

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 5 May 2011

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.K. Sneath)** took the chair at 11:04 and read prayers.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (11:05): I move:

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

Motion carried.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May 2011.)

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (11:06): I rise today to place on the record some comments about the Supply Bill 2011 which, of course, provides interim funding to keep the state's Public Service afloat until the budget and Appropriation Bill have been passed in this and, indeed, the other place.

First, I indicate that I will be supporting the bill, as the Public Service must be able to operate in order to provide services to the people of this state. However, I must say that I am somewhat disappointed that the government needs to introduce this bill at all. It would be preferable to be speaking to the actual budget bill and its associated Appropriation Bill, but it seems that the government has not quite got its act together to this extent as yet.

I cannot help but think that this government may not be spending our money effectively. I often think, for example, about those people who are fit for discharge but are stuck in our hospitals waiting for in-home support. For many of these people it costs much more to keep them in hospitals. I thought that it was all taxpayers' money, but the silo mentality of the Department of Health and the Department for Families and Communities means that, if the DFC budget does not stretch far enough to pay for the in-home support, then the person will be left waiting in hospital relying on health budget's purse.

This government does not get it. Whether it be funds provided to the DFC or the Department of Health, it is all our money; it is all one purse. I would like to take the opportunity to remind this government to think long and hard about the way in which it is spending our money and to recognise that it is letting some of our most disadvantaged and vulnerable citizens down, while, at the same time, flitting away hundreds of millions of dollars on football stadiums and the like.

One only needs to look at the unmet needs data to realise that this government is letting people with disabilities down, to say the least. For example, this government is further disabling the 1,117 people with disabilities who are waiting for the government to provide them with supported accommodation. This includes people like Tiffany, who has been on a priority 1 waiting list for more than 12 months and who has been told by the department that it will take years to find the accommodation that she needs.

It is further disabling the 993 people with disabilities who are waiting for the government to provide personal support services. This includes people like Rebecca, who has been waiting in hospital for nearly one year for additional in-home support. It is further disabling the 599 people with disabilities who are waiting for this government to provide with community support such as therapy services. It is further disabling the 344 people who are waiting for this government to provide them with community access programs such as day options and recreational holiday programs.

It is further disabling the 429 people who are waiting for the government to provide them with respite. This includes people like Tanya, who has a child with significant disabilities, but has only had respite once in the past five months. It is further disabling those people with intellectual disabilities who will be forced to transfer their funds from Disability SA Trust Management to the Public Trustee. This may seem harmless; however, as I have touched on earlier in this place, this

decision could result in disability support pensioners paying thousands of dollars in additional charges each year.

It is further disabling the 10 students with disabilities from Trinity Gardens School who have lost their accessible school bus and will now have to rely on the already overstretched access cab service. This government is further disabling Carolyn, who has an intellectual disability and is unable to use public transport; nonetheless, she is ineligible for Journey to Work Scheme vouchers and is therefore forced to spend \$200 a week on taxis. This government is further disabling people with disabilities like Charmaine, who is waiting for the government to provide her with orthopaedic shoes. This government is further disabling the families and loved ones of people with disabilities—people like Christine, who is worried about what will happen to her sister when her ageing parents, who have provided a lifetime of care and support to their daughter, are unable to care for her sister.

This government is further disabling the hundreds of people who wanted to use access cabs last Christmas Day but were unable to make a booking because there are only 90 wheelchair-accessible taxis to service 6,800 people. This government is further disabling people with MS and Parkinson's Disease, for instance, who have heat intolerance, as a result of their disability, and cannot afford cooling costs. This government is further disabling young people who are forced to live in nursing homes—people in their 20s living with people in their 90s.

I could clearly go on all day about how this government is further disabling people with disabilities in South Australia, but I think what I have said here today paints enough of a picture to show that the government is letting our people down. I appreciate that this government, in the last budget, did provide additional funds for people with disabilities. It provided an additional \$4.2 million for people with autism, plus an additional \$70.9 million over four years for Disability SA, plus an additional \$13.8 million over four years to reduce the equipment waiting list. However, this additional money does not seem to even touch the surface. This money seems to be a drop in the ocean compared with what is really needed.

There are thousands of people in this state who are in crisis because their needs have been ignored for too long, and an additional \$88.9 million in the disability budget does little to assist these people. Frankly, at the risk of sounding like a broken record, I am incensed that this government is happy to spend \$535 million on a sports stadium while offering an additional \$88.9 million to help people with disabilities live a full and dignified life, as we all hope to do and have the right to do.

The government accepts that there is a significant level of demand for disability services in South Australia, which is rapidly growing and will continue to grow, particularly as the population ages. I cannot help but note that as this level of unmet need grows so does the quagmire of despair and, as the quagmire deepens, the problems are becoming more entrenched, more difficult to overcome. So, as I said, I cannot help but think that this government may not be using our money effectively and is therefore playing a bizarre type of 'human lottery' with the life of our fellow South Australians with disabilities.

I am all for choice and autonomy and I would therefore not usually dare to assume that I speak for all people in the disability community, but I think that, in this instance, it is pretty safe to assume that I speak for all of us when I say that we have had enough. We have had enough of going without the very basics which we need in order to live and enjoy the same intrinsic dignity and rights which are afforded to our non-disabled peers. We have had enough of this government saving itself some precious cash by relying on unpaid family carers, including ageing parents, to take care of people with disabilities until they are too old, too frail or too dead to do so.

We have had enough of living in a South Australia where families even have to consider, and sometimes proceed with, relinquishing a child or loved one with disabilities in order to give the family a chance to be a family instead of a mere team of carers. We have had enough of people with disabilities not being afforded control and autonomy over their own disability funding and therefore their own life. But most of all, we have had enough of people with disabilities being told constantly, time and time again, to wait—wait for the results of this report and then another report; wait for a reply from the minister's office; and, most of all, wait for next year's budget.

So, yes, Mr President, the government is spending our money ineffectively when it comes to disability. Yes, we need a complete paradigm shift in the way in which the system is managed and services are delivered, such as self-managed funding and a national disability insurance scheme, which I, of course, have touched on previously in this place many times and will continue to do so. We need this government to address the silo mentality which exists between the health

and disability budgets so that people with disabilities are no longer treated like boomerangs, constantly being tossed back and forth between the two. Broadly speaking, we need a disability services system which enables us, not further disables us. But what we also need, as well as this long-term systematic change, is this government—and in fact every member in this place here today—to join me in standing up and saying 'Enough is enough.'

People with disabilities are among the most disadvantaged, both socially and economically, in this so-called rich country in which we live. South Australia, and indeed the nation, has the opportunity to demonstrate best practice and become a world leader in disability care and service provision. We have the opportunity to do that right now, yet this government continues to ignore that amazing opportunity, and we continue living in a state in which people with disabilities feel—and are—disadvantaged, mistreated, frustrated, desperate, shunned, ignored and shut out. Yes, we need planning and forward thinking—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Vincent—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Take it outside!

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Yes, we need planning and forward thinking, such as that which is proposed by Monsignor David Cappo and the Social Inclusion Board with their blueprint for the future of disability services. We also need this government to recognise that without immediate change in the form of funding, the tragic fact is that people with disabilities will not actually have much of a future, just the woeful status quo.

As the government is well aware, the Productivity Commission recently handed down its draft report into the feasibility of implementing a national disability insurance scheme in Australia. Not only that, the productivity commissioners—who, as I understand it, are usually known for being somewhat economically conservative—recommend the implementation of an NDIS, despite the fact that it would require an extra \$6.3 billion; that is, a doubling of the current disability budget. They also recommended an urgent and immediate injection of funds to address the crisis in the sector, and address it now.

In light of this, I would like to conclude by demanding that this government not only listen to me, not only listen to people with disabilities all around this state, but also listen to its own Productivity Commission, which says that enough is enough. I once again call on this government and its Treasurer to clear the disability unmet needs waiting list—and, clearly, the government must do this now, unless, of course, it is willing to look its citizens with disabilities squarely in the eye and tell them outright that it is going to willingly deny them their futures. If the government is willing to do this through inadequate funding and constant inaction and resistance to change, then, simply put, it would seem that my beloved state is perhaps not as great as I thought she was.

With that, I implore that what I have just said be treated as more than rhetoric and empty words because to me, to my party, and to anyone within the disability community who understands the issues and sentiments I have just described, they are so much more. These words are our lives, these words are our hope, these words are our present, and only the government can write our future.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (11:19): I rise to make a brief contribution on the Supply Bill 2011. The passage of this bill will fund the activities of the government from 1 July to when the Appropriation Bill passes sometime after that. From what we have seen in recent years with this government, I cannot imagine that the Appropriation Bill will not attract a hell of a lot of scrutiny and, therefore, could be debated for quite a while.

It is pertinent that I talk about some of the poor decision-making of this government when it comes to public money, particularly in portfolios which I shadow, including supply. In Aboriginal Affairs we have seen the minister announce many programs, spending millions of dollars which have had or will have little effect on the Indigenous community. Recently, I met with representatives from the Mai Wiru Regional Stores group who are deeply concerned about the affordability of food on the APY lands.

The minister's solution was to drive around the APY lands giving cooking lessons to local women. If they cannot afford the food in the first place, cooking lessons are not going to be of any value at all. Instead, what the government should be focusing on is trying to reduce the real cost of

food on the APY lands by subsidising the cost of the regional stores, particularly in the area of transport, which is one factor, if not the major factor, on the remote APY lands.

The drug rehabilitation centre in Amata—another brainwave. There is no doubt that substance abuse has been an issue in Aboriginal communities, but to spend \$1 million upgrading the facility to have no-one in it is hardly worth the money. The annual \$1 million could easily have been spent in areas where it would have had a real effect. People at Mai Wiru informed me that a \$300,000 subsidy has the potential to reduce food price on the lands to near Adelaide prices. That would create a real effect. Mismanagement and wastage of funds are, unfortunately, what we have come to expect from this government. A million dollars here and there may not seem like much on paper but, as I have just mentioned, that kind of money can have a real impact on communities in South Australia.

I will now touch on Correctional Services. The government has really dropped the ball in this area. The conduct of the minister and the department is nothing short of disgraceful in recent times and I am glad that the council has agreed to form a select committee in order to review this conduct and the flawed culture that exists within the department. It must be stressed that any failure of the department to act with the utmost integrity risks the genuine rehabilitation of prisoners and undermines our entire corrections system.

The recent escapes go to the heart of the department's shortcomings. The failure of this department to keep the people of South Australia safe is a direct reflection on the performance of the minister whose conduct through this entire saga has been pathetic and completely unbecoming of a minister. He has refused to take any responsibility for the string of escapes that have occurred recently, all of which were meant to be low to medium risk inmates. All three of the escapees went on to commit further violent crimes while on the run. I can say that there was a fourth escape but because the violent criminal did not get past the gates of the carpark of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, it was not actually classified as an escape, even though, at the time, the offender stabbed a guard with a pencil.

The minister went on to blame everyone but himself. He blamed G4S, the company subcontracted to transfer prisoners. If they are the problem, then why hasn't this happened before? The minister blamed the opposition for subcontracting out the responsibility in the first place but, apart from the year 1998-99, prisoner escapes never got above one in the entire time the Liberals were in government. There have been three so far this year—we have had three and counting.

This government has renewed the contract twice. The only difference between now and then is a toxic minister in a toxic government who has infected the department. It is clear that we have a Premier who has no control over his cabinet and flawed decision-making which is so typical of his ministers. He is not doing the appropriate background checks or screening when it comes to promoting members to cabinet and is allocating important portfolios to undeserving members. If he cannot even choose the right people how can he be expected to handle the state's finances?

In tourism we have seen millions of dollars being ripped out of the department's allocation, affecting the long-suffering regional areas of South Australia. Many towns in country South Australia will now have no tourism representation, no information centres, and local businesses and tourism operators are predicting large shortfalls in revenue as a result of these budget cuts. This policy of centralisation, pulling tourism funding from the regions, cannot benefit regional South Australia one bit, yet the government will say that this is a good thing for them—much like the electricity price hike in Coober Pedy. The government is centralising tourism in Adelaide, yet it is closing the Visitor Information Centre in King William Street. How can this policy make any sense?

At the end of the day these are just ill-thought through budget cuts which will impact on everyday South Australians. In a further blow to tourism and sport, this government has seen the loss of another major event, the Rugby Sevens—an event which was not only good for the sport of rugby here in South Australia but for tourism also. So far there has been no replacement for it and many businesses in Adelaide and elsewhere rely on the dollars that international visitors bring in and this needs to be sorted out.

The Adelaide Oval project is the budget white elephant. There is a massive cost for an inadequate stadium, and as Rod Sawford, the former federal Labor member for Port Adelaide said, we are now going to get a 20th century stadium for the 21st century. It is a massive cost for an inadequate stadium while South Australians are losing jobs and having their livelihoods threatened, particularly in regional areas. I am not suggesting for one second that we break the age old convention of granting supply to the government but I recommend that this council take a good

hard look at what this government is proposing, because if there was ever a time when it could be justified it almost could be now.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (11:25): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. This important bill ensures that our public servants and our departments continue to be funded, pending the announcement and subsequent approval by this parliament of the 2011-12 budget. As I understand it, the Supply Bill provides for some \$3.3 billion to be expended prior to the required appropriations being in place. It is important that we ensure that those billions of dollars are spent efficiently and effectively in areas that will provide the very best benefit to the 1.6 million people living across South Australia.

As we know, the traditional and continuing areas of state government responsibility have included the state education system, the public health system, public transport, roads, public sector housing, the state police force and the state judicial system. Other types of collective services at state level include the administration and control of crown lands and state forests, the supervision of water, soil and mineral resources, emergency welfare, an increasing range of community services, preschool, child care, and industrial disputes.

Sadly, the state has never seen the high number of protests following a state budget that we have seen in the last 12 months. These protests are across a whole range of issues including cuts to the Public Service, plans to sell the forests, cuts to the community hospitals and the list goes on. So many protests have happened on a continual basis since the delivery of the budget. The people in South Australia express how unhappy they are and they demand change, but guess what? There is only one change. The position of treasurer has changed. The former treasurer has gone and has been replaced by a new Treasurer.

The Labor budget has been so unpopular and the government has been so divided that the treasurer has gone from the portfolio—nine years as treasurer have now gone. What you have is a government that is internally divided. It has lost its direction and is on the nose with the South Australian public. This was further demonstrated in a Newspoll on 10 March, where Premier Mike Rann, the nation's longest serving leader, has taken a devastating hit to his personal standing. It was found that the man, who was once the most popular premier, has dragged Labor's vote down to its lowest level of support in 16 years.

The supply debate is about any government action that is funded by government money. That is why, by definition, it is a wide-ranging debate. On the first day the Treasurer took over from the former treasurer, the opposition asked the Treasurer some very simple questions about whether he would change any policies that were announced in the very unpopular budget announced by the previous treasurer. The Treasurer's response was he would not be changing any of the key policy settings. So, even though the Treasurer has changed, the cuts to the Public Service, the cuts to community services and the government waste continues.

It is not difficult for the new Treasurer to realise how hard it is for the government to deliver what has been promised. People should be very wary to hear the announcements in relation to two key major infrastructure projects to be delivered by the money in this Supply Bill. One is the Royal Adelaide Hospital project and the other is the selling of the forests. The Leader of the Opposition and shadow treasurer have been asking the government to come clean with the total cost of building the Royal Adelaide Hospital project. There was an interview with the Hon. John Hill, the Minister for Health, on the radio this morning, as well.

Let us look at the hospital. The government went to the election saying that the hospital is going to cost \$1.7 billion, yet it knew all along that it was, and had actually approved in cabinet, \$1.8 billion. It was not honest enough with the people of South Australia though to tell them that before the election. We know that Premier Rann said in 2002, in his election promise, that there would be better hospitals and more beds. After nine years of this Labor government, we are seeing hospitals in crisis and a health system in crisis in South Australia.

We recognise the need to build modern hospitals and refurbish hospitals so that people can access the best quality of care. This government has been here for nine years. What improvements to hospitals and health services has it introduced? Instead, we are seeing the closure of country hospitals and many hospitals in crisis. Our metropolitan hospitals are over capacity much of the time on any given day of the week.

We asked about the construction and finance costs of the new RAH build and then the ongoing cost to the South Australian public over the 29-year contract period after it is built in a five or six-year period. The government has promised that it will put all of those financial details on the

record, but those details are yet to be released. So, we do not know exactly what the taxpayer is going to be up for for the move of the Royal Adelaide Hospital from the east end of North Terrace to the west end of North Terrace.

What we do know is that it is going to cost more than \$1.7 billion, and it is going upwards. We were told that accessibility is going to be an issue. We were also told that fewer services will be delivered from the new site than are currently delivered at the existing site. What this means is that a new hospital on the rail yard site will be a great waste of taxpayers' money.

When I visit regional areas I find that country people tend to suffer more as a result of inadequate health information and inadequate health services. The biggest issue is that people in country areas often have to wait to get medical treatment.

Doctors at the front line inform us that they are very concerned about the lack of consultation, and we see that time and time again with this government. We saw it with the country hospitals: \$200,000 would help to save hospitals like Moonta, Ardrossan, Keith and even the Glenelg hospital, where they are providing an excellent service, supplementing the public hospitals with good community hospitals. This government chooses to deny these hospitals their real worth by denying them subsidies and denying people the right to access services which will take the pressure off our public health system.

With regard to law and order, it is frightening to learn about people robbing service stations in broad daylight and breaking into houses early mornings and at night. Innocent people are getting hurt and even murdered in suburban Adelaide. It is not just a problem for the police department, there is obviously a significant increase in social problems and mental health problems across the community. This government, which is supposedly tough in law and order, must address this endless cycle of crime.

The government intends to collect about \$1 billion extra in taxes and revenue. The cost of living is starting to hurt South Australian individuals and families. This government is completely out of touch and has stopped listening. All of the key economic data presented shows that our debt level and our tax level is growing.

There have been three independent reports in the last 12 months, all confirming that South Australia is the highest taxed state in the nation. We are also the highest spending government per head of population in Australia. There is no doubt that this Labor government is a high tax, high spending government. One of the hallmarks of the most recent budget, and the matters that the government is going through with regard to the finances of this state, demonstrate that the budget is out of control.

Economics affect the day-to-day living, material welfare and security of everyone in this state. The economic choices made by government have a big impact on the speed and direction of economic development. The government also exercises a profound effect on the level and nature of economic activity simply because of the volume of revenue it raises and the expenditure it undertakes.

The former treasurer had lost control of the expenses in the budget, and he admitted that himself. The state and this government finds itself desperate for cash and is doing whatever it can to increase revenues or to bring forward cash revenues. One key example is the proposal to forward sell the forests in the South-East. It is an outrageous plan for the government to even contemplate bringing forward rotations to the forests.

Treasury has obviously done the work, but what the government wants to do is to grab the cash now, because it failed to manage its finances and allowed its expenses to get out of control. It wants to grab the cash now and has put no thought into the future of the people and the industry of the South-East.

Similarly, we have seen a great waste of taxpayers' money in things like Shared Services. The budget to develop Shared Services has already blown out from \$60 million to \$100 million, and last year the Auditor-General pointed out that the projected saving is falling short of \$100 million as well. What we can take from this sort of data is that this government is not capable of managing the state.

We have also seen water prices double, and they will double again—and this is even before the federal Labor government introduces a carbon tax, and it was revealed in recent times that it would add \$863 to average household energy costs. No doubt, the average water bill will also go up. Let us be clear that this government has not been overly honest with the people of

South Australia on what the impact of that will be on the cost of living and operating their businesses.

Once upon a time, South Australia was the third largest state in terms of the size of its economy and its population. Our share of the national economy has declined under this government. Yesterday, I spoke about the Business Confidence Index being down by 3 per cent in the March quarter 2011. The latest MYOB Business Monitor reveals that South Australian business owners are among the least optimistic in the nation about the economy. We have high taxes across a range of things, such as stamp duty and payroll tax.

Our reputation as the high-taxing state is not something to be proud of. It is a real risk when we do not have the right climate to retain business or attract new investment into our state. What are the incentives or benefits for businesses to stay here or move to South Australia? That is my great concern because the issues surrounding the cost of operating a business and the regulations that surround a business create an enormous burden for some people to actually get out there and extend themselves, to grow their business, to give job opportunities to young people and capable workers, and to have the skills and capacity to grow our economy. This has all been lost.

It is so frustrating and frightening to watch South Australia accumulating a mountain of debt. How can this government allow it to happen? Debt is expected to go to \$7.5 billion. The 2010 budget has had a detrimental impact on the regions of South Australia. The Labor government has forgotten that the primary industries, such as agricultural and mining sectors, are driving most of South Australia's economy, yet all the costs for operating a business in the region have gone up, putting pressure on regional South Australia. There are few incentives or initiatives by the government to help stimulate growth in the regional economy.

For example, family businesses in regional areas have spoken to me regarding the need for power upgrades to expand their business, and the government put them through years of red tape and barriers. It really just stifled the growth of that business. Red tape seems to be the issue with any business that wants to come to South Australia. Any new or existing business that wants to expand continually has a barrier of red tape put in front of them. It is so frustrating to see that this government is not interested in encouraging investors to come to South Australia. It lacks the motivation to promote the state as a great place in which to invest, to build a new industry or to expand an existing industry.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should get back to supply.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Well, it is all about money. Time and time again, many businesses have said to me, 'We're going elsewhere. We're going to other states because the government over there is prepared to stand up and help us, and this government is not.' This Supply Bill gives the government the opportunity to change its policy and direction, and I encourage the government to reassess its priorities.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (11:39): I rise to support the second reading of the Supply Bill. We do not have much choice but to support it, but certainly I can flag some concerns I have about the direction in which the expenditure of this state is headed at the moment with respect to the government's Supply Bill. There are a great many matters that could be and need to be addressed on how the government is currently running its budget. This is a budget being run by a government that I see has lost at least three things: one, energy; two, vision; and, three, teamwork come discipline. I believe those three matters are having a negative impact on the state's best interests. It is certainly not the government that I saw in the first term, and it is a surprise to me that I see such a lack of discipline and lack of focus on the direction of South Australia's future, which is what you should be doing when a government.

The PRESIDENT: What you should be doing is sticking to the Supply Bill.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Thank you for your advice, sir: I am trying to do that in the context of monetary matters and issues around economic expenditure and mismanagement. In this speech I will cover major projects and the economic mismanagement of at least two of those, which are directly related, I might add, to the Supply Bill; the scramble for cash to pay for those projects; and also the continued pork-barrelling of marginal electorates and other related matters.

First, I want to talk, with respect to the Supply Bill, to an issue that is a hot topic even today in the media, namely, the Royal Adelaide Hospital. We have leaked documents that the media have. I have not seen them yet—I am not sure whether you have, Mr President. I would certainly

like to get a copy of that leaked document so I can better examine issues that will have not only immediate but long-term impact on this and future supply bills.

