

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 15 July 2002

The **SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that the written answers to the following questions on the *Notice Paper*, as detailed in the schedule I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 2 and 5.

KENDELL AIRLINES

In reply to **Hon. M.R. BUCKBY** (27 May).

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT**: The government, since it took office, has continually assessed the possible impacts on regional communities of the loss of regional air services. However, the honourable member may be confused about the government's intentions with regard to community impact statements. The Premier has requested chief executives of government agencies to document consultation in cabinet submissions as community impact statements, to inform cabinet of the full range of costs and benefits of proposals to the community. It may be that requirement that the honourable member is referring to. Since Australiawide Airlines' request for assistance was made directly to the treasurer and myself, this formal requirement did not apply. The answer to the question is therefore no.

In regard to the assistance requested by Australiawide Airlines, it needs to be understood that the current situation surrounding the sale of Kendell Airlines is immensely complex. To take a simplistic view that governments should intervene in the process to pre-empt a market solution is not in the best interests of either the regional airline industry or the communities it serves. Assistance provided to a potential purchaser of Kendell Airlines to the level suggested would immediately disadvantage competing airlines, create barriers to entry on what would effectively be subsidised routes and put large sums of tax payers' money at unjustifiable risk. It should be noted that all other State governments involved have taken similar positions.

This government does not believe that it is the business of government to subsidise commercial air services. However, the government did signal to the Kendell Airlines Administrator's preferred bidder that it is prepared to discuss what general types of industry assistance at the margin it might be able to provide.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Juvenile Justice Advisory Committee—Report 2000-2001.
Ordered to be published (Paper No 27)

CORNWALL, Dr J.

The **Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.J. ATKINSON**: Last Friday, 12 July 2002, at a further hearing in the case of Rowan v Cornwall and Others, His Honour Mr Justice DeBelle clarified a number of issues relating to his judgment which had been delivered on 21 June 2002. At the hearing His Honour stated that it was his intention in the judgment that each of the defamation defendants would be jointly and severally liable for the order on the defamation award. His Honour went on to say that there is also a joint and several liability with Dr Cornwall on the issue because his action was as much a cause of all that (injury and loss) as the defamation defendants. He therefore held that there is a joint and several liability of all the

defendants for the damages payable. In the result His Honour made the following orders:

1. Dr Cornwall, the review committee members, the state, the commonwealth and the two television stations (TVB and ABC) are jointly and severally liable to pay to the plaintiff the sum of \$259 606.10. This comprises the damages award for personal injury, injury to reputation, medical and removal costs.

2. Dr Cornwall, the review committee members, the state, the commonwealth and the two television stations are jointly and severally liable to pay to the plaintiff the sum of \$175 000. This is interest on the amount of \$259 606.10 referred to in the previous order.

3. The review committee members, the state and the commonwealth are jointly and severally liable to pay to the plaintiff the sum of \$55 819 damages. This is the award for loss of earnings.

4. The review committee members, the state and the commonwealth are jointly and severally liable to pay to the plaintiff the sum of \$70 235. This is interest on the amount of \$55 819 referred to in the previous order.

5. Dr Cornwall is liable to pay the sum of \$25 000 damages, being exemplary damages for misfeasance in public office.

In respect of the orders where the defendants are jointly and severally liable, the respective share of each of the defendants is yet to be determined. The legal representatives of all the defendants are negotiating the amounts to be paid by each. As the defendants are jointly and severally liable, the plaintiff can enforce the judgment sums against all or any of them. In addition to the judgment sums above, cost orders were made in favour of the plaintiff. His Honour apportioned liability for costs as follows: 15 per cent to be paid by TVB; the remaining 85 per cent of the costs are to be borne in equal shares by the remaining defendants.

It is understood that this means that one third of the 85 per cent—that is, 28.33 per cent—is to be the responsibility of the state defendants. However, as the costs have not been quantified at this stage, I cannot advise the house on the amount that is involved. I can also confirm that I have instructed the Crown Solicitor to institute an appeal against both the findings of misfeasance in public office and defamation. The defendants have until Friday 26 July 2002 to institute an appeal and consideration as to the grounds and detail continues. Finally, I also confirm that, on the advice of the Crown Solicitor, the state government will continue to indemnify all state defendants. This includes the state members of the review committee and Dr Cornwall.

DUNCAN, Dr G.

The **Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General)**: I seek leave to make another ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.J. ATKINSON**: In May 1972, University of Adelaide law lecturer Dr George Duncan was thrown into the River Torrens by a group of young men, and he drowned. The Coroner, Mr Cleland, conducted an inquest into Dr Duncan's death. On 5 July 1972, he reported that 'the cause of his death was drowning due to violence on the part of persons of whose identity there is no evidence.' The Coroner suppressed the names and addresses of certain witnesses, and anything tending to identify them. After the inquest, the Police Commissioner of the time engaged two Scotland Yard detectives to report on the case. The detectives, Chief

Superintendent Bob McGowan and Detective Sergeant Charles O'Hanlon, submitted their report on 2 October 1972. Their report is now known as the McGowan Report or the Scotland Yard Report.

The McGowan Report contains an appraisal of the evidence collected by the police and the detectives' views of what happened on the night of Dr Duncan's death. It names the suspects and also many people who were indirectly involved. For example, it contains the name of one of Dr Duncan's colleagues at the University of Adelaide Law School and a housekeeper at Lincoln College where Dr Duncan lived. It names the police officers who recovered Dr Duncan's body from the river on 11 May. It names others who were just in the vicinity on the evening of the incident, including one Bevan Spencer Von Einem. It also names the people whose identities were suppressed by the Coroner.

In 1972, the then Attorney-General, Len King, thought it improper to release the report because no charges had been laid, and he believed that its release might be damaging to reputations. Some 14 years later, in 1986, ex-police officers Michael Kenneth Clayton, Francis John Cawley and Brian Edwin Hudson were charged with manslaughter. Their committal was held before the then Chief Magistrate Mr Nick Manos. Once again, suppression orders were made in relation to certain witnesses. Mr Manos found that there was insufficient evidence to put Mr Hudson on trial, and he was discharged. Mr Clayton and Mr Cawley were committed for trial. The trial took place in the Supreme Court before Mr Justice O'Loughlin and a jury. Judge O'Loughlin also suppressed the names, addresses and anything tending to identify certain witnesses. On 30 September 1988, the jury acquitted both Mr Clayton and Mr Cawley.

Despite the outcomes of the trial, the McGowan report was kept confidential. Since the report was written, parliament has enacted the Freedom of Information Act. One of the aims of the act is to make as much information as possible available to the public, without infringing the privacy of individuals. The McGowan report is currently exempt from disclosure under certain provisions of the act that prohibit the unreasonable disclosure of information about 'personal affairs' and 'unproven' allegations or suggestions of criminal or improper conduct.

The protection afforded by these provisions lasts for 30 years, unless the time is extended by regulation. The McGowan report will cease to be exempt under the relevant provisions in October this year. The government has been forced to consider whether to release the report or to extend the period of exemption by regulation. Given the content and sensitivity of the report, the government consulted with the opposition about its public release. I thank the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow attorney-general for their positive contribution to the discussions on this important matter.

After much deliberation, these decisions have been made. First, the government will not make a regulation that continues to exempt the McGowan report from disclosure. The McGowan report will be released subject to this house's passing a resolution to do so. The government will, however, make a regulation which extends the time for the exemption of the many statements taken by police that are not relevant to the report or the events that led to Dr Duncan's death.

Secondly, the government will not apply to have the court orders suppressing identities of certain witnesses revoked. The report will be released, therefore, without revealing the identities of some of the persons who were named in the report. The government has reached this decision based on

consultation with the witnesses or their families that have come forward. We consider that the reasons the suppression orders were made in the first place are still applicable, and that removing the orders would cause unnecessary hardship to the witnesses and to their families. However, I would like to point out that the names suppressed in the report are the names of private individuals and not public figures. There are no current or former members of parliament, the judiciary, the media or the police force amongst them.

This brings me to the final group of people named in the report—the innocent people who happened to be in the vicinity of the incident when it took place or who were indirectly involved in some other way. The government has decided to release the names of these people (although it has deleted some addresses). This is despite objections from some of them whom we were able to contact. We have taken the view that the only way to end speculation about the report is to release as many names and as much content as possible. This view has not been reached lightly. The government has had to face the difficult task of balancing the public interest in releasing the report against the right of individuals to privacy.

At this point, I would like to make particular mention of Mr Roger James. Mr James was thrown into the river on the night that Dr Duncan died, and he broke his ankle. He is named throughout the report, and has legitimate reasons for not wanting it released. For instance, the report unfairly refers to Mr James as a suspected drug addict. Perhaps more offensively, it suggests that Mr James did not cooperate with police or was hiding information. In order to avoid any possible hardship to Mr James and to the other innocent people named in the report, we ask that all of you here today—and, in particular, members of the media—respect the privacy of these individuals. For many named in the report, simply being involved in the investigation was a traumatic event, and remains so today.

Finally, before moving that the report be published, I would like to state that the public may wonder whatever happened to Detective Chief Superintendent McGowan and his sergeant. As far as we know, both left the police force a few years after writing the report. Mr McGowan retired and was later convicted of fraudulent evasion of value added tax. Mr O'Hanlon was convicted of four counts of corruption. By leave, I move:

That the report written by Detective Chief Superintendent R.J. McGowan, concerning the death of Dr George Ian Ogilvie Duncan, be published in accordance with section 12 of the Wrongs Act.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: Before proceeding, there are matters which are inherent in the proposition that the house has now passed and to which I did not draw attention prior to the motion being put, for the very simple reason that I do not think it appropriate for me (from the chair) to try and influence what might be a debate or, if there is a debate, the substance of that debate prior to any question being put in that manner. I believe there has been an abundance of caution exercised in the Attorney-General's proposition and its passage through the house without debate. Under section 12 of the Wrongs Act it probably is not necessary for us to have exercised such caution for us to be able to claim parliamentary privilege for all documents tabled in this place.

Nothing that we have done today, in my judgment or in my personal opinion, has detracted from the privilege of parliament where it relates to such documents in any way, shape or form. If members and others wish to better inform

themselves of that matter, I draw their attention to section 12 of the Wrongs Act and, in particular, that part which provides:

It shall be lawful for any defendant in any civil or criminal proceeding in respect of the publication of any report, paper, votes, or proceedings of parliament, which either house of parliament deems fit and necessary and has authorised to be published, to bring before the court. . . the court shall thereupon stay the said proceeding. . .

This means that absolute privilege does apply to those documents which are simply tabled. Standing order 202 of the House of Assembly provides:

All papers and documents laid upon the table of the house. . . are considered public. Papers not ordered to be published may be inspected at the office of the house at any time. . .

Accordingly, I take that to mean, as I have stated to the house, that privilege is in no way diminished for those other documents which may be tabled but to which such a motion does not apply—as has happened today—and that they have no less privilege than this document which has arisen out of the decision of the Attorney-General for whatever reason to move and for the house to pass the motion it has so passed.

HOSPITALS, GLENSIDE

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As reported in today's media, two patients absconded from the Glenside campus late on Friday 12 July 2002. In two other separate incidents a further two patients also absconded from the Glenside campus on Sunday 14 July 2002. Three of these patients were considered to be low risk and were on licensed ground parole. The fourth person absconded after breaking out of a courtyard security area during a regular 15 minute break. Police were then advised. I am pleased to inform the house that that person has now been apprehended.

Glenside campus comprises 335 beds, 38 of which are defined as 'closed' beds providing a high level of secure in-patient care services and 297 as 'open' ward beds. There are three legal groups of patients cared for at Glenside. These are voluntary patients, patients detained under the Mental Health Act and patients detained under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act gives power to the courts to place a person in the care of the mental health system instead of the corrections system. Under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, patients at Glenside must remain under the treating psychiatrist and if they leave the grounds they are in breach of their licence and are apprehended by police.

The security of the courtyard is being upgraded; the fence is being strengthened; new lighting is being installed; and camera positions are being audited. I have been informed that service data for the 12-month period July 2001 to June 2002 shows that only one patient absconded from high security during that period. In view of the incidents last Friday and yesterday, I have ordered my department to review as a matter of urgency all security arrangements and related procedures at Glenside.

GAMING MACHINES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I refer to comments made over the last few days by Mr John Lewis of the Australian Hotels Association regarding the government's decision to introduce a gaming supertax on the super rich pokie venues. Quite frankly, I am concerned with these comments. Mr Lewis is making a number of inaccurate and misleading statements in what is obviously an attempt by the Australian Hotels Association—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We are going to vote against the legislation, are we? Mr Speaker, quite frankly, I am concerned with these comments.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'm going to come to that. Mr Lewis is making a number of inaccurate and misleading statements in what is obviously an attempt by the Australian Hotels Association to pressure the government to change its decision. We will not be bullied in this way. I do, however, accept the Australian Hotels Association—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Very sensitive on this issue! We know all about their letter. I do, however, accept the Australian Hotels Association's right to voice strongly its opposition to the government's decision. There are numerous inconsistencies in the information that have been provided to the media since Thursday.

Claims of massive job losses, rises in the price of hotel meals and drinks and the withdrawal of important investment in South Australia by hotels are contradicted by past experiences. Figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics' publication 8687 clearly shows that over the period 1995 to 1998 growth in employment levels within hotels and clubs was 15.4 per cent. There were two increases to the rate of gaming tax during this period.

Mr Lewis's claims of immediate job losses stand in stark contrast to comments made by the Scott Elmes Hotel Group Managing Director, Russell Elmes. On ABC radio on Friday 12 July 2002, Mr Elmes denied that staff would immediately be sacked over the introduction of this revenue measure, stating that it was too early to be making such statements, given that the increase will not even take effect until 1 January 2003. The hotels association—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You can defend them. You can vote against the tax.

The SPEAKER: Order! Let me make it plain: the minister has leave to make a statement; that does not involve debate. Perhaps the opposition needs to be reminded again that interjections are out of order. I do not even find much of what is being said by the opposition entertaining.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. The Australian Hotels Association has also failed to mention that a total of 368 hotels and clubs will pay either no tax or a reduced amount of tax, and many will pay no tax increase at all; and 246 of these are in the country. This revenue measure is progressive and designed to target those who can most afford it.

In Saturday's *Advertiser*, there were quotes from a number of hoteliers responding to the new revenue measures and its potential impact on their businesses. I am advised that in actual fact one of the hotels which is quoted in the article as saying that they will be reducing staff numbers as a result of the new revenue measure will in fact be \$140 a year better off under the revised taxation structure. This is an example of the

hype and misinformation created by the Australian Hotels Association.

Further to this, claims have been made by the AHA that Carlton & United Breweries will be reviewing their \$120 million investment in South Australia. Whilst they are certainly concerned by the government's decision, I have been contacted by representatives of CUB over the weekend stating that the comments made by Mr Lewis are not correct. Claims that hotels will raise the prices of meals and drinks are also concerning. My office is preparing for me today a letter to be sent to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC), seeking its urgent advice as to whether a 10 per cent price rise constitutes anti-competitive and collusive behaviour by some elements of the hotel industry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens will not interject.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is something the government will not tolerate. I also wish to comment on claims made by the AHA in Saturday's *Advertiser* regarding the undertaking given by the Labor Party, by me, during the recent state election campaign. This article provided some very selective quotes. On 26 January 2002 I wrote to Mr John Lewis regarding Labor's position on taxes and charges—

An honourable member: And lied.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And I lied, did someone say?

Mr Koutsantonis: Yes, Robert Brokenshire.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, Robert Brokenshire or a member opposite—

Mr Koutsantonis: The member for Mawson.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Mawson said I lied, and I ask him to withdraw.

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHERE: I don't appreciate having my name put in *Hansard* when I said nothing. I ask the Treasurer to retract.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise, sir, it was the member for Unley. It was one of them. I apologise to the member for Mawson.

Mr Brindal: It was not me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And to the member for Unley. I apologise to him as well. Somebody said I lied: we're not sure which one it was. I apologise to the member for Mawson and the member for Unley. On 26 January 2002 I wrote to Mr John Lewis regarding Labor's position on taxes and charges. The full sentence being quoted reads as follows:

Importantly, Labor will not raise taxes or charges from current levels or introduce new taxes and charges to fund our modest spending program and to achieve a balanced budget.

Further in the letter I quoted from the report of Ernst & Young on Labor's costings. They wrote:

The costings do not contain the provision or necessity for funding for any new or additional taxation measures or government charges. . .

They also wrote:

Nothing has come to our attention during the course of the review to suggest that the costings contained are not correct or are unreasonable.

Nothing came to our attention to suggest otherwise until we came into government and were confronted with the reality of Rob Lucas's and the Liberal government's significant budget deficits. We have funded our modest election promises through a reallocation of priorities and a reduction in the level of waste created by the previous government. Tax

increases will contribute to funding the Liberal party's budget deficits left to us when we came to office. No government, and indeed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has leave, not the member for Mawson or the member for Newland.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, Sir. No government and, indeed, no Treasurer likes to include increased revenue measures as part of their budget strategy. However, confronted with the advice of Treasury of \$90 million of super profits earned by a limited number of hotels, advice confirmed by two independent sources, I would have been negligent as a Treasurer to have ignored this advice. Indeed, the question should be asked: why did Mr Lucas, the Leader of the Opposition and the former Liberal government ignore advice that there were tens of millions of dollars of super profits being earned by hotels?

I would also be very interested to see the opposition's pre-election undertakings to the Australian Hotels Association. Will the Leader of the Opposition release to the media today a copy of the letter and then explain why he gave a commitment not to raise taxes, why the Liberal Party gave a commitment not to raise taxes, when I am advised that they were aware of the super profits being earned by hotels?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

QUESTION TIME

GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Does the Treasurer concede that his decision to increase taxation on poker machines has caused great damage to South Australia's reputation as an investment location?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Which it has.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Are you defending the pokies now?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: No, not at all.

The SPEAKER: Order! Does the leader have a question or an answer? I distinctly heard the leader say, 'Which it has.'

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Well, sir, I am not the only one interjecting at the moment.

The SPEAKER: I didn't think you needed to interject on yourself! Come back to the question.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Prior to the election, the Treasurer provided a written commitment to the AHA that a Labor government would not increase taxation on poker machines. This commitment was later confirmed in a meeting between the Treasurer and representatives of the AHA, eyeball to eyeball. As the house would now be aware, the Treasurer broke this commitment last Thursday without any consultation with the hotel industry. Many hoteliers have made substantial investment decisions, some of which are currently under construction, in good faith, based on revenue forecasts which have now been thrown out the window as a result of the Treasurer's decision. In a media release last week, the AHA stated:

The Labor government has sent a clear message to potential investors into South Australia that the ground rules could be changed at any time and the promises were not worth the paper they are written on which are disastrous for future investments in South Australia.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Thank you, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: I ask the Treasurer to resume his seat. I am contemplating the substance of the question as asked, and a good bit of the information, mostly opinion, provided in the explanation as to whether or not this question anticipates debate on the appropriation and gaming bills that are already on the *Notice Paper*.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I rule the question out of order. The member for Napier.

Mr MEIER: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, if one has a look at the—

The SPEAKER: The member for Napier will resume his seat.

Mr MEIER: If one has a look back at *Hansard* after previous budgets, one will find that questions have been asked on the budget immediately following presentation of the budget. Therefore, I ask you: on what grounds do you rule the question out of order?

Mr Brokenshire: A good point of order.

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Mawson, to begin with. Any further interjection will result in his being named. The grounds are quite simple. In this case, in addition to the budget, there is a measure of which the Treasurer has given notice on the *Notice Paper* directly relating to the substance of the question the leader asked, and to that extent the information sought anticipates debate on that bill. The question is out of order. In no other circumstance on a budget proposition has there been a bill upon which questions might have been asked and were not asked. If, in any case, a bill before the house has had questions without notice asked on it in the past, that has been disorderly and not something upon which I otherwise wish to further reflect. Our standing orders and the proceedings and practices of our house, most commonly taken from Erskine May, make it quite clear that such questions, as anticipate debate on a bill on the *Notice Paper*, are out of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On a point of order, would it be possible, sir, for you to give permission to the Leader of the Opposition to rephrase his question—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —so that it did not anticipate debate on that particular bill?

The SPEAKER: May I say to the Attorney-General, yes; and it would help if the Leader of the Opposition and other people making explanations to questions did not engage in a speech in which they express opinion. The purpose of explanation is simply to provide factual information—not to express personal opinion or political attitude to a measure. I invite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I invite the leader to restate the question in a form that will not offend the standing orders or the practices and, in the meantime, as the leader has nominated a wish to have the next two questions from the opposition, I ask the member for Napier to proceed with his question.

STATE BUDGET

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Will the Treasurer inform the house of public reaction to last week's budget?

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. If the question to the Leader of the Opposition was out of order,

is not a question directly on reaction to the budget equally out of order?

The SPEAKER: It is and for quite different reasons, in that no minister can be asked to comment upon remarks that have been made in the press or elsewhere outside the chamber. The member for Enfield.

HOSPITALS, INFECTION CONTROL

Mr RAU (Enfield): I was going to ask about the budget but I have now decided that I will ask a question of the Minister for Health. Will the minister provide the house with details of steps being taken to implement the government's policy to improve infection control standards and the cleanliness of our major metropolitan hospitals?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Can we have an answer? I thank the honourable member for this question because I have received many complaints over recent years from the public about unacceptable conditions in some locations. Members will recall that the 2001 Productivity Commission report found that South Australia had a higher rate of hospital-acquired infection than other states, including higher rates for hospital acquired bacterial infections and infections following surgery.

On 21 April 2002, I announced a review of infection control in our major public hospitals following the closure of the cardiothoracic unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital due to methicillin-resistant staphylococcus aureus (MRSA) contamination and similar incidents late last year at the Women's and Children's Hospital neonatal care unit and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's intensive care unit.

This report is due to be completed by the end of this month. An audit of hospital cleaning has also been ordered to identify where the system is breaking down and to make recommendations to ensure that standards of cleanliness are continuously upheld. This audit will be conducted by my department in consultation with hospital management, staff unions and cleaning contractors. Last week's budget allocated an extra \$6 million over four years to fund cleaner hospitals and infection control to ensure that they adhere to the highest cleanliness and infection control standards. Decisions on funding priorities will be made after receipt of the report by the Brennan review into hospital-acquired infections and the audit of cleaning standards in metropolitan hospitals.

The SPEAKER: Before calling the Leader of the Opposition, can I further explain, for the benefit of members, that questions without notice may not contain argument. Our standing order number 97 expressly states that. Equally, it can be found in the House of Commons practices 1864, or members can examine Erskine May at page 287. Further to that, our standing orders and the practices also, quite simply, make it highly disorderly to express opinions. Again, that is to be found on page 287 of Erskine May. I do not make the standing orders. They are in the possession of the house. The chair simply upholds those standing orders to ensure that things are orderly, according to the decisions which this house has made about what is orderly and what is not. The Leader of the Opposition.

GAMING MACHINES

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Treasurer. Will the decision to increase taxation on poker machines cause great damage to

South Australia's reputation as an investment location? In a media release last week, the AHA stated:

The Labor government has sent a clear message to potential investors into South Australia that the ground rules could be changed at any time and that promises were not worth the paper they were written on, which was disastrous for the future of investments in South Australia.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I am glad to finally rise to answer a question from either side. I am glad that the opposition has nailed its colours to the super rich pokie venues in South Australia. The opposition is standing up for the hotel operators in this state that are making very large profits. I am well qualified to debate and discuss this issue and to answer this question. I am one of few MPs in this house who has consistently opposed a freeze on poker machines and who has consistently supported the AHA right through my time in parliament.

When I was confronted with advice that a limited number of venues were enjoying in excess of \$90 million of super profits, I believed—criticise me, or not—rightly or wrongly, that I would have been negligent as a Treasurer of this state not to have taken back some of that profit for our schools and hospitals. In 2001-02, 73 per cent of net gaming revenue was earned by just 28 per cent of venues; of the \$39 million we will be collecting, 41 venues will contribute nearly half. That is the magnitude of the issue at hand here. Under the current existing tax structures, I am advised that the average rate of tax paid on net gaming revenue in South Australia by hotels is 36 per cent. This is below Victoria's 41 per cent and Queensland's 37 per cent, but above New South Wales' 24 per cent. This measure will increase that rate to, I think, just over 41 per cent. That is still average, about online with that of Victoria.

Let us remember that \$5 million of that money is going back to hotels and clubs: 292 hotels and 76 clubs pay less tax; 42 hotels and seven clubs have no change to taxation; and 15 clubs and 161 hotels pay more tax. I have already said that following comments by the AHA on the weekend—and clearly the Leader of the Opposition was not quick enough to change the thrust of his question after my statement—Carlton & United Breweries contacted me through an adviser to advise that, while they are angry, disappointed and concerned, and while they want to meet with me at the earliest opportunity, they are not at all happy with comments attributed to them by Mr John Lewis of the AHA. That is an important point.

With regard to the hysteria being raised, today in the paper one hotel said that it will have to lay people off to deal with this tax, or increase the cost of meals or beer. We did the calculation. We knew the hotel, and we had a look at it and found that it would be \$140 a year better off. The point of the exercise is this: hotels need to listen less to the hysterical responses of the AHA and look more at the facts and figures.

We have heard claims of 300 hotels being affected. As I have said, that is not supported or sustained by the facts. The number of hotels affected is 161. We need some calmness by the AHA. However, as I said, when confronted as a Treasurer with Treasury advice that between \$90 million and \$100 million excess super profits is being earned, what was I to do: ignore that, like the former Treasurer, like the former government? No; I had to deal with the dilemma that, yes, I had told the AHA we would not raise taxes on gaming machines. But, I said—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No argument; I said that to them in a face-to-face meeting during the election campaign. I am acknowledging that; I am not saying that I did not. The point I am making is that when I am confronted—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, I know what you would do, Leader of the Opposition, because you did it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Members opposite had advice and evidence that there were super profits, and they ignored it. You were in government for eight years, and you ignored it. I did two things: I got independent advice to understand and be certain of the cost structures from which clubs, pubs and hotels had to work. That advice then confirmed the Treasury calculation. I then said, 'I want further evidence, advice and comfort that this is correct.' We brought in accounting firm Allen and Co. It came in from interstate, and it provided—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Why not a South Australian firm?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Because too many accounting firms had a conflict of interest; that's why. I had to go interstate because I had to find somebody who did not have a conflict of interest.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Why didn't you advertise?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You are a dill, member for Davenport.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe that the Treasurer used unparliamentary language against the member for Davenport and I ask him to retract.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport is quite capable of defending himself in the event that he feels offended. I must say that, being distracted on another matter of substance at that moment, I do not know what was said to which the member for Mawson took exception.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, I humbly apologise and withdraw my references to the member for Davenport. Fancy suggesting that we should have advertised for an accountancy firm to come and help us work out whether there was a super profit in the industry—to do that in the lead-up to the budget—a silly suggestion! The Allen group advised me that the assumptions were correct. What was I to do when I had two independent bodies of advice confirming Treasury advice? As somebody who has been the biggest advocate in support of the hotel industry in this parliament, I had a dilemma, because I knew that friendships I had in the industry would be lost over this. I also knew that relationships I had with the AHA would be lost over this. But, I had to do what was right by the taxpayer—unlike the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition, who say that we should not have taxed them. Well, they are wrong. I have taxed them, and I am proud I have done it, because that money will go into our schools and hospitals. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to be the PR machine for the hotel industry and for the super profits, so be it.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I believe in answering a question that a minister is equally not permitted to debate the matter. Sir, I ask you to rule on that matter.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the minister strayed so far from the substance of the question into debate rather than answer that I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I will conclude with these comments. We are helping 76 clubs and 292 hotels. Should we not be doing that? We are taxing but a few

hotels. And I say this. You have a chance this week; you have legislation to vote on. If you are so damned concerned about this, vote against the legislation. Do not come in here with your hollow words. We know what you promised the industry. You do not have the moral fibre to go back on your promise. I have, because I have done the right thing in taxing the industry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will, as will all other members and ministers, address their remarks to the chair and not provoke other members into interjecting. It has always been a problem in any parliament when second person pronoun becomes part of the form of address, and that is the reason for us having a standing order that requires us to address our remarks to the chair.

STATE BUDGET

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): Will the Treasurer advise the house what has been the response to the Treasurer's office from the public to last week's budget?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I was concerned, because this was a tough (but fair) budget—and it was one that got the priorities right. As I said in my previous answer, it involved taking money from the rich and giving it to the smaller clubs and pubs, and putting it into our schools and hospitals. I am not ashamed of that: I am proud of that. I wish to inform the house of some of the comments that have been received. John Lush, President of the South Australian Farmers Federation, described the state budget, overall, as responsible. Clubs SA spokesman Michael Keenan said, in respect of the pokie changes:

It will enable some clubs to survive, there's no doubt about that, and we would expect that the medium-sized clubs will be much better off.

Adelaide University economist Cliff Walsh (not necessarily a fan of the Labor Party in the past) said:

I think it's probably the best budget we've seen since Stephen Baker's 1994. I mean, it's done the right things. It's got the public sector back into some sort of balance, and it's done it while shifting priorities.

Then there was Professor Richard Blandy, from the Centre for Applied Economics—someone held in high regard by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and I know the member for Fisher holds him in high regard, as do many others. Professor Blandy said that, overall, the budget is in good shape and it is probably worth a B+. It has a B+ from Professor Blandy, and he is a tough marker. Then there was the Director for Public Finance, Rick Shepherd, from the ratings agency Standard & Poor's, who said:

They have taken a big step and they are getting their accrual operating surpluses, which is like a profit for a commercial company. It's coming slowly back into surplus. It will be in surplus by the end of the forecast period. So, I think that's a big improvement from what we've seen in the past, where it seems to be stuck at around a deficit of between \$100 million and \$200 million.

Then there was, of course, a comment by Rex Jory, the Associate Editor of the *Advertiser*.

Ms CHAPMAN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The specific question was in relation to the response to the minister's office, not a list of published media quotations. I ask you, sir, to rule that the Treasurer stick to the question, and answer in terms of the response he received.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will not mention the member for West Torrens again in anything other than unfavourable terms with

respect to the prospects of his being here for the rest of the day. I uphold the point of order that the member for Bragg raises. The question was explicitly about public response to the Treasurer's office. I was assuming for a while that the same remarks as appeared in the press were also made to his office directly, until he reached Rex Jory, when I knew that Mr Jory was never likely to have rung his office to say anything. For that reason, I ask the Treasurer to give an answer to the specific question and leave Mr Jory where he belongs—right out of it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will not read out the very favourable comments made by the associate editor, but I will circulate them to members' boxes. Unfortunately, I cannot read Valerie of Davoren Park's comment in the paper, where she referred to me as a knight in shining armour.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker—unless the Treasurer has finished answering his question—

The SPEAKER: If he hasn't, I have.

PUBLIC SECTOR JOBS

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Mr Speaker, my question is to the Treasurer. Will you admit that last week's announcement—

The SPEAKER: No, I can't admit anything. You may address the question to me, but I can't answer it.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Sir, I did say that it was to the Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: But it's through the chair to the Treasurer—'will he admit'.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Thank you, sir, I will go by your guidance. Will the Treasurer admit that last week's announcement to cut 600 public service jobs is an unequivocal break of an election promise? In an interview on ABC Radio on 8 February this year the now Treasurer promised that 'no Public Service Management Act employees have anything to fear'. Four months later, we now find that 600 jobs will be cut from the Public Service with separation packages being offered to clerical staff and senior bureaucrats, employees whom I believe are very much Public Sector Management Act employees.

The SPEAKER: I guess the answer hinges on the definition of 'fear'. The Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Sir, no public servant has to fear this government at all. They are voluntary packages, and at \$70 000 for an average package I do not think there will be a lack of applicants.

MUSEUM

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Will the Premier and the Minister for the Arts inform the house of proposed new developments at the South Australian Museum?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I thank the member for Torrens for her interest in the Museum and, indeed, in all matters to do with the arts in this state. As Premier and Minister for the Arts I am delighted to be able to tell the house that, following the change of government just four months ago, more than \$1 million in extra funding will be granted to the South Australian Museum. An \$850 000 grant will be made to the Museum to enable the safe storage of a major collection of valuable natural science materials. This collection (the Natural Science Spirit Collection) consists of millions of specimens preserved in alcohol. A number of

these specimens are now extinct and are therefore priceless heritage items for our state. It includes specimens collected by Sir Douglas Mawson in Antarctica as well as extinct fauna.

