

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL****Tuesday 29 June 2010****The PRESIDENT (Hon. R.K. Sneath)** took the chair at 14:18 and read prayers.**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES) AMENDMENT BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**CREDIT (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**CREDIT (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS) BILL**

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE****The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:21):** I bring up the report of the committee on an inquiry into dental services for older South Australians.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Mineral Resources Development (The Hon. P. Holloway)—

Consumer Protection for Farmers: Reaping a Fair Harvest—Response to 70<sup>th</sup> Report of the Economic and Finance Committee—Report

Regulations under the following Acts—

Fisheries Management Act 2007—Licence Fees

Motor Vehicles Act 1959—High Powered Vehicles

Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act 1998—Cattle Industry Fund

Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes) Act 2005—Food Safety Schemes—Seafood—Fees

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (The Hon. P. Holloway)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986—General—Revocation of Regulations

By the Minister for State/Local Government Relations (The Hon. G.E. Gago)—

Reports, 2008-09—

The State of Public and Environment Health

Reports, 2009—

Department of Education and Children's Services

Flinders University

SACE Board of South Australia

University of South Australia

Regulations under the following Acts—

Mental Health Act 2009—General

Natural Resources Management Act 2004—Financial Provisions—2009-10 Levy Exemption

Outback Communities (Administration and Management) Act 2009—Administration and Management

Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002—Designated Bank Rate

**EDUCATION DISPUTE****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 for the City of Adelaide (14:23):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to an Industrial Relations Commission decision made in another place by the Hon. Jay Weatherill.

## QUESTION TIME

### RIVERBANK PRECINCT

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Urban Development and Planning a question about the Integrated Design Commission.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Members would be aware that, during yesterday's Budget and Finance Committee meeting, information was provided that the cost of the government's Adelaide Oval project has blown out to in excess of \$700 million and could approach \$750 million. There are unknown details of the area to be involved outside the precinct, including the riverside precinct, and now we have also been informed that there will be car parking on the southern side of the Torrens. The government is investing a vast amount of money in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Riverbank, Convention Centre and, if the parties can agree, the Adelaide Oval—totalling, I suspect, in excess of \$3 billion.

We noted with interest the appointment of Mr Tim Horton as Integrated Design Commissioner last week after Professor Laura Lee indicated that she was not able to start until September. It was so important that the government needed to appoint somebody straightaway rather than waiting three months. Mr Horton, who was the president of the Australian Institute of Architects, South Australian branch, put out a press release in relation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital location on 26 March 2009. I will not read it all, just a couple of important paragraphs. It states:

The case for good healthcare planning in South Australia is not advanced by politicians of any persuasion engaging in 'design-on-the-run'...

The release goes on to say:

'Design of the built environment is about forward planning to balance a range of competing needs. This takes time, as well as siting considerations, including understanding the links to public transport...[to] the river, the North Terrace precinct, the city and North Adelaide. All of these require detailed study by those with appropriate expertise...informed by detailed brief,' Mr Horton said.

Given that Mr. Horton is now the Integrated Design Commissioner, my questions are:

1. Can the minister outline why siting decisions were made without consulting those with appropriate expertise, as suggested by Mr Horton?
2. Will the government now put on hold the entire North Terrace Riverbank development to allow the Integrated Design Commissioner time to develop an overall plan for this particular project and precinct?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (14:27):** We wanted to start with an integrated design commissioner as soon as possible because there are a number of projects that we have on the go. We think it is important that we get better design around our projects. After all, integrated design is about looking at the interaction between the buildings that we build, and we will be advertising soon for a government architect to help with the building design.

The integrated design commissioner looks at where those buildings and other government projects fit in the landscape. Clearly, the sorts of developments proposed at Riverbank are areas that would benefit from having an integrated design commissioner, and that is exactly why the government is setting up this position. I just hope that this is not going to be a further example of members opposite attacking whoever the government appoints to these sorts of position.

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** I'm pleased you're not. I would hope that they do not try to detract from everything that is done in the city to try to get things moving.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Isn't it amazing that the opposition is talking about rushing things through. Heavens above! They would be the first ones to complain in this regard.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Look at this other rubbish. I will go back to what was said in the introduction to the question about a cost blowout. This is the sort of dishonesty that the Liberal Party is pushing very hard and, unfortunately, a whole lot of compliant and unprofessional journalists keep peddling the same thing. As Mr Whicker said yesterday at the meeting, how can you have a cost blowout when you have not even had a tender or any official amount? Still, we have the Leader of the Opposition here repeating the same nonsense about a cost blowout when, in fact, there has not been any—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Well, see what I mean! Members opposite are creating this dishonesty. You have the Hon. Mr Lucas ringing up every journalist in Adelaide. Unfortunately, many of them are just listening to his line and publishing it uncritically. It is very easy to attack everything, but the fact is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Well, there it is, Mr President. We have this negative, carping, whingeing opposition, frustrated because they did not win the last election, because they were not good enough. They are just frustrated, and they are whingeing. Unfortunately, we have a whole collection of media people in this town who seem to agree with them. They are quite happy to damage our city in the process.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** 'Oh!' Yes, it is 'Oh!' It is unfortunate, but this government will not be deterred. Through an integrated design commission, we will get better design in the city. We will not back off, we will keep pushing forward, and the more the members opposite whinge, the more they distort, the more incorrect information they put out, the more determined this government will be to push on and succeed.

I think the honourable member also referred to some comments made by Tim Horton and by the Institute of Architects. What he was calling for in that press release was that we support the important work of Adelaide Thinker In Residence Professor Laura Lee, which we understand is looking to draw together government, industry and the public to develop a model process that focuses less on outcome and more on building consensus to inform an outcome.

How could anyone ever have consensus with an opposition like this? How could you ever have consensus on anything, because they just oppose everything for the sake of it. I just hope the media in this town realise sooner or later that, rather than uncritically and unprofessionally reporting everything they do, perhaps they should start to look forward and consider the city and its future, rather than the frustration of members opposite and the distortions that they are creating because of it.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Ridgway has a supplementary question.

#### RIVERBANK PRECINCT

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** Will the minister provide to this chamber the advice the government received prior to deciding on the location of the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (14:31):** That will have to be referred to the Minister for Health because clearly where you site hospitals—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** So you think planners should site them—

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway obviously does not want to hear the answer. The Hon. Mr Brokenshire has a further supplementary question.

### TORRENS RIVER FOOTBRIDGE

**The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (14:32):** Will the minister advise the house whether the footbridge over the River Torrens will be proceeding, whether the government will be paying for it, and if so what price the footbridge will cost?

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! That had nothing whatsoever to do with the answer.

### RIVERBANK PRECINCT

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32):** As minister for planning, are you telling this chamber you did not have any involvement with the location of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and any decision?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (14:32):** No, I am not saying that. I am saying that the documentation in the original planning was conducted by the Minister for Health. He has possession of the documents.

### LE CORNU SITE

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:33):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Urban Development and Planning a question on the subject of progress on the Le Cornu site.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Honourable members would be aware that the old Le Cornu showroom was demolished some 22 years ago. Since that time, five separate development approvals were granted by the Adelaide City Council between 1989 and 1997. The government granted major development status in 2007 and final approval in 2008. The proponent was quoted as stating that, because the development was approved for six storeys instead of nine, it was no longer viewed as a profit-making venture in the short term.

The remainder of the site has very recently been cleared and, as we have been made aware via a property dinner speech, the Treasurer has outlined his view that the attitude and mindset of South Australians are the greatest obstacles to planning and development. My questions are:

1. Is the minister confident that, following the demolition process, site construction will in fact commence?
2. Can the minister name a time frame for when the sods will be turned, foundations laid, etc?
3. Was a construction time a criterion for its major development approval?
4. Given that this project has major development status, courtesy of his government, what is the reason for the delay since its approval? Does the minister blame the conservative nature of South Australians for it, as may be the Treasurer's view?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (14:34):** The Le Cornu site was approved back in 2008. Of course, shortly thereafter we had the global financial crisis, which has obviously made it difficult for the proponents of projects to raise finance, and that would have unquestionably affected the Le Cornu project as much as many other. But, as we emerge from that situation, it is certainly my hope that that development will proceed fairly soon.

When you have a major project approval, there are a number of conditions with it and, as one progresses, at various points along the way you will need to get permission to do that. The proponents of the Le Cornu site sought and were granted permission for the demolition of the remaining buildings on 7 January this year. That work, as I understand it, has now proceeded and those buildings are gone, so one would hope that the work will proceed, but of course it is entirely up to the proponents. I am not answerable for the corporation developing it, but what I can say is that major projects are subject to time frames.

The most recent request from the proponent came on 18 September last year and approved on 7 January this year. This was the staging of works that included the demolition, and

that is substantial. Under the initial approval, I am advised that substantial work on the site must be commenced by 18 September 2010. Of course, in relation to these projects we will often have applications for extensions and, if the company does request that, it will be considered on its merits and on what evidence can be provided; invariably, with these sorts of projects the approval is for a particular time period. Often with large projects and difficult projects, there may be very good reasons why the project is delayed, but certainly from my point of view I would expect that, at the appropriate time for the decision to be made, we would have some evidence that the project does intend to proceed.

### **DON'T CROSS THE LINE**

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:37):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about the Don't Cross the Line domestic violence campaign.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** The state government launched the Don't Cross the Line campaign in September last year, targeting domestic violence. The Ombudsman has upheld a complaint in relation to the campaign website that it carried misleading data and information. My questions are:

1. What was the evidence base for the public relations strategy undergirding the Don't Cross the Line campaign?
2. What market testing was done of the advertising campaign before it was implemented?
3. What measures has the minister put in place since the Ombudsman's inquiry to ensure that information and advertising in the campaign going forward are well focused and reliable?

**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 for the City of Adelaide) (14:37):** I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. Indeed, a great deal of work went into the preparation and planning of the Don't Cross the Line campaign.

I am advised that informing the development of the campaign was the VicHealth Review of Communication Components of Social Marketing/Public Education Campaigns Focusing on Violence against Women. One of the findings of the review was that campaigns to address violence against women should be accompanied by interagency partnerships and legislative changes. South Australia has indeed taken a multipronged approach to that, as I have outlined in this chamber on numerous occasions, in not only developing the Don't Cross the Line campaign but also passing legislation to better protect those experiencing domestic violence (and rape and sexual assault legislation reforms occurred prior to that as well) and developing partnerships between government agencies to ensure that communication is maintained between agencies supporting women most at risk of domestic violence, particularly through the Family Safety Framework strategy, which I have also outlined in detail in this chamber on numerous occasions.

The main target audience for the campaign is 18 to 25 year old men and women. To ensure this target audience would be engaged by the campaign and would receive messages in the way intended, the campaign's concept was tested by the market research company Square Holes, through eight focus groups of 18 to 25 year olds, which included young men from Aboriginal and culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds.

A community education grant fund has also been established as part of the campaign. It is aimed at informing and educating the groups in the community who might necessarily receive those messages through the mainstream campaign. Those grants were aimed at translating the message into the appropriate, if you like, language for a range of different groups. The Office for Women will be evaluating the effectiveness of each of the programs funded through the grants, and the program reports will be presented to the Office for Women.

I am pleased to say that I have been advised that there have been 14,336 visits to the website since its launch on 10 September 2009. Perhaps even more importantly, the 'hide this page' function was used 1,674 times, which could be interpreted that people using that function were clearly not wanting to betray to those people around them that they were accessing the site,

so there was some level of secrecy involved. I think this is a very important outcome as well in terms of reaching those people who require a high degree of discretion in the advice or assistance they might be seeking.

During the full advertising period in September there were around 330 visits per day, mainly during the evenings when the advertising was on TV, peaking at around 8pm. In October, after the advertising had finished, there was an average of 96 visits per day, still mainly in the evenings, peaking at around 10pm.

Interestingly, around 75 per cent of the visitors, I am advised, came directly to the site by typing in the website address during September. In October, once the advertising had stopped, this high rate decreased to around 60 per cent, implying that many people started to forget the exact address and used search engines or other ways of finding the site. In November, this rate dropped to about 48 per cent and it has remained stable at around 50 per cent ever since. These are very pleasing results indeed.

There have been a number of changes to the website over a period of time in terms of general upgrades to the site. I also announced in a ministerial statement changes that were made to correct errors that were on the site, and I have asked the agency to ensure that they have put in place ongoing monitoring of the site to ensure that, as new data is made available and new research results come into the public arena, we continue to update the data to ensure that it is of the highest possible integrity.

I think that in all of this, what must be kept foremost in our minds is the importance of the campaign that we are running. This is a campaign to ensure that we protect all victims of domestic violence and that we put in place strategies to try to ensure that we develop better respectful relationships, particularly between young men and women.

#### **DON'T CROSS THE LINE**

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:44):** I have a supplementary question. The minister advised that the Office for Women will evaluate the community projects. Will the minister advise who will evaluate the Office for Women's Don't Cross the Line campaign?

**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 for the City of Adelaide) (14:45):** The evaluations we have conducted thus far are around the usage and hit rate of the sites, which I have outlined: the effect of the advertising on changes to hit rates and accessibility. Those evaluations have been conducted. It is a program that is run over a number of years, and we will continue to monitor those and assess whether any further evaluations need to be done in the future.

#### **POPULATION STRATEGY**

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:45):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Urban Development and Planning a question about sustainable population growth.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** At the weekend, prime minister Julia Gillard said that sustainable population growth would be a policy priority. In focusing on sustainable growth, the Prime Minister also pointed out that there are parts of Australia desperate for more people to fill skills shortages. A gross misreading of her comments has prompted some antidevelopment groups and individuals to urge the South Australian government to abandon the population projections that underpin the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide. Will the minister explain how the government strategies will manage sustainable growth during the next three decades?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (14:46):** I thank the Hon. Mr Hunter for his important question and, yes, I was aware of some of the comments made by prime minister Julia Gillard at the weekend. There has been much public debate in recent months over projected population figures for Australia and also, of course, here in South Australia.

Adelaide faces significant challenges in the near future, including demographic change, water supply issues, climate change and land use pressures. Recently released statistics advise that, at June 2009, the state population was 1.62 million, a population that grew in the preceding

12 months by 19,600 people, or a growth rate of 1.2 per cent. This current growth is in line with the 30-year plan growth projections.

There are a number of challenges that South Australia will need to address in relation to the expected population growth of this state. The increase in population will require appropriate housing across the Greater Adelaide region. In putting forward a 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, this government recognises the need to adopt a suite of measures to maximise land supply and increase housing options for the projected population.

The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide provides the most comprehensive planning strategy ever adopted by the state government and maximises South Australia's capacity to benefit from the opportunities arising from the growth in population during the next three decades.

During the next 30 years, of course, the plan provides for a steady population growth of 560,000 people, the construction of 258,000 additional homes, economic growth of \$127.7 billion and the creation of 282,000 additional jobs. The adoption of the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide provides a responsible approach to sustainable population growth and the needs for housing, employment and the environment.

The plan presents the spatial and land use framework that facilitates locating the majority of new housing in current urban areas particularly around transport corridors; creating mixed use precincts bringing together housing, jobs, transport and services; 14,200 hectares for new growth areas based upon mixed use development; higher densities and a greater mix of housing linked to transport corridors during the next 30 years; protecting at least 115,000 hectares of environmentally significant land and up to 375,000 hectares of primary production land; as well as 14 transit-oriented developments and more than 20 sites that incorporate transit-oriented development principles.

The ageing of the South Australian population, which is ahead of the national average, is also a significant challenge to ensure our continued economic prosperity. By 2036, the percentage of South Australians aged 65 or older will increase from 18 per cent to 22 per cent. In addition, the number of South Australians aged 85 years or older is projected to more than treble in the same time period.

South Australia's ageing population will impact significantly on the state's workforce in the future. I have been advised that nearly half of the public sector workforce will be considering retirement before 2030. That estimate comprises 46 per cent of male employees and 43 per cent of female employees who will be reaching retirement age between 2011 and 2026. It is quite obvious that we cannot make up the shortfall in skills caused by this demographic trend by our birth rate alone. Immigration has long been an important element of population growth in South Australia. Migration accounts for about 60 per cent of South Australia's annual population growth, with the remainder attributable to natural increase. Given low fertility rates, South Australia will continue to rely upon overseas migration as the principal source of population growth.