It appears that, whilst the government was able in the budget papers to jump \$100 million from \$1.7 billion to \$1.8 billion in their estimated costings for the hospital—and not a lot was said about that; suffice to say that it was \$100 million that the government did not have—that is small beer compared with what we are possibly facing now, where we may see a blowout of an additional \$1 billion.

Whilst listening to minister Hill this morning on the radio while driving down to Adelaide, he said that you always had to put the furniture, fittings, plant and equipment and everything else in after. Unless I was not listening or reading properly, I actually understood that the total cost for the RAH, including the beds, scanning equipment, MRIs and everything else, was in that figure. That is what I believed and what I understand most South Australians believed.

The anger is building when they hear that \$1 billion of additional money has to be found. That is a massive increase. I also put on the public record, relevant to the Supply Bill, that I know Dr Jim Katsaros very well. He is an honourable man. I do not believe he would ever leak a document, and the minister needs to apologise in writing to Dr Jim Katsaros.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: Get out of cowards castle, put a written letter there and apologise to an honourable plastic surgeon who is highly respected in the South Australian community.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Go say it outside the house.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. P. Holloway: You can say it in the house.

The PRESIDENT: We all know the Hon. Mr Lucas says a lot outside the house. The Hon. Mr Brokenshire.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: What we need urgently, as we examine the Supply Bill, is a briefing to the Legislative Council, an in-confidence, in-camera briefing that has some transparency, honesty and accountability in what we are actually facing with respect to the government's commitment to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

One other thing that I found absolutely hypocritical: I thought the Premier, into a third term, would have got away from these gimmicks. We had a magnificent royal wedding last Friday night—and that was good; I watched some of it and enjoyed it—but after milking the cows on Saturday morning I sat down at the kitchen table to have my cornflakes and picked up the paper, and I could not believe that the Premier is still on the tricks and gimmicky media releases where he is inviting Prince William and—

The PRESIDENT: What's that got to do with supply?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: A lot.

The PRESIDENT: Why?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: Well, he is going to invite them to come and open the hospital in 2016. I am not sure whether the Premier will be here in 2016. I am not sure, but I just find it amazing that although he did not even want to call it the Royal Adelaide Hospital he now wants the royals to open it.

In terms of the desalination plant, I am very pleased the Hon. Tammy Franks has a select committee into the desalination plant. We may see some transparency and honesty when that committee reports to the parliament, but there is incredible concern about the project blowing out significantly. That risk, if it was known at an early stage, should have been addressed, as well as issues around the occupational health and safety and well being of those people working there.

The doubling of that desalination plant has always had a cloud hanging over it. How a prime minister and a premier can just make a decision to go from 50 gigalitres to 100 gigalitres without proper scrutiny and probity is beyond me, but I hope that as part of the importance of the ongoing supply bills we can see some answers to all of that when that select committee reports.

In terms of the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, there are some people who support that redevelopment, there are some people who do not support that redevelopment. My colleague, the Hon. Dennis Hood, thinks it is a great idea and that it will reinvigorate Adelaide and help to get more people to football, cricket and other events. I trust that will occur, but my concern again is that, when we are discussing a Supply Bill that is so tight, and when we see small cuts that have major impact on basic social service delivery, this government can find \$534 million plus whatever else it is going to cost to do all the other work around there, simply because the AFL demands the government spend our money—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: So Family First are opposing the oval?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: No; I just said the Hon. Dennis Hood loves the oval. In fact, the Hon. Dennis Hood will be able to go with the Hon. Russell Wortley from Prospect to the oval very easily, but it is not so easy if you live in the country.

My point is: where is the contribution from the AFL? They come over here heavy handed and demand \$534 million of expenditure and, as the Hon. John Darley just said, at best it sounds like the AFL may contribute up to \$5 million max—\$5 million. That is not much more than the chief executive officer gets paid.

What an indictment that is on the government that they are prepared to spend that sort of money with less than \$5 million contribution from the AFL, which, sir, has just signed off a \$1.25 billion media contract. Yet, I can tell you, sir, that there are sporting facilities in Adelaide, the metropolitan area and the country that cannot get five grand to do the basics like putting showers into the ladies netball rooms in my own town. They have to keep the sausage sizzles and fashion parades going and all the other things that they do to try to deliver basic facilities and yet the government overnight can spend \$534 million.

My question in the Supply Bill—and I would love the minister to answer this in her summing up—is: where are you getting \$534 million from? Where are you getting it from? We need to know. There are lots and lots of other issues that we could talk about in the Supply Bill, but some of the basic management needs addressing: Housing SA vandalism and damaged premises via poor housing allocation enforcement on disruptive tenants; school vandalism, costing between \$6 million and \$10 million a year out of the Supply Bill; and accidents at schools and particularly bullying and harassment of teachers and students, costing hundreds of thousands in compensation.

In terms of evidence issues, the Hon. Ann Bressington pointed out how, in the Families SA context, social workers get tied up in a matter when they have no substantive evidence to empower them to withhold a child from its family. There are issues around Families SA; there are issues around the lack of staff at the grassroots level to manage the core business of Families SA. Particularly worrying to Family First is the fact that it appears that if you are over two and you get a report as a potential child at risk, it is not even investigated under priority 1. Where is the money in the Supply Bill to protect these young children? This is the basic stuff we need to be delivered in the Supply Bill, and it is not happening.

I know the Premier and the Treasurer are running around now saying that we have \$80 billion worth of capital works projects. I would like answers also from the minister, first, in relation to how much of that \$80 billion is rock solid, signed up, locked away and about to start; and, secondly, in relation to the Treasurer saying that the state government is now going to be in control of \$10 billion worth of projects, how much of that \$10 billion is from the state, how much is from the commonwealth, how much of the state government contribution is going to be borrowed and then a break-up of what that \$10 billion is going to deliver? These are things that we need to know, as a house of review, so that we can scrutinise the expenditure of the government.

Just a couple of nights ago, I spoke on *Today Tonight* about a court case where people had lied to police about an incident where they stabbed a man, who was himself charged with assault. The resources of police were wasted and the court found that the alleged victims had lied to police and the court, yet, at this point in time, it is possible there will be no repercussions for those people who appear to have committed straight-out perjury. So, we have issues when it comes to resourcing, follow-up proper justice and the democratic process.

With respect to the Supply Bill, let's have a quick look at the dash for cash. Labor's dash for cash to pay for some of what can only be described as ill-conceived promises—I wish I did not have to describe it in those terms but is the only way I can see it. In relation to the forestry sale, as the chair of the select committee, I have been careful as to what I do say. The select committee is now going to have a very, very important job to get some transparency, some real facts and figures and some honest answers on the pros and cons in respect of this sale, particularly after the tabling of the ACIL Tasman report. I would suggest that we will have to look very closely at that report because it has already been noted from that report that, whilst apparently the report is all systems go, a net cost benefit has not even been done on the forward sale of—

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member should not be pre-empting something that has been referred to a select committee. The honourable member should have enough experience in this house, and in the other house previously, to know that.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Thank you for the advice, sir. I am not saying whether it is right or wrong; I am just saying that has been noted in the report.

The PRESIDENT: It's pre-empting.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I will leave it at that, sir, and we will look at it later.

The PRESIDENT: Hear, hear!

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, sir, for your wise words. The NRM water levy is certainly one I can talk about. Taxing rainfall is a desperate measure. In the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges alone, they are going to hit the irrigators for \$160,000 next year. I ask: why are they hitting them for \$160,000 because they did not need the \$160,000 last year? Simply because they now have a water allocation plan, they all of a sudden find that they have to take \$160,000 from the farmers. To me, taxing rainfall is something that is totally unacceptable. Sir, given the advice you gave me previously, I will not dwell anymore on that, either, at the moment because I know we will have an opportunity to debate in full those matters when we get back to the NRM bill.

I want to touch on a couple of other things that are really affecting primary producers, and it leads into a pattern that I see of concern with respect to the Supply Bill and the forward estimates. The property identification code fee is one of those. The government wisely agreed to national property identification codes and biosecurity measures—and I support the government on this. However, I do ask: why does this state have the highest charge for the property identification code fee and why is it that we are one of only three states out of all the states and territories that is charging at all? It is just about full cost recovery to offset the mismanagement of the global budget of this state.

I cannot conclude my remarks on the Supply Bill without talking about where we could see some levies taken away. The Save the Murray levy is one, for a start. It was not the Premier or the former minister who saved the Murray, even though they said they needed this levy to save the Murray: it was nature that actually saved the Murray—the God-given rain and the floods that came down. That is what saved the Murray and, given that something like \$6 million is still sitting there unspent when the community are seeing utility and government charges going through the roof, I think it is time, in this budget, that the government actually stopped charging people the so-called Save the Murray levy.

With regard to the community hospitals at Keith, Moonta and Ardrossan, I trust and hope that those communities will continue to fight against these draconian cuts. These are small cuts in the big picture, but I remind members that in just nine years the government has seen the budget double, yet it is cutting out \$800,000 of essential money to stop opportunities at Keith hospital, for example.

If we are serious about road safety—and I am sure that all members are—why is there not more focus on traffic policing, and why is there not more focus on fixed and mobile speed cameras being located in blackspots, rather than in top revenue spots? It is classic that just to the north-east of the parliament here, at the War Memorial Drive intersection, over \$1 million a year is raised from one set of fixed speed cameras. There were eight crashes there last year; it is not a blackspot area. Yet, from some work I have done, blackspot areas do not have fixed speed cameras or enough traffic police.

I would like to touch on pinching pensions from public and community housing tenants. If finances were managed properly, you would not be hitting the most vulnerable people in this state—the people in public and community housing—by ripping off money to the tune of \$30 a

fortnight that then prime minister Rudd committed to back in 2009 to help those people catch up on increases in food and utility costs. We now see that a letter is going out to those public and community housing tenants taking further money away from their pensions, and I understand that in September another lot of money will be taken away from those pensioners.

It is unfortunate that I cannot be more proactive in my comments on this Supply Bill, but from the government's point of view perhaps it is time to stop and reflect on just where we are with the monetary situation in the state at the moment. Where are the real priorities? What is going to stimulate and grow the economy in this state? Why do they continue to put money into about seven marginal seats in an effort to hold government at the next election in 2014, at the expense of governing and supplying adequate state government facilities, infrastructure and services across the state?

I will just finish with a couple of other questions that I do not have the answers to yet. We have this marine parks saga before the parliament and the community at the moment, and we have suggestions that up to perhaps \$10 million or more a year could be needed to manage those marine parks. I do not see any of that in any budget figures at the moment. Why are we bringing in legislation, and why are we stopping people from going about recreational activities that they have been able to go about since we were a colony, when we have not even considered how to fund the management of those parks?

My final point with respect to the Supply Bill is related to regional matters. We are fortunate that we have the Minister for Regional Development in our chamber, but a member in the other house has been running around the state in recent times—and I commend him for that because it is nice to see members get out and about. He came back and said that he wanted a 14-day visiting plan for ministers. First, in fairness to the ministers—

The PRESIDENT: Order! What's that got to do with supply?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: I am about to explain, sir, with respect to the monetary side of it.

The PRESIDENT: Supply to minister, all right.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: I cannot speak any quicker than I am. In fairness to the ministers of this government over nine years, they have been out and about in rural areas. Ministers have not spent all their time in the city, and I see that as an indictment against those ministers, because I have seen plenty of ministers in my own region and I know they are seen regularly across the state. However, what it has to do with the Supply Bill (and the point that I think the member in the other house was trying to make) is that it is one thing for ministers to go out to the country, but it is another thing to deliver the services, facilities and infrastructure, and pay more than lip service to country people when they are having a cup of tea and a scone in a country hall.

I do not think it is a matter of ministers coming out and spending a rostered day on watching the footy and the netball—although if they want to come to Mount Compass and watch the great Southern Football League at any time, I would love to look after them—but, in respect of the Supply Bill, it is a matter of ministers ensuring that fair and reasonable amounts of money are distributed across the state, across 47 seats rather than seven seats.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (12:01): I was not intending to have a reasonable speech on the Supply Bill but a great person once said that abuse is a poor substitute for a debate. What we have here is a bill looking at supply and many of the statements made by members here should have really been saved for the budget bill. That has prompted me to basically go through and really re-educate everyone in this chamber on exactly the sort of job and the great job this government is doing.

What amazes me is the concept of growing the cake: you must have a bigger cake to share the slices out, but that has not sunk in to many people in this parliament. On one hand we are criticised if we do not spend money in certain areas, but then we are criticised because we are lifting taxes and levies. You cannot have it both ways. A responsible government has to make sure that the cake is big enough to provide the essential services required to live in a decent society.

This bill looks towards an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account. Supply is required for the first three months of the 2011-12 financial year until the budget has passed and the Appropriation Bill receives assent. The amount being sought is \$3.32 billion. The premise of the bill is clear and its passage is crucial. It ensures that the required moneys

continue to flow to the numerous areas and agencies of the state until the budget proper is brought down later on in the year. That continuity is absolutely crucial.

Unlike those opposite, we in the Labor Party actually have a plan, a cohesive plan that builds on the achievements of previous terms and a plan that looks to the future. It is a plan that looks to a dynamic state that steps up proudly to the national plate, a growing resource powerhouse that will help to fuel our country and, most importantly, a community that allows people to achieve their best while continuing to protect its vulnerable members.

We on our side of the chamber look forward enthusiastically and proactively to a society that recognises both the opportunities and the challenges that lie ahead. Those opposite can carp, complain and carry on until the cows come home—they have nothing. Their leadership is invisible, the remainder are a rabble with no vision, no plan, no cohesion, and no internal unity.

Let us have a look at some of the initiatives that feature in the budget and the key features. Those opposite knows a bit about infrastructure. They let it moulder into decay when they were in government from the 1990s to the early 2000s. It took the Labor government a long time to rebuild and help develop the infrastructure that makes our society so much more productive and liveable. This government will invest a total of \$10.7 billion in our state's infrastructure over the next four years.

Transport is also a crucial priority. We are delivering the South Road Superway at a cost of \$843 million, and the Southern Expressway will be duplicated at a cost of \$445.5 million. At last, the debacle which saw the Liberals treat workers and people in the southern area with total contempt by building a one-way expressway will now be overcome.

The riverbank precinct, with all its new works, will go ahead at the cost of \$394 million, revitalising the precinct and making our city even more attractive and cosmopolitan. The recent SACA vote means that improvements to Adelaide Oval will proceed at a cost of around \$530 million. Upgrades to, and extensions of, our railway lines, costing \$1.5 billion over four years, have been provided for.

Those opposite might pause to reflect on the fact that, since taking office, the Rann government has delivered more than \$5 billion to our state's moribund infrastructure. I will repeat that: \$5 billion on infrastructure. This had to be done to make up for lost ground during almost a decade of the Liberals, from the late 90s to the early 2000s.

Another of our major priorities is the health and wellbeing of all South Australians. This year's budget earmarks a massive \$4.5 billion for health expenditure; that is more than twice the amount allocated to health in the last year of the former Liberal government.

Over the next four years, the government aims to achieve a maximum waiting time in casualty of four hours for 95 per cent of patients, and this will cost \$111 million. More than a quarter of a million elective procedures will be carried out, in both metro and country hospitals, at a cost of \$89 million.

The Women's and Children's Hospital will be upgraded at a cost of \$64.4 million, and additional funds will be allocated for related costs from 2010-11. The sum of \$12 million has already been allocated for the remodelling of the emergency department at Modbury Hospital and will be augmented by a proportion of total funds of \$46 million, with the balance to be expended on a rehabilitation unit.

Further, a new emergency department, operating theatres and outpatient facilities at the QEH are to be funded by way of nearly \$39 million over two years as part of that hospital's \$125 million redevelopment. There will be additional subacute beds and support care services at the repatriation hospital and more equipment for elective procedures and the casualty department.

Education is also, of course, a top priority for our government, and this year's budget includes \$720 million in capital expenditure. In fact, the total budget for the current financial year will amount to an increase of more than \$200 million on the last financial year—an increase which equates to almost 50 per cent more per student than was expended in the last year of the former Liberal government.

This was a government, I might add, that achieved consistently only in delivering us deficits; a government that, during its tenure, chipped and chipped away at health, education, transport and police services, leaving them depleted and our people in real trouble as a result. That took a long time to rebuild, both physically and in terms of community confidence.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Who wrote this bloody rubbish?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: An additional 700 teachers—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: Don't you read these speeches first?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: It's all true. It's all on the record. It's all very well to attack us from over there. It's all true. It's all on the public record. I know it is hard for you, John. I know it is hard for you to listen to this. I can understand that, because you ought to be ashamed of yourself for being part of the government that allowed this state to go into decay. Your legacy from the 90s and early 2000s is that you allowed this whole state to run into decay. So, just allow me to finish my factual speech and then you can get up and give yours, John. You are there after me and I will have the decency to respect your right to speak without interjection. Okay?

An additional 700 teachers and support staff will be employed across preschools and schools from the beginning of 2011. Moreover, this budget gives solid attention to students with disabilities. Special schools will be renewed and six disability units will be located on school grounds. Staff levels will be augmented and there will be extra funding for students with disabilities enrolled at non-government schools. In addition, four of our specialist high schools—Adelaide, Marryatville, Glenunga International and Brighton Secondary—will be expanded to accommodate a total of 800 students at a cost of \$60 million.

I now turn to the government's commitment to water security. Almost \$900 million will be allocated to water security and diversification this financial year. The desalination plant is nearing completion. We know that every drop of water should be conserved and re-used. Our significant investment in wastewater treatment plants, stormwater harvesting and re-use and non-potable wastewater projects recognises this. The health of our river and its communities will always be a major focus for the government. Continued robust consultation with our federal and relevant state partners will ensure guaranteed water supply into the future.

I will now look at our justice system and police. The security of our citizens is also a major concern. As I have said on previous occasions, the Rann government is extending its commitment to maintaining law and order in our community, and this year's budget provides proof of that. More than 300 additional police officers will be sworn in over the next four years. These men and women will supplement the 400 extra officers recruited over the past four years.

At the Legislative Review Committee inquiry into criminal intelligence the other day, Assistant Commissioner Mr Tony Harrison gave evidence. I asked him that very question about resources: was he happy with the amount of resources provided by the government? His answer, which is on *Hansard*, was that, yes, he is very happy with the extra 300 police this year, over the 400. So, not only is it me saying this, but this is actual evidence from the Assistant Commissioner of Police.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! You should not be talking about committee evidence, or anything like that.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: The government is also investing in the latest technology for SAPOL and in better security on our public transport services. That is genuine action for the protection of our community. The operational budget for the South Australian police has increased to more than \$693 million this financial year. The 2010-11 budget will, in fact, invest over \$186 million in new police initiatives targeting domestic violence and street crime: compare that with the mid-nineties when the Liberals had our police force down to about 3,500. It was the lowest per population in the history of this state.

On the latter, \$15.5 million has been allocated over four years. This provision includes the establishment of a southern community justice court—a first for our state—a model that has worked well in other jurisdictions. Domestic violence is not on for our community. Assessment and intervention programs are to be established and interventions will be implemented through amendment to the relevant legislation at a cost of \$7.8 million.

How does that total stack up against the expenditure in the last Liberal budget? I will tell you. It is 88 per cent more. Members opposite might not want to acknowledge that, as they do not, but that is just one of this government's achievements—88 per cent more. That figure includes, over the next four years, \$12.9 million for the continuation of the bushfire awareness program and \$5.5 million for new infrastructure, equipment and technology for the emergency services.

I will now look at the regions. Regional Australia has been receiving a lot of additional and long-awaited attention recently from our federal counterparts, both in government and opposition. The budget we are discussing today looks towards significant investments in the regions, particularly in infrastructure and services. The commonwealth's extension to the exceptional circumstances interest rate subsidies for drought-affected areas program will be met with a \$38.8 million commitment over the next two years by the Rann Labor government.

Meanwhile, infrastructure improvements in health, housing, schools and roads through our regions have been provided for. These include funding of \$23.5 million for Ceduna, \$14.7 million for Whyalla and \$12.7 million for Berri. Maintenance and equipment in country hospitals will garner \$8.4 million and there are increased allocations for ambulance services and aged care in areas of particular need.

Remote Indigenous housing will receive \$46.2 million and affordable rental units will be established in Port Adelaide at a cost of \$5.6 million. Road and ferry improvements and improvements to our rural freight network will couple with improved roadside rest areas. Work on high risk roads and road safety initiatives to decrease road accident related deaths and injury will continue, and rural and regional education infrastructure will be augmented at a cost of \$30.6 million.

The Port Bonython jetty, so crucial for our state's economic future, will be refurbished. A desalination plant in Hawker will be established and a variety of plans promoting sustainable futures, exploration and mining, plague control, drought support and rural cancer services, among other initiatives, will be implemented.

The Rann Labor government is investing \$20 million in re-establishing and renewing the Riverland through four areas of endeavour: retirement and aged care, and alternative agricultural production, coupled with food processing, tourism and education, and these will focus on jobs, economic diversity, productivity and emerging industries.

I will now turn to the disadvantaged members of our community. We in the Labor Party will never abandon people in trouble. Unlike those opposite, we will not countenance a society of haves and have-nots. Major new investment over the next four years include: more funds for the care of children under the guardianship of the minister, at a cost of \$137.7 million; increased assistance for Disability SA for support, access and respite services, at a cost of \$70.9 million; increased and indexed concessions and extended eligibility for energy and emergency services levy, at a cost of \$70 million. There is also new investment in disability equipment, home visiting for seniors, services for children with autism and a rebate scheme for the seniors' personal alert systems.

In other initiatives aimed at fostering healthy lifestyles, the government is investing more than \$28 million over the next four years in local sports facilities and grounds. In fact, funding for facility development and upgrades will increase fourfold, and clubs, local government authorities and school councils can now apply for grants of up to \$500,000.

The Department of Trade and Economic Development will welcome the redevelopment of Tonsley Park. The Eco-Innovation Program and the Cleantech Partnering Program will be key areas of the department's focus. These and related initiatives and programs will ensure that our state has new and sustainable industries, enabling us to move forward competently into the future. Those opposite take note: just sit back and see how it is done. Further, in a move that will save money and reduce carbon emissions, the government will replace over 1,000 six-cylinder fleet vehicles with smaller four-cylinder vehicles.

Value-adding is essential to a healthy, growing mining and minerals sector. A new system of minerals royalty, meanwhile, will provide a fairer return to South Australians by encouraging not only mining but also the refining of mining products in our state. There are many more features to this budget, including new arrangements for first home owners, which will not only target those most in need but also promote building and construction jobs and deliver savings, including additional funding for the festivals and exhibitions that are so much a part of South Australia's vibrancy and cultural leadership.

I am not going to pretend that there is no pain, because there is pain. As I have said, you have to have a big enough cake to share to provide the services that we enjoy in this state. There will be workplace reforms in the public sector. These are very difficult decisions that we had to make. People in our community will be affected by these necessary revenue and cost-recovery measures, and we understand that. However, we all have to share the pain and this government is

doing its utmost to ensure that savings are garnered from those areas of government that have the least adverse impact on families and citizens.