Also, of course, members would be aware that the Museum has been keen to promote alternative energy. The Museum is one of the most visited places in the state, with hundreds of thousands of visitors each year including tens of thousands of schoolchildren. It has a small display of, I think, about 20 solar panels on the roof. I have announced that \$200 000 will be allocated to allow the installation of more solar panels on the roof of the South Australian Museum. Members will also be interested to know that the State Library, the Art Gallery and the Museum are amongst the highest users of power on North Terrace. To this end, last week I informed Ron Radford of the Art Gallery that I have approved \$200 000 to allow the installation of solar panels on the Art Gallery roof as well.

This is about our meeting with the Capital City Committee (which includes the Lord Mayor, Alfred Huang, ministers and also members of the Adelaide City Council) about the desire to promote Adelaide as a green city, and I hope this will eventually lead to an alternative energy or sustainable energy precinct in the vicinity of North Terrace. There are a number of things that we can do to enhance and preserve the parklands such as involving our Youth Conservation Corp in the planting of urban forests (the lungs of the city). This is not just about providing different sources of sustainable energy but also about being effective in making substantial cuts to greenhouse gases. Not only is it interesting that it is environmentally sound to invest in green energy in the form of these panels, but also I wish to point out that the annual power bill for the Art Gallery alone is approximately \$430 000 per year.

PUBLIC SECTOR JOBS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Premier. Given the government's stated commitment to ensuring that health and education remain a priority for government spending, will the Premier confirm for the house that none of the 600 jobs targeted by the Treasurer for elimination from the public sector will be lost from these sectors? The government has constantly ruled out cuts to health and education, saying:

The efficiency dividend does not apply to health and education because they are priority areas.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): The 600 positions made available, as I said, are voluntary. They will be available to agencies to assist with the cost savings initiative. They will not be, where possible, from front-line services.

MAGILL TRAINING CENTRE

Mrs HALL (Morialta): My question is directed to the Minister for Social Justice, Minister for Housing and Minister for Youth. What provision, if any, has been made in this year's budget for the relocation of the clients at the Magill Training Centre? Media reports over the weekend and again today highlight the need for continued vigilance and planning when it comes to the state's correctional facilities. In the latest edition of the *PSA Review*, General Secretary, Jan McMahan, makes it clear that members of the PSA have serious concerns about the 'appalling conditions' existing in the Magill facility. The former government had included

\$22 million in its forward estimates for a facility at Cavan to replace the Magill Training Centre.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I am happy to take that question, and I will get absolute commitment on this, sir. From my recollection, notwithstanding the often stated position of the PSA that that money was in the forward estimates, from memory it was not. I will have that checked. It was listed by the former government, from memory, as a public-private partnership. My recollection is that it was not in the forward estimates, but I will have that confirmed and get an answer for the member as soon as possible.

FINES AND EXPIATION NOTICES

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Premier. Will he now admit that his government has broken another promise with respect to dedicating funds received from increases from speeding fines and expiation notices to increase support for police? In the current budget it is anticipated that several million dollars of increased revenue will be received from speeding fines and expiation notices, with the cumulative total projected of an additional 10 000 fines being issued to South Australians—and, yet, there is not an extra dollar dedicated for increased police numbers.

The SPEAKER: That, I understand, comes not from any document but, rather, from the mind of the honourable member for Mawson and is therefore an expression of opinion and not part of an explanation.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, it is in the documents. It is in the Portfolio Statements, Budget Paper No. 4, vol. No. 1, sir.

The SPEAKER: Would the honourable member restate the quote?

Mr BROKENSHIRE: In the projected outcomes for expiation notices and fines—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am asking the member for Mawson to repeat the last sentence of his explanation and then state where it is to be found in the document to which he refers.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: There is a total projection of an additional 10 000 fines being issued to South Australians, and yet there is not an extra dollar dedicated for increased police numbers or support for police.

The SPEAKER: Where in the papers is that statement to be found?

Mr BROKENSHIRE: It is under 'Outputs', and it is on page 5.20—Quantity: 'End of year (2001-02) estimated result—number of fines imposed and expiation notices lodged for enforcement—170 000'. The target for 2000-03 is an increase of 10 000 at 180 000 fines.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will resume his seat. The member for Mawson was asked explicitly to quote those words from the document that he was using in his explanation. It is cute to try to get away with it by saying that you were quoting from that document when it was the expression of an opinion that you were giving. Explanations must simply present to the house facts and not attempt to engage in debate. Equally, I remind the Treasurer that, in answering questions, factual information is to be provided and he must not engage in debate or discussion. I call the Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): A road safety and community fund in the budget paper as outlined and put forward by the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition has been incorporated in this budget. As to the specific

nature of the question, we will get the honourable member an answer.

EDUCATION SPENDING

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Will the minister representing the Minister for Education and Children's Services explain to the house why the government has broken one of its fundamental election promises by decreasing education spending by \$34 million in real terms over the next four years?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I cannot believe this question was asked, but I have been waiting for it. The former treasurer has been out there saying we are spending less money than they did on their budget. I am advised that, in the Department of Education and Training's 2002-03 budget, the operating expenditure rose by \$156 million compared to the 2001-02 budget. That represents real growth of approximately 6 per cent, I am advised. The 2001-02 budget of the Department of Education was \$1.803 billion. Subsequent decisions made by the former cabinet of \$4.5 million are added to that figure, bringing the implied mid-year review estimate of the Department of Education and Training's expenditure to \$1.808 billion.

The 2002-03 budget is \$152 million higher than the mid-year budget review figure that was implied, which represents a growth rate, I am advised, of 5.8 per cent. The higher estimated result compared to the budget for 2001-02 of course includes \$42 million of additional expenditure—not approved by the former government but approved by this government when we came to office; approved by this government between 7 March and 30 June (towards the end of the 2001-02 year).

That money was to cover a number of additional cost pressures—the unavoidable cost pressures that former treasurer Lucas failed to put into his budget—including increases and unavoidable cost pressures in user choice, Partnerships 21 funding and other critical areas. The implied mid-year budget review estimate for 2001-02 is significantly lower than the 2002-03 budget. This is because the mid-year budget review did not adequately address these cost pressures in the Department of Education's budget.

I am glad that, finally, former treasurer Rob Lucas has admitted that his mid-year budget review was nothing but a sham because, if his mid-year budget review was correct, there has been about a 5.6 per cent increase in real growth. That is the advice I have been given. The fact is that when we came to government we put more money into education to fund the unavoidable cost pressures which the previous government ignored and which lifted the 2001-02 budget to the level that it is at—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, sir, you specifically instructed the Treasurer not to venture opinion or to debate his answer to the question. I put to you that he is flouting your ruling.

The SPEAKER: He can express opinion but he cannot debate it. Again, I apologise to the house for not having heard the last sentence or so of what the Treasurer was saying. It seems to me that the Treasurer has probably concluded his reply.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Just in ending, the bottom line is that we are spending more on education. We have put more into education, and the member for Bragg has let the cat out of the bag—

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, sir, it seems that, on the question of relevance, the Treasurer is trapped in 2001-02. My question was in relation to the \$34 million deficit in real terms over the next four years. Perhaps he could move ahead a bit?

The SPEAKER: Can I say to the member for Bragg—
Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can I say to the member for Bragg that, whilst that may have been what the member for Bragg expressly stated as the basis of her inquiry to the Treasurer in explanation for what might have been proposed in the appropriations, the Treasurer may explain but do so without debating. I believe he did that.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Can I say that the member for Bragg has put her foot in Rob Lucas's mouth. What a silly question! How can you—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: How can you—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will not reflect on the integrity of other members in this chamber or their motives or the substance of their question: he must merely answer those questions. It is not only question time, it is also answer time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. As I was saying, the member for Bragg has asked a silly question, because how can I—

The SPEAKER: Order! To describe another member's question as silly is an inappropriate way to answer or respond. If the Treasurer has finished answering the question that has been asked, I suggest we move on. If he has further information to provide to the house, then by all means do so.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I apologise to the member for Bragg, but I cannot answer a question as to whether or not there has been a real increase unless I have a base to work with. You have to have the 2001-02 year as a base to work with. The simple answer is that if I used the mid-year budget review figure that Mr Lucas tells me was accurate, there is a 5.6 per cent increase. If Mr Lucas is now saying that there was not a real increase, because Labor had to put in more money since it came into office to 30 June 2001-02, then his mid-year budget review was what I have been saying all the way along: it was wrong, wrong, wrong!

PORT LINCOLN CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAM

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Attorney-General advise the house if the Port Lincoln crime prevention program has been cut? I have been contacted by the council, which is very concerned. It was involved in a phone link-up this morning with the Crime Prevention Unit regarding the program and was advised that the Attorney-General on Friday decided to cut the current crime prevention program. Funding for the program has been reduced by \$1.4 million to \$600 000 in total. A media release by the Premier clearly indicates the following:

... \$500 000 to support crime prevention committees in six regional service areas to focus on problem solving approaches to local crime issues. Committees will be funded in Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Murray Bridge.

The city council questioned the cut, cited the media release by the Premier and suggested that the regional areas would be funded and that the city would receive \$100 000. They were advised that this was a mistake and that a statement

would be made retracting the statement. When I checked the state budget web site today, the media release 'State budget will build positive futures for regional South Australia' was still on there, and there was no retraction that I could find.

The Port Lincoln city council has a crime prevention officer under the crime prevention program, and it was advised that the officers will have six months to wind down their projects. I understand that the crime prevention unit management project officer and administrative staff are public servants and will not be directly affected by the reduction in the local crime prevention program. This could mean that there will still be a crime prevention program in South Australia, but it will be centrally based.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I thank the member for Flinders for the question; it is a pertinent question. A mistake was made in one of the news releases that was issued in connection with the budget and a mistake was made in the news release displayed on the internet. In fact, there will not be a \$500 000 increase in crime prevention funding to local councils in those regional areas. That was, in fact, a budget bid of a previous government, and I emphasise 'a bid'. In fact, the crime prevention program will be reduced, as the member for Flinders says, and that was notified to crime prevention officers with local councils across South Australia today. The method used to reduce the overall funding will be a matter for me to decide in the weeks to come.

EDUCATION, SOUTHERN REVIEW

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Will the Acting Minister for Education and Children's Services tell the house about the forthcoming southern education review?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Reynell for her question, and I know that the honourable member is keenly interested in educational matters. Members will be able to read in the budget papers that there will be a review of educational opportunity resources in the southern Fleurieu Peninsula, particularly focused on the seat of Finnis. We are aware of incredible growth in that area and a greater demand for schooling by young people in that community and, obviously, more resources are needed to address those concerns. The former government had committed, in its forward estimates, something like \$20 million—I think, to be exact, \$19.6 million—of projects in the electorate of Finnis.

That was \$19.6 million out of a total of \$30.3 million of school upgrades for this year. The Minister for Education (Hon. Trish White), when she reviewed the budget bids for the coming year, thought that two-thirds for one electorate was probably a little much. The minister has embarked on an objective review of the allocation of resources for those purposes in this year's budget, and she has put on hold the plans for the Finnis area. I am not sure what methodology the former minister used in determining need but a methodology that resulted in two-thirds of the available money going into the one electorate (that of the former deputy premier) seemed to the current Minister for Education to be a little odd.

The minister is going through an objective process to determine need. The minister has not said no to any of these projects: she is merely going through a review process. We want to make sure that we get value for money. We will be spending a bit of money to get a better outcome, but we are

aware of the needs in the southern Fleurieu Peninsula. They will be addressed but not in this round.

HOSPITALS, GLENSIDE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Why was an upgrade of hospital security not put in place immediately following an escape of two patients from Glenside Hospital last Friday instead of being left until today, and why was there such a prolonged delay in alerting the public to the incident?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I draw the Leader of the Opposition's attention to the ministerial statement I made earlier today. He will find the answer there.

M NET

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Science and Information Economy explain to the house what benefits the government's investment in the M Net program has delivered to the business and IT community, and what are her plans for the future of that significant project?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Science and Information Economy): Members will realise that this was an investment by the previous government and not this one. The program is currently under assessment and I will report back with an answer at a later date.

OFFICE OF SUSTAINABILITY

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation explain the initiatives being taken to establish the Office of Sustainability? As part of its election policy to help ensure integration of environmental sustainability across government, Labor committed to establishing the Office of Sustainability within the Department of Environment and Heritage.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I will ignore the quip from the member for Fisher. I thank the member for the question. I know he has a strong interest in environmental matters; he is one of the greenest members in this place. The Office of Sustainability is an exciting initiative of this government. It is something that we proposed during the election period, and I am delighted to be able to announce that we are now going ahead with it. We are putting in an additional \$400 000 (which has been allocated) and there will be 25 staff, both new and existing positions, within the Department for Environment and Heritage. The office will be led by Anne Harvey, a very senior officer, the current Deputy Chief Executive of the DEH, and she will be the first director of this office.

The office has a number of goals and roles. It will develop broad strategic directions for environment and conservation, and a Murray River portfolio. I must emphasise, Mr Speaker—because I know you will be interested in this—it will have an across-government role as well. It will not just be focused on my department but will be looking at environmental issues across government. The office will critically evaluate proposals from all areas of government to ensure that cabinet can take an integrated approach to decision making. It will develop and implement accountability and reporting tools to emphasise sustainability. It will raise public awareness and sustainability and eco-efficiency issues. In the

future, we will establish a green business unit to provide practical support to innovative green business ideas.

CROWN LAND

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation inform the house of any changes he has agreed to, or is considering, to his announcement of increases in crown land leases and licence charges and the freeholding costs; and whether he is aware of the full ramifications of his announcement? In the recent budget, the government announced a new increase in charges to all crown leases and licences and an increase in freeholding costs. Since making the announcement the Minister for Environment and Conservation has admitted that there will need to be an exemption for war housing. I have been contacted by a man who owns a property in the state's north, near Orreroo. This gentleman has spent his own money fencing and undertaking weed and vermin control measures on a portion of the property which has no farming value but which contains very important native vegetation. This land is registered under four different crown leases. He will now be billed a minimum of \$1 200 for his efforts to protect the state's native vegetation. Is that what the government intended?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I gave notice last week of my intention to introduce a bill to amend the Crown Lands Act. I will introduce that bill today. That act in fact deals with these measures because, while they were announced as part of the budgetary process, separate legislation is required in order to have them brought through this house. I hope my answer is not out of order. There are something like 15 000 crown leases in South Australia. They have been implemented, introduced or allocated over the history of white settlement in South Australia. Some of them go back to the 1880s and 1890s. The lowest rent on the records that I could find for a crown lease is 5¢; the highest is probably just over \$1 000. In fact, I think 31.9 per cent (around 5 000) of all leases pay less than \$5 per annum for that lease; 18 per cent pay between \$5 and \$10; another 21 per cent pay between \$10 and \$25; and 22 per cent pay between \$25 and \$100. So a large number of parcels of crown land have been given on a peppercorn rental basis to some 15 000 leaseholders. Some of them have multiple holdings, as the member said in his question.

As the minister in the state government I decided to address this issue. It was brought my attention by officers of the Crown Lands Department. They informed me that the government currently brings in about half a million dollars a year by way of rent under the Crown Lands Act, but it costs us over \$1 million a year to collect that rent. That seemed to me a fairly foolish set of circumstances, one that no minister in the past had dared to address because, no doubt, of the objections that would be raised by those who were beneficiaries of these arrangements. I decided that we ought to do something about it. In addition to a shortfall of about half a million dollars in the collection of the rents, the crown lands section of the department needed significantly more resources in order to modernise its equipment and procedures. This was a way of doing it.

The honourable member asked about the soldier settlement leases. There was never any intention of having them included. That was ruled out from the very beginning, and by regulation they will be excluded. They are covered under different legislation and different arrangements, as are

pastoral leases, which will not be covered by this act. There is a capacity in the legislation by regulation to exclude particular kinds of leases—and the member for Chaffey is coming to see me later in the week because she has some concerns on behalf of her residents. She raised with me the possibility of aged-cottage homes, or something of that order.

Mrs Maywald interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I understand that she has raised townships as well.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: It is a bit hard to answer the question when there are three loud voices on the other side. I understood there was a concern about aged-cottage homes and it may be possible to exclude them by regulation in those circumstances as well. But the point is that we have 15 000 perpetual leases, licences, and so on, which are available to certain citizens of this state. This is land which is owned by the taxpayers of South Australia and which has been granted on a peppercorn lease a long time ago. Those rents have never been increased. Some of them may have been fair rents when they were first introduced. It seems absurd that One Steel in Whyalla, with property on the foreshore at Whyalla worth more than \$1 million, is paying \$2 by way of rent for that land. A range of businesses and land users with considerably valuable property, which is crown property, pay very little rent.

The other point I make to members is that a number of people over time have used crown land and have made a mess on that land—poisoned and polluted the land—and then given it back to the state for the state to take on the ongoing liability of cleaning up the mess. We need additional resources to cover our liability problems into the future as well. We will be having a debate on this issue because there is legislation before the house. All these issues can be discussed and all the questions that members on the other side have to ask can be addressed.

GLENELG TRAMLINE

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Will the Minister for Transport inform the house when the government will make an announcement on the future of the planned public-private partnership that was to be entered into to allow the upgrade of the Glenelg tramline and rolling stock? The former minister for transport instigated inquiries into the development of a public-private partnership to redevelop the Glenelg tramline and rolling stock. I understand 70 inquiries were received.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): When the government is ready.

CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Will the Minister for Health outline to the house the government's primary health care initiative to improve early intervention services?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): It is well recognised that enhancing child development and early intervention is the key to preventing developmental and health problems later in life. Last week's budget includes a new funding initiative to help children. While this initiative will focus on children with developmental delay, the government is firmly of the view that such measures must and will be placed within the broader context of children's development.

The government has allocated an extra \$4 million over four years to strengthen locally-based childhood development programs. This will provide extra support for parents to deal with such problems their children may have and give them a chance to nip them in the bud. Services will be family centred and will involve a range of different programs. This will include the provision of additional speech therapy services, as well as better links with specialist services in hospitals and other agencies, including schools, kindergartens and child-care centres.

Most importantly, the government will seek to initiate a broad range of measures designed to enhance child development more generally. This is a vital area of priority for this government. I have made this a specific focus of attention for the work of the parliamentary secretary, the member for Wright, who will work with me to ensure that child development issues retain a permanent policy focus for the government. As we strive to rebuild health services in South Australia, we will be strengthening and reorienting services towards prevention and primary health care. This is one of the clearest examples of that drive and that commitment.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ECONOMY

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I would like to make some comments on an article in today's *Advertiser* (pages 6 and 7). For those who have not read it, it is worth a read. It is headed, 'Time to break from the past', and it is written by Colin James. We know that the *Advertiser* is a quality newspaper, and I assume that what has been reported in there has been done so accurately. Colin James' first interviewee was the Department of Industry and Trade Chief Executive, Roger Sexton. I have known Roger for a long time, and I respect his authority and acumen. However, I cannot put two and two together here because, if he has been reported accurately, he does not paint a very rosy picture of South Australia at all. We all know that that is not the case. We all know that the South Australian economy has been booming and will continue to boom if it is given a chance and is not held back by this current government. Mr Sexton says in his article that we need to regenerate South Australia's economy. The article states:

Mr Sexton warned that an economic turnaround would not happen overnight.

The budget statement, Budget Paper No. 3 (page 9.5) states:

... the South Australian economy is in a growth cycle.

So, if we turn it around, will we shrink it? The following are the government's own words:

Domestic consumption growth is strong, with retail spending up 10 per cent throughout the year through to the March quarter 2002, and new motor vehicle sales up 11 per cent through the year to May 2002. In addition, the ANZ Bank job advertisement series shows job advertisements in South Australia up 20 per cent through the year to May 2002, arresting a 13 per cent decline through the year to December 2001.

So, there is a growth cycle. The South Australian economy is going not backwards but forwards. One only has to look at Budget Paper No. 3 (page 9.4). With the leave of the house,

I would like to include table 9.2 in *Hansard*. The table is headed, 'Value of South Australian overseas merchandise exports by selected commodity'. From the table it is apparent that in the 10 months to April 2001 the value of wine has gone from \$888 million to \$1.059 billion, up 19.2 per cent; road vehicles, parts and accessories from \$1.18 billion up to \$1.35 billion, an increase of 14 per cent; meat and meat preparations up 25.7 per cent; wheat up 66.2 per cent; and wool and sheepskins up 4.8 per cent. The increases are across the board. The economy is going exceptionally well. This is in the budget documents, in the government's own words. South Australia's GSP will grow by 2.75 per cent. That would be the envy of many countries in world. South Australia is going well, and I am proud to be South Australian and proud to be associated with the former Liberal government. The article in the *Advertiser* further states:

There is also a perception in some quarters that our workforce is not sufficiently skilled, or sufficiently flexible, to be able to attract new employers to the state.

My son works for Motorola, and I am proud that Motorola is in this state. It employs 400 people. I am not quite sure of the economic impact of 400 people in this state, but I guarantee that it is not negative. Holden's has just put on another shift, and Mitsubishi has experienced success, all due to work of the previous Liberal government.

Mr James's article continues on page 7 of the *Advertiser*. Another interviewee was city planner Charles Landry, who said that Adelaide should be concerned with revitalising itself. One only has to look at what is happening in Adelaide with regard to the urban infill and the growth that is going on through the whole coastal strip right back to the city centre to see that it is all going forward.

Another interviewee was Spanish bureaucrat Alfonso Martinez Cearra. I think Mr Cearra has been drinking too much Spanish wine. He should try some good Australian wine. He said here that we should be looking at something for a world-class project. What was his world-class project? It was \$160 million to build a Guggenheim Museum. Next time Mr Cearra is in Adelaide, I invite him to come down to the Bay and see how \$350 million has been spent there on the Holdfast Shores. It is a fantastic effort; it really is.

I am sure that the members for West Torrens, Lee and Colton would all be pleased with the fantastic development along our coast. We do not need a specific icon. We have seen icons built in the past. South Australia is going well and is a great state.

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member for Morphett seeking leave to incorporate a table?

Dr McFETRIDGE: I was, Mr Speaker. It is a table from Budget Paper No. 3 relating to the increase in exports from South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not necessary for the member to do that. Indeed, it is disorderly if it is already in the budget papers.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I am glad of that. At least I have referred people to it. Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Yes, indeed. You can draw people's attention to such documents, but once they are in the possession of the house it is not appropriate to seek to incorporate their contents into the *Hansard* a second time around.

Dr McFETRIDGE: My enthusiasm knows no bounds, Mr Speaker.

TISSUE RETENTION

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I am pleased that the Minister for Health is in the chamber, because I rise to congratulate her on the memorial service that was held yesterday for families affected by issues of tissue retention. I have a longstanding interest in this issue which arose when a constituent of mine came to my office. Her daughter had died in a car accident some time ago, and it became known to her that on the autopsy report it had 'Tissues removed and retained' without her permission or even knowledge. This becoming apparent to her had an enormous effect on her and her husband. They had basically to relive the grief which they had experienced and had thought that they had dealt with.

I do not think there is any doubt that the medical practitioners who were involved in this practice were so involved with reasonable motives. However, there was certainly a very patronising attitude towards grieving relatives—particularly grieving parents—and it was thought that, in relation to some of these issues, it was just best that the relatives were left ignorant. All that resulted is an exacerbation of the grief when these issues have become known to those involved.

The service held yesterday at the Seaton Christian Family Centre was addressed in a moving way by a mother whose child had died from sudden infant death syndrome and who had tissues removed, and by a doctor—a neurologist, in fact, who had had this happen to him as well. There was also some quite moving symbolism in the service, during which a musical ensemble sang. I know, from speaking to my constituent, that she was moved by this service and felt that the service had helped her a great deal in dealing with her grief.

I congratulate the minister, and also the former minister, the member for Finnis (who was at the service), who was the minister at the time when these issues became apparent. I think the service helped a great deal in providing some closure to people affected by this issue, and I look forward to the government's making changes and reviewing the issues to deal with autopsies and tissue retention so that this never happens again.

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I rise to speak—

Mr Koutsantonis: Give us hell, Gunny.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, I have a couple of interesting things to say. I wish to refer to the effects of certain departmental policies that the government has instituted in relation to the future employment of Department of Transport employees in my constituency, in the Far North of South Australia. I have been contacted today and over the weekend by people who are most concerned that, by the end of the week, they will probably have their jobs terminated—

Mr Koutsantonis: Are you defending bureaucrats?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: These are not bureaucrats. These are daily paid people who are maintaining our road system in the Far North of South Australia. Some of them live in little country towns such as Marree. Their incomes are important; they are important to those communities. They have families who attend the local school; that is important. They are people with expertise and skills in constructing and maintaining this large road network, into which taxpayers have put millions of dollars over the last few years. If it is not properly maintained, it will be a waste of resources. Some years ago, Sir Humphrey decided to do this, and I was

fortunate enough to have it drawn to my attention and I intervened to have that foolish decision reversed. I say to members, and to the member for Giles (I know that she has been made aware of this): do you have the courage to stand up to the bureaucrats and your minister?

This is a silly decision. There have never been as many people accessing the Outback of South Australia as there are at the present time. The tourism industry is benefiting. A silly decision has been made in the budget to stop the department's funding tourism roads. In the past, this provided the ability to upgrade these roads and employ hundreds of young people in tourist facilities around South Australia. It was a sensible policy, which has had wide community support. One has only had to drive in Outback South Australia in the last 10 days (as did some of my colleagues) to see the number of people moving through from the Northern Territory border and from the east of the state to the west, as we did. They were all spending money—whether it was at a little shop at Kingoonya, the large motels at Coober Pedy, the hotel complex at Leigh Creek or elsewhere. Everyone is benefiting. People have jobs, and it is doing a great deal for South Australia.

The people to whom I am referring (some of whom are contract employees and have been employed for over 20 years) have been told that their jobs are about to go. Instead of spending hundreds of thousands of dollars on having a paid ALP office at Port Augusta and Murray Bridge, it would be far better to have this money invested and continue to keep these people in employment. I will have more to say on that matter as the weeks go on, because that is a story yet to unfold. It is all right for the honourable member to smile; Don Farrell paid his money and lost, and now they are going try it again.

The second matter I want to raise today relates to a very concerned South Australian who contacted me last night in relation to one of his neighbours, who is the victim of unreasonable action by the inspectors of the department of environment—the anti-farmer brigade. This poor constituent is a Vietnam veteran and is suffering some degree of stress from his unfortunate involvement in that conflict. He is a goat farmer and has a property, alongside which is a big park. He put in a scrub and created a decent firebreak to protect him and the rest of the community. These nasty little characters have been along and threatened him, because they reckon he has put in too big a firebreak. His neighbour who contacted me said, 'I nearly lost my life last time all that country caught on fire. Do you know that the monuments on the side of the road are to the person who did lose their life? What will you people do about it?' I had to say to him, 'Well, you've got the anti-farmer brigade running the department of environment at the moment. They have the minister's ear, so you people had better put pen to paper.'

One of the silliest laws ever passed in this parliament was the restriction of widths of firebreaks. I ask the government: who will accept the public liability when some of these parks catch on fire and people are being prevented from putting in adequate firebreaks to protect the public of South Australia?

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: This'll be good.

CASINO

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I always enjoy the member for Stuart's contribution—the wisdom of 32 years on the back bench poured over the chamber. I enjoy it

every time. I want to talk about our former treasurer, and the economic genius of his privatisation of the casino. The *Adelaide Advertiser* (which is excellent at in-depth investigative reporting) has let us know that, if the super tax that this government is applying to rich hotel barons had been applied to the casino (which it is entitled to be), we would have raised \$140 million per annum. I am sure the Minister for Health would like a piece of that \$140 million to put into the QEH, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Women's and Children's Hospital, the Lyell McEwin and maybe the Barossa hospital—which the member for Schubert is always talking about in terms of a lack of funds. The lion of the Barossa is always out there fighting for his constituents.

But I want to talk about the genius of the former treasurer in engaging in a privatisation exercise. This is almost as good as the TAB sale—almost, but not quite as good. He sold an asset that the people of South Australia owned, with virtually no risk, because we were told in the previous parliament by the previous government that the reason why it was being privatised was to remove the state taxpayer from any risk. That is what we were told. So, we sold an asset such as the casino, which is basically no risk at all. Now we find out that we are missing out on the super profits that the casino is making, which are flowing back to New Zealand; we are missing out on \$140 million.

An honourable member: Over what time?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That is for the period of the entire sale. From what I understand, the former treasurer has an explanation for this. In his wisdom, he gave us an explanation as to why he had to cap the tax rate on a privatised asset. He said:

Who's going to pay \$180 million for a casino if you can't get a commitment to what the tax agreement is going to be?

That is his reasoning for locking out \$140 million of revenue and taxes, of super profits from the Adelaide casino. One could have sold the former treasurer a bridge. He would buy a bridge. One could go to up to him and say, 'Hey, Rob, do you want to buy the Bakewell Bridge?' and he would ask, 'How much?' This guy is unbelievable. Not only—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: We built your bridge. It cost \$13 million.

Ms Rankine: We said 'Thank you.'

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I said 'Thank you.' And you didn't rebuild it; you just put up safety barriers.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: No, the Hindmarsh Island bridge.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It's not my bridge

The Hon. I.F. Evans: It's your party's bridge.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It's not my bridge. Not only did this former government enter into privatisations that have forced us, because of the lack of revenue we are now receiving from assets we used to own—

Mr Rau interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I have just been advised by the member for Enfield that this super profit that is tax free is for the next 13 years. Well done!

Ms Chapman: Did you oppose it?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Did I oppose privatisation? Here we go. The member for Bragg interjects and asks did I oppose it. I will tell members what I do oppose. I oppose super profits by the casino that are not being taxed and not going into our hospitals and schools. In her hypocrisy, the member for Bragg gets up today and asks about extra funding in the education portfolio, yet due to the actions of her colleague \$140 million over the next 13 years which could

have gone into education and hospitals is going to Auckland, New Zealand. Thank you very much, the member for Bragg!

What a deal for the South Australian taxpayer! The most important thing today is that from the opposite side there was no political response to the budget. They are bereft of ideology, they are bereft of ideas, and they could make no response: there was no economic response, no policy response and no political response. They are leaderless and rudderless, and they have no vision for South Australia. The best they can do is talk about trams.

Time expired.

CORNWALL, Dr J.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Today, the Attorney-General made two ministerial statements, and I wish to briefly comment on both. First, the Attorney-General announced a further determination by Justice DeBelle in the case of *Rowan v. Cornwall & Ors*. In his statement, the Attorney acknowledged that, in his judgment—and in the judgment following the further hearing on 12 July—His Honour stated that it was his intention that each of the defendants would jointly and severally be liable for the defamation order. The Attorney went on to inform the house of the particular orders that were made: the damages entitlement of \$259 606.10; interest thereon of \$175 000; a further payment in relation to loss of earnings of \$55 819; interest thereon of \$70 235—the total of which is \$530 660.10 if my addition is correct.

This judgment was delivered on 21 June 2002—which happened to be my birthday—and it was a rather lovely present, but it was not a present for the people of South Australia, because this judgment is for a very substantial amount of money for which, as the Attorney again today confirmed, the state government will continue to indemnify all the defendants, notwithstanding any appeal which may seek to reduce the total liability or the number of defendants who are to share in the joint liability of this award.

The Attorney-General reported this to the house, as I think he should, to inform members that some aspects of this judgment, including the finding of misfeasance in public office against Dr Cornwall specifically (which, in itself, attracted a further \$25 000 in damages) will be the subject of appeal—and I thank him for that. However, I note the obvious and clear omission of any apology to me or this house following previous questions which were raised about this matter regarding the clear determination of Justice DeBelle, which he confirmed on 12 July, that the defendants, as I have said, were jointly and severally liable. That has again been confirmed in the orders that were made. I am very disappointed that the Attorney-General has seen fit to omit any acknowledgment or apology to the house in relation to that. I invite him to do so, because in my considered opinion he should.

The Attorney-General's second ministerial statement related to the release of what has been described as the McGowan report some months earlier than required. The particulars of that report were laid on the table today so that the Attorney-General could move a motion to release it. The Attorney-General, in consultation with the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow attorney-general, determined that this report should be released. Aspects of the report continue to be suppressed in accordance with the continuation of the suppression order and the protection of anonymity given to certain parties.

Time expired.

MATERNITY LEAVE

Mr RAU (Enfield): I would like to address a few comments this afternoon on a subject that was canvassed this morning on ABC national radio. Mr Malcolm Turnbull, of whom I am sure everyone has heard, was talking about the issue of paid maternity leave. He advocated something in the order of a 12-month paid maternity leave proposal. I would like to raise a couple of issues about this matter for consideration in the parliament because, to some extent, this will become an issue for the parliament, as the state government clearly has a number of employees who may ultimately be eligible for this scheme if it is implemented.

