YEAR PLAN FOR GREATER ADELAIDE

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Urban Development and Planning a question about the Greater Adelaide plan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Page 47 of the recently released draft of the government's 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide highlights the challenge presented by the urban heat island effect, that is, localised warming related to an increase in the amount of paved and dark-coloured surfaces resulting from urban development. The report also notes that the effect of urban heat might be reduced by ensuring that there are sufficient green spaces within urban areas.

The urban heat island effect increases water consumption by humans and increases water demand, and mitigating strategies also will take more water. However, there is no mention in the plan's draft policies of developing water options or green spaces in established areas (the areas which will suffer most from the urban heat island effect). The plan focuses on new developments and reducing water consumption. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why does the plan not contain any policy for addressing the urban heat island effect in established areas?
2. How does the government intend to reduce water consumption while still providing further open spaces to reduce the heat island effect?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his question. Hopefully, shortly after question time today, after we have dealt with the Appropriation Bill, we will be dealing with the amendment to the River Torrens Linear

Park bill which makes provision for a number of linear parks along the major creeks and waterways in the greater Adelaide area.

As I indicated in summing up on that bill last night, it is compatible with the 30-year plan. It is one of the practical ways in which the government is seeking to implement the strategy of greenways. In addition, at the same time as launching the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide—and, of course, it is still subject to public consultation until the end of September—the government has also released detailed information on water sensitive urban design. That information, which is also compatible with the government's Water for Good strategy, is a very detailed set of guidelines for designing in the urban environment. Of course, the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide also sets out its goals for new development and new subdivisions.

Retrofitting is a more complicated issue. Through the Water for Good plan, this government has set out those areas where you can re-use stormwater and have aquifer storage and recharge. The GHD report—a very significant geotechnical report that was the basis of the Water for Good strategy—has looked at where one can use aquifer storage and recharge. It is on that report that the government has updated the Waterproofing Adelaide strategy which, incidentally, the opposition seems to have based its policies—the state government's old Waterproofing Adelaide strategy which I think dates back to 2005.

With all the additional information the government has had in its Water for Good strategy, as a result of a significant and comprehensive engineering survey, we now have much better information. All of that work and information on stormwater re-use, combined with the water sensitive urban design documentation, which was originally supported by the federal government—and I think the original grants go back to 2007 when this government received significant funds from the then federal government—has now been released to all local government areas. It is a very comprehensive, detailed strategy for getting the best water sensitive urban design. It is a very important part of our strategy.

I remind the honourable member that one can require the best practice in new subdivisions much more easily than you can in existing subdivisions. One of the important parts of this government's strategy in trying to contain urban growth to within the current boundary (or at least 70 per cent of the growth within the boundary) is that as you get the turnover of housing—and most housing has a life of 40 or 50 years—you have the opportunity for bringing best practice into urban design.

Many people argue that Adelaide should not grow because we cannot cope with the water requirements or we do not have a solution for energy use and other issues, but I think it needs to be pointed out that, the more you delay and freeze Adelaide, the less likely you are to get the turnover in buildings which will enable modern technology, better water practice, better energy practice, green buildings and so on to be introduced. I believe it is important that Adelaide should continue to grow and get redevelopment of our areas because, the more redevelopment we have, the better chance we have of getting greater energy and water efficiency into our buildings. I think that is an important point that needs to be made in this debate.

The government, through the 30-year plan, is concentrating on transit-oriented developments. Anyone who goes to the briefings—and these will be rolled out increasingly by the department during the consultation period until the end of September—will see examples of some visual demonstrations about how along transport corridors, through the greening of those corridors, you not only make them more attractive but you make them quieter and cooler. So the greening along those corridors where the densest development will take place is a key part of that strategy.

This government is well aware of the need to introduce better water and energy efficiencies throughout our suburbs, and it believes that the 30-year plan is the best way to do that. It has been very carefully thought out in terms of how to get the best value for our infrastructure dollar over the next 30 years. I certainly do not accept any criticism that the plan, and the planning of this government, does not adequately take into account the issues of water and energy efficiencies.

30-YEAR PLAN FOR GREATER ADELAIDE

The Hon. M. PARNELL (14:35): I have a supplementary question. When will the Growth Investigation Areas report be released?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:36): I do not intend to

release the Growth Investigation Areas report. Obviously, information about where Adelaide might grow is potentially highly commercially sensitive—

The Hon. M. Parnell: It is the basis of your plan.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member has all the details now, they have been put out there. He only has to look at the report; the detail is in there about where, following all its studies, the government thinks Adelaide should grow. It is there in the report. If we had background information it could clearly be of significant commercial sensitivity.

30-YEAR PLAN FOR GREATER ADELAIDE

The Hon. M. PARNELL (14:36): I have a further supplementary question. If the report was important enough to announce in a press release that you were preparing it, why would you not now release it?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:36): I have told you; I have just said why.

TRANSPORT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Urban Development and Planning a question in relation to his recent trip to the United States and Europe.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: As members would be aware, the Minister for Urban Development and Planning and the Minister for Transport recently led a delegation of industry and government representatives to the United States and Europe to look at transport-oriented developments. Both this minister and minister Conlon have indicated, as have some other participants on the trip, that it was a very comprehensive and full program with a very busy itinerary; in fact, I think there were almost back-to-back official and site visits. My question is: did minister Holloway participate in all the site visits and functions?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:38): On some occasions there were alternative visits. For example, on an evening in Denver I met with the mining industry there because I thought that, as Minister for Mineral Resources Development, it was a good opportunity, given that Denver is a significant mining centre. I went to that particular meeting, and on some other occasions there were alternative visits. Clearly, in these major cities there are often a lot of alternative places to visit; just as if you were visiting Adelaide and looking at some of our sites you might go to Mawson Lakes or Noarlunga. So, there were alternatives; however, apart from one visit that was cancelled because the people organising it were unable to attend, I am not aware of any other scheduled visits that I did not attend.

TRANSPORT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): I have a supplementary question. Did minister Conlon participate in all site visits and functions?

The PRESIDENT: You had best ask that of minister Conlon.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:39): The honourable member will have to ask the question of minister Conlon.

TRANSPORT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): I have a further supplementary question. How many people participated on the tour?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:39): There were approximately 33 people. Some of the participants on that tour attended the European part and others attended the US part.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: So you couldn't tell whether he was there, out of 33?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I remind the honourable member that he asked a question similar to this some time back when I indicated that I thought minister Conlon did deviate from the planned program on one occasion to go to sign up or negotiate a tram contract. I think he and Rod Hook attended that particular negotiation. Those of us who were there had other meetings. I can report that minister Conlon also had another meeting in Washington with the embassy. I know where the honourable members are coming from, but what I can say is that my colleague and I—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: —were busy during the entire visit. Even though we both attended most of those meetings, there were occasions on which we both went to meetings that were not part of the tight schedule because we used the opportunity to have meetings in relation to other parts of our portfolios. If the best the opposition can do is try to raise some gossip about this visit, it will not succeed. I can assure the member that both minister Conlon and I were very active members of that visit. We went to the—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Isn't it amazing? We are eight months from a state election and, if this opposition wanted to stand up to the people of South Australia and say that it was not fit to govern, it was bereft of ideas and it had no idea where it was going, it could not do it any better than by its performance today.

TRANSPORT-ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Will the minister provide me with a list of the other visits he made, other than the ones on the published itinerary?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:42): I have already indicated one of those visits.

30-YEAR PLAN FOR GREATER ADELAIDE

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (14:42): Will the Minister for Urban Development and Planning provide details of the implications for the City of Adelaide coming out of the release of the plan for Greater Adelaide?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:43): The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide not only provides a framework for accommodating our expected population growth but also aims to reinforce the cultural and economic focus of the City of Adelaide. We aim to achieve this objective by increasing the amount of residential accommodation within the central business district, including more affordable housing and specialist housing for students and professionals.

Investment in the tram extension to Port Road, the O-Bahn extension to West Terrace and the construction of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital and research centre in the City West precinct provides a catalyst for reinvigorating our capital. The 30-year plan also explores new opportunities to improve key public spaces, such as the Torrens riverbank, Victoria Square and North Terrace. We want to re-energise the Parklands to increase their appeal and safety, especially where they adjoin residential areas within the city and the inner suburban fringe.

Managing growth within the central business area and mixed-use zones, such as the north-west and eastern sectors of the city centre, will help promote the broader transit-oriented development approach of the 30-year plan. The focus on commuter-friendly developments along transit corridors provides an opportunity both to regenerate the city, including a cafe precinct along the Torrens riverbank, and strengthen the role of North Terrace as the city's premier cultural and educational boulevard.

The historical residential precincts of North Adelaide and the south-east and south-west corners of the city should be conserved as valued elements of Adelaide's heritage. The plan provides for more space for new jobs, new forms of housing and new and improved entertainment

and recreational facilities. At the same time, the 30-year plan reinforces the role of the Parklands as a major recreational, natural and open space asset, not just for city dwellers but also for all of metropolitan Adelaide.

The state government is already working with the Adelaide City Council to enhance key elements of the city. Open space grants, totalling \$3.275 million, are supporting council projects, worth \$6.67 million, that will further enhance our great city, including the Parklands around the zoo and North Terrace. These grants highlight how the state government and Adelaide City Council work effectively together to add value to Adelaide's premier cultural, civic and educational precinct. We hope that we continue to work collaboratively to achieve the goals set out in the 30-year plan. This means an acceptance of our aim to focus medium rise mixed development along the edges of the parklands.

By concentrating new residents in key areas the plan enables us to support a growing residential population within the city and improve the passive surveillance of our important public spaces. We want the parklands to be a place that attracts people rather than the case now, where, especially at night, residents are extremely wary of using these open areas because of concerns about their security.

I was heartened to read in this week's *Advertiser* that this trend towards city living is picking up momentum here in Adelaide. The Real Estate Institute President, Robin Turner, was quoted in the newspaper as saying that more city dwellers are using the parklands as their place for recreation rather than a backyard. This acceptance of apartment living within the CBD, balanced with access to public spaces, has long been accepted in major cities such as New York; so it is not surprising that, with Adelaide's assets, its ring of parklands and networks of squares, more people are adopting a similar attitude here.

The 30-year plan aims to accommodate and encourage this trend. In that way, we hope to attract 16,300 more people living in the city by 2039, supported by the provision of 9,700 additional dwellings. The 30-year plan is currently open for public consultation, and submissions can be lodged with the Department of Planning and Local Government by close of business on 30 September. Again, I commend the plan and trust that honourable members will obtain a copy and encourage South Australians to have a say about where they live.

ALDINGA TURKEYS

The Hon. DAVID WINDERLICH (14:47): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, representing the Minister for Environment and Conservation, a question—it has nothing to do with Burnside—about the enforcement of EPA licence conditions for Aldinga Turkeys at McLaren Vale.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DAVID WINDERLICH: A resident of McLaren Vale faces the possibility of 60,000 litres of Turkey effluent (that is, water filled with the waste left after processing turkeys) flooding into her backyard from Aldinga Turkeys. Aldinga Turkeys has expanded its operations dramatically in the past eight years and, in the process, has damaged the quality of life of nearby residents with noise, smells and effluent. To give one example, a visitor to Aldinga Turkeys on 22 April 2009 asked about the putrid smell coming from Aldinga Turkeys and likened it to rotting flesh.

Three years ago the EPA approved the installation of a 30,000 metre tank without requiring it to be bunded as per guidelines for abattoirs, slaughterhouses and poultry processing. The bunding is a wall to guard against spillage or a rupture of the tank that would create a tsunami of turkey waste. When residents complained, the EPA said the company would be told to bund the tank. No bund was built.

Last year, Inghams installed another 30,000 litre tank, also without bunding. The company's licence expired on 31 October 2008, and the new licence required the installation of bunds by 31 March 2009. On 20 March 2009, the company wrote to the EPA requesting an extension of the time allowed to install the bunds to 30 September 2009, citing 'cash flow availability'. I have a copy of that letter, and I will read two paragraphs from it, as follows:

We write to advise you that while the company is very mindful of its obligations it has had to cut its capital expenditure in line with cashflow availability and there will therefore be delays throughout its Australia/New Zealand operations in the completion of many of the current projects. The waste water bunding project at Foggo Rd is one such example of a project on delay. Inghams is hereby requesting that we be granted an extension until

30 September 2009, by which time we will have completed all the bunding required in compliance of licence condition.

As discussed previously at our meeting on 26th November 2008 at the EPA office located at 77 Grenfell Street Adelaide SA, it is the intention of the Company to comply with the EPA Licence (EPA 19422). However as clearly stated at the time, the coming effect of the economic climate could possibly delay the outcome of the Waste Water Bunding project.