There is a risk of falling standards of living or significant wage pressures from skills shortages if South Australia fails to attract and maintain a working age population. This is a genuine threat that has been acknowledged by the Prime Minister in her comments at the weekend. I was at a demographic conference 12 or 18 months ago where it was pointed out that, apart from Tasmania, South Australia would be the first state since the Industrial Revolution several centuries ago to reach the point where the number of people leaving our workforce would be greater than the number of people coming in—the first time in several hundred years—so it is going to have a big impact on the workforce of this state.

Mr President, sustainable growth does not equate to no growth. I can assure you that we will not be going down that no growth path because we know that will lead to economic stagnation and an erosion of our enviable standard of living here in South Australia. The estimated population growth in the 30-year plan, taken as an average during the next three decades, equates to about 20 people a week more than Adelaide's current growth rate. We believe that is a measured pace of growth that is sustainable, as far as planning is concerned. It is a pace that, if we plan appropriately, we can accommodate by putting in place the required infrastructure as and when it is needed and development policies that will encourage the development of more housing within Adelaide's existing boundaries while limiting the need to expand at our city's fringes.

To put that pace of growth into perspective, Adelaide's population grew in 2008-09 by 17,613. An increase in the population of greater Adelaide of 560,000 by 2036 requires an average annual growth of 18,677 persons. At a state level the South Australian Strategic Plan aims to

increase South Australia's population to two million by 2050 with an interim goal of 1.64 million by 2014. This will be achieved by arresting the annual net interstate migration loss to zero and increasing net overseas migration gain to 8,500 a year by 2014 while maintaining a fertility rate of at least 1.7 births per woman.

If you reject the idea that somehow we can freeze our population at the current level—or heaven forbid, go backwards—there are really only two valid choices when it comes to responding to our population growth: either we recognise that the population of South Australia will grow during the next 30 years and plan responsibly and sustainably to renew our suburbs and encourage new suburbs or we put our heads in the sand and allow unplanned and ad hoc developments. That, of course, would inevitably lead to a community that is not properly integrated with surrounding areas. That allows the inefficient and unsustainable use of land and ultimately will reduce the livability of our great city. Rather, we need a city where the government and the private sector invest in infrastructure and services in a timely manner.

As I have said before, Governor Hindmarsh did not arrive at Holdfast Bay to find the Glenelg Tram waiting for him; instead, we need to appropriately gear our investment to the areas where the greatest priorities are identified within the 30-year plan. That is to say we do not need to plough our investment in infrastructure across the city into the first year of the plan but neither should we leave it until the 29<sup>th</sup> year. Instead, the rationale for having a 30-year plan is to use the sustainable pace of growth as a guide for drafting a timetable for rolling out the investment where and when it is required. So when looked at in tandem with the Water for Good document, the government also has a framework for securing our water needs as the population grows. The challenge South Australia faces is to plan and guide the growth within the Greater Adelaide region in a way that provides a responsible, sustainable and prosperous future.

This government believes that the 30-year plan provides us with a blueprint to meet the challenge. I welcome the comments made by the Prime Minister, particularly her comments about Australia not needing to be a big Australia. We agree and work with the commonwealth government on sustainable policy so that future population growth will be adequately planned and catered for.

### DISABLED INPATIENTS

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:55):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, representing the Minister for Health and the Minister for Disability, a question regarding inpatients at state government health facilities who are medically fit for discharge.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT:** Over the past few weeks my office has been in contact with a number of people who have remained in hospital whilst waiting for support packages from Disability SA or SA Health, despite being medically fit for discharge. As reported in the *Sunday Mail* last weekend, a man with a mild intellectual disability has been waiting since 27 April to go home from Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre but cannot leave until a mere three hours a week of support is provided. Not only has this man's mental health and wellbeing deteriorated but his hospitalisation is costing the state \$5,600 a week, when all that is needed for him to go home is less than \$150 a week to cover three hours of in-home support.

It is clear that this man is not an isolated case, as we are also aware of a gentleman with multiple disabilities who has been in the Royal Adelaide Hospital for more than six months. He occupies an acute hospital bed and, as such, is exposed to infection risk and ever decreasing social and mental stimulation. His world is shrinking and he is essentially confined to his room. This man has also been waiting many months for appropriate support and services from Disability SA.

I have since learnt that the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre has a list, known as the 100-day waiting list, which lists patients who have been medically ready for discharge for at least 100 days but who are stuck waiting for the provision of services from Disability SA or SA Health. My questions are:

1. As of today, how many inpatients in state government health facilities are ready for discharge but are waiting for the provision of funding from Disability SA or SA Health, and how much will it cost the state to clear these respective waiting lists by providing appropriate accommodation, support and services to these people?



2. Over the past 12 months what is the total number of hospital days that people with disabilities have waited in hospital pending Disability SA or SA Health support, despite approved discharge orders?

3. What steps is the government taking to address the issue of people waiting in hospitals for funding from Disability SA or SA Health?

4. Which other inpatient health facilities in South Australia have lists similar to the 100-day waiting list at Hampstead, how many people are on these lists and for what 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 for the City of Adelaide) (14:58):** I thank the honourable member for her most important questions. I understand that she has written to the relevant ministers in relation to at least some of these matters, and I am advised that the minister has received that correspondence and is formulating a response to it. However, in the meantime I am pleased to refer those questions to the relevant ministers in another place and bring back a response.

### BACKYARD CAR DEALERS

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:59):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question about backyard car dealers.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** The term 'backyarders' refers to people who sell second-hand vehicles without the appropriate licence. Given that the buying of second-hand vehicles through a licensed dealer gives consumers better protections, what is the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs doing to crack down on backyard dealers?

**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 for the City of Adelaide) (14:59):** I thank the honourable member for his important question. I understand that a number of reports from consumers have been made during an operation by the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs to put the brakes on so-called backyard car dealers. I understand that consumers often believe (or are led to believe) that they are dealing with a genuine private seller but that deception often hides many more issues that can end up costing them considerably.

Buyers are often told that the seller of the vehicle has owned the car for years and that the car has been reliable when, in fact, the seller has only recently acquired the vehicle and may not know much at all about the history of the vehicle. In some cases, odometer interference detected by OCBA has been known to be associated with backyard car dealing as well. As the honourable member noted, buying a used car through a licensed dealer affords greater protection for the consumer under the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995.

However, it is not just buyers being ripped off. Backyarders can gain a commercial advantage over licensed dealers as they are not required to provide a warranty on any of the vehicles they sell. When purchasing from a licensed dealer, consumers are guaranteed vehicle ownership. They should also be informed of the previous owner's details, as well as receiving a warranty on the vehicle, under certain circumstances. It is unfortunate that backyard car dealing often goes unreported, and it can be very difficult to detect. We rely very heavily on members of the public coming forward when they suspect that something untoward is happening.

However, as a result of OCBA's actions since February this year, I am very pleased to advise the council that, over the past four months, the Office of Consumer and Business Affairs has reported individuals for interfering with odometers of second-hand vehicles and has reported a licensed second-hand vehicle dealer who has allegedly been posing as a private seller, therefore avoiding their obligations under the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995. The dealer has been reported for alleged breaches of the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act and one alleged breach of the Fair Trading Act 1997.

OCBA has also issued written warnings to licensed dealers about failing to ensure required particulars are contained in their advertising of second-hand vehicles, and to people about carrying on a business as a second-hand vehicle dealer whilst they are unlicensed.

Maximum penalties for these alleged breaches range from \$2,500 for a licensed dealer failing to ensure that required particulars are contained in a second-hand vehicle advertisement;

\$5,000 for interfering with an odometer; and \$20,000 for conducting business as a second-hand vehicle dealer whilst unlicensed. I am advised that OCBA is currently investigating further reports of unlicensed second-hand vehicle dealing, and it is anticipated that more alleged offenders will be reported.

This work is a great step in helping to protect consumers and also in helping to create a more level playing field for legitimate, licensed second-hand vehicle dealers. The Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Act 1995 requires that any person who carries on business as a second-hand vehicle dealer be licensed. The act presumes a person to be a dealer if they sell or offer for sale four or more second-hand vehicles in a 12 month period. As I have said, the maximum penalty for unlicensed dealing in South Australia is \$20,000. I encourage members to remind their constituents that, if they are aware of unlicensed vehicle dealing, they should report the activity to OCBA as soon their suspicions arise.

### HOUSING SA WATER POLICY

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:04):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Mineral Resources Development, representing the Minister for Housing, questions about Housing SA's policy on water consumption and meters.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY:** About a month ago, I was contacted by a constituent, Mr Steven Crockford, regarding his 78 year old mother, Mrs Georgina Crockford. Mrs Crockford lives in a Housing SA unit. Her unit is one of five in the group. Mrs Crockford lives alone; however, there are up to five people living in each of the other units in the group. Mr Crockford contacted me because he did not believe it was fair that Housing SA divided the water usage equally between the units. He believed that, as his mother was a sole tenant, she would have used less water than those units with five tenants. However, under Housing SA's policy, water consumption is divided equally between all those who share the meter.

I made inquiries on Mrs Crockford's behalf to Housing SA, asking for either a separate water meter to be installed or for the method of calculating the water usage to be changed to take into account the difference in the number of tenants. I had previously made inquiries of a similar nature to Housing SA, and was told explicitly that it was not Housing SA policy to provide separate meters for tenants as it was simply not economically viable. I was given the same response when I made inquiries on behalf of Mrs Crockford.

Housing SA was also unwilling to consider an alternative method of calculating consumption. However, Mr Crockford contacted Channel 7's *Today Tonight*, which aired this story on Tuesday 22 June, only three weeks after I had made inquiries on his behalf. I understand that Mrs Crockford has now been provided with a new meter. My questions are:

1. Could the minister clarify what Housing SA's policy is in regard to dividing water consumption for properties that share a metre and also Housing SA's policy on providing separate water meters?
2. Has Housing SA changed its policy with regard to providing separate water meters for each property?
3. Will Housing SA now be providing a separate water meter for each of its properties; and, if so, what is the cost and who is responsible for the cost?
4. Why did Housing SA provide a separate meter for Mrs Crockford after explicitly telling my office that this was not possible, and was it the media's influence that caused a backflip in Mrs Crockford's circumstance?

**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 for the City of Adelaide) (15:07):** I thank the honourable member for his important questions. I will refer those questions to the Minister for Housing in another place and bring back a response.

### PUBLIC SECTOR PERFORMANCE COMMISSION

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:07):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government a question about the Public Sector Performance Commission.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Just on two years ago the Public Sector Performance Commission was appointed, and the Premier's friend and adviser to his office, Mr Lance Worrall, was appointed to the position. There was recent publicity about that particular appointment, worth more than \$300,000 a year. Throughout the last two years the Liberal Party, it is fair to say, has been very critical of the Public Sector Performance Commission, having described it often as a waste of space and a waste of money, with some \$3 million a year being spent on the commission.

Last week, the Leader of the Government entered into a passionate defence of not only Mr Worrall but also the Public Sector Performance Commission. At great length he told the Legislative Council about all the wonderful things, in his view, that it had been doing for the last two years.

Information provided to the opposition from a senior government source indicates that the Rann government has finally decided to abolish the Public Sector Performance Commission as of tomorrow. The opposition has also been told that the minister and his officers have been involved in discussions with the Premier about finding another cushy job for Mr Lance Worrall somewhere in the public sector. My questions are:

1. Has the Rann government finally decided to abolish the Public Sector Performance Commission and, if so, what are the reasons for the decision?
2. Has the minister or his officers had any discussions with the Premier or his officers about finding a new cushy job for the Premier's mate, Lance Worrall, and does it involve a contract of up to five years at more than \$300,000 per year?
3. If so, was that job advertised, or is it just going to be given to Mr Worrall?

**The PRESIDENT:** The minister should disregard the opinion in the honourable member's question.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:09):** Well, there wouldn't be much left. There is not a lot that was correct in it, either.

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** Just answer the question.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order, the Hon. Mr Ridgway!

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** In relation to the abolition or otherwise of the Public Sector Performance Commission, as I understand it the funding for the commission was due to expire on 30 June. The decision of the government is to continue that commission for a period of at least six months until the future of the work that has been undertaken by the Public Sector Performance Commission can be determined.

As I said last week, it is important that there be some central agency of government that looks at the performance of the public sector. The alternative, as I pointed out last week, would be simply to have no focus whatsoever on such things as recruiting the best staff. We should be recruiting within our Public Service, if it is to be of the highest possible calibre, the best graduates from our universities and other people with similar skills. What arrangements we have going forward will be determined over the next six months.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** So it's being abolished at the end of the year.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Well, as I said, we will be looking at other arrangements as to how we go forward. I am not going to speculate on what they might be, other than to say that I expect that there will be some central focus within government on quality and performance within the public sector—as there should be. As to the latter part of the question, I certainly have not been involved in any discussion in relation to that matter.

#### **PUBLIC SECTOR PERFORMANCE COMMISSION**

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:11):** I have a supplementary question arising out of the answer. Is the minister aware of discussions at the senior level of government in finding another cushy job for Mr Worrall at the end of his contract with the Public Sector Performance Commission?

**The PRESIDENT:** The minister will disregard the opinion.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the**

**Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:12):** As I said, the Public Sector Performance Commission will be around for a while yet; indeed, the advisory committee will be preparing a report to government. In relation to any discussions about the future of Mr Worrall, that is a matter that rests with the Premier.

### SOFT TISSUE INJURIES

**The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (15:12):** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Will he provide the chamber with details of what action is being taken by WorkCover and its claims agent, Employers Mutual, to reduce soft tissue injuries?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:12):** I thank the honourable member for her question. As members would be aware, this government has a strong commitment towards improving safety at work, and this commitment is reflected in our Greater Safety at Work Strategic Plan target which is to achieve the nationally agreed target of 40 per cent reduction in injury by 2012.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** Obviously, there are some members in this parliament who do not seem to be interested in that. I would have thought it is a far better target to prevent workers being injured. It is a pity that that is not the focus of some other people. I am advised that in the 2007-08 financial year, soft tissue injuries represented the largest percentage of worker injuries. This government supports the work of employers and others in working to achieve this target of a 40 per cent reduction. I am pleased to report on one of these initiatives today.

Soft tissue injuries are often very painful for the worker involved and significantly impair their quality of life. These types of injuries also drain the productivity of workplaces and can be very costly for the WorkCover scheme. WorkCover's claims agent, Employers Mutual, runs a member incentive program, and each year they reinvest a share of operational profits to assist South Australian employers with occupational health, safety and welfare and injury management initiatives. This member incentive program aims to achieve better outcomes for injured workers and reduce the cost of workers compensation for employers.

In April this year, Employers Mutual approved a project application by the South Australian branch of the Pharmacy Guild aimed at reducing soft tissue injuries in the community pharmacy industry. The Pharmacy Guild of Australia is Australia's leading community pharmacy industry organisation and in South Australia represents 90 per cent of community pharmacies. The guild has previously developed and delivered projects and programs in the community pharmacy setting in partnership with the commonwealth Department of Health and Ageing.

Muscular joint work injuries represent a large cohort of WorkCover claims in South Australia. The Pharmacy Guild's project aims to address this growing trend of soft tissue injuries suffered by employees in the community pharmacy sector. The project is developing a best practice integrated model of musculoskeletal risk minimisation in the workplace. This project will also include resources to help prevent injury, in the first place, provide effective rehabilitation when injury does occur and strategies to help injured workers return to work. This four year project will involve assessment, training and continuous improvement in the workplace to ensure a sustained permanent change in community pharmacies across the state.

I commend the Pharmacy Guild and Employers Mutual on this proactive approach to injury prevention and management, and I look forward to monitoring the project as it evolves and reduces injuries and improves the return-to-work rates of injured workers in community pharmacies.

### NGARRINDJERI PEOPLE

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:16):** I table a ministerial statement made today by the Attorney-General on a report on discussions with the Ngarrindjeri people.

**QUESTION TIME****CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY**

**The Hon. T.A. JENNINGS (15:16):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question on the subject of Carnegie Mellon to the minister representing the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.A. JENNINGS:** As members would be aware, there are two schools of the US non-profit, private university, Carnegie Mellon, that came to Adelaide with considerable funding from the state government and less, but also considerable, funding from the federal government. The H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management and the Entertainment Technology Centre were those two schools.