The issue which concerns me particularly is the fact that paid maternity leave is advocated on the basis that it will encourage people to have families and enable them to support themselves, and so forth. As far as that goes, I suppose that is right, but it is fairly clear from the budget papers that one of the most serious problems facing South Australia is a lack of population. Of course, importing population is nowhere near as good as producing your own.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr RAU: Yes. We need to address the issue of why it is so difficult for people, not just in South Australia but in Australia, to have families which are above replacement level. The fact is that, anecdotally—if that is not a completely Irish way of describing anything—as far as I can determine, it appears that a lot of people would like to have more children but do not do so, essentially for financial reasons. What concerns me is that paid maternity leave, as far as it has been thought through, leaves out an important group in the community: single income families who might wish to have more children or who might wish to remain a single income family. Those people will get absolutely nothing out of these proposals, and they are probably more in need of a supplemented lifestyle in terms of having enough money to get through each week than those who are in full-time employment and likely to become the beneficiaries of a paid maternity leave scheme.

The point I would like to make is that, if public moneys are to be advanced for paid maternity leave in any form, why is it not being canvassed that balanced amounts of money should be advanced towards people who are not in the work force? If you are in a situation where there is only one breadwinner, your financial position is probably worse than the scenario of families with two breadwinners in the work force and your need for support is considerably greater.

I would like to hear more about schemes where families with one person in the paid work force can receive moneys which they can either devote to maintaining the family in its chosen condition—namely, with one person in the work force and one person at home—or, alternatively, advancing those moneys towards child care so that both members of the family can be involved in the paid work force—but do not leave them out of the loop altogether. All the discussion at the moment seems to be driven by people who are comfortably off. If money is going to be involved in any of these proposals, it is starting to get the look of middle-class welfare about it.

That is all right if it is done across the board and the people who are not in the paid work force get the same benefits from this as the people who are. But, transparently, if groups of people who are not in the paid work force are going to miss out and public moneys are going to be devoted towards assisting people in the work force, I think we need

to go back to basics and ask some questions about where these public resources are going, and make sure they are going to the people in the greatest need. That is not to say that there is no role for paid maternity leave, but it is to say that it is but part of a proper debate on the subject. It is not the whole answer: it is only the whole answer for those people who are able to take advantage of it.

Time expired.

HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMPLAINTS BILL

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for the making and resolution of complaints against health or community service providers; to make provision in respect of the rights and responsibilities of health or community service users and providers; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The purpose of the *Health and Community Services Complaints Bill 2002* is to provide for the making and resolution of complaints against health or community service providers; to make provision in respect of the rights and responsibilities of health and community service users and providers; and for other purposes.

Before detailing the purposes and provisions of the Bill it is worth recalling the background to the development of this legislation.

This initiative to establish a Health and Community Services Ombudsman is long overdue. Every day our fellow South Australians in their thousands approach health and community services for help, support and care. They do this at a time in their lives when they are at their most vulnerable due either to physical or mental illness, disability, or the despair brought on by family crises, unemployment, poverty and social exclusion.

Most people can and do approach these vital health and community services with confidence, certain in the knowledge that they will receive the help they need in a caring, respectful and professional manner. South Australia's dedicated health and community service providers, whether in government, non-government or private sectors, have an enviable and well-deserved reputation for delivering high quality services that meet 'world's best' standards of care.

While this picture is true for most people who use these services there is another more disturbing experience which can confront consumers. The sad reality is that things can go wrong when they should not. People can be poorly cared for, or receive the wrong treatment or medication, or can be dealt with in a disrespectful or at times careless manner. They can have their rights denied or be further damaged, or worse, by the very services meant to assist them.

Before honourable members come to debate the provisions of this bill I ask that we all remember one critical thing, and that is that problems and complaints about health and community services are intensely personal and affect individuals every day when they are at their most vulnerable. I am sure that all honourable members have dealt with women trying to escape from domestic violence situations who have not been helped by crisis service, or the mental health patient who cannot get the community support she needs, or the daughter whose elderly parent is not being cared for properly in an aged care facility, or the son whose mother received the wrong medication, or the expecting mother whose antenatal care is compromised because the GP and the specialist are not coordinating their services, or the teenager who has been mistreated by the care system designed to protect him or her.

Sometimes these problems can arise because of lack of resources or through misunderstanding and confusion. But we cannot discount the possibility of poor practices, improper or unethical behaviour or things just plainly going wrong when they should not.

In these times when people are at their most vulnerable the last thing they need is for a care service to further harm them or exclude them. The last thing they need is to be abandoned. The Labor Government is pledged to stand by people to provide them with the means of having their complaints and concerns addressed and resolved. At the very centre of the Government's Election Policy in Health and Community Services was the commitment to introduce this legislation.

There is now an established system of accountability for health providers internationally and throughout every State and Territory in Australia. That is, except here in South Australia. Everywhere in Australia if people have a problem with a provider of care, either public or private, and cannot resolve it directly, they can seek the intervention of a powerful, independent complaints body. Everywhere that is except here in South Australia.

Former State Labor governments started the process of providing health consumers with protection in the South Australian health system. In the 1980s the then State Labor Government established the Health Advice and Complaints Office as part of its commitment to develop a broader based independent complaints office.

In 1993 the then State Labor Government signed the Medicare Agreement committing the Government to establish a Charter for Health Consumer Rights and an Independent Health Complaints Agency. The former Minister for Health and former Member for Elizabeth, the Honourable Martyn Evans, concluded a broad based consultative process and developed clear proposals for a Charter and draft legislation to establish such a Complaints Agency. Today, I wish to acknowledge and commend his work.

It was not until 1996 that the former Minister for Health Dr Michael Armitage finally moved to establish a small Unit with limited powers and jurisdiction, within the Office of the State Ombudsman. I emphasise that this however only provided for limited coverage of the State Public Health System.

By 1996 the rest of the country had already moved beyond the terms of the 1993 Medicare Agreement. By 1996 all other States and Territories in Australia had either implemented or were in the process of establishing comprehensive independent health complaints commissioners or ombudsmen, which had the powers to cover both the public and private system. These moves were in line with recommendations of the 1996 Final Report of the Task Force on Quality in Australian Health Care.

It is clear to anyone who has had to use a health or community service or who provides such services that people can and often do receive assistance from many different professionals and providers across the public, non government and private systems. A person can approach a general practitioner, be admitted to both a public and then private Hospital at different stages of care, use the services of a specialist, have tests performed by pathologists or radiologists and receive after care by Domiciliary Care or RDNS, and they may then also approach community support agencies for ongoing assistance. On each occasion of service they move across an unseen border between the public and private system. If all is well this movement should present no problem. But when things go wrong who is to say where a proper investigation must go in order to identify an error and reach a resolution? In South Australia the State Ombudsman's Consumer Health Complaints Unit can only intervene with the public sector, not the private and nongovernment care services.

In July 1998 Labor introduced a Private Member's Bill into the House to amend the South Australian Health Commission Act. This amendment would have broadened the powers of the State Ombudsman to include private and nongovernment health care providers within his or her jurisdiction.

In March 2000 and again in October 2000 Labor tabled a more comprehensive proposal than the one contained in the 1998 Bill. The provisions of that Bill tabled in 2000, are very similar to those I am presenting today. That Bill also sought to establish a Health and Community Services Ombudsman with wide powers to investigate, conciliate and resolve complaints not just across the public, nongovernment and private sectors but also across the broad sweep of health and community services. That Bill has been available for debate, discussion and broad community consultation for over two years. Many well considered responses from the community and service provider groups were received. Their views have helped strengthen the current form of the Bill I am tabling today and the Government thanks them for their contribution.

The former Minister for Human Services finally tabled some legislation in 2001, as a result of Labor's actions and as a result of community pressure. However that Bill was deeply flawed and was based on minimal consultation. It was never debated.

The Health and Community Services Ombudsman established by this Bill will have wide powers of investigation. The principal aim though is to seek resolution and remedy. The Bill builds on the well-established reputation for independence, which is the cornerstone of the public's confidence in an Ombudsman role. The Health and Community Services Ombudsman does not take sides, but rather has the authority to seek out the truth of a complaint and has the authority to construct a remedy.

The Bill is far-reaching in its jurisdiction simply because it reflects the diversity of providers of health and community services. In today's world, health and community services are delivered in a wide variety of settings including: government, nongovernment and private operators, registered professionals, unregistered care providers, alternative and complementary therapists, volunteers, large institutions, shopfront and neighbourhood centres. To this point no one Authority has had the ability to go with people, protect their interests, investigate their grievances and provide an avenue for redress, resolution and remedy. This Bill will allow this to happen.

The Health and Community Services Ombudsman does not duplicate the role of professional Registration Boards. It is clear that the Health and Community Services Ombudsman's role is complementary. Registration Boards are there to protect the public interest, but whatever disciplinary steps may be taken by a Board or Tribunal it can still leave the complainant outside of the process and without a sense of resolution.

Unfortunately also, for some members of the public, Registration Boards are seen as professional clubs, closed shops designed to protect the interests of the professionals. Whilst this is not the Government's view, we believe such a perception underscores the absolute necessity of having a Health and Community Services Ombudsman who is and who is seen to be completely independent of any professional group or provider. Only then can the public approach the Health and Community Services Ombudsman with confidence.

The other limitation on the role of the Boards is that they are only empowered to examine the conduct of one particular professional group like doctors or nurses or physiotherapists. Today, health and community services are more often than not based on multidisciplinary teamwork where a consumer can receive a variety of services from a range of registered professionals or unregistered care providers at the same time. A Registration Board is unable to look at the full range of issues, which could arise.

In addition to the conduct of any one professional a problem or complaint may cut across a number of professional groups or care workers, the organisations they work for, or the methods of their coordination and communication. Only the Health and Community Services Ombudsman has the ability to investigate the total care process.

It is always hoped that whatever the complaint may be, it can be addressed and resolved directly and immediately between the consumer and the provider. But this cannot always happen. Sometimes the power imbalance between the consumer and provider is too great, or sometimes the complaint is too serious for there to be an effective, direct avenue for remedy. By establishing the Health and Community Services Ombudsman, Parliament recognises this problem and provides a place of last resort where aggrieved parties can seek objective investigation, conciliation, resolution and remedy.

The approach taken by the Health and Community Services Ombudsman envisaged in this Bill is one that not only benefits consumers but also benefits health and community service providers. When the relationship of trust between the provider and consumer breaks down, because of actual or perceived problems in the care delivered, it can sometimes be almost impossible for providers to restore that trust by themselves. The Health and Community Services Ombudsman can be an independent third party who assists the provider and consumer examine the problem and help to conciliate their differences.

In underscoring the role of the Health and Community Service Ombudsman regarding providers of services I want to briefly mention the situation as it applies to volunteers. Volunteers in South Australia make great sacrifices to give of their time to help improve the health and welfare of their fellow community members. The Premier himself has taken on the Portfolio as Minister for Volunteers to demonstrate how important their role is and how much this Government values their significant contribution.

Volunteers of course can be the subjects of a complaint from an aggrieved consumer. That is to be expected, but volunteers have nothing to fear from this legislation. The legislation is about resolution not persecution, it is designed to ensure that providers (including volunteer providers) and consumers are fairly dealt with and can arrive at a positive solution to whatever problem may exist between them.

In the case of a volunteer they are invariably providing a service through an organisation, as such should a complaint be made about them which comes to the attention of the Health and Community Service Ombudsman, the actual process of investigation is directed at the organisation providing the service. The volunteer is providing a service as an 'agent' of that organisation, be it a hospital, local community support centre or welfare group. The volunteer by definition would have to be involved in the resolution of a problem but they would not be expected to deal with this situation by themselves. Their organisation would also be intimately involved in dealing with a problem and finding a remedy if needs be.

As bold as some members think this initiative may be, all it does is to bring South Australia into line with well-established national and international moves of several years standing. Health Complaints Commissioners or Ombudsmen are established facts in all other States and Territories in Australia. Several have had their legislation drafted or specifically amended to include community services within their jurisdiction.

Where this Bill goes further is in providing clear and inclusive definitions for health and community services covered by the legislation, it also provides for a clearer role for the Health and Community Services Ombudsman in early and informal resolution of complaints and, finally, it clarifies the role between the Health and Community Services Ombudsman and other complaint handling bodies particularly Registration Boards to ensure a proper and well coordinated working relationship between all parties.

I will now detail the provisions of the Bill.

The Bill establishes a Health and Community Services Ombudsman whose independence is guaranteed by legislation. The Health and Community Services Ombudsman will have an extensive jurisdiction covering health and community services sectors in the government, non-government and private sectors. This jurisdiction reflects the diversity and complexity of the health and community sectors. The Bill confers extensive powers on the Health and Community Services Ombudsman to assess, investigate and where appropriate conciliate complaints. The chief purpose of the Bill, as I have stated, is to seek resolution and remedy.

The role of the Health and Community Services Ombudsman is extended to look at the issues of rights and quality standards and complaints more systematically. The Health and Community Services Ombudsman will be able to comprehensively monitor trends in complaints across the health and community services sectors.

The Health and Community Services Ombudsman will also have the powers to initiate investigations into emerging problems in the service delivery system and therefore will play an important part in fostering safety and quality improvement across health and community services generally.

A key task of the Health and Community Services Ombudsman will be to draft a Charter of Health and Community Services Rights for consumers. It is intended that this Charter will provide a description of consumer rights or entitlements. In other words, it will be a description of what consumers can reasonably expect from health and community service providers and other professional providers in these areas. The denial of these rights can in itself become a basis for complaint. The Health and Community Services Ombudsman must, when developing the Charter of Health and Community Services Rights, have regard to a number of important principles including the rights of a person:

- to participate effectively and have an active role in decisions about their health, wellbeing and welfare;
- to be provided with health or community services in a way considerate of their background, needs and wishes; and
- to have access to procedures for dealing with complaints about the provision of health or community services.

By introducing this Bill, this Government is presenting to Parliament a detailed set of proposals to provide consumers with a comprehensive and straight-forward system for responding to their needs when the system may have failed them in some way.

Research suggests that frequently consumers want a frank acknowledgment of the problem created, an apology from the service

provider and an assurance that the issue will be addressed so that others do not have the same experience.

It is worthwhile to make reference to the 1999 report of the Expert Advisory Group on Safety and Quality in Australian Health Care, which states:

The Quality in Australian Health Care Study (Wilson et al 1995) estimated that in Australia 'adverse events' account for 3.3 million bed days per year, of which 1.7 million (that is, about 8 per cent of all bed days) would have been from adverse events that were potentially preventable.

The researchers also noted that:

as in other complex systems ... adverse events in health care seldom arise from a single human error or the failure of one item of equipment but are usually associated with complex interactions between management, organisational, technical and equipment problems, which not only set the stage for the adverse event but may be the prime cause.

These adverse events can range from relatively minor disagreements through to life-threatening errors, and in some instances even death. The causes of these events in our health system covers a wide spectrum, from problems with resources, unthinking bureaucratic procedures, poor communication, staff attitudes, inexperience and lack of junior staff. Whatever the cause, none must be tolerated. People's health is too important. The basic principle of health care is, first, do no harm. Our health and community service providers must continue to grapple with improving the quality of their services for the good of their clients and for the good of the community as a whole. But they must do it with the consumer.

This Bill then, in addition to being a mechanism for addressing individual concerns, also becomes an important mechanism to support the quality and safety of a complex system and the services it provides.

It is incumbent on government to establish an effective system that protects South Australian consumers when the health and community services system fails, or is perceived to fail, to deliver appropriate care. This Bill must therefore pass several tests. A properly established agency must have the following:

- it must be rights based; its processes must be transparent and accountable;
- its jurisdiction must be comprehensive, covering private and public health and community services to reflect modern, complex service provision networks;
- it must have extensive powers of early intervention, conciliation and investigation;
- it must be independent;
- it must offer protection to complainants and service providers alike;
- it must have the capacity for speedy and effective interventions with the minimum amount of formality necessary;
- it must be accessible to all South Australians;
- it must have the capacity for research and analysis and the ability to conduct systemic reviews when necessary;
- it must have a broad-based education function for both consumers and service providers; and
- it must have consultation and involvement mechanisms for consumers and providers to promote dialogue on emerging issues and trends.

The Health and Community Services Complaints Bill passes all these tests.

The Bill has nine parts which set out the jurisdiction, objectives, powers and functions of the Office of the Health and Community Services Ombudsman.

Part 1 of the Bill states the definition of terms.

Part 2 deals with the administration of the Act. It describes the process to appoint the office of the Health and Community Services Ombudsman and the terms and conditions of office. It also defines the functions and powers of the Health and Community Services Ombudsman ensuring the independence of the office. A key aspect of the Health and Community Services Ombudsman's role is the duty to encourage and assist direct resolution of complaints between users and service providers.

Part 2 also makes the Ombudsman responsible for identifying and reviewing issues arising out of complaints and to make recommendations for improving services, and recommend ways to preserve and increase the rights of consumers.

Part 3 provides for the development of a Charter of Health and Community Services Rights in consultation with interested persons.

Part 4 deals with the making and assessment of complaints and the process for suspending or taking no further action on complaints.

Part 5 deals with the conciliation process and Part 6 the matters that the Ombudsman may investigate and the conduct of investigations. To maximise the opportunities for access to the complaints mechanism, the Ombudsman has discretionary powers to provide appropriate assistance and encourage internal resolution and early intervention, where necessary.

Part 7 describes the relationship between the Health and Community Services Ombudsman and Registration Authorities and the process of referral between each.

Part 8 establishes the Health and Community Services Advisory Council and describes its membership and functions, the major part of which is to advise the Ombudsman and the Minister on matters related to the operation of the Act and on means to inform users, health and community service providers and the public.

Part 9 deals with miscellaneous matters not dealt with elsewhere in the Act, such as delegation of power or function, protection of identity of service user or complainant and maintenance of confidentiality, protection of consumers from intimidation and reprisals, and the scope of regulations related to the Act.

In summary, this Bill establishes a benchmark for resolving complaints in both the health and community service sector under a single piece of legislation and a single office. No other State or Territory provides for this level of support for users of health and community services in both the public and private system. In this way it is a much more comprehensive Bill than that previously proposed by the now Opposition. It ensures that the Health and Community Services Ombudsman must always act impartially, independently, and in the public interest.

Finally this Bill stands as testament to this Government's commitment to return South Australia to national leadership in social advancement. This Government is committed to bringing about bold, much needed and well thought through reforms to improve the life of all South Australians. The measures contained in this Bill provide fair, reasonable, balanced and accountable reforms designed to protect individuals as well as improve the quality of services for all of us.

I commend this Bill to the house.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

The measure may be brought into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause sets out the definitions required for the purposes of the measure. The measure will apply to community services and health services, as defined. It will be able to exclude classes of service by regulation.

Clause 4: Appointment

There will be a *Health and Community Services Ombudsman* (the "HCS Ombudsman"), who is to be appointed by the Governor.

Clause 5: Term of office and conditions of appointment

The HCS Ombudsman is to be appointed on conditions determined by the Governor for a term not exceeding 7 years. An appointment may be renewed but a person must not hold the office for more than two consecutive terms. Limitations will be placed on the ability of the Governor to remove the HCS Ombudsman from office.

Clause 6: Remuneration

The HCS Ombudsman will be entitled to remuneration, allowances and expenses determined by the Governor.

Clause 7: Temporary appointments

The Minister will be able to appoint a person to act as the HCS Ombudsman in an appropriate case.

Clause 8: Functions

This clause sets out the functions of the HCS Ombudsman under the Act. These include to prepare and review the Charter of Health and Community Service Rights, to identify and review issues arising out of complaints and to make recommendations for improving health and community services, to receive and to assess and resolve complaints.

Clause 9: Powers

The HCS Ombudsman will have such powers as are necessary for the performance of the HCS Ombudsman's functions.

Clause 10: Independence

The HCS Ombudsman will act independently, impartially and in the public interest. The HCS Ombudsman will not be subject to Ministerial control.

Clause 11: Committees

This clause provides that the HCS Ombudsman may establish such committees as may be required.

Clause 12: Appointment of conciliators and professional mentors

The HCS Ombudsman will be able to appoint suitable persons as conciliators or professional mentors under the Act. An appointment will be for a term not exceeding three years determined by the HCS Ombudsman, on conditions determined or approved by the Minister.

Clause 13: Staff

The HCS Ombudsman will be assisted by staff assigned by the Minister. The HCS Ombudsman will be able to enter into arrangements for the use of the staff, equipment and facilities of a Department.

Clause 14: Annual report

The HCS Ombudsman will prepare an annual report, which must be tabled in Parliament.

Clause 15: Immunity

A person acting under the Act will not incur any personal liabilities for his or her acts or omissions (except in a case of culpable negligence). The liability will instead attach to the Crown.

Clause 16: Development of Charter

The HCS Ombudsman will be required to develop a draft *Charter of Health and Community Service Rights*. The draft is to be presented to the Minister within 12 months, or such longer period as the Minister may allow.

Clause 17: Review of Charter

The HCS Ombudsman will be able to review the charter, as appropriate (and will be required to do so at the direction of the Minister).

Clause 18: Consultation

The HCS Ombudsman will be required to take steps to achieve a wide range of views when developing or reviewing the charter.

Clause 19: Content of Charter

This clause sets out various principles that must be considered when the HCS Ombudsman is developing or reviewing the charter. These include having regard to principles such as the fact that a person should be entitled to participate in decisions about the person's health and well-being, that a person should be entitled to take an active role in the person's health care and that health and community services should be provided to the person in a considerate way.

Clause 20: Approval of Charter

The Charter will be subject to the approval of the Minister and will be subject to scrutiny by Parliament.

Clause 21: Who may complain

A complaint about a health or community service may be made by a user of the service, someone acting on behalf of the user of the service, a service provider if the service is having to be provided because of the actions of another provider, the Minister, the Chief Executive of the Department, or another person authorised by the HCS Ombudsman in the public interest.

Clause 22: Grounds on which a complaint may be made

This clause sets out the grounds upon which a complaint may be made. These include that a health or community service provider has acted unreasonably by not providing a health or community service or providing a service that was unnecessary or in an unreasonable manner, or the provider failed to treat a user in an appropriate professional manner or respect a user's privacy or dignity.

Clause 23: Form of complaint

A complaint is to be made in the manner approved or determined by the HCS Ombudsman.

Clause 24: Time within which a complaint may be made

A complaint must be made within two years after the day on which the complainant first had notice of the circumstances giving rise to the complaint unless the HCS Ombudsman is satisfied that it is proper to entertain the complaint in any event.

Clause 25: Further information may be required

The HCS Ombudsman may require a complainant to provide further information or document, or to verify a complaint by statutory declaration.

Clause 26: Assessment

The HCS Ombudsman must assess a complaint within 45 days after receiving it (or such longer period as may be required in view of any delays or a preliminary inquiry) and then either refer it to a conciliator under this measure, investigate it, refer the complaint to a registration authority or other person (if appropriate), or decide to take no further action. A complaint may only proceed if it appears that the complainant has taken reasonable steps to resolve the matter with the relevant health or community service provider.

Clause 27: Preliminary inquiry

The HCS Ombudsman may undertake a preliminary inquiry in relation to a complaint and during the conduct of the inquiry, assist the parties to resolve the complaint through informal mediation.

Clause 28: Provision of documents, etc., on referral of complaint
The HCS Ombudsman may hand over documents and information on a referral and may make copies or take extracts from such documents.

Clause 29: Splitting or joining of complaints
The HCS Ombudsman will be able to either split a complaint into two or more complaints, or join two or more complaints together in appropriate cases.

Clause 30: No further action on complaint
The HCS Ombudsman may at any stage, determine to take no further action on a complaint in certain circumstances. These include where the HCS Ombudsman is satisfied that the complainant is not entitled to make a complaint under this measure, or that there are no grounds for a complaint or the complaint is frivolous, vexatious or not made in good faith. The HCS Ombudsman must take no further action on a complaint if the matter has been adjudicated by a court, tribunal, authority or other body.

Clause 31: Withdrawal of complaint
A complainant may withdraw a complaint at any time. The withdrawal of a complaint under this provision does not necessarily affect the powers of a person or authority to whom the matter has been referred.

Clause 32: Function of conciliator
A conciliator will attempt to encourage settlement of the complaint by arranging discussions, assisting in the making of an amicable agreement, and taking other action with a view to resolving the complaint.

Clause 33: Public interest
The HCS Ombudsman and, if necessary, a conciliator, will identify any issues raised by the complaint that involve the public interest.

Clause 34: Assistance at conciliation
A party to a conciliation may be assisted by another person unless otherwise directed by the conciliator. A party to a conciliation must not be represented by another person unless the HCS Ombudsman is satisfied that the representation is likely to assist substantially in resolving the complaint.

Clause 35: Reports from conciliator
A conciliator must provide a written progress report to the HCS Ombudsman on request. A conciliator will provide a written report of the results of the conciliation to the HCS Ombudsman when satisfied agreement has either been reached or it is not possible to reach agreement.

Clause 36: Conciliation may be brought to an end
A conciliator may end a conciliation for any reasonable cause at any time or at the direction of the HCS Ombudsman. A conciliation must be brought to an end if the conciliator or the HCS Ombudsman considers that the complaint reveals the existence of a significant issue of public safety, interest or importance or a significant question as to the practice of a health or community service provider. If, at the end of a conciliation there are matters that remain unresolved, the HCS Ombudsman may refer the complaint to another conciliator, investigate the complaint, refer the complaint to a registration authority or other person (if appropriate), or decide to take no further action.

Clause 37: Privilege and confidentiality
Anything said in a conciliation (other than an issue of public safety, interest or importance) must not be disclosed in any other proceedings without the consent of the parties to the conciliation.

Clause 38: Professional mentor
The HCS Ombudsman may appoint a professional mentor to be available to the conciliator to discuss any matter arising in the performance of the conciliator's functions.

Clause 39: Enforceable agreements
An agreement reached through a conciliation process may be made in a binding form.

Clause 40: Matters that may be investigated
The HCS Ombudsman will be able to investigate any matter specified in a written direction of the Minister, a complaint under the measure, an issue or question arising from a complaint if it is a significant issue of public safety, interest or importance or significant question as to the practice of a health or community service provider, or any other matter relating to the provision of health and community services in South Australia.

Clause 41: Limitation of powers
The statutory powers of the HCS Ombudsman under this part of the measure may only be exercised for the purposes of an investigation.

Clause 42: Conduct of investigation
An investigation will be conducted in such manner as the HCS Ombudsman thinks fit.

Clause 43: Representation
A person required to appear or to produce documents may be assisted or represented by another person. The HCS Ombudsman may also make a determination about representation of a person to whom an investigation relates.

Clause 44: Use and obtaining of information
The HCS Ombudsman may obtain information or documents relevant to an investigation, or require a person to produce information or documents, or to attend before a specified person and answer questions. There is a maximum penalty of \$5 000 for failing to comply with such a requirement.

Clause 45: Power to examine witnesses, etc.
A person may be required to take an oath or affirmation, or to verify any information or document by statutory declaration.

Clause 46: Search powers and warrants
A magistrate will be able, on the application of the HCS Ombudsman, to issue a warrant authorising a person to enter and search premises for the purposes of an investigation, seize and remove anything relevant to the investigation or require a person on the premises to answer questions or provide information relevant to the investigation.

Clause 47: Reimbursement of expenses
A person attending for the purposes of an investigation may claim expenses and allowances allowed by the HCS Ombudsman.

Clause 48: Reference to another authority for investigation
The HCS Ombudsman may refer a matter arising in an investigation to another authority, person or body (without limiting any power to investigate further).

Clause 49: Possession of document or other seized item
The HCS Ombudsman may retain documents or things seized under these provisions for such period as is necessary for the purposes of the investigation.

Clause 50: Privilege
A person is not required to answer a question or provide information or a document that might tend to incriminate a person of an offence. A person is not to be required to provide information privileged on the grounds of legal professional privilege.

Clause 51: Reports
The HCS Ombudsman may prepare reports during an investigation, and must prepare a report at the conclusion of an investigation. The HCS Ombudsman may provide copies of a report to such persons as the HCS Ombudsman thinks fit. A report may contain information, comments, opinions and recommendations for action.

Clause 52: Notice of action to providers
If the HCS Ombudsman concludes that a complaint is justified but appears incapable of being resolved, the HCS Ombudsman may make recommendations to the relevant service provider. The service provider must advise the HCS Ombudsman as to the action that he or she is willing to take to remedy any unresolved grievances. The HCS Ombudsman may publish a report together with the service provider's advice and any other commentary considered appropriate.

Clause 53: Complaints received by HCS Ombudsman that relate to registered service providers
If the HCS Ombudsman receives a complaint that involves a registered service provider, the Ombudsman should consult with the relevant registration authority in relation to the management of the complaint unless the HCS Ombudsman resolves the matter through informal mediation or decides to take no further action on the complaint.

With its agreement, the complaint may be referred to the registration authority. If the registration authority and the HCS Ombudsman are unable to agree as to who should deal with the complaint, the party that considers the complaint should be investigated will be responsible for conducting the investigation. If both parties consider the complaint warrants investigation, the registration authority must comply with the written direction of the HCS Ombudsman. If the registration authority thinks there is sufficient grounds for the matter to be heard as disciplinary proceedings in accordance with its registration Act, the HCS Ombudsman must refer the matter to the registration authority.

The registration authority and the HCS Ombudsman may agree on protocols in relation to the referral of complaints.

Clause 54: Referral of complaint to registration authority
A registration authority that receives a referral from the HCS Ombudsman must investigate the matter or otherwise deal with it under its registration Act. The registration authority must report its findings to the HCS Ombudsman and any action it has taken or proposes to take.

Clause 55: Action on referred complaints

A registration authority that receives a referral may exercise the powers and perform the functions in relation to the complaint in accordance with its registration Act.

Clause 56: Referral of complaint to HCS Ombudsman

A registration authority that receives a complaint that appears to be capable of constituting a complaint under this Act must consult with the HCS Ombudsman and may refer the matter to the HCS Ombudsman under this clause.

If the registration authority and the HCS Ombudsman are unable to agree as to who should deal with the complaint, the party that considers the complaint should be investigated will be responsible for conducting the investigation. If both parties consider the complaint warrants investigation, the registration authority must comply with the written direction of the HCS Ombudsman. If the registration authority thinks there is sufficient grounds for the matter to be heard as disciplinary proceedings in accordance with its registration Act, the HCS Ombudsman must refer the matter to the registration authority.

Clause 57: Action on investigation reports

A registration authority must inform the HCS Ombudsman whether it is going to act in relation to a matter raised in a report referred to the authority by the HCS Ombudsman. Following performance of the function in accordance with a recommendation, the authority must advise the HCS Ombudsman in relation to the results, any findings and any other action taken or proposed to be taken.

Clause 58: Information from registration authority

A registration authority may provide to the HCS Ombudsman information, comment or recommendations relevant to a complaint. The HCS Ombudsman may request a registration authority for a report on the progress of an investigation of a complaint.

Clause 59: Information to registration authority

A registration authority may request the HCS Ombudsman to provide a report on the progress or result of an investigation of a complaint.

Clause 60: Assistance with proceedings

The HCS Ombudsman may assist a registration authority in any matter if requested by it.

The HCS Ombudsman is entitled to appear or be represented in proceedings before a registration authority and in doing so, may provide documents and other material, call evidence, examine or cross-examine witnesses or make representations and submissions.

Clause 61: Interim action on a complaint

A registration authority may take interim measures in relation to a registered service provider's right to practice under the relevant registration Act pending the outcome of any consultation or investigation under this measure, including suspension or imposing conditions on the provider's right to practice.

Clause 62: Further action by registration authority

This measure does not prevent a registration authority from taking action in relation to a registered service provider in addition to action taken or recommended by the HCS Ombudsman.

Clause 63: Establishment of Council

Clause 64: Conditions of membership

Clause 65: Functions of the Council

Clause 66: Procedure at meetings

Clause 67: Disclosure of interest

These clauses provide for the creation of the *Health and Community Services Advisory Council* to provide advice to the Minister and the HCS Ombudsman in relation to various matters, or to refer matters that, in the opinion of the Council, should be dealt with by the HCS Ombudsman under this measure. The Council may not provide advice in relation to the handling of a particular complaint.

Clause 68: Delegation

The Minister or the HCS Ombudsman may delegate a power or function under the measure to another person.

Clause 69: Adverse comments in reports

The HCS Ombudsman must give a person in relation to whom an adverse comment is to be made in a report (and who is identifiable) a reasonable opportunity to make submissions in relation to the matter before the comment is made unless the HCS Ombudsman is satisfied that such action is inappropriate in accordance with the terms of this provision.