The letter provides only general assertions and no evidence about the economic circumstances of Inghams, which, by the way, has a turnover of \$1.5 billion and around 7,000 employees across Australia. On 22 June 2009, two larger tanks were delivered to Aldinga Turkeys without the neighbours being consulted or notified. The residents' concerns about whether Inghams is able to control its turkey waste are borne out by this email that I received on 15 May 2009:

At the moment there is a torrent of water running down Foggo Road past our drive and onto the Kangarilla Road from the Aldinga Turkeys stormwater pipe. There has been no rain. There are turkey feathers strewn all over the verge.

My questions for the minister are:

1. When the EPA approved the delay in building the bunds, did it audit Inghams' finances to see whether its claims of financial difficulties were accurate, or did it just accept the company's assertions?

2. Does the EPA ever demand that companies open their books to validate claims of financial difficulty when those claims are used to justify breaches of licence conditions or appeals to relax licence conditions?

3. Given that Inghams is simultaneously struggling and expanding its operations, how many other Inghams plants and factories are having their licence conditions relaxed due to current economic circumstances?

4. How many other companies operating in South Australia that are the subject of complaints about pollution have had their licence conditions relaxed due to the current economic climate?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his important questions. I will be happy to refer them to the Minister for Environment and Conservation in another place and bring back a response.

BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CENTRES

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Small Business a question about business enterprise centres.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I note today's ministerial statement from the minister following my question on Wednesday about business enterprise centres. I quote from the second dot point in the statement:

In terms of the funding agreements, between the Minister for Small Business and each of the BECs, the payment of the funds will be made in instalments of \$150,000 at the beginning of each financial year during the term of this agreement but not before receipt of a valid tax invoice.

Apparently, past practice has seen this funding paid in the last week of each financial year. My questions are:

1. Will the minister confirm that BECs were told by DTED not to submit tax invoices before 1 July?

2. Is it just a coincidence that payments were made to BECs the morning after my question was asked?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:52): The answer to the latter question is no, because by the time I would have got through to the department to raise this matter things were already in place.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Rubbish!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Let me read it:

...the payment of the funds will be made in instalments ...at the beginning of each financial year...

It is now Friday 17 July, about two weeks into the new financial year, and they all have their money. I would have thought that many other areas receiving government funds would be delighted to have their funding within two weeks of the start of the financial year.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The information I have been provided with, and the answer is in the statement, which states:

In terms of the funding agreements, between the Minister for Small Business and each of the BECs, the payment...will be made...

That is the terms of the funding agreements, that they will be funded at the beginning of each financial year but not before receipt of a valid tax invoice. When the honourable member asked his question I promised him that I would follow it up with the department straightaway after question time. I did that. I was told, at that stage, that some invoices had not been received.

By the time we got to answer this question they had all been received, and so, as I said in the statement, those payments have all been paid, except for one. If the funding agreement states that they will be paid at the beginning of each financial year, but not before receipt of a valid tax invoice, then that is what will happen. I would have thought that payment within two weeks is well within government guidelines.

BUSINESS ENTERPRISE CENTRES

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:54): I have a supplementary question. Will the minister concede that past practice has meant that the payment has been made in the last week of each financial year, and the failure to continue that practice has meant that business enterprise centres have been embarrassed in meeting commitments with other businesses in their local communities?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (14:55): I do not know what has happened in the past. I indicated earlier that there was some pre-payment in the first year. However, as I understand it, there is now a three-year payment which will give certainty to the organisations. As I pointed out in answer to a question the other day, there are three sources of funds, and the \$150,000 from the state government is only one of the contributions. There are contributions from the federal government and also from local government. It will be interesting to see whether that money has been received and whether they are as efficient as this state government in terms of delivering it.

Just because a pre-payment was made in one year, at the time the agreements were reached, by the former minister for small business, once those agreements were signed, the terms of that agreement were met. There are many other organisations that I am sure would like their government payments within the first fortnight of the start of the financial year.

POLICE BARRING ORDERS

The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question about police barring orders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN: In the past, I understand that the police have expressed frustration about disruptive and disorderly patrons being at licensed premises in circumstances where, while no offence has been detected, police nevertheless hold concerns for the safety and welfare of other people at those licensed premises. Will the minister update the chamber on how the power to bar legislation is assisting police?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his important question. Indeed, more than 250 people have been barred from South Australia's licensed venues (from our pubs and clubs) in the first four months of our new barring laws, implemented under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. The police have, indeed, made good use of these tough new powers initiated by the state government from 1 March 2009.

As everyone knows, there is nothing worse than having a night out with friends or family spoilt by the idiotic, bad and offensive behaviour of some people who are obviously out of control. Feedback from employees working in pubs and clubs has indicated that they feel safer because of the quick and ready response from police in removing these patrons whose behaviour is offensive and unruly. An added flow-on effect from this is that interstate and overseas visitors are able to enjoy their night out in a pleasant and safe environment.

Three people have been indefinitely barred from South Australian pubs; six people for up to six months; and, on another 100 occasions, people have been removed for up to three months. Despite these extended barrings for second and third incidents, 138 incidents led to a ban of 72 hours and another four were banned for a single event.

By giving police the power to act promptly in relation to unsavoury behaviour, they have a better chance of cleaning up angry, aggressive and loud-mouthed behaviour. It also helps authorities to move swiftly to nip potentially serious incidents in the bud before they occur.

Offensive and disorderly behaviour has prompted 104 of the barring orders; 133 arose from the commission of an offence; six were imposed on other reasonable grounds; and another eight were on welfare grounds.

People breaching a barring order can incur a fine of \$1,250, and police have the power to bar from licensed venues in a particular area or all venues of a particular type for a specified period. This can be for reasons based on criminal intelligence, the welfare of the person or their family being at serious risk, offences, or offensive or disorderly behaviour in or around licensed premises.

Police sergeants have the power to bar people for 72 hours for committing an offence of disorderly or offensive behaviour in or around licensed premises and police inspectors can bar for longer periods of up to three months on the first occasion of offensive behaviour or an offence being committed and six months for the second time. The third occasion can lead to indefinite barring.

DISABILITY SA

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:01): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, representing the Minister for Health, a question about Disability SA.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: It has recently come to my attention that, following the resignation of a senior clinical psychologist in January, Disability SA now has fewer than two full-time clinical psychologists under its employment to care for all adults in South Australia. I understand that, previously, Disability SA had quite a number of psychologists. However, this number has diminished over the years as vacancies have not been filled. Were it not for the services of psychologists, the government would be responsible for providing additional funds to support homeless and abused children. My questions to the minister are:

1. How many psychologists work for Disability SA and on what basis?
2. How many people are these psychologists responsible for?
3. Is there any intention to fill vacated positions?
4. Does the minister accept that Disability SA needs to employ more psychologists to give patients better access to these services?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his important questions and will refer those to the relevant minister in another place. I am not too sure whether that is the Minister for Disability or the Minister for Health, but I will make sure it gets to the right person.

COOBER PEDY, HOUSING

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, representing the Minister for Housing, a question about the proposed Coober Pedy transitional housing development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: Recently, I have been contacted by constituents who have inquired about the proposed Coober Pedy transitional housing development. Aboriginal people, particularly from the APY lands, who visit Coober Pedy are either sleeping on the street or bunking 20 people into one house.

My understanding is that the proposal for transitional housing development has state government support; therefore, the need for support from the federal government and ongoing federal funding is vital. My question is: will the minister make urgent representations to the Rudd federal government to lock in funding for the proposed development?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for his question and will refer it to the Minister for Housing in another place and bring back a response.

SMALL BUSINESS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Small Business a question about skills training.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Can the minister please explain what efforts this government is making to support small business operators throughout the state through the provision of skills training?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (15:03): This government is committed to providing a range of services and programs to assist small business operators, not just through the Office of Small Business within the Department of Trade and Economic Development but also through various agencies.

The Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (DFEEST), for example, provides substantial support to small business operators in South Australia. In September 2008, DFEEST established the Industry Skills Development Directorate to support industry and employers including small businesses to upskill their workforce.

In these times of global instability, it is vital that small businesses maintain their commitment to training to ensure that they have a skilled and ready workforce when the economic recovery occurs; and, indeed, for jobseekers, there is no doubt that skills training can improve their chances of finding work. DFEEST works closely with industry groups and enterprises including small businesses to develop programs and initiatives that will address the future skilling needs of the state's workforce. This includes the management of a significant volume of contestable funding streams from both the commonwealth and state governments so that training can be provided to job seekers and existing workers in skill areas of high demand.

By way of an example, DFEEST is able to directly support small business by providing advice on the application processes in order to maximise accessibility to the Productivity Places Program for existing workers. The existing worker funding is a state/commonwealth initiative that provides up to 90 per cent of funding for small businesses to upskill their workers. This training allows workers to complete nationally recognised qualifications, primarily from Certificate IV to advanced diploma level, in areas of high skill demand. Importantly, from a small business perspective, this training is also available to self-employed people and sole traders.

The agency also supports access to state government funding, via the Industry Partnership Program, by providing a point of referral for small business to one of the nine industry skills boards. The industry skills boards act as a broker and work with small business to develop Industry Partnership Program proposals that seek to upskill and improve the productivity of their workers. The strength of the Industry Partnership Program lies in its ability to aggregate demand and to respond to the skill needs of small markets. Businesses in the retail sector and those associated with food production, tourism and hospitality have already been beneficiaries of this program.

DFEEST also provides assistance through the Labour Market Adjustment Initiative, which was established in 2004 in response to the closure of Mitsubishi's Lonsdale plant. The program has since supported former employees in the automotive manufacturing sector and other eligible

workers, including automotive supply chain small business employees who have been displaced due to downsizing, closure or restructuring. This program has included transition advisory services; development of job search skills; career counselling; individual case management; recognition of prior learning; retraining, including self-employment; and small business training.

The agency also supports small businesses in South Australia to develop proposals for training facilities relevant to their industry sectors, through the management of the National Training Infrastructure Program (NTIP) on behalf of the Australian government. This program provides capital infrastructure funding to skill centres, with the key purpose of increasing the number of people undertaking accredited vocational education and training, particularly in areas of high labour demand. Since 2008, South Australia has punched well above its weight in the securing of commonwealth funding for skill centres, with nearly \$4 million being allocated to develop training facilities in industry areas, such as automotive, electrical, construction, plumbing and aquaculture.

TAFE SA will also increase its focus on developing and facilitating industry partnerships to ensure that engagement with industry and small businesses continues to be a fundamental and defining feature of the way in which this important agency operates. This will include the establishment of a business TAFE strategy, a targeted marketing effort that provides employers with easy access to training through a 1300 number, with direct links to account managers. Lead institutes that are specialised training centres with close alignment to key industry sectors will also be set up to ensure greater industry access and engagement with TAFE SA.

Workplace delivery will be a fundamental component of TAFE SA training programs delivered in partnership with industry to enable more rapid engagement in enterprises with high training demand. By 2012, the government estimates that 25 per cent of delivery of training programs will be in the workplace. TAFE SA will also establish enterprise advisory groups to directly link up with employers, who will provide feedback on graduate skill levels, employment demand and training methods. These groups will meet regularly with service providers to provide information and advice on local issues. TAFE SA will also implement customer relationship management principles and practices to key accounts to strengthen existing relationships and to facilitate the development of new business and promote customised services to industry, including small business.

These programs complement much of the training that is provided to small business through the Department of Trade and Economic Development. At this time of unprecedented world economic challenges, it is important that the government steps up to provide support for the sort of skills training that will position our small businesses to make the most of the expected recovery.

CARBON POLLUTION REDUCTION SCHEME

The Hon. M. PARNELL (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Mineral Resources Development, representing the Premier in his capacity as the Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change, a question about the impact of the CPRS on state government budgets.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. PARNELL: Recently, the Australia Institute released an economic analysis of the Rudd government's proposed carbon pollution reduction scheme, entitled 'State of denial'. The paper argues that the demarcation of responsibility for responding to climate change is inappropriate and will result in a substantial reduction in the ability of state governments to provide services, such as health and education, to their citizens. The paper concludes that, while the commonwealth will receive a windfall of more than \$10 billion per year in revenue from auctioning pollution permits, state and local governments will transfer more than \$2 billion a year to the commonwealth government, primarily through increased energy costs.

According to a May 2009 report by Access Economics—which, incidentally, was commissioned by state Labor governments through the Council for Australian Federation—South Australia's share of this loss is \$92 million by 2013 and \$211 million by 2020. In addition, South Australia, along with other states and territories, will be liable for tens of billions of dollars worth of expenditure associated with adapting to climate change, for example, increased health costs and storm and fire damage. This is because the federal government, which is giving away more than \$10 billion in compensation to households and polluters each year, will not be providing state governments with any financial assistance to meet either the direct costs of the CPRS or the need for urgent investment in adaptation infrastructure. In short, the report states that, although it is the

responsibility of the federal government to solve climate change, the bill for addressing the problem is being sheeted home to state governments.

