

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 16 July 2002

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

### CROTHERS, Hon. T., DEATH

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier)**: I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Trevor Crothers, a former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

The Hon. Trevor Crothers was born in County Tipperary in Ireland in 1938 but grew up in Belfast in Northern Ireland. At 14 years of age, he left school and became a ship's carpenter and there began his long association with the union movement. He joined the Carpenters and Joiners Union, and he also joined the Irish Labour Party. His association with the union movement and with Labor lasted for 47 years. Trevor often used to speak to me and other parliamentary colleagues on both sides of politics about his childhood and his youth in Northern Ireland. He told us about the times when he was a boxer, an athlete and a champion cross-country runner, running more than 100 miles a week. He told us stories of hunting for deer, hare and rabbit in hills near Belfast.

Trevor also told us about the glory days of the Belfast shipyards when Belfast, along with Liverpool and Glasgow, was one of the great powerhouses of ship-building in the world. He told us how he had worked on some of those ships, including ships I remembered as a child at the Devonport naval base of the Royal New Zealand Navy; for instance, I remember him talking about the *Royalist*, a large New Zealand cruiser, and also the *Blackpool* that he and his family had worked upon.

His father knew the father of George Best, the Northern Ireland soccer player who was a neighbour. Trevor came to Australia in 1958, and his first job was as a rigger and a heavy plant driver for the Victorian State Electricity Commission. In 1963, Trevor moved to Adelaide and began work at South Australian Brewing as a forklift driver. He became a shop steward with the Liquor Trades Union and, from there, he began his rise through the trade union movement. He went on to become State Secretary of the Liquor Trades Union and one of its longest serving presidents. And, of course, Trevor held senior posts in the Australian Labor Party during the 1980s. He was a member of the party's State Executive, and he was also State President of the ALP during 1987-88.

From memory, in the mid 1980s, Trevor was approached by John Bannon to be the Labor Party's candidate for the state House of Assembly seat of Spence. He declined, and chose the road to the upper house. He won his position in the Legislative Council in 1987 after the resignation of the Hon. Brian Chatterton, a former minister of agriculture under Don Dunstan, Des Corcoran and, briefly, John Bannon—and, of course, we know that Brian Chatterton went on to move to Italy. Trevor Crothers served on a number of select committees during his term in this parliament, and during this time he suffered a number of major setbacks that took a terrible toll on him both personally and in terms of his health—and I refer in particular to the tragic death of his son Bill.

Trevor was a great amateur historian and could speak most eloquently about events in history in Ireland, England, Britain and Europe over the centuries. In fact, Trevor was a prolific reader and had an almost encyclopaedic knowledge for dates, battles and other historical events, tracing the lineage of great families. Trevor shared with me a keen interest in soccer, and often spoke with me about his lifelong love of Manchester United. I remember bringing him back just a few years ago an official tie from Old Trafford and his speaking to me of United's glory days in the 1960s and its renaissance in the 1990s with Alex Ferguson and Eric Cantona, whom Trevor admired greatly. Trevor was passionate about British soccer and loved to talk about it.

In June 1999, Trevor resigned from the Labor Party just before he crossed the floor to vote with the then government on the sale of ETSA. I know that must have been a very difficult decision for Trevor and, obviously, he believed that he was acting in the best interests of the community. Trevor continued to serve as an independent Labor member, and unsuccessfully contested a position in the Legislative Council at the last election as an Independent.

I know that Trevor had close personal friendships with Terry Cameron and Rob Lucas, and my sincere condolences go to them, but particularly to his family. He was the father of five and the grandfather of 15. I think it is a tragedy that he died so young and so soon after his retirement from politics. He was devoted to his 15 grandchildren, and it is a great tragedy that he will not be able to spend more time with them. Our deepest sympathies go to Trevor Crothers' family and his friends.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

The **Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition)**: On behalf of the opposition, I second the motion and express our regret at the passing of the Hon. Trevor Crothers. As the Premier said, Trevor was a qualified ships carpenter. He moved to Australia from Ireland in 1958. He was, in fact, only the 18th person of Irish ancestry to become a member of either of these chambers. He was an active member of the trade union movement since the age of 15, and became a shop steward at the South Australian Brewing Company in 1963. He later rose to be president and full-time organiser. He was elected to the upper house in 1987, and was a founding member of the Labor Party Centre Left and one of the Australian Labor Party's most influential members in South Australia. He was the longest serving member on the ALP state executive, and the longest serving member of the Centre Left executive.

Upon election, Trevor was reported to have said that he would be keeping a close eye on unemployment, the endeavours of the new right and the social fabric and wellbeing of society. His credo was not to oppose just for the sake of opposition. He believed that each item of government business should be addressed on its merits in relation to the benefit that it would have for all the people of South Australia. A search through *Hansard* reveals that he was true to his word. Trevor debated a wide range of issues, from gaming machines and stamp duties to state emergency services, workers' rehabilitation, youth and employment and, as many members on this side know, he showed a great interest in our farming sector. He debated on principle for the good of Australia and Australians and often called for all parliamentarians, at both state and federal levels, to adopt the same approach that he showed.