Clause 70: Protection of identity of service user or complainant from service provider

The HCS Ombudsman may withhold revealing to a service provider the identity of a service user or complainant in certain cases.

Clause 71: Preservation of confidentiality

A person involved in the administration of the measure will be prevented from disclosing confidential information, other than as permitted under this clause.

Clause 72: Returns by prescribed providers

Designated health or community service providers will be required to lodge an annual return with the HCS Ombudsman containing specified information about complaints.

Clause 73: Offences relating to intimidation

It is an offence for a person to threaten or intimidate another person to refrain from making a complaint or to withdraw a complaint, fail to provide information or otherwise fail to co-operate in relation to the performance of the HCS Ombudsman's functions under the measure.

Clause 74: Offences relating to reprisals

It is an offence for a person to treat a person unfavourably on the basis that a person has made a complaint, provided information or otherwise co-operated with the HCS Ombudsman in the performance of his or her functions (unless the person made false allegations or has not acted in good faith).

Clause 75: Offences relating to obstruction, etc.

A person must not obstruct or otherwise hinder the HCS Ombudsman in performance of his or her functions under this measure.

Clause 76: Offences relating to the provision of information

A person must not provide the HCS Ombudsman or other person with information they know to be false or misleading or to fail to provide information, without which may be false or misleading in a material particular.

Clause 77: Protection from civil actions

If a person acts in good faith, he or she is not liable for any loss, damage or injury suffered by another person in relation to making a complaint, a statement or report, or providing information, documents or a report to an authorised person under the measure.

Clause 78: Informality of procedures

The HCS Ombudsman will have regard to the rules of natural justice when acting under the measure and should proceed with the minimum of formality.

Clause 79: Determining reasonableness of health or community service provider's actions

In assessing the reasonableness of the conduct of a health or service provider under the measure, the HCS Ombudsman must have regard to the Charter, principles specified under the measure, and generally accepted standards.

Clause 80: Regulations

The Governor may make regulations for the purposes of the measure.

Clause 81: Transitional provision

A complaint may be dealt with under the measure even though the circumstances arose before the commencement of the measure if the complainant was aware of the circumstances not earlier than two years before the commencement of the measure.

Schedule

The Schedule specifies registration Acts for the purposes of this measure.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Crown Lands Act 1929. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The *Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2002* provides for the introduction of realistic rents for perpetual Crown leases and two minor administrative changes to the *Crown Lands Act 1929*.

The introduction of a minimum rent for leases will rectify an historical shortcoming of Crown lease administration that has permitted lessees of the Crown to occupy land in perpetuity for, in some cases, minuscule rents. For example, a large winery in the Riverland valued at \$5 million is partly located on three leases with a combined rent of \$7.55 p.a. while a new and used car dealership in a town in the same region pays a rent of five cents p.a.; a motel at Whyalla valued at \$2.6 million is located on a lease with a rent of

\$3.07 p.a. and a large commercial chicken farm in the Adelaide Hills has two leases with rents of \$2.20 p.a. and \$1.70 p.a.

A program for voluntary freeholding of perpetual leases has been in place for more than 15 years but it has not adequately reduced the number of leases or reduced the cost of administration. The minimum rent proposal will recover the cost of administration and provide funding for Crown land business reforms which will include streamlined and automated processes, better systems for handling data and improved organisational structure.

The proposed amendments to the *Crown Lands Act 1929* will provide for—

- the application of a minimum rent to all leases (section 47), and
- the recovery of GST on lease rents (new section 47A)

Section 47 of the current Act provides for a minimum rent of \$25 to apply to all leases issued since 1985. However, approximately 11000 perpetual leases (or 71% of the total number of 15406 perpetual leases) still have rents set below this figure and below the cost of administration. It is proposed to increase the minimum rent to \$300.00 for all perpetual leases regardless of when they were issued. It is proposed to introduce the minimum rent following the passage of this Bill through parliament. Increases will be applied to lease rents each month as they fall due.

Section 288 of the current Act provides for the Governor to make regulations to give force and effect to the object, purposes, rights, powers and authorities of the Act. It is proposed to extend the scope of those regulations to include future minimum rents or indexation rates to be applied to lease rents.

The definition of "lease" in proposed section 47 allows the regulations to prescribe classes of leases that will not have the minimum rent provision apply. It is proposed that leases issued under the *War Service Land Settlement Agreement Act 1945*, a Commonwealth and State agreement, will not be included in the proposal at this time.

Under Commonwealth GST legislation, GST is not payable on perpetual lease rents until 2005 because of the long term nature of the leases and the absence of a rent review opportunity. The introduction of a minimum rent will constitute a review opportunity as defined in GST legislation and perpetual lease rents could then be subject to GST depending on the use to which they are put. Rents on leases used for agricultural purposes, like the majority of perpetual leases, are exempt from GST. However, provision is made in this amendment, under proposed section 47A, for the recovery, as a charge against the lessee, of any amounts payable on lease rents by the Minister under GST legislation.

Two minor administrative amendments are included in the Bill. These are:

- removal of the current artificial restriction on freeholding perpetual leases in the Lyrup Village Irrigation District (section 85), and
- removal of the current restriction on broader delegation of powers of the Minister under the Act (section 9A)

Historically, section 85 of the current Act has limited the jurisdiction of the Lyrup Village Association (the irrigation controlling body within the Lyrup Village District) to "lessees" of land within the District. It seems that legislators of the time never envisaged that landholders in the District would be anything other than "lessees". This requirement has created an artificial barrier to freeholding perpetual leases issued in the Lyrup Village District. A simple amendment to include "or owners" in the definition of members under section 85 will remove this barrier and enable 175 lessees in the Lyrup Village District to take advantage of the freeholding policy.

Significant productivity improvements in processing Crown land transactions have been achieved by delegation of powers of the Minister under the *Crown Lands Act 1929*. However, the power to delegate contained in section 9A currently precludes delegation of powers under Part 2 of the Act that deals with dedication of reserves, issue of easements and Trust grants. Part 2 refers to joint powers of the Minister and the Governor and the restriction on delegation emanates from the Governor's powers with regard to Trust grants. The proposed amendment to section 9A will not affect or inhibit the powers of the Governor but will enable more effective delegation of Ministerial powers and assist improvement in the timeliness of service to clients.

The Government looks forward to the support of the Parliament in passing the *Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2002*.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 9A—Delegation by Minister and Director

This clause amends section 9A to allow the Minister to delegate functions and powers under Part 2.

Clause 3: Substitution of s. 47

This clause replaces the current section 47 with two new clauses as follows:

47. Minimum rent under lease

Proposed clause 47 provides that the annual rent under a lease granted under any of the Crown Lands Acts or any other Act dealing with the disposal of Crown Lands (other than a lease of a prescribed class) is to be not less than—

- \$300; or
- if a regulation is made fixing a different amount or providing for the determination of a different amount—that amount.

The clause also provides that a regulation fixing or providing for the determination of an amount for the purposes of the provision cannot come into operation until the time for disallowance has passed.

47A. Minister's power to recover GST

Proposed clause 47A allows the Minister to recover GST from lessees.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 85—Continuance of Lyrup Village Association

This clause amends section 85 to allow owners of land (as well as lessees) to be members of the Lyrup Village Association.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 288—Regulations

This clause amends the regulation making power in the principal Act consequentially to proposed new clause 47. The proposed amendment would allow regulations to be of general application or limited application and to make different provision according to the matters or circumstances to which they are expressed to apply.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 July. Page 749.)

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): The Rann government's first budget is a budget of betrayal. This budget is a betrayal of trust of the South Australian voting public. Last Thursday, the Treasurer handed down a budget which would leave all South Australians justified in feeling cheated. This was clearly a budget of broken promises.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order and hear the Leader of the Opposition speak.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: South Australians might have been excused for expecting a big increase in health spending in this budget. Why? Because that is what they were promised. They also would have assumed that all this would have been achieved without the need for new taxes or increases in existing taxes or charges, which once again is what they were promised. What did we actually get? Cuts to the education budget in real terms; no meaningful increase in health spending; more than \$200 million in increased taxes over four years; increases in the emergency services levy revenue and compulsory third party insurance premiums; more than \$120 million increase in government charges over four years; a cut to the Public Service of 600; and an increase in net debt and unfunded superannuation liabilities.

Those South Australians who believed the Premier's promises and voted for him will be extremely angry that, within four months of his being elected, all his key promises have been discarded. In June last year the Premier (who was then Leader of the Opposition) told this house that 'good government does not promise one thing before an election

and cynically do the opposite three months after the poll'. It is both sad and ironic that the Premier has now done precisely what he criticised the previous government for doing—only this government has done it several times already.

It has been said that this is a true Labor budget and, unfortunately for South Australians, I have to agree. Back are the days of higher taxes, unfocused spending and, most disappointingly after the hard work of the past eight years, state debt and unfunded superannuation liabilities are once again on the rise. The lesson from this budget is clearly that the AIP has not learned from the mistakes of the past. Of course, the government would like us to believe that it has achieved a surplus for this financial year and the forward estimates period.

However, it is clear that this was only achieved through what the *Financial Review*, very correctly, described as 'an accounting fiddle.' But I will return to that point later. First, I would like to address the government's supposed commitment to health and education. Throughout the election campaign, the Premier assured the South Australian electorate that a Labor government would have the right priorities. He promised big increases in health and education spending and assured us that this would be possible by simply reordering government priorities and not through additional taxation. It is now clear that he has broken that very key election promise. In real terms, the Rann government has cut education spending by an incredible \$34 million in real terms.

Not only has education's operating expenditure been cut but the government has also slashed capital expenditure on education by \$6 million. Regional schools have borne the brunt of these cuts with schools such as Ceduna, which has waited for a long time for an upgrade, missing out on this much needed funding, which would be a real disappointment to the people in that area. It is a disgrace. This year education is estimated to account for 24.7 per cent of total expenditure, which is actually a reduction from 24.9 per cent last year. How this reduced priority for education is justified by the Rann government defies explanation. This is an outrageous betrayal of trust from a government that promised to make education spending a priority.

Our health system, which we were constantly told was the other great Labor priority, has also missed out in this budget. The total increase in operational funding for human services this year is \$106 million, compared with an increase last year of \$213 million. In real terms, health spending has only increased by 0.94 per cent. When you examine the detail, it is clear that any increases in funding will almost entirely be consumed by wage increases and not increase services, as the government would have us believe.

As an example, the Department of Human Services received a nominal increase of only a 3.6 per cent increase in funding, while most salaries this year will actually increase by about 4 per cent. The budget papers also show health costs increasing by 7.1 per cent, so 3.6 per cent funding actually does mean fewer services. The government's own figures show that for the coming year there will be 159 200 fewer outpatients; 16 000 fewer emergency patients in metropolitan hospitals; and 8 300 fewer emergency patients in country hospitals.

The budget also shows that semi-urgent elective patients will have to wait longer for surgery. The Premier promised to improve the health system but instead he has delivered a budget that can only result in longer waits in the emergency departments and longer waiting times and waiting lists for people in need of surgery. This is not the budget of a

government with the right priorities. As is the case with the education budget, country areas also lost out in the health budget. The Rann government has shown little regard for regional areas since taking office, and a range of savage cuts to health services in the country is further proof of this disturbing trend.

Country hospitals are clearly the big losers under this Labor government. While metropolitan hospitals have been given a 7.1 per cent increase for costs, country hospitals have been given only 2.4 per cent. This is clearly discrimination against country hospitals and will put an enormous amount of pressure on them. The government has also failed to provide capital funds to replace HomeStart aged care funds to build new aged care facilities in 15 of the 16 country hospitals where this was to occur. The member for Finnis highlighted in the house last week that, if the HomeStart loans scheme had not been cancelled by the Labor government, 269 aged care beds could have been built. Instead, the scheme was cancelled by the government and these beds went begging, along with the commonwealth funding which would have accompanied those beds being built.

The growing crisis in aged care was again highlighted in the *Sunday Mail* on the weekend, and this only serves to highlight the folly in the government's policy to cut a scheme to provide more beds for our elderly. A government with the right priorities would not let our frail and elderly citizens live in temporary hospital accommodation while funding for new aged care facilities goes begging. This is particularly important in our country areas, where aged care beds are vital. Elderly people should not have to move to the city away from family and friends to secure an aged care bed simply because the government is unwilling to provide adequate funding for country hospitals, as was put in place.

Since taking office this government has displayed a tendency of seeking to rewrite history. This has again been evident in the lead-up to the budget. Last Wednesday the Premier and the Minister for Health announced extra funding of \$51.8 million over four years for extra hospital beds. However, during the election campaign the Premier had promised \$75.4 million for this same purpose. Last week the Premier was therefore announcing a cut of \$23.6 million from the promised amount, and that is yet another broken promise. There is no doubt that the government's promises to fix our health system are now in tatters, and serious questions must now be answered.

Honesty and accountability have been another catchcry of the Rann government. However, talk is cheap, and this budget has revealed the hypocrisy of the Treasurer and the government seeking to manufacture a false deficit through accounting measures for the last financial year purely to suit the hollow cries of 'budget black holes'. Last year the Treasurer criticised the Liberals' budget, claiming:

The government has again used assets of government to prop up its budget bottom line and it has used approximately \$194 million from the bad bank to prop up the current budget, together with in excess of \$100 million from capital taken from SAFA.

He goes on to say:

This government . . . has used assets to meet its budget bottom line commitments that should have been used to retire state debt, and that is concerning. . . It would have been my preference for that money to be used to pay off state debt. . .

In a separate interview he went on to say that this practice was a trick and a smoke screen. Well, lo and behold, what do we discover in this budget? The Treasurer has deferred capital and dividend payments from the bad bank and SAFA

and transferred them into the current financial year to create a false deficit for 2001-02 and an inflated surplus for the current year. What utter hypocrisy! The Treasurer saw fit to criticise the previous government for transferring \$321 million in dividends from public financial corporations in 2001-02, yet he had the gall to defer the majority of this payment until the current financial year, when he has budgeted for dividend and capital payments of \$340.9 million from these entities for the single purpose of creating an inflated surplus in the government's first year. Of course, the Treasurer had little choice but to take this course of action, because, if he had not, the budget papers would have shown that the last budget under the Liberal government delivered a surplus far in excess of budgeted targets. Such a result would have left the Treasurer's credibility in tatters and would have shattered his claims of a mythical budget black hole.

Members would be aware of two memos from the Under Treasurer, dated 15 and 16 January 2002, confirming Treasury advice that the estimate of the underlying surplus for 2001-02 was actually between \$60 million and \$96 million, even after cost pressures were included, and not the fictional black hole deficit of \$26 million claimed by the Treasurer and the Premier. Unfortunately for the Treasurer, this sleight of hand has not gone unnoticed. In fact, the *Financial Review* and former New South Wales Auditor-General Tony Harris have described it in articles last week as an accounting fiddle. One article by Alan Mitchell titled 'Accounting fiddle paints rosy picture', and the article by Tony Harris stated:

He has shifted nearly \$300 million of dividends from the government's remnant bank and finance corporation from his rival's 2001-02 budget into his 2002-03 budget.

The *Financial Review* journalist made it clear that without the fiddle the budget would be in deficit, not surplus. It is a pity that some of our local journalists did not pick that up quite as quickly. This is the same Tony Harris that the Treasurer applauded last year as a respected independent commentator when he made some criticism of last year's budget.

That brings me to the government's promise not to increase taxes and charges—yet another election promise that has been broken after only four months in office. During the campaign, the ALP assured the South Australian public that it would not introduce any new taxes or increase existing taxes and charges. This promise was spelt out in black and white in the ALP's policy costings document, which stated:

The basic principles of Labor's financial strategy will not require any increase in existing government taxes and charges or new taxes and charges.

This promise has been broken in spectacular fashion by the government's increasing general government fees and charges by 4.2 per cent across the board and, following that, with an additional \$200 million in tax increases over the four years in the budget.

The Treasurer has made much of his tax on poker machines, claiming that he is taxing the rich. He would like us all to see him as a modern day Robin Hood, but in reality he is just 'rob'n everyone'. On the issue of gaming machine taxation, perhaps we should ask the AHA what they think of Labor's promises, particularly after a personally written guarantee from the Treasurer not to increase taxation was reneged on at the eleventh hour without any consultation as to the impact on our hotel industry or on investment within that industry.

How dare anyone criticise the Treasurer! Today we saw the bully really exposed. His focus on super profits is not as simple as he would have everyone believe. This decision is a grab for money. On the surface it is popular. However, the impact on those who lose their jobs has been ignored, as has the impact on investment in the hotel industry—and there has been very considerable investment. What it does to the investment climate in South Australia and to the value of the assets of a lot of very hard working South Australians has also been totally ignored in this decision, and by attacking the hotel industry to try to justify it and hide the fact that it is a broken promise I do not think will do this government a lot of good.

In the end, South Australians will know the true extent of the broken promises when the bills start arriving in their letterboxes; when they find that their emergency services levy is higher; that their compulsory third party is higher; that, if they sell their house, their stamp duty is higher; and, if they enter into a commercial hire purchase agreement they will have to pay rental duty that will now be on that agreement, whereas it did not exist before—and that one is unequivocally a new tax. Remember the promise: no new taxes or charges. However, that is clearly a new tax.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The emergency services levy has been raised. Last year, the Liberal government looked at the cost to the community in the previous year and capped the levy at that amount. The Labor government has well and truly reaped the benefit of the increase in property values and the impact on the emergency services levy, and that means an absolute bonanza for the government, and it has grabbed it with both hands, whereas the previous government was conscious of what it was costing householders.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens will stop interjecting.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The suspicion with which many look at this budget is heightened by the fact that much of the detail is missing. One example is the lack of transparency and accountability over the very promises that gave them the final nod to form government—the raft of promises they agreed to without any idea of what they were going to cost. The deal that was done was in contempt of the South Australian electorate. That attitude continues, and I quote from the budget speech, as follows:

Upon coming to government, we committed to a number of initiatives as part of the compact for good government. These initiatives have been funded in this budget. They are funded from reallocation and savings—as are all our promises in this budget.

We would appreciate the Treasurer's detailing the cost of these promises. A number of the promises have not been addressed either in the budget or publicly; yet we are told that they have been funded. To add to this cynicism, we heard the member for Hammond say on Friday that what the government has allocated as funding for the eradication of branched broomrape is not enough but that it would be fixed.

Mr Brokenshire: How?

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Well, it is not in the budget. Let us have some openness and accountability on these promises, particularly as, without having blindly committed to these costs—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will be named if he does that again.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: He has been to the Graham Ingerson school of knocking, I think. Let us have some openness and accountability on these promises, particularly as without having blindly committed to these costs we would not be debating such a smoke and mirrors budget.

I have already highlighted the fact that regional health and education services will suffer under this Labor government. However, the broader issue of regional services is one of great concern to many members on this side of the chamber. Since coming to office, this government has done nothing but pay lip-service to our regional communities. This budget is the culmination of a growing ALP trend to ignore the needs of our regional communities in preference to metropolitan areas, and we heard members from within the ALP speak out very vocally on that last year. The fact that this budget did not include a regional statement, as did previous budgets under the Liberal government, is typical of this government's attitude towards our regional areas.

A classic example within this budget is the government's decision to close three regional ambulance communication offices within the next 18 months, which results in job losses for 16 regional communications officers, but that is only one of the issues. The bureaucrats have been pushing for the axing of this service for some years. However, we resisted because we understood the value of this service to our regional communities. The fact that the government immediately decided to axe this service suggests either a government that is captive to its bureaucracy or a government that simply does not understand regional communities and the impact of some of these decisions.

This issue has a long history. It has an enormous impact on our magnificent ambulance volunteers throughout regional South Australia, who never wanted this to happen. It impacts right across South Australia because these three radio rooms cover the whole of regional South Australia. This government has totally ignored the wishes of these vital people in our communities. So much for the promise to consult volunteers on all decisions that would affect them. I doubt that government members have even considered the most important aspect of this decision. If they had bothered to ask, they would have been left in no doubt about how our ambulance volunteers across the state feel, because, when this issue was raised by bureaucrats before, members on this side were quickly told by the volunteers what the impact would be. That is the beauty of consultation: you tend to find out what the impact might be.

These volunteers give thousands of hours unselfishly tending to the sick and to accident victims. This decision is a shocker and makes a real statement on how this government feels about volunteers and country areas—it could not care less.

Mr Brokenshire: A bit like Kangaroo Island when they knocked that building over.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is out of order.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Thank you for your assistance, sir. This attitude was also evident in the decision to introduce an enormous hike in crown land leases—in some cases a hike of up to 300, 400 times the current rate. This proposal has been put forward by the bureaucracy on numerous occasions. The government has tried to justify this decision by using some very untypical examples. This measure has ultimately resulted in an enormous hike in lease payments and ignores the fact that many landholders have multiple leases. As I am

told that one property is on 60 different leases, I do not think that 60 multiplied by 300 is what was initially intended.

Again, it is a decision that demonstrates a cabinet not familiar with the detail and not prepared to investigate the real impacts of its decision beyond the straight budget impact. I think that was highlighted today when, in answer to a question, the minister responsible used an example of a small lease applying to a foreshore property in Whyalla worth more than \$1 million. He fails to understand that the building standing on that property belongs to the owner, not to the government. It is clearly a type of tenure whereby the person with that tenure has purchased that land from someone but tenure is crown lease or perpetual lease.

People across the state holding these leases are not renting property from the government: they have bought the property from someone else and they are paying a crown lease based on their type of tenure, and that is not understood. I think that if the government had understood that fact it would not have moved in that direction. I ask that the government reconsider this decision. I really believe that this decision has some unintended consequences. I do not think that the government understood two issues: first, that people have purchased these properties; and, secondly, the improvements to which the government refers in its press release do not belong to the government: they belong to the people.

For the government to say that it is charging someone X amount of rent on something that that person owns is a nonsense. I really think that the government will need to have a good look at how it goes ahead with this and that it should reconsider it. The government mentioned recovering costs involved in collecting this but that is a separate issue. To impose \$300 as a minimum freehold cost, I think, shows a lack of understanding of this particular issue. So much for all the rhetoric from the ALP regarding regional impact statements. These decisions demonstrate that this cabinet definitely needs to undertake regional impact statements, because it is clear that cabinet does not have knowledge about most of these issues.

Further proof is the absolute razor job that has been done on Primary Industries and Resources South Australia. Without consultation, many of PIRSA's functions have been transferred to the environment portfolio—an act of some insult to the many rural people involved in land care, soil boards, pest control and our pastoral community. Not satisfied with that act, the government has then slashed what is left of PIRSA's budget by something like 12 per cent in real terms. The government, obviously, does not understand that this sector has been the major contributor to this state's amazing export performance and economic turnaround.

I read an article this morning that tries to rewrite the history of the last few years, but no mention was made of these sectors. It not only totally ignored these sectors based in Adelaide but also ignored even the existence of them. I just hope that this government eventually realises that South Australia is not confined to the metropolitan area. Another interesting omission from this year's budget papers was an employment statement. When in government the Liberal Party produced an employment statement as part of the annual budget papers. We saw this as an important document as it highlighted the government's employment generation programs and plans for job creation. The Liberal government made huge strides in addressing the state's unemployment problems. From a high of 12 per cent under the previous Labor government, we managed to cut over 5 percentage points from the unemployment rate and, for the first time in

a long time, bring South Australia's unemployment rate to within 0.1 per cent of the national rate. Such a result would have been unthinkable a decade ago. This budget forecasts a reduction in the employment growth rate, with an expected growth for 2002-03 of only 0.75 per cent.

The opposition has already revealed that the government has slashed 100 traineeships in this budget. This will have a significant impact on young job seekers, particularly those 100 job seekers. The government has also broken its promise to quarantine public service job cuts to supposed 'fat cats'. The government is now planning to shed 600 public sector jobs and it has indicated that the cuts will be made across the board, including junior clerical staff. This is despite the fact that, prior to the election, the Treasurer said that Public Sector Management Act employees would have nothing to fear under a Labor government. Even some of the government's strongest supporters have been scathing in their criticism of this budget. We heard some pretty selective quotes from the Treasurer today as to the attitude of some people and, likewise, I will quote some myself. Janet Giles of the UTLC commented, as follows:

The big disappointment is jobs. There is really nothing there that would give us any hope that would create employment, particularly for young people.

Jan McMahon of the PSA claimed that it was a sad day for the public sector. She went on to say:

It will mean less service for ordinary South Australians, longer queues. It will impact on health and education. It's a sad day when a Labor government can't deliver more jobs and services.

Even the government's friends are now deserting them. That alone is testament to the complete betrayal of trust typified by this budget.

What has become of the ALP's promise to cut expenditure on consultants by \$20 million? Surprisingly, this is yet another broken promise. The budget has set a target of \$10 million in cuts—half of what was promised. Last week, the Treasurer told consultants to watch out because he was coming after them. I am sure that, now the budget has been released, a few consultants are sleeping a little easier.

This is a budget of smoke and mirrors. It is littered with broken promises and deception. The 36 per cent of South Australian voters who actually voted for this government have every right to feel extremely angry that they were deceived into believing that an ALP government would honour its extravagant promises. Let me make it perfectly clear that, during the estimates process, the opposition will comb through these budget documents and reveal every single broken promise. We will highlight those funding areas that will suffer under this Labor government, and we will expose the hypocrisy of the Treasurer and this government for what is simply a budget of smoke and mirrors and broken promises. The South Australian public deserve better, and we will ensure that this government is made accountable for breaking the trust of the South Australian electorate.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): As I said earlier today, this reminds me of the last days of Bob Hawke's prime ministership when Fightback was announced. This reminds me that the former prime minister had no response to Fightback. He tried to have an accounting response—he went through it to try to find broken funding promises and extravagant spending. There was no political response. Today, we see an opposition that has been surprised and stunned by the budget, and they have no political response. The opposition is leaderless and rudderless. They are unable

to attack the government on any point in its budget because they have been outclassed, out-manoeuvred and out-flanked.

The Leader of the Opposition raised a few interesting points. He said that this government made a promise that it would not increase taxes and charges. Well, I remember an article in the *Advertiser* under the heading, 'Labor refuses to rule out tax rises'. The current Treasurer and former opposition Treasury spokesman, Hon. Kevin Foley, member for Hart, when asked to rule out tax increases, said that Labor would introduce a 'fair and competitive tax regime.' He went on to say:

Taxes are falling around the country and I have to be mindful of that. . . The main planks of Labor's policy will include:

BALANCED state budgets—

delivered—

FINANCIAL responsibility made law—

delivered—

STATE debt would fall in real terms under Labor because the general government sector would record an operating surplus each year—

delivered. The article continues:

Mr Foley said Labor would introduce legislation that would hold the government accountable to the principles of financial responsibility.

That was delivered. I will come back to that. Mr Foley then went on to say that a new expenditure review committee would become a permanent committee of cabinet—delivered—'which would scrutinise each spending commitment and ensure it passed a public interest test'. I am sure that most of his ministerial colleagues are a bit wary of the expenditure review committee, but I am sure they welcome the extra scrutiny. The article continues:

Financial fiascos such as the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium blowout would not be allowed to occur. 'We will put our schools and hospitals before soccer stadiums and wine centres,' he said. 'We will put police before consultants and there will be a stark difference between the priorities of a Rann Labor government and an Olsen government.'

Treasurer Rob Lucas said Labor had been flushed out and it was clear they would raise taxes to pay for promises of big increases in spending on health, education and police.

Members opposite cannot have it both ways: they cannot come in here and, on the one hand, tell us that we have broken our promises and then on the other tell us that we have lost the trust of the South Australian people. The former treasurer, Rob Lucas, said that we have been flushed out to pay for our big increases in health, education and police. Which one is it? I note that the member for Unley is a little stunned by his colleague's remarks.

I have another interesting article from the *Advertiser*—which is an excellent paper. This article, which is from the *Advertiser* of 1 June 2001, is about the previous budget. It is headlined 'Increases to raise revenue by \$20.6 million', and it states:

. . . fees and charges [will increase] by the CPI rate of 3.1 per cent.

Those fees and charges increased by the CPI rate of 3.1 per cent—the same formula that this government used. But what did the hapless former treasurer say during his budget? The article states:

'This budget contains no new taxes,' Treasurer Rob Lucas said in his budget speech. 'It contains no tax increases. In fact, it contains significant tax reductions.'

The formula the Treasurer used to increase taxes and charges by the CPI is the same formula used by the former govern-

ment and the former treasurer. But what does he say? He says, 'No increase in taxes and charges.' What blatant hypocrisy!

But there is more about the hapless opposition and its leaderless, rudderless position on the budget—because it has no political response whatsoever. It is in a mad fury to try to find some sort of political response. One minute we have broken promises; the next minute we have abandoned rural communities; the next minute we are not spending enough. Which one is it? Are we spending too much on health and education? Are we not spending enough? Are we neglecting rural communities or are we porkbarrelling rural communities? Which one is it?

I think members opposite should make up their minds because it seems that every day there are five different leaders of the opposition in the chamber. There is the hapless one—the one who cannot believe he is Leader of the Opposition and still pinches himself each morning when he realises that he is leader of that rabble opposite. Then there are the pretenders to the throne. That is why we have so many different political responses to the budget. First, we have the deputy leader—the man with the swagger because he is back. He cannot believe his luck. Every time there is a new issue in the parliament, it is, 'When did the Leader of the Opposition know about it and when did the Deputy Leader of the Opposition explain it to him?' That is the way it works. He is the real guy in charge. We all know that, and it is just a matter of time before he takes that step.

But there are other pretenders to the throne. The member for Unley has aspirations to greatness. He believes his calling in life is to rescue the Liberal Party from the abyss that it is in right now. He believes that, from Unley, he can initiate a resurgence of the Liberal Party, and he will try his best.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, sir. I can speak for myself and I claim to be misrepresented. My point of order, however, is relevance. My aspirations or lack of aspirations have nothing to do with the member for West Torrens, and nothing whatever to do with the budget.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The member for West Torrens needs to confine his remarks to the Appropriation Bill.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Leader of the Opposition came into this chamber and made his remarks regarding the budget, saying there was nothing—

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS:—uninterrupted, mind you, apart from the thrill of my being thrown out, which was perfectly valid. This government has indeed increased fees and charges using the same formula as the previous government, and the opposition has claimed that this is a broken election promise.

At the last election, Labor said that it would not require the introduction of new taxes and charges, based on the budget mid year review that we were given. It was not given access to Treasury officials, as has been the practice in the past, and the opposition stands condemned for that. This government will not do that.

In each of the previous government's budgets—all eight of them—it increased fees and charges like clockwork. This government has used the same formula, yet the shadow treasurer says it is not an increase in taxes and charges: it is just CPI. In the first seven years of the previous government, it increased taxes by nearly \$1 billion.

An honourable member: How much?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: By nearly \$1 billion—over 50 per cent—and that was before the GST. Before the 1997

election, the then government said that there would be no tax increases, and the former treasurer, Stephen Baker, said, 'We are not out to get an increase in the quantum of tax.' That was in the newspaper on 19 September 1997, before the state election. In the following two budgets, it increased taxes by \$500 million. That government introduced an emergency services levy, which it increased and which this government has capped and not increased.

The opposition complains about the normal annual change in charges and says that it is not really an increase, according to the former treasurer, yet the former government has given us an electricity price hike of between 30 per cent and 100 per cent. Because of privatisation and its former budget positions, electricity prices could push the average power bill above \$1 000 per year. Water bills have gone up by \$70, and stamp duties, from this lot opposite, went up 300 per cent in one year. How dare they complain to us today, after we have frozen the emergency services levy! They dare to come into this house, raise their heads and say to us that we are taxing and spending, when the record speaks for itself.

We are working to restore the budget mess. We will not do what has been done in the past, namely, hide figures from Treasury officials and spend capital money on recurrent expenditure. We will not do that sort of accounting, and we will not have a phoney \$2 million surplus. This Treasurer has delivered to South Australians the highest surplus ever seen in South Australia: \$96 million. At the last budget, we were \$340 million worse off, thanks to the former treasurer.

The opposition should be ashamed. It says there is no extra spending and no extra increases. Over four years, we will spend \$411 million on hospitals; there is \$7.5 million for more projects; there is a \$162 million capital works program in the year 2002-03; \$35 million will go to upgrade the clinical information system in hospitals; and \$9.5 million will be spent over four years for cleaner and safer hospitals, in order to reduce infection rates—a key election promise that is being delivered. Mental health services will receive a boost, too.

What does the opposition have to say to this? It says that this budget fails to deliver. That is it. That is the political response: it fails to deliver. You could bring in a group of year 7 students and say to them, 'Respond to the budget,' and they will say to themselves, 'What do we say? Broken promises, failure to deliver and tax increases and charges. We wouldn't have done that.' The question is, 'What is the opposition's policy?'