There are three ways for the Rann government to respond to the increase in costs: first, it could seek to emulate the approach taken by trade-exposed industries and seek direct compensation from the commonwealth; secondly, it could increase state taxes; or, thirdly, it could cut services. The report states:

It is difficult to comprehend why state governments would not object to the introduction of a system in which the commonwealth does little to prevent climate change and demands, meanwhile, that all the costs of adapting to climate change become the responsibility of the states. The fact that the CPRS actually transfers money from state governments to the commonwealth makes their silence even harder to explain.

My questions are:

1. Has the Premier raised concerns with the federal government about the transfer of up to \$211 million over the next 10 years from South Australia to the commonwealth under the CPRS. If so, with whom and what was the response?

2. Has the South Australian government followed the lead of big polluters and specifically sought a share of the revenue from auctioning CPRS pollution permits to compensate for rising costs under the scheme. If not, why not?

3. If the government is not prepared to seek compensation, does it intend to cover the shortfall by raising state taxes, cutting services or both?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (15:13): I am aware that the Premier has raised issues in relation to the CPRS with the commonwealth government, but I will refer the question to him to get the exact details of that matter, given the honourable member's quite detailed question.

MARINE PROTECTED AREAS

The Hon. C.V. SCHAEFER (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for State/Local Government Relations a question about marine parks.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.V. SCHAEFER: The combined councils of Lower Eyre Peninsula, Port Lincoln and Tumby Bay have expressed concern at the size and proposed boundaries of Marine Park No. 6. They have called for an economic impact study and/or a community impact study to determine more appropriate boundaries. My questions are:

1. Has the minister been consulted by the Department for Environment and Heritage or by the Minister for Environment and Conservation on this matter?

2. Will she arrange for the conduct of these studies on behalf of local government?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy) (15:14): A very comprehensive process has been put in place to ensure consultation in an ongoing way through the phased approach to the development of our marine parks which involve all appropriate stakeholders in relation to their input. It is a comprehensive process which is continuing and which is being led by the Minister for Environment and Conservation. I have every confidence that the minister is dealing with that process in a highly adequate way.

MOBILE PHONES

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question about mobile phones.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA: With the impressively sophisticated array of mobile phones on the market and more complex plans and contracts available, a decision about which phone and service option may be best for the individual is not getting any easier, particularly for young people. Will the minister inform the council about the new mobile telephone booklet for young consumers?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister Assisting the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Energy) (15:16): I am pleased to announce a new booklet to help young consumers make informed decisions about purchasing and using mobile phones. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has seen an increase in complaints relating to mobile phones over the past three financial years, with approximately 160 complaints lodged with OCBA in the past financial year relating to mobile phone services and equipment.

The majority of complaints related to faulty handsets, premium services and phones not performing as described by the trader; and, in many cases, the trader had not fulfilled their legal responsibilities to follow up warranty issues on behalf of the consumer. Data compiled by OCBA has shown that, with respect to many of the complaints, both the trader and the consumer were not clear about their respective rights and responsibilities. In order to remedy this OCBA, together with other states and territories, is working to ensure that consistent information about warranty rights and responsibilities is being conveyed to consumers and traders across Australia.

One of the ways this is being done is through this new booklet or brochure. The booklet will be available from next week and is targeted at an audience of young people aged between 16 and 30—though all mobile phone users can obviously benefit from reading it. The brochure provides information on key issues, such as understanding contracts and obligations that come with the phone, consumer warranty rights, what to do if the phone is lost or stolen, an understanding of how premium SMS and call services work and the potential costs.

Some of those costs are quite hidden—as young people and their mums and dads have discovered—when they have downloaded items, and on the next bill appears these outrageous costs associated with those functions. It has caused quite a degree of family disharmony. Other information provided includes common SMS scams, concerns relating to network coverage, the potential cost of smart phones that can access the internet, how to dispose of old and broken mobile phones safely and who to contact if consumers cannot find a resolution to problems they may encounter.

The brochure is compact but information rich. It aims to distil some of the complexity into quite user-friendly, straightforward and simple advice that consumers can easily comprehend and arm themselves with. It will be available online via the OCBA website and also in hard copy. It will be distributed through Service SA, community information centres and educational institutions in order to provide a balance of information for those who are most likely to be the target of aggressive marketing by this industry and who, sometimes, are easily pressured into making very poor decisions that can end up being very expensive ones.

30-YEAR PLAN FOR GREATER ADELAIDE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Urban Development and Planning a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Family First is greatly interested in the recent release of the 30-year plan for the development of Greater Adelaide, and we will be seeking further information on a number of things in the council in the coming sitting weeks. Today I ask the minister about the overview map accompanying the plan, which has dots travelling up the Adelaide to Crafrers freeway marked 'potential mass transit'. There are also two other potential mass transit lines going west near Adelaide Airport, and on another map there is a line going to the eastern suburbs, as well. There are also some dots travelling from the city to Virginia, apparently through North Adelaide (as far as I can work out) and some connecting onto the end of the O-Bahn, with the Gawler rail line. Obviously, I realise that these are only listed as 'potential' mass transit lines, but I also see that they are marked as 'indicative'. Nevertheless, I am sure that they are not drawn on the map carelessly and that some plans must be afoot for development in those areas, along the lines as indicated on the map. My questions are:

1. What exactly are these dots on this map and do they indicate that, indeed, there will be a mass transit line up the Crafrers freeway to Mount Barker; and would such a line use the old road past Eagle on the Hill?

2. What other insights can the minister give in respect of other indicated lines which I have mentioned; that is, the ones travelling west from the city and north of Virginia and, potentially, to the Barossa, as well?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (15:22): There is more detail on pages 80 and 81 of the plan for Greater Adelaide. There is a map, D5, 'Major transit corridors and high order transit-oriented developments'. Clearly, over the next four or five years of the budget, significant investment in public transport has already been announced. Over the life of the 30-year plan, clearly, there will need to be further investment. The 30-year plan has tried to envisage what spacial shape Adelaide might be in in the next 30 years, where the population might be and where the jobs might be, and therefore, as part of that 30-year plan, it has identified potential mass transits.

Obviously, these are indicative only. No studies have begun and, clearly, no funding provided, because we are talking about 30 years, and the budget has had a very heavy commitment out to about 2015, 2016—and even that information is indicated in a table somewhere within the plan. Clearly, those sites are potential transit corridors and, indeed, if Adelaide does grow in the way that the plan envisages over that 30-year period, they are areas where potential mass transit is likely to be provided.

In relation to Mount Barker, I indicated yesterday that the particular corridor follows the freeway. I indicated the other day that one of the potential growth areas could be Mount Barker and, as Mount Barker grows, you could set aside separate bus corridors along the existing freeway, for example, to provide a better delay-free transport. This really is for the future. The 30-year plan does not attempt to depict the exact shape of Adelaide over the next 30 years. Clearly, many of those things may happen. We know the plan that has guided Adelaide's shape since 1962 has turned out to be remarkably accurate in the way Adelaide has grown. The reason we need a new plan is not only that the 1962 plan has been outgrown but also that we need to shift the direction of Adelaide away from a car-dependent society to a less car-dependent society. That is why it is so important that we have this detailed plan to guide our future.

It is part of the 30-year plan that we would update it regularly (annually) so that the plan has flexibility, but those particular transit corridors have obviously been supplied in conjunction with the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure so they reflect its thinking for the future.

I think councils have also raised issues in relation to some of those potential corridors. If one looks at map D6 on page 83, one will see that it is a fairly logical extension of public transit to those areas where we expect most of the growth to be. It is not surprising that, if Mount Barker is to grow to a city the size of 20,000 to 25,000 people, it will need improved public transport.

Similarly, as Aldinga fills out within the existing boundary, even though we are not expanding the urban growth boundary in that area, there is the potential to extend the line from Seaford to Aldinga. The extension to Seaford is already being considered in the current budget. Similarly, regarding the expected expansion east of Gawler and to Roseworthy, there are already rail lines in those areas and that is why these areas were chosen as suitable corridors. However, clearly, the potential will arise over the next 30 years to expand public transport to service those new growing areas.

The other corridor—the line to Virginia—of course, has already been speculated about publicly in relation to a new freight corridor route. Rather than having freight trains going through Salisbury and then out to Virginia, it has already been widely publicised that the government was investigating possibly putting that freight corridor west of the existing Port Wakefield Road. Of course, that also provides the opportunity to serve new growth areas there.

The map on page 83 has some detail, but, apart from the government's existing transit budget which takes us up to 2015 and 2016, those indications are indicative only that, should Adelaide grow the way it is expected to in 30 years, they will be the corridors that are most likely to be planned. However, clearly, they are decisions that will ultimately be made by other governments over the next 30 years.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 2972.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:27): I rise to speak to the second reading of the Appropriation Bill and make some opening comments in relation to the performance of this government and its ministers in terms of public accountability—accountability, essentially, in relation to financial issues.

First, I refer to the attitude of minister Holloway as the Leader of the Government in this chamber in relation to the issue of the Appropriation Bill debates, and I will summarise his approach as patronising, puerile and pathetic. Indeed, we can summarise it as minister Holloway's own version of the PPP, as demonstrated in the past few budgets. He is the only minister and Leader of the Government, in my experience—and, I understand, even prior to my participating in these debates—who has adopted the approach of refusing to answer questions from members in the Appropriation Bill debate.

Members will recall that, in the past couple of years, in a petulant (if I can add another P to the three Ps) fashion he has refused to answer most questions from members on the basis that, 'You lot have formed a Budget and Finance Committee, and you can go off and ask these questions in that committee.' I hasten to say that he is the only leader of this chamber who has ever adopted that approach, even excluding Labor leaders prior to him.

I go back to the period of former attorney-general Chris Sumner and others who took their responsibilities seriously. When a question was put to them in debate on the Appropriation Bill, they asked Treasury officers to use their best endeavours to provide an answer within the relatively limited time frame we had to debate these issues and, if they could not do so, they would take it on notice and undertake to provide an answer in writing to the member's inquiries.

In part, this developed because, during the 1980s, this chamber exercised its right at the committee stage of the Appropriation Bill to quiz ministers in this chamber on the detail of the budget documents. On occasions, senior departmental officers were available to ministers to provide answers in this chamber's version of a mini estimates committee in just one or two selected areas.

As a result of developments during the eighties and nineties and the genuine endeavours of former leaders of the chamber—undertakings given by attorney-general Sumner and me, as leader, during the period that we were in government—this chamber accepted not to continue down that path; instead, it accepted a process of genuine endeavours by the representative of the government to provide answers.

As I said, in the past two or three budgets, we have seen the patronising, petulant, puerile and pathetic response from minister Holloway. It is beneath contempt when one looks at the sorts of responses the minister has given. Yes, it is correct that this chamber has established the Budget and Finance Committee for accountability purposes. The general process of that committee means that, over a period of 12 months, agencies are asked to provide evidence to and answer questions from members of that committee.

It means that regarding the Appropriation Bill we have before us today, for example, some agencies have not appeared before the Budget and Finance Committee for approximately 12 months due to the question of processing their appearances before the committee. Any questions that were asked 12 months ago are obviously out of date so, when they next appear before the committee, the members who attend that committee can ask questions.

However, agencies like Premier and Cabinet, which appeared before the Budget and Finance Committee in February, March or April of this year, prior to the presentation of the budget, have only just been before the Budget and Finance Committee and answered questions on the basis that they could not say anything because the budget had not been brought down. They will not appear again before the committee in this four year cycle until after the next election, if the committee is to be re-established.

As I said, it is a petulant response from the Leader of the Government. I urge members to consider and look behind that sort of glib response because there is no need for him to adopt that approach to answering questions in this chamber. As you know, Mr President, the dogs are barking, and the young turks and some of the older turks within the Labor Party are trying to remove minister Holloway from his position and from the chamber.

One would hope that, if this government were re-elected and, heaven forbid, the Hon. Mr Finnigan or, even worse, the Hon. Ms Gago were to lead the government in this chamber—spare a thought for the person who could actually lead the government in this chamber in the future, whoever it is—they might at least be prepared to look back at the sort of approach

adopted by former leaders of the government of both persuasions in this chamber and not follow the approach that, sadly, has been adopted by the current leader. As I said, he is the only leader in this chamber's history ever to have adopted this approach in relation to the Appropriation Bill debate.

In the event that there is a Liberal government after March 2010, I would certainly hope that a leader of the government in this chamber from my own party would adopt the traditional, conventional, sensible and rational approach expected of leaders of the government in terms of public accountability and, through genuine endeavours, try to provide answers to questions from members in the Appropriation Bill debate.

This comes within the whole gamut of the lack of accountability of this government and its ministers. We see it in questions on notice, in questions without notice, and in freedom of information requests. The government laughs when I describe it as the most secretive government in the state's history, but I think testimony to that comes not just from opposition members but from many crossbench members as well.

I recently had an FOI document refused on the grounds of either public interest or a working document, or some similar excuse. That particular document was amongst a number of others and was actually a copy of *Hansard*, which referred to a particular issue I had sought information about under FOI. So, here is a publicly available document being refused under FOI, because it is one of a large number of documents, on the basis that it was not in the public interest that it be released.