The Entertainment Technology Centre has closed down after two years, due to low enrolments resulting from difficulty competing with the courses that are already offered at a very high standard at the University of South Australia in this state. Premier Mike Rann said about the Entertainment Technology Centre when it was set up that it would produce graduates who would work for the likes of Disney and Spielberg and enormously benefit the creative industries in South Australia. Clearly, this has not eventuated. I would note also on that point that our own home-grown Disneys and Spielbergs have often found the need to move out of this state to continue their creative technology industries.

On 29 June 2005, minister Holloway, in reference to the H. John Heinz III School of Public Policy and Management, said, 'This government'—the Rann government—'wants the best qualified public administrators in the country, and that is why we will support them to go to the best courses.' And of course they are the ones who will. Of the 247 students who have graduated from CMU in Adelaide since 2006, 100 have been paid public servants on 75 per cent government scholarships. CMU's enrolment levels are not meeting the targets. Heinz college aimed for 200 students this year. They are very far off that, with only 109 students so far. This is only an extra 29 students on the first year.

Despite government claims that enrolments are rapidly rising, they are rising by about six students per year. That is six students per year. Over the four years that the university has been operating in Adelaide, only 135 students have graduated. A small number, given the cost of \$43 million. It is no surprise that enrolments are low, of course. A one-year Master of Science in Public Policy and Management or a one-year Master of Science in Information Technology would set you back more than \$65,000.

Premier Mike Rann also claimed that Carnegie Mellon would help to turn Adelaide into a university town, saying in *The Advertiser*, 'We are trying to sell our state as a university city.' Premier Rann has, indeed, succeeded to some extent. Since the arrival of Carnegie Mellon we have also welcomed Cranfield and University College London to our small city. The state government is also supplying University College London with \$4.5 million of support. UCL has designed its courses for mid-career professionals who come in on a fly-in/fly-out basis. The course fee, excluding flights and accommodation, is \$64,500 for two years—cheaper, I note, than Carnegie Mellon—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I remind the honourable member that matters of interest are tomorrow.

**The Hon. T.A. JENNINGS:** —but still out of reach of—

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Ridgway can sit there in silence.

**The Hon. T.A. JENNINGS:** —most South Australians. I point the minister to the statement made in *The Australian* on 23 June 2010 by Peter Coaldrake, the Universities Australia chairman, regarding Carnegie Mellon University. He said that CMU 'to date hasn't had a demonstrable impact on the local or international scene. It has had an indifferent impact.' Peter Coaldrake said that the ultimate success of CMU in Adelaide was to be judged on key measures such as asking whether it has addressed unmet demand, boosted diversity or raised quality. I ask the minister:

1. Has it done any of these things?
2. How long will it be before South Australians see a benefit from the enormous amounts already paid out to a university that has such, according to Peter Coaldrake of Universities Australia, an indifferent impact?
3. How will Adelaide become a university town if most of the students are flying in and flying out? How does that provide sustainable educational benefits for South Australians?
4. Would not that money have been better spent transforming South Australia's own universities to a world-class standard?
5. At what point will the South Australian taxpayer start seeing a benefit from this funding to an apparently failing institution?

**The PRESIDENT:** The honourable minister should ignore the opinion and the debate in the question.

**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 for the City of Adelaide) (15:21):** I might as well sit down. I thank the honourable member for her important questions. Indeed, a key priority for this state government and also the Adelaide City Council has been for Adelaide to be known as a learning city.

The government and council are, and have been, working very hard together to attract universities and students to Adelaide. We know that South Australia offers outstanding educational opportunities and, particularly, wonderful lifestyle opportunities here which we work very hard to package attractively to overseas students.

I am advised that South Australia continues to outperform other states. Nearly 34,000 students from overseas were based here last year—which is a 20 per cent increase from 2008—and our growth is significantly higher than the national rate of 16.8 per cent. You can see that a lot of that hard work and investment have yielded quite impressive results that we should all be proud of. We know, of course, that this contributes significantly to our economy. I am informed that forecasts predict that this sector has the capacity to earn almost \$2 billion in exports and employ more than 14,500 in South Australia by 2014.

We know that Adelaide has developed a reputation for the quality of our education and our educational institutions. It is obviously a priority of this government to continue to develop that and to work with our institutions to continue to enhance that very valuable reputation. In relation to the specific questions referred to by the honourable member, I am happy to refer them to the relevant minister in another place and bring back a response.

#### **THEVENARD PORT FACILITY**

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:24):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government a question in relation to the port of Thevenard on Eyre Peninsula.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE:** The Minister for Mineral Resources Development in this council has on a number of occasions emphasised government support for the mining industry. On 23 June, the minister was asked in this chamber to outline the Plan for Accelerating Exploration, and he said:

This government has worked hard during the last eight years to ensure that South Australia becomes a world-renowned destination for resource investment.

On Tuesday 2 June 2009, the minister provided a report to this council that the government had announced the go-ahead of the mining project Iluka Resources heavy mineral sands deposit in the Eucla Basin on the state's West Coast.

To provide you with an overview of the state's West Coast, the Eyre Peninsula provides a significant contribution to the state's economy. The broadacre production in the region produces 45 per cent of South Australia's grain harvest and almost 7 per cent of Australia's national export; 90 per cent of Australia's plasterboard manufacture relies on gypsum from the Eyre Peninsula, as does the national cement industry. The world's most significant zircon discoveries in 30 years in the Eucla Basin of Eyre Peninsula and exploration expenditure indicate promising long-term prospects for the state and national economy.

The port of Thevenard is the main export facility of western Eyre Peninsula. It is also the region's only major multicommodity port. Recent concerns have been raised by both the former and the current members for Flinders in another place, as well as industry leaders in the Flinders electorate.

With significant mineral prospects in the area, the Thevenard port facility is set to become the key export facility for the mining industry. However, the challenge is that, with the expected surge in activity, it will require upgrades and expansion to the existing port facility to ensure capacity and capability for increased export volumes and shipping activity.

The Eyre Peninsula Regional Development Board and a range of local stakeholders have facilitated the development of four planning documents in relation to the port of Thevenard which include the Eyre Peninsula Ports Master Plan (2009) and the Economic and Social Impact Study and Business Case (2009).

Thevenard is estimated to be currently operating at approximately 40 per cent of its total import/export capacity. The inability of existing rail line to sustain existing and increased gypsum volumes in the medium to long term and the 8.2 metre channel depth of Thevenard is a significant impediment for the current and long-term use of the port facilities, particularly as global shipping trends are moving towards utilisation of a larger vessel size.

**The PRESIDENT:** I remind the honourable member that she should get to her question.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE:** Thank you, Mr President. My questions are:

1. Can the minister outline the government's plans to address the key impediments at Thevenard to ensure that the port remains internationally competitive?
2. Will the government support any of the recommendations that have been put forward by the Eyre Peninsula master plan, including the deepening and widening of the Yalata Channel at Thevenard?
3. With the emerging mining and resources sector boom that the government has been constantly reminding us of, what action will the government take to implement the necessary infrastructure upgrades at Thevenard to sustain and expand the region's economic base?

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:28):** I thank the honourable member for her question but I just remind her that some time before she came into this place, a former government—a Liberal government—privatised the ports in our state. So, now, of course, Flinders Ports—

*The Hon. S.G. Wade interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** So, you think we should put taxpayers' money into private infrastructure, do you?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY:** The point I am making is that Flinders Ports is responsible for the ports in South Australia. I accept the honourable member's point that Thevenard is a less than ideal port. I was over there earlier this year when Iluka launched its new Jacinth-Ambrosia project, and while the port, as the honourable member says, is a fairly shallow depth, nonetheless it is adequate from the point of view of the Iluka exports and the gypsum.

I think the honourable member herself said in the question that there are some issues in relation to the rail line which, of course, is a fairly old track but, again, that is actually controlled, I think, by Genesee and Wyoming.

But there is a need for major port infrastructure within this state, and it is something the state has been addressing, but there are a number of ports that are likely to require upgrading, including other ports on Eyre Peninsula. Given the tonnages involved to make viable iron ore exports these days, obviously transport is a significant cost. One needs rail transport and also large ports that will handle Capesize vessels, which require depths of 20 metres or more, so there have been a number of investigations looking at ports on the Spencer Gulf side, and of course that is the sheltered side of the Eyre Peninsula and also closer to where most of the resources are kept.

There are a number of infrastructure programs under consideration at the moment. Of course, the one that is closest to the mineral projects in the north of the state is Port Bonython.

OneSteel at Whyalla has also been looking at the possibility of deepening the port at Whyalla to take at least Panamax-size vessels, but there are also other proposals in relation to ports further to the south of Eyre Peninsula. Members would be aware that currently, as a short-term measure, exports of iron ore are due to be made out of Port Lincoln but there is investigation of other options south of Tumby Bay, so there is an amount of work going on.

Thevenard is the only multi-user port but, given the quantity of mineral sands produced and the fact that they are exported around to Geraldton in Western Australia, the depth of the port which takes vessels in the order of 20,000 to 30,000 tonnes is adequate to handle that sort of activity. If one is to get involved in bulk commodity export where you would be talking about not just a few thousand tonnes but tens of millions of tonnes of iron ore, then we would need very significant port infrastructure, and that is what the government has been looking at facilitating.

However, as I said, all current ports are operated by Flinders Ports, as a result of the decision to outsource those some years ago. In relation to future infrastructure, the government is aware of that, but inevitably we would expect that the industry would fund the vast majority of the cost because it will cost hundreds of millions of dollars, if not billions of dollars, for the sort of infrastructure that would be required for major bulk commodity exports.

## ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

### COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO ELIMINATING SUICIDE

In reply to the **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (12 May 2010).

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management):** I have been provided with the following information:

SafeWork SA provides funding for occupational health, safety and welfare (OHSW) research projects to assist in the achievement of objectives contained within South Australia's Strategic Plan relating to OHSW. On 26 May 2009, the SafeWork SA Advisory Committee endorsed the 'OHSW Research Strategy for South Australia'. One of the recommendations of this strategy was that psychosocial risks should be a 'key project area' for university-based research.

In 2009, the SafeWork SA Advisory committee approved two grants to the University of South Australia for two projects dealing with psychosocial stressors. Funding of \$146,623 was provided for a project on working hours, fatigue and work-family strain, and \$150,000 for a project to undertake a population-based survey of a range of stressors in the workplace (the Australian Workplace Barometer). Both projects are relevant to measuring the types of workplace stressors that might make suicide more likely. The Barometer project will look at developing workplace change strategies to prevent and reduce the risk of mental health injuries and potentially suicide related to work.

There is capacity for representatives of the Community Response to Eliminating Suicide initiative to approach appropriately qualified university researchers to see if they would be interested in submitting a funding application under SafeWork SA's Commissioned Research Grants Programme. Details on the 2010 call for applications and how to apply for a grant will be available on the SafeWork SA website from 5 July 2010. Applications will close on 27 August 2010.

### COPPER COAST DISTRICT COUNCIL

In reply to the **Hon. M. PARNELL** (27 May 2010).

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management):** I have been provided the following information:

I can confirm that the District Council of Copper Coast has adopted a setback of 5.0 metres for detached dwellings for 'The Dunes' development, Port Hughes along with other development controls relating to protrusions, porticos, bay windows, verandas, porches and landscaping.

The setbacks which applied previously included an 8.0 metre setback for double storey dwellings and 6.0 metre setback for single storey detached dwellings. Other controls which continue to apply include design guidelines and an encumbrance.

Council's Environment Advisory Committee considered a Report from Connor Holmes, Development Consultants and an Officer's report at its meeting held on 26 May 2010. The



consultants had been engaged to undertake a review of the subdivision design and the planning controls to assist in meeting market demands. Feedback from builders, developers and purchasers suggested the subdivision allotment sizes were not large enough to accommodate the popular or common building designs.

The setback controls applying in a number of other Council areas were considered by Council as part of the investigations and similar setback controls have now been adopted by the Council.

Council officers have the authority to approve development with reduced setbacks provided the development is not seriously at variance with the Development Plan, provided the development on balance meets the relevant provisions of the Development Plan and each application is assessed on its individual merits.

Compliance with setbacks is not a mandatory requirement for development applications; rather it is one matter to be taken into consideration by Council along with all other relevant Development Plan provisions.

There is no justification for removing the Council's statutory development responsibilities and placing them with the Development Assessment Commission.

### **HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL**

Bill recommitted.

Clause 4.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Before moving my amendment, I will ask a question of the minister, and it anticipates my amendment. If I were to move the amendment standing in my name, would it be the government's intention to promulgate the national law by regulation, as anticipated in new clause 4(1)(b)? If so, how soon would that occur?

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** I have been advised that, yes, it will and that it will be approximately six weeks.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Thank you. On that basis and with that commitment, I move:

Page 7, lines 26 to 33—Delete clause 4 and substitute:

4—Application of Health Practitioner Regulation National Law

(1) In this section—

*South Australian Health Practitioner Regulation National Law text means—*

- (a) until a regulation is made under subsection (3)—the text set out in the schedule to the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009* of Queensland as in force on 1 July 2010;
- (b) thereafter—the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)* set out in the schedule inserted under subsection (3) (as in force for the time being).

(2) The South Australian Health Practitioner Regulation National Law text—

- (a) applies as a law of South Australia; and
- (b) as so applying may be referred to as the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)*; and
- (c) as so applying, forms a part of this Act.

(3) In connection with the operation of subsections (1) and (2), the Governor may, by regulation, insert a schedule into this act that sets out the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)*.

(4) If, after the commencement of this section, the Parliament of Queensland enacts a provision to make an amendment to the schedule to the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009* of Queensland, the amendment does not apply in South Australia but the Governor may, by regulation, modify the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)* text to give effect to that amendment as a law of South Australia.

(5) The Governor may, as part of any regulation made under subsection (4), make any additional provision (including so as to modify the terms of an amendment that has been made by the Parliament of Queensland or to provide for related or transitional matters)

considered by the Governor to be necessary to ensure that the amendment made by the Parliament of Queensland has proper effect under the law of South Australia.

- (6) A regulation made under this section may, if the regulation so provides, take effect from the day of the commencement of an amendment made by the Parliament of Queensland in that State (including a day that is earlier than the day of the regulation's publication in the Gazette).
- (7) Section 10 of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* does not apply to a regulation made under subsection (3) (but will apply to any subsequent regulation making a modification under this section).

I thank the council very much for giving consideration to this bill. Members have appreciated that we are considering not just health practitioners but also how national law is to be promulgated and embedded in South Australian law. The council in relation to this scheme was attracted to a corresponding law approach rather than an adopting law approach.

I indicate on behalf of the opposition that we are not saying that we will always prefer a corresponding law approach. It may be appropriate in certain circumstances to take an adopting law approach. We thought that this was a good example of a case where corresponding law was appropriate. I cannot speak for other members who supported the Hon. Michelle Lensink's amendment last week. They may have taken the view that corresponding law is a standard preferred approach, but it is for them to speak on other occasions. As for the opposition, we thought that this was a good example of where corresponding law should be imposed.

In that regard, faced with the decision of this council the government suggested an alternative amendment, for which I thank it. It highlights that where there is a will there is a way. If the executive is willing to allow the parliament to continue to exercise its roles and for the community to have access to laws in a readily accessible way, it can be done; it is not that hard and should have been done in the beginning.

For the benefit of the council I highlight the two main issues we raised in terms of the legal or legislative manifestation of the national law. The first was that we were concerned that the law applying in South Australia would be a Queensland law by reference. We did not think that that was appropriate. We thought that in terms of access, particularly access for citizens to their law, they need to be able to look to a South Australian statute book to see a South Australian act. As I understand the operation of this amendment, it would ensure that in six weeks, according to the minister, we will have embedded into the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2010 the full text of the national law. It would be a schedule to the act, but as section 4 would provide, it applies as the law of South Australia.

The regulation comes in when that national law needs to be amended. The schedule is a fully functioning section of the South Australian legislation but, if the ministerial council asks the Queensland parliament to legislate to change the Queensland version of the national law, it would not come into effect in South Australia until a regulation were made, which effectively, as a result of this clause, would amend the schedule. It is not that our law sits in the regulations: the regulations are a vehicle for amendment.

As any regulation is disallowable, so too would these regulations be disallowable. This parliament can say, 'Okay, the ministerial council and the Queensland parliament think that this is an appropriate national law in relation to health practitioner regulation; what do we think?' This council and the House of Assembly, under its responsibilities to review subdelegated legislation, will have the opportunity to decide whether that law is appropriate.