When we were in opposition, the former government used to yell out every day, 'What would you do? Where's your policy?' I say the same thing to them. Unlike the former government, we will make your work like a crown of thorns. What is your policy? Currently, we have spokespeople opposite who have not asked a single question of their minister. I will not name them, lest I embarrass them. There are some who have not asked a single question—with or without notice.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I don't want to name them. I will not get into name calling; we are about delivering outcomes. There are some other increases. We have increased the education budget by \$527 million. Our education minister has given birth and raised budgets.

An honourable member: At the same time!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: At the same time. She can walk and chew gum—unlike members opposite. What is the response from the shadow education spokesperson? 'You've

failed to deliver.' 'You've increased taxes and charges.' 'What do my other colleagues say?' That is the political response from the Liberal juggernaut opposite. We are quaking in our boots about the political response we have got! It is obvious that the leadership of the Liberal Party will change very soon. I will be sad to see it change, because I think the current leader is quite a nice guy. He will not deserve the knife in the back when he gets it. However, members are already sharpening their knives, given the response he has given to this budget.

Mr Brindal: You worry about your leader, not ours.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Our leader's doing fine thanks; look at the polls.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will refrain from interjecting.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The greatest thing about this budget is that, unlike the previous government, we will open a school. We will open the Sturt Street Primary School in two years. The school provided 88 years of service to the people of South Australia, and the previous government just shut it. We will reopen it, fulfilling an election pledge. What is the opposition's position on that? We do not know; it says nothing other than that the budget does not go far enough. Perhaps it would like us to open up every school. Perhaps it could detail to us which schools were closed by its former administration and which ones they would like to open and how we are going to pay for it. Of course, we will not hear that from the opposition. We will just hear whingeing and whining, and the usual response nuttered out by those geniuses in the leader's office: 'You failed to deliver,' 'You're leaderless,' and, 'Your taxes have gone up.' They are the responses.

However, in addition to that, the former government was very good at pork-barrelling. We have opened a new police station. Is it in a Labor electorate? No. Where is it? It is in one of the safest Liberal seats in South Australia. Why? Because there is a need, so we are opening it. The former government would have slashed the spending from that project and put it into one of its own marginal seats. We do not play like that; we play fair. We do not have favourites; we play fair. This government is very proud of its new Treasurer and what he has delivered to the people of South Australia. He has given them hope and vision, whereas in years past the former government gave absolutely nothing.

In terms of education—we have heard nothing from the shadow minister—I will explain what we are getting. Blackwood High School is getting \$730 000. Is that in a Labor electorate? No. Christies Downs school is getting \$2 million. Marie Dunstan school in my electorate is getting \$525 000; McLaren Vale Primary School—not in a Labor electorate—is getting \$2 million; Modbury Special School is getting \$2.2 million; Playford Primary School is getting \$600 000—due to the good work of the member for Playford, in his lobbying of the Treasurer. He is a tireless—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Isn't it? Okay. The Woodville Special School is getting \$2.6 million. This is an extra \$20 million worth of capital works money in the education budget—money that the previous government would not have spent on our children.

With regard to the mental health initiatives, \$5 million over four years has been committed for adult services for systemic changes. In the past we have seen a policy of the opposition to release into the community people with mental illnesses, and it has been unfair on the mental patients and

their families. We are doing something about it—an extra \$9 million over four years.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: But apparently they won the election.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has become a serial interjector, and he should cease.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: That's one thing he is serial at, sir; I won't go into other details. This budget delivers for South Australia. I can think of a number of ways to describe it: it brings home the bacon; it is a beautiful set of numbers. Finally, we have given hope and vision to South Australians. We have done something that the former government will not do. We talked about this in question time today: the tax on pokie barons and their excessive profits. In the political wisdom of the opposition they think they can win an election by coming out and defending a few rich pokie barons. The opposition is on a loser with this and we are on a winner, not because it is politically expedient but because it is good policy—very good policy. Unfortunately, because of the great deal the former treasurer did for us, as I said today in the grievance debate, over the next 13 years we miss out on over \$140 million in revenue from a super tax on the casino.

This Treasurer will see an extra \$39 million going directly into our schools and hospitals from a tax on the wealthy pokie barons. What is the political policy of members opposite? It is to oppose it, and they have come out screaming. What great political judgment! No wonder you hold hardly any seats in the country. The Leader of the Opposition talked about a regional focus—

Mr Brindal: We hold every seat.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Do you—you hold every seat in the country? The members for Giles, Chaffey, Mount Gambier and Hammond might have something to say about that. Members opposite do not even know which seats they hold, yet they want to run the finances of this great state. The Treasurer has gone further. Despite being handicapped by the former government's not letting us tax the casino super profits, we have gone after super profits for the hoteliers. They are screaming because they cannot afford the personal helicopter and have to downgrade to the light aircraft. I feel no sympathy for these people because our schools and hospitals are crying out for extra funds and the former government will have them making their super profits. They knew about it and did not do anything.

What is the thinking in defending the extremely wealthy, the top 1 per cent of hoteliers? What is the political thinking? That is why the member opposite will not last. This Treasurer has delivered us a budget of which we can be proud. South Australians love this budget. It is only the first step of four leading to a balanced budget, with no net borrowings. This government is delivering on its promises and, no matter how members opposite bleat and scream, they are nothing but whingeing, whining opposers. If they had any courage they would oppose the budget: let us go to the polls on it.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): The last contribution puts me in mind of Macbeth, who said, 'It's a tale told by a fool, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.'

Mr Koutsantonis: You would know all about that.

Mr BRINDAL: I do know all about Shakespeare, as the member for West Torrens interjects. I do not think poorly of him, but of a government who gives senior people on its middle benches thankless tasks to do and does not even

prepare them properly to do that task. Let us look at this rationally and logically—something the member for West Torrens was pleading with us to do. It is they who say we are defending anything. As far as I can tell, the leader of our party has stood up and questioned in this house, as he should, a party, a Treasurer, who by his own admission was not in possession of all the facts but, not being he claims in possession of all the facts (which is the best construction we can put on it), he has a meeting with senior people in this town, looks them in the eye, gives his word and then breaks it.

That was the import of the first question by the Leader of the Opposition today: not whether we should or should not support a taxation measure but what trust business can have in a government where a senior member of the government puts in writing and gives his word to senior business people that something, should they be elected, will be the actions of government, only to find him today saying, 'I won't be very popular over this, but I didn't have all the facts: therefore I changed my mind.' One thing that business and the community expect is certainty, and one thing in my life thus far that I have come to value is my word.

I do not think that many members opposite would say that, if I give my word, I break it—and I am not saying that the Treasurer does lightly. But what was questioned today was the assertion that the Treasurer wrote to a group of people and said he would follow course A and that, in fact, he had followed course B. That is not a defence of anyone. It is a legitimate line of questioning for an opposition about business investment in the future of this state. For the member for West Torrens to stand up and say that that means we are supporting this group or that group is not correct. It is a distortion of truth. But I should expect no more.

What did former New South Wales Auditor-General Tony Harris say in the *Financial Review* about this wonderful and glowing budget, this tribute to modern intellectual practice in accounting, this very model of budgets? I should not be surprised if the member for West Torrens were to put the Treasurer up for 'Treasurer of the universe', or 'Treasurer of the world'. Paul Keating got it. Why should not Kevin Foley, if one listens to the debate from the member for West Torrens? The former Auditor-General, Tony Harris, says:

He [Foley] shifted nearly \$300 million of dividends from the government's remnant bank and finance corporation from his rival's 2001-02 budget into his 2002-03 budget.

That is according to this independent expert—who is not in the pay of the Liberal Party, not a consultant to the Liberal Party, nothing to do with us at all that I know of. He wrote this article independently in the *Financial Review*—hardly a newspaper to be quibbled with when it comes to financial matters. It might not meet the great accolades of the *Adelaide Advertiser*, accorded by the member for West Torrens but, generally, in Australia-wide financial circles, it is held in some regard. He ran his article under the headline 'Accounting fiddle paints rosy picture'. So, not everyone except some of the poor members in the middle benches of the government will stand and defend this budget and say how good it is.

But I did find interesting the logic of the member for West Torrens. He quoted one of the leadership group of the Labor Party and said, 'They said, "We will put police before consultants."' That is fine. It is a noble sentiment. I wonder if that is why one of the first actions of this government when it was incoming was for the Minister for Local Government to spend \$50 000 on a consultancy. I wonder why in this budget there are no extra police officers this year, or in any

of the projected years. If spending \$50 000 first on consultants and then supplying no extra police officers is, to fulfil the words of his leadership, putting police before consultants, then I am afraid my understanding of the English language differs markedly from that of the member for West Torrens.

Then the member talked about the following matter. When we were in government for the last eight years it was almost a ritual in here—and there is a certain irony in this debate, because we could just swap speeches: the speeches that members of the government are now making are exactly the sorts of arguments they learnt from us over eight years, and they are regurgitating them. I would therefore remind them that, for each of the eight years when we sat there and the opposition sat here, opposition members were always berating us, complaining about the basis of putting up taxes and charges and saying that it was unethical, unfair and unreasonable, and complaining year after year. Now that they have become the government, what they are now arguing is: 'Well, we complained when you did it. We said it was unreasonable and unfair. We are doing nothing to cut it back. We are simply doing exactly what you did. How dare you now complain. It was all right for us to complain. It is all right for us to take every what you called unreasonable windfall profit that we ever took. You can take all our taxation measures, not repeal one of them, not renege on one of those things that was horrendous—the end of the world as we know it, and all the rest of it—grab every single cent you can, then use the very basis you criticised us for eight years.'

There is a word in the dictionary that describes that, and that word is 'hypocrisy'. Hypocrisy means exactly that: you say one thing and then, when you get a chance, you do exactly what it is you said you would not do. I believe that many South Australians might, in fact, use that word in connection with this government. And why? I will tell you why. This was the most leaked budget in the history of the universe. I doubt that there was much new to be learnt. Everyday some new story was coming out, and the one that absolutely took the cake was the *Sunday Mail* story. The Sunday before the budget came out, this wonderful, thoughtful, caring government, this light to the world, this new Jerusalem being built in Adelaide by the Rann government, announced the creation of 500 new traineeships.

Two years ago the then opposition criticised us for dropping the number of traineeships from 1 200 to 1 000 and then to 500. In fact, we never dropped the number to 500—we dropped it to 613. We had years of criticism for that, yet this time in renewing the last government's commitment to those traineeships not only did the Rann government knock 113 traineeships off and save \$2 million in the process but it announced it as a new program and pretended, at least to the *Sunday Mail*, that this was a new program for 500 people. In fact, it was an old program for 613 people—113 trainees will not be taken on by the government this year—and \$2 million was saved and your government, sir, trumpeted it as a victory, as something good and something to be praised.

If that is the level of its moral integrity and its honesty to the people of South Australia, then I think, sir, you who are a person of integrity are obviously backing the wrong horse and the quicker you get to the front bench the better. I must commend you, sir, because it was an historic performance today worthy of any frontbencher and much better than half the ministers are doing. I could see what you were doing. It was a performance guaranteed to get you a spot on the front bench. I hope it will do so, but I believe that so many of the ministers are not listening that I think you had better circulate

in their boxes and, if you do not, I will because I am always anxious to help.

The then leader of the opposition (Hon. Mike Rann) on 18 January 2002 said—and I will quote exactly—‘None of our promises will require new or higher taxes and charges and our fully costed policies do not contain provisions for new or higher taxes and charges.’ He did not say, as he is now trying to say, ‘our new policies, our election promises’. He clearly said, ‘our fully costed policies’. As I understand it, sir, the fully costed policies of this party when it was in government and your party now it is in government are all the policies of the government—and this is one quote that I picked out. I could pick out any number of the same sort of thing, but the minute he gets there, well, we find that there are allegations of a black hole.

That must be the black hole which was referred to in the *Financial Review* and to which I referred previously, the black hole which is an accounting fiddle to shift money out of this financial year where it was appropriated, where it was voted by the parliament; and that does raise an interesting question. I admit that it was the last parliament, but the last parliament voted to appropriate moneys according to the last budget. As I understand it, those moneys have not been fully appropriated in accordance with the wishes of the last parliament; and therefore this Treasurer has not appropriated moneys voted by the last parliament but has deferred those payments and has put it in his own budget this year.

I am quite clear about the morality of the process. I do not know about the legality of that process, but I would that the last parliament were here because, if the last parliament were here, it might have something to say on the wishes of the last parliament being ignored by this parliament.

The last budget was not just the former treasurer’s budget; it was passed by this house and the upper house, and it was the property of this parliament. If it has been fiddled with by the former treasurer, then he has fiddled with the wishes of this parliament—and that is no small matter. On 5 June 2001, Kevin Foley, the then opposition treasury spokesman, said:

The government has again used assets of government to prop up its budget bottom line and it has used approximately \$194 million from the bad bank to prop up the current budget, together with in excess of \$100 million from capital taken from SAFA. This government... has used assets to meet its budget bottom line commitments that should have been used to retire state debt, and that is concerning... It would have been my preference for that money to be used to pay off state debt... .

Having told us that, what do we find that he does in his first budget? Not only does he not honour that commitment, which he criticised last year for being paid, but also he defers that commitment so that he can use it to come up with—what was your word, sir?—the biggest surplus in the history of this state. One wonders at the ethics of a government that is out to make a profit. My understanding of government appropriation—

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, it did.

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Hang on!

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Well, if it’s going to be used to retire debt, let the Treasurer budget to retire debt and let him say that it is going to be used to retire debt.

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Excuse me! I didn’t call you a dill, and I would thank you if you did not call me a dill. The fact is

that, as I understand it (and I stand to be corrected by my betters), if the Treasurer wanted to retire debt he could budget to do that. He does not—

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Playford might know more about this than I. That is a fact: he could budget to retire debt. He may well choose to use the surplus to retire the debt or pay for some more pork-barrelling or do anything that he wants with it; by declaring it a surplus I believe it is available for reallocation.

Mr Snelling: No, it isn’t.

Mr BRINDAL: I will let my colleagues argue with the member for Playford about that; I’m not going to. I would rather spend the brief time available to me on some of the real tragedies of this budget which I see in terms of employment and employment outcomes. Mike Rann (when he was the opposition leader) said not once but repeatedly that the major priority of Labor if it came into government would be more jobs, more jobs and more jobs. That was going to be their number one priority along with hospitals and schools. Well, on air on 11 July this year we heard this:

The big disappointment is jobs. There is really nothing that would give us any hope that would create employment, particularly for young people.

Where did that come from? It came from Janet Giles, the President of the UTLC, who is not exactly known as a Liberal card-carrying member. I have already detailed to the house that cruel hoax, the cutback in 113 traineeships for young people who would otherwise have sought government employment. And what was that for? Not to reduce the highest level of TAFE fees in the nation. I again quote opposition sources who were always berating us saying that our TAFE fees were too high. They have taken \$2 million not to reduce them by one cent but to cap them. So, having told us that they are too high, what is the best we get from the government? The same all over again! There is a little bit of moral turpitude in that sort of an attitude. Then Pam Simmons from SACOSS stated:

I think it’s going to be another tough year, I think, for low income people. There’s not quite the relief we were hoping for in this budget.

Then Jan McMahon of the Public Service Association, a very strong Liberal supporter, said:

No job creation, only 500 new jobs for young people. The Liberal government had over 600 new jobs for young people.

Barrie Magain, the Real Estate Institute President, said on 12 July:

It looks like a wealth tax. A tax on a tax. And the government’s already done very well out of the stamp duty and the boom that’s happening and we’re just concerned that eventually this sort of tax will impact on affordability at the end of the day.

And the AHA has already been quoted. In this budget there is lots of glossing over the fact that Labor is selling out even its own heartland, even its own constituency. The housing proposition is not a tax on the wealthy. The median price of property in this state is \$168 000, and that includes all units and townhouses—that means that more than 50 per cent of housing attracts more than \$168 000. So Labor brings in an additional tax at \$200 000. That will certainly impinge on my electors in Unley and on the member for Mitcham’s electors but, also, sir, it will touch places such as your electorate of West Torrens and the electorate of Norwood. It is not only Liberal electors who will be belted by this tax. I challenge any member opposite to say that in 2002 in South Australia \$200 000 is a princely price to pay for a house.

If Labor is true, if this government wants to be true to its tenets, I would admire it more if it really were defending the battlers and the workers and the people who need help. But a government that delivers a budget that turns its back on the young, on the unemployed, on people who seek only a modest level of housing, and that encourages into redundancy a further 600 public servants I think is a Labor government bereft of ideas and a Labor government that has sold out its traditional values. I think those members opposite who truly espouse a light on the hill must be shame-faced, because if this is Labor's light on the hill, God knows why they are in government.

Mr RAU (Enfield): This budget has been very well received by most members of the community and, except for some publicans who are understandably not happy with it, it appears that virtually everyone else is happy. I think in those circumstances the document and the underlying philosophy of the budget can be regarded as something of a triumph for the Treasurer and for the government.

I will not spend too much time on the details of the budget, although I will spend a bit of time because there are a couple of matters which I think are particularly significant in, importantly, the health area—for example, the additional funding of \$17.657 million for capital works and an MRI machine at a cost of \$2.25 million for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, both of which will be very well received. However, I would like to talk about the structure of the budget and how it fits into the big picture.

Mr Brindal: You're fairly honourable. Get stuck into them for what they are not doing for your electorate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order!

Mr RAU: We will get onto that in due course, but the interesting thing about the state budget, of course, is how little of it is raised by the state government. Since federation, the states have been losing taxing powers at quite some considerable rate. Of course, the advent of the GST has done nothing to slow that process—in fact, it has accelerated it, because the GST corresponds with one of the largest intrusions of federal taxing powers into what, historically, had been regarded as the province of the states, which is licence fees and so forth.

Increasingly, the commonwealth is collecting moneys which, in the past, have been state moneys. This state proposes to collect (in the budget year 2002-03) \$2.182 billion in taxation. Where does that tax come from? That tax comes from payroll tax—which, of course, was one of the many taxes that was supposed to disappear with the GST. It comes from taxes on property which are largely stamp duty, conveyancing costs and land tax; and, of course, there has been a bit of a blip in stamp duty receipts. It comes from taxes on gambling, which we have heard quite a bit about from the other side, and taxes on insurance.

In addition to the tax receipts of the state government, which are approximately \$2.3 billion, receipts from other grants and income are coming to the state. However, the state is overwhelmingly reliant on commonwealth grants and moneys, whether those moneys are in the form of GST payments or commonwealth grants. GST grants in the relevant year amounted to \$2.7 billion, which is already greater than the whole of the state's tax base; transitional grants were another \$172 million; and direct, specific purpose grants were \$1.156 billion, making a total of \$4.528 billion. So, we have approximately twice the amount of money

coming into the state coffers from the federal government compared to our own tax base or other income base.

Most of the taxes that are available to the state, with the exception of stamp duty on property, are taxes that are fairly unlikely to be growing at any dramatic rate. What this means is that, as far as the state's revenues are concerned, the state has very little room to move, and the part of the state's revenue that it controls is roughly only—according to those figures—a third of its income and, within that, a large portion of that income is very difficult to adjust due to the nature of the income. For example, one could hardly imagine an increase in payroll tax being advocated by any sensible government, particularly a Labor government.

So, the scope for this government to actually increase taxes is very limited and, in that context, what has it done? It has employed a progressive increase in stamp duty which does affect (I would agree with the member for Unley) modestly priced homes, but only to a small extent, and overwhelmingly collects larger amounts of money from the more expensive transactions. Of course, that money is receivable only when there is a transaction. It is not as if members of the public are required to continually pay stamp duty: it is only when they purchase a property. So, it has an effect which might not touch most people for many years.

The other important aspect of this is the future of the state's payments from the commonwealth, because the only adjustments the state has to make are on the expenditure side. Its capacity to adjust revenue is very limited, and it is a disappointment to me that so much focus seems to be on the gambling tax and on the stamp duty points which, in the scheme of things, are a minor amount of money compared with where the major adjustments need to be made for the state, which is on the expenditure side of the equation.

If we look at the commonwealth grants which have been provided to the state we see that the state is completely dependent on the current arrangements with respect to the return of moneys to the states from the commonwealth. There is a considerable risk if, in the future, adjustments are made in commonwealth-state financial relations, whereby a different formula is employed, the state is going to be in serious financial difficulty. It is a sad fact that the state has very little control over its revenue in the scheme of things.

I refer to the Budget Statement 2002-03, Budget Paper 3, which canvasses some of the risks that lie ahead for the state. I think it is important that we spend a little time on these because they are relevant. At paragraph 8.3 reference is made to the risk to the revenue of commonwealth grants. It refers initially to general purpose payments and makes the comment in the third paragraph:

There is a further risk of change to funding arrangements as a result of changes in commonwealth policy.

Of course, we are all aware that the states collectively were duded by the commonwealth when it unilaterally abandoned the indexation of the fuel excise at the beginning of last year, and that will have a continuing effect on the moneys distributed to all of the states. It is equally the case that any future changes in policy by the federal government will flow through to the states and change our budgetary position without our having any say whatsoever about the matter. The budget papers go on to make this very worrying statement:

Recent and past experience indicates there is an undoubted risk element in commonwealth grants to the states.

Commonwealth grants are the vehicle for horizontal fiscal equalisation (HFE). However, possible variability in Commonwealth Grants Commission assessments of payments which are required to

achieve HFE are most appropriately considered in the context of state own-source revenues and expenditures.

That is then talked about later on. So, here we are, completely vulnerable to the whims, effectively, of the federal government.

The question of further risks, which are identified in the budget papers, include the risks to the state's own taxation revenue, and it appears from Table 8.1 that in the current year there has been an 82 per cent increase in stamp duty receipts. But the estimate for next year is a 64 per cent reduction in stamp duty receipts. So, while this might be described as a growth tax in the state's control, it is the sort of tax that is likely to fluctuate fairly wildly, particularly at times of large capital growth in property values.

As far as royalties are concerned, there is also some concern here because of shifting world prices for commodities and because of the change in the value of the Australian dollar, all of which tend to lead to a shaky prospect for royalties. The summary in the budget paper states:

State revenues are not generally exposed to a strong cyclical component. The main areas of volatility are stamp duty on conveyances and royalties. Even in these areas, the impact of cyclical influences is dampened through the fiscal equalisation process—

which, of course, means we are back to relying on the federal government to look after us.

We then have some other matters in the papers that I think warrant comment, and one of them is the question of the state's population. The budget papers report that in the year to June 2001 South Australia's population growth rate was .5 of 1 per cent, compared with a national growth rate of 1.4 per cent. South Australia's annual population growth rate has been between 0.4 and 0.6 of a per cent for the last four years. This is low by national standards and has been for some time. As I mentioned earlier in the grievance, the only way that we are going to be able to do something about that is to either have more people move to South Australia or increase the growth rate here. The main reason for our lower population growth is in fact net interstate migration. Even though this slowed a little in the late 1990s it is again increasing. In 1995 the net interstate migration loss was nearly 8 000 people. This declined to 4 200 in the year 2000-01 and reached 2 700 people in the year to December 2001.

In the year to June 2001, interstate migration detracted 0.28 percentage points from South Australia's population growth. New South Wales, Tasmania and Western Australia also experienced net migration losses to other states, while Victoria has recently started to gain population from interstate; and Queensland, of course, has been continuing to gain population from interstate sources for many years. South Australia also has the highest median age of all states, which contributes to the lowest rate of natural increase of all states.

In addition, we receive a very low share of overseas migrants and, even though overseas migration as a net factor was positive in the year to June 2001, it was insufficient to compensate for interstate migration, resulting in a slight overall detraction from population growth from total migration. So, as we can see, all the indicators about the South Australian economy—talking about the growth in population and its mix, that is, the mix of older to younger people and so forth—are pointing in the wrong direction.

Population projections provided in the commonwealth budget's 2002-03 intergenerational report indicate that Australia's population growth will fall slowly from the current 1.2 per cent per annum. This means that the South Australian population position will be even worse. In the

housing sector, dwelling construction during the last period rebounded strongly from last year's slump, but it would appear that we cannot rely on the building industry to keep pulling us out of trouble.

The number of housing finance commitments for the purchase or construction of newly established dwellings fell by 12 per cent in South Australia during April 2002 compared to a national decline of 2.2 per cent through the year. However, commitments increased by 15 per cent in South Australia and 10 per cent nationally, so there is mixed news there. The budget papers talk about regional economic conditions and demonstrate that there are regions in South Australia where there has been growth. Obviously, there has been good agricultural news in some of the regions.

But this really highlights the problem that South Australia faces in any budget: we are overwhelmingly dependent on the commonwealth for our revenues; our capacity to raise money at state level is very limited and is often through what might be described as obnoxious taxation measures such as payroll tax; and we are in a situation where the population is declining relative to the rest of Australia. The population mix in this state is unsatisfactory in the sense that it is an ageing population and it is a deskilling population, where people who receive education in this state move onwards and outwards in search of better work and employment opportunities.

In those circumstances, for this budget (which seeks to introduce some fiscal responsibility into the process) to be criticised is very unfortunate. The fact of the matter is that South Australia does need to be very careful about its future directions. It needs to have sound, tight fiscal management, because this state more than any other, probably with the exception of Tasmania, cannot afford to have its balance sheet out of order. We have enough problems without that.

It is interesting that members opposite have today demonstrated such sympathy for the Public Service. I noticed them asking questions about 600 public servants being offered voluntary redundancy. I cast my mind back to the number of targeted separation packages that were offered—I do not know whether they were voluntarily offered or imposed on people—at the time of the Brown Government's election in 1993-94. So, their criticism of these offers being made to public servants does ring a little hollow. In fact, their comments today reminded me of that *Yellow Pages* ad: 'Not happy, Jan!' That seemed to be the refrain.

In any event, South Australia is a state which has tremendous potential if it concentrates on its advantages and is aware that it has a number of demographic and educational disadvantages to overcome. This is a budget which moves in the most progressive possible way to increase tax receipts from the limited resources available to the state government by way of taxation by picking measures which overwhelmingly do not affect South Australians; that is, it is a targeted, progressive system where particularly lucrative gambling venues pay a larger share of tax, and people who are transacting business in the form of conveyancing, with bigger properties being loaded to the top end of the scale, will contribute more to tax. The pastoral leases matter has also been the subject of comment here.

I will say before I finish up that one thing I would like to see in future budgets is more of a concentration on how the expenditure side of the equation can be more tightly targeted and focused. Since coming into this chamber, one example that has come to my attention is the emergency services levy, which is one of the most peculiar taxation measures I have

ever seen. The levy consumes in administration a huge proportion of its actual take. In fact, some \$7 million-odd of the moneys raised by the emergency services levy in the past year went straight back into paying for the administration of the system. That is the sort of place where savings should be able to be made where, instead of spending \$7 million on collection expenses, the tax or the system should be improved to knock out whatever is causing that wastage.

Other areas that need to be examined in the future are probably many of the programs and much of the manner in which programs are administered at state level; attempts must be made to eliminate duplication. But, in the circumstances with which the government has been faced, this is a very responsible, progressive budget, which focuses on providing services in the areas that were promised at the election—namely, health and education—and raises money for those purposes, to the extent that the state is able to raise any moneys at all from its own resources, from progressive taxation measures which collect moneys from those most able to pay and distribute them through the public system.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): As I rise to speak to this Appropriation Bill, I am reminded that this is the twelfth appropriation bill following a budget to which I have had the privilege of speaking in this chamber. That means I have spoken to appropriation bills that have seen changes through myriad Treasurers and across governments of both political persuasions of the major parties but, beyond any other of the 12 that I have spoken to, this particular budget is one that is littered with broken promises and with accounting play that is in my view plainly dishonest or, at the very least, deceptive.

We have effectively seen delivered in this chamber a budget that has taken that which was put together by the previous Liberal government, which has moved moneys around, which has artificially created a black hole and which has moved some moneys into those areas that are normally favoured by Labor governments but with some significant catastrophic results for sections of our community, and my colleagues and I on this side of the chamber will progressively detail those during our addresses. It is important to reflect on just what some of the key broken promises were as they were laid out at the last state election. We have seen a more than \$200 million increase in taxes flagged over the next four years, with increases in stamp duty for conveyancers, rental agreements and gaming taxation. We have seen increases in emergency services levy revenue and compulsory third party insurance. We have seen a more than \$120 million increase in government charges over four years. We have seen a cut of up to 600 public servants announced.

In real terms this budget will see a reduction by \$34 million in education spending. We have seen no big boost in health spending as Labor promised during the last election, but in real terms an increase of less than 1 per cent funded mainly by a run-down in the cash reserves of almost \$20 million, and we have also seen large increases in state net debt and unfunded superannuation liabilities. All of this is against the key promises that were made by Labor in the last state election campaign, notably, Mike Rann's promises that there would effectively be no increased taxes to fund Labor's election expenditure bids.

Certainly the members from the left wing of the Labor Party must be frustrated by this budget, for it does not deliver the social reform opportunities they would have liked to have seen, and they have to face the music from their electors as

promises have been broken, notably those people who were expecting concessions for the first time, such as superannuants or people on fixed incomes. I refer to concessions that would have been delivered by the outgoing Liberal government, concessions that we had undertaken we would deliver and concessions that individual Labor Party members told their constituents they would ensure would be delivered but which have not been delivered. These are further broken promises and, in that particular area, they are promises that were made by many individual Labor members.

I will leave it to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to reveal which Labor Party members broke that promise, because the chamber ought to be aware that Labor members were surveyed independently during the election campaign, and we on this side will ensure that the *Hansard* record shows, word for word, what each of those Labor Party members of parliament said to their constituents on receipt of phone calls requesting information.

Those South Australians who believed that Labor's promises would be delivered and voted Labor—albeit only 49 per cent of them on a two-party preferred basis—are no doubt particularly angry that just four months after coming into office, Labor has already discarded its key promises. It is also important to look at the way in which the accounting deceit has been carried out in this budget.

We heard much on this side of the house from the Treasurer about the so-called black hole in the budget, the so-called \$300 million black hole, or whatever amount it might be depending on the day of the week or the month of the year. The Treasurer's figures seem to ebb and flow, and now the reason for his figures ebbing and flowing has finally been released. As the Treasurer was fully aware, the 2001-02 budget laid down by the Liberal government had included within it a figure of \$304 million of South Australian Asset Management Corporation and South Australian Finance Authority revenue and dividends that would be included in the budget.

What the Treasurer did was target that \$304 million, and that is why he was talking about a black hole of about \$300 million, and the black hole size depended on how much he deceptively manipulated that \$304 million. I put it to the house that the Treasurer has deliberately reduced that \$304 million by an amount of \$276 million to create a false impression of a deficit. Effectively, he has then moved the balance of the moneys across into this budget for the 2002-03 financial year, thereby being able to claim a surplus. In fact he is claiming a surplus of \$92 million.

In the 12 budgets I have seen delivered in this house, I have never seen a treasurer behave so deceptively to manipulate the budget figures in that way—deceptively and, I would argue, dishonestly. The Treasurer today during question time took much delight in quoting extracts from various Australian newspapers of critiques of his budget.

However, he left out a very important series of quotations today. For example, he did not talk about the *Financial Review* article of 12 July and, for Labor members who might not have read that paper, I tell them that the article was entitled 'Accounting fiddle paints a rosy picture'. The article was edited by Tony Harris of the *Financial Review*, who is a former New South Wales auditor-general. He saw through the smoke and mirrors deceptive action of the Treasurer: he pointed the finger right at what he has done and recognised that money has been manipulated to artificially create a deficit in the 2001-02 financial year budget. The Treasurer also did not refer to an article by Alan Woods, the economics

editor of the *Australian*, again of 12 July, where he says in part:

The bottom line is that the new Rann government is shaping up as yet another high taxing, high spending one.

I wonder why the Treasurer did not reveal that quote to the chamber today. The Treasurer also did not talk about the comments of none other than Jan McMahon, the General Secretary of the Public Service Association, in the *Advertiser* of 11 July. He was intent on quoting other material from the *Advertiser*, but he left out this comment by Jan McMahon, who was quoted as saying:

This will impact on education and health. We will lose filing clerks and ward clerks, so nurses and teachers will end up doing more.

That is the Public Service Association, a group that is notoriously supportive of Labor in opposition and Labor in government. Those quotes were not given to the chamber today because the Treasurer continues in his deceptive behaviour to prevent this information from being aired properly in parliament.