There is work still to be done to mitigate the effects of our last exposure to those opposite—the neglect of health, education, transport and many other vital areas, the years of decline in our rural and regional areas, and the rear-vision parochialism used in those days to characterise our state. The Rann Labor government is determined to act on this state's needs for the future, and the measures I have outlined represent that determination. Far from neglecting vital nation building investment, this government takes hard steps and the hard yards to ensure a safe, prosperous and equitable future for all in this state. I commend the Supply Bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. I.K. Hunter): The Hon. Mr Wortley has stretched some of the boundaries that normally pertain to debating a supply bill, but I understand that he was following on from precedence from the opposition.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (12:19): I rise to support the second reading of this bill, which provides, I believe, some \$3.332 billion to ensure the payment of public servants and the continuation of state government services from 1 July until the Appropriation Bill for 2011-12 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. Before moving on to make some comments on particular areas of those priorities, I note that the use of that money is for the work of public servants to service the constituents and residents of South Australia.

Initially I want to go into the work of the regional coordination networks, the first being established by the previous government in the Riverland. They have been rolled out across most of non-metropolitan South Australia by this government. Those networks have been established on the basis that they incorporate the senior public servant across each portfolio within a region, and they have also been based around having representation from members of the local government bodies in the area, as well as the regional development sector, previously the regional development boards and currently Regional Development Australia.

I have been concerned in recent times that the focus of those bodies has not been given to them by the government on their work. I recently asked the Minister for Regional Development about the government's commitment to those regional coordination networks and whether they would continue to work with the RDA network and local government in developing solutions for areas without having to send matters off to North Terrace or to the Adelaide CBD and wait for months, when sometimes those decisions can be made very quickly by people who have local expertise.

In her answer the minister indicated to me and to the chamber that she had actually no understanding whatsoever of the regional coordination networks, and in fact talked completely about the fact that Regional Development Australia (the RDAs) 'are the tripartite mechanism to bring those different levels of government together'. In addition to not knowing anything about regional coordination networks, which I thought would be something a regional development minister would know, the minister continues, as she did in the Riverland press recently, to tell everybody that they need to take all their grant funding applications and projects to boost communities through the RDAs.

That would indicate to me, if I did not know better, that this government values RDAs. But do they? They are going to pull out the funding as of 2013, and have not indicated any way in which the Regional Development Australia boards can recoup that money. Their commitment is not even flimsy. They stand up here and say. 'Oh, you must go off and use the RDA bodies because they're the one's we quote as the tripartite mechanism', and then they just pull away the money. I find that extraordinary.

I hope this minister in her time as regional development minister comes to learn that the regional coordination networks have the capacity to work very well if the public servants who are part of those feel they have the commitment of their ministers and of the government to actually allow them to work. I have also recommended in the past that similar bodies would work very well, certainly in the northern suburbs of Adelaide and maybe in other sectors of the metropolitan area.

Moving on, I am concerned about the lack of commitment to Regional Development Australia because, when agreements were made between the federal, state and local governments in this building—I was witness to the signing under minister Caica—there was a commitment that

funding to RDAs would go on for the future without any time limits on it, yet within 12 months of it all being fixed up the government came down last year and said, 'Oh, sorry, from 2013; that's it. See you later; go and find some money from somewhere else.'

That brings me to the Business Enterprise Centre Network. The business Enterprise Centre Network I think is well known to many members of this house. Like regional development boards or now RDAs, they actually provide a terrific service to the community on, relatively, the smell of an oily rag, compared to the services that the Department of Trade and Economic Development provides.

The BECs have had their money taken away from them. They have been told to go and find money from alternative sources. This government seems to use this phrase a lot lately. 'Go and find an alternative source,' and they rely on the federal government. The federal government came into the Business Enterprise Centre Network, and they particularly noted that South Australia is leading the way with those networks. They came in and put the money there. They said, 'Yeah, we'll put money into this as long as the state government's remains.' Of course, the state government pulled their money away, and the BECs are now trying to scramble around to say to the federal people, 'Please don't pull your money out.'

Local governments have been asked to put more money in; they can't find it, so the BECs are, I think, in significant doubt of their continuation. That is a great shame, because they are providing extraordinary advice for people going into small business and those who are in a small business and having some financial difficulties, and they provide that free. It is a service to the small business sector that cannot be replicated by any other body. I urge the government to have a look at these decisions to pull the money out of these organisations, because it is hurting the community across South Australia.

I want to move on to the area of the horticulture industry in this state but also a matter that affects the whole of South Australia, that is, South Australia's fruit fly free status. That status is something that has given us a reputation overseas that has been built over many years, and it is the envy of other states and overseas nations. It has been a great asset in selling fruit and produce, and it is built into most supply agreements.

Any proposal to remove the 24/7 vigilance of our major quarantine stations sends a terrible message to our overseas markets but, of course, that is what was done at the last budget, where the government decided they would remove the 24-hour, seven day a week staffing of the major quarantine stations at Ceduna and Yamba.

I have been here long enough, and I am sure there are other colleagues who would know that there have been a number of ministers of agriculture or primary industries over the years who have had submissions put to them by their department to say that we can save some money by cutting back on the fruit fly inspection timelines at Yamba and Ceduna. I know that there are a number of ministers on both sides of parliament who have told the bureaucrats to go away and said, 'No, we're not going to do that; we need to protect that fruit fly free status.'

Unfortunately, on this occasion minister O'Brien allowed that to go forward, and the government indicated last year that they would remove that 24-hour service at those stations. There has been extraordinarily strong opposition to that and, subsequently, the government has changed its mind. It does concern me that, for those markets overseas—the citrus industry and other industries—that status is built into the agreements, but the government entertained this notion, stuck to it for a number of months and then promised a review and eventually backflipped. It must create concern in those overseas markets that this is on the agenda. It must not be on the agenda. It will not be on the agenda under a Liberal government, because the economy of South Australia is very reliant on our horticultural industry.

I should emphasise that the government's own Horticulture Plant Health Consultative Committee and the Tri-State Fruit Fly Committee, which operates across South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, strongly support the retention of 24-hour fruit fly road blocks. Having said that, I would ask that the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries do the horticultural industry and the state as a whole a service and rule out any attempt to remove the 24-hour inspection regime indefinitely, because this has been a huge cloud over the horticultural industry of this state.

I now move on to another area that has had an impact on the agricultural industry of this state. I know that one or two of my colleagues will think that this is a blast from the past when I mention the words 'branched broomrape'. Branched broomrape is a parasitic weed of a wide range of broadleaf crops in the Mediterranean, Europe, Central Asia, the Middle East, South Africa and

North and Central America. Broomrapes are root parasites that extract all their nutrient requirements from their host plants.

We have had a significant issue with branched broomrape in the Murraylands, where a very large area was identified as having infestations of this parasite. About 10 years ago, a program was established to work towards the eradication of branched broomrape in South Australia. Funding for the program has a national component and a state component and is over \$4.2 million per year, of which the national component is \$2.5 million; also, there is involvement from local government. I think there are four councils in the affected area.

For some time there have been suggestions that industry beneficiaries should be responsible for part of the cost and, whilst there is a reluctance for voluntary contributions because of fragmentation, there also does not appear to be many simple options for collecting contributions. The initial agreement for funding of the program was for 12 years, subject to three-year performance reviews, and this ends on 30 June 2012. A review panel visited the program earlier this year and talked to participants, and we understand that its report is imminent.

To give some data on the area that is involved in this program, there are 15,000 hectares in the managed spray program, and 9,000 of that has been sprayed by air, including 280 hectares by helicopter because of the nature of the terrain. I think you, sir, would understand that some of this area includes floodplain and cliff faces on the river, so it is almost impossible to do it by any other method other than helicopter. The remainder of the area is done by ground boom spray. This is in addition to on-farm spraying carried out by landowners. An eradication time frame, estimated by modelling in the current program, is by the year 2030.

There are 370 farmers and 960 other landholders in the program and 207,000 hectares under quarantine, including 5,230 paddocks, of which 768 have had branched broomrape infestation, or about 15 per cent. Because of buffer zones that have been implemented in the scheme, about 7,000 paddocks are surveyed each year. The program has 45 seasonal and 14 permanent staff. Almost 2,800 paddocks in the quarantine area on branched broomrape-free farms have had no infestation and are eligible for release at the end of 2012, and 180 infested paddocks are eligible for release by 2013. The area is a large area, extending from north of Swan Reach to Taillem Bend on both sides of the River Murray, east to Karoonda and west to almost the base of the Adelaide Hills.

As I said, the program was reviewed earlier this year, and that review was conducted by the federal Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry and its Consultative Committee on Exotic Plant Incursions to establish whether the pest is still considered eradicable. The concern is that if it is deemed ineradicable the program's funding will cease. I know that largely relates to federal funding, but I think that the commitment of the state government towards this program needs to be emphasised.

Minister O'Brien has made some supportive noises about continuing the funding, but I think he needs to make sure that the federal funding is continued and focused on that aim of eradication. Eradication may not be completely achievable across the whole area—in particular, there are those areas I mentioned where it is so difficult to address this parasitic plant—but I think that the government needs to make sure that it does not take its eye off it. Certainly it is a major issue in many parts of our agricultural community.

I want to briefly relate to the government's commitment, or lack of it, to maintenance of outback roads. In recent times we have heard about the amount of wet weather we have had in the outback in the last 12 to 18 months, which has been unprecedented. People who have been through the outback are just amazed at the amount of water lying around, and the green feed that is there that people have not seen for a very long period. That has an impact on the status of the roads in the outback.

As someone who has travelled widely as a shearer and in other occupations, Mr President, you would know that the status of those unsealed roads is reliant on the behaviour of the people who use them, particularly after wet weather. We have a lot of tourist activity in the north of the state, particularly with Lake Eyre filling up and just with the magnificent state of the country of the moment, and while a lot of people behave properly on outback roads many do not.

The people who are producing cattle in the north are very concerned about the state of the roads, and they believe that government should put more money into their maintenance. We know that they have reduced the number of crews available to work on the roads. I think there should be a return to the method by which the previous government allowed local councils to contract and do

some of the work in the areas close to them. Certainly, in the Gawler Ranges and the north-east pastoral area that is something that I think will allow a lot of those roads to be kept in better order.

There are two main aspects to that, and one is that there is a lot of cattle from south-west Queensland that would come through to South Australian markets if they could rely on the road structure. At the moment that is not the case and so we are missing out on a lot of that livestock coming down through South Australia. They are going to Queensland because at least in Queensland they have a network of bitumen roads. Even though some of them are very narrow, they are still all-weather roads.

It is time that the government had a look at how it can better service those residents of South Australia. The public servants who work within DTEI and who look after the pastoral area do a terrific job, but they need to have access to better ways of dealing with the issues of that connection into the north of South Australia. I am also concerned about the government's decision to cut funding from the Advisory Board of Agriculture. That body has been around for well over 100 years.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Some very famous people have been on it, too.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: My grandfather was chair of it twice, and I am not sure that too many others have had that privilege. The Advisory Board of Agriculture has given great service to the state with very little remuneration (if any), and it has been faithful to all ministers of all flavours over a very long time. We now have a decision by the minister and the government to replace it with an agribusiness and seafood council or similar, which we are told is going to be formed soon. I note minister O'Brien's response to the member for Schubert in the estimates process, where he said:

This new Council will have a more clearly defined role with a focus on what happens pre farm gate. It will be a Council that will cover all aspects of South Australian agribusiness and fisheries activities. This will allow Government to capture advice from people within the industry who have something of value to contribute, using their expertise to determine opportunities for agribusiness and fisheries/aquaculture and economic development opportunities for South Australia.

The Advisory Board of Agriculture, as the governing body for the Agricultural Bureau movement may continue to exist, if its members see that it has a future, but it will not be funded by the South Australian government. The Bureau movement is a very effective and extensive network through the rural community, which PIRSA and other government agents will continue to collaborate and use to deliver information and to seek advice.

So we are going to utilise them and use them for everything we can get out of them, but we are not going to support them with any funding. The agricultural bureau movement in this state is unique; there is no other organisation like it in other states. It is something that I am very proud of and I think it has served South Australia very well.

The answer that the minister gave talked about getting 'a more clearly defined role with a focus on what happens pre farm gate'. If we're talking pre farmgate, the best people I know who know anything about what happens before it goes out the farmgate are the producers themselves: the farmers, the people who are on the Advisory Board of Agriculture. I am not quite sure why this government would want to change that. The amount of money that has been committed to the advisory board is—I go back to that smell of an oily rag—very little. Here again, they are being told, 'If you want to continue to operate you can, but we are not going to give you any money. Go and find some alternative sources.'

Very briefly in conclusion, the other issue that concerns me out of the previous budget that I think is affecting local communities is the government's decision to reduce its funding assistance to local government to run community libraries. I am aware of the concern in the District Council of Loxton Waikerie that there has been a cut of \$30,000 to the operation of the Waikerie and Loxton libraries.

The community is very upset about that. They believe that these libraries play a very valuable role in the community. State governments have had a commitment to assisting communities in running libraries for a long time, but this has been pulled back and that area of Loxton Waikerie is just an example. I know local government bodies across the state are concerned about the government's decision to pull back on those libraries.

I appreciate the opportunity to make some comment about the public services which the Public Service provides to the community of South Australia via the government. I support the facilitation and continuing delivery of public services by public servants, which is facilitated by this

bill. I support the role of public servants in their commitment to delivering services to the people of South Australia and I support the bill.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (12:46): I rise to speak in support of the Supply Bill. I am concerned that the government is not seen to be following the simple principle of household budgeting of living within one's means; that is to say that your expenses cannot exceed your income.

Should the budget not meet the expenses, there are two courses of action that can be taken: either reduce non-essential expenditure or increase income. We all know that one of the few ways for government to increase income is to increase taxes, which would cause an outcry from the public who are already suffering from higher taxes and new taxes. So, the focus should be on reducing expenditure.

With regard to reducing non-essential expenditure, my understanding is that 70 per cent of the expenditure of the government is used in paying salaries. Therefore, an obvious area for the government to reduce expenditure is to cut salaries. I am not suggesting that front-line staff providing essential services to the public should be cut or suffer a salary decrease. Rather, as I have suggested previously, I do not believe that the government's 20 per cent reduction of executive level staff in the Public Service goes far enough. As a matter of fact, I openly refer to an executive director of an agency, who today I shall call John Citizen, as executive director John Without-a-Job Citizen, simply because there is no job.

Savings seen from these reductions should be put back into ensuring essential services continue to be provided to South Australia. I understand that the Public Service Association probably will not like my comments, but even they have to admit that the government needs to live within its means.

Further to this, my experience in the Public Service has shown me that the requirements for public servants are constantly changing. Whilst people have been employed in various activities over a number of years, as a result of changes, there is a need for certain activities to cease and for new ones to commence; that is to say that there is an ever increasing need for an ongoing review of each and every activity being undertaken. CEOs should look at their staffing requirements from a zero-base point of view—how many people are required, and at what level, to carry out the essential activities of government.

A good example of this would be an issue we are currently involved in—the staffing of escort services for over-dimensional loads. I understand that the police commissioner has about 20 highly qualified police officers engaged in this program, instead of on more important crime prevention. By comparison, Victoria has no police officers providing escorts for over-dimensional loads. Rather, they have staff from their equivalent of road transport undertake this task.

Another example can be found in the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. During the drought, the department contracted a team of about 47 contract officers to address various drought-related issues concerning the Lower Lakes and Murray Mouth. Following the inflows from interstate into that area, I understand the same people are still employed, irrespective of the recovery of the Lower Lakes.

A final example of the need to review process and identify areas that need improvement was seen yesterday during the debate on the Summary Offences (Weapons) Bill. The minister asked the Hon. Stephen Wade whether he had discussed one of his amendments with the department. The Hon. Stephen Wade commented that the department would not discuss his amendment unless the request came through the minister's office.

I have long suffered with this policy, or convention, that public servants need the approval of ministers before talking to members of parliament. Without making myself sound like a broken record, I have had over 39 years in the public service and had never encountered this policy prior to my entering parliament. In my experience, public servants were free to talk to whomever they liked and if it was thought that the minister needed to know about the conversation, they would be told.

Unlike the Hon. Paul Holloway, who said yesterday that it was a matter of courtesy for matters to be referred through the minister's office, in my view it is a matter of sheer inefficiency and a waste of time. Further, it shows the government and ministers are distrusting of their public servants as they feel that public servants need to be nannied and supervised. I believe that only the weakest ministers strictly uphold this policy.

With regard to leave loading, I have previously expressed concern about the way leave loading has been reduced rather than phased out over a number of years, but in hindsight, and this goes back a bit, perhaps leave loading should only have been provided to those people who were working shift work, as it was intended.

Similarly, long service leave provisions have been cut and probably on this issue there should have been a more strict direction as to when people should take their long service leave, rather than the current situation where people accumulate their leave, which is taken as a lump sum payment when they retire.

There is much discussion in the media about the new Adelaide hospital. I have always been of the view that the Royal Adelaide Hospital should remain on its current site. At a briefing with the minister on the need for change, I was told that there was a lack of suitable space to rebuild the hospital where it was. I stated that one of the reasons for this was that a previous Labor government had given the area of land used for car parking between the zoo and the existing hospital back to parklands.

Rather than build the Adelaide hospital at the government's preferred site, which I still believe is potentially the most valuable commercial property with water frontage, I believe a more appropriate approach would have been to demolish the old nurses' building, replace that with a new tower and then move the north wing into the new tower. The north wing could then be completely refurbished and other sections of the hospital could be moved into the new building, and so on. The new hospital could be built incrementally as funds became available.

With regard to reducing expenditure, the government should examine its outgoings on non-essential infrastructure projects and weigh this up with maintaining existing services. Similarly, with increasing income, the government would provide the best outcome for the people of South Australia, both in the long and short term, and act accordingly. With these few words I support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.G. Wade.

[Sitting suspended from 12:54 to 14:15]

PARKS COMMUNITY CENTRE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Presented a petition signed by 801 residents of South Australia requesting the council to urge the government to reinstate funding for the redevelopment, continuation of existing services and locating of new community services at the Parks Community Centre site and support legislation that will guarantee protection of the Parks site as community land preserved for future generations.

HOUSING SA RENTAL INCREASES

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Presented a petition signed by 101 residents of South Australia requesting the council to urge the government to:

1. Abandon the policy of Housing SA from March 2011 taking as rent the rental proportion of the pension increase that the federal government intended for pensioner retention as income; and
2. In future heed the wish of the federal minister in this regard.

HOUSING SA WATER POLICY

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Presented a petition signed by 359 residents of South Australia requesting the council to consider our respectful petition and work to ensure that all Housing SA households are provided with their own individual water meters in the interests of fairness and so that tenants might monitor and control their own water use paying SA Water for accurate and appropriate usage.

ELECTRICITY PRICES, COOBER PEDY

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Presented a petition signed by 1,111 residents of South Australia requesting the council to urge the government to reconsider plans to increase electricity prices in Coober Pedy and 12 other northern communities.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Regional Development (Hon. G.E. Gago)—

Government Response to the Premier's Climate Change Council on Climate Change Targets in South Australia's Strategic Plan

SELECT COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATED TO THE GENERAL ELECTION OF 20 MARCH 2010

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:20): I bring up the interim report of the select committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and ordered to be published.

SOUTH EAST SOUTH AUSTRALIA INNOVATION AND INVESTMENT FUND

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:21): I lay on the table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis on the \$17 million boost to jobs in South Australia's South-East.

QUESTION TIME**PRESIDENT'S CASTING VOTE**

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to you, Mr President, and I seek leave to make a brief explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: In the event of a tied vote on the floor of the Legislative Council, the Presiding Officer has the casting vote: in this case, Mr President, that would be you. It has been a long-standing convention in this and other parliaments in the Westminster system that, in the event of a tied vote, the President will vote to maintain the status quo; that is, the President will vote against any new legislation. Because of circumstances entirely beyond your control, the leader of the government in this place has resigned from the ministry and has not taken his place in the chamber this week, and there is no way of knowing whether he will be in parliament again in the next week we sit.

While the government and the lone minister and acting leader this morning on radio indicated that the government is frantically searching for a second minister, and as yet has been unable to find one—notwithstanding the fine gentlemen and lady left in the team—the government does not seem to be having much luck at finding a replacement minister. Of course, these changes in this parliament, in the Legislative Council, mean that we now only have 20 votes on the floor and that any government legislation, for example, supported by Family First and the No Pokies Independents but opposed by the Liberal Party, the Greens and Dignity for Disability that goes to a vote will of course result in a tie.

That means that the President will get a casting vote, which puts the President—that, sir, being yourself—in a potentially invidious situation of either supporting the traditions of the parliament, which go back hundreds of years in the Westminster system, or ignoring the convention and supporting new government legislation. Given these very unusual circumstances, will you, Mr President, uphold this important, centuries-old convention?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT (14:25): Order! There is no constitutional—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is no constitutional provision nor standing order which requires me to follow a course of action in the use of the casting vote to maintain the status quo.

There have been other instances, I understand, where the casting vote has been used to pass legislation. I accordingly will consider each piece of legislation on its merits. The Hon. Ms Lensink.

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question about red tape.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Liberal Party has received letters from several frustrated individuals who are finding themselves caught in OCBA's red tape, particularly in the processing of building work contractors' licences taking up to 10 to 12 weeks. As a result of these exceptionally long hold-ups, the cost of renovations is increasing for the consumer, and the creation of jobs in the industry is being prevented.

The minister was quoted recently in relation to the Sogin Corporation case, saying that she had instructed public servants to aim towards a target of between three and five weeks, noting that the current time is unacceptable. My questions to the minister are:

1. For how long have these processing times been taking place?
2. When did the minister instruct her agency to aim for the three to five week turnaround?
3. What work is she doing to review the efficiencies of OCBA's processes?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her questions. Indeed, the OCBA licensing laws are put in place to ensure that building work contractors meet a number of particular requirements in respect to solvency, business experience, technical skills and experience, supervision of work and also fitness and propriety to conduct business. For example, a current police clearance is required. The law is also there to help ensure that home building work is performed to an appropriate standard and also that unfair practices are minimised.

There is a range of different provisions that are put in place to protect consumers and also ensure particular standards are met. A person must be licensed as a building work contractor if they carry on the business of performing building work for others or performing building work with a view to sell or let land or buildings improved by that particular work. Every building work contractor must have a registered building work supervisor to properly supervise their building work and to ensure that it meets required standards.

Applicants must provide originals or certified copies of all relevant trade and technical qualifications, a detailed work history and, if possible, two written work references from licensed builders or other building professionals whom they have worked with recently and then, on receipt of that documentation, an assessment is required to be made as to whether or not to interview that person to assess their technical knowledge. I am advised that most processes do proceed to the interview stage. I am advised that OCBA receives well over 66,000 licence applicants annually, and a substantial number of these are building licence applications.