Obviously, as well as making the law accessible to the public, South Australian law and South Australian statute book, it will maintain what we believe is an appropriate balance between the executive and the parliament. We believe that it is extremely important that the parliament maintain its oversight of subdelegated legislation, otherwise we will almost have our laws being written and managed by the executive, with a significant diminution of democratic processes.

I think this episode highlights two things, the first being that the Rann government, after eight years, is yet to learn that this parliament will not be bullied by the executive. I would urge the Legislative Council to learn from this experience and to stand on its digs. In relation to suggested amendments to the Julia Farr Services Trust Bill, I believe this council was bullied by the executive to the great and ongoing detriment of the disability community.

So, I am very pleased to see that on this occasion the council has maintained its position and that we have seen a positive response from the executive. I thank the government for its

support for the changed approach and, in fact, for suggesting the approach, which has been modified in my amendment. However, I think it does highlight some work to be done not necessarily by the government but perhaps by the parliament itself in terms of, as we move forward into modern federalism, what is going to be our preferred approach on national law.

I see this as a very significant day for the Parliament of South Australia. We have said that we are interested in an approach the Parliament of Western Australia has been taking for some years. I know that our Legislative Review Committee looked at the application of national laws in the late 1990s, but that work was not completed. My understanding is that the National Committee of Parliamentary Counsel has also been considering how best national law can be reflected in state legislation.

So, I think it is incumbent on us as a parliament to consider the framework in relation to how we want national laws to be legislated in South Australia. Possibly the work done by the Legislative Review Committee, perhaps informed by parliamentary counsel and others, would mean that when we come to bills such as this we have a framework, so that when the executive is drafting the legislation it can have a clear indication of what the parliament prefers and that, when legislation such as this comes before the parliament, the parliament has guidelines before it with which it can consider the model being suggested.

With those few words, I thank the government for its cooperation in the development of the amendment, and I thank the legislative councillors who supported the original amendment. I also thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for basically drawing a line in the sand, because I think it is an important line.

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** The government supports the amendment. The government was concerned that the Hon. Michelle Lensink's amendment, passed by the upper house on Thursday 24 June, had the potential for the South Australian legislation to fall behind that of other jurisdictions that have agreed to the adoptive law model. It is quite easy for differing election and parliamentary sitting schedules to impact legislative time frames, despite best endeavours. This will be a problem not only for this government but also for future governments.

The government now accepts the opposition's current amendment as a compromise to ensure that health practitioners are not disadvantaged, with the national registration scheme set to begin on Thursday. This compromise will now allow amendments to the national law after 1 July 2010 to be effected in South Australia as quickly as possible in order to maintain national consistency while retaining the sovereignty of parliament.

The government particularly thanks Family First and Dignity for Disability for supporting its original bill, and we thank the opposition for considering the government's suggested amendments and incorporating those into its amendment.

Amendment carried; new clause inserted.

Clause 7.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I move:

Page 8, after line 21—Insert:

- (2) To avoid doubt, subsection (1)(g) does not apply to a regulation made under section 4(4), (5) or (6).

Amendment No. 2 is consequential.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Schedule 1.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I move:

Clause 2, page 50, line 3—Delete 'of another state or a territory'

Amendment No. 3 is consequential.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

## SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 June 2010.)

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:49):** I rise to support the Supply Bill and to briefly raise a few issues related to my work in the shadow portfolio of sport. I want to take this opportunity to focus on an issue which is gaining some traction in the media, which has been an issue for local sporting clubs for some time, that is, the continued lack of funding from the state government for grassroots sport.

The next state budget must address the calls from grassroots sport and recreation organisations for further funding for new improved facilities. Labor has turned its back on grassroots sport. Following the news that federal Labor has refused to fund local sporting facility redevelopments, it is now time for the Rann government to undertake a full and comprehensive audit of sporting facilities in South Australia. Sir, I am sure you must think I am a broken record constantly calling for this audit, but I will not cease until it actually happens.

During the last state election campaign, the Rann government promised to join the Rudd government in funding the exciting upgrade of the Campbelltown Leisure Centre. This redevelopment would finally give the Norwood Basketball Club a home base and the entire local community would benefit from new facilities. Now that the federal government has pulled its funding pledge, it will be interesting to see whether state government funds are still on the table for this and other projects. The Port Augusta Central Oval redevelopment is another project which will be incredibly important for the local community but has also been knocked back by the federal government.

The Rann government promised funding for this facility upgrade during the last state election campaign to match the state Liberals' \$5 million pledge. The member for Stuart in the other place consistently pressed the Liberal parliamentary team to back this very worthwhile proposal when we were doing the sums during the last election campaign. Due to his hard work and fighting on behalf of his electorate, as well as the strong merits of the proposal, we supported this redevelopment along with supporting a number of other sporting projects and organisations in our community.

We have so many sporting and recreational facilities requiring work here in South Australia. Too many are being ignored by government, and that is the message I am constantly getting from people involved in local community sport. I quote Sport SA Chief Executive Jan Sutherland, who recently said in an interview with *The Advertiser* in May of this year:

Adelaide Oval gets bigger and bigger, but just getting \$85 million would be great for other sports. We cannot even get our funding indexed to CPI across the sports. We want a state facility fund to develop sporting hubs. There is an enormous lack of fields across every sport. We probably could not hold a multi-sport event in Adelaide and they do not seem to care. I am not anti the River precinct, but not at the expense of everything else.

As I have stated before, a full and comprehensive sporting facilities audit must be conducted as a matter of urgency, to help identify the most urgent projects and funding allocations in the community. During the last state election campaign, the opposition committed to a comprehensive facilities audit as well as doubling the Active Club Grants program run by the Office for Recreation and Sport. We made financial commitments to assist netball, fund a number of local sporting projects and to lobby the federal government to increase funding for grassroots sport, just as the LGA had called for in its election submission to the parties.

Labor, on the other hand, seems focused only on its plans for Adelaide Oval and continues to neglect grassroots sport. I am not even sure Labor had a policy for sport and recreation. People involved in grassroots sport should rightly be calling for further funding when we look at the Adelaide Oval situation. Last month, the opposition pointed out that the cost of the Adelaide Oval project has now blown out from \$450 million to almost \$700 million.

Of course, now we have just discovered that the blowout could well be even more than this, much more in fact. *The Advertiser* reported yesterday:

The Adelaide Oval redevelopment 'with all the extras' would have cost more than \$700 million...but the Stadium Management Authority, which is overseeing the project, has been forced to cut three major elements: a \$40 million bridge over the Torrens, a \$50 million carpark and a \$40 million retractable roof over the Memorial Drive Tennis Centre to try to meet the government's \$535 million funding plan.

What I could go on to say is that I do not think that \$700 million actually includes the \$85 million for SACA's debt, and that is something that we will certainly be exploring. That \$700 million could well be \$785 million. The article went on to report:

With the government capping its contribution, it now appears the original scope of the project will have to be scaled back further.

*The Advertiser* also reported that:

The SANFL had written to the AFL in November last year saying the redevelopment could not be done for the \$450 million figure that was being put forward by the SA Cricket Association.

These revelations really do damage this ailing project and, of course, the credibility and career of the Treasurer. All the while, local sporting clubs are battling along while the government is scrambling to get this project up and finding millions more to fund it after first capping the contribution at \$450 million and, as the Hon. Mike Rann has said, 'not a penny more'. Of course, we know how much we can believe what the Hon. Mike Rann says. This government cannot be trusted on its promises and is letting us all down.

With those comments, sir, I support the bill and I look forward to the budget being handed down in September but, as with every Labor budget, I am not expecting too much.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley):** The Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (15:54):** Mr Acting President, it is a pleasure to see you in the chair and awake.

It gives me great pleasure to speak to the Supply Bill 2010. In the Supply Bill we often talk about providing sufficient financial resources for the Public Service to continue. This year, we have a significantly longer period of time because, normally, the Supply Bill is introduced only a matter of a handful of weeks prior to the budget, but, as members are well aware, the budget is not being delivered until, I think, 16 September. It is a little strange that, when we saw a change of government in the United Kingdom, within 50 days the new government was able to bring down a budget. I know we think we have a big economy in South Australia, but theirs is a fair bit bigger than ours, yet this government—your government, Mr Acting President, the one that you are a member of and part of—has been in government for eight years and cannot bring down a budget until sometime in mid-September.

So, for the passing of the Supply Bill, certainly there is a larger quantum of money this time around to cover the public sector and the necessary expenses while we wait for the Treasurer and your government, Mr Acting President, to bring down the budget. I think it is important to note that it must be passed before the end of the financial year and that two days prior to the end of the financial year we get this bill to debate. Again, I think it is a sign of an arrogant government that takes a parliament for granted, that it leaves us only two days to debate the bill.

Most of us will be making contributions today, and I will try to keep mine reasonably brief. In particular I want to focus on the area of the Department of Planning and Local Government, but not so much the personnel there, although I think that, sadly, over time, because the minister really does not show much leadership in that area, the department is not inspired by his style of leadership.

However, today I will turn to the future of our city and the decision of the government, which I alluded to in question time, to site the Royal Adelaide Hospital on the rail yard site. In question time, the minister said that he would bring back the document that was the advice the government received in relation to the location of the hospital. At a gathering about 12 months ago (the same gathering as the one he spoke to the other night, where the Treasurer indicated you needed to be a prick to get things done in South Australia), when I asked treasurer Foley, 'What planning advice did the government seek prior to making that decision?' he said no, they had not done that.

I guess it is a little concerning because we have a program here in South Australia called the Thinkers in Residence program. It is a concept the government has applied, but I do not think there has actually been much focus benefitting South Australia. A lot of the Premier's friends have been thinkers in residence; sadly, a lot of their recommendations have been ignored and a lot of them have been forgotten. We have had a few thinkers in residence who have been particularly related to development and planning. In 2003, Mr Herbert Girardet, the social anthropologist and cultural ecologist. His theme was 'making Adelaide a green city'. In 2003, the residency of Charles Landry, who is the author of *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Planners*, was entitled

'Rethinking Adelaide: Capturing Imagination'. Just recently, we have had Professor Laura Lee, whose great contribution was to recommend an integrated design strategy for South Australia.

Of course, members would be aware that, after the minister gave me a list of cities where Professor Lee had practised, the library was unable to identify any examples of practical architecture anywhere in the world. Mr Acting President, I know you are an avid traveller, especially overseas on extensive study tours; I have been impressed with your capacity to travel and to study. I was hoping to get some information from the minister as to where I could go and look at a streetscape or a regional city the size of Adelaide and say, 'Well, this is the sort of impact that Professor Lee has had on this particular city, and this is the type of thing that we could expect in Adelaide.' Sadly, that is not the case. I have not been provided with practical examples anywhere in the world that I could perhaps go and visit.

In relation to supply and finances, I have submitted a number of FOIs on the costs associated with each of the thinkers in residence and I am still awaiting a response that is significantly overdue. When I receive that information, it will be interesting to see just how much South Australians have paid for the few recommendations that have actually been implemented and realised by this government. An online *Adelaide Review* article, I think, therefore sums up Adelaide's attitude towards thinkers in residence, as follows:

Adelaide remains most uneasy about accepting challenges and criticism offered by respected international thinkers.

The article notes Charles Landry's request to have his report widely publicised. He wanted a robust discussion on his challenges and criticisms of Adelaide. The article notes that subsequent private sector debate had been notably muted. On the occasions that the thinker's recommendations have reflected government plans the thinker has often not been credited, as was such for Herbert Girardet and Charles Landry in the State Strategic Plan.

Further examples of this government's attitude towards constructive criticism and particularly into its urban development and planning sphere from experts is that shown towards John Montgomery, an internationally respected urban planner. His book *City Dynamics: The Fall and Rise of Creative Urban Economies* was completed in Adelaide. I quote from the same *Adelaide Review* article, as follows:

'Adelaide could have been the Barcelona of Australia', said Montgomery. Yet he arrived in time to see progress falter with a change of state government. As new urban projects failed to materialise, Montgomery grew impatient—especially as work offers...crystallised for him in Canberra and Queensland. (He then made) a swipe at Adelaide as being an 'above-ground cemetery'—though the facts on which he based his criticisms ring true.

Described by some as difficult and precious, Montgomery is nonetheless an expert in his field and possesses the skills required to steer serious urban renewal. His view is consistent with Richard Florida, Charles Landry and the State Strategic Plan, yet he did not find work here and was derided by the Deputy Premier for holding a contrary view of Adelaide's economic and social standing. People such as Montgomery, declared Mr Foley on ABC TV, should 'get on their bike and get out of town'. The view implied that Montgomery had nothing to offer. It also suggests that, if you're thinking doesn't fit within the existing, accepted framework, then you don't belong. If this is the case, it seems as if the global view remains beyond Adelaide's field of vision.

This state government hires experts for their opinions yet attempts to muffle any advice contrary to their political agenda. Professor Laura Lee said that the Royal Adelaide Hospital exemplified integrated design. The hospital is to be completely divided from the existing medical precinct, and the final plan for the hospital has not yet been selected.

Perhaps more sound advice was given by Mr Tim Horton which I will come to shortly. It is interesting that, when Professor Laura Lee said that the Royal Adelaide Hospital exemplified integrated design, there were no plans for the hospital. Nothing had been published and at that point the two preferred consortia had not been identified, yet clearly Professor Lee was singing from a hymn sheet written for her by somebody else within government to try and establish or add some weight to the fact that the government had not chosen any experts to provide advice on the location of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

However, Mr Tim Horton, who is now the Integrated Design Commissioner—I quoted some of this media release during question time but for the purposes of the supply speech I will quote it all—stated the following in relation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital which I think can be expanded (now that he is the Integrated Design Commissioner) to a whole range of projects in South Australia:

1. The case for good healthcare planning in South Australia is not advanced by politicians of any persuasion engaging in design-on-the-run;

2. Design of the built environment is about forward planning to balance a range of competing needs. This takes time and, as well as siting considerations, includes understanding of the links to public transport, and the river, the North Terrace precinct, the city and North Adelaide. All of these require detailed study by those with appropriate expertise, and informed by a detailed brief;

3. The Institute—

which is the Institute of Architects—

calls for a more measured debate on the RAH, to focus on public discussion on the potential for an innovative and integrated development that provides for a vibrant mix of uses and is an active hub for the city;

And, as minister Holloway said, in my question:

4. We [the Institute of Architects] support the important work of Adelaide Thinker in Residence Professor Laura Lee which we understand is looking to draw together government, industry and the public to develop a model process that focuses less on outcome, and more on building consensus to inform an outcome;

Exactly—that is where this government has totally lost the plot when it has made a decision to build a new Royal Adelaide Hospital on the rail yards and has not sought any advice.

It is also interesting to note that, in relation to the Adelaide Oval project, I saw a letter that (I think) the former speaker had written to constituents during the election campaign in the middle of last year where he said that the Rann government was about building hospitals and schools. They were their priorities and they would not be under any circumstances wasting any money on a football oval in the city.

Notwithstanding the Premier's comments that he had told football and cricket to go away and sort out their differences and come back and he would then be prepared to sit down and talk to them if they could sort out their differences, we heard yesterday, in evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee, Mr Leigh Whicker from the Stadium Management Authority say that the South Australian National Football League (SANFL) was invited to the Premier's office the night before 2 December—on 1 December—to be informed of the government's policy announcement that it was putting \$450 million towards the Adelaide Oval project.

The rail yard site was a site that both sides of politics said needed to be developed for the future of South Australia. Everybody—or the vast majority of people—agrees that football should be in the city. It is our great game, it is our state game, and notwithstanding the growing importance of soccer and other sports, Aussie Rules is still the main game in town. We all agree it should be in the city, and yet this government thinks it knows best. It has not sought any expert advice and has carried on down a path which ultimately will leave Adelaide worse off than it is today and potentially destroy some great opportunities we have in our city. I will go back to Mr Horton's statement:

Let's all take a step back and allow due process the time it needs. Everybody is interested in making the RAH a great long-term asset to the state and to make sure this is done right.