I would argue that the deceit goes further than that. We also saw the Attorney-General release a document today in this house. He released the Duncan files. Why? Why today when those files could have been released any time up to December this year? There is one very simple reason: to try to reduce the media airplay that might criticise this deceptive budget. That is why it was done today. There is no other reason for that, and I challenge anyone in the Labor Party to stand up and deny that to be the truth of the matter. This is a very shabby, deceptive piece of behaviour by the Treasurer and therefore by every member of the Labor Party who supports him in his deceptive conduct.

It is also important to look at just what the government's own budget figures show. If we look at health, more broken promises are revealed, for their own figures show that 159 200 fewer outpatients will be treated; 16 000 fewer emergency patients will be treated in metropolitan hospitals; and 8 300 fewer emergency patients will be treated in country hospitals. They are not my figures but Labor figures straight out of their budget, and if members of the Labor Party have not woken up to the fact that this budget cuts health services then I advise them to read the papers carefully and, if they have trouble finding those parts of the budget with that information, I am sure members of the opposition, myself included, would be happy to guide them to the appropriate sections. Remember, this budget was drafted against Mike Rann's infamous comments—

THE ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I refer to the now Premier's, then Mike Rann's, infamous comment—

THE ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: —of 18 January, when he said:

None of our promises will require new or higher taxes and charges and our fully costed policies do not contain provisions for new or higher taxes and charges.

It does not matter which way you look at it: this budget contains new charges and it contains higher charges, but even with that it fails to deliver on health. They have not been able to deliver better health. Let us look at the tax rises: a 4.2 per cent increase in all state charges such as car registration, licence fees—\$120 million over the forward estimates period; increases to stamp duty paid by home buyers—just as the home market has become buoyant, Labor kicks it in the guts

with a \$33.9 million tax take over two years; there is also a tax slug of more than \$48 million on hotels, despite the fact that the Treasurer wrote to the AHA during the election, as we revealed in parliament today and as he has now confessed, to promise otherwise. I am not a great supporter of poker machines, everyone in this chamber knows that because I have been an ardent critic, but I do not support deceptive conduct.

We have also seen a 700 per cent rise in native vegetation clearance application fees—700 per cent—and massive increases in leases on crown land properties, and we will certainly have an opportunity to address that when the bill comes before the house for debate. I also want to look briefly at my shadow portfolio responsibilities, which are the same as those responsibilities I had as a minister in the Liberal government. I want to refer in the first instance to a media release issued by the Hon. Paul Holloway in his role as Minister for Mineral Resources Development. His press release is entitled 'Boost for mineral and petroleum exploration' and is dated 11 July 2002.

I can only conclude that the Hon. Paul Holloway has taken lessons from the Treasurer because this press release is as deceptive as the Treasurer's budget actions. In part, the minister's press release states:

\$1.14 million in new spending will go to providing strategic scientific data to exploration companies under the new Targeted Exploration Initiative 2020. The funding will increase to \$2 million over five years.

The press release also states:

The new initiative is an excellent investment in the South Australian economy. The former Liberal government had not funded the old TEISA scheme beyond the current financial year.

That is blatantly wrong. Not only had we provided funding for the new initiative in the 2002-03 budget (had we continued in office) but we gave the program the same name—TEISA 2020. I took that very name to the budget bilateral process on 13 December last year and have retained copious notes to that effect. My copious notes also reveal that the budget bid I had put forward on 13 December 2001 was for a budget bid of \$1 990 000. Labor has put forward \$1 140 000—effectively, it has again short-changed the minerals and petroleum sectors. So, far from making new funding available the Hon. Paul Holloway and his Labor mates have slashed the Targeted Exploration Initiative program.

They have slashed the opportunity for new exploration. They have duded the minerals petroleum sectors in the most shabby, disgraceful, deceitful, underhanded and, I argue, dishonest way, and I will ensure that is put forward to the industry so that it knows just how disgraceful the conduct of this government is. This government has cut the moneys that would otherwise have been available, but it does not end there. I am sure that members who represent opal-producing areas in the state will be interested to know that Labor has axed a further program. It has axed a program which I also took to the budget bilaterals on 13 December last year and which I named Opal SA.

Opal SA was effectively to help develop and implement a strategic approach for the future development of a sustainable opal industry in South Australia. It was important that was done properly; it was important that it was funded. The opal industry provides enormous potential for our state but Labor has turned its back on the opal-producing regions of our state. Indeed, I had put forward a bid of \$500 000 for 2002-03, increasing to \$1.2 million in 2003-04, and

\$1.5 million in 2004-05. I am sure that the member for Giles would be interested to see that she has been duded by her Labor Party colleagues again. I am sure that people from the opal-producing areas will ask the member for Giles with interest why she was unable to continue that funding that would previously have been put in place by the Liberal government.

Where has that money gone? That is the question that needs to be asked. Where has Labor put that money? It is also interesting to note that Labor appears to have ended the hot water service rebate scheme. That is something that I put to the minister to debate in this chamber. What has happened to the hot water rebate scheme to encourage solar hot water systems to be installed in South Australian households? Certainly, there has been no announcement within the budget and there is no detail within the budget papers, so has that also gone? Is that something else that Labor has chopped? I look forward to the estimates process where I can scrutinise these ministers in detail albeit in a reduced time frame—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Minister for Tourism might well interject, but in my 12 years and seven months in this place—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member will address his remarks through the chair.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Minister for Tourism is the first minister who, during my 12 years and seven months in this place, has endeavoured to avoid scrutiny by not being available for a full day of budget questioning and by being questioned in the evenings after the media have left. Where is the weakest link in the Labor Party? Let the weakest link stand up, because there is no doubt that there has been every attempt to hide the weakest link during the estimates process. We look forward to continuing to negotiate that through. If this government is dinkum about honest, open and accountable government, it will allow each cabinet minister to be scrutinised for a full parliamentary day from 11 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. The member for Bright knows full well that the estimates program was signed off by the opposition—

The ACTING SPEAKER: There is no point of order, although it is a good point.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I remind the honourable member that the program has not been signed off and it has not been agreed. There is much more debate to be held about the deceptive conduct of the Labor Party in relation to the estimates program. I now turn to something else that has been axed by the government. Here we have a government that claims to be tough on law and order. In my time as correctional services minister, I was pleased to introduce at the Cadell Training Centre a training program called 'Operation Challenge'. The program was based on the United States boot camp model of imprisonment. It was a tough regime that worked prisoners hard and ensured that prisoners not only worked hard and were treated tough in the system but also there was a great opportunity for rehabilitation. The program was heralded around Australia, and it was seen as a resounding success. However, it was obviously too tough for Labor—too tough for the left-wing prison minister who now heads that regime for Labor.

So, what happened to Operation Challenge? It was too challenging for the government so it axed it. That is what it has done. Labor has gone soft on law and order in the prisons, and it has axed it. Again, it is more evidence of the disunity

on viewpoint within the Labor Party. I am sure the Attorney-General does not know about the axing of this program. So, the broken promises and deceit continue.

This government has put forward a budget that is nothing short of a sham. It has put forward a deceitful document; it has put forward the good old-fashioned pea and thimble trick with plenty of smoke and mirrors around it. It has tried to create an artificial budget surplus in the last financial year. Any economic analyst with knowledge, on examining these budget papers in detail against the preceding ones, could conclude nothing other than this government has put forward a fraud on South Australian taxpayers. It is one that I would be happy to stand up and debate with any member of the Labor Party from the Premier to the newest backbencher in front of any audience to reveal what they have to say.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Most members would know that I am a very positive and proactive person, and I like to support progress. I would like to support this budget but, unfortunately and sadly for the South Australian community, there is no way that I can give this budget any positive credit—no way whatsoever. Let us look at the history of this. This budget does not have any strategic vision at all. In fact, when comparing this year's budget papers with those of the former government last year, we had a dedicated document (a separate document) that had a strategic direction and a strategic vision for South Australians to capitalise on the strategic documentation to fix Labor's mess that we had worked with since 1993 when we won the election. We developed a strategic direction called 'Charting the way forward'. What did 'Charting the way forward' do? It set up the opportunities we are experiencing in South Australia today.

Let us talk about some of those opportunities. It set up low unemployment—the lowest unemployment we had seen for a long time. Remember when Premier Rann was the minister for employment? He should really have been called the minister for unemployment, because unemployment almost hit 13 per cent in the 1990s. We turned that around to approximately 7 per cent and, of course, it was still trending down. We saw real growth outcomes for South Australia. We saw investment in infrastructure and improvements to our schools. We saw improvements to literacy and numeracy—the basic cornerstone and foundation for education. We did all these things whilst we were in office.

Now what has happened? We are about to see a turnaround. Sadly, it will not be a turnaround that is in the best interests of South Australians. For a start, we saw the budget figures fudged. In fact, not only did the media pick up that, where indeed there should have been a surplus in the budget for this year—a surplus for the 2001-02 outcome, the last Liberal government budget—but also the figures were fudged; they were shown as a deficit, and the new government took that money which the former government had as a surplus to show it as a surplus for itself. In addition, the new Labor government deceived the parliament, the opposition and the community of South Australia. But, even with that, I do not believe the government will be able to deliver what it is estimating to deliver. How will it do it? First, the government said it was going to get rid of consultancies, or words to that effect.

Mr Meier: It was one of the first things they did.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Last year we spent \$73 million on consultants—the same amount of money that Labor spent in its last year, eight years earlier. The government said it was

going to make big savings on consultants, and it estimated \$20 million, yet it is now forecasting \$10.6 million. Given the amount of money that it has already put into reviews, and so on, I do not believe it will be able to deliver on that.

Let us remember that, in theory, health, education and police are quarantined—and I will talk more about that later. The government is asking other agencies, which represent half of all government agencies, to deliver savings this year of \$99.5 million. I do not believe they will be able to do it.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: The Minister for Tourism asks, 'Whose fault is that?' It is simply the fault of the Labor Party that broke promises. It made promises before the election for which it did not have the money.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: We will talk more about that also. In order to show that this budget is not very well framed, let us look at the lack of detail and consistency. In the Capital Investment Statement 2002-03, the budget papers show that the government expects to spend \$7.446 million on the audio management system, which is to help the GRN and the cab projects, for which the former government budgeted and paid last year. The Portfolio Statements, Budget Paper No. 4, vol.1, under 'Audio Management System', shows the estimated expenditure in 2002-03 at zero.

On the one hand, the government has a budget paper showing that it will spend \$7.4 million on an audio management system and, on the other hand, it has a budget paper showing it will not spend anything. If the government is prepared to print that in its own budget papers, when we get time to go through this line by line we will find huge errors. If it is able to make errors such as that in the printing of these documents, then what sort of budget is this? This budget is a bad budget; it has no strategy, vision or direction and it is an attack, particularly on rural and regional South Australia and tourism. Where was the jobs growth over the past few years? A lot of those jobs came from rural and regional South Australia and tourism—two areas that this government is ripping apart.

I want to turn to my own electorate. It has already been admitted by one member of parliament on the government side that there was a political reason for having a Minister for the Southern Suburbs. I am happy that that political reason occurred, because I am passionate about the south, and I will support the Minister for Southern Suburbs in anything he can do to help deliver services. Let us remember that the Labor Party said it was for political reasons because it neglected the south before it lost office in 1993. The former government turned that around. It is no longer 'the forgotten south'. It is a southern area of prosperity, confidence, commitment, jobs and economic strength.

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

Mr BROKENSHIRE: As I was saying, we were seeing a lot of strength in the south as a result of a real partnership—the commitment by the government and by the community—and the dollars that were being put in. In fact, in the last four years of the Liberal government I could, conservatively and easily, add up to \$100 million of extra money that went into real outcomes with capital infrastructure in the south, over and above the normal money that governments are meant to spend on teachers' wages, police and so on—\$100 million.

I am not an unfair person, and I do not expect unreal outcomes, but I would have thought that, after all the years

of neglect when Labor was in government and with the fact that it said it had a Minister for the Southern Suburbs for political reasons, they would have at least matched our money. All I am asking for is \$100 million over four years out of a budget of \$7.5 billion each year, that is, I am asking for \$25 million for the south out of a budget of \$7.5 billion to help the south grow. I am sure, Mr Deputy Speaker, that you would support me, because you are also a hard-working local southern member.

But, what have we got? Very little. In fact, apart from a couple of projects that I am pleased to see, such as the Flinders Medical Centre mental health facility, which I understand the previous minister for health (Hon. Dean Brown) was committed to in any case, apart from some money that I am pleased to see for the McLaren Vale Primary School redevelopment and apart from some money that we were working through anyway to fix the atrocious road access from the Victor Harbor Road onto the Main South Road at Old Noarlunga, we have not seen a lot at all. There has been some money for the Christies Downs Primary School and a few bits and pieces.

But the government had \$6.2 million for Willunga Primary School. It is there in Treasury: 'approved: urgently needed', and it has been put on hold for some reason on the basis that this government claims that the Hon. Dean Brown had too much capital works for education.

First, this government ought to realise that Willunga Primary School is not even in Dean Brown's electorate: it is in my electorate. I worked hard with my community last year to ensure that when we were in government that money was there. This government needs to reinstate it, and it needs to reinstate it urgently. Our community will not stand for this. We want a new primary school in Willunga. The money is there, and the government cannot hold us in contempt.

I also want to talk about the cancer research centre that was allocated for the Flinders Medical Centre. That program has been cut, when nothing in health, I would suggest, is as important as research into cancer. Roadworks have been cut way back—for example, only a measly \$90 000 has been allocated for upgrades to roads from Old Noarlunga through to Victor Harbor, and yet, sadly, we continue to see road trauma.

With regard to economic development and the great work being done by the City of Onkaparinga, such as the export extension services, the council asked for \$5 million over a three-year period, which is not a lot of money in addition to what had been worked out with the Mobil indenture agreement to help create jobs, prosperity and opportunity, particularly for young people, and there is not one dollar in there for that.

So, this is not a budget that has a vision, and this is certainly not a budget where the Labor government has come out and stuck to what it tried to imply in a smoke and mirrors image before the election, that is, that it would now be committed to the southern suburbs. It is much more than just brokering partnerships. We can do that ourselves; we do not need a lot of help, but we need dollars, and the dollars are not being given to us in the southern area.

I turn now, in the last part of my speech in this debate on the Appropriation Bill, to the agencies. Before the election, we heard the Labor Party, in opposition, criticising me, inaccurately, for not delivering for police. Can I put on the record what we did deliver for police. I was extremely proud to be police minister, and it was a privilege to serve for police. I have a passion for the portfolio, and in opposition

I will continue to fight for a fair go for them, because they are fundamental to whatever legislation is made in this house. Whatever else may happen whilst you are in government, the police, a proper budget and proper resourcing are fundamental.

There were three successive increases in budgets under the Liberal government to a record of approximately \$400 million. There was also an increase of approximately 6.5 per cent of the work force sworn and non-sworn during our time in government, as well as a budget increase by the time we were 'dumped out of government', as was said by the honourable member behind me—not by the community, I might add, but by others—which amounted to \$140 million of additional money in one year to police and a major capital works program.

Effectively, in real terms given the budget for increased salaries due to enterprise bargaining last year, I do not believe there is an extra dollar for police in this. In fact, even the government's own press release shows that, in the next four years, no additional police will come into the South Australian police department other than those who will be replaced because they will retire or choose another career. That is a sad indictment on this government, and I will not forget to remind it of that. More money had to go into emergency services, but the money we put in there was money well spent. We increased those budgets as that was necessary, and some cost pressures were involved. However, notwithstanding that, there are cost pressures in every budget. Why is it that the capital works program, for example, for the CFS has been cut by nearly half this year? Why has SAMFS not had a significant increase in its budget, because it certainly needs to continue to build new stations and replace equipment?

I credit this government for continuing with our volunteers portfolio, and I know that the volunteers agency for which I was responsible as minister for a while will continue to deliver, because we have to look after the 450 000 volunteers who are the lifeblood of South Australia and whose organisation delivers services, fosters community spirit and builds social fabric. I will be watching that one very closely.

I am extremely disappointed with the gambling portfolio, as the government will take an extra \$39 million of tax revenue from gambling, with only a measly \$1 million or thereabouts over four years being put into both research and rehabilitation. That was announced even before the increased tax take. The government is effectively pulling another \$39 million out of an industry with hardly a dollar being committed to help undertake research in crucial areas. The lines should be much broader than they are to include such issues as the impact on families and children of problem gamblers and, of course, rehabilitation programs.

I supported the Drugs Summit, although we could not engage this government in the matter for two years. We had a tough law and order strategy, and we delivered on that. We had a lot of tough law and order policy to come through in this term. We were tough on drugs, and when I and other members on our side in government tried to engage the Labor Party on the drug issues, it was not tough; it would not even become involved. Fortunately, a couple of new members have come in who realise that things have to be done there, and I look forward to working with them. I supported the Drugs Summit, but where is the money for the initiatives, ideas and opportunities resulting from the Drugs Summit? It is not there. The sum of \$5.48 million is there for a social inclusion unit to give the Premier advice. Why does it have to spend

\$5.48 million for advice and officers in a social inclusion unit in the Premier's office when we know what social inclusion is all about? We have to look at the outcomes involved in good social inclusion and deliver money for them. That has not happened, and to my knowledge the Drugs Summit does not have any money provided for it.

Where are the jobs, vision and initiatives for infrastructure development? Capital works have been cut right back to try to fund promises among all the promises the government has reneged on. It is interesting to pick up a paper from one of the Labor MPs with the headline, 'Labor government up and running'. It is up and running, but it is running backwards. This is the start of a Labor government running backwards and taking our state backwards with it. It is very disappointing, given that it inherited from us an excellent budget which, as I said earlier, would have been a surplus budget in a strong economy. It is forecasting a reduction of approximately 25 per cent in economic growth for every year of the four years that it will be in office, from 3¾ per cent last year under a Liberal government back to 2¾ per cent. What sort of a vision is that? That is an admission by the Labor government that it does not have the skills, the vision or the ability to run a business—the business of government—and it is an admission that they will turn around this economy in a negative sense. It is a sad day for South Australia.

To finish on a couple of points, they said they would not increase taxes or charges or bring in new ones. We know that was a furphy as we see \$200 million worth of increases. It has hit stamp duty. Real estate generates a lot of jobs and economic opportunity. For three years we have seen major capital growth in this state. What is happening now? The real estate market is flattening out. So, what does the Labor Party do into government? It makes it tougher again by increasing stamp duty on conveyancing. There will be \$120 million more in government charges over the four years, with 600 public servants to go. It will be interesting to see what happens there, but having worked with them and knowing how tight it was, given that we had to fix the State Bank mess, I do not believe we can afford to cut 600 public servants.

The government talked about being the smart state, the innovative state and delivering on education. I understand that effectively in real terms there is a \$34 million cut in education, and in health a measly 1 per cent increase in real terms. I predict that this time next year we will see bigger waiting lists, more stretchers in the ambulance and emergency area and greater pressure on health because they have not delivered in that area—it is all about rhetoric. This year the government delivers about half the \$213 million we provided last year in the budget.

It is not just me saying this: we can look at the people wise enough to wake up to it: the *Financial Review*, the Economics Editor for the *Australian* and even the Public Service Association are critical of this. They talk about the disappointment around the lack of jobs, vision and opportunity, particularly for young people. This budget is flawed and flat. I would have thought, after eight years in opposition, that if Labor were listening it would have been able to give some new vision and new direction. I do not know what they were doing when they were out listening, but clearly they were not understanding. We now have a situation where, instead of growing on the opportunities, we will see a reversal.

While we will try to help this government to grow, when it starts to go down the wrong track, as clearly shown in this budget, we have a responsibility as an opposition to highlight

that to the South Australian community. Not one minister came to a previous government minister and asked for any advice. We were happy to do that. They talk about bipartisanship: there has not been bona fide bipartisanship and they will have to live with this budget. In the days, weeks, months and the year ahead, more people will see how disastrous and outrageous this budget is. We have heard a Labor government before say it will bring home the bacon. Well, there ain't any bacon to bring home in this budget and a lot of people will suffer as a result.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I will pick up a small point the member for Mawson has raised in terms of the Labor Listens campaign. In my electorate in the year running up to the state election a meeting was held in Gawler and another in Freeling. The one in Freeling was of particular interest as it was forecast as a Labor Listens meeting, but it was scheduled for 2.30 in the afternoon. Who will you get to listen or discuss anything with shadow ministers at 2.30 in the afternoon? All you get is the retired people, as mothers and fathers are getting ready to pick up their children from school at that time and the rest of the community is working. I am not sure who they thought would listen. As it happened, I think all of 12 people turned up—

Mr Brokenshire: Branch members.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Yes, probably branch members, as the member for Mawson says—all apart from one of my staffers. She gave me a good report on the subject. I am told that in Gawler 34 attended and most were branch members. But let us get on to the budget, because those meetings were just a farce. It is very similar to this budget, because this budget is just an absolute sham.

If one looks at Budget Paper No. 3 (and I refer the house to page 4.18), one will see the distributions received from public non-financial corporations and public financial corporations. In the budget year 2001-02, there was a total distribution of \$321.1 million, and the estimated result was \$34.7 million. One would wonder how a budget of \$321 million set by the previous government can change so dramatically to an estimated result of \$34.7 million, when this government has been in power since March. When one looks at the next year (which is even more interesting), one will see that we go back up to \$340.9 million.

Anyone who can read accounts would be able to tell you that the Treasurer obviously saw that there was no black hole, so he decided not to redistribute from these public non-financial corporations, as every other government—both Labor and Liberal—has done beforehand, and that was the way in which he created the black hole. Likewise, he created a \$95 million surplus by, lo and behold, transferring \$340.9 million in 2002-03. How interesting that precedents can apply for one year but not for another.

This is where the Treasurer was hoist by his own petard. He was going around both before and after the election saying that there was this black hole when, in fact, we knew that there was no such black hole; it was all a fabrication by the Treasurer. These accounts show that that is true. They show that the Treasurer has done some tricky business in developing these accounts, and by ensuring that his own argument was supported and not the financial position of the state. It is a sham, without a doubt.

In addition, in terms of broken promises, I remember the Premier and the Treasurer running around before the election saying that all the Liberal government policies would be supported—those that were approved in the budget by this

house—and those policies that were being put forward by the Labor Party, were it to get into government, would be paid for by a reduction in consultancies and a reduction in government advertising and from efficiencies within the Public Service.

Sir, let me tell you that what has happened is a broken promise in that area, without a doubt. To relate it to my former portfolio, the principals in my area who were up for capital works or who had capital works budgets approved for 2001-02 on 5 March were told, 'All is on hold. We are reviewing all these projects in respect of which contracts have not been signed.' As a result, capital works, in education in particular (I cannot speak for health), have come to a grinding halt. One also has to look at the fact that capital works in this year's budget have been reduced from \$1 300 million to \$940 million—a \$360 million reduction in capital works. I would suggest to you, sir, that what we see in this budget is capital works funding being used for recurrent funding.

We spent about \$940 million last year on capital works, and I can tell members that no government—Labor or Liberal—achieves its capital works budget because of delays, tenders that do not come in on time or a capital works project that is budgeted for comes in over budget. As a result, one has to go back and look at where savings can be made, or whatever, to come within budget. So, the \$940 million that is aimed to be spent by this Labor government will not be spent. No government achieves its capital works budget. As a result, it will be more than a \$363 million projected reduction because that \$940 million, which has been estimated, will not be spent, either.

Let me talk about some of the things in my electorate. Gawler Primary School has been listed to be refurbished for over 10 years now. Last year, I think we allocated some \$2.14 million for this refurbishment. I was talking to the principal today and she said, 'It has been put on hold.' I said, 'On hold until when?' She said, 'I don't know.' I said, 'I will tell you when it is on hold to. It is not listed in the budget this year, so you will be holding for 12 months.' I said, 'How far have you got to now?' She said, 'We have got right up to the stage of being ready to go out to tender.'

What has happened is that all the architectural, accounting and costing work has been done on this project and it has not been listed in this state budget and, as a result, when it comes up to be included in the budget in 12 months, all those costings will have to be done again because either building prices will have increased or factors will have changed. We have spent one lot of money on costings and now we will have to go down the same path in 12 months' time to obtain another lot of costings. What a waste of money! This has also happened to Smithfield Plains High School, which is in a severely deprived area. In last year's budget we allocated about \$940 000 to develop a business hub within that school.

A building in the school had been burnt out many years ago. The idea was to set up 26 small businesses within that building on the school site—it would be the first of its type in Australia—to give students in a very disadvantaged area the opportunity to mix one to one with local business people to get an idea of the types of skills that they need and maybe end up with some employment, but certainly it would put a focus on the Smithfield Plains High School. That has been deferred as well because it is not in the budget, either. I spoke to the principal today and said, 'You had better find out whether this has been deferred indefinitely because commonwealth funds hook on to this as well and you are applying for them. They will want to know about that.'

Here we have a severely disadvantaged area, and this funding has been pulled out. They have gone to the same stage; that is, they are on the edge of being ready to go to tender as well. All the work that has been done will be deferred for 12 months: they will have to do the costings again and spend the double the amount of money that should be spent.

The Peachey belt area is known to members in the northern suburbs as being severely disadvantaged. It has unemployment rates of some 25 per cent. If members bother to travel around that area and look at the state of some of the homes, there is no doubt that they would be disgusted. This is the fault of both Liberal and Labor governments, not just this government, because they have talked about rejuvenating this area for 30 years. This area was included in my electorate at the last election.

Prior to the last election, I spoke with the former minister for the Housing Trust (Hon. Dean Brown) and said, 'This is an area that we have to develop. How can you change your Housing Trust budget to accommodate a rejuvenation of this area because it has been going on for too long.' There is nothing in this budget for this area, yet these people have been waiting for 30 years.

The Playford council is prepared to put \$800 000 into this area. It was suggested that there would be a trial, but the trial was not large enough. That is why I approached the member for Finnis prior to the last election and said, 'The council has the money. What we need to do is put in a sizeable project to ensure that we receive the benefit of that \$800 000,' and he agreed with me. However, there is not a stitch in this budget for those people, so they will go on for another four years with no hope.

One of the factors which the previous government included in the public works program for my electorate was a flood mitigation dam on the North Para River. Many members might remember the floods that occurred in 1991 in the Gawler River. There was some \$10 million worth of damage in the lower reaches of the Gawler River through Two Wells, Gawler and those areas. The whole idea of this flood mitigation dam is to ensure that the North and South Para do not come down at the same time, meeting at the Gawler River, swelling it and bursting its banks, but I believe that this project has not been funded in this budget.

The government is running an extreme risk if a flood occurs over the next few years and this mitigation dam has not been put in place because after the last major flooding in 1991 it was reported to the government that it would be liable for any damages that occurred as a result of another flood. If the government does not go ahead with this mitigation dam—I think from memory it would require about a \$2.4 million or \$2.5 million input from the state government; and we were to get federal funding as well—it is placing the state at risk of receiving insurance claims from landowners who are affected by flooding should the Gawler River flood at any time, because a previous report which was handed to the then Arnold government stated that this risk existed. So, because the government has had prior knowledge of this, it is now liable. This is a definite fault in the budget.

I turn now to my shadow portfolio. Apart from the fact that there has been a reduction in capital works in the transport and planning portfolio of over \$14 million, in addition, Output Class 2: Maintenance and Operation of the Transport System (Budget Paper 4, Volume 2) shows that there has been about a \$9.5 million or \$9.6 million reduction in the maintenance and operation of road infrastructure and

systems in South Australia. So, the transport portfolio is one of the areas to be cut. It is pretty predictable really because, when one looks at the programs that have been cut, one only needs to look at where money was previously being spent in rural areas and how it has been hacked—for want of a better word—out of there and placed elsewhere. It is quite unbelievable.

Funding for the unsealed rural arterial roads program, to which the former government allocated \$10 million in the 2001-02 budget, has been reduced to \$2.8 million. There is a regional roads program which was to be allocated \$2.2 million which has been completely obliterated, and many others have also been reduced. This is not surprising because under all Labor governments basically state government funding for projects ends at Gepps Cross—it is that simple. It is very disappointing because very little funding has been allocated to the northern suburbs. As I said, the Peachey belt desperately requires funding. Smithfield Plains High School is another example. The Mawson Lakes development road infrastructure has been reduced in this budget. And so it goes on.

What has been created is a state black spot program, which I guess we are supposed to be ever thankful for. But let me tell you, sir, that that funding is merely a rebadging. The overtaking lanes have been reduced, now that I think about it. I do not see any overtaking lanes in metropolitan Adelaide: to my knowledge they are all in the country. So, there is a particular safety initiative which everybody knows the benefits of, and the state government criticises the federal government for an extension of the time for that particular program. Yet here, lo and behold, we have a reduction of that program in the state budget. Government members are absolute hypocrites in this regard and in many other areas.

There have been renewals of announcements of things such as the South-East rail, which was included in our budget—in fact, it was approved by our cabinet. Then, lo and behold, the Premier announces this wonderful program for South-East rail. It was already done—the previous government had already set that up. There is a reduction—nothing, from memory—of the Glenelg tram expenditure. I think we put \$3.25 million in our budget but there is nothing in this year's budget for it. So, we continue to support the older trams, which we all know need replacing but which involve a high maintenance cost, and what is a very good tourist icon for Adelaide goes begging because there is no money to be spent on it.

As I said, this is a very disappointing budget. It contains a litany of broken promises, and the South Australian public has been deceived because of the tricky accounting which has been used by the Treasurer to ensure that he does not take money from the finance corporations of the state government so that he can confirm his own argument of a black hole when, in fact, we know that there was no black hole whatsoever. Indeed, he has created one by not transferring those funds. It is disappointing in the utmost that we have this sort of accounting, when this government proclaimed that it would be an honest, accountable and open government. All those adjectives used by the Premier and the Treasurer prior to the state election are meaningless.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): This budget is very disappointing. As I have highlighted in this house before, under a Liberal government we came to a new plateau in terms of economic development and in terms of the status of this state. Remember that we took this state from being a basket case some

eight years ago to a new high—a new high in terms of our manufacturing, a new high in terms of our rural productivity, a new high in terms of exports and a new high in terms of reducing the unemployment rate to being one of the lowest in Australia. That was something that had never been contemplated before, and the Liberal government did it.

What did we do to help create this environment? One of the key things was that we sought a balance—a balance between city and country. We also sought a balance between economic activity and the absolutely essential ingredients of health, education and law and order. And our balance was such that we restored enough confidence in the economic situation that people from interstate could again see that South Australia was worth investing in.

At the same time, with our health services and education services we started leading the country. We well recall some of the headlines from interstate about the crisis in health in Victoria and New South Wales. They were absolute disaster cases, particularly compared to the health services in South Australia. In fact, we had figures showing that South Australia led the world in so many areas in health. In education, we introduced Partnerships 21. Again, it was literally applauded around the world, certainly even by the Blair government in Great Britain. I think that was a real feather in the cap for the Liberal government and for the state of South Australia. In terms of law and order, we continued to employ more police in the last two to three years and, in fact, we have a police force that is doing an excellent job at a time when population has increased and there is more economic activity.

So, coming back to the question of balance between city and country, you would think that the very least this government would do is ensure that funding for the regional areas is maintained and, if possible, increased. But is that the case? Unfortunately not. In fact, in the area of road funding we see cuts in the rural arterial road program, the sealing of rural arterial roads. The Liberal government gave a commitment that we would seal all rural arterial roads within 10 years. We had eight years and not a lot to go. This year there has been a cut from something like \$9 million down to \$2-odd million dollars—a huge cut for rural arterial roads.

But it is not only in roads; it is also in health. In fact, we heard the Leader of the Opposition outline earlier the massive loss to country areas in health. In fact, I would just like to highlight again that, while metropolitan hospitals have been given a 7.1 per cent increase for costs, country hospitals have been given only 2.4 per cent. If ever I have seen discrimination, this is it. I do not know, but I suspect that the government has no idea of the enormous pressures in the country with respect to health. I will cite the example of Wallaroo Hospital. It not only closed all non-elective surgery over the Christmas period but, I think, over the May-June period it had to close again for some weeks. Why? It was because of the cost pressures. It has happened at other country hospitals as well. We are seeing the crisis now with the public liability insurance for some of the private hospitals. Hamley Bridge, as a classic example, is literally struggling to exist, and it seems there is no help from the state government. So, we are seeing a decrease in spending in health in country areas. Those are two examples.

I can also cite examples from education, and I know we will be hearing from the opposition spokesperson on education, the member for Bragg, a little later. But if you look at the schools which are not being funded, or which have had significant cuts in funding for this coming year, it is almost

entirely in the area of country schools. The list is as highlighted by the shadow spokesperson for agriculture: schools that have had some capital works cut or axed are Angaston Primary, Booleroo Centre School, Ceduna Area School, Gawler Primary, Orroroo Primary, Peterborough Pre-School, Smithfield Plains High School (that is a metropolitan school, I agree with that), Willunga, Mawson Lakes (another metropolitan school) and East Torrens. The vast majority there are country schools.