To assist in dealing with the high volume of applications and improve processes, OCBA has recently implemented strategies to reduce unnecessary red tape, and these have been in place for a number of months, so I am advised. These include things like amending the financial assessment criteria. This will simplify the requirements so that applicants can more easily satisfy OCBA that they have sufficient financial resources to undertake their work so that they are not a high solvency risk, rather than requiring full financial assessment to be undertaken.

That is an area where improvements have been put in place. It also includes simplifying the process for establishing business knowledge. Applicants must now complete an improved business course or seek recognition of prior learning from a training provider. Unfortunately, that can sometimes take some time where it is unclear about the accreditation of courses or work that they may have done, not only interstate but also overseas. Another strategy is introducing a simplified re-application process to cancel licences, which will enable straightforward applications to be processed quickly.

As announced some time ago, Consumer Affairs and Liquor Licensing are going through a merger process at the moment to form a consumer business service. The merged agency will create a critical mass of staffing levels, which will be able to move resources to areas of highest need while not diminishing provisions of services in other areas. Part of that merger process includes a process of improving a review to identify efficiencies and synergies in functions. Occupational licensing will form a significant part of that process improvement review to identify opportunities to reduce waiting times for applicants.

In light of these changes, it is anticipated that waiting times should be no more than five weeks. Hopefully, we aim to have that backlog reduced by somewhere between July and September this year. I was quite surprised to see the claim by the Hon. Iain Evans, I think it was, that, under the Liberal government, they were processing building applications in 10 days. The data we keep in OCBA clearly shows that that was not the case. Back in 2002, the majority of building applications were taking somewhere between three and likely up to five weeks to be processed.

So, it is an absolute nonsense to say that, under the Liberal government, they were processing these building applications in 10 days. Data does not support that. So, we have checked that. A number of months ago, I became aware of a backlog in our processing. I met with the agency, and we have continued to meet and have put in place a number of steps to improve that and to set a goal of reducing that backlog of applicants within the next few months.

OFFICE OF CONSUMER AND BUSINESS AFFAIRS

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:32): I have a supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether there is a streamlined process for someone who already holds some form of OCBA registration, such as in the case which was mentioned in the newspaper, that is, the case of Robert Rollison, who has held a building work licence since 2004?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:33): As I have outlined, these are technical matters. There are a number of considerations that each applicant undergoes to ensure that they meet solvency, probity and skills standards. It is dealt with on a case-by-case basis. I am not a technical expert. It would be incredibly irresponsible of me to be making assessments of whether or not someone is eligible to hold a building licence; that is the responsibility of those people in the agency who have the technical expertise. The gentleman wrote to me, and I am aware that there was what seemed to be a most unreasonable delay in the processing of his application, and I have asked the agency to look at that carefully and to expedite that, where possible.

FIREARMS PROHIBITION ORDERS

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Police a question relating to firearms prohibition orders.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Firearms prohibition orders have been in place in South Australia for a number of years. Firearms prohibition orders place a number of restrictions on individuals and others who come into contact with them. Section 10C(11) of the Firearms Act 1977 provides that a person who has a firearm under their immediate physical control is not to be in the company of a person to whom a firearms prohibition order applies and is in jeopardy of a \$10,000 fine or imprisonment for two years. Likewise, section 10C(12) of the act makes it a criminal offence to bring a firearm onto a premises where a person with a firearms prohibition order is present. Similar provisions are being considered by this council in the context of the weapons bill.

The Firearms Act provisions put police at risk of committing a criminal offence in the normal course of their duties. Most police carry firearms as part of their standard kit. Furthermore, to avoid committing the offence, police would need to disarm themselves when coming into the presence of some of South Australia's most violent criminals. My questions are:

1. Will the government amend the firearms legislation to ensure that police do not risk breaking the law for doing their job?
2. How many exemptions have been granted in relation to section 10C(11) and 10C(12) of the Firearms Act 1977?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for his questions and will refer them to the relevant minister in another place and bring back a response.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Regional Development a question about her recent endeavours to develop relationships between government and regional South Australia.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: Clearly, those opposite don't believe that regional South Australia is terribly important. The Minister for Regional Development is strongly committed to encouraging economic growth and future development throughout regional South Australia. Minister Gago has been a great supporter of the regions and the commonwealth Labor government initiative, the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund, which aims to assist regional areas financially. Each region has its strengths and weaknesses, which must be taken into account when seeking funding. My question is: will the minister discuss recent opportunities she has had to explore potential applications for this fund?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:36): It is with great pleasure that I respond to this most important question, for which I thank the honourable member. I am very pleased to inform the house that on 19 and 20 April I visited a number of businesses and organisations across the Adelaide Hills and Fleurieu Peninsula to engage with the local community, hearing first-hand about regional projects and community priorities for the future.

I am particularly aware of how much of this state's economy, now and in the future, relies upon industries as diverse as mining and agriculture that are based outside of Adelaide. That is why this government significantly invests each year in regional education, health, roads and, of course, other infrastructure. This government also continues to support vital programs and projects through initiatives such as the \$20 million Riverland Sustainable Futures Fund and Regional Development Infrastructure Fund.

This regional visit also provided me with the opportunity to see some of the benefits to those communities which have received funding assistance previously, through programs such as the RDIF. The grant program provides up to 50 per cent funding towards the cost of infrastructure which enables economic activity and delivers economic outcomes; for example, jobs, gross state product, exports or import replacement. Since its inception in 1999, approximately \$30.6 million in RDIF assistance has supported projects that have generated an estimated 5,543 new jobs and over \$1.4 billion in total project investment.

For example, in the 2007-08 financial year \$500,000 was allocated from the RDIF towards pipe, pump and storage infrastructure to enable commercial wastewater reuse from the Mount Barker treatment plant. I inspected the new pipeline during my visit, to see how the local community gained through the provision of recycled water to the Kanmantoo mine site as well as to the Callington township for the upkeep of local parks and the oval. The project saw a resources company, the local council and state government all working together to develop improved economic and environmental outcomes.

Members would also be aware that the Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island region is home to some of the state's premier food and wine industries, so I also took the opportunity to visit and learn about some of these businesses and the economic opportunities in the area. I met with the manager and head cheesemaker of the award-winning Woodside Cheese Wrights, Ms Kris Lloyd. Members may not be aware that the Woodside Cheese Wrights is a specialist cheesemaker of goat and cow cheeses and produces fresh white mould and mature cheeses. I discussed her vision for expanding and promoting regional produce.

I also met with members of the Langhorne Creek Grape and Wine group and heard about their ideas for establishing a business and community hub for growing and supporting the tourism industry. In addition, I met with members of the Victor Harbor Business Association, which supports

local businesses, to gain their perspective on opportunities in the area. The trip was very valuable in gaining insights into the potential growth and development of opportunities in the region and also for visiting with representatives of the RDA committee. There was an opportunity to look at their Roadmap, which was very interesting and valuable, as well.

It was great to have the experience of exploring opportunities and projects with them. I was able to look firsthand at how communities can benefit from funding and the importance of sustainable growth in regional areas for South Australia's continued economic development. Obviously, I am committed to being a very strong advocate for those projects, particularly those that complement both state and commonwealth government priorities. I have a program to visit all the RDAs throughout the next number of months. I commenced that tour in the Riverland some time ago and will progress to visit all the regions over the coming months, and I look forward to it.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (14:42): I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's answer (and the answer specific to Kangaroo Island), is the minister lobbying the federal government and her cabinet colleagues to address the water gap issue that is holding back economic development on Kangaroo Island?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:42): I have previously visited and met with the Kangaroo Island Council, the mayor and various other board members there—

An honourable member: What is the mayor's name?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Jayne Bates. There are a number of issues for KI which I have been briefed on—a large number of issues and challenges that the council is facing. The state government is committed to working with the local council and other local stakeholders to work out a strategy to assist KI to move to a more sustainable state. Kangaroo Island is certainly deeply challenged at the moment and there will be a process of further negotiations and considerations to help, as I said, ensure that it has a sustainable future.

EDUCATION AND CARE SERVICES NATIONAL LAW ACT

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Families and Communities a question—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: 'Pick me before Brokie'; that's what he's saying.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: —regarding the proposed Education and Care Services National Law Act. That's never going to happen, David!

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Back in December 2009, the Council of Australian Governments agreed to a new national quality framework and legislation for early childhood education and care outside of school hours. Victoria was selected to host the legislation, and other states and territories agreed to adopt the legislation by reference, including South Australia. It has been raised with me that there are significant concerns regarding this proposed legislation from members of the community regarding this bill and its particular insistence on the model regulations and, in particular, draft regulation 86 which says that children may not be separated from other children except because of illness or accident and, further, that children must not be required to undertake any activities that are not compatible with the child's cultural values. These definitions are indeed very broad.

Indeed, one reading of the draft regulation 86 would imply that children who are misbehaving quite seriously cannot even be separated from others, as I understand is common practice at the moment, leaving childcare workers very few, if any, means to control bad and destructive behaviour. Further, the requirement that children cannot participate in any events that do not specifically align with their individual cultural perspectives would also seem to imply that childcare centres will not be able to put on Christmas or Easter celebrations of any form, as a result of these proposals.

The Western Australian community services minister, Robyn McSweeney, has called the proposed regulations 'left wing rubbish' and vowed to oppose them. My question to the minister is: is it the government's intention to introduce legislation which will put an end to separating

misbehaving children from the rest of the children who they are associated with in child care and which will also put a stop to Christmas and Easter plays and other activities in kindergartens and other places where children congregate?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for his questions and will refer them to the Minister for Families and Communities in another place and bring back a response.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question about recent scams affecting consumers. I am not talking about the scam of this shabby mob calling themselves an opposition: I am talking about other scams.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs continues to promote awareness of scams and will explore any initiative that will enhance delivery of the agency's objectives. My question is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Can you hear me, Mr President?

The PRESIDENT: No.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: You can't hear me. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs continues—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Thank you, Mr President. Thanks for your protection, sir.

The PRESIDENT: It seems that the Hon. Mr Wortley has this effect on the opposition every time he gets to his feet. The Hon. Mr Wortley.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Thank you, Mr President. The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs continues to promote the awareness of scams and will explore any initiative that will enhance delivery of the agency's objectives. My question to the minister is: will the Minister for Consumer Affairs advise the chamber about any concerns raised with the department of consumer affairs in relation to Mother's Day and provide advice as to how consumers can respond?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his ongoing interest in this very important policy area. Indeed, I would like to remind you of some of the traps that consumers should be aware of, particularly in the lead-up to Mother's Day, which I am sure we are all aware of in this place. Of course, increased shopping opportunities, unfortunately, attract scammers as well, so shoppers need to beware.

Consumers looking for that perfect gift for Mother's Day may be tempted to buy items that they might come across, particularly online, that seem very cheap and have been significantly reduced. Of particular concern this year are the scammers who use online classifieds and auction sites where, we understand, scam ads can easily be posted. We are concerned that consumers' money could easily be taken, leaving them out of pocket and without their gift.

Scam classified ads that appear can relate to any consumer item from pets through to jewellery or clothing. The scammer will often advertise an item at a very low price, generally much lower than the price of comparable products on that same site. Scammers may pretend to be selling an authentic branded item, so that is another ploy that we have become aware of. Then, when the item is delivered, it is obvious that the item is a very shoddy and shabby imitation of that branded item, or it may not be delivered at all. Of course, it can be extremely difficult to have people's hard-earned money returned to them.

Scammers will often try to deal outside of the site's secure payment facility. I want to make members aware of that. If you do go online, particularly at auction sites, do not be encouraged to go offline to secure your payment, because if you do that you then lose the protection that a lot of those site operators offer if the goods do not meet the expectation of the consumer.

Alternatively, scammers may claim that you are the winner of an auction, that you were in a bidding that has pulled out, and then offer to sell the item to you. Most online stores and auction sites are reputable; I need to qualify that, and most of them put a lot of effort into excluding dodgy operators, but shoppers should watch out for unscrupulous merchants.

So, be cautious. If the advertised price of an item looks too good to be true, the old adage that it probably is is as true today as it always has been. Do not trust the legitimacy of an ad just because it appears on a reputable online classifieds auction website; scammers post fake ads on those as well. Where possible, avoid any arrangement with a stranger who asks for upfront payment via money order, wire transfer or international funds transfer, because it is very rare that we can recover funds if they are paid for in that way and things go wrong.

I urge online shoppers to be aware of potential scams in the lead-up, particularly, to Mother's Day. Remember, do not just look at the amount that you are saving; you need to look at the potential to be ripped off. OCBA continues to use its regular media appearances and websites to promote awareness of scams and, obviously, we urge consumers to report any scam or suspected scam to OCBA or the ACCC, and they can do that either by telephone or online.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES, PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Correctional Services questions regarding people with disabilities, including mental illness, being held in our state's correctional facilities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Just last month, our nation heard the distressing tale of a man with an intellectual disability who was held for nine years in Western Australian prisons, despite not being convicted of any offence, or waiting to stand trial. I am sad to say that he is not the only person who was or, indeed, is detained in correctional facilities despite being declared unfit for trial or not guilty by reason of mental incompetence. I must say that this is not only a sad but an outrageous state of affairs.

Recently, I was told of a young man with an intellectual disability who was not guilty by reason of mental incompetence but was, nonetheless, held in a high security cell block at Yatala for his own safety, after no alternative facility was available to house him. This is not surprising, in view of the fact that James Nash House is, seemingly, the only facility that comes close to being appropriate in such circumstances. My questions for the minister are:

1. During the calendar years of 2008, 2009 and 2010, how many people were detained in our correctional facilities despite being found not guilty or deemed unfit to stand trial by reason of mental incompetence?
2. As at today's date, how many people are currently detained in our correctional facilities despite being found not guilty or deemed unfit to stand trial by reason of mental incompetence?
3. Since January of 2008, what is the longest period that someone has been detained in our correctional facilities despite being found not guilty or deemed unfit to stand trial by reason of mental incompetence?
4. Finally, when will the minister make adequate arrangements, such as a forensic disability service, to detain people with intellectual disability who have fallen foul of our criminal justice system?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions and will refer those to the relevant ministers—it is probably ministers, given that they do cut across a number of different portfolio areas—in another place and bring back a response. However, I would like to make a couple of general comments, given that it is not an area that I have responsibility for.

The honourable member touches on an extremely difficult issue that we face here in South Australia—and it is not just here in South Australia: it is around the nation and also internationally—in terms of having the sorts of facilities necessary to house or facilitate those people with particularly significant behavioural problems, particularly those with severe behavioural problems, that manifest in a way that either pose a significant risk to themselves or a significant risk to others.

Indeed, we attempt, wherever possible, to place these people in the best and most suitable place possible. I would have to accept that we could do more and need to do more. We have committed extra funding to upgrade the James Nash centre. In the meantime, however, we do the very best with what we have and we do attempt, as I said, wherever possible, to ensure that these people are not placed at risk, nor can they pose a risk to other people, and we do attempt to place them in the most suitable and very best facility available to us.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES TRIBUNAL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Acting Leader of the Government for an interim period on the subject of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On 7 October last year in the *Government Gazette*, the Rann Labor government announced the appointment of one Karen Marie Hannon as a member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal for a three-year period commencing on 6 October 2010. In the same gazette the government announced the appointment of Karen Hannon to the position of the Presiding Member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal for a term of three years commencing on 6 November 2010, which was one month later.

I understand the position of the presiding member is paid at approximately the equivalent rate to a stipendiary magistrate, which the current *Government Gazette* indicates is \$257,000 a year, plus a car. On the same date, the now Acting Leader of the Government on an interim basis but then just an ordinary minister, the Hon. Gail Gago, issued a press statement dated 7 October where she announced the appointment of Karen Hannon. She said she was a former managing partner of law firm Duncan Basheer Hannon. I quote:

Ms Hannon has previously held roles as lawyer and Inaugural Manager of the SA Unions' Workers Compensation Legal Service and Inaugural Director of the Members' Rights Centre for the Liquor Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers' Union (SA Branch). She is also currently Director of the South Australian Council of Social Services Board.

What the press release does not mention is that Karen Hannon is a Labor mate—amongst other things, was the Labor candidate in 1998 for the federal seat of Adelaide, and is also a personal friend of the minister. I am advised that approximately two to three years ago, in response to an expression of interest advertisement, Ms Hannon applied to be a member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal. As part of that particular process, all applicants had to be interviewed by a properly constituted panel to judge whether or not they were suitable to be a member of the tribunal.

I understand the particular panel that interviewed Ms Hannon included a representative of the former attorney-general's office. I am informed that Ms Hannon's application to be just a member of the tribunal was rejected by that properly constituted panel. I am further advised that late last year the minister intervened personally and directed that Karen Hannon not only be made a member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal but also be given the plum job of Presiding Member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal.

The Residential Tenancies Tribunal, as anyone who knows, is a very busy jurisdiction. Each member is required to handle or conduct hundreds of hearings a year. This includes the presiding member. I am advised that the former presiding member, Pat Patrick, had handled hundreds of cases on average per year. Generally the presiding member handles the most complex cases for the Residential Tenancies Tribunal.

I am also advised that the new presiding member initially advised all and sundry that she would not be participating in or handling any hearings at all. After some pressure, I am advised in the last couple of months she commenced participating in a limited number of hearings. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is it correct that approximately two to three years ago Ms Hannon applied to be a member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, was interviewed by a properly constituted panel, and was not successful in her application to be a member of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal?

2. Did the minister personally intervene and direct that Ms Hannon not only be appointed as a member of the tribunal but also be given the plum job of presiding member? If so, how does she justify to the taxpayers of South Australia the appointment of Ms Hannon to this position?

3. Will the minister take advice on the number of hearings the last presiding member, Pat Patrick, participated in in each of the financial years 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10, and how many hearings has the new presiding member, Karen Hannon, participated in for each month since October last year, since her appointment to the tribunal?

The PRESIDENT: Disregard the opinion in the question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (15:01): This is just a typical example of the Hon. Rob Lucas. It is just so typical of his bitter and twisted outlook on life. Really, he clearly has nothing better to do than to stoop down in the gutter and try to besmirch the good names and reputations of good people.

We see him come into this place time and time again, cowering under the privilege of this place, and in his bitter, twisted and warped way he seeks to besmirch and undermine. It is just disgraceful—absolutely disgraceful. It is sort of sad in a way. It is sad, because he is a former, albeit failed, treasurer, but to think that he has come from a position like that to this today is sad, really. I feel a bit sad for him that his career has ended in this gutter-sniping, degrading, low-life position. Nevertheless, we have come to expect nothing less.

As members may be aware, the former Residential Tenancies Tribunal president, Mrs Pat Patrick, resigned in November last year. Pat was appointed as the presiding member in 2000. I take this opportunity to put on the record my appreciation of the tremendous and valuable work she did: she was just marvellous to work with. I really enjoyed the time we had together, and I certainly wish her all the best for the future.

The presiding member must be a lawyer, a resident and also qualified to practise in Australia. The presiding member is also expected to ensure that the tribunal operates fairly and efficiently. The Governor appoints the presiding member, and the process for that is through a recommendation made by cabinet. This is a very typical way that these sorts of positions are appointed. The Liberal government did very similar things in making governors' appointments through recommendations through cabinet for many positions while it was in government. This is a very typical and usual way of proceeding. Cabinet went through that process. It made a recommendation to the Governor, and the Governor did indeed appoint her. I can quite categorically say that I made no direction on any person or persons.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: That's untrue, and you know it.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: No directions were made. You can't win in this place, Mr President. He comes into this place with lies and innuendo, and then when I seek to correct the record, he just simply refutes it. He has made himself look incredibly foolish yet again. As we know, he comes in here without facts and figures, shoots off his mouth, and he does not care whose name or reputation he ruins. He does not give a flying leap about these good people time and again—good public servants, good people who are committed and work hard for the government. He does not give a flying leap or have any care or concern about these people. It is a disgrace that he cowers under the protections and privileges of this place.

There were no directions made. The recommendations were made in the typical way that cabinet makes these decisions. As I said, cabinet considers applicants and then makes a recommendation to the Governor, and the Governor then appoints. It was made in a very typical way.

Ms Karen Hannon is an eminently suitable person for this role. She has extensive experience in decision-making, legal advocacy and staff supervision. She has been a partner in a firm where she has not only had a legal case load but she also had to manage organisational

matters. She has both legal expertise and skill and expertise in managing an organisation's staff and administrative operations. Those attributes were valued highly when cabinet considered these matters.

She also demonstrates a strong commitment to social justice issues, which is again a very important element. I understand that she has a great knowledge of issues related to community housing and also disputes resolution. I was absolutely delighted that she agreed to take up this appointment. She commenced the role on 8 November 2010. I have to say that she has done an extraordinarily good job since then, so I am very pleased to have her on board. As I said, she has done an extremely good job in that position.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES TRIBUNAL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:08): I have a supplementary question arising out of the answer. Why is the minister refusing to answer the question as to whether or not she applied for a position as a member of the tribunal, was interviewed by a properly constituted panel, and whether or not she was rejected by that panel some two to three years ago?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (15:08): That sort of process is completely out of my hands. I am not too sure when it happened; I am only taking it on the assertions of the honourable member. Goodness knows, it may not have happened at all, knowing his track record in this place. It was a process that was before my time as minister. I had nothing to do with the process. I can hardly be held accountable for the considerations and decisions of others made in a time long gone. The honourable member would need to ask those people involved.

WOMEN AT WORK INITIATIVE

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about the Women at Work project.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: No doubt members in this chamber are eagerly awaiting an update on the government's 2010 election commitment to develop a promotional campaign to encourage women to access training in high demand, non-traditional industries such as mining, defence and construction. Known as the Women at Work Initiative, the Office for Women, the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology and the Department of Education and Children's Services are joint partners in this initiative and continue to work with industry representatives to develop potential projects. Will the minister inform the chamber of the latest in the Women at Work project?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. We are all aware that the construction, mining and defence industries are growth areas here in South Australia. Historically, women's employment participation has been in female industries such as administration, child care, health care, education and retail, while growth industries such as construction, defence and mining have consistently low levels of female participation.

Apart from being an issue of equity, increasing the participation of women in these non-traditional areas is an economic issue. The Goldman Sachs JBWere report 'Australia's Hidden Resource: the economic case for increasing female participation' estimates that closing the gap between men's and women's employment in Australia will boost Australia's GDP by 11 per cent. According to the report's authors, other economic benefits of improving women's productivity include alleviating labour market shortages, lowering interest rates, raising income and demand, and improving public finances. That is why the Labor government made this election commitment.

I am pleased to advise the chamber that the joint partners in the Women at Work initiative have established a relationship with the Mining, Energy and Engineering Academy, which I shall refer to simply as 'the academy', and will be providing financial assistance to the Constructing Roads for a Bright Future program (Bright Future program). This program includes training for almost 40 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander men and women. Following completion of the program, I am advised that 32 men and women will be offered positions with John Holland

Construction to work on the urban superway extension at South Road, Wingfield. Fortunately, with the training under way, this program is progressing.