That goes for an oval and an entertainment precinct. We know that the casino operators are keen to look to a new facility to try to enliven the riverbank. We have the Convention Centre that needs to be expanded: the government has committed to that. We actually have, I think, a lot of goodwill in this state from both sides of politics to get it right on that particular site and that includes the Adelaide Oval precinct—the existing precinct—or the Riverbank precinct and the North Terrace rail yards precinct. Now we have the Integrated Design Commissioner saying, 'Let's all step back and allow due process to take the time it needs.'

However, it appears that the earlier experience of this state government with the Thinkers in Residence program has led it to adopt the process of making political decisions on urban development and planning and forcefully encouraging the chosen expert to fall in line with those decisions.

I hope that the minister and the government, the Premier and others take a step back, take a deep breath and let the Integrated Design Commission look at what is on the table and hopefully they will come to their senses. We have a great opportunity to transform the state and particularly our city into something that we can all be proud of rather than this 'design-on-the-run'.

As a token gesture, they may cherry-pick some expert recommendations to tie in with their direction. For example, in relation to Victoria Square, Jan Gehl recommended in 2002 that the state government deliver an overall plan for the city squares. Instead, eight years on, there is only a concept plan for a single square. Other recommendations that the Labor government has forgotten, particularly in Jan Gehl's Public Spaces and Public Life report 2002—

**The PRESIDENT:** The honourable member might have forgotten that this is the Supply Bill.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I haven't forgotten, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** You're wandering a fair bit there. Stick to the speech.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I haven't forgotten.

**The Hon. Carmel Zollo:** It sounds like you have.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** That's because you haven't been listening properly.

**The PRESIDENT:** I have been listening. The honourable member should be reminded to stick to supply.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Jan Gehl is to be engaged, as I understand it, in the next few months to come back and do another report, and it will be entitled 'Public Spaces Public Life 2010'. I think it is important for people to understand the work he did in 2002 and just see whether the government has followed up on and done any of that work.

On page 23 of that report he says that Adelaide is lucky still to have the four squares included in Light's vision. Their present state does not reflect the contemporary vision for fine public spaces where people want to spend time. Jan Gehl recommended to have an overall plan for the squares. By 2010 that still has not happened. He also made a comment on the need for open, transparent and welcoming street frontages in order to create a sense of a safe and nice city to move around in. In 2010 an investigation by *The Advertiser* revealed that there are more than 80 empty stores in the area between the East End of Rundle Street and the West End of Hindley Street.

He also illustrates a concentration of unattractive street frontages in Adelaide, and they are concentrated in the West End of the city. How will the government's hospital plan serve to bring pedestrians back to that area and invigorate it? He also discusses the role of the Torrens and that Colonel Light never intended it to have buildings between North Terrace and the Torrens. In his summary he said that the connections between the city centre and the River Torrens are weak. Buildings close off the immediate visual links between the two, and passages have not been kept open in many cases or they are of such poor quality that people do not want or cannot use them. These conditions need to be changed.

Adelaide should have a strong visual and physical connection to the river and the access to the water should be eased; activities on the riverbanks and the water should be encouraged. I am sure he will be quite disheartened when he arrives for his next placement here to learn that the government is planning on building a hospital between North Terrace and the river. While there will be one walkway, it will be effectively closing off that part of North Terrace to the river. I think he will be deeply disappointed that his recommendations from eight years ago will not be accepted.

It is also noted that Jan Gehl highlights the crucial role of the Parklands in making Adelaide a liveable city, making pedestrians feel safe with well lit paths and recreational opportunities. It now appears that we are going to have between 2,000 and 4,000 car parks as a result of the Adelaide Oval development on our Parklands. I would be intrigued to learn exactly what Jan Gehl is paid. My understanding is the last project he did was some \$120,000 of work. That was eight to 10 years ago, and I am sure it will be a significant sum of money to come out of this coming state budget.

I will briefly touch on the 30-year plan; the minister talked about it today. The tragedy is that this government is renowned for using reports and plans as a stalling tactic. There are constant reports and plans being commissioned but with very few tangible outcomes. The 30-year plan is a perfect example, predicting population increases of 560,000 over the next 30 years and where those people will be situated but no clearly outlined steps on how we will achieve sustainability in large scale growth areas. I think the minister was clutching at straws today in his extremely long answer in question time in relation to how their 30-year plan fits into the new Prime Minister's admission that she does not believe in a big Australia.

Where the plan is meant to achieve sustainable growth in target areas such as Buckland Park, Mount Barker and Roseworthy, the plan does not outline strategic infrastructure plans to achieve sustainable growth in these areas. I have been in contact with the people in Mount Barker. One of the big concerns they have is with—

**The PRESIDENT:** Were they public servants?



**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** They could have been public servants. I did not ask what they do for a living because—

**The PRESIDENT:** The Supply Bill is about supplying money to the Public Service to get on with their job.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Yes, and I am sure that—

**The PRESIDENT:** Not projects.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I am sure public servants live in Mount Barker, and I will get the member for Kavel to check this—

**The PRESIDENT:** The honourable Leader of the Opposition might set an example to the people who are going to follow him because I am not going to tolerate it for much longer, and I am very surprised there are not points of order raised from the people in the chamber on your wandering away from the Supply Bill.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** The plan does not outline a strategic infrastructure plan to achieve sustainable growth in those areas and I am disappointed that the good public servants in the departments of planning, transport and infrastructure have not been engaged to deliver tipping points, if you like, that when the population grows to a certain point that then triggers the development of a new interchange or a new bus service. I think you will find that the resources have not been provided to the Department of Planning and Local Government or the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure. That planning work is not done or, if it is, they are not prepared to share it with the community.

We then see some flaws in the plan developed by the government, in particular Planning SA, when 25 per cent of the growth will be in the Barossa, while only 4 per cent will be in the Fleurieu region. One would have to ask why a government would spend almost half a billion dollars in the next four years on the Southern Expressway. Sure, it needs to be duplicated but, with its plan only stating a 4 per cent growth in population, the investment certainly does not match the population growth.

One of the plan's principles is to create a compact and carbon efficient city. That is important as we move towards the next 20, 30 or 40 years and how much more difficult it will be to fund our Public Service. We want them to be fresh and bright when they come to work. The further you live from the city, if you do not have adequate public transport, you will find that you are spending more and more time in a vehicle.

It is quite amazing that, if you travel to work in a car for an hour each day, whether it is a pooled car or you are on your own, that is two hours a day, 10 hours a week and 480 hours a year, if you have four weeks' annual leave. If you extrapolate that over a 40 year working life, it is some 24,000 hours—three years of your life totally lost. In working years, it is about 11 years of your life lost because we do not have adequate transport facilities for people to get to work more quickly.

Another thing was that the whole 30-year plan was lacking—and I am disappointed that the department did not push the minister to explore some of the areas, in particular, the alternatives in the plan. I asked questions of the minister at one stage about the wastewater treatment plant at Bolivar, where there are opportunities for it to be redeveloped for new technology. We have some very clever public servants in South Australia who are desperate to use their skills.

*The Hon. S.G. Wade interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** And we will be paying them, as my colleague the Hon. Stephen Wade points out. This bill will allow those very clever public servants to be paid and make sure they are financially remunerated. I think the 30-year plan failed to look at all the options. The minister and government were desperate to deliver a 30-year plan before the last election, and I do not believe they fully explored all the options.

Members can see that this government has had an opportunity with significant revenue. The public sector has grown significantly in the last eight years, and I think there are some 17,000 more people now than when the Liberal Party was last in office. We have had some of the best revenues, yet sadly this government in an arrogant way will put a hospital on a site in the city that will deny future generations (and future generations of public servants) a wonderful entertainment precinct where we can all enjoy and recreate from the office after work on some of our beautiful evenings in autumn and on weekends.

However, sadly, we see this government, with a very arrogant approach, thinking that it knows best and seeking no professional advice from within the public sector or privately about the location of the hospital and other major projects on the riverbank precinct. If it does not reverse that decision, I am sure that we will regret it as a state for many years to come. I endorse the Supply Bill and wish the public servants all the very best with their salaries.

**The PRESIDENT:** I remind honourable members—and I know a couple of our newer members will speak to this bill—not to take the Hon. Mr Ridgway's lead, who waddled all over the place. Do not follow that example. This bill is about moneys supplied to the Public Service for expenditure. I would be surprised if new members did not do it better than the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

**The Hon. T.A. JENNINGS (16:20):** I was in fact looking for guidance from speakers before me to know exactly how to address this Supply Bill. I will also take the guidance given by the President in the previous debates. I rise to support the Supply Bill on behalf of the Greens. We welcome this bill, but we would be much happier to be looking at a budget, as I imagine many members here would. We echo the concerns that the Tasmanian election happened on 20 March, as it is did here in South Australia, yet we have already seen the Tasmanian government hand down its budget. Perhaps it is with the constructive assistance of the Greens that it has been able to do that—I am not so sure.

I will also move on to note that the Sustainable Budget Commission has already run \$2.5 million over its own budget. I hope that does not bode badly for what we will see eventually in September. I draw the attention of the council to a few areas. I will echo the words of the Hon. Terry Stephens on the allocation of moneys for sporting endeavours. I have a passionate belief that our community sports and our kids in sports need a lot more support, and we echo the words previously mentioned today.

I also draw attention to the plight of the CFS. While they are not public servants, they are hardworking volunteers who do work that public servants would otherwise have to do. I note that over the term of the Rann government we have seen eroded the services that are able to be provided by the CFS volunteers in South Australia. Many would be shocked to learn that our volunteer firefighters are currently paying for many CFS resources out of their own pockets or out of their own fundraising.

It is high time this government got its priorities right and ensured that, rather than running sausage sizzles, our volunteer firefighters were adequately resourced with employed public servant trainers to ensure they have the training and the ability to respond to such things as house fires, car accidents and serious issues in our community. I congratulate them on that work, and I look forward to their getting more support to continue that valuable work.

In relation to the fine teachers of this state, I also note that the second part of their arbitration case was ruled on last Friday. I look forward to seeing that ruling that class sizes will not be diminished in typical schools and the teachers' request for better conditions, not just for themselves as public servants but for the children of this state, being met, and I look forward to the budget outlining how that will be carried out and supported by this government.

I also note the role of TAFE in South Australia, and I again point to the erosion of funding to TAFE at real levels. When we see people who want to study things such as engineering, and areas where we do have skill shortages, being turned away from TAFE because not enough resources go into the TAFE sector to meet the demand, I think we are getting our priorities wrong. I also have great concern about the provision of literacy, numeracy and language courses at TAFE. Again, we are turning away people who really need those skills, and I am talking particularly about refugees and newly arrived migrants but also about those who have missed out on the opportunity in earlier childhood of obtaining those skills to be able function in highly paid, or even adequately paid, jobs in our community. I think the onus is on us to get our priorities right.

I refer now to the health budget and the mental health budget. Members would know that I have a particular passion for the mental health sector. When the government is doing its figures and looking at the report of the Sustainable Budget Commission, I would like it to be noted that health economist studies show that in mental health, for example, early intervention spending saves \$6 to the rate of each \$1 spent. So, having a look at those health economics figures might go some way to seeing a budget the Greens would welcome.

One particular area I raise today is the issue of electronic waste, or ewaste. I think this is a great opportunity for the state of South Australia, and I will give credit where credit is due: this government is to be congratulated on some of its approaches to waste. I refer to South Australian

iconic schemes which, from the Greens' perspective, are certainly envied by other states that do not have such schemes. I am talking about such things as the container deposit legislation and excellent kerbside recycling and support for recycling in this state, for which this state is to be congratulated.

I point to ewaste as an area that is sadly lacking at the moment: I believe that is an opportunity that this government should be embracing. We are still at least six months away, or perhaps longer, from having a really serious national approach being rolled out for the recycling of electronic waste.

At times, I have seen various Rann government environment ministers come out and say that South Australia would go it alone on this issue: time and time again, you read about this issue, extending over years and years of national meetings on it. On Thursday, we will see the digital rollout across rural and regional South Australia, yet we are still waiting for a national scheme for recycling non-digital analog television units.

We hope to see in the coming South Australian budget moves to more extensive producer responsibility schemes to harness the potential in terms of re-using the very valuable resources we could be harvesting through our electronic waste. It will be a toxic time bomb if we do not do anything about it. It is a double-edged sword; it is a problem that needs to be addressed. However, it is a great opportunity on which I would love to see the Rann government taking the lead, and I look forward to that eventuating. With those words, I reiterate the Greens' support for the Supply Bill.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the council.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:31):** I rise to support the second reading of this bill, which provides, I believe, some \$5.22 billion to ensure the payment of public servants and the continuation of state government services from 1 July until the Appropriation Bill for 2010-11 passes both houses. As we know, the Supply Bill gives parliamentary authority to the government of the day to continue delivering services via public expenditure. The government is entitled to continue delivering these services in accordance with general approved priorities—that is, the priorities of the last 12 months—until the Appropriation Bill is passed.

I want to make just one or two comments before I move into the particular use of that money for the work of public servants to service the constituents and residents of South Australia. First, the figure we passed last year in the Supply Bill was \$2.75 billion, and this year we have reached almost double that to \$5.22 billion, as I mentioned earlier. That is because of the delay, because we are not having a budget until September, rather than June. I think it is an extraordinary situation.

I know it has been mentioned by my leader and others that a government that has been in power for eight years knows the state of the finances very well (or it should do), has an election in March, and cannot put down a budget for six months. As has been referred to earlier, the Tasmanian government, which is in a similar situation and held their election the same day as this state, has already handed down its budget. More remarkably, the new government of the United Kingdom, which is a coalition government, brought down a budget within 50 days of coming to power.

I think it is extraordinary that this government keeps everyone on hold. There are other projects, particularly infrastructure projects, out there in the South Australian community waiting to know whether they will get support from this government. We have to wait until the middle of September to get confirmation of what projects are going forward.

I noted that in last year's supply speech I highlighted, among other things, the situation whereby the government had moved towards a central procurement policy for hospitals around this state and had taken the ability for local hospitals to purchase in their own communities away from those facilities. While we have seen some backflips, certainly there were concerns that cost benefits would be put in the way of these hospitals to purchase from a central facility rather than their local community. I think, largely, that has been resisted by the people in localities, who do appreciate the fact that they have local small businesses who put into the community, obviously in contrast to a central government office in the metropolitan area.

However, it is an example of the concern that a number of us in this parliament have about the inability of this government and many (not all) who work in bureaucracies to understand what

local communities are all about. Certainly, the new member for Stuart and, I know, other members in another place, have raised the importance of keeping the fabric of small, local communities, particularly regional communities, and that is something that I feel very strongly about. While I am a great supporter of members of the Public Service, and I think they do a great job in most instances, there are some who just do not understand the way in which country communities work. Some of the ministers concerned give them no encouragement to listen to local communities, particularly those outside metropolitan Adelaide.

I am concerned about the lack of emphasis on the work of the regional coordination networks. Members in this place have heard me talk about the value that I think those networks can play in the various regions of the state, getting together the most senior representatives of each government department for that region, along with local government and regional development representatives, to sort out problems in the local area before they go off to Adelaide to get lost for several months. I am disappointed that there does not seem to be a lot of emphasis from the government on making sure that those bodies work as they should.

I am also concerned that I think there is a lack of understanding about the people who give great service in local communities within the metropolitan area. I know of a number in the northern suburbs of the city who feel an equal frustration about the lack of understanding of their area, as do people who live hundreds of kilometres from where we are today. I do urge the government to take mind of that and think a bit more about the fact that not every community in this state is the same. Certainly, there are communities outside of the metropolitan area that are far different from those in the urban aspect of the state.

I want to take the opportunity now to highlight the work of a very good community group in this state that is having ongoing discussions with the Department of Education and Children's Services and taking up issues with that department. The group I refer to is the Isolated Children's Parents' Association (ICPA). I have had some significant dealings with them over a period of time. I give great credit to these people who are volunteers. They are enormously selfless in the way they go about fighting for the issues that are important to those people who have children in isolated areas of the state.

Yesterday, I was pleased to meet a delegation of six ladies who represent that organisation. They brought to my attention a number of issues that I would like to put on the record that they are taking up with the new Minister for Education, after, I must say, having taken them up with a number of other ministers in the past.

The first issue relates to the preschool travel allowance. ICPA members are seeking an extension to the existing travel allowance for schoolchildren to include preschool children. They believe that very young students in rural and remote South Australia should not be denied access to these vital services simply because their parents are constrained in their ability to transport them.