As a guesstimate, we currently have at least 2,000 questions on notice that remain unanswered. My staff tell me that, as of this morning, I alone have 983 unanswered questions on notice, and I know there are also other members who have significant numbers of questions that remain unanswered. Again, this comes back to leadership; obviously it comes back to the Premier and, sadly, to the Leader of the Government in this chamber as well. Together they are not prepared to follow the conventions that all previous governments have followed in this chamber of, through reasonable endeavours, providing responses.

I accept that in the past some members may not have been happy with the quality of the responses, and whether or not they truly answered all the questions the way the member may have sought, but at least the convention and tradition of being prepared to be accountable was followed by former premiers and leaders of the government in this chamber. Sadly, that is not occurring at the moment.

So, whilst we have all of that, questions without notice is a whole new minefield, because there is no central record of those; however, my office quickly checked some of the questions I have raised (and I know that other members would be able to give similar examples). Back in December last year I asked a question of the minister representing the Attorney-General that related to the appointment of Mr Kourakis and Mr Bourne to various positions under this government (of course, we know that Mr Kourakis and Mr Bourne generously provided free legal advice to the Attorney-General in a private legal action some years ago that related to Mr Clarke). At that time I asked the following questions:

1. To ensure that there could be no perception of conflict of interest, did Attorney-General Atkinson exclude himself from, first, any cabinet discussions or decisions on appointing Mr Kourakis to the position of Solicitor-General and then recently the cabinet decision to appoint Mr Kourakis as a Supreme Court judge and, if not, why not?

2. In relation to the most recent defamation case involving the Attorney-General and Mr Cannon, is the Attorney-General receiving free legal advice from any solicitor or barrister in relation to those proceedings?

These are genuine questions of public interest, given the Attorney-General's form in this area but, seven months later, the arrogance of the government and Attorney-General is such that no reply has been provided.

Of course, we now know that the most recent legal costs of the Attorney-General are being picked up by the government, and that is an issue about which I will address some comments when the parliament reconvenes, given the Attorney's and the Premier's statements in the past about such matters. These are genuine issues of public interest that are just ignored by the arrogance of the government and, in this case, the Attorney-General.

I will go back to June 2007 when I asked questions, and I will not repeat them all. For example: 'Was the Attorney-General, or any other Rann government minister, or any of their advisers, recently advised of concerns relating to the behaviour of the then ombudsman? If so,

what action was taken in relation to any such concerns and, in particular, were any inquiries initiated? Were the communications staff within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet briefed on any such issues and involved in providing advice on handling any possible media issues resulting from those concerns?' That was June 2007 and, two years later, the Premier and the Attorney-General steadfastly refused to answer.

I referred to an issue on a number of occasions in early 2008—and I will not repeat it—relating to a public servant who had been suspended from their workplace for saying 'bullshit' to a senior officer in the workplace. That officer was sent home on full pay and suspended for almost 2½ years, waiting for a disciplinary inquiry for that heinous crime, in the view of senior officers in the Premier's own department. I asked a series of questions as to what action was taken, why and how it was going to be resolved. Again, it was just another example of the very many questions—that I, and many other members, could put on record—asked in this place that ministers just arrogantly ignore.

I give credit to former attorney-general Sumner, a Labor leader in this chamber. He was someone prepared to respect the conventions and traditions of this chamber. Sadly, the current leader is not prepared to follow that sort of leadership. As I have said, I am prepared to say that it was not just former Liberal leaders in this chamber who followed that convention and tradition: Labor leaders (such as former attorney-general Sumner) were prepared to follow the conventions and traditions of the chamber and provide some form of accountability.

I think it is a sad way for minister Holloway to leave this chamber, as clearly appears likely if the Hon. Mr Finnigan has his way. It is sad that we have a situation where minister Holloway is just demonstrating right across the board an unwillingness to be financially accountable in a whole range of areas, whether it be questions on notice or questions without notice in this chamber.

It is only a personal view that I am expressing at this stage, and I have expressed it before. I think it is important to talk about the reform of parliament, rather than the sort of nonsense we have heard from minister Holloway and the Premier in the past 48 hours. Talk about reform—give me a break. All they are doing is trying to get out of the difficult circumstances they got themselves into in terms of having a referendum to abolish the Legislative Council.

In terms of genuine reforms of this chamber, the sooner we establish a budget and finance committee—whether it is exactly the same as it is at the moment, or some variation thereof, is open to debate—as a standing committee, with permanent and ongoing staffing, as I have outlined before, the better; so that, irrespective of the backgrounds of the members of that committee, they can be provided with expert financial analysis and advice to enable appropriate questioning of chief executives on budget and finance issues.

If a Liberal government comes into office after March 2010, I hope that it would introduce legislation and changes to make the Budget and Finance Committee an ongoing standing committee. The successor to the Hon. Mr Holloway—should the Hon. Mr. Finnigan be successful—in opposition, could then see whether they could use the forums of the parliament, through a budget and finance committee, to highlight important issues of accountability in terms of budget and finance issues. It is important that that occurs. If there is a Labor government after the next election, it will not be interested in financial accountability at all and will obviously not want to see the Budget and Finance Committee continue in its current form.

As I said, whilst I am expressing personal views, I think this chamber should look at ways of ensuring, even though at that stage it would not be a standing committee, that it be more permanently established through changes to sessional orders and through a motion to ensure that appropriate funding is provided through the Legislative Council budget to provide permanent, ongoing expertise to the committee to allow it to undertake the task that is required of it.

The second area—and, again, I have expressed this before as a personal view and not as a party view—concerns an issue that I have and will raise more formally with my colleagues; that is, as a result of the breaking of convention by this government we cannot go on with this process of just having thousands of unanswered questions on notice. I have highlighted before that most other jurisdictions now place a time restriction on ministers within which they must provide some response to a question on notice. It is, sadly, now time that we go down that path if a majority of members in this chamber agrees to change the sessional or standing orders to ensure that that occurs.

To be fair, if there was agreement, it ought to be something that is flagged prior to this election, so that whoever is elected after March 2010 can either benefit or not benefit from it in the

new parliament, depending on your own perspective of this issue. Both a Liberal government and a Labor government will be required to follow it. That is an eminently reasonable, sensible and fair proposition. It is an issue that I think we ought to debate.

If the Hon. Mr Finnigan and others can move some of the old thinking on from the Hon. Mr Holloway's way of thinking, perhaps some of the newer members of the Labor Party will be prepared to look at some of these sorts of reforms rather than the nonsense that the leader and the Premier are putting out, such as reducing the number of members in this chamber from 22 to 16, and the other sort of nonsense that they put out as a facade for parliamentary reform.

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, the Hon. Mr Holloway would have to be pretty thick if he did not know what my views are; but, I suspect he might be, so perhaps he does not realise—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My views have been on the record for a long time, unlike yours. You have been all over the place. You are a man for all seasons; you do not know where you are. The latest view from the Premier happens to be your view on issues. I will not go on in relation to accountability issues, but they represent a taste of some of them. In terms of genuine reform and accountability, there are many others that we could look at.

The Hon. Mr Parnell—and I pay him credit—has highlighted some of the issues that one can look at in the House of Assembly in terms of its reform processes. I do not agree with all of the reforms the Hon. Mr Parnell raised this morning, and I understand he may well raise them in his speech this afternoon. Nevertheless, a willingness of the lower house to look at some of its own processes would be welcomed, as well.

In relation to some of the claims raised during the debate by the Hon. Mr Wortley and, I note, from the debate in the House of Assembly—and we have seen it before in debates on the Appropriation Bill and the Supply Bill—they have a wonderful Goebbels-type consistency to them. That is, you continue to repeat a lie or an untruth, and you work on the basis that if you keep saying it you might be able to eventually get a number of people in the community to believe it. We have seen a number of such examples, as I said, in the current debate on the Appropriation Bill. The first one is, of course, that the former Liberal government never produced a surplus budget. That is just factually incorrect; it is a Labor lie. I challenge the current Treasurer or the Hon. Mr Wortley to look at the budget documents that were produced by Treasury during the eight years of the last government.

In its last year, in the final outcome, the Liberal government recorded a surplus of \$22 million. I refer members to my Supply Bill speech in May this year and the table of the deficits and surpluses of the eight Liberal budgets between 1993 and 2002. The last four budgets were virtually lineball. There were small surpluses in two years of \$20 million to \$30 million and small deficits in two years of, I think, \$30 million and maybe \$50 million, or something, but in an \$8 billion-plus budget they were essentially balanced budgets, and in two cases (the last two years) surpluses, even on that particular measure. So, the budget documents are there.

What this government has done, of course, is it has gone back and recreated a different budget sector, a different measure of what is a surplus or deficit, and then it runs around saying that the last government could not balance a budget. As I said, it has a delicious Goebbels-type consistency to it. It does not surprise me with this government and its ministers, but they are not going to get away with it, and they will not be allowed to get away with it.

There has been this wonderful consistency, again, from the current Deputy Premier in claiming that, under the former government, money was given to agencies like health and Treasury, for example, and that it had no oversight of the agency until the end of the year when they were overspent. Let me read what the Deputy Premier claimed in the estimates committee:

Such was the animosity between Rob Lucas and Dean Brown that Dean would be given his budget at the beginning—

I might just interpose there. That too is a Labor lie. There was never any animosity between Dean Brown and myself, but that is not the main point—

of a year and Treasury would have, effectively, no communication and control until the end of the year when health told it how much it had overspent. That is what happens when you have a divided government.

As I said, that is just another Labor lie. Treasury maintained an ongoing watching brief, not only of the health department but all departments and agencies, during the period of the former government—and, in fact, during the period of the former Labor government that preceded the election of the Liberal government in 1993.

Later in my contribution I will refer to the health department. The Deputy Premier makes criticisms of the health department under the former Liberal government. We will have another look—after his so-called bold reforms and financial accountability—at how well he has done in terms of managing the health budget and budget overspends, but I will return to that later.

As I indicated earlier, I spoke on a range of budget related issues in the Supply Bill debate in May of this year, such as credit ratings, the work of the Budget and Finance Committee, the Auditor-General and things like that. I will not repeat the views I expressed in May; they remain the same.

I acknowledge that we are in difficult economic circumstances. We are in difficult financial circumstances as a result of being in difficult economic circumstances. There has been a lot of publicity in the past week of an announced decision by the Adelaide Bendigo Bank to encourage, in the first instance, its staff to take up to two weeks unpaid leave over the current financial year. That has been in the headlines in most of the newspapers and the electronic media as well.

It is unfair to single out the Adelaide Bendigo Bank in this respect. I hasten to say that I have a family member who is an employee of the Adelaide Bendigo Bank, albeit at a lower level, not at management level. There are a number of other companies in South Australia and, I suspect, in other states as well, which have adopted or are adopting similar practices to the announcement from the Adelaide Bendigo Bank.

Let me refer to one of the biggest accounting firms in South Australia, Ernst & Young. It required all staff to take a minimum of three weeks of unpaid leave over the next 12 months. Adelaide Bendigo Bank encouraged people to take up to two weeks or 10 days of unpaid leave, whereas Ernst & Young required them to take a minimum of three weeks, with an option of up to 12 weeks in total; this, too, was an alternative to redundancy.

Internationally, KPMG in the UK recently offered staff a four day week as well as three to six month career breaks. I am not sure whether, in South Australia, KPMG has adopted a similar proposal but, certainly, its international cousins have done so, and people have advised me that a number of other companies of a smaller nature are also encouraging staff to take unpaid leave.

The bottom line in relation to that is two things: first, clearly, we are in difficult financial circumstances; and, secondly, the published unemployment rates in South Australia (and nationally, I suspect) to that extent will be misleading; that is, whilst the unemployment figures may well indicate the percentage as being in the order of just under 6 per cent in South Australia, what we are seeing, probably for the first time in any major way, is an alternative mechanism being explored for redundancies. According to the finance sector union, within those agencies people are feeling that it is more than just encouragement and that it is, indeed, an expectation that they will share the pain by agreeing to take unpaid leave over the next 12 months.

The Deputy Premier, whilst he did not refer to this particular option during the estimates committees in relation to the wage debate, did point out that the public sector unions had the option of bigger wage increases or further redundancies. I do not think he used the word 'redundancies' but, obviously, further job losses within the public sector. We are already going to see a number of those anyway, under the announced terms of the Mid-Year Budget Review.

As we look at the 2010 budget, it is informative to look at some of the essential underpinnings of that budget. I intend to look at some of the aggregate budget figures and at one agency in particular—the health agency—to see how robust some of these figures are. As I have highlighted before, I think it is important for members to recall that this government's word and the leader's word (and the Premier and Deputy Premier) on budget and finance issues are not to be believed. We know that, in 2002, the then Labor opposition made specific commitments in relation to no tax increases.