Trevor truly believed in Australia. In his maiden speech, he called himself an Irishman by birth and an Australian by choice. Throughout his life he promoted this country as a land of great and constant opportunity. There is no doubt that many members will have very fond memories of Trevor and his very unique sense of humour. In paying my respects on behalf of the Liberal Party, I would like to offer my condolences to Trevor's extensive family and his many friends. I am sure that all members present, party allegiances aside, will join me in doing so.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier):** I would like to speak briefly to this condolence motion. I joined the Labor Party in the early 1980s and, together with a number of my colleagues, I joined the Centre Left faction of the Labor Party, as it was then known. Trevor Crothers was, at that time, a larger than life character within the Centre Left faction and, indeed, the Labor Party and he, along with others, took a particular interest in my career. I well recall that Trevor assisted me in my career by providing some opportunities for me within the Labor Party, in particular, with a Labor senator. Luckily (or unluckily, whichever way you look at it), the day after that I was offered a job with Lynn Arnold, so I never got the opportunity to serve with a former senator.

Trevor took a particular interest in me at that time, as did a number of other key people within the Centre Left and the Labor Party. Throughout my time in the Labor Party, Trevor was clearly a considerable contributor to Labor party politics. Notwithstanding recent events which saw Trevor leave the Labor Party and cross the floor in another place, the reality is that he devoted an enormous part of his life to the Labor movement and the Labor Party. He assisted many of us within the Labor Party to reach our goals and ambitions, and he was a supporter of mine within the Labor Party for many years.

I would like to pass on my condolences to his friends and family and, in particular, his grandchildren. His passing was a sad moment so soon after he left this place. It is a tragedy and, as I said, I pass on my condolences to his family and friends.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I would like to join my leader and members opposite in expressing my condolences on the passing of Trevor Crothers. I acknowledge the magnanimity of those opposite in this debate. It is never easy for a government party when one of its own does something of which they do not approve because of the discipline exerted by the Labor Party. So, I pay tribute to the fact that on Trevor's passing they are being magnanimous.

Trevor will be remembered by many of us as one of the great intellectuals of this place. As many members would know, sometimes he was easier to read in the translation than in the brogue, and many of us had long conversations with him that would probably have been better if he did not have that very thick Irish accent. To those members who were not here at the time, I commend some of his very erudite speeches.

One of the great speeches that he made—and I say this honestly—was that which he made on the occasion when he crossed the floor. Not everyone will agree with the content of that speech, but it was very thoughtful and thought-provoking—probably one of the great contributions of the last parliament in terms of our thinking about the parliamentary process.

The leader kindly alerted to the fact that Trevor had the romance of the Celt. We have heard many of his stories—I would like to know which ones were entirely accurate and which ones were slightly gilded—but I think they can be attributed to some of the blood that Trevor inherited and the traditions of the Irish.

One of the things that the leader did not mention was that Trevor's driving abilities were legendary. Many of us will recall the celebrated incident when he tried to drive a car a long way with fewer than four wheels.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** He had the smartest car in Adelaide.

**Mr BRINDAL:** He may well have. He had some very strong allies and friends who protected him in that instance. As the leader said, he suffered a profound personal tragedy, and I am told by many who know that he was never quite the same person after his son died. Shakespeare said:

The evil that men do lives after them, the good is often interred with their bones.

I hope that Trevor Crothers will be remembered for the intellect he was, the great Labor member he was and the great contribution, by and large, that he made not only to this place but to the party in which he believed so strongly.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** I was saddened to hear during question time on Thursday that Trevor Crothers had gone to join the great majority. I had known Trevor for about 17 years. I had been a political ally of his for most of that time and a friend of his for all that time. On a personal and political level, Trevor was a formidable presence. He was a controversial political figure towards the end of his life in politics, but it is less well known and deserves to be better known that Trevor was an important figure in the success of the Australian Labor Party, federally and in South Australia, during the 1980s.

Trevor Crothers, John Quirke (former senator and former member of this place), and the Hon. Terry Cameron were the trinity that ran the South Australian Centre Left faction throughout the 1980s. Much has been written and said about the Centre Left in the politics of the ALP; not all of it complimentary. But it was that faction's role in delivering crucial support to the Hawke and Keating governments in successive ALP national conferences during the 1980s and early 1990s that allowed the Hawke and Keating governments to achieve the things that they did.

Any student of Labor Party history knows that one of the most destructive events the Labor government can suffer is to have its party conference, state or federal, adopt a contrary position to the Labor government. The Hawke and Keating governments undertook the most radical revision of Labor's economic policies since Federation and it was the sensible position adopted by the Centre Left faction, in alliance with Labor Unity (the Right) that allowed far reaching reforms of the Australian economy of which we are now enjoying the benefits. The floating of the dollar and the deregulation of the banking industry, in particular, were hard debates within the ALP and, in my opinion, the angels won because of Trevor and his comrades.