I remind members that these areas of work and training are in the area of non-traditional work for women. Obviously, it is going to take time to encourage women to view these as valid occupational choices, and that is why initiatives like Women at Work are so important. Not only do they allow us to publicise the economic opportunity areas, like construction, they offer for women, they also allow us to recognise barriers and develop strategies to overcome them. For example, I am advised that some feedback from the academy states that more flexible hours of training might help to increase the number of women choosing to take up this training.

This is an important lesson, and it can help to guide the development of future Women at Work projects. The Mining, Energy and Engineering Academy was established to support the competitiveness and productivity of the mining, energy and engineering industries by assisting with the industries' workforce requirements. To achieve this, the academy seeks to align the resources to develop existing employees and grow the pool of available skilled workers.

John Holland Construction is one of Australia's largest construction companies, and it is great to have a partnership with them. The training includes a 10-week pre-employment program run by the academy, including components in the following areas: things such as personal development leadership, computer training, technical training, civil construction and one-on-one mentoring and case management.

I am pleased to advise that the full-time training program commenced on 18 April and will run for approximately 10 weeks. Following completion of the course, the successful participants will commence their employment with John Holland, working on the precast stage of the project. I am advised that DFEEST's Employment Programs have contributed \$50,000 towards this program. I am also pleased to contribute \$15,000 towards the additional mentoring of the female participants involved in the program.

The Office for Women also funded the development of a flyer advertising the project, and I am advised that the Australian Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations contributed funding towards the project as well. The academy has subcontracted its mentoring program to a group that has a proven track record working with Aboriginal people and has worked previously with the academy and DFEEST on a similar ongoing employment project; I am told it was with Woolworths.

WESTERN MOUNT LOFTY RANGES DRAFT WATER ALLOCATION PLAN

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs, representing the Minister for Environment and Conservation, a question with regard to the Western Mount Lofty Ranges draft water allocation plan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: The National Water Initiative, to which South Australia is a signatory, provides the framework for a national water management plan incorporating water pricing, trading and regional water plans, amongst other things. The National Water Initiative describes water plans as:

statutory plans for surface and/or groundwater systems, consistent with the Regional Natural Resource Management Plans, developed in consultation with all relevant stakeholders on the basis of best scientific and socioeconomic assessment, to provide secure ecological outcomes and resource security for users.

The National Water Initiative also outlines the need to assess and consider socioeconomic impacts with regard to water planning and management of water.

I wholeheartedly support providing secure ecological outcomes and resource security for users; however, I am concerned that on 9 March 2011, when the minister organised a briefing for members of parliament to provide details on the draft Western Mount Lofty Ranges water allocation plan, it was discovered that socioeconomic factors had not been taken into consideration when developing the plan. My questions are:

1. How valid is a water allocation plan that ignores the guidelines and principles set out by the National Water Initiative?
2. Is the minister aware of any other parts of the National Water Initiative that have been ignored in the development of water allocation plans?

3. Is the minister comfortable with releasing a draft plan that does not take into account socioeconomic impacts?

4. Has the minister actually read the Western Mount Lofty Ranges water allocation plan; if so, and more importantly, did he understand it?

5. Will an assessment of socioeconomic impacts be conducted for future water allocation plans?

6. Given the divergence from this important guideline, will the minister now withdraw the draft plan?

7. Has a socioeconomic impact statement been provided on the recently announced Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges water allocation plan?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions, and will refer those to the relevant minister in another place and bring back a response. However, there are a few general comments I would like to make on this, because it is a very important area.

I have been advised that surface water, watercourses and groundwater resources in the Western Mount Lofty Ranges were prescribed back in October 2005. The prescription establishes a framework for the sustainable management of water resources and provides for more secure access to water for all water users, including the environment. The prescription of water resources in the Western Mount Lofty Ranges resulted from a number of technical assessments into the state and condition of water resources in the region, I am advised, and these assessments raised concerns about the impact of increasing demands for agricultural, industrial and domestic water supply. The assessments indicated that water resources may not meet future demand if unmanaged development continued.

The Mount Lofty Ranges water catchment area is vitally important to South Australia socially, economically and ecologically. The Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board has prepared a draft water allocation plan, to which the honourable member refers, for managing the allocation, transfer and use of available water. I am advised the draft plan is based on the best available science and takes into account community and industry advice and feedback. The draft plan must ensure sustainable environmental outcomes that balance environmental water provisions with water for development and other commercial use.

I am advised that three local water allocation plan advisory committees made up of community and industry members were established to engage local communities and provide advice to the board. The board also established key stakeholder groups to provide further input into the preparation of the draft plan. I am advised that these groups and committees have spent many hours going through each part of the draft plan and bringing to the table their knowledge of local areas and experience in running businesses that rely on water, and constantly considering the social, environmental and economic implications of every proposed policy, so I am advised, in the draft plan.

The notice of prohibition is currently in place to hold water use at current levels until the water allocation plan is adopted. I have been advised that extensive scientific and technical work has been undertaken by the board and the Department for Water to provide the information needed to make sound water allocation decisions. I am advised that the board undertook an initial round of community consultation to inform the development of the draft water allocation plan in late 2007.

I am advised that the board distributed over 2,500 information and discussion packs on topics including environmental water requirements, permits for new dams, well permits, forestry, aquifer storage and recovery, recycled and imported water and roof run-off. I understand that these information packs were followed up by five public meetings held across the region.

I am advised that the community and industry feedback gathered through this consultation process assisted in guiding and developing the draft plan, and I understand that the draft plan was subsequently released for community consultation on 13 October 2010, with 10 public meetings being held between 8 and 24 November. I am advised that all were well attended and were generally very positive. I understand that community consultation ended on 10 January 2011. I am advised that the board received 80 submissions during the statutory consultation period.

The board is currently reviewing these submissions and considering what changes should be made to the draft plan and, once this is complete, the board will forward the draft plan with the proposed amendments to the minister for consideration and, finally, adoption. I am advised that existing users will be issued with licences after the adoption of the plan. As can be seen from the advice that I have been given, indeed, the social, economic and environmental implications were in fact considered substantially throughout the development of this plan.

SUPPLY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:23): I rise as a matter of convention to support the second reading of the Supply Bill. In noting that, I will make some general comments about the nature of Supply Bill debates. I noted this morning the Hon. Mr Wortley's contribution. He spent a good part of his earlier contribution attacking the current Liberal Party of opposition, accusing them (in his words) of division and disunity, lack of leadership, etc. as part of his Supply Bill contribution. He then proceeded to attack former Liberal governments, going back through the period 1993 to 2002 for what he claimed to be maladministration, poor economic performance and poor fiscal management.

That has certainly been the nature and thrust of the current debate that we have got. I note, as I looked back in preparation for this Supply Bill debate, the contributions of Labor members over the years to the Supply Bill debate. I look at a contribution from the Hon. Mr Hunter to the Supply Bill debate in 2006, where he spent most of his time attacking the federal Liberal government and Peter Costello's budget and lauding the virtues of Kim Beazley and federal Labor, in his 2006 contribution.

Then, the most recent leader of the government in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Bernard Finnigan, in 2006, spent a good part of his time attacking prime minister Howard—who, he said, wasn't a hero of his—attacking industrial reforms and various policies of the federal Liberal government, and also, of course, attacking the policies of the former Liberal government during the period from 1993 to 2002. Then, to round it off, he started attacking state members of the Liberal Party in the House of Assembly and defending the preselection processes in the Labor Party, as part of the Supply Bill debate in 2006.

When one goes back to other contributions, the Hon. Carmel Zollo, in 2002, gave a lovely whimsical account of the joys of rural South Australia and Lisa and John Rowntree and their olive grove plantation at Coonalpyn.

The Hon. Carmel Zollo: What's wrong with that?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Nothing. I am just acknowledging the nature of the Supply Bill debates over the years. She talked about the industries of the West Coast and kingfish. She had her first kingfish meal 'late last year', in 2002. She talked about the tuna industry and her travels. The HIH industry collapsed nationally in 2002. She then concluded with discussion about how the Rann government was going to get tough on law and order, with a wonderful whisk through all the things that the Rann government was going to do in terms of introducing tough new legislation—

The PRESIDENT: All with the support of the Public Service.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —in relation to knives and all those sorts of things in nightspots, zero tolerance and lethal cocktails. She spoke about all those sorts of things in her, as I said, lovely whimsical contribution in 2002 to the Supply Bill debate.

The PRESIDENT: There is no relevance to supply in your contribution so far.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, they were all part of the Supply Bill debates, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: No; you're on your feet. The Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Indeed, with you in the chair this morning, Mr President, the Hon. Mr Wortley, spent, as I said, a good amount—

The PRESIDENT: No, I wasn't in the chair.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes, you were.

The PRESIDENT: No.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Yes you were. You were sitting in a chair when the Hon. Mr Wortley was there.

The PRESIDENT: It wasn't me.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: You were talking to another government member, but you were in the chair and the Hon. Mr Wortley was waxing lyrical, attacking the Liberal Party about division and disunity—

The PRESIDENT: No, he wouldn't have done that.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —and supposedly, a lack of leadership.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley wouldn't have done that.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Terry Roberts used to always give us a lovely contribution to Supply Bill debates about global and international issues as they related to the South Australian and national economies. This is all part of the Supply Bill contributions. He loved to talk about the problems of the manufacturing industry, of course, which was a great passion of his. He talked on many occasions about rural industries, as the Hon. Carmel Zollo did in 2002.

One can go back over the history of the Supply Bill debates of the last 30 years. In 1980, Chris Sumner, as the leader of the opposition, spoke about McLeay Bros, because he had some concerns about some of their practices in terms of consumer affairs and related it to the Corporate Affairs Commission. The then president of the day ruled: 'There is no reason why the Leader'—that is, the Hon. Mr Sumner—'cannot discuss the Corporate Affairs Commission' and, by inference, the problems that he saw, with McLeay Bros. That was on 27 August 1981.

Again, in 1986, the Hon. Terry Roberts was talking, as I said, at that time again about the manufacturing industry and the problems of global issues as they related to manufacturing in South Australia. The Hon. Terry Roberts was asked what the connection was and the president was going to rule as to whether it was part of the Supply Bill debate. This was president Levy, a Labor president, Mr President, from your particular faction, or your ex-faction, as well. The Hon. Mr Roberts said:

What I am projecting is that if the manufacturing sector does not have increased capital investment in the next financial year, the receipts and revenue to be distributed in forms of a revenue base will decline unless immediate action is taken.

The Labor president Levy ruled:

I accept that relevance to the Supply Bill debate.

There are many others who I have on the record in relation to the Supply Bill debate. I think it is to be encouraged, rather than trying to unduly restrict the Supply Bill debate, as acknowledged this morning by the Hon. Mr Wortley when you were in the chair, Mr President, when you allowed him to viciously attack the current Liberal opposition with his claims of lack of leadership, division and disunity. You were quite happy to allow that to be a contribution to the Supply Bill debate, Mr President.

He then proceeded to, again, viciously attack the former Liberal government's record, as he saw it, from 1993 to 2002, as part of the Supply Bill debate. Well, come on board. We welcome debate in this chamber. We do not resile from good, honest conflict of opinion, and I think it would be a travesty if the conventions of decades, under Labor and Liberal presidents, were to be inhibited in any way in terms of the Supply Bill debate.

That is why I was a little bit concerned that when my colleague the Hon. Jing Lee was giving, I think, a very good contribution in relation to issues which have relevance to the Supply Bill debate, you, Mr President, directed her back to matters that relate to the Supply Bill debate, but, as I said, no such direction was given to the Hon. Mr Wortley when he was viciously attacking the Liberal Party, its leadership and his perception that there was division and disunity.

I place that on the record because this debate is an important debate and I think it would be disappointing to see it (a) disappear, or (b) be inhibited or restricted in any way. The contribution from my colleague the Hon. Mr Dawkins, I think, was a very good example of where one can talk about, for example, branched broomrape, which is of particular interest to him and many in our rural constituency.

There is a contribution in the Supply Bill that goes towards the branched broomrape programs, but he does not have to talk about the actual provisions as they relate to the financing of

them, he can talk about the issue generally, the importance, the priority, or lack of priority, that governments have to it, the reasons why you need to spend money on branched broomrape, or why you do not, and those sorts of issues. That has always been the way with the Supply Bill debate. You allowed his contribution to continue, and I congratulate you on that, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: He said a public servant was driving the tractor, I think, or something.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Did he? I am not sure. You allowed that to continue and I think that is a healthy part of the Supply Bill debate. If I can now turn to matters strictly financial, in the first instance anyway, and note that the major change that we have seen in South Australia's financial management since the 2010 budget is that the former treasurer has been dumped from the position as treasurer.

I think it is important that, as we note his dumping from that position by his own colleagues, we look at the record of the former treasurer and the government as it relates to financial management. As I noted in my contribution yesterday afternoon, many commentators are referring to this government as the most secretive and most incompetent government in this state's history, and I added to that, the most scandal-prone government in this state's history as well.

I want to look at the issue of competence, or incompetence, as it relates to financial management. What we see is that after nine golden years, with the rivers of gold from the GST flowing into the coffers, from a GST deal that was negotiated by the former Liberal government, which the now Premier and the former treasurer, Mr Foley, derided as a lemon of a deal for the state of South Australia, we are now getting over \$4.5 billion a year in GST revenues.

As noted by one of the earlier speakers, I think the Hon. Mr Brokenshire, the size of the state budget back when this government was first elected was about \$7 billion to \$8 billion; it is now almost double that: \$16 billion. What we have seen is a doubling of the revenue—the income, the taxes, the receipts. I think the question to put to the people of South Australia—and I think we know the answer—is: can you see what this government has done with almost an extra \$8 billion a year in terms of additional revenue and income?

I think, without a doubt, everyone you put that question to will say, 'No, we can't see an \$8 billion improvement in the level and quality of services being provided by our state government.' In fact, for many of them, as my colleagues have highlighted, they are continually seeing a reduction in the level and quality of services being provided to them, in particular, our constituency in rural and regional South Australia, as my colleague the Hon. Mr Dawkins and others very accurately portrayed, and I will not go over the detail.

I seek leave to have incorporated into *Hansard* without my reading it a purely statistical table, Table 1.7 from Budget Paper 3.

Leave granted.

		2008-09 Actual	2009-10 Estimated Result	2010-11 Budget	2011-12 Estimate	2012-13 Estimate	2013-14 Estimate
Budget balances							
Net operating balance	\$m	-233	167	-389	55	216	370
Net lending	\$m	-872	-1,124	-1,791	-841	-194	126
Cash surplus	\$m	-721	-1,121	-1,773	-793	-139	163
Revenue and expenses							
Revenue real growth	%	1.8	12.3	-5.4	0.2	0.5	-0.7
Expenses real growth	%	7.4	9.2	-1.9	-2.7	-0.5	-1.6
Interest ratios							
Net interest to revenue(a)(b)	%	0.2	0.1	0.8	1.2	1.3	1.5
Net interest plus nominal superannuation interest to revenue(b)	%	3.1	3.1	3.6	4.0	4.0	4.0
Balance sheet indicators							
Net debt	\$m	475	1,587	3,335	3,633	3,864	3,847
Net debt to revenue	%	3.5	10.2	22.1	23.4	24.1	23.6
Unfunded superannuation	\$m	8,939	9,476	9,442	9,445	9,428	9,389
Net financial liabilities	\$m	11,562	13,271	15,096	15,558	15,967	16,105
Net financial liabilities to revenue	%	85.5	85.4	100.1	100.2	99.8	98.8
Net worth	\$m	24,146	25,192	25,392	26,162	27,245	28,379

Note: Real-terms calculations use the Adelaide Consumer Price Index.

- (a) Net interest does not include nominal superannuation interest cost.
- (b) Revenue does not include interest income.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This table, together with two others that I will have incorporated as well, is the damning indictment on this government and the former failed, dumped treasurer Foley. The first part of this table shows three separate measures of the health of the budget. Everyone will understand the health of their individual budgets—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. I.K. Hunter): Hon. Mr Lucas, were you seeking leave to have the other two tables incorporated as well?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, not yet. Thank you for your assistance, Mr Acting President. This table shows the health of the budget. As I said, everyone will understand the importance of balancing your budget. There are three separate measures that this government uses. One is called the cash measure, the second one is called net operating balance and the third one is the net lending balance.

The sad reality is that, after nine years of the rivers of gold, the former dumped, failed treasurer has left this 2010-11 budget with massive deficits on all three measures of the budget deficit or surplus. If you look at the cash-in/cash-out measure of the budget, this year's budget is estimated to be in deficit by \$1.7 billion just for this financial year. That is actually the measure that the federal government uses to measure the health of its budget. Believe it or not, all of the state jurisdictions have moved to what is known as accrual budgeting in terms of its headline budget figure, but for its own reasons the federal government continues to use the cash-in/cash-out measure of the budget.

If this was a federal budget being reported, the headline figure in *The Advertiser* would be \$1.7 billion deficit this year on the cash measure. When the former failed, dumped treasurer Foley was first elected back in 2002, he said, 'Look, there is only one real measure of the health of the budget, and that's the accrual measure called net lending.' I will not go into the techo description of that, but in layperson's terms it includes everything—accounting for, for example, long service leave, but also accounting for the payment of your capital works program.

He said that is the only real measure and that is what he was going to use to measure the health of the budget from 2002 onwards. He soon changed his mind. After about three years, when he could not get it into surplus, he then quietly jettisoned that measure, even though, as I said, he had said this was the only real measure of a budget. 'The Libs weren't prepared to do it; I am going to do it and we are going to do it.' On that measure, that is, the net lending measure, this year's budget is in deficit by \$1.79 billion, so the same as the cash measure. So, if we are reporting on the measure the former, failed, dumped treasurer Foley had proclaimed to be the only real measure, then the headline in the 'tiser would be: 'This year's budget \$1.79 billion in deficit'—just for this year. That is one year's in and out, the measure of all your expenditures—a \$1.79 billion deficit.

The one measure the former, failed, dumped treasurer, Mr Foley, used finally was the third measure, another accrual measure, called the net operating balance. That is the headline figure used now, and that is a deficit of \$389 million, so still very considerable but obviously much smaller than the other two measures, which are a \$1.7 to \$1.8 billion annual deficit. This one is a mere—if I can use that word advisedly—\$389 million deficit for this financial year.

We continue to get attacks by people like the Hon. Mr Russell Wortley, attacking the former Liberal Government in relation to its fiscal management as it sought to fix the problems of the State Bank debacle, but here we see, after eight or nine years of the rivers of gold from the GST deal, through the debt being paid down through the ETSA privatisation, the former, failed, dumped treasurer Foley and the Labor government here in South Australia delivering massive deficits in 2010-11 because they have not been able to balance their budgets right across the board.

The rest of that table, 1.7, is a damning indictment as well of the government, but time today will not permit me to go through it in any greater detail. I now seek leave to have incorporated into *Hansard* without my reading it table B.2 from Appendix B of Budget Paper 3, a purely statistical table.

Leave granted.

Table B.2: General government key balance sheet aggregates (\$million)^(a)

As at 30 June	Net debt ^(b)	Unfunded superannuation ^(c)	Net financial liabilities	Net financial worth	Net worth
1988	859				
1989	694				
1990	854				
1991	1,817				
1992	4,610				
1993	7,884				
1994	7,113				
1995	5,815				
1996	5,512				
1997	4,983				
1998	4,762				
1999	4,779	3,909	9,733	1,894	10,624
2000	1,920	3,543	6,911	2,986	12,445
2001	1,246	3,249	6,093	4,091	14,816
2002	1,303	3,998	6,907	3,559	14,721
2003	666	4,445	6,974	3,500	15,288
2004	224	5,668	7,858	3,842	15,760
2005	144	7,227	9,393	3,853	16,359
2006	-119	6,146	8,171	5,846	19,703
2007 ^(d)	-24	5,075	254	8,110	22,128
2008 ^{(e)(f)(g)}	-276	6,468	8,078	7,580	23,741
2009	475	8,939	11,562	5,551	24,146
2010	1,587	9,476	13,271	5,155	25,192
2011	3,335	9,442	15,096	3,898	25,392
2012	3,633	9,445	15,558	3,717	26,162
2013	3,864	9,428	15,967	4,301	27,245
2014	3,847	9,389	16,105	5,099	28,379

- (a) During the implementation of the 2008 revised uniform presentation framework (UPF) minor variances in some aggregates compared with earlier budget publications were discovered. This table reflects minor revisions resulting from the back-casting of budget aggregates associated with implementing the revised UPF.
- (b) Net debt data for the years before 1999 are sourced from Australian Bureau of Statistics, Government Financial Estimates 2003-04 (Catalogue no. 5501). (c) There is a structural break in the methodology used to calculate superannuation liabilities between June 2003 and June 2004. This accounting change, which involved the adoption of Commonwealth Government bond rate for valuation purposes in line with AASB 119, Employee Benefits, resulted in a significant increase in superannuation liabilities.
- (d) There is a structural break in 2007 reflecting the amalgamation of SAFA and SAICORP on 1 July 2006. The transfer of SAICORP's assets and liabilities from the general government sector to the public financial corporations sector resulted in an increase in general government net debt of \$99 million at 1 July 2006 and an increase in net financial liabilities of \$90 million at 1 July 2006.
- (e) There is a structural break in 2008 reflecting the transfer of rail assets from TransAdelaide to the general government sector. This results in an increase in net debt and net financial liabilities of \$66 million in 2007-08 and a reduction in net financial worth of \$591 million, with no impact on net worth.
- (f) There is a structural break in 2008 reflecting the transfer of assets from the Adelaide Festival Centre Trust to the general government sector. This results in an increase in net debt and net financial liabilities of \$28 million in 2007-08, and a reduction in net financial worth of \$76 million, with no impact on net worth.
- (g) There is a structural break in 2008 reflecting the first time recognition on the general government balance sheet of South Australia's share of the net assets of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. This has no impact on net debt, however results in a reduction in net financial liabilities of \$615 million in 2007-08, and increases in net financial worth and net worth of \$615 million.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: No-one here to grant it.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It is very disappointing, Mr Acting President: there is not only not a minister but no government member on the government benches. It is obviously too embarrassing for government members to take their thrashings in terms of fiscal management. This table B.2 is headed 'General government key balance sheet aggregates'. The particular section of that to which

I want to draw the attention of members and those 27 readers of *Hansard* who will see this table is the net debt column.

First, general government is not the total public sector and does not include, for example, areas like the housing trust and what are called non-financial public corporations. It is a narrower section of the budget. That table shows, when one goes back over the years, that net debt in South Australia peaked at \$7.8 billion in 1993 at the time of the State Bank debacle, and then through the period of 2001-02, the change of government, it had been reduced significantly through the long-term lease of electricity assets from \$7.8 billion down to just over \$1 billion. Through the early part of the government administration, with all the rivers of gold flowing into the coffers and surpluses in the early days, it become almost a zero net debt—slightly above zero and slightly below on certain occasions.

What we now see on that measure of debt, increasing from the levels just post the ETSA privatisation, is it now climbing again by 2014 to \$3.8 billion. I will address some comments also to another table. I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it. It is purely statistical, table B.9, 'Non-financial public sector key balance sheet aggregates' in Budget Paper 3.