The infamous words of the Deputy Premier in 2002 were that he had the moral fibre to break his election promises and that the opposition leader, Rob Kerin, did not have that moral fibre to break his election promises. That is the guiding moral compass of the Deputy Premier and this government and the Leader of the Government in this chamber as well.

We saw it repeated in 2006, when there were specific commitments not to have job cuts. One may remember the campaign against the then Liberal opposition's proposition that, through targeted separation packages and attrition, 4,000 jobs would be removed from the public sector to help pay for tax reduction, service delivery improvements and the like. The commitment given by this government is not to go down the path of targeted separation packages, not to have job cuts and certainly not to have 4,000 job cuts.

As I highlighted in the May speech, we saw that promise also broken: in the first budget in 2006-07, 1,571 job cuts; in the 2008-09 budget, up to 1,000 job reductions in the public sector; and then in the Mid-Year Budget Review, a promise of another 1,600. Already you can see over 4,000 job cuts in three separate budget decisions by this government, after promising and campaigning against the position of using targeted separation packages and attrition to reduce job numbers in the public sector.

So, the message for members of parliament, for the community and the media is: whatever the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Government in this chamber say in relation to the budget position, this budget and what they take to the election, you cannot believe it because they work on the moral compass that they have the moral fibre to break their election promises. They see it as a virtue that they are so strengthened by that particular moral compass that, if they make a promise, they at least have the moral fibre to break those election promises. So, the commitments that have been given now and in the lead-up to 2010 cannot be believed on the basis of the record of this government and its leaders.

As we look at this budget, the 2009-10 figures and the forward estimate figures in particular, the kindest description one can give them is that they are rubbery. They are certainly designed to mislead both members in this chamber and members of the media, but also more particularly, to mislead the analysts in the rating agencies—Standard & Poor's, Moody's, Fitch and others—as they look at the forward estimates.

Those rating agency analysts do not have the capacity to go into, to dig down or 'drill down' (to use the appalling jargon of recent years) into the budget figures to see whether or not the claimed aggregate figures in terms of savings will ever be achieved in aggregate or by the individual agencies. It is clear—and I will look in particular at the health department—that these figures being rubbery and designed to mislead will not be achieved by this government if it is re-elected.

It is clear that this government will again have to break the inevitable promise it will give. The promise will be that there will be no tax increases or 'We see no reason to have tax increases,' or some such phrase, but soon after the election, when the Sustainable Budget Commission brings down its report, I am sure that either it will recommend further tax and revenue increases or the government itself will recommend further tax and revenue increases.

Let me put my flag in the sand here now based on some information provided to me. I believe that, when we look back on this budget after the next election, if this government is re-elected, it will increase royalties on mining companies in South Australia. I know they are telling everyone that they will not. I accept that no final decisions have been taken yet, obviously, but based on the skerrick of information provided to me from inside Treasury, I reckon as we look back (and if the Hon. Mr Finnigan has his way minister Holloway will not be here to see the results of it), we will see royalty increases being actioned by a Labor government if it is re-elected.

As we look at these rubbery numbers, one of the key areas in relation to the figures that have been provided is that assumptions have been made about wages growth. I want to refer members to a story in the *Australian Financial Review* of only Wednesday of this week, 15 July. I refer members to the front-page story headlined 'States battle to contain wages', which is continued then on page 8. I know members will be delighted when I say that I will not read all of the article but let me just quote six figures that the *Financial Review's* analysis shows. In summary, the article is basically saying that the states will really be battling to keep wages growth to the level they have proposed or assumed in their budgets. I think it is fair to say that there is a degree of scepticism that state governments will achieve it.

The *Financial Review* analysis has looked at the 12 month growth for the state government wages bill in 2009-10, and it has calculated that as a percentage. The highest percentage increase for the 12 month growth figure is Victoria, 6.3 per cent; the second is South Australia's wage growth bill of 6.2 per cent; the third highest is a significant drop from that with Western Australia at 5.8 per cent; Queensland, 5.3 per cent; New South Wales, 4.9 per cent; and Tasmania, 4.3 per

cent. The total Australian figure is 5.5 per cent for 12 months growth in wage bill costs. That shows that, in terms of the total wages bill, South Australia is the second highest.

I hasten to say that the *Financial Review* analysis obviously looks at total wages costs, which include the number of employees. It may well be that South Australia has had a bigger increase in public servants than the other states (I do not know that), or it may well be that we have had bigger wage increase cost settlements than the other states, or it could be a combination of both, which I suspect is possibly the case. However, what it shows is the enormity of the task of keeping one element of that calculation, which is the wage cost increases, to 2.5 per cent, as the government has assumed in producing numbers for deficits and surpluses in the budget papers we are looking at.

The Deputy Premier has said that, if we can keep wages growth figures to 2.5 per cent, \$290 million of the \$350 million in annual savings required by the end of the forward estimates would be achieved. What is not clear is whether that calculation includes the current situation in relation to teacher salaries. As we know, the AEU is before the Industrial Relations Commission at the moment, and it is quite clear from that there is not going to be a wages settlement at 2.5 per cent, given the government's offer is already above the 2.5 per cent annual figure.

Again, in normal circumstances, that would be one of the questions I would put to the Leader of the Government and seek a response to whether or not that is included. However, for the reasons I have already outlined, he has adopted and continues to adopt an approach that he is above answering those sorts of questions or, indeed, even asking Treasury to provide answers in relation to these issues to mere members of the Legislative Council.

I turn now to the second big issue in relation to the rubbery nature of these figures and that is the agencies. In May, I looked at a number of agencies, but I will only look at the health department because this has been a subject of some interest to the Deputy Premier over the years; in particular, in the estimates committees this year.

Let us look at the major reforms the Deputy Premier and Treasurer says he has instituted in relation to managing the finances of departments, having been critical of the management of departments, such as the health department, by former treasurers. In the 2006-07 financial year, the health department, in the first instance, massively overspent its budget by some \$62 million, and, at the end of the 2006-07 financial year, it had to be bailed out by Treasury with an extra grant of \$62 million. Even with that, the department reported a \$32 million overspend.

When departmental representatives appeared before the Budget and Finance Committee some months later, they said, 'Well, we don't know whether or not we are meant to repay this. We overspent the budget, and they gave us an extra \$62 million because we had overspent. We overspent it again by another \$32 million, and we don't know whether or not we have to repay it.' Eventually, they were told that they did not have to repay it. There was a \$94 million overspend in that year, all of which was bailed out by Treasury on the basis of, 'Don't worry about it; you have overspent your budget; here is \$94 million.'

Having blown its budget by \$94 million, what happens in the following year? In 2007-08 the agency overspent its budget by \$70 million. Again, Treasury and the Treasurer bailed out the health department by giving it an extra \$70 million to help balance the books. In two consecutive years there has been a blow-out of \$90 million and \$70 million—\$160 million—in the budget of the health department. This is under the so-called major reforms instituted by the Deputy Premier, where he said that he would be insisting on fiscal discipline by departments and agencies.

As I said in May this year, my information from within the health department is that in February or March this year it was looking at a budget blow-out or overspend of between \$50 million and \$100 million for the financial year 2008-09. Of course, the financial year has just concluded, so, again, one of the obvious questions to which I would seek an answer from the Leader of the Government is: did the health department in 2008-09 again overspend its budget? If it did, by how much? Finally, did Treasury have to make another allocation to help to balance the books of the health department in 2008-09?

Given that the Leader of the Government will not even deign to consider those sorts of questions, the opposition is left in the position of either pursuing the matter through the Budget and Finance Committee—and, luckily, we have Health coming before us in the next month or so—or freedom of information requests to try to see whether we can get an answer to that question.

In relation to the rubbery nature, that is the history of the past two or three years. If we look at the nature of what this government has built up in the agencies in terms of trying to balance its books, it has said to the agencies, 'Okay, here are the savings tasks you have to achieve over the forward estimates period.'

If we look at the health department—and I am looking at only the one department on this occasion—and what the cumulative effect will be by the end of the forward estimates period of the budget cuts which have been announced in the past four year period, in 2006-07 the department's budget was cut by the end of the forward estimates period (which at that stage was 2009-10) by an annual figure of \$35.5 million per year.

When health department representatives appeared before the Budget and Finance Committee last year, they indicated that at that stage they had not implemented or made decisions to achieve all that \$35.5 million cut. They had implemented savings measures to achieve a minority share of the \$35.5 million. They said that they had a rough idea as to how they might achieve it but that all those decisions would be announced closer to the 2009-10 budget.

In the 2007-08 budget, the Premier announced further savings initiatives of up to \$80 million by the end of the forward estimates period. In this case that is 2010-11—so another \$80.2 million cut in that year.

In the following budget, there is a further cut of \$48.6 million by the end of the forward estimates, which in this case is 2011-12. In the most recent budget, there is a further cut in Health at the end of the forward estimates period of \$24.3 million by the end of the forward estimates period. We then have to add to that the announcement in the Mid-Year Budget Review of a reduction of 428 full-time equivalent staff and, if one works on a rough equivalent of \$70,000 to \$80,000 a head, that is a further job dollar value of around \$30 million a year.

When you add those altogether, by the end of the forward estimates period in terms of ongoing savings, the health department has to achieve savings of approximately \$220 million a year—not over a four-year period, but annual savings of \$220 million a year. A small percentage of that—possibly \$20 million, a maximum of \$30 million—might have been achieved in terms of decisions taken, that is, the final value of the 2006-07 budget cuts was about \$35 million by 2009-10.

We may well have had decisions taken—maybe not announced completely—to achieve \$35 million worth of savings. If that is the case, what we have to see is another lump of savings of around \$190 million a year by the end of the forward estimates period to achieve the sorts of figures that are being placed in the bottom line in this budget. The only way the deficit and surplus figures have been achieved in this budget is by using the sorts of assumptions that I have just given, that is, the government keeps wages growth at 2.5 per cent (it has been open about that), but that agencies will have to achieve (as in the case of health) a massive cut of somewhere between \$190 million to \$220 million a year by the end of the estimates period.

This is the same for all other departments and agencies. I do not have the time today to go through the education department or Families and Communities, but, through the work of the Budget and Finance Committee, we have all these analyses that are either finished or in the process of being concluded. As I said, the only way this Treasurer and this government have been able to produce the figures, which has meant that these rating agencies have said, 'Okay, if you achieve these figures, we'll keep the AAA credit rating', is by making the assumption that all these savings will be delivered.

On the one hand, you have an agency such as health, which instead of saving money has been overspending and blowing out by \$94 million and then \$70 million again last year. And this budget is predicated on the basis of it not just standing still and not blowing out but actually cutting its expenditure base by up to \$220 million a year by the end of the forward estimates period. Under this government that will not be achieved, under this Treasurer that will not be achieved, and that is why I say that the figures are rubbery and designed to deceive ratings agencies, media commentators and members of parliament.

Should it be re-elected, this government will go back to its moral compass of, 'We have the moral fibre to break our election promises', and we will see significant tax and revenue increases right across the board to help it balance the budget. Okay then, what are the options in terms of where you can start to achieve some savings? I can only offer personal views, they are not party views, but let us have a look at some areas that are ripe for reductions rather than some of the areas in health which, I am sure, the government will have to end up having a look at.

Let us look at the decision taken by this government and the Deputy Premier to add another 50 to 60 policy officers into the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to provide a second-guessing capacity for that department. They are highly paid officers within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Clearly you would be talking about probably up to \$4 million to \$6 million a year or \$20 million to \$30 million over the forward estimates period of extra policy grunt—as they put it—in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet so that they can second guess the submissions coming in from other departments and agencies.

Let us have a look at the Public Sector Performance Commission. It costs, we understand, up to \$3 million a year and, if that is right, up to \$12 million a year. We have seen the lack of output from the government reform commission (its predecessor) and clearly there is no need, in my personal view, to continue with that agency or role. Again, I hasten to say it is a personal view.

A very strong argument from me in relation to the Social Inclusion Board and some of its fellow travellers is that we have agencies and departments charged with the responsibility of tackling problems of homelessness and drug abuse across the board, and we have ministers who are paid good money to undertake these tasks, so why on earth do we need commissars or commissioners to usurp the role of duly elected members of parliament and ministers? It ought to be their responsibility, not that of a non-elected official, however well intentioned he or she might be.

The number of ministers could be reduced—and my party is on the record in terms of reducing the number, whether it be to 12 or 13—and the number of ministerial staffers could easily be reduced by anywhere from 60 up to about 80 just to take it back to the numbers that existed in 2002 to achieve significant savings.

Then there are the wrong priorities—again, I express my personal views, but some of my colleagues have expressed these views, as well—of the big ticket items like trams through the centre of the city and through the western suburbs right down to the smaller issues, which have been the subject of much mirth from government members this week. The former leader, the member for Waite, indicated his view about the wrong priorities, and we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars. One of the messages my mother gave me in terms of finances was that, if you look after the little bills well, it will be the approach you adopt in relation to the big bills.