This would acknowledge the lengths that parents of preschool children living in rural and remote areas go to in order to access a preschool education, and it would help to cover some of the cost of travel in that preschool year. This issue has been presented to the Universal Access to Early Childhood Education Stakeholders Advisory Committee for discussion.

I would like to move to the Country Areas Program, otherwise known as CAP. The state council of the ICPA has asked the Minister for Education and Children's Services to guarantee a continuance of what was previously the commonwealth-funded Country Areas Program. ICPA believes that, from January 2009, the funding has been delivered through the National Education Agreement and that the state government is now responsible for these funding allocations.

CAP funding is instrumental in exposing country children to events and challenges that their urban counterparts often take for granted or have easy access to. In addition, CAP funding enables rural and remote schools to bring artists and workshops to the children and also assists with school camps and other excursions.

I would like now to refer to the issues that ICPA has brought up relating to School of the Air (SOTA) distance education. First, regarding internet accounts, the internet is becoming more and more an essential mode of learning for remote students with ever-increasing usage as a communication tool for students through voice over internet protocol (VoIP), videoconferencing and collaboration tools, including discussion boards and 'moodles' etc., as well as for research purposes.

Families of students studying via schools of distance education are continuing to pay exorbitant costs in order to access the increasingly necessary usage of the internet for educational purposes. Families of distance education students are also being unfairly penalised and/or limited in their capacity to keep up to speed with education service provision. A dedicated internet connection for the schoolroom would allow DECS to be responsible for sourcing a connection that is best suitable to the delivery of internet-based lessons and remove the onus from the families of children who need to study this way.

I now refer to IT support. The South Australian branch of ICPA seeks more funding for the ICT support position based at the School of the Air. The School of the Air curriculum and lesson delivery is heavily computer/internet-based. However, the current ICT support person at SOTA works limited hours during the week with a Marden campus help desk number being the option after that.

I should interpose here that the ICPA people are not looking for more money in this area, but they are more looking for a more even distribution of the pot of funds allocated in this area. They told me that the ICT support hours need to be increased, especially during times of increased need; for example, the start of a new school year, the beginning of term and face-to-face events when people are due to visit the school. The members of the delegation advised me that telephoning the Marden campus is not a good option as the majority of the time families get an answering machine when they often need more immediate assistance.

I now move to the area of supervisor support. The South Australian branch of ICPA stresses the importance of, and asks for, a dedicated supervisor support position based in Port Augusta at SOTA. This vital position provides empathy and support to supervising parents and paid supervisors with the issues that they face on a daily basis. These issues are diverse and can include behaviour issues, curriculum issues and issues of general wellbeing and support. Currently, this position is an added role of the Assistant Principal's position at the School of the Air. The Assistant Principal currently teaches a year 3/4 class, for which he is allocated a 0.6 ratio of teaching, plus the assistant principal role encompasses supervisor support, student learning support and the duties of an assistant principal. The delegation emphasised that this is not a role that should be tacked onto, or added as an afterthought to, another position.

In conclusion, in relation to the work of those delegates from the ICPA, I take my hat off to them for the efforts that they make in advancing the prospects of children in rural and remote areas. Sir, I know you are well aware of the issues for people living particularly in pastoral areas outside local government boundaries and quite distant from some facilities. Certainly, the expenses involved that these people put into their families are very large, but they are very generous people with the time they put into advancing the future of their children.

I appreciate the opportunity to raise these issues in relation to the Supply Bill, and I emphasise that I think the government needs to examine the way it looks after all the communities of this state and not take a broad brush and treat everybody as if they were within a few kilometres of the centre of the city. On that note, I thank the council again for the opportunity to make comments about parts of the public service provided to the community of South Australia by the government. I support the facilitation and the continuing delivery of public services by public servants, which is facilitated by this bill. I support the role of public servants and their commitment to delivering services to the people of South Australia. I support the bill.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (16:47):** I rise to support the second reading of the Supply Bill debate and, perhaps unsurprisingly, will devote my brief time this afternoon to an important part of public expenditure within the state of South Australia at the moment, an increasingly important part—the amount of money being spent on the Adelaide Oval project redevelopment. Mr President, as you are well aware, at the very least \$535 million of taxpayers' money is in the process of being expended on the project and, as I intend to outline, I believe that certainly significantly more millions of dollars of taxpayers' money will be expended on it.

I want to take members quickly back through the history of the project. It was announced by the government, by Mr Foley and Mr Rann, on 2 December last year. We all remember the men in suits walking across Adelaide Oval, patting each other on the back and talking about the historic agreement that had brought together the project for a cost of \$450 million.

**The PRESIDENT:** I don't think there were any public servants amongst them.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** There was a significant number of public servants there and a significant number of people being paid out of the Supply Bill and the Appropriation Bill debates, Mr President, which is of course the issue of concern to you, I am sure.

Just prior to that, we are now aware that in November last year Mr Whicker, who is currently being paid by the taxpayers—sorry, I should not say that; he is employed in an authority that is costing \$5 million of taxpayers' money, the Stadium Management Authority. The South Australian National Football League evidently wrote to the AFL (because the AFL was negotiating the deal with Mr Rann and Mr Foley) indicating that it did not believe that this project could be delivered for the \$450 million the government was going to announce on 2 December. This was on 17 November last year, so it was some two to three weeks prior to that particular announcement.

We now know that the night before, 1 December, that Mr Whicker and others were brought together with the senior ministers of cabinet, Mr Rann and Mr Foley, and indicated the nature of the deal that would be negotiated with Mr Andrew Demetriou from the AFL and others and that the development would be for \$450 million. What we were promised, with the taxpayers' money, was the Adelaide Oval Project, which would be fully FIFA compliant for the prospect of World Cup games in 2018 or 2022.

We were promised a bridge over the River Torrens linking the Convention Centre precinct with the Adelaide Oval precinct. We were promised a roof on the Memorial Drive Tennis Centre so that that facility could be used not only for upgraded tennis facilities but obviously also as a replacement for 'the shed', which is the colloquial expression for the entertainment facility for Adelaide Crows fans currently down at the AAMI Stadium and also, although I am sure a much smaller venue would have been required, for the Port Power fans, should they wish to celebrate the occasional Power victory at Adelaide Oval.

**The PRESIDENT:** The honourable member should keep to the Supply Bill.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Thank you, Mr President. The fourth aspect was of course car parking. The nature of the agreement that had been struck with football and cricket and the government was that a term sheet had been negotiated, in particular for football, because cricket was happy as a pig in mud because it had a significant debt that was going to be picked up by the taxpayers of South Australia. The term sheet laid down the minimum requirements from football from this \$450 million taxpayer funded project. There has been a lot of publicity about all the aspects of that term sheet and I do not intend to take up the council's time to go through all of those, but there were three or four key aspects that relate to the expenditure of taxpayers' money and the project.

Firstly, there is a minimum requirement for 3,800 car parks to be provided within the precinct. This precinct is bounded by Montefiore Road, War Memorial Drive, King William Road and Pennington Terrace. We now know that there are 2,100 car parks supposedly currently available within that precinct and that the proposal advocates an underground car park for another 800 car parks, but that the term sheet requirement for 3,800 is still 900 short, even if someone can be found to fund the underground car park. That was a minimum requirement in terms of the project. We know that the roof on the tennis centre is now no longer to be part of the project, and I will refer to that later on in my contribution.

That is what was promised in December 2009: a fully FIFA compliant stadium, 3,800 car parks, the roof on the tennis centre and a bridge across the Torrens. We now know that prior to the election, on 19 February, treasurer Foley met with Mr Whicker and was briefed about a blowout in costs on the Adelaide Oval project. We now know that three days later, on 22 February, the Stadium Management Authority—Mr Whicker and Mr McLachlan—met with the government steering committee to look at the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

That steering committee is chaired by the government's consultant of choice, Mr Bruce Carter, who has been involved in a number of Rann government projects, paid for out of the taxpayers' purse. He chairs that committee which consists of other public servants such as Mr Rod Hook; Mr Kevin Cantley, the head of SAFA and one of Mr Foley's senior officers within Treasury; Ms Jenny Hughes from the Office for Recreation and Sport; another officer from SAFA, Ms Alison Back; and Mr Manuel Delgado, who is a senior officer within the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (DTEI).

That meeting took place on 22 February and those senior government representatives were again advised of the blowout in the costs of the Adelaide Oval project. The minutes of that

meeting make it quite clear that Mr Foley had met with Mr Whicker prior to that particular meeting and that he had been advised of a blowout in the Adelaide Oval project costs.

Why is that important? It is important because during the election campaign, in that period leading up to 20 March 2010, the Treasurer and the government on a number of occasions denied that they had been provided with any advice, from the Stadium Management Authority or anyone else, that there had been a blowout of the \$450 million cost of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

Treasurer Foley went so far as to authorise a statement which said that he swore on his grandmother's soul that he had not received any advice in relation to a blowout on the project costs. I am indeed aware of that because, on 8 March, I issued a press release which claimed that information provided to me at that time from sources with an intimate knowledge of the workings of the Stadium Management Authority had told me that at that stage there had been a \$100 million blowout in the costs of the Adelaide Oval.

I was then personally subjected to abuse and ridicule from the Treasurer of the state, which is not unusual. As I said, he then issued a statement saying that he swore on his grandmother's soul that he had not received any advice along those lines. The strenuous nature of the criticism, the denial and, as I said, going so far as swearing on his grandmother's soul that he had not received any advice, managed to convince significant sections of the media that this claim from the opposition was unable to be proven, during the election period.

We also know that during that period, just five days prior to that, on 3 March, Mr Foley met with the Stadium Management Authority about the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. Mr Foley says that he said at the start of the meeting that there was to be no discussion in relation to the costs of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. Mr Whicker has no recollection of that. He indicated that he could not recall that being mentioned, but he did confirm that there had been no discussion at that particular meeting about the costs of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment—so there we are.

On 8 March, only 17 days after a critical meeting when he was told about a blowout and only about 14 days after his senior advisers had been told about a blowout in the Adelaide Oval costs, the opposition, in the middle of a white hot election campaign and one of the key issues, claims there has been a blowout. One can only assume that the Treasurer's defence is that he had forgotten about the meeting, only 17 days beforehand at that stage. If he had not forgotten, he was not telling the truth when he issued those denials and he swore on his grandmother's soul that he had not received any advice. All through the election campaign we had denials from the government and the Treasurer in particular.

Then, on 30 March, after the election, we are told that the Treasurer received a verbal update on escalating costs of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. We know that on 1 April—April Fools' Day—the Treasurer gets written Treasury advice on escalating costs and we understand that that particular advice was noted on 7 April. I am not sure why it takes the Treasurer six days to note advice on a critical issue like this, but that is the advice that he has provided to the parliament.

We are told that on 13 April the Treasurer met with the Stadium Management Authority and the steering committee, and one can only assume that there was some discussion about cost blowouts at that particular meeting. We know that on 29 April the Stadium Management Authority provided a cost estimate to the government steering committee about the escalating costs. We now know that that particular estimate was not for \$469 million, which was the basis of the 19 February discussion with the Treasurer, but for \$701 million.

The \$701 million includes estimates for not all but most of the things that were promised on 2 December: that is, it includes some parts of FIFA compliance but not all because it does not include estimates of costs for a temporary northern stand and a range of other components that are required for FIFA compliance.

We know that it includes some estimate for the cost of a roof on the tennis centre and it includes an estimate for some car parking—800 underground car parks—but still does not meet the 3,800 car park number that is required for the precinct, and it includes some estimate of costs for the bridge over the River Torrens.

That particular number is \$701 million, and I will come back to it later on in my contribution, but that was provided to the steering committee on 29 April. On 12 May and days afterwards, there were questions to the Treasurer in the House of Assembly about the issue, and on 18 May the

Treasurer gets written Treasury advice about the escalating costs of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment. We are told that there are attachments to that particular written advice.

We know that, in that written advice, there are copies of the minutes of the critical meeting of 22 February which indicate quite clearly that the Treasurer had been briefed by Mr Whicker on 19 February and had been told about the escalating costs and the blowout in costs of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

On 25 May, I think it was, cabinet agreed to put in an extra \$85 million of taxpayers' money over and above the \$450 million. Then, in the following days, there was a series of questions asked of Mr Foley in the House of Assembly where again he denied any knowledge of the blowout prior to the election which, of course, subsequently, Mr Foley has had to indicate was wrong and was the substance of a recent apology to the House of Assembly.

We now know that, on 25 or possibly 26 May, Mr Whicker was very concerned that he and the SANFL were being fingered by the media and being accused of having misled the government in relation to a blowout in costs. We know that a telephone call with a very strong message from Mr Whicker went to Mr Cantley (and possibly also to Mr Carter on that day) indicating very strongly that he had told Mr Foley on 19 February (and he had told the government steering committee on 22 February) that they—that is, Mr Whicker and the SANFL and football—were not going to cop an accusation that they had not told the government and that they had misled the government in relation to the blowout in costs issue.

Now, that is important because soon after that, early in the following week, Mr Foley went public and indicated that he had misled the house, and clearly also had misled the public, when he had indicated that he had not been told about a blowout in costs before the election. In late May, Mr Whicker tells Mr Kevin Cantley in Treasury and possibly also Mr Carter that he was not going to cop accusations of having misled the government, that he had told Foley and he had told the government steering committee before the election.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins):** The honourable member should refer to the Treasurer as 'the Treasurer' or 'the Hon. Mr Foley'.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Treasurer Foley had also indicated, as I said, that he had told the government steering committee on 22 February—both prior to the election. That was late May, and soon after that, on 2 June, Mr Foley came out and admitted it. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Foley will indicate that it was coincidental that on the very same day the Liberal Party was being briefed by Mr Whicker and the SMA, and there was a clear prospect that he would indicate to the Liberal Party representatives that he had advised the government prior to the election. Of course, I think it was on that morning that Mr McLachlan, who is the chairman of the SMA, had also indicated that he had been telling the government steering committee and the government for some time that there had been a blowout in the costs of the project.

That is a potted summary of the project and in particular the saga of the blowout in costs and when the Treasurer in particular had been told about the blowout in costs. It has been the substance of debate on other issues, and I am sure it will be the substance of debate on other issues in this council in relation to the accusation that the Treasurer has not told the truth to the parliament and to the people of South Australia. I do not intend to spend much of my time in the Supply Bill debate on that. What I am interested in is the blowout in costs and how much the taxpayers of South Australia ultimately are going to have to meet to deliver this project.

The most recent advice, as we understand it, was that minute from the Stadium Management Authority on 29 April which says that the cost of the project is \$701 million. As I said, the government is now going to take out of that the roof on the tennis centre which will reduce the costs somewhat. It is now saying that the \$40 million for the bridge will still be paid for by taxpayers but it will not be part of the Adelaide Oval project redevelopment, even though originally it was promised that it was going to be part of the project. So the taxpayers will pay for that out of a project redevelopment of the Convention Centre and that precinct south of the Torrens. One can add that \$40 million or so to the \$535 million that the government has already announced, so we are talking about \$575 million or so at the very least from taxpayers' funds for those components.

Then there remains the issue of the car parking, and that is at a stalemate at the moment. If the underground car park is to proceed and if the government continues with its current position—and that can always change as we have seen—then the taxpayers will not fund all of that or indeed part of it, and that is about a \$40 million cost for 800 car parks. At the moment there is no



private sector funder for that and there is no City Council agreement to fund it, but there are discussions to try to find somebody to fund that particular aspect.

We then have the third aspect of the remaining 900 car parks. Let's assume that either the council or the private sector will fund the underground car park, there are still meant to be another 900 car parks. The term sheet that I referred to earlier requires that to be within the precinct. At this stage it appears that it will not be, and therefore the term sheet from football in particular will not be complied with. The Stadium Management Authority and the government are looking at providing maybe 900 car parks south of the Torrens as part of the Convention Centre development. Again, we do not know who is going to pay for that particular 900 space car park.

That is potentially some tens of millions of dollars. It depends, of course, on whether it is underground, underground and above ground, or completely above ground, or indeed whether it is open air on a slab of dirt. If it is on a slab of dirt, then someone has to purchase that slab of dirt, even if it is from another government department and there is an additional cost from taxpayers to be charged to this particular project. So there is potentially an additional taxpayer cost for the 900 car parks that are being currently contemplated on the south of the Torrens.