Leave granted.

Table B.9: Non-financial public sector key balance sheet aggregates (\$million)

As at 30 June	Net debt ^(a)	Unfunded superannuation ^(b)	Net financial liabilities	Net financial worth	Net worth
1988	4,397				
1989	4,197				
1990	4,457				
1991	5,418				
1992	8,142				
1993	11,610				
1994	10,550				
1995	8,844				
1996	8,432				
1997	8,170				
1998	7,927				
1999	7,657	3,909	13,099	-12,256	10,624
2000	4,355	3,543	9,914	-8,986	12,445
2001	3,223	3,249	8,151	-7,109	14,816
2002	3,317	3,998	8,973	-7,902	14,721
2003	2,696	4,445	9,096	-8,811	15,288
2004	2,285	5,668	10,031	-9,550	15,760
2005	2,126	7,227	11,511	-11,004	16,359
2006	1,786	6,146	10,451	-9,889	19,703
2007 ^(c)	1,989	5,075	9,518	-8,795	22,128
2008 ^{(d)(e)}	1,611	6,468	10,208	-10,487	23,741
2009	2,872	8,939	14,302	-14,921	24,146
2010	4,864	9,476	16,901	-17,168	25,192
2011	7,101	9,442	19,253	-19,499	25,392
2012	7,209	9,445	19,513	-19,623	26,162
2013	7,360	9,428	19,835	-19,745	27,245
2014	7,545	9,389	20,191	-19,939	28,379

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

- (e) There is a structural break in 2008 reflecting the first time recognition on the general government balance sheet of South Australia's share of the net assets of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. This has no impact on net debt, however results in a reduction in net financial liabilities of \$615 million in 2007-08, and increases in net financial worth and net worth of \$615 million.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This is the most damning table, because it shows the total net debt, taking into account all of the statutory authorities, etc., in South Australia. Total net debt at the time of the State Bank debacle was \$11.6 billion in South Australia and, by the time of the change of government in 2001-02, that \$11.6 billion had dropped to just over \$3 billion, so it was a decline of \$8.5 billion dollars in terms of the total non-financial public sector net debt.

From that low it is now being predicted by this government and the policies of the former, failed, dumped treasurer, Mr Foley, to reach \$7.5 billion by the end of the forward estimates, that is, 2013-14. Just to repeat: from \$11.6 billion down to just over \$3 billion; now that number is climbing steeply to \$7.5 billion in terms of net debt. That, of course, does not include the particular issues as they relate to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and others—and I will address some comments to those issues in a moment—but this is the actual measure of net debt without those particular issues being incorporated.

So we are seeing more than a doubling of the net debt in South Australia being predicted by the policies of the former, failed, dumped, Labor treasurer, Mr Foley. That is the structure of this Supply Bill. Table B9 shows the total net financial liabilities, and you add in the unfunded superannuation, which is around about \$9 billion. It was down to just over \$3 billion at the change of government, and again it has increased by over \$6.3 billion under this Labor government.

What we see with the net financial liabilities is that at the change of government they were at a low of \$8.1 billion, and in 2014 they are predicted to be \$20.2 billion. So you are talking about your financial liabilities as a state having jumped from \$8.1 billion to \$20.2 billion under the policies of the former, failed, dumped Labor treasurer, Mr Foley.

So, Mr Acting President, I am not surprised that you and others within the caucus took the view that you did, that enough was enough and that something had to be done, that the former, failed, dumped treasurer, Mr Foley, needed to be gotten rid of, preferably out of the parliament altogether, but at the very least the first step was to get him out of the treasury chair and to at least try somebody else. I must admit I have no confidence in the person who has been placed there, but—

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. I.K. Hunter): The member might like to try to go back to some semblance of relevance.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Well, Mrs Acting President, you will be delighted to know that, in terms of precedents in the Supply Bill debate, I was very pleased to quote your contribution of 2006, where you spent the entire speech attacking Peter Costello, John Howard and the federal budget. I am sure you will find that my contribution is much closer to the Supply Bill debate than your contribution, which attacked John Howard, Peter Costello and the federal budget in 2006.

The ACTING PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Lucas will try to apply some semblance of relevance to his closing remarks.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They are not closing remarks, Mr Acting President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT: It's a shame.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —they are my opening remarks; I'm just starting. I now want to turn to what we were told prior to the election in terms of financial management and commitments. Mr Acting President, I am sure you will note that your acting leader for an interim period during debate this afternoon in my view quite erroneously accused me of telling lies on a frequent basis in this chamber.

If that is the language that we are allowed to use, my criticism goes back to the statements that have been made by your representatives, Mr Acting President—your Premier and your Treasurer—prior to the election, I think, in the words of the acting leader, on an interim basis in this chamber of the government, that the Premier and the then treasurer told lies to the people of South Australia prior to the state election and knowingly told lies to the people South Australia in the period leading up to the election about a number of key issues, some of which I am now going to outline.

The key lie, we know, was the lie in relation to Adelaide Oval, and that was in relation to what the former, failed, dumped treasurer, Mr Foley, said prior to the election, even when challenged during the election, by me as it turned out, that I had been provided with information that there had been a \$100 million blowout in the cost of the Adelaide Oval project and that the government had been advised. The lie that was told by Mr Foley, Mr Rann and others was, first, that there was no blowout; and, secondly, that they had received no advice at all about a blowout in the cost of the Adelaide Oval project.

That was a lie and, in the end, the former, failed, dumped treasurer Foley had to admit to that when football and cricket representatives were about to meet with the opposition post the election in terms of what they had advised the former treasurer, and that was that there was an estimated blowout of \$100 million in the cost of the project—that it could not be done for 'not a penny more than \$450 million', as we heard prior to the election.

So, the former treasurer then fessed up and said that he had forgotten about the meeting; he had forgotten about being told; he had forgotten about being advised of the \$100 million blowout; he had forgotten about everything in a most convenient way. Well, no-one in his own caucus believes that, no-one in this parliament believes that, and no-one in the South Australian community believes that. One of the problems this government has is when it thinks it can get away with such bald-faced lies like that to the people of South Australia, both before the election and since the election.

The same thing with the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which, of course, has had much prominence in the last few weeks, I guess. Prior to the election, we were told that it was definitely \$1.7 billion. The first lie was that, late in the year before the election, cabinet had approved an increase in the budget from \$1.7 billion to \$1.8 billion—an increase of a lazy \$100 million in the cost of the project. Yet all through the election campaign, the bald-faced lie that was being told by the Premier, the former treasurer and the current Minister for Health was that their advice was that it was \$1.7 billion and it would be built for \$1.7 billion, when each of them separately and all of them collectively as a cabinet had approved an increase in the budget from \$1.7 billion to \$1.8 billion.

How do we know that? Because the Auditor-General, subsequent to the election, reported on that. So, as I said, a lazy \$100 million blowout at that stage being acknowledged. Of course, what we have seen subsequently is now the revelations from the Macquarie Bank prospectus, and that is being debated at great length now. Again, that reveals the starkness of the bald-faced lies that we were all told prior to the state election and subsequent to the election as well. The media reported today that the total up-front cost is \$2.7 billion. The cost of the total payments over the 30 years of the concession are approximately \$11 billion over the period of the PPP deal that is being conducted.

When one looks at the information that has been leaked to the media, evidently, it indicates, for example, that the service payment in 2016 (the first year) is \$257 billion. In 2021, it will be \$367 billion; in 2027, it will be \$377 billion. It peaks in 2031 at \$391 million, and then in 2036 it is \$370 million. There are another 10 years after that, but for some reason the document does not include further estimates of the service payments. That is an issue that will need to be pursued but, on any sort of rough estimate of the average payments, it is close to \$11 billion in total payments for the hospital.

I guess this is one of the problems this government has, because in the areas I have highlighted it has told so many bald-faced lies to the people of South Australia that, frankly, people just do not believe this government or its ministers on virtually anything. I assume it will occasionally be the case that the government tells the truth, but it is almost impossible to know, because it has told so many bald-faced lies to the people of South Australia that people just will not know when what they are being told is truthful and factual or when it is just another big, bald-faced lie like the ones they were told prior to the state election.

When one goes through that document it is obviously going to be an issue, although I suspect it might be closed down. Other committees of the parliament might look at it but, knowing the Budget and Finance Committee, I would imagine that when Health and Treasury bureaucrats come, at the very least—it may well be even more intensive than this—there will be some close questioning done.

I know that we have always been told—the parliament and the public have been told by the ministers, and the Budget and Finance Committee has been told by bureaucrats—that, on the

issue of contamination, other than some initial site works, the total cost of the contamination would be the costs of the project and the consortium. That was always what we have been told. Look at what is now being leaked; on the issue of contamination; these are the key terms of the project agreement:

Subject: Contamination

The consortium [that is, SAHP] must conduct detailed due diligence on the site to ascertain the suitability and adequacy of the site. SAHP is responsible for remediating any contamination on the site. There is a compensation regime whereby the state will be responsible for 80 per cent of the cost of remediation of unknown, pre-existing contamination and 100 per cent of contamination caused by the state.

Let us be clear about that: the compensation regime is that the state will have to pay the consortium for any clean-up of 100 per cent of the contamination caused by the state and 80 per cent of the cost of remediation of any unknown, pre-existing contamination.

That is completely contrary to the commitments that the Premier, the former failed, dumped treasurer and the current health minister have been giving for some period of time. It is certainly contrary to the evidence given by senior bureaucrats to parliamentary committees such as the Budget and Finance Committee. That is the problem; that is just another problem that we have with this administration, with this government, in terms of how it manages major projects. The information now in the public arena will lead to extraordinarily close scrutiny of the statements made by the Premier, the former failed, dumped treasurer, the current Treasurer and the current health minister in relation to this particular project.

It is huge project. The issue that is not widely understood is the reason, or one of the major reasons, it is being done as a PPP. If it was done in the traditional public sector procurement method—that is, the normal way that we build schools and hospitals—then over this next five years or so, from 2011 to 2015-16, when it is built, the total cost (whether it is \$1.7 billion or \$2.7 billion, which appears likely now with the Macquarie Bank) of that \$2.7 billion has to be included in the budget measures in the budget documents. As you build a school for \$50 million it goes on the budget documents and it is part of your capital works expenditure and it is part of your net debt. So that \$50 million for your local high school or primary school, or whatever it is, goes on your budget aggregates. It has to be included and, therefore, has to be budgeted for.

So, if it was done in the traditional way, the former, failed, dumped treasurer (Mr Foley) and the current Treasurer would have had to have included in their forward estimates portions of the \$2.7 billion for each of those financial years up until the end of the current forward estimates, which is 2013-14, and then in the next lot of forward estimates for 2014-15 and 2015-16. The amount of \$2.7 billion is a huge chunk of any budget. The total budget is around about, as I said, \$16 billion, and \$2.7 billion is a huge chunk to absorb.

The PPP allows that, for the next five years, you do not have to include anything in your operating accounts. You do not have to include anything in your capital payments because the private sector has, through the investors, through Macquarie and others, pulled together the capital, borrowed the money, and financed the \$2.7 billion. So, nothing has to appear in that period in terms of your annual operating expenses or your annual capital works expenses in your budget aggregates.

However, what happens in 2016 when this hospital gets turned over—albeit, at the moment, it looks like it does not have a lot of the equipment and stuff in there and that will have to be paid for by the taxpayers over and above the financing arrangements with the hospital? From 2016 onwards you have to then start budgeting somewhere between \$260 million and \$390 million a year for the next 30 years to pay for it. That will be an annual operating expenditure, part of your net operating balance costs and, therefore, an impact on your net operating balance but will not happen until 2016.

Of course, this government is working on the basis that it is not going to be in government after 2014. It is in there for its last hurrah. It is not interested in the long-term measurement in terms of the impact of this budget on the state's finances. Essentially, what it is saying is, 'We are going to have a ride for four years until 2014.' The Premier is going to retire or be ushered off into the horizon if the left has its way next year or late this year. The former, failed, dumped treasurer will leave the parliament and this government assumes (this is its judgement) it is not going to be around from 2014 onwards. Therefore, it does not worry about what the impact on the budget is going to be from 2016-17 onwards.

All the government was worried about was winning the 2010 election and having a couple of monuments. The former, failed, dumped treasurer wants to have a statue erected of him outside the new Royal Adelaide Hospital because he believed in the magnificence of his own work, and that it should be recognised by a statue outside the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. All they are interested in is monuments to their time in office. They could not give a continental about who is going to have to pay for it after the 2014 election. Whether it is \$250 million a year or \$400 million a year, or whatever it is, for how many years it has to be, that will be a cost for our children and for our grandchildren in terms of the payment for that project.

Now, in the past, the primary guideline for doing a PPP was only when it could be demonstrated by Treasury and to the auditor-general that it was cheaper than doing it through the public method. This government breached that guideline when they went down the super schools path. Up until then, they had said they would never do a PPP unless it was shown to be cheaper than what is called the public sector comparator; that is a model which is done by Treasury and the public service to indicate, 'This is what it would cost to deliver it if we did it the traditional way. This is how much it will cost if you do it through a PPP. We will only do it if it is value for money and if the PPP is cheaper than the public sector comparator.'

As I said, that was their guideline up until the super schools PPP. When they found that it was actually going to be \$9 million or \$10 million more expensive than the public sector comparator to do the PPP for the super schools, they threw that guideline out the window. They said, 'We are not going to worry about that. We want to go down the super schools path.' Again, the financial advantage to them was they did not have to find the money up-front. The future generations would have to pay the cost of that over the period of whatever it is—20 or 30 years—for the super schools project as well.

So, that guideline, which is an essential guideline for proceeding down the path of PPPs, is a guideline which has to be (or should be) followed for this PPP but also future PPPs as well, if they are to be contemplated. We should only be moving down these particular paths if we can demonstrate that they are value for money and they are cheaper than the public sector comparator.

I did have a further significant contribution in relation to the many examples of government waste that have been demonstrated through the work of the Budget and Finance Committee and through my colleagues in another place. Given the time this afternoon, I now do not propose to go through all of the details of those. I am sure there will be other occasions when we will be able to highlight those particular examples of waste.

I indicate, in general response, that we constantly get the interjection from government members, 'Well, what would you do instead?' It is quite clear what we would do, that is, cut the significant examples of waste we have seen right across the board. We issued a document prior to the 2010 election with many of those examples of cutbacks: the Public Sector Performance Commission, the Centre for Social Innovation, the Social Inclusion Board, Thinkers in Residence, government spin doctors, etc.

Many of those we listed then are still applicable today in terms of the massive areas of government waste that we see through departments and agencies. That is where we should be cutting the budgets at the moment, rather than the weight disorder units at Flinders, rather than the Keith hospital, in terms of the health system, rather than the quality of some of our outback roads.

These are not the priorities for expenditure cutbacks. Have a look at some of the other pet projects that the Premier and this government have indulged themselves in over the last eight or nine years. There is plenty of fat in the system that can be cut before the sorts of cuts that they have been implementing over the last couple of budgets.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:08): I rise to speak relatively briefly on the Supply Bill. The Attorney-General brags that he has commissioned 14 reviews in his time as Attorney-General, yet there have been very few outcomes from these consultations. The Attorney-General might enjoy consultation, but consultation is not an end in itself: it is only a means to an end—an outcome. Those outcomes we do see are so often flawed in many respects. Much of the increased legislative activity of this council since the last election is as a result of the flawed work of the Attorney-General.

When amendments are made by this place, we often find that the bills are returned to us without any accommodation. The arrogance of this government is staggering. They have an almost religious conviction that their proposals are perfect and have no scope for improvement. Often,

they maintain that view in the face of those proposals being rejected by a full two-thirds of this council.

Getting an outcome from a consultation with the government is almost as hard as getting copies of submissions from the Attorney-General. Despite using all the trappings of the department to run the consultations, the Attorney-General fails to be open and transparent. The government is afraid of criticism, it is afraid of anything that challenges its point of view.

On some matters the Attorney-General is having narrowly focused consultations, including only a small number of stakeholders in decisions that impact on whole industries and, at times, all South Australians. I would like to focus my comments today on the broad public consultations, particularly consultations on bills.

The Liberal Party is committed to openness and transparency. We consider that openness and transparency in government are vital for a healthy liberal democracy. The development over recent decades of freedom of information and whistleblower legislation is testimony to the commitment of this parliament to that fact.

Consultation with the community on issues affecting them is also vital for quality decision-making. On this point I would recognise the well developed process for consultations on parliamentary bills which have developed in the Attorney-General's Department over a number of years.

Of course, the team of Attorney-General's Department advisers who manage the development of policy and bills and consultations on them is resourced through the Appropriation Bill and the Supply Bill, which is before us this afternoon. I am concerned that the government is winding back the openness and transparency of these processes and in that sense it is going against the flow of more freedom of information.

I have taken the position, as shadow attorney-general, that community input into bills through formal consultation is some of the most relevant information that this parliament could have available to it, and it should be available to the parliament. It is relevant because it reflects community views. It is relevant because it is the material which the government implicitly claims it is taking into account in finalising bills that are considered by this place.

I have established the practice of asking for copies of all submissions to consultations in relation to draft bills when the government briefs me on the bills when they are subsequently tabled in parliament. The problem here is that the requests are not being acceded to. In some cases, even though the notes of the meeting record such a request, the government is denying that a request has been made.

I have also developed the practice of lodging freedom of information requests on consultations on bills. There are a range of problems with this approach. First, the information may not be provided by the time the parliament considers the matter. It is not just that bills may be considered within 12 days of being tabled and FOI requests take three times longer, but the processes for parliamentary groups is such that papers for party meetings need to be prepared in advance; in other words, less than 12 days.

It is not realistic to say, 'Just FOI it', which is what we are being told by the government. The information may involve cost. One recent FOI application in relation to a bill before this place, I was told, would cost almost \$1,500. To be charged \$1,500 for information from the public, from my constituents, on a bill that the government wants me to support without being fully informed, I find offensive.

There is also a growing trend for the Attorney-General's Department to claim exemptions under FOI. One of the early FOI requests I made on a bill was in relation to the weapons bill and, I must admit, I was delighted with the range of material that arrived and it was instrumental in informing much of the opposition's contributions to that debate. In fact, I am sure that honourable members would have recognised opposition amendments in submissions from community organisations.

There has been a growing trend for the Attorney-General's Department, in particular, to be more vigorous in claiming exemptions under the FOI Act. On one application an officer was suggesting to me that they were going to contact all submitters on an application in terms of documents affecting personal affairs. There was no suggestion that an assessment had been made as to whether the documents had any elements of personal affairs in them, it was just

assumed that would be a good thing to do. I reminded the officer to consult section 6 of the act, and I understand that did not occur.

I had a range of other exemptions claimed, exemptions such as: the material is confidential and it might be reasonably expected to prejudice the future supply of information. I find it incredible that you could suggest that the community will stop communicating with its government because it might dare to tell the opposition. After all, the opposition may well be the government. I find that stakeholders, overwhelmingly, are keen to engage both sides, yet the government wants to twist the Freedom of Information Act to deny access and information.

The fourth problem I find in terms of using the FOI Act for collecting material on consultations on bills is that an FOI application by its definition is an application from one person. As this government so often forgets, this parliament consists of 69 members. There are five parliamentary groups—the Liberal Party, the Labor Party, the Greens, Family First and d4d. There are a further five or six Independents, depending on how you want to count them. That means there are 10 or 11 political entities in this parliament.

If there is an FOI application from myself as shadow attorney-general, that is one set of information going to one member of 69. I would suggest to the government that it is bizarre to suggest that freedom of information is an appropriate mechanism to distribute information in relation to consultation on public bills because, after all, we would otherwise have a huge waste of public resources as 69 members—or at least 11 political entities—are each making their own application to the government for an FOI. It is not in the spirit of FOI. FOI is not to provide people access to appropriate information in the public domain. It is not meant to be a locked door to information: it is meant to be a facilitator where that door is not otherwise open.

The Liberal Party (for its part) is committed to transparency and accountability. We support disclosure of submissions made by organisations and members of the public in relation to public consultation on draft public bills and issues papers leading to bills. Doing so we believe would have three particular outcomes. First of all, it would promote openness in government and accountability of ministers of the Crown and other government agencies, enhance respect for the law and further the good government of the state. Those of us who are good students of the Freedom of Information Act would recognise those as key phrases from that act.

Secondly, we believe that openness would enhance the quality of the legislative process. Thirdly, we believe that it would reassert the parliament in the legislative process vis-a-vis the executive. We understand that the Premier has been forced to back down on his latest attempt to undermine this council—I understand a second minister will be appointed. However, having two ministers in this place can just mean one more person to say no.

The executive needs to remember that it does not own the people and their views. The executive are the servants of the community, accountable through the parliament. When the executive receives the community views on a bill through consultation, I think it is arrogant for the government to micromanage the conversation and deny access to those documents to the wider parliament. After all, the consultations I am focusing on are not consultations on government policy. The government from time to time will want to consult about how it manages this issue and that, and much of that will involve the way the government organises itself and develops and implements its policies. However, here I am focusing on proposed parliamentary bills.

Bills are the key business of the parliament, not the executive. The parliament is the arbiter of the bills. The executive may have the resources to develop bills that other members lack, and for that matter a head start in any vote in this parliament, but, in the end, it is the parliament that makes the laws. Members of the executive need to remember that they are first and foremost members of this parliament. While they can be a member of parliament without being a member of the executive, they cannot be a member of the executive without being a member of parliament.

The Liberal Party has decided that, as a matter of principle, all submissions on public bills or issue papers on public bills issued by the Attorney-General or the Attorney-General's Department should be made available to parliamentarians at the time the bill is tabled. We hope that the government will see the value of this openness and transparency but, if not, we will be seeking the support of members of this council to support us in establishing this principle as the standard practice in South Australian public law development and the practices of the Parliament of South Australia.

Given the lack of cooperation of the government in response to direct requests and freedom of information requests, the opposition has decided that we will seek the support of the

parliament to force the government to embrace transparency. This is a principle of good practice that we are seeking to establish. There will be exceptions, but the default position should be disclosure. The presumption should be that, if submissions are not available, the bill should not progress. I suggest that it would facilitate this process for the government to make a clear statement when it calls for submissions that all submissions will be made public.

Depending on the subject matter of the consultation, it may be more appropriate in some instances to give people the opportunity to indicate whether they consider the material they are providing is confidential. However, on the whole, considering we are talking about public consultation on public bills, people who make submissions to public consultations expect their submissions will be broadly distributed.

In any event, just as the FOI Act does not give people a veto over the release of documents relating to them, the opposition does not think that it is appropriate that people, corporations and organisations should be able to cart blanche insist that their submissions to government are kept confidential. The opposition will be vigilant to resist any attempt by government to try to manipulate the consultation processes by encouraging assertions of confidentiality.