I well remember that when I first came into parliament the area of Riverton was in my electorate, and Riverton reached either number one or number two position for redevelopment under the Liberal government, the then Tonkin government. Labor came in and that was it—the list literally disappeared and Riverton was no longer on any list for redevelopment. It is tragic that the new government seems to be following down that same track, because we remember what happened when the Bannon government came in after the Tonkin years: debt slowly went up, bit by bit by bit. Then, of course, it went over the precipice when the State Bank collapsed, bringing it to a head some years faster than would have been the case.

However, I think that one of the things that has hurt country people as much as anything is the decision to increase charges for perpetual leases. It is the government's intention to implement a minimum index rent of \$300 a year for all Crown leases and licences and increase the freehold purchase price for perpetual leases to a minimum of \$6 000. I suspect that many members opposite think that all Crown lease and license holders should be paying some rent. But, let us be clear: what happens if you want to purchase perpetual lease land? Obviously, you would purchase it from a person who is selling it. What sort of money would you pay for it? You would pay the going market rate. In other words, if the land is worth \$1 000 per acre that is what you will pay for that perpetual leasehold land. Further down the road there may be a similar property also for sale at \$1 000 per acre, but it is freehold. There is no major difference. You buy the land at the going rate.

The government is now saying, 'We are getting literally peppercorn type rentals. It is unfair.' I will tell you what: it is not unfair at all. If the government has a complaint about the cost of administering it, as the minister did in the house earlier today, I would suggest that it should make it easier for people to relinquish the perpetual leasehold altogether, rather than imposing this impost. I can assure you I have had complaints from some pretty irate farmers in my electorate and, speaking to some of my colleagues, I find they have had the same.

The other thing that is highlighted in the budget is the fact that the so-called budget blowout was fictitious. You might recall that I highlighted some weeks ago to this chamber that, even if the Treasurer was correct in his assessment of the budget blowout, that actually worked out to less than 1 per cent of the total budget—I think it was .9 of 1 per cent, so it is almost insignificant—but he kept at it. Now we have seen that the scheme has been exposed by none other than a former New South Wales Auditor-General, currently a journalist with the *Financial Review*, who has identified 'accounting fiddling' used by Rann and Foley to create the supposed black hole deficit of last year and the claimed surplus for this year. All I say is: why are we not fast tracking the honesty and accountability legislation that has been brought before the parliament? I hope that this legislation will outlaw, once and for all, this sort of fiddling by treasurers and others because I am heartily sick and tired of it. It is downright deceitful.

We have heard from other members just how it works, but I will highlight it as well. In last year's budget papers the Liberal Party identified \$304 million from the South Australian Asset Management Corporation and the South Australian Finance Authority going into the budget to help deliver a \$2 million surplus. In this year's budget figures Treasurer Foley takes only \$27.5 million from the South Australian Asset Management Corporation and the South Australian Finance Authority prior to 30 June, not the \$304 million, so that he can claim the fictional black hole deficit of \$62 million for 2001-02. He then puts it into the budget this year to create a supposed surplus of \$92 million. It is downright dishonest. It is not the way that a new Treasurer should be starting his term in office, because, from now on, I for one will always be suspicious of any figures that he puts forward.

How can I rely on him? How can I trust him when it is clear as clear that he has used a gigantic fiddle? That, I guess, is the one positive thing that comes out of the budget: that at least it has been identified very clearly now how he managed to convince so many journalists that there was a black hole; and we see the truth coming out at present. Without doubt, there have been many broken promises. We heard from Mr John Lewis of the Australian Hotels Association on radio this morning and certainly over the weekend, and I can understand his anger and annoyance.

Not only did Mr Lewis apparently receive a letter from the Treasurer to say that there would be no tax increases for the hotel industry but also, in face to face discussions, it was said, 'There won't be any increases.' And then the government comes in and bang—king hits on these so-called pokie barons. You, Mr Deputy Speaker, know my attitude towards pokies. I voted against them: I think they are a real evil in our society, yet I can see how governments have now decided to use those profits as a major windfall for their own budget. That is by the by. What I think about the tax is irrelevant in that respect.

I am highlighting the fact that a clear, unequivocal promise was made to the Australian Hotels Association: 'We won't increase your tax rate.' And it is broken. It is tragic to think that that has happened, particularly coming from a Treasurer who, if I remember correctly, when the Liberal government sold ETSA, tried to identify the fact that he felt that was outrageous. Whether or not he was justified for thinking that, I will not say. In fact, you, sir, would rule me out of order, because it would not be directly related to the budget.

But what a hide to have been critical some years ago and now to do something himself where he had clearly, unequivocally promised not to! You wonder why people lose faith in members of parliament, yet I would hope that members of parliament can be looked to. But, when the Treasurer does these sorts of things, it is very difficult to justify.

I note that there are going to be more than \$200 million of increases in taxes over four years, with increases in stamp duty for conveyances and rental agreements and, of course, the gaming tax: a \$200 million increase. This from a government that said, when in opposition, 'We will not increase taxes and charges to pay for our promises.' Yet, of course, we know that so many of its promises are the real reason for these increases. It is hypocrisy of the first order. We also note significant increases in emergency services levy revenue and compulsory third party insurance increases. In fact, if you look at the figures for the third party premium in the city, last year it was \$531, and under the Rann government it will go

up to \$579, a 9 per cent increase. I did not think that inflation was anywhere near 9 per cent: in fact, I know it is not, it is about 2.8 per cent.

In the country the premium goes from \$444 to \$482, an 8.6 per cent increase. I suppose I will give acknowledgment there: there is a 0.4 per cent benefit to country areas, but it is still a very high increase for third party and, again, it will hit so many of the people who can least afford to run a motor vehicle.

Another thing that really disappointed me was that the self-funded retirees have lost a \$45 million concession package. Members will recall that we introduced that in the last budget, because so many self-funded retirees were living on a lower income than pensioners. Previous governments had ignored their plight, so the liberal government acknowledged that and said, 'All right; we will extend a concession package specifically to you, because pensioners receive so many concessions.' And what does the Rann government think of helping the less well off? It simply takes it away from them. So much for their care of people; there is no care in this case. We remember that those concessions included \$70 per year for electricity, \$185 per year for water and sewerage rates, \$190 per year for council rates and \$56 per year for motor vehicle registration, so we are talking big dollars.

I come back to the broken promises. We will see an increase of more than \$120 million in government charges over four years, which again is a huge increase, and a cut of up to 600 public servants. Again, I well recall hearing during the election campaign that it was only going to be the fat cats, and the rest of the Public Service could rest easy; no problems. I can see that they are quivering in their shoes now. In an earlier speech someone said, 'What about you, the Liberals? You cut the Public Service.' Yes, but did we make any secret of it? No. We said very clearly that the state was overspending and that we could not afford to keep that number going, but what did Labor say? 'No, we will only cut the fat cats; the rest of the Public Service we will leave as is,' but what have they done? Broken another promise.

We have seen that the so-called increases in health and education are not really the increases that they sought to make them out to be, because when you take inflation into account the increase in health spending is shown to be less than 1 per cent—an almost zero increase—and a loss of about \$34 million has been identified in education. Yet, we heard the Rann government make such a big song and dance about saying they will redirect the priorities back to health and education. That is absolute rubbish, according to this budget; they have not done a thing, yet even the journalists get it wrong. I hope they will pick up some of the points that I and other members of the opposition make and remind people that what was said in the election has not been put into practice in this budget. It is not a budget that will help South Australia; I fear that South Australia will start on a downward ride—something that we as Liberals worked so hard to avoid by bringing the state to a new pinnacle, a new peak. I am very disappointed with this budget.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I speak in this debate on the Appropriation Bill out of a sense of responsibility to the people in my constituency, and I would like to make one or two comments. It is not my wont to take a great deal of time in the house—I am normally a person of few words. However, on this occasion, I will break my rule and address a considerable number of comments to this document, which

I read very carefully over the weekend. It is interesting, not for what it says but for what it has not said. It is also interesting to note the direction the government will take. The first comparison one should make is that between the economy and the state of the finances of South Australia that the Liberal Party inherited in 1993 and the economy when this minority Rann-Lewis government took power. You have a soundly based economic situation, with low interest rates and an expanding housing market with increasing housing purchases.

You have a strong manufacturing base—all of those elements in the economy which make life far easier for a government. Of course, it makes it easier for government to provide the basic necessities which state governments are set up to provide—that is, the general services to the average person in South Australia. That is the role of the state government. We are closer to the scene. We are there to provide those basic health services, to maintain a decent road network, and to provide public education, police services and those sorts of public infrastructures which have traditionally been the responsibility of state governments.

One of the problems facing this government is that it promised too much to too many people. Therefore, in an attempt to deliver it to some, it has decided to vent its spleen on those whom it does not think traditionally would support it. It has fallen for the three card trick. It has accepted chapter and verse some of the suggestions put forward by the bureaucracy which will lead it into trouble. It is not for me to want to get it out of trouble, but it is my role to point out when it will commit injustices or implement unwise policy which will have a detrimental effect on my constituents and the people of South Australia.

One of the largest employers in my constituency is the Department of Correctional Services. I have the Port Augusta prison and the training centre at Cadell in my electorate. The training centre at Cadell provides a very good service for the people of South Australia. It is very important for that small community, and they have had in operation there for many years a scheme known as Operation Challenge. That scheme gives first offenders, young people, the ability to receive some basic training and life skills. It equips them when they go out into the community and hopefully lays a foundation so they will never enter the prison system again. That I believe would be the hope of most members in this chamber.

I have attended a graduation ceremony at the Cadell prison. Anyone who has had the pleasure of attending one of those functions could not help but be impressed by the dedication of the staff and the benefits which have accrued to the people who have participated in the scheme that has been implemented and by the way in which it is run. I am very disappointed to learn that this scheme is set to close; it has been scrapped in the state budget. I would put it to the house that there was far more value in continuing this scheme than spending in excess of \$400 000 putting a couple of so-called ministerial offices in rural South Australia, one at Murray Bridge for whatever purpose, because it is within 100 kilometres of Adelaide, and one at Port Augusta.

It will be interesting to learn which minister is involved in doing this. The \$400 000 that this will cost would be better utilised in maintaining Operation Challenge at Cadell which is doing something constructive. It should be an ongoing scheme which is of benefit to first offenders and will keep them out of the prison system. But, Don Farrell having spent his money, he is now wanting a bit in return.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I'm sorry? Where does the Don come into this?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, he spent his money at the last state election in Port Augusta. He spent a huge amount of money, was unsuccessful—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He spent a bit in Hartley, too.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: He was unsuccessful there, too.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: He spent a bit in Light, too.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am coming to that, because Senator Schacht has addressed himself to this at great length. I think the house needs to be brought up to date on that matter. But we will come to that.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The late great Senator Schacht!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I understand that the honourable member was one of those who helped rid the state of Senator Schacht.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, the electors did that.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: But you ensured that his political demise was complete.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I voted for him to get into the Senate in the first place.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That was not one of your better actions. However, I was indicating that the government seems to have mixed priorities. One of the worst decisions they have made is their attempt to change the Crown Lands Act. We have across South Australia currently a vast number of people travelling through the northern parts of the state. They are enjoying the wide open spaces and it is of great concern that proposals are at hand to downgrade the Transport SA gangs in this state. This afternoon I received a fax from one of my constituents, and I think it is worth reading sections of it to the house because it clearly indicates the problems that are going to arise. It is dated today and, under the heading 'Proposed changes to outback roads services—Reduction in work gangs from 4 down to 2', the letter reads:

At present South Australia has probably the best outback road network in Australia. This is due not only to commitment from previous governments but also the dedication and skills of Transport SA staff who have created and maintained this network of roads. This network of outback roads is an integral part of the infrastructure required for the ongoing prosperity of South Australia as they service key industries, namely, pastoral, tourism, mining, communications.

Several years ago the available work force to look after this network was reduced from nine gangs to four. I believe that there is a proposal now to further reduce this work force down to two gangs. It seems rather ironic that, in the Year of the Outback, there is a proposal to reduce the base that supports this most vital form of infrastructure.

During this Year of the Outback there has been a considerable marketing campaign to encourage both domestic and international tourists to visit outback regions and, without a good road network, this will be to no avail. The Strzelecki, Oodnadatta, Birdsville Tracks and the Northern Flinders roads are probably the most used unsealed roads in Australia at present, and it distresses me to hear that there is a proposal to further reduce the level of service available to maintain this quality, especially considering the aggressive attitude of the government in encouraging people not only to visit but also to live in the bush.

It is worth considering what one small part of the Year of the Outback generated. . . It was estimated that the Great Outback Cattle Drive put \$7 million directly into our economy and indirectly attracted about \$12 million in both international and domestic publicity. Having been involved in the outback all my life, it concerns me greatly when I hear that services. . . are going to be reduced.

It goes further than that because the people who are going to be affected, who have been put on notice, who live in these small rural towns, are going to lose their jobs. There is no alternative employment. It will affect the schools because, if

someone has worked with the transport department for 20 years, where are they going to get another job at Marree or Coober Pedy? That is where some of these people reside and they have developed the skills on how to build roads in the Outback and how to maintain them and it would be a most unfortunate occurrence if those people were to lose their jobs, there was no further work and all that investment were lost and the roads were to fall into disrepair.

The second matter concerns the freeholding of Crown leases. I received today a copy of a letter that was sent to a constituent of mine who lives at William Creek. That is not a part of the world where one would think that people readily go to live. Let me outline this gentleman's unfortunate circumstances, as follows:

I refer to your application to surrender Miscellaneous Lease 21111 in favour of a freehold title. I advise that an inspection of allotment . . . Deposited Plan 32887 was recently undertaken. It is apparent from that inspection that the site currently appears to be managed in a manner consistent with your lease conditions. However, the inspection has not provided any evidence to suggest that the department should deviate from its policy as it relates to the non-issue of freehold title in rangeland country. I regret to advise therefore that the ministerial delegate has declined your application to freehold miscellaneous lease. . . For further information contact . . .

The letter is signed by the Property Officer for Crown Lands SA. That is an outrageous response. There is no reason in the world why that person, having built a decent home, should not be able to freehold their property. Under this current policy, the government intends to increase his rent—and he gets virtually no service from the government of South Australia—and deny him and his wife the ability to freehold. I believe it is a scandal. I look forward to the next Liberal government's continuing the process of freeholding land. It is an absolute nonsense that people in these small towns should not be able to freehold their land.

If the honourable member thinks that I am going to vote for a bill that includes these sorts of injustices he has another think coming. I hope that the parliament deals appropriately with this very bad legislation. Even worse is the person in William Creek who has built excellent take-away and tourist facilities and developed a camping ground. He has provided hot showers and accommodation. That person wants to freehold their block to get a little more security and to make it better, but, no, Sir Humphrey cannot have that. Well, that in itself is an outrage.

Why would you want to stop someone freeholding their block at William Creek when they have gone there and built an excellent take-away facility? The public supports it. The facilities have been expanded. He has developed a camping area and installed toilets and showers, and for some mad reason—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is a nonsense. If he can assist in freeholding this land, I give the Attorney full marks because it is long overdue. I think that most reasonable people who went there would say—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I will get Justin Jarvis onto it.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is really smart. Anyone who went there and had a look would say, 'This person has done a great job assisting the community'; but to deny them the right to freehold their property is a disgrace because these people are providing an excellent facility for tourists and it is indecent that they are not allowed to freehold their properties. I call upon the property officer who has been given the delegated authority to come to his senses, show a

bit of commonsense and get on with it because we have allowed people to freehold land, quite properly, at Blanche Harbor, close to the sea.

In my view, this person at William Creek, or any other tourist operator, should be allowed to freehold the land on which their assets are placed. It does not matter whether it is at Oodnadatta or anywhere else, because we want to encourage them to have even better facilities and to give them security of tenure. I am appalled that these people have been treated in such a shabby fashion for such a long time. In relation to the other areas of the state where people have been denied the right to freehold, one of the most annoying things I faced during the period of the previous government was when we learned that the bureaucracy had so misinterpreted the freeholding policy that it had excluded very large sections of the community in South Australia from freeholding their property, contrary to government policy.

Constituents contacted me today from Wilmington. Only last November they were allowed to freehold their property because, fortunately, the backbenchers found out what Sir Humphrey had been up to and got the stupid policy changed. The poor fellow, only last year, had purchased this block of land. He contacted the department at Port Augusta and said, 'Look, I'm really battling financially and I want to freehold'. The person with whom he spoke from the department said, 'There's no hurry. This offer has been made to you and there's no time limit on it. You've got plenty of time.' The officer confirmed the conversation today. He has a small block of land, and he has to work part time at the Quorn hospital to support himself and his family. He paid full market value for the asset. The government does not own the assets on perpetual leases: those assets are owned by the lessees. The minister gave a bloody typical socialist response today: it was an appalling answer. If he thinks that members on this side will take that sort of treatment, he is in for a fight.

That poor constituent was advised by a public servant that he had plenty of time. If the government wanted to change the policy, it should have given people the opportunity by saying, 'Either you freehold or we want more money.' We also need to allow lessees to consolidate leases. One of my constituents has 60 separate leases, some of which are very small. These leases were issued, if you know anything about the history of the Crown Lands Act, in the semi-marginal areas. It is not agricultural land—land around Jamestown—and there were a number of others. This is a nonsense. Why have we arrived at this situation? It is interesting that we are now in a situation with the membership in this house. The *Australian* of 29 June this year stated:

[Senator] Schacht was just the latest victim of a corrupt system that has concentrated power over the South Australian Labor Party preselection policy, and the spoils of office, in the hands of a few faceless men from the trade union movement. The 'Machine', as it is termed, is the label for the formal alliance between the Left and Right factions in South Australia that engineered Schacht's downfall. It allows two blokes from two of South Australia's big unions—the right-wing Shop Distributive and Allied Trade Association (SDA) state secretary Don Farrell (aka 'Don the Pope'), and the left-wing Liquor Hospitality and Miscellaneous Workers Union state secretary Mark Butler (or 'Misos' backed in Federal Parliament by Senator Nick Bolkus)—to decide behind closed doors who is going to get into parliament. There are a few independents and the 'SA Left', but the Machine has the numbers, as Schacht learned. Sure, the South Australian conference has a 50:50 rule—

He then goes on to explain that—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am not familiar with Adelaide, although I drive through it. I will finish this speech another

day. Do not worry, I get 10 minutes. I used to cut down, but the other day my way was blocked because someone had built a big wall along there. I am not sure of the name of the street where you cut in—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I had great difficulty finding my way out. During the last few weeks I have been learning how to drive around the city again.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Just drive down there anyway, Gunnie; everyone else does.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I don't know about that. I was not particularly pleased late at night. So that is about as much as I know about the honourable member's district. I drive through it. I understand that the honourable member had the support of the now Premier, and that is how she got into parliament. I look forward to finishing this speech on another occasion, because I am sure that members are interested.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): This budget is based on deceit. It is an accounting fiddle and it is a fraud on the people of South Australia. It bases its existence on a supposed black hole that has been dismissed as a fabrication. The Treasurer has made a range of claims in this house in the period leading up to the budget that have been proven, both here and in the other place, to be totally wrong. The media have summarised that error by the Treasurer in a quite dismissive way. An editorial in the *Sunday Mail* claimed:

Foley was forced to confess that there was actually at least \$205 million in the budget to pay teachers' pay rises—contrary to the misleading statements he had made.

The editorial goes on:

In a major embarrassment to Mr Rann and Mr Foley. . . memos signed by the Under-Treasurer confirmed that this year's budget was actually in surplus by \$60 million to \$96 million rather than the supposed black hole deficit of \$26 million.

I could go on, but it has been shown that the black hole simply does not exist. It is a clever reinvention of the books. In fact, the former government left the economy and the budget in good shape. The Treasurer and the government have inherited an economy which is vibrant: exports are booming; farmers in our regions have experienced three seasons of incredible outcomes; unemployment is at record low levels, as are interest rates; the economy at all levels is simply thriving. The previous government can take much of the credit for stimulating that economy, that drive, that new energy in the economy. Imagine for a moment where the government would be today, how its budget would look, had it still had in excess of \$9 billion worth of debt, which the previous government had to deal with as a consequence of the chaos it inherited from Labor. Imagine for a moment the budget challenges this government would face if it now still owned those electricity assets and had to deal with the pressures from the public about the price of electricity; with the pressures of the national market; with the cost pressures of having to provide hundreds of million dollars of new capital investment to provide for new generation; and if it was facing diminishing returns from those very assets. It would still have the debt, and it would have a massive ring around its neck in the form of those electricity assets.

This government has inherited an economy and a budget in fabulous shape because of the courageous decisions made by the former government. This budget is a budget of broken promises. We had no new taxes or increases. On 18 January 2002, Mike Rann said:

None of our promises will require new or higher taxes and charges, and our fully costed policies do not contain provisions for new or higher taxes and charges.

If this budget is not a broken promise, what is? If the people of South Australia feel they have been misled and that this is a dishonest budget when they reflect on these remarks, who can blame them? Kevin Foley in costing Labor's policies released a document on 7 February 2002 which states:

Labor will achieve savings by . . . introducing a 1.75 per cent efficiency dividend across government recurrent spending, excluding health, education, police, and the operational budget of emergency services.

It is another broken promise. On ABC Radio on 6 February 2002, Trish White said:

. . . putting a lot more resources into our schools. . . over next term of government. . . promising over \$100 million extra on top of what's budgeted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I rise on point of order, Madam Acting Speaker. The member for Waite persistently refers to members on the government side by their Christian name and surname, rather than their ministerial portfolio or electorate. I ask you to ask him to desist.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Thompson): I uphold the point of order. I had noticed the inappropriate language from the member for Waite. I ask him to use parliamentary terms.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: On ABC Radio on 8 February 2002, the Premier said:

That's exactly right. . . the efficiency dividend does not apply in health and education because they are our priority areas. . .

On ABC Radio on 7 February, in response to a remark from David Bevan, who said, 'Doesn't this mean that there are going to be a range of cuts across a whole series of government departments, excluding the most important ones—health, education, police and emergency services—but everything else will suffer a cut,' the Treasurer said, 'Absolutely.' Not only is this budget a litany of broken promises but it is also an accounting fiddle. The now Treasurer, in *Hansard* on 5 June 2001, commenting on the budget of the previous government, had this to say about funds transfers from SAAMC and SAFA:

The government has again used assets of government to prop up its budget bottom line, and it has used approximately \$194 million from the bad bank to prop up the current budget, together with an excess of \$100 million, from capital taken from SAFA. This government. . . has used assets to meet its budget bottom line commitments that should have been used to retire state debt, and that is concerning. . . it would have been my preference for that money to be used to pay off state debt. . .

But what did the *Financial Review* have to say about the current Treasurer's budget the day after its release? Simply, that it was an accounting fiddle, whereby he had done that very thing—switched money from SAAMC and SAFA to fiddle the budget figure, to create the artificial impression of a sound surplus during his tenure and to misrepresent the performance of the previous government, so that it seemed there had been a deficit when, in fact, there was none. This is a budget of deceit and broken promises. The charter of budget honesty proposed by the government lies in tatters.

There is some good news here—mostly the work of the previous government—such as the Genomic Centre at the Waite Research Precinct for Plant Functional Genomics, an initiative of the former government which has, mercifully, not been cut by this government. In addition, there are the redevelopments of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Lyell McEwin Hospital, totalling \$64.4 million. These initiatives of the former government,

totalling \$198.8 million, are simply being pursued by the new government. The redevelopment of the State Library, which has been allocated \$44.2 million, is another initiative of the former government. Support for Mitsubishi was another initiative commenced by the former government.

The good news in this budget is predominantly the good news of the former government for which the present government seeks to take credit. There are disappointments galore in this budget: net debt is to remain steady at \$3.4 million, which is no further reduction. I imagine the present Treasurer is overjoyed that he does not have to face the massive crippling debt that the Liberal government inherited when it took over from Labor's chaos.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Precisely right—check the budget documents. The sum of \$7.6 million has been allocated to eradicate branched broomrape. If this government had \$7.6 million to spend on its priorities, one may well ask why it is choosing to spend that amount on branched broomrape. Ministerial offices are to be established in the Mid North of this state and the southern suburbs. Well, won't that be cute—a Labor minister and Labor staff prancing around the Mid North and the southern suburbs at the taxpayers' expense carrying out their official duties and, no doubt, tinkering at support for the Labor Party at every corner!

The dishonest approach in dealing with the gaming and hotel industry demonstrates the nature of this government's litany of broken promises. Irrespective of what individual members may feel about the taxing of gaming revenue, to write a letter in which you guarantee you will not increase taxes, then to have a face-to-face meeting and say that you will not increase taxes and then on election to turnaround and rip that up and throw that away and defy that commitment given sends a signal to business in this state that South Australia is not open for business, that South Australian businesses cannot rely on the present government to stick to its commitments, that business cannot take this government at its word. There has been a massive increase in stamp duties. In my constituency of Waite, people could be paying anything from \$500 to \$7 500 extra in stamp duties at the behest of this government, not to mention the new taxes on commercial hire purchase, set to bring in \$7.5 million, mainly at the expense of small to medium enterprises. Is South Australia really open for business under this government?

What about the future? In education the debate coming from this government in this budget seems to be about inputs. I have heard nothing from this government about outputs. Government members sit there wondering why families have been moving to private school education in increasing numbers over recent years. It seems the only answer the government has is that inputs need to be increased. Has it ever occurred to this government that parents and families may actually be focused on the outputs being achieved and received by their children? Maybe therein lies the area that should require and focus this government's attention. In the area of health there is nothing here for the future in real terms but a recommitment to the initiatives of the former government. As has been shown, neither education nor health, in defiance of promises made, have really been quarantined from cuts in this budget.

Economic growth has been tipped by this state government to drop from 3.75 per cent to 2.75 per cent—almost a one-third drop in growth. That comes as no surprise to me. The initiatives this government has taken in this budget will

guarantee that outcome. The cuts are savage in the areas for which I am shadow minister—tourism, the arts, information economy and innovation—the cuts amount to millions. They are cuts that will take away business from private sector and SMEs and from infrastructure development in the regions and in the city. They are cuts that will take away events that are so important to the tourist industry, cuts that will diminish the fabulous arts capabilities in this state, and cuts that move right away from the Labor Party's promises in regard to science innovation and technology. We have taken a massive step backwards in innovation, IT and information economy in this budget, and I will have more to say about that later in the week. When the media become aware of the figures in million dollar terms that have been stripped from the budget by this government they will be astonished.

Yes, economic growth will be down, thanks to this budget and the policies of this government. Of course, employment will be going down from 1 per cent to three quarters of a per cent, and be it little wonder, given the initiatives contained in this budget, that employment growth will withdraw. Labor will slow the economy, and this budget has taken its first major stride in that direction. The cuts it contains to industry development and, as I mentioned, to innovation and the sciences will ensure that the very attribute that could grow jobs and the economy will remain contained, that is, our ability to innovate, to be creative and to add value by being smart rather than by 'me tooism' and simply doing what everybody else does and trying to do it cheaper. The creation of a new Department of Employment, Further Education, Science and Small Business will be interesting to watch. Those portfolios do not seem to sit together. Their promulgation in this budget is surprising and will attract close scrutiny by the opposition.

I point out to the house, from Budget Paper No. 3, the expected taxation revenue that the government hopes to whip from the South Australian people begins with \$1.984 billion this year. Over the next six years this government will strip \$13.5 billion from South Australian taxpayers—an average of \$2.246 billion per year over the next six years in taxes flowing from the broken promises and deceit evident in this budget—and it will no doubt be followed in the budgets that flow on from it. The telling story is to look at this government's intention to spend, beginning with \$7.3 billion. Over the next six years this government will spend \$46.49 billion. This is a taxing and spending Labor government. This is a step back to where the Labor Party was in the 1980s.

This budget is simply more of what we have seen from Labor before, and in the fullness of time subsequent budgets will, no doubt, dig the Labor Party further into the hole it is creating for itself in its first budget of this term of office. This is a budget based on deceit and a massive accounting fiddle.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): This budget is certainly one of bluster and a great deal of arrogance. For a government whose theme has been to boast of honesty and accountability in government—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The Attorney-General should know that interjections are out of order—it has taken only four months to break the major promises offered to South Australians, not only pre-election but during the past four months. The Premier, Mike Rann, boasted throughout the election campaign that he would not increase taxes and charges and promised a substantial increase to funding in both the health and education portfolios. He also barefacedly

assured public servants that they had nothing to fear from a Labor government and that no non-executive public servants would lose their job.

In fact, his Deputy Premier on 8 February on ABC Radio stated categorically that no Public Service Management Act employee would have anything to fear. He further indicated to the ABC presenter that 'job cuts would not be extended to more junior levels'. Of course 8 February was 24 hours before South Australians would go to the polls and vote. We have already seen the very desperate measures that the Labor Party will take to get into government and indeed to hold government.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: No, 50.1 per cent of the vote means that you did not. So, is it not surprising to see the Labor Party promise a raft of inducements to voters one day and break the same promises the next? How many public servants believed the Treasurer's promise to protect their jobs? And how many of those are now amongst the 600 public servants to be removed from the Public Service? Of course, that could very well be a fictional number as, quite obviously, far more than 600 public servants may in fact lose their positions.

To add insult to injury, the Treasurer stated in this place today that public servants are very happy with the proposition, and they are standing in line tapping him on the shoulder to get at the \$70 000 redundancy package. This intolerable, arrogant Treasurer not only breaks a promise to these people; he then also publicly suggests, quite gleefully, that public servants—all 600 of them—are more interested in grabbing a one-off payment than retaining employment and future security for themselves and their families. How dare this Treasurer hold public servants in such public contempt! I would imagine he has made quite sure that he did not have too many of them in his own electorate before he decided to make those comments.

The greatest disappointment in this area is the fact that jobs and, therefore, employment have well and truly been lost and forgotten in this budget. There is nothing that looks to create employment—and particularly for young people—in this budget. For all the fanciful noises emanating from the Labor Party for some years about high rates of youth unemployment, where are the measures and the funding to support employment growth? I do not believe that this government has yet considered the need to take an active role to reduce unemployment, as the absence from this year's budget papers of any semblance of an employment statement clearly shows.

A government's employment statement should be an inclusive and important practice of an open and accountable government, highlighting government's plans for job creation. These budget papers (the first for the Labor Party since 1993) show no such document. I trust that this is not shades of pre-1993, when the incoming Liberal government faced a high of 12 per cent unemployment left to us by a group of incompetents who could not see the benefit of investing to create jobs. We managed to cut over five percentage points from the unemployment rate over the last few years and place South Australia's unemployment rate within .1 per cent of the national rate. No-one in this state could have predicted that that could, or would, have been done over that short period of time. This budget forecasts a reduction in the employment growth rate, with expected growth projection of only .75 per cent for 2002-03. I say to this government: ignore these statistics at your own peril.

The broken promises, of course, do not stop at 600 public servants. The opposition has already revealed that the government has slashed 100 traineeships in this budget, and this will also have a significant impact on young job seekers. Watch our unemployment figures in the next six months in this state. This is not a budget that invokes confidence in investment across the industry and, unless confidence is maintained, young job seekers will be added to the unemployment figures rather than the employment figures of the state.

The major promises of this Labor government to the people of South Australia lay in the areas of health and education—promises of millions of dollars additional to previous budgets to buy extra teachers and resources. But before I deal with this very specific area, let me put on the record what the across-the-board budget means to my constituency and to all South Australians.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So, you've been getting back there lately, have you?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: It is very difficult when you spend four days in this place. But I always manage to contact and to maintain contact with my constituency, as difficult as the government may have made it for us. We were promised big increases in health and education without the need to increase existing taxes or charges, and without the need for new taxes. We got none of that. Instead, we have cuts to the education budget; no real increase in health spending; increases in the emergency services levy revenue and compulsory third party insurance premiums; an increase of more than \$120 million in government charges over four years—and ordinary citizens will feel that in their hip pocket through car registrations and licence fees—more than \$200 million in increased taxes over four years; the cut I have mentioned of up to 600 public servants; and an increase in net debt and unfunded superannuation liabilities. This 'back to the past' budget has been dubbed 'the smoke and mirrors budget', 'the accounting fiddle paints rosy picture budget'—and it is all of those.