I referred to the issue of FIFA compliance earlier and I mentioned that the current proposal, even at \$701 million, is not FIFA compliant. We are told it includes costs for laser levelling the oval, which is a requirement for soccer and FIFA, but it does not include any costs for permanent or temporary grandstand seating at the northern end of the Adelaide Oval. The only way that that would be able to be achieved would be for temporary grandstands to be erected at the northern end of Adelaide Oval, and it would have to be on the oval itself, because those of us who are familiar with the Adelaide Oval will know that, if you are going to construct a temporary stand at the northern end—given the scoreboard, the trees, the mound and the terracing—the temporary grandstand will have to be on the oval itself at the northern end. The costs of that are not included.

We also know from Mr Whicker's position and advice that they are still not aware of all the FIFA requirements and, therefore, have not been able to cost those. We are not aware who is taking responsibility for that, and that is an issue the taxpayers will have to fund, whether that be a combination of federal government funding and state government funding, if we are successful with the bid for the World Cup in either 2018 or 2022.

The remaining aspect that is possibly not included in the costs—and this issue will need to be clarified—is whether the estimate of \$701 million for the delivery of the project as promised in December includes the \$85 million for paying off SACA's debt and the \$5 million for the cost of the Stadium Management Authority or whether that \$90 million will have to be added to that \$701 million estimate. If it is, that takes the number to \$791 million in terms of delivering the project promised in December of last year which was promised to be delivered for \$450 million. As I said, even that figure of \$790 million does not meet all of the promises from December 2009.

The other point I would make in relation to this is that there has been some reference in sections of the media that these are the extras that are being added to the Adelaide Oval project or, if you wanted bells and whistles to be added to the project, then you could do certain things. What I want to make clear is that these are not extras being added to the Adelaide Oval project: these were the aspects of the project promised by the government in December 2009.

They have to be costed into the project, so it is not an issue of bells and whistles nor is it an issue of extras: it is an issue of what was promised by the government in December 2009 and what the costs of that will be. It may well be that the taxpayers and the government now say, 'Okay, we promised this but now we can't afford it and we are going to cut it back.' That is obviously a decision that the government can take as it looks at its appropriation and supply bills and budget priorities. It can make a judgment as to how it is going to fund the projects it wants. If they want to throw out of a supply bill or an appropriation bill an extra \$85 million into this project, and if they want to spend an extra \$40 million on the bridge in the Entertainment Centre precinct and spend extra money on SACA debt and extra money on car parking south of the Torrens, then they are decisions that governments can take.

But, in taking those decisions, they have to be held publicly accountable and, if they are breaking promises, breaking commitments or are found to have told untruths or lies to the people of South Australia or to the parliament, then they have to be held to account. That particular issue is not an issue for debate in the Supply Bill, but it will be and has been an issue in another place and possibly will be an issue for debate in this chamber as well.

In concluding my contribution on this debate, we are left with questions still unanswered in relation to the total costs of this project. It is incumbent on the Premier and, more particularly, the Treasurer of South Australia to answer those questions. We know the Treasurer in particular is under considerable pressure at the moment, but that does not excuse the fact that he has to be held responsible.

We know he will be sacked from the project and the project given to another minister in the coming weeks, but nevertheless he is still the minister responsible for the mess we are in at the moment and he has to be held personally responsible for the costs being incurred on this project. In particular, we need to know whether the final cost for this project will rest at the \$535 million, plus the \$40 million or so for the bridge (which is \$575 million), and then we need to know whether additional taxpayers' money will go into the car parking option south of the Torrens and whether any additional taxpayers' money will be going into any other aspects of the project.

I conclude by saying that this saga has turned into a financial scandal. It is one that could and should bring down not only the Treasurer but also the Premier. We know the Treasurer is under pressure, and I would hope that you, Mr President, and other members of caucus, having listened to the details of this saga, will take on board some of these issues and mount pressure on your own Treasurer and Premier and hold them to account in caucus, as indeed you should.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:18):** I rise to speak to support the Supply Bill, which I understand is for an amount of just over \$5.2 billion. Obviously, this is the money necessary to fund the Public Service and the services and programs provided to the people of South Australia between now and when the government brings down the budget in September. Being brought up in a Chinese family means that we learn about money and budgeting from a very young age. Those who have developed close friendships with Chinese know that they like to talk about money a lot. They often ask how much was your house, how much did you pay for your car, and what school fees do you pay to send your kids to school. They want to know the turnover of a business and what projects will provide them with the best return on investment.

To talk about money and, more importantly, how to spend money effectively and efficiently is an important process, especially when it comes to managing the economy of the state. The government has been re-elected for a third term, so it surprised me and many others that an eight year old government could not bring down its budget within the normal time frame. Why has it taken so long? One cannot help but wonder whether it is because the budget will carry a lot of bad news for South Australia.

Since becoming a new member of parliament I have been bombarded by constituents wanting to know how the government is spending taxpayers' money and questioning expenditure decisions the government has made. Therefore, I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in the Supply Bill debate and highlight the wide-ranging areas of concern. Many families have shared their concerns with me, and they have spoken about things that keep them awake at night. Families that are in employment and those hunting for jobs are worried about job security. Families who have children going to school or university are worrying about the educational outcomes and about their children's wellbeing and safety. Families who have ageing parents or loved ones who are sick are concerned about the availability of hospital beds and healthcare services.

Families in difficult situations wonder whether they will have a roof over their head and food on the table. Families who own businesses are concerned about the escalating cost of doing business both locally and internationally. Regardless of the structure or size of families I have come across, they are genuinely worrying about money. Will they have enough money to get through a day, a week, a month or a year with their income? How much tax, levies, mortgage payments, fees and charges will they have to pay? What types of increased burden and costs of living will be imposed on them due to the government's budget?

When we look at the Supply Bill, it is crucial to look at the performance of the government in a whole range of areas. Under this state government, since coming to government, the percentage share of the national economy that the South Australian economy makes up has actually declined. Our share of the national economy has declined from 6.8 per cent to 6.5 per cent over the term of the Rann government. Business investment in South Australia has also fallen. South Australia had 7 per cent of national business investment when the Rann government came to office in 2002. We now have only 5.3 per cent of national business investment.

The member for Waite in another place has issued good press releases lately about the level of exports. The export community is very concerned about the declining level of export in

South Australia. The value of South Australian exports has fallen from \$9.1 billion in 2001-02, when the state Liberals were last in power, to just \$7.9 billion today. When you shop in supermarkets, you realise that we are now importing more food and vegetables than we are exporting. We are also importing more and more fish. We have all those beautiful products in our state, yet we are importing them. That is not a very good indication that our society or our economy are committed to being a major food producer. South Australia has built the state economy and a quite a significant proportion of its workforce upon its ability to export from our land, seas and factories.

When we look at the drastic drop in export income to our state over the last eight years, without adjusting it for inflation, we find that is a cause for concern for this state. If we also look at the fact that a smaller number of businesses in South Australia are involved in the export business (I believe the national figure is something like 14 per cent, but for South Australia it is more like an 8 per cent margin), it shows that there is a lack of serious encouragement from the government to support businesses to make themselves export ready.

There is a lack of control by the state government over the economy and the budget, and it has been independently verified by two sources (the Commonwealth Grants Commission and the Institute of Public Affairs) that South Australia is now the highest taxing state in Australia.

The Public Service has increased by about 10,800 positions above budget, and this does not include positions in key areas, such as police, nurses, doctors and teachers. The cost of the extra 10,800 extra public servants is around \$700 million per year. The Public Service has increased to a point where \$750 million will have to be cut out of the budget.

On the other hand, the Liberal Party, being the party of low tax, moved the agenda forward and promised land tax reform. The government then announced its policy and matched what was being offered by the Liberal Party. We will be debating the land tax bill later this week, and the Liberals welcome the changes to land tax.

When I was travelling in the country, I found the other thing a lot of constituents are not happy about is the cutbacks, not only at the state level but at the federal level, to research in the agricultural sector in regional towns. If we want to lead and continue to lead in the areas of agriculture, horticulture and export, we have to invest in research and on-farm support and programs. However, what we have seen in recent years at the federal and state level is that there has been a gradual diminution in support for fundamental research. If you drive through the state, you will see that a lot of research centres have been scaled back and given rough treatment. I think that is really unfair to the regional community.

Members need to realise that we are now importing more fruit and vegetables than we are exporting, and this is bad for our economy because we have less ability to earn income and create jobs for South Australians. We have to be careful that we do not allow our expertise in agriculture, as well as our skills and so on, to diminish over time. I know the government does not have many members in rural areas, but I do not think that is a reason for taking it out on agriculture and horticulture in terms of not funding adequate and appropriate research.

Last week, I asked the minister a question about crime and safety in the community. In terms of law and order, there are just too many examples of people in the community doing things of a criminal nature, which results in fear in the community. We really need to focus more on the efficient management of crime in this state so that people in our community do not feel that they cannot even get off at a bus stop and walk home or walk out of their front door without being confronted by criminals.

There is no doubt that this state has great potential for the future. However, to ensure that that potential becomes a reality, we have to put in place a set of policies that encourages investment and also encourages businesses to be successful. My great frustration with this government is that it is not helping businesses or families. We have to ensure that the discussions we have and the legislation that is put in place, as well as the policy adopted by the government, provide the opportunity for hard work to be recognised and enterprise to be rewarded and for people to have the opportunity to be successful in their business ventures, which will, in turn, provide the opportunity for more people to be employed.

We have nearly 800,000 people in this state who are unemployed. There will still be challenges in the future years to ensure that the workforce we need will be available to replace the significant number of people who will be retiring. That is why migration and population increase will be important factors for us. It is important that we provide the framework for businesses to be

successful. That is why I have a lot of frustration in relation to the taxation burden imposed on businesses in South Australia.

South Australia is full of passionate people who have the capacity to move forward to grow business opportunities and provide employment for people. However, until we can create the climate, the skill set and provide the support base and have champions within government and the community to make the opportunities become reality, we are not doing enough. Anyone who drives extensively will know about the frustrations with transport, etc. We need to really recognise that our regions will need far more support in road infrastructure. I talked about the port of Thevenard earlier, and I asked the minister about the upgrades. We want to ensure that facilities are available so that business opportunities will support the community in the city and in the country.

Overall, enormous challenges are facing our state. I believe that the next budget will be a difficult one. To conclude, I support the Supply Bill, but I think there a lot of challenges for the state to deal with and for the government to address.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (17:31):** I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. My comments will be specifically about the work of the Public Service in relation to the Social Inclusion Unit. The Commissioner for Social Inclusion is Monsignor Cappo. This unit is located within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. In particular, I want to discuss the work that the unit will be doing over the coming months in relation to the review of disability services. I will remind honourable members of the establishment of that review, which was announced in a press release by the Hon. Jennifer Rankine on 10 December. I will quote a couple of excerpts of that release to explain what the review is meant to do. The press release states:

Ms Rankine will also announce that Monsignor Cappo has been asked by the state government to apply the Social Inclusion approach to disability services across government to develop a blueprint for long term reform across all government agencies in South Australia.

Later in the release it states:

'We recognise that there is clearly more that needs to be done. That is why the Premier and I have asked the Social Inclusion Board to develop a blueprint for long term reform—to join up services between health, education and the Department for Families and Communities.'

I was gobsmacked by the announcement of that review. At the time, I was the Liberal spokesman for Disability Services. I was amazed that eight years into government, on the very eve of the next election, the government announced a reform of disability services. It was also four years after what it hailed as one of the greatest reforms of disability services in living memory, that was the reform that led to the establishment of Disability SA.

This council has made its view clear, in a strong motion against those reforms in 2008, that we believe those reforms are a failure. Four years after the Disability SA reforms, the government's response is to have another review with a view to even more reforms. I would put reforms in inverted commas.

What is particularly frustrating for people with a disability is the reporting time frame. The review, we are told, has a time frame of 18 months to report. Then, of course, the community will need to wait for a government response. I am reminded of Monsignor Cappo's recent comments in relation to the government's response to one of his earlier reports, the Breaking the Cycle report. That report particularly focused on young offenders. Monsignor Cappo said that he gave the government one out of 10 for its implementation of that report.

The disability sector is being asked to wait for 18 months for the report, and it cannot afford another 'one out of 10' report. My response at the time was to suggest that the government's announcement of that reform failed to appreciate the urgency of the situation. At that time, disability waiting lists had been published, first of all in November 2008 (it might have been December 2008) and again in June 2009.

At that time, we did not have the December 2009 stats; in fact, we did not even know they existed. We did not know that those statistics had been produced until last month—May. That is six months after the government had those stats. The government was willing to go to an election, announcing a review into disability services, which was announced in the very month that statistics were available in relation to unmet need for disability. Yet, in another example of the government failing to be full and frank with the community, those stats were not made available to the disability sector and the wider South Australian community until May this year.

In December, the government had stats which showed that there were 663 South Australians in category 1 of disability services unmet needs. I will remind members of what category 1 means. Category 1 in disability services speak means that the person's need for support is critical—they are homeless or at immediate or high risk of harm to themselves or others. This is not a waiting list of inconvenience. Often, if we are on a waiting list for health services, or any sort of services, the delay is a matter of inconvenience; but, for people on the critical category 1 list, the government itself recognises that the person's need to wait is putting them at immediate high risk of harm to themselves or others.

That was not a revelation. As I said, we had stats from November 2008 and June 2009 that showed not quite as scary but very concerning data in relation to unmet need. Even if the government had been full and frank with the South Australian community, we already knew that the disability services sector was in crisis.

So, what was the government's response? The government's response was to call for another public sector inquiry. What was the opposition's response? The opposition's response in the lead-up to the 2010 election was to give a commitment to clear the category 1 waiting list. In making this commitment, we had a team of people with budget and finance skills who calculated the cost of the commitment and identified a series of initiatives to fund the cost of providing additional services to meet this commitment.

We were planning to effectively deploy funding that had already been committed, including the \$31 million committed in December 2009. We had plans to improve efficiency within disability services. We planned for greater impact for expenditure through individualised funding, improving the health disability interface, and, in addition to all that, a commitment of \$10 million in extra funding. Our calculations were that it would take a lot more than \$10 million additional funding to clear the category 1 list but that, with a range of strategies and an additional \$10 million, it could be done. Our priority was action that was focused on outcomes. We knew, and we still know, the urgency of the situation faced by people with disability and those who support them. The government's response was another inquiry: our response was a commitment to outcomes.

Whilst the opposition anticipates a greater impact for expenditure through individualised funding, our costings did not rely on any financial savings from individualised funding. Unfortunately, as an opposition, our work—and, for that matter, the work of all members of the Legislative Council and the parliament—was made harder by a government that is not being full and frank about the unmet need and the spending required to meet it. The government had the December update and failed to provide it to the people of South Australia until May—six months later.

In relation to our commitment to outcomes, for us the key commitment was to clear the category 1 waiting list, not the \$10 million commitment. Our commitment to clear the category 1 waiting list was not conditional on its being able to be achieved with an additional \$10 million. We were not saying that we would clear the waiting list only if it cost no more than \$10 million. I repeatedly said, with the authority of the Liberal team, that if we were not on track to reach our commitment to clear the category 1 waiting list we would adjust the strategy, and one option would be to increase funding to meet our commitment.

Labor, on the other hand, right through the election period and even up to this day, has made no commitment to clear the list. The government did not allocate a single additional dollar to address the list in the election campaign or make any commitments in relation to the crisis waiting lists. Its commitments to disability education were within the education department budget. Its commitment to disability equipment was beyond the unmet needs waiting list and is not prioritised for those in crisis needs.

It is my view that outcome-based commitments, such as our commitment to the crisis waiting lists, offer much more hope for people with disability than funding commitments alone. Whilst funding is necessary to deliver outcomes, insufficient or poorly targeted funding will not deliver outcomes, as we have seen over the past eight years of the Rann government. Outcome commitments will drive funding, and commitments by parties to outcomes are more transparent and the benefits more measurable than funding commitments.

Faced with a crisis, the opposition response was urgently to address the waiting list. On the other hand, faced with a crisis, the government's response was to call for another inquiry. The government's failure to appreciate the urgency of the situation is causing growing disquiet in the disability sector. I note that Disability Speaks issued a press release today with the headline 'Is it

any wonder that parents harm their children?' I will read a portion of that release to the house. It is dated today, and it states:

Last Sunday, the Adelaide Sunday Mail ran a great story on the disability waiting crisis in SA.