In terms of the parliament insisting on access to submissions, on behalf of the opposition I commit to working with the government and with the crossbench MPs to develop sensible, practical principles for the disclosure of information and appropriate transitional arrangements, and we do expect an evolving process. As an opposition we believe that the parliament and the government of South Australia are at the point where we are mature enough to expect full disclosure of consultation on public bills before they enter this parliament.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (16:21): I thank honourable members. Given that there are no further second reading contributions, I will make a few closing remarks. This bill provides for government service delivery until the budget has been passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2011 receives assent. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given the main Appropriation Bill.

In closing debate on this bill I reiterate the achievements of this government in fiscal management. Careful management of the state's operating position has put the state in a position to embark upon record investment in critical infrastructure that will provide benefits to South Australians for many years to come. The last budget provided more than \$10 billion of infrastructure spending over the next four years. The government has also delivered tax cuts in recent years to help both businesses and individuals and to secure future growth.

In total, it is estimated that, once all measures have been brought in the government will have reduced taxes on a cumulative basis by around \$4.6 billion by 2013-14. This is not a trivial sum and will help boost private enterprise, which is still feeling the after effects of a global recession. The last state budget provided extra investment over the next four years in areas that affect the lives of South Australians every day: \$883.5 million more investment in health; \$156 million more investment in education; and \$525.4 million more investment in transport.

Also, over the next four years the government has provided for an extra \$137.7 million in alternative care funding for vulnerable children (this was on top of an extra \$25.2 million in 2009-10); an extra \$70.9 million for Disability SA on top of the extra \$13.8 million specifically for disability equipment; and an extra \$4.2 million for children with autism.

I again remind the house that this government has increased energy, water and sewerage and fixed property emergency services levy concessions for pensioners. We also extended the energy and emergency services levy concession to low income earners. Prudent management of operating spending has enabled these investments to be delivered, while keeping borrowings at a manageable level.

Through prudent financial management this government has maintained the state's AAA credit rating against a backdrop of global recession, a global recession which saw other advanced economies suffer. This government took the difficult decision to reduce jobs in the Public Service. This government does not hide from cutting back on administrative aspects in the Public Service by reducing the number of executives. What the opposition will not tell you, though, is that

this government has also invested in new front-line public sector jobs, with nearly 2,000 new, full-time equivalent employees, who will fully carry out the promises the government took to last year's election.

Despite the criticism from across the chamber, I remind members that the government's fiscal record speaks for itself: AAA credit rating, better hospitals and more doctors, nurses, police and teachers, and more than \$10 billion invested in infrastructure over the next four years. At this point I wish to thank all honourable members who contributed to the second reading debate for their support.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (16:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WOODVILLE WEST URBAN RENEWAL PROJECT

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (16:27): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the significant milestone for the Woodville West Urban Renewal Project made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Hon. Jennifer Rankine.

HEALTH SERVICES CHARITABLE GIFTS BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 22 March 2011.)

Clause 15.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 7, lines 18 and 19 [clause 15(c)]—Delete 'the Investment Advisory Committee established in Schedule 2 and any other body' and substitute:

any person or body

At the outset, I would like to thank minister Hill, his adviser, Ms Alexandra Keen, and departmental staff, Mr Rob Smetak and Mr Andrew Thompson, for their cooperation in relation to my amendments to this bill. Minister Hill has listened to my concerns, and his staff have worked collaboratively with my office in an effort to reach an acceptable compromise. Again, I am grateful for the minister's support on this issue.

This is one of 10 amendments relating to the proposed establishment of an investment advisory committee. The other amendments are Nos 2, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17 and 21. The first amendment, which is consequential, removes the reference in clause 15(c) to the board consulting with the investment advisory committee when determining investment strategies and provides instead that the board be allowed to consult with any person or body it considers appropriate.

This set of amendments proposes to replace the establishment of the investment advisory committee with the requirement that the board meet on a quarterly basis with a person nominated by the minister, with the agreement of the Treasurer, for the purpose of receiving advice and recommendations on the exercise of the board's functions in relation to its investment portfolio, investment objectives and strategies, and any other related matters.

The board must provide the nominated person with any document as may be required for the purpose of providing that advice. The nominated person referred to in this clause will be an employee of Treasury. There is no obligation on the board to accept the advice of the nominated person. I have consulted at length with the Commissioners of Charitable Funds in relation to these amendments, and it is certainly my understanding, and I think that of the ministers, that they are satisfied that this proposal is preferable to the current provisions in the bill.

As mentioned in my second reading contribution, commissioners generally only ever invest in the top 50 Australian companies and, more particularly, in the top 10 Australian companies. Even this is done only after taking advice from at least two companies specialising in investment advice for non-for-profit organisations. I understand that the government's position is that it would like Treasury to play some role in the provision of financial advice to the commissioners. This amendment achieves that end without the overly cumbersome process involved in establishing an investment advisory committee. I urge all honourable members to support this amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: This amendment amends clause 15(c). We see it as consequential upon the Hon. Mr Darley's amendments to remove the requirement that the board establish an investment advisory committee. The government supports all of these three amendments, so I will speak generally on all of them.

The government's chief concern in establishing the investment advisory committee was that, with the broadening of the investment powers for the Health Services Charitable Gifts Board, there would be a greater capacity for exposing the charitable assets to investment risks. The government was therefore concerned to have in place a process whereby the government and the public could be assured that the board was cognisant of the risk of its investment decisions it may be exposed to.

The amendments proposed by the Hon. Mr Darley, while removing the requirement for an investment advisory committee, maintains a process for the board, proposed under amendment No. 9, to consult with a person independent of the board who is nominated by the minister, with the agreement of the Treasurer. This addresses the government's concern.

Amendment No. 1 removes the reference to clause 15(c) to the board consulting with the investment advisory committee when determining its investment strategies. As amended, clause 15(c) will allow the board to consult with any person or body it considers appropriate.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Liberal Party supports the Hon. Mr Darley's amendments as well. I indicate that our health spokesperson has been in contact with the honourable member to discuss these matters. I would like to congratulate the Hon. Mr Darley on coming up with a fairly comprehensive set of amendments which will remove references to the Investment Advisory Committee, which I agree is a fairly bizarre structure in modern governance practice. The honourable member clearly has a lot of experience in this area, and has done a significant amount of work to improve this legislation.

I am pleased that the government will also support the amendments. In principle we agree with the honourable member, and I am happy to indicate that the opposition will support all the consequential amendments that relate to this legislation.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 7, line 22 [clause 15(d)]—Before 'body' first occurring insert:

person or

This amendment is also consequential, and again relates to the Investment Advisory Committee. It makes it clear that the board can consult with any person or body it considers appropriate on the application of funds rather than having to consult with an investment advisory committee. I ask all honourable members to support this amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: This is consequential.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am happy with that, Mr Chairman.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

Clause 18.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 9, line 2 [clause 18(1)]—Delete 'The' and substitute:

Subject to this Act, the

This is the first of a further set of amendments relating to the application of charitable assets. It is a consequential amendment. It requires the board to apply the charitable assets for the benefit of a

public health entity or a prescribed research body subject to the new clause proposed by my amendment No. 5. To put this into context, my amendment No. 5 requires that the board considers the intent of the donor and, as far as is reasonably practicable, give effect to that intent. If the donee remains in existence as a public health entity or a prescribed research body, but the board decides to apply the gift or a portion of the gift to some other public health entity or prescribed research body, the amendment requires that the board first consult with the donee.

For example, if a bequest is made to the Royal Adelaide Hospital but the board considers that the intent of the bequest would best be achieved if the gift were applied to some other hospital or research body—say, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital or the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute—then the board could only apply that gift to that body after consulting with the RAH. It is envisaged that this might occur when, for instance, a specific area of research shifts from one public health entity or research body to another.

This amendment addresses concerns raised with my office in relation to the application of charitable assets. It ensures that a donee is appropriately consulted in relation to any changes to the application of charitable assets. I ask all honourable members to support this amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government supports this series of amendments. This amendment No. 3 amends clause 18(1) and is consequential upon the Hon. Mr Darley's amendment No. 5, which requires the board to consult with the donee of the gift if the board decides to apply a portion of the gift to a public health entity or prescribed research body other than the donee.

The government is concerned to have in place mechanisms in the bill that would provide for the Health Services Charitable Gifts Board to have the discretion to apply a gift in a way that can best achieve the intended purpose of the donor. This includes a capacity to apply a gift to a public health entity or prescribed research body other than the one that may have been specified by the donor. To ensure that the board acts properly, it is required to consider the donor's intent, where practicable, and give effect to that intent.

The amendments proposed by the Hon. Mr Darley to require the board to consult with the intended public health entity or prescribed research body (the donee) is a refinement of these provisions. The government is of the view that the need to consult with the relevant entity or body would have been required by the board when it was considering the intent of the contended donor. Nevertheless, making this explicit in the bill will remove any doubts about the process the board must undertake in this regard. The amendment and the reporting requirements are consistent with the government's view and, therefore, we are pleased to support it.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Lensink, are you happy with that?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIR: I will ask the Hon. Mr Darley to move the other two amendments (Nos 4 and 5), because we can put them all together.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 9, line 4 [clause 18(2)]—Delete a 'public health entity' and substitute:

an entity or body (the donee)

For the reasons just outlined I ask honourable members to support this amendment. I move:

Page 9, lines 11 to 16 [clause 18(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

- (3) In managing and applying a portion of the charitable assets attributable to a particular donor, the Board—
 - (a) must consider the intent, as far as it may be reasonably ascertained, of the donor; and
 - (b) so far as is reasonably practicable, must apply the portion in a manner that the Board considers is most likely to achieve the intention of the donor; and
 - (c) if the donee remains in existence at the relevant time as a public health entity or prescribed research body—may only apply the portion to some other public health entity or prescribed research body if the Board first consults the donee in such manner as the Board thinks fit.

As previously outlined, this amendment requires that the board considers the intent of the donor and, as far as is reasonably practicable, give effect to that intent. If the donee remains in existence

as a public health entity or a prescribed research body, but the board decides to apply a gift or a portion of a gift to some other public health entity or prescribed research body, the amendment requires that the board first consult with the donee. Again, for the reasons already outlined, I ask honourable members to support this amendment.

The CHAIR: The honourable minister has already indicated support for the series of amendments, and so has the Hon. Ms Lensink.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Clause 20.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 10, line 17 [clause 20(4)]—Delete 'property specified in Schedule 1 clause 2' and substitute:

prescribed property

This amendment is one of five amendments relating to the Hanson Institute (otherwise known as the Hanson Centre for Cancer Research) and the IMVS. The amendment removes the ability of the minister to direct that the board transfer Hanson Institute and IMVS moneys from the charitable assets to a health trust, the terms of which may be determined by the minister. Instead, Hanson and IMVS moneys will continue to vest in the charitable assets and to be used in the usual manner.

The amendment addresses specific concerns that have been raised with my office in relation to moneys that have been donated to or raised through bodies such as the Hanson Institute, particularly in light of the future opening of the South Australian Health Medical Research Institute. This is not a criticism of the new SAHMRI, nor is it intended to suggest that the minister intends to redirect those funds held by Hanson or IMVS to other purposes. The amendment simply seeks to ensure that the funds of those bodies are preserved.

In addition to the Hanson Institute and IMVS, another area of concern raised with my office concerns doctors' private excess earnings. At present the commissioners hold doctors' private excess earnings for the RAH. I am advised that the bill would allow those funds to be transferred to a health trust. However, this is only intended for a very limited purpose of providing a means for those funds to be transferred back to the RAH so that in future they can be administered by the hospital itself rather than the commissioners.

Importantly, it is not intended that the minister will determine how that money is to be dealt with, and those funds will continue to be administered by the commissioners according to present terms until they can be transferred back to the RAH. I understand the minister is willing to provide an undertaking to that effect. If that is the case, I ask all honourable members to support this amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: These amendments are supported by the government. Amendment No. 6 amends clause 20 and is consequential upon the Hon. Mr Darley's amendments that will ensure that the property held by the Commissioners of Charitable Funds on behalf of the Hanson Institute and IMVS become part of the charitable assets. Currently the bill provides that these funds may be put into a health trust.

The Commissioners of Charitable Funds were not empowered under the Public Charities Funds Act 1935 to hold funds for the Hanson and IMVS. This situation arose because of the complexities in interpreting that act and the historical establishment of the relationship between the Hanson and IMVS and the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The government was to address this by enabling the health services charitable gifts board to properly hold the funds for the Hanson and IMVS as part of a health trust. The amendments proposed by the Hon. Mr Darley provide for the board to properly hold the funds as part of its charitable assets. This is consistent with the government's intent to ensure that the funds for the Hanson and IMVS can be properly held and managed.

Amendment No. 6 amends clause 20 to delete reference to schedule 1, clause 2. Schedule 1, clause 2 identifies the Hanson and IMVS funds as property that may be transferred into a health trust that is deleted by amendment No. 20. I acknowledge the contribution made by the Hon. John Darley to the debate on the bill before the house and the concern he has raised about provisions in the bill that are intended to deal with what can be described as the excess private practice earnings

of medical officers engaged by a public hospital. These provisions are continued by amendment No. 8 to this clause.

Included in the bill are provisions that deal with the excess private practice earnings of medical officers who donate a part of their private practice earnings to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, as part of an industrial agreement, under the department's rights of private practice policy. In summary, this policy means that, as part of the rights to private practice in a public hospital, a medical officer can donate an amount of their private practice earnings above an agreed sum to that particular hospital. This is a policy that has worked well for the medical officers at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

As a donation to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, under the current act, these funds are currently vested in and managed by the Commissioners of Charitable Funds. When the Health Services Charitable Gifts Bill is enacted, it is expected that all metropolitan hospitals will come under the new act, to ensure consistency in this area for all hospitals.

It is proposed that the responsibility for donations that are part of the rights of private practice policy be maintained by the relevant hospital. It is proposed that the existing funds held by the Commissioners for Medical Officers at the Royal Adelaide Hospital will become part of a health trust. Once the amounts and details of all donations are fully determined by the commissioners, the health trust will be wound up and the funds transferred to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for its management.

The terms and conditions of this health trust will only be concerned with the process of the transfer and management of the funds until they are given to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The terms and conditions will not refer to how these funds may be applied or who will have access to them. This will remain a matter for the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the medical officer and the commissioners.

Future donations to the Royal Adelaide Hospital, or any other hospital where the policy may apply, will be excluded by regulation from becoming part of the charitable assets vested in the health services charitable gifts board. They will be a matter for the hospital and the medical officer to determine. Medical officers will, of course, remain free to make any donation outside of this to a hospital, however these donations will become part of the charitable assets vested in the board.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 10, lines 22 to 27 [clause 20(5)]—Delete subclause (5)

Again, this amendment relates to my previous amendment regarding the Hanson Institute and the IMVS. I ask all honourable members to support this amendment. I move:

Page 10, after line 39—After subclause (9) insert:

(10) In this section—

prescribed property means property that—

- (a) is prescribed by regulation and was given in a manner prescribed by regulation; and
- (b) was held by the Commissioners of Charitable Funds immediately before the commencement of Schedule 3 (and vested in the Board as part of the charitable assets on the commencement of Schedule 3),

but does not include property given (or purportedly given) to or for the benefit of a body specified in Schedule 1 clause 1.

Again, this amendment relates to my previous amendment regarding the Hanson Institute and the IMVS. I ask all honourable members to support the amendment

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 and 22 passed.

New clause 22A.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 11, after line 5—After clause 22 insert:

22A—Board to meet with public sector employee nominated by Minister

- (1) The Minister must, with the agreement of the Treasurer, nominate a public sector employee (with expertise, knowledge or experience deemed suitable by the Minister) for the purposes of this section.
- (2) The Board must, on a quarterly basis, meet with the person nominated by the Minister for the purpose of receiving advice and recommendations from the nominee on the exercise of the Board's functions in relation to the Board's investment portfolio, investment objective and strategies, and related matters.
- (3) For the purposes of a meeting under subsection (2), the Board must provide the nominee with such information or records in the possession or control of the Board as the nominee may require in such manner and form as the nominee may require, by no later than 1 month prior to the meeting.

This amendment replaces the requirement for an investment advisory committee with a requirement that the board meet with a public sector employee for the purpose of obtaining investment advice. As mentioned earlier, the board will be required to meet on a quarterly basis with a person nominated by the minister, with the agreement of the Treasurer, for the purpose of receiving advice and recommendations on the exercise of the board's functions in relation to its investment portfolio, investment objectives and strategies, and any other related matters. This approach is considered more preferable to the current provisions in the bill and I ask all honourable members to support this amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government supports the amendment. It is basically consequential.

New clause inserted.

Clause 23.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 11—

lines 8 to 12 [clause 23(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

- (1) The Board may, subject to subsection (2), establish committees to provide advice on any matter affecting the administration of this Act as the Board thinks fit.

line 15 [clause 23(2)]—Delete 'under subsection (1)(b)' and substitute:

(and the regulations may make provision in relation to the establishment of the committee and any procedure to be followed by the committee)

line 16 [clause 23(3)]—Delete 'established under subsection (1)(b)'

line 21 [clause 23(4)]—Delete 'established under subsection (1)(b)'

Amendment Nos 10, 11, 12 and 13 all relate to the deletion of the requirement for an investment advisory committee. I will speak to all of those amendments together. All four amendments amend clause 23 of the bill to remove the requirement that the board establish an IAC. I ask all honourable members to support these amendments.

Amendments carried.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I believe that all of the amendments of the Hon. John Darley, from 14 through to 21, are substantially consequential amendments and we would be happy to progress them all together.

The CHAIR: Some are to different clauses. The Hon. Mr Darley can do amendment Nos 14, 15 and 16, which all relate to clause 23.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 11—

After line 21 [clause 23(4)]—Before paragraph (a) insert:

- (aa) as prescribed by regulation; or

Line 22 [clause 23(4)(a)]—Before 'as' insert:

insofar as the procedure is not prescribed under paragraph (aa),

Line 23 [clause 23(4)(b)]—After 'is not' insert:

prescribed under paragraph (aa) or

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 24 to 28 passed.

Clause 29.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 12—

Lines 29 to 31 [clause 29(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

- (3) The report on the operations of the Board under subsection (1)(a) must include the following:
 - (a) if the Board has, in the relevant financial year, applied a portion of the charitable assets that is attributable to a gift to or for the benefit of an entity or body to some other entity or body, a statement of reasons for the Board's decision to so apply the portion;
 - (b) a summary of any advice given, or recommendations made, by the public sector employee under section 22A in the relevant financial year;
 - (c) any other information prescribed by regulation.

Line 34 [clause 29(5)]—Delete subclause (5)

These amendments are consequential to previous amendments regarding the investment advisory committee. Clause 29 of the bill provides reporting requirements for the board. The board must, on or before 31 October of each year, deliver to the minister reports on the operations of the board and, subject to the regulations, any trust established under section 20 during the financial year ending on the preceding 30 June.

The amendment requires that the report on the operations of the board include a statement of reasons where the board's decision to apply a portion of a charitable asset that is attributable to a gift to or for the benefit of an entity or body to some other entity or body, as well as a summary of any advice given or recommendations made by the nominated person under section 22A. It also provides for the reporting on other information prescribed by regulation.

The purpose of the amendment is to ensure appropriate levels of reporting. Subclause (a) in particular provides for specific reporting by the board where it has decided to apply a portion of a gift to some other entity or body. This provides for a greater level of openness and transparency. I urge all honourable members to support this amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Consequential; the government supports this amendment.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 30 and 31 passed.

Schedule 1.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 13, line 15 [Schedule 1, heading]—Delete 'and parts of the charitable assets'

Clause 2, page 13, lines 23 to 35—Delete the clause

These amendments are also consequential to previous amendments relating to Hanson and IMVS, and I ask all honourable members to support them.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The government supports these amendments.

Amendments carried; schedule as amended passed.

Schedule 2.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I move:

Page 14, line 1 to page 15, line 33—Delete the Schedule

Again, this amendment relates to the deletion of the requirement for an Investment Advisory Committee. It deletes schedule 2 of the bill, which provided for the framework for that committee. I ask all honourable members to support this amendment.

Amendment carried; schedule deleted.

Schedule 3.

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

Clause 6(1)(b), page 17, lines 1 to 4—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) for the benefit of Metropolitan Domiciliary Care, including funds held in the Metropolitan Domiciliary Care fund in the *23 series accounts*.

The Commissioners of Charitable Funds recently advised that they incorrectly described the account name in Schedule 3, clause 6(1)(b)(i), the Hampstead Centre Fund (04-40), as being one that is held for the benefit of Metropolitan Domiciliary Care. The fund is in fact a Royal Adelaide Hospital health account for funds for the purpose of research, education, purchasing of equipment and patient amenities. The government therefore moves an amendment to have the reference to the Hampstead Centre fund removed from Schedule 3.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I support the amendment.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (17:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CHILD EMPLOYMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 April 2011.)

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Public Sector Management, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for Gambling) (17:02): There being no further contributions to the second reading, I thank members for their contributions to this bill and I am very grateful for their support, in particular the contributions of the Hons Tammy Franks, Rob Lucas, Dennis Hood and Carmel Zollo. This bill gives effect to this government's long-standing commitment to providing greater protection for South Australian children at work. Young workers under the age of 18 years are amongst our most vulnerable workers. This bill will enhance their protection in the workforce by complementing existing industrial laws. The bill is the result of extensive consultation over a number of years and I thank everyone who participated in the consultative process and highlight the importance of the collaborative approach in the development of industrial relations legislation.

The bill creates general duties to ensure the protection of children at work in South Australia to ensure that children's schooling is not adversely affected by employment. The bill also creates the machinery for the establishment of particular employment arrangements for particularly young people through regulations and industry-driven codes of practice. The regulations and codes of practice will only be developed through extensive and inclusive consultation to ensure that they are adequate and appropriate for the protection of children who work in South Australia.

In relation to the questions raised by the Hon. Rob Lucas, I can provide the following information. I have been advised that the vast majority of employers who employ or engage children in South Australia do the right thing. This does not mean, however, that children are not at risk in the workplace due to their particular vulnerability.

The government acknowledges that youth support agencies, such as the Young Workers Legal Service, have dealt with a number of matters involving exploitation of children in the workplace and these instances highlight the need for specific protections to go beyond the existing regulatory arrangements. These include the exposure of children to bullying and harassment at work in circumstances where children lack the ability or confidence to speak up.

Children are being pressured to work at times that interfere with their important schoolwork. Children are being made to work late hours during school time without access to sufficient breaks

or rest time between shifts. Exposure of children to health and safety risks at work directly relate to their inexperience in the workforce.

In relation to children's working hours, national legislation does not prevent this parliament from seeking to regulate this area. Indeed, the commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009 and associated regulations are specifically structured to allow for state regulation of the times during which a child may be employed. I draw members' attention particularly to regulation 1.14 of the Fair Work Act 2009 Regulations, which expressly reserves to the state the capacity for them to regulate.

In relation to the regulatory gap that this legislation would fill, I can provide the following information. The Education Act provides for the compulsory schooling of children between the ages of six and 16. It creates an offence for employing a compulsory school-age child during school hours, but it does not sufficiently regulate the interaction between schooling and the growing number of school-age children who participate in employment.