We saw this nonsense over the past couple of weeks, when the government fought to prevent the release of information and did not answer questions in the house: because the Premier and the Deputy Premier were feeling hot in their cars, they decided to spend \$30,000 of taxpayers' money to put a shade over their cars.

Those people who look at us—particularly those who have made grant applications or who are parents of children with disabilities who have sought additional funding and have been told that an additional \$5,000 or \$10,000 is not available for their child or their child's disability—are being told that one of the priorities of this Premier and Deputy Premier is that, because they feel a little hot in summer or get a little wet in winter when they get into their car, they would prefer to spend \$30,000 of taxpayers' money on shade for their car.

As I highlighted earlier, it never worried the Tom Playfords, the John Bannons, the John Olsens or the Dean Browns of this world; they managed to get to meetings with businesspeople. Minister Holloway said, 'Do we want the Premier to turn up, sweating, to a meeting with important people?' That is the real world. Many hardworking South Australians have to hop into a hot car in summer, and maybe in that small way, if the Premier and the Deputy Premier did have to hop into a hot car in the middle of summer or dash 10 metres to a car when the rain is falling in winter, they would become more in touch with the real world, rather than this insular—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Premier of the state has a covered car park in Gawler Place, and he also has a covered car park here. The Premier has covered car parks everywhere: he has one here and one in Gawler Place; it is not as though this is his only car park. He and his driver have any number of covered car parks they have used and previous premiers and deputy premiers have also used.

As I said, whether it be issues of \$30,000 or hundreds of millions of dollars in terms of the tram issues that the member for Waite highlighted in recent years and some of the other areas that I have highlighted today, there are many examples of wrong priorities and waste within this government's spending patterns. These are the areas that should be targeted for cutbacks rather

than some of the other areas that they are targeting—and, I suspect, they will target—over the forward estimates period.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON (16:25): I wish to speak briefly on this bill because it does provide an opportunity to comment upon the Rann government's record in managing the finances of this state.

The first point I want to make is that, despite the Treasurer's self-promotion and self-aggrandisement, the record of this government in financial management is unimpressive. The Treasurer placed great store upon the state's AAA rating—a rating, I interpose, that was earned by the previous Liberal administration through prudent husbanding of the state's finances and resources. It was earned by an earlier government but actually awarded after Labor formed an alliance with Peter Lewis. So, this particular Treasurer should take no credit in obtaining the AAA rating. However, listening to him, one would think that the AAA rating is the be-all and end-all and is in some way the true measure of the Treasurer's competence. I do not share that faith in AAA ratings—or any ratings, for that matter, bearing in mind the history of Enron, Bear Stearns, Merrill Lynch, Allco Finance, etc., all of which enjoyed high credit ratings virtually within hours of collapsing.

As my colleague the Hon. Rob Lucas mentioned a moment ago, the credit ratings are based upon information provided by governments, and claims made by governments, and the agencies do not have the capacity to go beyond those claims. Where we see in this budget factors such as the government's proposal to limit wages growth to 2.5 per cent per annum, it may be a noble objective (and it would be wonderful if it was achieved) but, in the statements I have seen, even the Treasurer himself acknowledges that it is unlikely. The savings targets that are built into this budget upon which the credit rating is based are not merely optimistic: they are grossly exaggerated as, once again, my colleague pointed out in his contribution a moment ago.

A lot of the hyperbole of the Treasurer is virtually in cloud cuckoo land. It is all spin and bluster. It relies upon the catchy term 'AAA'; it is headline grabbing; and it simplifies (indeed, it over-simplifies) the situation to such an extent that it disguises the underlying issues. It is a great pity that members of the public do not have the capacity or the inclination to go beyond the headline. I think it is a regrettable fact that the media in this state appears not to have the capacity to do so.

In my view, a Treasurer's competence should be judged by his capacity to husband the available resources, plan prudently, control costs, and adhere to budgets; but, instead, in South Australia, this Treasurer prefers to spruik the AAA line.

I want to mention a number of factors briefly which show the weakness of the budget and the incapacity of this government. One important element, of course, in any Treasury, is to control costs, and this government has singularly failed in that direction. For example, the budget shows that, over the past eight years, over 16,000 additional public servants have been hired and, as everyone knows, the most significant element in the total of the state budget is wages paid to public servants. Undoubtedly, some of those additional public servants were appropriately hired, but only about a quarter of the 16,400 were nurses, teachers, doctors or police officers. Whenever the Treasurer or the Premier are challenged about public sector numbers, they say they make no apologies for hiring more teachers, doctors, nurses and police officers, but that accounts for only one quarter of the rise. So, the government has been unable to control costs.

It has also been unable to control spiralling debt. The way in which the Treasurer described the situation at the time of the budget was that the government's debt was increasing to \$3.1 billion. He conveniently failed to mention the fact that the debts for which the South Australian taxpayer is collectively responsible include the debts of public non-financial corporations such as SA Water, TransAdelaide, the Housing Trust, ForestrySA, etc. If you take those debts into account—and they amount to some \$3.6 billion—the total rises from \$3.1 billion to \$6.7 billion.

Other debts ought be included. For example, \$1.7 billion of debt is linked to the proposal to relocate the Royal Adelaide Hospital to the rail yards. The Treasurer has indicated that will be debt if, as is likely, the government is unable to find a private partner for the exercise. Of course, there are unfunded superannuation liabilities. In 2002, when this government came to office, they amounted to some \$4 billion; they are now some \$9.8 billion. The figure of \$3.1 billion as government debt overlooks the unfunded liabilities of WorkCover, which are once again likely to be well over \$1 billion, notwithstanding the amendments which the parliament made to the scheme

last year. So, the total unfunded liability of this government is, in global terms, nearer to \$20 billion. Once again, these are unfortunate facts which are papered over by the Treasurer.

Another sign of good budgetary management is adhering to budgets and programs that are laid down. This government has made much of its law and order policy. They are good, cheap political capital but they require investment and, quite correctly, in previous years, the government announced that Mobilong Prison would be extended to accommodate additional prisoners. That is absolutely necessary expenditure, but that project was abandoned in this current budget. The government has abandoned not only projects but also programs. In its first budget it abandoned crime prevention programs. It reduced psychological services in prisons. It reduced other programs in the correctional institutions in the name of budget stringency but, once again, it is an unfortunate fact that this government has been unable to plan, to budget or to ensure that budgeted moneys are expended.

For example, I note that the Techport development and the Defence SA developments are important in the government's priorities, but costs have not been controlled. The original Techport proposal involved expenditure of some \$120 million; it has been re-scoped to \$260 million. I am all in favour of having a strong defence industry, but I believe that this government has placed practically all its industrial eggs into one basket and made huge investments in that defence infrastructure at the expense of other forms of economic activity which would be equally as productive and which would provide us with a more rounded industrial economy.

Yet another aspect of this government's failures in relation to this budget is manifest in its approach to taxation and revenue raising. We complain—and I believe correctly—that the government's reliance upon property taxes is unhealthy and counterproductive and has led to an inefficient taxation system. In particular, there is the fact that land tax has so vastly increased; property taxes themselves are up by some 95 per cent. When this government decided land tax was a good source of revenue, some 69,000 taxpayers were paying it; now almost 190,000 people are paying that tax. The tax grab has increased by almost 300 per cent since this government came to office. It is a counterproductive measure, and it is sending investors interstate and penalising many good citizens who have used property investment as a form of superannuation.

The government has also failed in some of its expenditure priorities. For example, stormwater infrastructure is vital for this state's water security but it has been abandoned in favour of some pet projects such as solar panels on top of Parliament House, windmills on city buildings, and the like. Solar panels on Parliament House may be a good photo opportunity for television, but the simple fact is that we have to make investments in real infrastructure which will benefit the state—and stormwater is one of the many that has not had appropriate investment.

In the past I have complained—and I do so again—in relation to the failure of the government to invest in court facilities. The law and order policies of this government have been high in terms of political capital but low in terms of investment, and if we are to have an effective criminal justice system it needs buildings, personnel and resources to ensure that justice is provided quickly, in the interests of victims and the community generally.

Over the years the Appropriation Bill has increased quite markedly. When I came in here the appropriation for 1994, the first under the Brown Liberal government, was some \$4.6 billion; it is now some \$11.5 billion. When this government came to office in 2002, the appropriation was just a little over \$6 billion; it went up by \$195 million the next year; the following year it went up by \$600 million; it went up by \$500 million the next year; and then by \$400 million in 2006. By 2007, it rose by some \$600 million in one year, and then in 2008 by \$1 billion. This year the appropriation has risen by some \$2.2 billion. Obviously inflation is a factor, but the appropriation here has been going up well above the CPI, and I do not believe that it is under appropriate control.

I note that it is now proposed that there will be a referendum held at next year's election. There is no doubt that that will add to the expense of conducting the election. The government's announcement on Wednesday this week concerning its proposal to emasculate the Legislative Council was prefaced with the words, 'The government has listened to the people'—the clear inference being that the proposals now being put are supported by the people.

In 2002-03, the government spent some \$710,000 of taxpayers' money on a constitutional convention, which was based upon a system called deliberative polling. The government must have been confident about the accuracy of this form of polling, otherwise it would not have spent such a vast sum on it. The essence of deliberative polling is to take a poll of a random selection of people at a particular point in time, then provide them with objective information and education in

relation to the question, then poll them once again. This is said to provide a more accurate poll, polling more educated opinion.

If this government has—to use its own words—been listening to the people, it will be interesting to see what the results of that particular poll are. On the question of the perceived effectiveness of the current system, before the convention was held, 54 per cent of delegates thought that the system was good. After they had received information, 67 per cent thought the system was good, so it went up considerably.

Regarding the perceived effectiveness of the role of committees, 70 per cent of people polled before the convention thought they were effective, and 96 per cent thought that after the poll. On the question of the belief in the power of both houses to block legislation, at the earlier poll, 76 per cent thought it was appropriate, and that increased to 84 per cent after the convention.

On the question of whether the current size of the Legislative Council was about right, 58 per cent initially thought it was and, after the convention, some 65 per cent considered it was about right. So, if this government is—to use its own words—listening to the people, what possible justification can there be for abandoning a promise to hold a referendum to abolish the Legislative Council, and what possible justification can there be for adopting, instead, proposals which were positively rejected by the people in the most expensive political opinion poll held in the history of Australian politics?

The fact is that the government seeks to go ahead with this referendum and seeks to further squander public moneys on an exercise which has already been rejected. I think it is yet another sign of this government's propensity to squander public funds in the interests of some perceived political expediency. Once again, the final budget in this particular parliament is one of missed opportunities. It is a situation that I regard with some regret.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (16:45): I thank honourable members for their contributions to the budget speech. Given that it is nearly 5pm on the last day of sitting before we adjourn for the winter break, I will not spend too much time on the bill. Clearly, the Appropriation Bill gives an opportunity for members of parliament to raise issues on a whole range of subjects, and indeed they have done so.

Given that this is the last budget debate before the next election (some eight months away), given the global financial crisis and the general economic circumstances we face and given the fact that the Treasurer outlined in his budget the difficult financial position facing South Australia—with the decline in revenues and the loss of investments on the stock market, which affect a number of government entities—clearly, the state is in for harder financial times. This is a period in which it will be necessary to ensure that we have sufficient capital expenditure to keep the economy moving. We have done that, and the federal government has, fortunately, supported it through its programs.

At the same time, we need to have very tight control of our current ongoing expenditure. Therefore, I find it quite extraordinary that members opposite, particularly the shadow ministers, who, if they were successful at the next election, would become ministers, spent all their budget speeches, effectively, calling for more spending in their particular areas and/or tax cuts.

If ever there was a time that the state needed good tight fiscal management, it is now. We are facing the most difficult financial circumstances the world has faced since the Great Depression in the late 1920s and early 1930s. One would therefore expect that members opposite, if they are seriously going to put themselves up as a legitimate alternative government in this state, would in this last budget debate temper their promises with the reality of the financial circumstances that face the state. It is not a time when you can just find money to spend on a whole lot of other things or make offers of tax cuts, even though they might be vague.

One of the big challenges facing this government is the issue of public sector wages and how that is handled. It is absolutely crucial to this state, facing its financial challenges, to do it, but none of the shadow ministers opposite even mentioned that subject during their debate. One would think that, since that is the key ingredient of whether we can manage the budget over future years, they would either support the government's target of 2.5 per cent, or, if they did not agree, put up some alternative, but, all we had was a list of pork-barrelling promises from members opposite. It certainly will be disappointing if, in the lead-up to the next election, all we hear from members opposite is just pork-barrelling because that is the last thing the state needs, given the current financial situation.

I will not spend too much time in closing the debate, given the time, as we have other legislation to deal with. I want quickly to address the comments made by the Hon. Rob Lucas, who accused the government, and me in particular, of breaching convention. Well, one convention that was breached in this parliament in my time here was the convention that the government used to choose the chairs of committees within this parliament. That convention was breached by the Hon. Rob Lucas and members opposite. So, that is one convention that has been breached.