You know the waiting lists that the Government just hopes will go away! With the official new data released just last month (after the state election?) the Dec 2008-Dec 2009 comparison makes horrific reading.

In just 12 months, SA Cat 1 critical waiting lists jumped from 525 clients to 663 or 26.2%.

Total clients awaiting disability services jumped from 2173 to 2667 or 22.7%.

And the Dec 2009 major response of Premier Rann was to announce...yup, another inquiry?

Little wonder no one seems keen to support this Cappo inquiry unless crisis management intervention is taken first!

I will repeat the last sentence of that press release:

Little wonder no one seems keen to support this Cappo inquiry unless crisis management intervention is taken first!

I highlight that that statement reiterates the theme of my contribution, which is that the disability sector is becoming increasingly cynical about the government's inquiry, the Cappo inquiry, because it looks, first of all, to a response to the crisis. Our view is that reform is important but that, first and foremost, the government urgently needs to address the waiting list and that reform should go hand in hand with strategies to address urgent need. I urge the government to re-prioritise and, through this Supply Bill, and particularly through the next budget, to provide tangible outcomes to people with disability and not just postpone and play with their hopes.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (17:44):** I rise to speak on the Supply Bill and to make a few comments about government priorities in terms of funding, particularly as we head toward this late delivered budget, as the Hon. Jing Lee has mentioned. We have warning signals that it will be a tough budget, and my concerns, in particular, are for the current environment departments, that is, the Department for Environment and Heritage, DWLBC, the natural resource management boards and the EPA, and I will throw PIRSA in there as well because it has some responsibilities in environment-related issues.

DEH has a number of responsibilities. One that I believe is at threat is the Adelaide Gaol. It has been an issue of some concern to me over the years that it has been neglected and not provided with adequate funding, and, indeed, the volunteers who have been able to raise funds that were applied back to managing the gaol have been excluded from the process on the spurious grounds of occupational health and safety.

DEH also has responsibility for biodiversity and animal and plant species. Biodiversity is an issue that is very close to my heart. Had we been elected and had I been the environment minister we would have implemented a biodiversity act. Under this government, biodiversity has gone backwards, and we have seen an increase in land use contributing to that, particularly into the future with the advent of the 30-year plan.

Premier Rann in 2002 pledged to 'save our native species', and we are aware that the number of threatened species has increased from 1041 in 2000 to 1143 in 2008. That includes reptiles, birds, mammals and plants, and six more amphibian species have been added to the list of threatened species. We believe that a biodiversity act would put the issue of where habitats need to be protected as front and centre as putting the horse in front of the cart, if you like, so that we can identify what it is that we want to protect, rather than the current ad hoc approach that we have through a number of different agencies.

While on the topic of the number of agencies, we do have a range of different agencies. The Liberal Party has long warned that the natural resources management boards would be overly bureaucratic and would duplicate a number of roles that are already performed by other departments, and that they would become an end in themselves.

We have seen that. I was even at a function on Friday night where a conservation volunteer was lamenting the natural resources management boards as being pretty ineffectual in terms of actually getting anything done. They produce a lot of reports, but they frustrate a lot of people. I do not hold it against any of the people who work in the system; I think it is actually the system and not the people. There are a number of very passionate people who are staff members of those boards.

Another of our election commitments was that we would ensure that all of the proceeds of the solid waste levy would be provided for the purposes of waste reduction and the \$5 million that the Treasurer stole from the Waste to Resources Fund in 2007, when the government decided to unilaterally double the solid waste levy, would come from general revenue, thereby providing the EPA with a firmer source of its own funds, rather than having to chase funds through fines and so forth.

Heritage is a particular area which is, I think, under a huge amount of threat from this government. The National Trust of South Australia did receive some recurrent funding from the government. It now receives none. It has 5,000 volunteers around the state who make all sorts of valuable contributions to looking after our heritage and history. They now get no funding whatsoever from the government, and I think they themselves put out a regular Our Heritage at Risk list. I think the National Trust, unfortunately, is at risk because it receives no funding.

I note that there was a recent survey done of councils across South Australia by the *Sunday Mail*, which found that almost half of our 66 councils have no heritage lists or registers to protect buildings of local significance. A former minister for environment conservation, the Hon. John Hill, did put out the Heritage Directions document and made some changes to the act, and I think he understood that local councils struggle to do their heritage surveys. Particularly for smaller councils, it is not exactly at the top of their list.

Funding was provided in 2005—and, on average, it was about \$145,000—to assist local government with their surveys. That has dropped to \$80,000 this financial year, and I note that the heritage branch of DEH has shrunk and has been allowed to wither on the vine. It has become a bit of a timid talk group of late, because this government clearly has no interest in heritage.

We have had the interim listing of Union Hall, and we are all waiting with bated breath to see whether that will continue. I congratulate Mr Marcus Beresford of the National Trust, who has sought to have one of the buildings—the nurses home—in the Glenside campus listed, and it has received interim listing. While I am on the subject of congratulating the National Trust, I congratulate Mr David Beaumont on his recent election as its new chairman, and I thank Anita Aspinall for her service over many years to that fantastic organisation.

This government has not proclaimed any state heritage areas since 2002. In our policy, we are proposing that there be a more transparent procedure for the management of state-owned heritage buildings and a review of the nomination procedures to encourage greater community involvement.

We are also interested in considering establishing a charitable trust along the lines of MINT Inc, which operates in Victoria, or the Historic Houses Trust of New South Wales, which would provide an up-front amount of capital to restore properties and ensure that they were not lost to the community forever. So, I would encourage the government, if it has any concern about heritage, to take up some of our suggestions. It has seen fit to steal our policies on many occasions, and it should do so again.

**The Hon. S.G. Wade:** And then they botch them on things like the oval.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Well, they do botch them on things like the oval, to the point that the Adelaide Oval—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Some people have a habit of botching a supply speech. You might want to stick to the Supply Bill.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I apologise, Mr President. As we are talking about heritage and the loss of heritage, I had to respond to that interjection, but I do appreciate that it is out of order.

There is also the issue of animal welfare, which falls under DEH's responsibilities. That, again, is under threat. The poor RSPCA lost that case, which was quite devastating for it and for the sector in general. I think we need to have a full and open inquiry about how that took place and we need to ensure that that is never allowed to happen again in future. I suspect that the RSPCA needs either more resources or greater assistance in terms of the collection of evidence, and so forth. However, I urge the minister to make open that process so that we can all learn from it in future.

The Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation will also be abolished. A large part of it will become part of the new water department, but the particular areas for which I

hold concerns are biosecurity, the River Murray and native vegetation. I have already spoken briefly about natural resources management.

In terms of natural resources management, we have a huge issue with weeds and pest species at the moment. A number of our Liberal country members hold concerns about rabbits and mice, and those sorts of creatures, which can be quite devastating to our crops. Again, greater strategies are needed, not only for our farming communities but for our native animals and plants, to ensure that there is no cut to contributions from the government.

There has been concern expressed publicly. I have had a few bits and pieces from departments, but some people have been prepared to speak on the public record. I note, in particular, that the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden and the Lenswood Research Centre have been singled out as areas of considerable concern in that future funding cuts could threaten their survival. Again, we have the issue of botanic gardens and the numerous volunteers who provide hours of their time for the love of what they do, and I think it would be a travesty if the government were to cut back on staffing.

I would like to say a little bit about water and climate change issues. Again, referring to the recent election, I urge the government to stop being such a dog in a manger about the issue of bringing stormwater up to drinkable standard. I think it is about the only stakeholder in this debate who continues to oppose the reclamation of stormwater for potable purposes. I note that the Water Commissioner, as recently as 2 May, was saying that it could not be done. The CSIRO is obviously in favour of it, and I would put more stock in what it has to say than the Water Commissioner. Quite frankly, I am not quite sure what her qualifications are. I think they are dubious.

**The Hon. S.G. Wade:** Former Labor candidate.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** We should not necessarily hold that against her, but I am not sure that she has any great academic qualifications in water, so I would not put a lot of stock in what she has to say.

SA Water is clearly not in favour of stormwater harvesting. I note from the required sector agreement in relation to climate change that they have completely ignored the issue of stormwater. SA Water is an interesting agency in terms of climate change, given that it accounts for the same amount of energy as every other government department and administrative unit. They estimate that their direct and indirect greenhouse gas emissions range between 400,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent in any year to 700,000 tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent in a severe drought.

I say this because—again, this comes back to part of our policies and stormwater harvesting, being much more carbon friendly than a desalination plant and other ways of producing and treating water—they could save themselves a lot if they were to desist from having the 100 gegalitre plant and revert to the Liberals' policy of a 50 gegalitre plant. The means by which they are to reduce their emissions, which they are required to do through this agreement, are a little fuzzy, I have to say.

Their strategies include contributing to the 20 per cent renewable energy target through the self-generation of renewable and purchased energy, purchasing 25,000 tonnes of accredited offsets (I must say that offsets really ought to be the last resort for any energy abatement) and maintaining major pumping efficiency improvements, although I am not sure what 'maintaining' means. I would have had more confidence if they had said something a little bit more ambitious and more like they were trying, rather than just maintaining what they were doing at the moment.

The next strategy is to continue a program of targeted revegetation for carbon capture—this does not have any figure attached to it, so one wonders whether it is being quantified—and maintaining the Hope Valley mini hydroelectric facility, but there is no detail as to how they intend to do that. They have provided quite a comprehensive chart about how their emissions will increase if there are no efforts to reduce them. In the first scenario, uncontrolled emissions would lead to approximately 300 per cent above the 1990 baseline levels for the period 2012-18. If they are to change the way they are doing business, then that would be significantly reduced, according to this chart.

However, they state that they will 'adopt a Kyoto aligned target'—and I find that quite unspecific and not very useful. SA Water is the largest user of energy in this state and it really needs to provide a much more specific document in terms of exactly how it intends to reduce its emissions. It consists of some 14 pages, and there is not a lot of quantification of usage, strategy or specifics to provide any comfort.



This leads into the issue of what I believe includes a number of claims that the Premier often makes here and abroad about climate change. I spoke very briefly last week in a grievance about how he had been caught out in his renewable energy targets. One of the areas which I think is ignored in the whole climate change debate is the potential for captured carbon storage. The Wentworth Group of scientists has written to a number of us—I am not sure whether other members received it—and has produced a document.

There are very significant amounts of carbon which can be stored, which I find quite exciting. On searching through the government's website and its documents there is absolutely no reference to soil carbon sequestration at all. This document, entitled 'Optimising carbon in the Australian landscape: how to guide the terrestrial carbon market to deliver multiple economic and environmental benefits', states that a 15 per cent increase in the world's terrestrial carbon stock would remove the equivalent of all carbon pollution emitted from fossil fuels since the beginning—

**The PRESIDENT:** Order, the honourable member! I doubt whether 15 per cent of this speech so far has been in relation to the Supply Bill.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** With respect, I have been talking about budget cuts and funding priorities.

**The PRESIDENT:** You might want to do that under the Appropriation Bill or something like that, but the Supply Bill is all to do with the supply of money to the Public Service. Perhaps you might want to get back to that.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Perhaps I could frame it in terms of what public servants should be directed to be looking at.

**The PRESIDENT:** To be fair to the honourable member, she is not the only one who has gone totally off the track with a speech on the Supply Bill. I want to advise members, before we do the next Supply Bill up the track, that they might want to go and get some idea about what their speech should be about and how it relates to supply. Really, there is not a lot of longwindedness in a Supply Bill speech because it is very specific, unlike the Appropriation Bill. Carry on.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Thank you, Mr President. Indeed, these would be very useful things for the Premier (the minister for climate change) to be asking his officers to be examining.

The last points I wish to make are in relation to the federal budget impacts and how they will play through to our state. A number of programs which were providing funding to South Australian agencies have been cut, which I believe will have an impact in South Australia. In particular, I would like to mention the Caring for Our Country program which came under the auspices of a couple of other names in a former life. That has been cut by \$81.3 million, so that is going to have a direct impact on biodiversity and natural heritage.

We have also seen the scrapping of the solar rebate scheme, the scrapping of rebates for water tanks and the scrapping of \$249 million from cities to recycle their water, and they will have a particular impact on us as well. The Renewable Energy Future Fund, which I am sure the South Australian government hopes to avail itself of, will receive \$652 million over four years. That will assist in renewable energy projects such as wind, solar and biomass. Overall, I think the poor old environment departments are in for a big hit. It is something that I am very concerned about.

A number of public servants have been contacting us to let us know of areas which they think are in direct threat, including park rangers who have retired from their positions but are not being replaced, particularly in remote areas where they have been heretofore ensuring that things such as the Ediacaran fossils are not being raided—there is no longer anybody to do that job as they are quietly not being replaced. With those comments, I commend the public servants for doing what they do and we on this side of the chamber have sympathy for the cuts that they are about to undergo and the rough treatment from this ungreen-friendly Rann Labor government.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (18:06):** I thank honourable members for their contribution to the Supply Bill. The Supply Bill appropriates \$5,220 million for the coming financial year, which begins on Thursday. As you have correctly pointed out, Mr President, most of the debate really had very little to do with that. There were lots of political issues raised, but I will let those go for now and commend the Supply Bill to the chamber.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (18:08):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the Clerk to deliver the Supply Bill and message to the Speaker of the House of Assembly notwithstanding that the houses be not sitting.

Motion carried.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS—PRICE DETERMINATION PERIODS) BILL**

Second reading.

**The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (18:08):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC) in its review of the South Australian energy market has indicated concern with the level of flexibility in existing energy price control frameworks.

The South Australian Government has no intention to remove energy price control mechanisms at this time, but has been prepared to examine ways of making the existing framework better.

The Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) has advised that while there is a degree of flexibility within the current regime, greater flexibility would be achieved if provisions in both the Electricity and Gas Acts allowed for a variation of an existing price determination in cases where special circumstances exist, without the need for a new three year determination to be made.

ESCOSA considers that special circumstances are generally events of a magnitude to disturb the fundamental basis of an existing Price Determination so much as to require a new determination to be made. So, if an unexpected event occurs which can be shown to have a material impact on the credibility of the existing price path determination, a review would be initiated pursuant to the 'special circumstances' provisions of the Acts to confirm or deny the existence of special circumstances. If the event was unable to be predicted, planned or reasonably insured against, then 'special circumstances' exist.

The current provisions allow a new price determination be made before the expiry of the preceding determination in cases where ESCOSA has determined that special circumstances exist. Under the current arrangements, any flexibility, however is lost due to the requirement that the new determination itself will need to be made for at least three years.

While this current provision is suitable if the existing price determination was nearing its completion, it would be more cost efficient and timely to make an adjustment to an existing price determination within its own life without the need to make a new determination of at least three years.

The Bill provides ESCOSA with the ability to determine whether making a new three year price determination or making an intra-period variation to the existing determination was the more efficient approach following the confirmation of the existence of special circumstances. This may depend on the timing of the pass-through proposal in relation to the age of the existing price determination. The Bill amendments provide the opportunity to deal with special circumstances in a more timely and less costly manner.

The practical effect of this amendment would be that if a significant change in input costs arose following the commencement of a three-year price path, then that existing price determination could be varied by a subsequent variation to the price determination.

Alternatively, if a significant change in input costs (i.e. special circumstances) arose towards the end of a three year path, ESCOSA could use its discretion and decide that making a new price determination at this time would be less onerous than revising the existing price determination and making a new one in the near future. This is already allowed under section 36AA(4a)(d)(i) of the *Electricity Act 1996* and section 34A(4a)(d)(i) of the *Gas Act 1997*.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Electricity Act 1996*

3—Amendment of section 36AA—Provision for standing contract with small customers

This clause relates to the *Electricity Act 1996* and will allow the Essential Services Commission, in special circumstances, to make a determination that has the effect of varying an existing standing contract price determination for the balance of the term of the existing determination.

Part 3—Amendment of *Gas Act 1997*

4—Amendment of section 34A—Standing contracts

This clause relates to the *Gas Act 1997* and has a comparable effect to the amendment set out in clause 3.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.W. Ridgway.

#### **HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL**

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

#### **ELECTORAL (PUBLICATION OF ELECTORAL MATERIAL) AMENDMENT BILL**

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 18:11 the council adjourned until Wednesday 30 June 2010 at 11:00.