The Education Act does not necessarily prevent a child from being employed to do inappropriate work out of school hours and/or during school holidays, and it does not deal with issues such as the supervision of children at work and the working hours of children. It also provides no protection to children over compulsory school age.

The Child Employment Bill is not limited to children of a compulsory school age and covers all children under the age of 18. This is because many children over compulsory school age work, sometimes in their first jobs and sometimes while they are in their important final years at school. The Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986 creates duties for employers and employees in relation to health, safety and welfare at work.

It provides protections that apply to all employees, but it does not cover all the issues relating to the employment of children who may have entered the workforce for the first time and have no experience in dealing with workplace issues. The Child Employment Bill fills a significant regulatory gap in South Australia related to the employment of children.

The Child Employment Bill creates machinery to establish some basic rules as to the type of work that children of various ages are permitted to do, the times when they are permitted to perform such work and the requirements for appropriate supervision. These issues are not appropriately covered by the current South Australian legislation. This bill strengthens and complements existing state regulations relating to children.

It may be appropriate that some regulations only relate to children under the age of 16, while others relate to all children under the age of 18 years. Regulations will only be developed out of extensive consultation with key stakeholders. On the issue of the consistency of penalties, I can indicate that the penalties are different under the Education Act and Child Employment Bill. However, the offences created by the respective pieces of legislation are different.

The Education Act relates specifically to a child's compulsory attendance at school and is not intended to provide protections for children in the workplace. The Child Employment Bill creates a broader duty on employers to ensure that the work a child is required to undertake does not adversely affect a child's schooling. For this reason, the Child Employment Bill introduces penalties of \$20,000, consistent with the intention of providing broad protections for all children working in South Australia.

The penalties are also consistent with those contained in industrial relations legislation generally. It is possible that the same set of facts could give rise to an offence under both the Education Act and the Child Employment Bill, but it is not uncommon that a particular set of circumstances may give rise to a cause of action under more than one law. Clause 16 of the bill ensures, however, that a defendant will not be punished more than once for the same set of circumstances where those circumstances amount to an offence under the Child Employment Bill and the Education Act, or the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act.

In relation to the nudity provisions contained in clause 8 of the bill, I can indicate that the bill applies to nudity in the course of the performance of work. It is clear that where no work is performed, whether paid or unpaid, the bill will have no application. The bill's intention is that the age of five years is an appropriate threshold, after which a female child's bare chest should not be visible in the course of employment.

In relation to the general issue of protecting children's development, clause 32 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child requires nations to recognise the rights of the child to be protected from economic exploitation and performing any work that is likely to be

hazardous or to interfere with the child's education or to be harmful to the child's health or physical, mental, spiritual, moral or social development.

The duty imposed on an employer does not require employers to take on the role of parents. It ensures that children will not be required to undertake work that is harmful to their development. It recognises the special place of children in our society and ensures that their development into adult members of the South Australian community is not jeopardised by the work they undertake.

On the issue of the requirement of clause 9 of the bill to provide certain information to child workers, I note the interest of the Hon. Dennis Hood in this matter, as well as the Hon. Rob Lucas. I can indicate that a consistent message during the public consultation period was that children need clear information about their entitlements at the place where they are employed and that children, due to their inexperience in the workplace, lack information and knowledge relating to their basic rights and entitlements.

Clause 9 ensures that only employers who employ children of a class prescribed by the regulations will be required to provide such information. Regulations will be made only in full consultation with stakeholders, including business and employer groups. The government is fully aware of the need to reduce the amount of red tape that employers, particularly small business, are required to deal with, and red-tape reduction remains a primary focus of this government. It is likely that any regulations will complement requirements for the provision of information obtained in other industrial relations legislation while recognising the special requirements of young workers at the same time.

Concerns with the impact of the bill on the modelling and entertainment industry more broadly were also raised. I am advised that the entertainment industry has been broadly consulted, through various industry groups and individual employers, and the possibility of a code of practice for this sector has been raised by some stakeholders. Local modelling agencies will be included in ongoing consultations within this context.

It is important to note that the bill allows for codes of practice and regulations to be drafted to apply to specific age groups and not to everyone who meets the definition of 'child' for the purpose of the bill. It is possible, therefore, to have regulations or codes that apply only to children under 14 or under 16 years of age, for example.

Finally, I reiterate the important role of the Industrial Relations Advisory Committee (IRAC) as a tripartite representative forum in the development of any regulations and codes of practice that are made under this legislation. Such regulations and codes of practice will be made only on the basis of an identified need and in full consultation with all stakeholders, including employer and business groups.

Once again, I thank honourable members for their contribution to the second reading stage of this bill. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I thank the minister, on behalf of the government, for the reply at the second reading. Many of the issues to which the minister responded on behalf of the government, we will be able to pursue during the specific clauses of the bill. I just want to make some brief opening comments and ask the minister some general questions in relation to the overall nature of the bill.

The minister, in reply to the second reading, indicated that there had been broad consultation. I think a number of members have received correspondence from a number of business and industry groups in relation to their view of the consultation and the result of that. I want to read briefly from the Business SA correspondence, which states:

Unfortunately, the bill still does not address our major concerns as it is apparent that the comments and suggested amendments to the bill, which were provided by Business SA and other employer organisations have largely been ignored. As a consequence, Business SA advises you that it does not support the bill in its current format. We understand that the state opposition will table amendments to the bill in the house, which are based on the concerns that Business SA has raised in its submission. We strongly urge you to genuinely consider adopting these and have the bill amended accordingly.

I will refer to that submission, and to the submission of others, when we look specifically at the amendments.

I guess the general point I am making is that, yes, there has been a long period of consultation and discussion, but the consistent view of virtually all the employer associations and groups—I think I have consulted with close to 10 of them, and have had indications of support for the various amendments from eight or 10 of those organisations—is that they were consulted, but the government, in particular the former minister the Hon. Bernard Finnigan, who was handling this bill on child employment but who is no longer the leader of the government or a minister, had, for his own reasons, largely ignored the submissions made by business and industry groups.

I guess their plea to the Legislative Council is that, first, if the government proceeds with the legislation, in the absence of the Hon. Bernard Finnigan, to get some answers to the questions they have been putting to the government but for which they have not been getting answers and, secondly, to seek to amend the bill in some way.

The view of a number of the organisations—and I think Business SA summarises this as its view—is, in the first instance, where are the examples of the abuse of children's employment that cannot be resolved by the existing legislative framework? The then minister, the Hon. Bernard Finnigan, in his second reading speech, indicated that, under the modern awards of the national Fair Work provisions, we in South Australia are not able to regulate working hours, rates of pay and those sorts of conditions.

They are issues that have now been referred to the federal jurisdiction; they are covered by the so-called modern awards, and at this stage, even if we wanted to, we are not allowed to poke our nose into those particular issues. When you talk about children's employment, a lot of the issues are about young people being ripped off in terms of what they are paid, the hours they are working, and those sorts of things. The former minister the Hon. Bernard Finnigan indicated in his second reading explanation that all those issues are not for the state parliament or the state jurisdiction; they are covered under the federal arrangements under the modern awards, under the Fair Work Act.

We have this little niche market I suppose, if you want to talk about it like that, which is, in some way, the interrelationship with the Education Act and the impact on learning. When we get to those provisions, I disagree with an aspect of the response the minister gave in terms of the distinction with the Education Act. The Education Act provision that is there does not just refer to the requirement to go to school; it talks about the impact of a job on a child's educational schooling, or words to that effect. I guess we will explore that in detail when we get to that particular clause.

As I said, the position of Business SA and a number of others is, first, 'Convince us where are the abuses that cannot be covered by industrial commissions or the occupational health and safety laws that exist or the current Education Act.' Essentially, their position is 'Hey, we don't really think you need this legislation.' We, in the parliament and the state Liberal Party are prepared to consider the legislation and we are seeking, obviously, to amend it in a number of ways. However, the position of employer organisations is that, as I said, you have not demonstrated yet where the abuses are that cannot be fixed by the current industrial legislative framework.

That question was put to the minister and, with the greatest respect to the minister, the speech drafted for her does not actually highlight examples of current abuses which cannot be fixed by modern awards, the Fair Work Act, the Occupational Health and Safety Act or the Education Act. Again, we put the question to the minister to give some specific examples of particular abuses that cannot be fixed by the current legislative framework. As I said, that is the general position of a number of employer groups who think that, given that we have handed over all our industrial relations powers to the commonwealth, by and large, there is not a convincing case for even having a child employment bill in South Australia.

My specific question to the minister at this stage is: under the provisions of the Education Act, as the minister has noted, there are penalties of up to \$5,000 for breaches of the Education Act. Can the minister advise the chamber how many successful prosecutions there have been under those particular provisions of the Education Act against employers?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will have to take that question on notice and bring back a response.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I wonder whether the minister, through her advisers—and I accept the fact that she will need to take it on notice in terms of the actual number—can say, in general

terms, if there have been some prosecutions? It is just an issue of working out how many; it is not an issue of whether there have been or have not been any.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I will need to clarify that and I am happy to take it on notice and bring back a response.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I think it is an important issue. We are being told that there is a problem and there is abuse of young persons in employment as defined as under 18, but this provision in the Education Act is under 16. When one looks at that—and the minister is taking it on notice—that particular provision of the Education Act says that a person must not employ a child of compulsory school age or compulsory education age during the hours at which the child is required to attend school or to participate in an approved learning program, as the case requires, or (b) states:

In any labour or occupation that renders or is likely to render the child unfit to attend school or participate in an approved learning program as required by this part or to obtain the maximum benefit from such attendance or participation. Maximum penalty \$5,000.

That second provision under paragraph (b) is, as I said, the area where I take issue with what the minister said in the second reading; that is, there is a specific offence which says that you cannot, as an employer, employ a child of compulsory school age (which is under 16) in any occupation that renders or is likely to render the child unfit to attend school or to participate in an approved learning program. I think it is important, in terms of the justification for the bill, to find how many examples of successful prosecutions there have been under paragraph (b) over recent years and, similarly, under paragraph (a) where it states 'during the hours at which the child is required to attend school'.

We will come to these provisions later on but my question to the minister at this stage is: given the modern education system—and many of us perhaps went to school when the traditional school day was 8.30 or 9 o'clock through to 3.30 or 4 o'clock or whatever it happened to be—these days school extends over a much longer period. One may well undertake some subjects at a TAFE or at a workplace away from the school site or, indeed, at another school, particularly if you are in a regional area, or you may undertake it by distance education, for example, at night.

So, the minister may well need to take this on notice as well. That is why, I guess, I might as well put these questions to the minister now so that she can seek advice, either from the new Minister for Industrial Relations or, I guess, probably the Minister for Education as well.

How are these particular provisions to be interpreted when we are looking at potential offences for employers, during the hours at which the child is required to attend school or to participate in an approved learning program? If a child is going to participate in an approved learning program which involves after-hours or early evening study at a TAFE or in another workplace, is it an offence, under the Education Act, for an employer to even employ a child of compulsory school age (which is under 16) during those particular hours?

I also ask the question of, for example, the increasing number of children involved in homeschooling. How are these particular provisions of the Education Act, and offences for employers, to be interpreted for children of compulsory school age who are being homeschooled, or does the current exemption for homeschooling exempt employers of those children from these particular provisions of the Education Act as well?

If you are being homeschooled by your parents, you are not being homeschooled just between 8.30 and 3.30. You can be homeschooled at any hour through the day or evening, or indeed, on the weekend as well. So, are the current provisions of the Education Act—and the government is saying that these new provisions are going to complement the provisions of the Education Act—making it an offence for an employer to employ anyone under the age of 16, for example, who is being homeschooled, given the hours?

As I said again, too, a student under the age of 16 could be undertaking a TAFE course, for example, or work experience course, as part of their school program, or community service. If you are undertaking the International Baccalaureate, you have compulsory volunteerism or community service as part of your school program; the International Baccalaureate is an approved learning program. Some schools even in the government system (some schools in the government system are part of the International Baccalaureate) are requiring community service and community attendance as well, as part of their approved learning programs, which gain accreditation.

Certainly, in the early years—these would be some under-16s who would potentially be in year 10 and some advanced students who would be in year 11—we have, for example, accelerated programs in a number of government schools where young people under the age of 14 and 15 are participating in SACE subjects because they are intellectually gifted and talented and are accelerated through various programs. They would be participating in SACE projects. Some of those students are, indeed, undertaking university study at that age.

With those, anyway, who are studying subjects outside their normal school, in another high school, for example, or in a TAFE or something like that, where they are undertaking an approved learning program after school hours, is it an offence under the Education Act for an employer to employ that student in after-hours work, for example, from four o'clock to six o'clock at the local delicatessen or supermarket?

The student may well be studying up until six o'clock at a particular education institution for one or two days a week, but on those other days of the week, may well have a job at the local supermarket or delicatessen. Are the provisions of the Education Act such that it is already an offence for an employer to employ a child of compulsory school age, or compulsory education age, during those particular hours?

The key ones are really those participating in an approved learning program because that, obviously, is undefined and therefore can cover a multitude of learning programs, from homeschooling right through to approved learning programs for gifted and talented students, or students with disabilities who may well undertake, again at their local TAFE, for example, specific community learning projects or programs because the facilities at the TAFE may well be better than either their local primary school or secondary school, for example, in cooking or those sorts of domestic chores. A number of specific programs for students are engaged in that way.

We also have behavioural learning centres. I put this question, through the minister, to the Minister for Education: we have children of compulsory school age (under the age of 16) who are expelled or suspended from their government school but they are attached, compulsorily, to a behavioural learning centre. So, they are still of compulsory school age and they are still required to attend the behavioural learning centre, which may or may not reflect the normal school learning hours.

In some cases they do not because, again, they have a different program, an approved learning program, which may well involve TAFE, voluntary programs, work experience, as well as alternative learning environments. They are all students under the compulsory school age. My question is: in their expulsion or suspension from the government school system, are these provisions still operative on them in their alternative learning environment, such as a behavioural learning centre, etc.?

As we seek to understand and explore potential amendments in the committee stage to the bill, I think all of us need to understand what the existing provisions of the Education Act are, which, depending on how they are to be interpreted now that there is to be a new focus, could be quite onerous already in terms of whether or not you are entitled to even employ a child under the age of 16 during certain hours.

I would imagine that there are some students at year 10, who may well be 15 (under the age of 16), who are already involved in part-time study because they have permission to do so, or who are attending school through various hours and may well have part-time paid employment. When we get to the area, for example, of modelling and acting, etc., I understand that there are specific provisions there.

Modelling agencies and theatrical agencies have indicated to the opposition that there are many examples where students of a compulsory age are not attending school—if there is a film shoot, for example—for weeks at a time. They may well be engaged in distance education, which is an approved learning program, it is an approved way of education, but they are actually working during compulsory schooling hours when they are under 16. I think the government, in that section of the bill, seeks to get over that with parental approval, and we can explore that when we get to it.

What I am canvassing at this stage is that there is a clear need for this chamber to understand the existing provisions in the Education Act, because the government is not changing that. It says that it is there, but it is obviously saying that it does not believe that it is tough enough, strong enough, or covers the field enough, and that, therefore, we need the specific provisions in the Child Employment Bill.

If that is the government's argument, then we need to understand what it is that the current provisions of the Education Act are doing, how often have they been used and how does the government see them being interpreted in the large number of examples that I have just given, and which I think this chamber needs to have answers to.

The reality is that this is Thursday afternoon and we are certainly not going to get through the committee stage this afternoon. The minister has taken on notice a number of questions and I would hope that she would take on notice some of these others, which I am the first to admit that she cannot be expected to respond to now. Some of them will, obviously, be reliant upon advice from the education department and the Minister for Education in relation to how those existing provisions are being utilised.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Yes, some of the questions, as indicated, I will have to take on notice—the numbers of prosecutions and I will also need to get some legal advice around home schooling. However, in relation to some of the span of hours questions around different schooling environments, I have been advised that the Education Act states that you have to be at school when you are required to be at school, or attending an approved learning program, so whatever those hours might be. It takes into consideration a full scope of different potential hours and, as I have been advised, it accommodates for different hours, according to whatever the various obligations might be.

I have also been advised that there is an employer defence in employing a child of compulsory school age during school hours. The employer's defence under this bill states that there is a defence if the employer did not knowingly employ a child of compulsory school age when they should have been at school. The act requires simply that the employer, in employing a school-age child—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: Sorry, do you mean the proposed bill or the Education Act?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: This current bill I am now talking to requires that the employer puts their mind, when they are employing a school-age child, to the impact that their employment might have in employing a child of compulsory school age. They are the parameters of consideration that are required under this act, and the guidance given in the Education Act.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I think it is useful to raise some of these issues, and the minister clearly can get legal advice, and others. I think the legal advice needs to apply not just to the home schooling but also to the issues of the accelerated students and the approved learning programs that are outside school hours, for example, TAFE and others. I guess that is an issue for the government to respond to.

When you look at this proposed bill, when we get to later clauses, we are actually talking about children under the age of 18. This is an issue that needs to be debated. Earlier, we were talking about compulsory school age; there is a compulsion and you actually understand that. Under this bill, we are going to be talking about 17-year-old young adults who are not required to be at school, and yet the provisions state that an employer must, in respect of each child, ensure that the child is not required to undertake work that adversely affects the child's schooling.

So, we are going to have a position where, at least with the under 16s, you understand that it is a compulsion, other than home schooling and all those other exemptions that we have to explore. However, for most of them it is a compulsion; you have to be at school under the age of 16. However, at 17 you are a young adult and you do not have to be at school; it is voluntary whether you are at school or not. Therefore, this notion of what is school and school hours, which I have asked earlier in relation to the Education Act, is not necessarily directly relevant to the 17 year old—it might be, but it also might not be.

We are going to be asked to look at this when we get to these clauses. If we leave it at 18, which is one of the amendments we are moving, we think there is just going to be huge confusion for these 16 and 17 year olds within the system. In essence, if you look at clause 7(1) it states:

An employer must, in respect of each child—

that is, under 18—

employed by the employer, ensure so far as is reasonably practicable, that the child is not required to undertake work that...adversely affects the child's schooling.

In those circumstances, as an employer—it is not compulsory for the 17 year old to be at school—how do you understand all of the ramifications of that child's schooling?

Again, schooling is undefined. Compulsory attendance at school is at least something we can understand, because you have to be at a school and it is a defined education institution, and all that sort of stuff. We still have these other exemption issues that are a problem, but generally you can understand that. We have in this proposed bill the concept of schooling—'affect the child's schooling'.

We need to understand—there is no definition—whether the government is saying that the legal interpretation of schooling will be education provided at a school (I suspect it is probably not), or is it going to be education provided of a school-type nature, for example, at a school, at a TAFE, at home schooling, at a university or at a training institution if you are undertaking an apprenticeship or traineeship? If you are doing community service at an old aged home and you get credits towards your SACE, for example, through community service, there are any number of credits that are approved learning programs towards your South Australian Certificate of Education or your International Baccalaureate, and they do not occur within the school, but they probably occur within the definition of schooling.

The government is asking us in this to change the legal concepts of the compulsory attendance at school to this undefined concept of schooling. We are making offences now of \$20,000 to an employer that, in any way they adversely affect a child's—that is, a 17-year old's—schooling, there is a penalty of up to \$20,000. The government needs to come back to us when next we sit (before would be useful if we could all get copies of the advice) with an understanding on what is the legal advice the government, the former minister, the Hon. Bernard Finnigan in drafting this bill, was using in relation to schooling and insisting that it apply to 16 and 17-year olds over and above the provisions as they relate to education.

There are literally dozens and dozens of other detailed and specific questions this committee will have to explore, I assume not this evening but when we next return. They are some fundamental questions and threshold issues where the government's advice to us, both legal and educational, needs to come back to us as to exactly what it is they are talking about and how they will ping employers in relation to adversely affecting a child's schooling.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: As indicated, I am happy to take those matters on notice and bring back a more detailed response to the issue of how we approach the span of hours in different educational institutions and their different requirements. Are there any other questions the honourable member wants to put?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: If we have a brief period before 6 o'clock I can raise a number of general ones on which it may be worthwhile getting advice. The minister in the second reading referred to a United Nations declaration or something in relation to how we are to interpret development. In that I think she referred to 'physical, 'mental', I think 'moral' and 'social'. Again this will be one of the amendments we come to later, and that is why I am interested in the government's advice on this, particularly as we come to some of the later provisions. Health and safety are concepts we are all familiar with.

We have had legislation on occupational health and safety, etc., and we understand in broad terms what we are talking about. We will have this issue of adversely affecting a child's schooling, or in the Education Act we have this issue of 'likely to render the child unfit to attend school'. I guess that is a bit more specific in terms of those particular provisions but, when we come to the issue of an employer adversely affecting a child's moral and social development, we are raising some huge issues in terms of the responsibilities on employers.

The employers are saying, 'Hey, fair go. We are talking about 17-year old apprentices in the workplace and you are putting on us that we cannot affect the 17-year old's moral or social development and, if we do, then it may be harmful to the child's health or moral or social development. You are saying to me that some of my employees at 18 or 19 could in some way adopt a practice which is harmful to the moral development of the 17-year old in the work site. Give me a break!' That is what the Hon. Bernard Finnigan and the government are asking us to do in relation to this. The minister has read out what this is based on: it is based on that United Nations whatever-it-was, and we are definitely talking about moral and social.

We understand health and safety, but when you start getting into the area of a 17-year old apprentice, for example, how do you interpret that and how is that to be ruled on in terms of an employer employing, for example, a 16 or 17 year old and their moral or social development? This development issue is really going to be a significant debating point.

The employer groups tell me that in the early drafting it included 'physical, mental, social or moral' and there were questions raised so those specific words were taken out but, even though they have been taken out, clearly, based on the advice we have got, 'development' does cover those areas. It may well cover other areas as well, for example. You do not just have to look at the United Nations to give you the definitive definition of 'development'. 'Development' could cover a whole range of things. Does it cover spiritual development? Does it cover a whole range of other notions of development? Just because the United Nations says it is physical, mental, social and moral does not mean that is how a court in the end is going to determine it. They are the issues the employer groups are raising with me.

We are getting close to conclusion this afternoon and I want to indicate that, in relation to the series of amendments that I have foreshadowed this afternoon, in the consultation process that I have had, not only have Business SA indicated their support for the amendments and their concern about the current government bill drafting but also the Master Builders Association, the Australian Hotels Association, the Civil Contractors Federation, the Motor Trades Association, the Wine Industry Association of South Australia, the Housing Industry Association and the Self Insurers of South Australia.

I think that is a reasonable cross-section of employer organisations who have all now looked at this bill, have felt that they have not been listened to, have looked at the amendments that the Liberal Party is proposing to move and, at the very least—as I said, some of them would actually say, 'We don't think we need the bill and you should defeat it—they are saying to this chamber, 'Please ask the questions and please, at the very least, support the amendments that the Liberal Party has placed on file.' I think it is useful at least that that be placed on the record at this early stage of the committee.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 17:50 the council adjourned until Tuesday 17 May 2011 at 14:15.