In relation to the concept that questions asked during debate on the Appropriation Bill would be answered by the minister, it was certainly a convention in relation to the Leader of the Opposition that, when questions were asked, they would be answered. But, of course, what has happened since then, as I pointed out in the budget several years ago, is that we now have the Budget and Finance Committee, which this council required. As a result of the establishment of that committee, senior public servants have to spend many hours away from the duties that they would have been doing in the past to attend that committee.

I do not have a problem with that in relation to accountability, but I think it is a bit rich to expect that you have that and then in addition you expect that answers will be given, and not only given to the Leader of the Opposition but other members as well. The reality is that the Hon. Rob Lucas is no longer the Leader of the Opposition in this place.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Independent members. Your claim is untrue.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: What, do you mean you are the Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No; your claim is untrue. When I was a backbencher in the eighties Sumner used to answer the questions on appropriation.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: There is a question—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Your claim is untrue.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Lucas has had his go.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Yes, that is correct. I made the offer, in a similar response to a budget speech, either last year or the year before, that it is appropriate that this council should reconsider the way we conduct estimates committees. At the moment they are House of Assembly committees. It is, to my mind, rather absurd that shadow ministers in this council cannot participate in those; it just means a duplication.

If the ministers in this council are to spend a full day in estimates committees, why not have some arrangement where the members of this council can use that time in a similar exercise? I made the offer, in that speech, that if anyone wanted to discuss or raise with me ways in which we might improve procedures, then I would be happy to listen. No-one has approached me to do that.

To this extent I do agree with the Hon. Rob Lucas that the procedures that have been adopted through the estimates committees in the house have long outlived their usefulness. It is time to get some reforms.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No; I never said that. Don't misquote me.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Well, in that case I do disagree with the Hon. Rob Lucas on everything.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You do disagree with me; good. I feel much more comfortable when you are disagreeing.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: It is a much more comfortable place to be when you disagree with him on everything.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Exactly. For both of us.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: For both of us; yes, exactly. It is time that we should be considering ways of more effectively utilising the time of this council in relation to the consideration of these matters. The Budget and Finance Committee has now been tried for a couple of years and I guess we can make judgment on that in the future as to whether that should become a permanent feature. I would certainly suggest—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Would you support that?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I have no problem with it. It has effectively been established by this council, anyway, but I think that, whereas one might agree in principle, we need to, at least, think about how it—or some similar committee—might work more effectively in relation to the budget itself. That is something that perhaps should be addressed, but I did want to answer that particular criticism.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: The Appropriation Bill could be referred to the Budget and Finance Committee.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Notwithstanding the Hon. Rob Lucas's comments, the Hon. John Dawkins did at least give notice of some questions that he was asking, and, in relation to those questions which he placed, concerning regional development boards, and some other areas, I will undertake to get answers in writing to him.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Hear, hear! He has shamed you into it, and he is not the Leader of the Opposition, either.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: No, he is not, but at least he had the courtesy to come and do it. If the Leader of the Opposition had asked questions—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You're a bit embarrassed.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Leader of the Opposition did not ask any questions. I was quite prepared to answer questions asked by the Leader of the Opposition, but there were no specific questions. The only one who did ask questions and specifically asked for answers is the Hon. John Dawkins, and I will undertake to get those.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No, I did. I put two questions.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: You have asked them at 5 o'clock on the very last day of sitting. At least the other members were better organised than the Hon. Rob Lucas and were able to get their information about those questions on notice.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I said I will undertake that. He said in his speech that he was quite happy for a response in writing, and it will be done. With those words, I commend the 2009-10 budget to the council.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I would like to take up the kind offer from the Leader of the Government in acknowledging that he has been given notice of some questions of the Hon. Mr Dawkins. He asked for answers to those questions and he was happy to accept them in writing, so I indicate that I am very happy to accept an undertaking from the Leader of the Government to correspond in writing about the two specific questions that I put in my second reading contribution.

One was in relation to the AEU's wage claim and whether that was part of the Treasurer's 2.5 per cent or \$290 million calculation, and the subsequent question that I put concerned health finances. They are clearly outlined in the second reading contribution so I will not repeat the questions. I am very happy to accept an undertaking from the Leader of the Government that he will correspond in writing on behalf of the government.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I can, and I will refer them to the Treasurer for his consideration.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 8), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RIVER TORRENS LINEAR PARK (LINEAR PARKS) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I move:

Page 2, line 14—Delete 'urban' and substitute 'public'.

The Hon. Mr Ridgway had raised some issues in relation to private ownership and how that would be dealt with in the parks. I did respond to that matter in the second reading debate. Basically, it is not the government's intention to include private land within a linear park. There is the capacity to compulsorily acquire private land if that is necessary. That has not been used in relation to the River Torrens Linear Park and I would not expect that we would use it, unless in extraordinary circumstances.

It really is the intention that the inclusion of land into a linear park would essentially be public lands: that is, land that is owned by council; unalienated Crown land; or land owned by or under the control of the minister or another agency of the Crown. It was not our intention to include private land. Clause 4 provides:

delete 'as a world-class asset to be preserved as an urban park' and substitute ', and other linear parks as world-class assets to be preserved as urban parks'

That should read 'as public parks'. That should clarify that it is not our intention that these parks would include private land.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this amendment. We had been waiting for the Local Government Association's submission which we have now received and which indicates that it wants some amendments. The minister has so moved and the LGA has indicated that it is happy with the amendments. On that basis, we are happy to support the amendments.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7.

Page 3, lines 19 to 23—Delete the clause and substitute:

7—Substitution of section 4

Section 4—delete the section and substitute:

4—Linear parks

- (1) The Minister may, by plan under this Act—
 - (a) constitute a linear park consisting of—
 - (i) unalienated Crown land; or
 - (ii) land owned by, or under the control of, the Minister or another agency or instrumentality of the Crown; or
 - (iii) land under the care, control or management of a council; and
 - (b) assign a name to the linear park so constituted.
- (2) However, a linear park that is proposed to include land under the care, control or management of a council must not be constituted unless the Minister—
 - (a) has given written notice of the proposal to the council; and
 - (b) has given consideration to any submission made by the council within a period (of between 3 and 6 weeks) specified by the Minister in the notice.
- (3) The Minister may, by instrument deposited in the GRO, vary a plan under this Act.
- (4) However—
 - (a) a variation to add land to a linear park must relate to—
 - (i) unalienated Crown land; or

- (ii) land owned by, or under the control of, the Minister or another agency or instrumentality of the Crown; or
- (iii) land under the care, control or management of a council; and
- (b) a variation to a linear park may not be made unless the Minister—
 - (i) has given written notice of the proposed variation to any council that would be affected by the variation; and
 - (ii) has given consideration to any submission made by such a council within a period (of between 3 and 6 weeks) specified by the Minister in the notice; and
- (c) a variation may not be made by virtue of which land ceases to be included in a linear park except in accordance with a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

This amendment deletes clause 7 and substitutes a new clause. Correspondence from the Local Government Association indicated that the LGA was concerned that, before any new linear park is established, the councils that would be affected by such a park would be consulted.

That would inevitably happen. It was always the government's intention that it should happen, and it also conforms with the memorandum of understanding we have with local government in relation to this. However, the Local Government Association was keen that it be put in legislation, so we are happy to do so.

My amendment effectively requires that, before a new linear park is constituted, the minister must give written notice of the proposal to any council that has land under its care or control or management and that the minister must give consideration to any submission made by the council within a period of between three and six weeks specified by the minister in the notice. We are happy to comply with that request from the Local Government Association.

I would also point out that, as well as consulting with councils prior to a linear park being established, it is also a requirement that, before any variation to add land to a linear park is contemplated, again, there would have to be written notice and the consideration of submissions from councils in relation to that.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I indicate that the opposition supports the amendment moved by the minister.

Amendment carried.

Remaining clauses (8 to 12) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SECOND-HAND VEHICLE DEALERS (COOLING-OFF RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Page 3, after line 34—Insert:

- (7) Section 3—After its present contents as amended by this section (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:
 - (2) For the purposes of this act, the sale of a second-hand vehicle negotiated by an auctioneer during the period commencing after the conduct of an auction for the sale of the vehicle and concluding at the end of the day on which the auction occurred will be taken to be a sale negotiated by the auctioneer immediately after the conduct of the auction.

I appreciate that I may not have the numbers, but this amendment is in relation to defining what is an auction. From reading the act and the bill, I note that there is no definition of 'auction'. There are concerns within the industry that there has been some misuse by either auction houses or people

who conduct auctions that enables them to participate in the sale of motor vehicles and that some of these sales may not occur at the fall of the hammer but are negotiated before or after the auction.

So, the well-understood definition of 'auction', which may mean negotiation very shortly afterwards, has been expanding due to a lack of appropriate monitoring. This amendment really is an attempt to address this problem but, as I have said, I appreciate that I may not have the numbers for it to be successful.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government opposes this amendment. We have already put on the record our reasons for opposing this amendment. There is little or no evidence to indicate that there is any problem activity around the end of auction transactions causing problems to the industry at present. We believe that to restrict transactions to the fall of the hammer would be restrictive to industry practices, and there is little or no evidence to suggest that it is causing problems at present. We oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 16 passed.

Clause 17.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I move:

Page 8, line 19 [clause 17, inserted section 18B(5)]—

Delete '2 per cent of that price or \$100, whichever is the lesser' and substitute:

10 per cent of that price

We have undertaken considerable discussions and negotiations with the MTA and the opposition. We have come to a compromise position, which is a sound position. The industry has raised concerns about limiting the cooling-off provisions to only 2 per cent or \$100, whichever is the lesser amount. The industry was concerned that people would shop around, given that it believed it was such a nominal amount. We have agreed that the industry would be able to include a deposit of up to 10 per cent, of which 2 per cent or \$100, whichever is the lesser amount, would be associated with the cooling-off option and would be non-refundable, and the rest of the amount would be refundable, according to the industry standards. I commend the amendment to the chamber.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I support the amendment. As the minister said, we have negotiated this amendment, and the following amendments, which are all consequential and similar to amendments Nos 2, 3 and 4 in my name, which I will not be moving.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I move:

Page 8, lines 21 to 23 [clause 17, inserted section 18B(6)]—Delete subsection (6)

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I move:

Page 8, after line 27 [clause 17, inserted section 18B]—After subsection (7) insert:

(7a) If a purchaser rescinds a contract by notice under this section, the dealer must, before the end of the next clear business day after receiving the notice, refund to the purchaser any amount paid in respect of the sale less 2 per cent of the contract price of the vehicle or \$100, whichever is the lesser (which the dealer is entitled to retain).

Maximum penalty: \$5,000

(7b) For the purposes of subsection (7a), a refund may be paid—

- (a) by giving the purchaser in cash or by cheque; or
- (b) by posting a cheque by registered post to the purchaser's last known address (in which case the refund is taken to have been paid when the cheque is posted); or
- (c) by electronic transfer of funds into an ADI account nominated by the purchaser (in which case the refund is taken to have been paid when the transfer is executed by the dealer); or
- (d) by any other prescribed method.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I move:

Page 9, line 39 [clause 17, inserted section 18D(2)]—

Section 18D(2)—delete 'is' and substitute:

, or any part of the trade-in vehicle, is altered in any way or

Negotiations may have included a trade-in. When that trade-in vehicle arrives at the yard and it has been altered in some significant way that would affect the worth of the vehicle, and this amendment would allow that to be considered accordingly.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 18 to 24 passed.

Clause 25.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Page 11, after line 29—Before subclause (1) insert:

(a1) Section 33—after subsection (2) insert:

(2a) A document for the waiver of the right of a prospective purchaser of a second-hand vehicle under section 18B to rescind a contract for the sale of the vehicle must conform with the following requirements:

(a) the document must contain—

(i) a statement of the rights of a prospective purchaser under section 18B to rescind the contract; and

(ii) a statement warning a prospective purchaser of the legal effect if he or she waives the right to rescind the contract under section 18B;

(b) the document must be written in plain English;

(c) the document may be completed electronically or manually but must be signed by the prospective purchaser and witnessed by a person other than the dealer;

(d) the document must contain any other prescribed information.

This amendment is really to prescribe in some way the form of waiver to ensure that it is not overly wordy and that it is a fairly simple instrument that will have a standard form that the industry and consumers are able to access without difficulty.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government supports this amendment. Again, this is a compromise position. We would have preferred these matters to be detailed in regulation. However, the industry was very keen to have at least the principles outlined in legislation, which is not a usual process; nevertheless, there is no reason why that cannot be done. I think that the reference to 'two pages' was too prescriptive, so I am pleased the opposition has removed that. The government is prepared to support this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 26 to 30 passed.