This government has failed the people of South Australia with a budget without honesty and a budget of broken promises. Where were the caring and compassionate Premier and Treasurer when the education budget was being done over? In real terms, education spending has been cut by a staggering \$34 million. As well as education's operating expenditure being cut dramatically, the government also slashed capital expenditure on education by some \$6 million. Out of the total budget expenditure, education accounts for 24.7 per cent, which is a reduction from the 24.9 per cent provided in last year's budget. For a government that promised to make education spending the centrepiece of its first budget, I can only suggest that a great number of people in the government's constituencies will be horrified as the full implication of these budget cuts take hold.

The same applies in the area of health. Only last week the Premier and the Minister for Health announced extra funding of \$51.8 million over four years for extra hospital beds. Of course, during the election the Premier made the same announcement but he promised \$75.4 million. So in last week's announcement (which was a rerun of the Premier's election promise) that promise had now been cut by \$23.6 million. So much for the beds promised in hospitals over the next four years.

This government has also shown a complete disregard for people living and working in regional and rural areas of our state. Country hospitals have been clearly discriminated

against in this budget, receiving only 2.4 per cent increased funding—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Did you brief your ministerial officers? The last speaker was just complaining about them.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Does the Attorney-General wish to take the floor of the house?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes, I'm happy to make my contribution during yours.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I like to be able to hear what I'm saying, not what you're saying. Country hospitals have been clearly discriminated against in this budget, receiving only some 2.4 per cent increased funding as opposed to metropolitan hospitals which benefited by an increase of 7.1 per cent. This is a disgraceful situation and one which I believe the Labor government will severely regret. If one life is lost due to the harsh measures being perpetrated on country people by this government, I can assure members opposite that you will have ensured your own political demise. The deceit and broken promises inherent in this budget are really quite breathtaking.

Labor voters will indeed find their hip pocket hit quite severely by the Labor government's increased taxes and charges and, as we look further into what this budget takes away from South Australians, you can rest assured that we will bring it to the public's attention. However, what have we discovered so far—smoke and mirrors. The Treasurer, in one of the most gifted pieces of sleight of hand, has continued throughout this whole budget process—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: 'Gifted pieces of sleight of hand'—

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Yes, absolutely gifted—gifted and treasured.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: An unusual expression though, don't you think?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I thought it was quite accurate. Definitely, 'sleight of hand' was very accurate. The Treasurer has deferred capital and dividend payments from the bad bank and SAFA and transferred them into the current financial year, which creates a false deficit for 2001-02 and an inflated surplus for the current year. The Treasurer criticised the previous government for transferring \$321 million in dividends from public financial corporations in 2001-02 and, with absolute hypocrisy, he has now deferred the majority of this payment until the current financial year, when he has budgeted for dividends and capital payments of \$340.9 million from these entities for one purpose and one purpose only, namely, creating an imaginary inflated surplus in this government's first year. It really does take one's breath away. That is sleight of hand in the most gifted manner possible.

The Treasurer had little choice but to take this course of action because, if he had not, the budget papers would have shown that the last budget under the Liberal government delivered a surplus far in excess of budgeted targets, and a positive Liberal budget would have left the Treasurer's credibility in absolute tatters and shattered his claims of a mythical budget black hole. As the Leader of the Opposition correctly pointed out today, members would also be aware of the two memos from the Under Treasurer dated 15 and 16 January 2002 confirming Treasury advice that the estimate of an underlying surplus for 2001-02 was actually between \$60 million and \$96 million, even after cost pressures were included—and not the fictional black hole deficit of \$26 million claimed by the Treasurer and the Premier.

Unfortunately for our Treasurer, his particular sleight of hand, gifted as it may have been, has not gone unnoticed. In fact, the *Financial Review* and the former New South Wales Auditor General, Tony Harris, described it as an accounting fiddle in articles written last week. One article by Alan Mitchell entitled 'Accounting fiddle paints rosy picture', and Tony Harris's article, went on to say:

He shifted nearly \$300 million of dividends from the government's remnant bank and finance corporation from his rivals—meaning the Liberals', of course—

2001-02 budget into his 2002-03 budget.

The *Financial Review* journalists make it clear that, without the fiddle, the budget would be in deficit, not in surplus. I will have a great deal more to say about the budget once we have had an opportunity to discover where all the little secrets are lying, and I am sure that will happen during estimates.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): It is a fairly unique experience for me to stand here in my first—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Fairly unique? I thought it was unique or not; it's an absolute.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I have had similar unique experiences, but this is an opportunity for me to really see what the responsibilities of being in government are all about. What did we hand to this government? We handed it a state that was in a wonderful economic shape. What did we get from members opposite in 1993? We got \$9.3 billion worth of debt. Let us not forget it: in 1993, we got \$9.3 billion. What did we give them? Let us have a look. I will not use my words; I will go to the actual budget documents. Let us look at Budget Statement 2002-03, Budget Paper No. 3. The 9.2 economic outlook makes very interesting reading and there are a few especially interesting areas which I will mention as I speak. There is mention of the reduction in interest rates in this state due to privatisation. There is the wealth tax that will be imposed by way of stamp duty on conveyancing. We will have death duty next. Stamp duty is a property tax any way you look at it, and I will say more about that in a moment. But let us go back and see what the economic outlook is according to the government's own scribes, as follows:

Economic Outlook

... the Department of Treasury and Finance forecasts South Australia's GSP to grow by around 2¾ per cent, while national GDP is forecast to increase by 3¾ per cent.

So, under the good care of both the Liberal government in the past in this state and, certainly, the national Liberal government, we have one of the best economies in the world, and this state is not lagging far behind. The budget paper goes on to state:

Growth in business investment and domestic consumption is expected to continue, in line with strong national economic growth. South Australian exports should continue to grow through 2002-03.

Why are they continuing to grow? Because of the confidence that the previous Liberal government was able to give people in this state. It continues:

... net exports will continue to provide a boost to the South Australian economy ... employment growth is forecast to be 1 per cent in 2001-02.

There is then a slight drop to ¾ per cent in 2002-03, but then it will return to 1 per cent in 2002-03. Why? Because both nationally and in South Australia we have had good Liberal governments that have provided sound, economic management. Sound economic management—not what we have had

in the past from this Labor government. I just hope that, as the Treasurer said (he will soon be Premier, I suppose), they have learnt from the past. I sincerely hope they have learnt from the past because it will be really sad if South Australia has to suffer more hard Labor. It continues:

Medium to long-term employment growth projections are also reduced to 1 per cent per annum, down from 1½ per cent.

It is just a small fluctuation, but it will come back. Let me continue to read:

... the growth in South Australian household disposable income per capita for the year 2001 was 8 per cent—equal to the national average growth.

There are we: South Australia is performing on a national basis again! Let us look at South Australian real growth rates. The growth state product (GSP) in 2002-03 will grow by 2¾ per cent. It is still growing. It continues:

Underlying demand for farm exports is likely to remain strong through 2002-03 as the global recovery gains momentum.

It is fantastic to see the state going ahead, and let us just hope that this government does not put the kibosh on things. PIRSA estimates that the total crop this year will be the same as last year and that the rural region will once again be a huge contributor to the economic activity and success of this state.

It is important that we look at exports in South Australia to see how this economy is going. And remember: these are not my words. They are the government's own words. This is the state of the economy according to the budget statements of the Labor government, which recognises the fantastic job that the previous Liberal government has done. The value of South Australian overseas merchandise exports by selected commodity include wine valued at \$1.059 million—over a billion dollars in wine, up 19.2 per cent. Then there is a figure for road vehicles, parts and accessories. Motor vehicles: what another success that is! If it was not for the lobbying on behalf of the South Australian people by the previous Liberal government, we would not have the Mitsubishi deal and we certainly would not have the third shift at Holdens. What is the figure for road vehicles, parts and accessories? It is \$1.350.2 million, which is up 14.1 per cent.

Economic activity in South Australia continues to grow. Let us hope that this government does not put the stoppers on it. Private dwelling investment in South Australia has grown by 22 per cent through to March 2002, showing the confidence that South Australians not only had in the previous government but also had in the national Liberal government. Household consumption in South Australia—with the real growth rate at 6.3 per cent—was up, once again, showing confidence in the way the economy was being managed. And what will we talk about in a moment? We will talk about broken promises and doom and gloom.

The South Australian economy is in a growth cycle. Domestic consumption growth is strong, with retail spending up 10 per cent throughout the year to the March quarter 2002. New motor vehicle sales were up 11 per cent throughout the year to May 2002. In addition, the ANZ Bank job advertisement series shows job advertisements in South Australia up 20 per cent throughout the year 2002.

These sorts of figures are music to my ears. They show the truth behind the South Australian economy. It is an economy that has been growing. It has been well-managed but, unfortunately, it has been handed over to people who, I am afraid, will not continue to be as responsible in their endeavours; and we are seeing that already.

We are seeing a wealth tax. What will the people in Morphett—and I expect in the Labor seats of Colton, West Torrens and Port Adelaide—think when the government announces the wealth tax, the stamp duty going onto their homes? Residents in the seaside suburbs will be paying stamp duty and conveyancing of between \$40 000 and \$100 000 extra for their home. People say that, if you can afford to buy a home like that, you can afford \$100 000. That is not the case at all. Some people have taken many years to be able to afford these homes and then the impost, this tax increase, that has been put on by this government will be the straw that breaks the camel's back at the high end of that market.

Let us look at what is happening with education. It is a shame to see all the smoke and mirrors. Under the Rann Labor government, if inflation and other increases are taken into account, the education budget has been cut, in real terms, by \$34 million over the next four years. More than \$26 million has been cut from school building programs.

There is one particular school in the seat of Morphett, Paringa Park Primary School, which has 1953 Bristol buildings that I am ashamed to say are still there. I would have loved a Liberal government, in the past, to have rebuilt this school. But it has not happened. I hope that members opposite, who have all the answers, will do something about this. The students at Paringa Park Primary School deserve better. I hope that there is a bit of bipartisanship and that the government spends some money on the Paringa Park Primary School.

These buildings are an absolute disgrace and I hope that those opposite can bypass their Labor socialist policies to look after the children of this state and spend some money where it is really required, and not just on television adverts telling us how good they are. Self praise is no recommendation. It is a shame to see them repeating the mistakes they accused us of.

I turn now to health. Morphett was the oldest electorate in Australia, and while the demographics are changing because of the fantastic building cycle that is going on down there, with younger families moving in, there are a significant number of people aged over 60 living there. They will be rather concerned that self-funded retirees will be missing out. During my doorknocking campaign, I had many people question me about what the government was going to do for self-funded retirees, but under this government the self-funded retirees have lost out on a \$40 million concession package that they were going to get as of 1 July. It was in place, but this government has stolen it—it has taken it away.

The concessions for self-funded retirees included: electricity at \$70 per year; water and sewerage rates at \$185 per year; council rates at \$190 per year; and motor vehicle registration at \$56 per year. All of those, all gone. Why? Because this government thought self-funded retirees were able to look after themselves in more ways than one. Well, with current interest rates, self-funded retirees are often worse off than pensioners. I spoke to a couple of pensioners the other day who were complaining about their living conditions. They could not get into a Housing Trust house. I would like to see more public housing built instead of being reduced. Pensioners are also copping a \$20 increase in electricity concessions—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: What did your government do about public housing? Tell us what your record is.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The government can sling off about what happened in the past, but the bottom line is that it is in office now and it must provide the answers. Let us show a

little bit of leadership on this; let us not keep on carping, whingeing and whining; and let us not go back to the past. Instead, let us have some real progress and so do the right thing for the people of South Australia.

A lot of people down in Morphett are senior citizens. They have other concerns beside their health and their wealth, or their lack of wealth as it is going to be under this government: everything is being taken away. They are also concerned about law and order, and what have we seen in this budget? We have not seen any increase in police numbers.

You should see the fantastic new police station down in Sussex Street. The police are on motorbikes, in cars and also on pushbikes down at the Bay. It is fantastic to see the cops out there on the beat. It is wonderful to see that but what is this government doing? Nothing, absolutely nothing. There are no new police coming up.

What do we expect when some of our senior citizens, the weaker and more downtrodden members of our society, want to get on the tram and come into town? They will have to travel on refurbished trams. Okay, the trams will be refurbished under this government, but there will be no new rolling stock. The tram tracks will not be upgraded. When I asked the minister today about a timeline for any decisions on public/private partnerships, all I received was a contemptuous answer. It was contemptuous not of me but of the people of South Australia. He does not care about the people of South Australia. The minister lives at Glenelg, and he should have given a bit more consideration—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: I hope he rides on the tram. I hope he talks to the people on the tram, because I certainly do. They would like to see improved tram vehicles and tram tracks. It is so important that this government understands that it has been elected to look after all people in South Australia, and it should not neglect the people down in Morphett just because they happened to vote for a Liberal member of parliament.

The former government promised to develop a swimming pool down in Marion, but where has that gone? I cannot find a trace of that. There is not a drop of water down there. I drove past the site yesterday and there is a wonderful, big sign proclaiming, 'New State Swimming Centre'. What am I going to tell the students of Sacred Heart College next time I go to speak down there? I was talking to some Year tens at Sacred Heart a few weeks ago, and they asked me, 'Are we going to get the swimming centre at Marion?' What could I tell them? I said, 'We will have to wait and see what Mr Foley has to say.' They were not impressed and how do you think they will feel now? These children deserve something better than the way they have been treated.

It is important that this government accepts its responsibility. If it does not shoulder the burdens of all the people of the state—not just of those who vote for them or those who live in Labor areas—it will be very disappointing for all of us. I just hope that this government will spend some time reflecting on its true responsibilities, that it does become an open and honest government and that it gives the people of South Australia what they deserve.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Tonight we are considering the Appropriation Bill 2002. It is the first such bill that I have debated, and some others in the chamber will share in that. Essentially, what the government is asking us to do, via the Treasurer's presentation of this bill, is authorise him to write out cheques, bank transfers or electronic deposits from the

Consolidated Account to a total of \$6 050 million. That is somewhat less than the overall budget figure that has been identified in previous presentations, but I think it is important that we remember it for a number of reasons.

One reason is that the request to be able to pay funds to that amount (which, as I said, comes from the Consolidated Account), as well as giving permission to transfer expenditure from the Hospitals Fund—that is a separate account—and go to an overdraft limit of up to about \$50 million, is all in addition to the provisions in the budget for other income to be received from other sources.

They come from a number but, primarily, they are included in the provision from commonwealth funds, from income generated by some of the departmental enterprises and activities and, indeed, on some occasions, from sale and transfer of assets and other income earning assets that generate funds. Some funds are allocated, as is evident from previous administrations, from the sale of assets, not necessarily those which have been acquired in that financial year but those which are held in separate accounts that are to be transferred. For example, the previous government had allocated some funds to come across, as was clearly set out in the previous budget, to make the full provision for funding. That, combined with those moneys, gives us the annual expenditure of the government, on this occasion now close to \$8 billion. That is what is proposed for the current financial year.

A number of other contributions made to this house have described this budget as being deceitful, as cheating the South Australian public, as deceptive to the extent of the ultimate effect of the same; others have used words like fraud, Robin Hood and the like. I think that it is quite reasonable for any new administration to identify its priorities and the way that it perceives the best administration of the state and the provision of services ought to be undertaken, and how they can be paid for. That is the right of every government, and the right of this one no less.

In February this year, this government asked the people of South Australia to support its administration going into government and, accordingly, sought their support in the electoral ballot, based on the premise that it would make a commitment to the people of South Australia concerning a number of things, but fundamentally two that are important for the purpose of today's exercise: first, that there would be no need, on its programs, to introduce any new tax or to raise the revenue from taxes other than in the ordinary CPI provision; and, secondly, that it would have an absolute and clear priority of provision of services.

Whilst one might always appreciate that in the absence of new money being generated there would have to be some cuts in other areas, I think it is fair to say that it was clearly understood at that time that the people of South Australia could expect that the new government, if the Labor Party were to form government, would spend money on the areas of dedicated priority that it had identified, in particular, health and education—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And law and order.

Ms CHAPMAN: And law and order—not that much has actually gone to that, as I will come to in a moment. Nevertheless, the government would commit to the provision and extension of services that it identified a high level of need for, and there would be a consequential reduction in funding for consultants, for example, and what was clearly going to be a consequence, capital works and infrastructure; and the government has announced particulars of those. The develop-

ment along the Torrens, for example, proposed to be undertaken by the previous government, this government has proposed to abandon.

All that is quite legitimate to the extent of what it presented to the people of South Australia as to what its priorities would be and how the government would fund those with the commitments that it had made. What then happened after acquiring the opportunity to govern in South Australia was that, as has been acknowledged today, the Treasurer clearly undertook to identify areas for increased revenue. In presenting the budget address last week he announced that this would primarily come from four areas. The first is a significant increase in the taxes and charges that already existed. Secondly, up to \$4 million per year would be available from a higher rental payment from Crown lessees. There would also be some \$18 million in any one year from rental and stamp duty obligations, which would be increased or extended respectively; and some \$39 million in increased revenue from the poker machine industry and therefore, in particular, hoteliers who have the privilege of operating the licences for that purpose. All this came about in circumstances where, as the Treasurer pointed out, he conducted inquiries using interstate experts for the purpose of identifying areas from which he could take funds.

I want to say something briefly about these taxes on this occasion, because I will be referring to them in more detail later. First, it is quite clear from the Treasurer's address and other statements supporting the budget that the Labor government sees any opportunity where anyone makes a significant amount of money as being ripe for the purposes of rape and gaining revenue for what they want to do in this state. This ought to sound a clear warning bell to any industry in this state, which through its own endeavour, hard work and enterprise has the opportunity to make income and profit, that it will be open for raping in the future. This budget should be a clear warning that they are open to that. It will come; it will not necessarily be for perpetuity but, at present, you have only to look through industries in this state that are generating significant incomes at present to see that they will be vulnerable to that which is about to come.

What is quite obscene about this is that not only had there been a promise to the electors of South Australia that they themselves would not have their taxes increased—not only are these taxes coming in—but also they have not yet been exposed to the trickling through. There is no question that, if you take more revenue from any of these industries—whether you take it in stamp duty or any other tax—it will affect people. Every taxation law that is passed in this house affects someone's life and income, and this will be no less. If the Treasurer espouses his right, entitlement, duty and responsibility to take funds from the hotel industry arising out of income from poker machines or any other revenue from any activity they operate which may be exposed to the taking of those funds out of that turnover, then ultimately that cost will be worn by the consumers and therefore the people of South Australia. So, it is just a fantasy to say that we will take this out of the profit margin of one industry and expect that it will have no effect on South Australians other than those who may enjoy the income from that revenue stream. It is a complete nonsense, and the fraud on South Australians is the expectation that in some way they will be quarantined from these tax increases and new taxes: they will not be; they will be at risk, just as the others will be who initially write out the cheques and pay them to the Treasurer. I will have more to say about that in due course.

I will also speak tonight about the process that has been used, and others have spoken in some detail on this. Whilst others have commented on the Treasurer's conduct in holding over funds from the state financial institutions from one financial year to another, it is nothing new. There is no trick or sleight of hand about it; it is pretty simple stuff. I am not impressed by it and, when the public of South Australia appreciate what has happened, I do not expect that they will be too impressed about it, either.

But there is nothing clever about it. It is fairly simple stuff, to be frank. The only reason that the Treasurer has been able to get away with it until last Thursday, and to be able to continue to present to media outlets and therefore to South Australians this furphy of there being a black hole, is that he had control of the books. Well, the books are on the table now, and it is not difficult to look down columns of income and columns of funds against the budget to identify that \$300 million plus is held back in one year and placed into the next. It is pretty simple stuff. Kindergarten children could understand that. And soon the people of South Australia will have the opportunity to appreciate not just how simple but how obvious this furphy is that the Treasurer of South Australia has attempted to perpetrate on South Australians.

I want to say two things about the actual education situation, one in relation to education and one in relation to women, and I will conclude with some brief comments on the electorate of Bragg. In relation to women—and I do hope that the minister who has portfolio responsibility for women listens to this—two things have been concerning me. Notwithstanding that there has been a crying need for the provision of a new women's prison in South Australia, that is not in the current budget, and not only is it not provided for in this budget with any proposal for it to come forward: even the psychology services for the current inmates who previously had psychologists available to assist them during that period of incarceration have been slashed. They no longer have any services whatsoever, and I say, 'Shame on this Government.' In all the hue and cry about law and order reform and provision for South Australians, not only have women in prison been abandoned as to the provision of permanent adequate services for them in terms of accommodation in the future, but even what paltry services they have had to date have been cut away.

In the other area relating to women, I read with some interest the minister's announcement that there will now be a new Premier's women's committee, apparently led by some high profile woman. We have a very well run and functioning Office of the Status of Women in this state. It has delivered considerably on policy to this house and for the benefit of previous ministers and, furthermore, we have a board representative of women around the state who have offered their advice and have been participating in that role. The announcement to discard what is already clearly a functioning, operational unit providing a significant service is a complete waste of money. If they were really honest, if they really were not happy with those who are there, surely they did not need to announce a new structure but improve what is there. I suggest that is where we really start to identify the slipping off the rails by this government when it comes to the strategic and responsible application of the limited funds that are to be carved up.

In relation to my electorate, I want to say briefly that it is an electorate of people—and I have said this before—who are largely self-reliant. There is a significant number of self-funded retirees in my electorate whom I am very proud to

represent. There is a significant aged community. Some are already aware of this, but they will be devastated to learn that, as of 1 July, they will not be receiving the promised \$40 million concessions. It is a small amount to make provision for a very large number of people. The amount had been clearly budgeted for in the previous government's proposal for people who have purchased and largely paid for their homes and who provide for themselves and do not call upon government services to a large degree. To be offered this small contribution by the state government and then to have it callously stripped away is cruel.

In relation to one other matter that affects my electorate, I point out that I also have a significant number of constituents who are in the mature age category, who are wise, intelligent and skilled and, frankly, the absence of any provision to support mature age employment across South Australia—it affects not only my electorate—is a serious indictment of the priorities of this government. For 10 years we have known about the ageing community, which we are looking to support, yet there is a wealth of knowledge out there among people who are keen to participate, who are able to participate, and who ought to be given the opportunity, and could have been given the opportunity if this government had indicated some priority in supporting them.

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: This has been on the agenda for a long time, it is not new, and I suggest that there has been an abandonment of support for that. I come now to the question of education. Some of this has already been in the public arena, but let me say the following. One of the most interesting aspects about this budget in relation to education is that there has been a failure to increase in real terms the provision for education services in this state. One does not have to be Einstein to work out that, if we have X million dollars to provide current services, without any change to those services we need to continue to have some increment in the overall amount that is applied annually to simply address the cost of living and to continue to provide the same services.

This government has done a number of things. First, it has held over a number of projects from the previous budget to the extent of having a significant saving. Secondly, it has made a very small extra cash allocation. The Treasurer today referred to an additional amount of \$156 million, and that is budget to budget. Of course, in actual 2002 budget terms, the difference is only about \$20 million. He tries to claim some credit for putting the extra amount in the 2002 budget, but one does not have to be terribly bright to realise that there must be a much greater increase over four years even to maintain current services.

How does the government then absorb or accommodate an extra 160 teachers; the extra teachers whom they say they will supply for the provision ensuring that children remain at school until age 16; and the extra 14 counsellors and the extra cost? First, even though the government keeps refusing to admit it, over \$200 million was put in the budget by the previous government to assist in the costing for extra teachers. Secondly, the government has significantly cut capital works—\$26 million net is coming off the capital works for schools. I congratulate the new schools, the 13 of them that have come onto the list under this government, because at least they have been acknowledged in the budget papers and the press releases to date. There may be others that we do not know about, but at least 13 have been acknowledged.

Time expired.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): This is certainly a very interesting budget. I admit that I had some hope when the Treasurer got to his feet, and there has been positive acceptance of some of the government's policies to date, but it was not too long into the first page of the Treasurer's speech that I saw, as I am sure others have seen, that the government has not changed. In some ways I believe that members opposite are still behaving like an opposition. Last week this house passed an important bill with regard to the Wine Centre. Members on this side commended the government for what it was doing in order to have the wine centre rescued so that it could deliver to South Australia what it intended: the wine centre to remain a viable part of South Australia, given that we export 70 per cent of Australia's wine. When I listened to the Treasurer's speech I was concerned because I knew that this government was still in election mode. The Treasurer stated:

The budget delivers what we understand the community expects from government. It delivers schools, not soccer stadiums, roads not rose gardens, productive infrastructure not white elephants.

I knew that this government was still behaving like an opposition because we all know that the wine centre and the rose garden are located on the same site. We know, though, that this government, with its tricks, took the wine centre out of the rose garden. It stuck with the soccer stadium but I am sure that if Australia had done well in soccer, if it had beaten Uruguay, Hindmarsh Stadium would have been part of the budget. It would have been a great asset for South Australia, and I still believe that it is a great asset. This is an election document. The public expected more because, during the election campaign, time and again the opposition emphasised the priorities of health, education—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Law and order.

Mr SCALZI:—and law and order. It intended to be a government that would not break promises. The then Leader of the Opposition said that the public expected more. What short memories government members now have. I remember quite clearly that, when the emergency service levy was introduced, members on this side of the house kept saying, 'It is the emergency service tax.' Fortunately, I have got a good memory. Now there is no such thing as new taxes: it is just an increase of the last charges. Do not tell me that increases in taxes on stamp duties are not taxes. I think that Susie O'Brien, a good journalist, sums it up well in the *Advertiser*. She says that a tax rise is a tax rise however you say it.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Who is a good journalist?

Mr SCALZI: Susie O'Brien. She says that a tax rise is a tax rise however you call it. Right? The budget document states:

There are no new taxes but increases to a number of existing taxes.

The headline of Susie O'Brien's article says it all, 'A tax rise is a rise however you say it.' Budget papers give few details of cuts. Many people say that the devil is in the detail. We have no detail in which to find the devil. It will spring at us as time progresses, I am sure. I was interested to see that, on the front page of Friday's newspaper, the Treasurer has taken the title of Robin Hood. He is robbing from the rich to give

to the poor. We heard him in the house today saying that he makes no excuses for increasing taxes for the pokie barons. At least he used the word 'tax', and I give him credit for that. As well as using the word 'tax', he actually admitted that he had broken some promises. The Treasurer is no Robin Hood nor is he a knight in shining armour. I believe that, if we analyse the budget properly, he is more like the Big Bad Wolf in *Little Red Riding Hood*. He comes along the path and sees Little Red Riding Hood's basket of goodies which is, in a way, the basket of goodies this government inherited from the former government. The basket of goodies contained the lowest unemployment in 10 years; exports of \$9 billion; and one of the most confident real estate and construction markets. Then the Big Bad Wolf comes along and fiddles the books, in cash terms, and says that we have a surplus this year because we had a budget deficit last year.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Let's get back to Little Red Riding Hood.

Mr SCALZI: We will get back to Little Red Riding Hood because there is a moral to this story. This budget affects the young—the Little Red Riding Hoods—and the Grandmas—the elderly. As the member for Bragg has accurately said, there are problems for the self-funded retirees, the asset rich and the income poor—and there are many of those in my electorate. So, it affects the grandmas of this world as well as the young. The government has delivered cuts to traineeships that have dashed the hopes of young people of improving their employment opportunities—that is the effect on Little Red Riding Hood.

The SPEAKER: Does the Attorney-General have a point of order?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, sir. My point of order is that the member for Hartley persists in referring to members of the government in the second person. I ask you, sir, to have him refer to us by our portfolios or our electorates.

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General raises a valid but trivial point. It is probably less significant than the level of interjection to which the member has been subjected during the course of his remarks. The member for Hartley.

Mr SCALZI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am sure that I would not have made such a grave grammatical error if I had not been frightened by the Big Bad Wolf.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will get out of the zoo!

Mr SCALZI: The problem with this budget is that it is still in election mode. The opposition does not realise that it is in government—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, that is not true. I have got used to it now.

Mr SCALZI: They do not realise it. As I have said, the language of the first page of the budget speech was clearly that of an opposition and not a responsible government. Referring again to the fiddling of the figures, in last year's budget papers \$304 million from SAAMC and SAFA went into the budget to help deliver a \$2 million surplus. It is as simple as that. In this year's budget figures, the Treasurer took only \$27.5 million from SAAMC and SAFA prior to 30 June, not \$304 million, so that he could claim the fictional black hole deficit of \$62 million for 2001-02. He then put it into the budget this year to create a supposed surplus of \$92 million a year. That is the Big Bad Wolf confusing Little Red Riding Hood.

If members do not understand the analogy of Little Red Riding Hood, it is a little like someone who submits two tax

returns in the same year. Instead of doing their tax return last year, they wait until the last day this year. So you could in fact submit two tax returns in the same calendar year. You could say, 'I got \$6 000 back, but I got nothing back last year.' In calendar terms, that would be correct: you received \$6 000 this year and nothing last year but, in reality, most probably it was \$4 000 last year, because you did not do the tax return on time, and \$2 000 this year. There is no question that the government has used statistics and accounting figures like a drunk uses a lamp post, not for illumination but, rather, for support. The light is on, but it is dim, and the public will wake up to it.

There is one thing that the public will not wear any longer, and both sides of the house have known this. They want us to be honest and to put all the cards on the table, not to lead them down the garden path, to say one thing and then do another. I must admit that the Treasurer today had his confession when it came to the pokie machine tax. I do not necessarily disagree with the Treasurer that we should not tax gaming machines.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I must be honest. I am not a big fan of poker machines, and I have been consistent on that. I would not mislead the public on that. I take note of constituents' concerns, as we all must do. We must not mislead them. It is wrong to mislead people outside the house, as well as inside the house. It is wrong to mislead. When it comes to my electorate of Hartley, I have already stated clearly that, like the member for Bragg, a significant proportion of the population is ageing and self-funded retirees—asset rich and income poor. I fought very hard to get concessions for them when the emergency services levy—which members opposite then called a tax—was introduced. I accept that; that is what it is. It is money coming in instead of money going out.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It is at the same level you set, so don't complain about that.

Mr SCALZI: That is why I fought very hard to ensure they got concessions the first time. Then we made representation to our federal colleagues to ensure that we had further concessions for self-funded retirees. Members must bear in mind that self-funded retirees have worked hard. Most probably, they bought a house 40 or 50 years ago. It has gone up in value, they pay the extra council rates, and they definitely need that extra help that the previous state Liberal government and the present federal Liberal government has provided for them. But this government let them down; they let grandmother down. That comes back to the story of Little Red Riding Hood. Members opposite let them down. That is something to think about.

Before the election, there was 100 per cent commitment to open space at Lochiel Park—no ifs or buts.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Were you offering that?

Mr SCALZI: No, I did not offer that. I do not mislead my electorate.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You won the seat.

Mr SCALZI: I faced the music in front of 340 people and I said that I was happy I got them 20 per cent, whereas the Labor opposition at the time sent an email on the last day to all the environmental groups that it was going to give 100 per cent. We are now going to have a moratorium, we are going to have consultation, but who knows if the 100 per cent will ever be delivered. I hope it will not be delivered with the same promises that the Treasurer made to the Hotels Association. As a government, we made a promise of \$270 000 for a gymnasium to East Torrens Primary School, which resulted

from the amalgamation of Hectorville school and the former Newton Primary School. An amount of \$550 000 was allocated, and I note that part of that amount for the amalgamation is in this year's budget. I thank the government for that, but where is the commitment for the gymnasium? We talk a lot about a healthy lifestyle. My constituents at East Torrens Primary School need that gymnasium. I hope that you will deliver.

The then opposition was very big on law and order. What is happening to the funding of the very successful crime prevention program of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters and Campbelltown? Do you know that the Campbelltown and Norwood areas have the lowest rates of graffiti and vandalism? It is a very successful program that works in conjunction with Neighbourhood Watch and the police. I attended an information evening about crime prevention last week at Payneham Senior Citizens in Coorara Avenue. There were guest speakers, and Andrew Paterson, the officer of that project, informed the public of ways to deal with crime. It is a very successful program, which we hear could be cut.

I was very concerned about the real estate members last week when the legal fraternity took on some of their work, and I fought hard for them. In this budget, we find that stamp duty has increased significantly for houses over \$200 000. This is a time when demand will shift to the left or will decrease. The home grants scheme is winding down and interest rates are increasing slightly, as is indemnity

insurance on building. So, what does this government do when this industry is a bit shaky? It kicks it in the guts with the increase in stamp duty to make sure that it will fall. This is the compassionate government that we hear about. As I said, I am concerned that it is not delivering in the areas that they said they would. I welcome the section on the dental programs, but when you think about the government's commitment to health in general and the increase in wages, it is not delivering on the health of the elderly or the young, or law and order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Time expired.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGRICULTURAL AND VETERINARY PRODUCTS (CONTROL OF USE) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.17 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 July at 2 p.m.