The CHAIRMAN: I point out to the committee that clause 31 is a money clause in erased type. Standing order 289 provides that no question shall be put in the committee upon any such clause. The message transmitting the bill to the House of Assembly is required to indicate that this clause is deemed necessary to the bill.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (FAIR TRADING) BILL

Consideration in committee of the House of Assembly's message.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

The circumstances in which the requirement to provide services with due care and skill can be modified or excluded, obviously, have been the subject of some debate. The bill that was introduced in the other place originally contained an express provision that stated a modification or exclusion of liability would be void unless 'the consumer and any third party consumer are each of full age and capacity'. That provision was removed from the bill by an opposition amendment. Despite that amendment, neither a child nor parents, we believe, will be able to modify or exclude the child's right to have services supplied with due care and skill due to the effect of common law. However, as a result of the opposition's amendment, there is greater scope for a service provider to enter into an agreement, known as indemnity, that requires a third party to compensate the child.

The Independent Schools Association is concerned about that change and points out that schools could end up having to pay for the actions of service providers who fail to render services with due care. This amendment rectifies that situation. This could also apply, for instance, to a football club or some other sporting club that takes a team out for a special occasion such as horse riding and ends up being required to indemnify the service provider if one of the children is hurt. Clearly, that was not the intention of the amendment that was moved in this chamber. It was an unanticipated effect which we believe this amendment now rectifies.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The opposition supports this amendment for the same reasons. It has much sympathy for the position of the Independent Schools Association in that, clearly, it does not want to be in a position where it needs to indemnify for injuries and so forth, which may well have been an unforeseen consequence of our prior amendment which was successful in this place. I commend the amendment to all members.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: I place on the record that Family First also supports the amendment. I also commend the government for its quick response to this issue—and also the opposition. It came to our attention only yesterday morning and, through a quick series of phone calls, I think we have been able to rectify it in this chamber very quickly, and that is a credit to all concerned.

Motion carried.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

A quorum having been formed:

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (17:25): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the Clerk to deliver the message in the Appropriation Bill and the message concerning the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Fair Trading) Bill to the Speaker of the House of Assembly whilst the council is not sitting and notwithstanding the fact that the House of Assembly is not sitting.

Motion carried.

COMMUNITY TELEVISION FUNDING

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. A. Bressington:

That this council urges—

1. The Premier to call upon the federal government, in particular the Prime Minister and the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, to provide appropriate and swift funding to enable community television to simulcast in both analogue and digital frequencies;
2. That the Premier, at the next meeting of the Council of Australian Governments, insists that his interstate counterparts do the same; and
3. That the resolution be forwarded to the Premier, the Prime Minister and the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy for their urgent consideration,

which the Hon. B.V. Finnigan has moved to amend by leaving out all words after 'That this council urges' and inserting the words:

representation be made by the Minister for Science and Information Economy to the Federal Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, at a future meeting of the Online and Communications Council, to explore options enabling simulcast in both analogue and digital frequencies for community television.'

(Continued from 15 July 2009. Page 2887.)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:28): I rise on behalf of the opposition to indicate that we support the Hon. Ann Bressington's motion that the Legislative Council urges the Premier to call upon the federal government, in particular the Prime Minister and the Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy, to provide appropriate and swift funding to enable community television to simulcast in both analogue and digital frequencies.

Members would be aware that the federal communications minister (Hon. Stephen Conroy) set 2013 as the digital television switchover deadline. The federal opposition branded this move a naive and political chest-beating exercise that did not consider the future of community television. Community television cannot be viewed through a digital set-top box, and many argue that its existence will be forgotten when the switchover to digital broadcast takes place.

Leading up to the 2009 budget, the shadow minister for broadband communications and the digital economy (a good friend to all of us on this side of the council), Senator Minchin, called on the government to provide funding for community television. However, community television has received no assistance to convert to digital transmission. In 2001, the commercial free-to-air broadcasters were given access to spectrum at no cost to assist them with simulcasting arrangements during the switchover, but community television was not included in the deal.

Mr President, you can see that there are some deficiencies in what is happening at the moment. The opposition believes that community television plays an important role in our community and we would like to see the federal government pressured by the Premier. We are very happy to support the Hon. Ann Bressington's motion to see that happen.

The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN (17:30): I spoke to my amendment in my contribution yesterday.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:31): I indicate that the opposition will not be supporting the Hon. Bernard Finnigan's amendment.

The Hon. A. BRESSINGTON (17:31): I am not supporting that amendment, either. I have asked for an explanation as to the amendment and have not received one that satisfies my curiosity. I believe that asking the Premier to take this in hand also identifies the matter of urgency that faces community television, and I think it is appropriate that this should come from our Premier to our Prime Minister and our Minister for Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy. It being the matter of urgency that it is, I believe that they are running out of time and that, by mid-next year, if they do not get that funding and are left to broadcast in analogue, they will basically have to switch off. This is an urgent matter, indeed.

The Hon. M. PARNELL (17:32): The Greens support the original motion. We do not support the amendment.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

DEVELOPMENT (MAJOR DEVELOPMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 July 2009. Page 2899.)

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:33): I will not make a very long contribution on this as it is late in the afternoon. The major development part of the Development Act was established under the Liberal government when the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was the minister. I know that there has been some concern in the community that this current government has been abusing the major project status by declaring projects almost willy-nilly. There has been some criticism of the government on that basis. I do not believe that happened under the Liberal government and I am sure that, after 20 March next year when the Liberal government will be returned, it will not happen under the next Liberal government.

It is interesting to note that the minister had carriage of some significant reforms to the planning system here in South Australia. I consulted with a range of stakeholders and one of them was the HIA. This was a couple of years ago. Their response to major developments was that it is clear that there has been an increased number of government-declared major developments under section 46 in the past 12 months. They do not believe this is because the criteria is too ambiguous; rather, it is a recognition by the government that the South Australian planning system is dysfunctional and will not or cannot produce efficient results from an economic development perspective.

When you look at the definition of 'major development', I think it is important that the minister can declare a proposed development or a major development if he or she believes such a declaration is appropriate or necessary for proper assessment, or the proposal is considered to be of major economic, social or environmental importance. I think that is the key thing, if the government of the day is straying away from the ideals of major economic, social and environmental importance—and I have to say that I do not believe that some of this government's major projects have fallen into those criteria.

At the end of the day, I think it has probably used this a little too much; however, having said that, we have supported some wide-ranging changes to the planning system. The HIA's view and its submission state that the planning reforms announced in June 2008 had been implemented through a three year program and that, potentially, some components had been introduced to tackle some of the deficiencies in our planning system.

Therefore, the opposition believes that it would be appropriate to hold fire and observe the effects of these reforms over a considerable period of time. Of course, given that we will have a Liberal government after the next election and return to more sensible use of major development status, we do not believe that it will be a problem. I indicate the opposition will not support the Hon. Mark Parnell's bill.

The Hon. M. PARNELL (17:36): I will start by thanking the Hon. Carmel Zollo and the Hon. David Ridgway for their contributions, but I will say that I am absolutely gobsmacked that one of the simplest bills you could possibly see, which calls for nothing more than the minister to offer the courtesy to councils of consulting with them before making a major project declaration, is not capable of support. It absolutely amazes me.

I will not repeat my second reading explanation, but I want to acknowledge the correspondence I have received from local councils since I introduced this bill. I particularly want to put on the record my thanks to the following councils who have written to me in support of the legislation: City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters; Tatiara District Council; City of Port Lincoln; Naracoorte Lucindale Council; City of Mitcham; District Council of Karoonda East Murray; District Council of Grant; Town of Gawler; Mid Murray Council; District Council of Peterborough; Barossa Council; City of Mount Gambier; District Council of Mount Remarkable; City of Victor Harbor; City of Port Augusta; Berri Barmera Council; Port Pirie Regional Council; District Council of Yorke Peninsula; City of Onkaparinga; City of Tea Tree Gully; Corporation of the City of Whyalla; and Southern Mallee District Council. I also thank the Local Government Association.

The support amongst local councils for a simple measure that states 'Please consult with us before you declare a major project' is overwhelming. I will not read every piece of correspondence I was sent, but I will read a few salient quotes to give members a feel for the views of local government. For example, correspondence I received from the General Manager, Urban Planning and Environment for the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters includes the following:

The council believes that it is critical that councils be consulted as part of the declaration process to ensure that the minister is making a fully informed decision in relation to a major development declaration.

He goes on to say:

...councils have to deal with the broader consequences of major developments to ensure that they are integrated into surrounding localities. If the minister was required to consult with councils...it will enable councils to provide the minister with information relating to the council's strategic planning and implementation of projects within localities affected by major projects.

He continues:

Major developments tend to have major impact on local communities and it therefore makes sense that councils are able to articulate a response in such cases on behalf of those affected communities before the minister makes a decision.

The Town of Gawler was also very supportive. It stated:

The proposed amendment would strengthen the current legislative process and make it more transparent, thus creating an environment that is more conducive to collaboration between councils and the department of planning and local government. Council's daily association with the local community and environment means the department would benefit substantially from the input of these professionals at an early stage in the assessment process...[We are] concerned with the decline in...collaboration and consultation between local government and the state in recent times, and have felt ill-informed with regard to major developments and the motivation of the government...Passage of the Development (Major Developments) Amendment Bill would therefore be a welcome step forward.

The City of Port Lincoln says:

It is with some irony that the state government seeks continuing improvement with openness and transparency from local government and through public consultation with its constituents, yet shows slight regard to consultation between tiers of government regarding planning matters of community significance.

Yorke Peninsula said the following:

Given our recent experience with the proposed Stansbury marina being granted major project status, our council is in full support of the amendments to the major developers section of the Development Act. The emphasis on the minister consulting with the council before making a declaration is certainly council's preference. As with the Stansbury proposal, our first knowledge of this project was from being contacted by the media for comment on the proposal, proving it to be a very awkward situation.

There are a few more, which I will not read, but the City of Victor Harbor said this:

The current major project announcement process is almost entirely based on the proponent's argument for support for their project. Council, as representative of the community, is a major stakeholder and should be involved at a much earlier stage than the current process provides.

Port Augusta said the following:

It is considered that open communication between state and local government is an essential part of building better communities, and you are to be congratulated on introducing this amendment bill before the state parliament.

I have one final quote from the mayor of Tea Tree Gully. Talking about developers, she states:

They are coming in banging their fists on the table at the council saying, 'Well, if we don't get this up and this doesn't happen within the time frames' that are what they consider fair and reasonable, they will then take that to the state government.

That is a description of the abuse that has been talked about before where proponents are threatening—

The Hon. P. Holloway: Which development did they do that with?

The Hon. M. PARNELL: If you want to go through a list of the major developments for the past several years, we can go through the ones where developers have gone to the government because they do not want to have to deal with local councils.

I will mention briefly that there have been some criticisms of my bill from councils. They universally say, 'Go further. The consultation you are calling for doesn't go far enough.' A number of councils do not trust an open consultation provision. They say, 'Build time lines into it, build in an automatic 30 day response period, because we don't trust that the government will consult in a genuine fashion.'

I drafted my bill with as much flexibility as possible trusting that, if it passed, the government would do the right thing. Clearly, councils believe that we could have gone much further. So, with those comments, I can see that the government and the opposition are combining to keep local councils out of the picture. I will enjoy writing to the local councils and reminding them of the position of the major parties in relation to important developments in local areas but, given that the two old parties have put their position on the record, I will not be dividing on it. I may well seek to bring back a strengthened provision when parliament resumes.

Second reading negatived.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

VALEDICTORIES

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Small Business) (17:43): I move:

That the council at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 8 September 2009 at 2.15pm.

As we are about to begin a seven-week winter recess, I wish all members and their staff—and, indeed, all the staff of Parliament House—a refreshing break. I trust that everyone will be able to avoid the swine flu, or any other variation of the flu (whatever lurgies are going around at this time of year), and return in good health and very much refreshed in September when we resume for the final stretch before the 2010 election.

Again, I wish members a healthy break. It is an opportunity for members to go out into their electorate, and out into the state, and catch up with electors and with their own families. As I said, I trust that members will have a refreshing break over the winter period.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (17:45): I reiterate the comments made by the Leader of the Government. On behalf of the opposition, I wish to thank all members in this chamber, members opposite on the crossbenches, the staff, the hardworking, long-suffering Hansard staff, who look after us and make sense of some of our ramblings, all the catering staff, and, in particular, the opposition's staff on the second floor.

As members know, we have had some changes in the past couple of weeks, so I especially would like to thank the staff up on the second floor, who are hardworking, loyal and keep the wheels of opposition turning for us. I wish everybody a good and relaxing break. I indicate to the government that there is a massive number of invitations for the new leader to get out and about in the community, because people are quite excited about Isobel Redmond.

The PRESIDENT (17:46): I also wish all honourable members and Parliament House staff a happy and healthy break. I will see you all back here in September.

Motion carried.

At 17:46 the council adjourned until Tuesday 8 September 2009 at 14:15.