Macro-political achievements aside, Trevor played an important and, again, a little-known role in my own political and personal history. In 1986 I married, and my wife and I were looking for a new home. As I was keen to be preselected, I asked my patrons which state districts might become available, and was directed to certain suburbs that my wife

did not like. So we bought a house in Croydon and I resigned myself to being the loyal sub-branch secretary for the expected new Labor candidate for the seat of Spence, namely, the secretary of the Liquor Trades Union, Trevor Crothers. Trevor lived in Bishop Street, Renown Park. He was the president of the Spence East ALP sub-branch and I became the secretary. Our monthly meetings were at the Brompton Park Hotel.

Trevor was an interventionist chairman. Every contribution reminded Trevor of some historical or anecdotal connection that he felt compelled to share with the meeting. At about this time it emerged that one of our long-serving sub-branch members, the Mayor of the Town of Hindmarsh, Mrs Floss Pens, was planning to run as an Independent candidate for Spence at the next general election. Floss had been a candidate for the preselection in 1975 against Roy Abbott, the secretary of the Vehicle Builders Union. Roy had been chosen.

The tension at the meetings chaired by Trevor and attended by Floss, who was yet to announce her candidacy as an Independent, was palpable. Even before Floss became a potential candidate, she had controversially and, in my view, unwisely, expressed concern about Trevor's style of chairing meetings, which she compared most unfavourably with her own stewardship of the Hindmarsh council.

Trevor referred to all members at sub-branch meetings as 'comrade'—Comrade Atkinson; Comrade Pens; Comrade Hefford; Comrade Karzis; Comrade Dillon—Johnny Dillon being the previous secretary of the Liquor Trades Union and a former councillor on the Hindmarsh council. Mrs Pens objected to being referred to in what she regarded as a communistic manner. One night it came to a head, although the issue is irrelevant. What sticks clearly in my mind is Her Worship rising to take a point of order, at which time Trevor rose as well in his seat and thundered, 'Sit down, Mayor Pens.' Still on her feet, Floss tried valiantly to say that she would not be spoken to in that way. 'Sit down Comrade Pens', Trevor yelled; 'Sit down, Comrade Pens, and shut up. Under rule [and he named a rule] whenever the chairman rises, all must resume their seat and cease speaking.'

Floss had never been used to treatment like this at the council and, whether it was a concern at the treatment or the embarrassment of being unfamiliar with the standing order, left the Brompton Park Hotel in a huff. Trevor had won, but Trevor was not silly: immediately after the meeting he dispatched his sub-branch secretary to visit her at home to ensure that the incident would not weigh too heavily in her thinking about a possible independent candidacy—and off I went.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** Are you sure he sent you, or you just took it on under your own steam?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** He said she went down Pickering Street, turned left at Second Street and I was meant to follow her. Later on, Trevor was elevated to the Legislative Council. Floss's prospective candidacy caused then Premier John Bannon to think that there was a risk that Labor might lose Spence if Trevor were the candidate. I do not think there was much risk, but premiers like to play it safe. If Floss had won in 1989, the recent political history of this state would have been much different. I am sure that Floss would have helped John Olsen form a government, which then could have been blamed for the State Bank disaster.

So, Trevor was offered and accepted a position in the Legislative Council. This left me with the clearest run on the rails of any candidate for preselection you have ever seen,

and my wife was able to live in the suburb of her choice, which was Croydon. Trevor loved and needed the company of his comrades: John Quirke, Terry Cameron and, later, Paul Holloway gave their time generously to Trevor, listening to his stories and engaging in very long conversations with him. It is one of my regrets that I did not give my time as generously to Trevor as I might have.

I am pleased that recently Terry Cameron organised a lunch for Trevor Crothers here at Parliament House, and I was the only Labor member there attending what turned out to be the last supper, along with Angus Redford, Legh Davis, and Rob Lucas and, of course, Terry Cameron. I gave Trevor a box of cigars on that occasion, only to be told that he had stopped smoking. Vale, Trevor Crothers.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** I rise very briefly to express my condolences on Trevor's passing. Members may not know that Trevor was a font of knowledge on history, but particularly military history. I recall many nights in the members' bar and elsewhere going through I think every campaign from the First World War right through to modern times. He could have written the authoritative encyclopaedia of modern conflict.

Trevor was a man of great conviction, and I certainly enjoyed his company. I think he was a very brave man, and I think he set a very fine example to members present and future as to how to carry yourself in this place and how to stand up for what you believe. My condolences go to his family, his children and grandchildren in particular.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I, too, rise to speak briefly on the passing of the Hon. Trevor Crothers. I knew Trevor for about 20 years. In about 1981 or 1982, I was first sent to meet Trevor on the advice of Chris Schacht, who at that time was assisting me to get preselection for the seat of Fisher. He gave me the list of names of people whom I ought to see, and I think there were about three or four powerful men on that list, Trevor being one of them.

I attended Trevor's office at the Liquor Trades Union, put myself before him and listened to him speak for a good half hour or 40 minutes, and I think I probably understood a good quarter of what he had to say. I went away quite unsure whether or not he was supporting me, but I enjoyed the experience. I later found out that he was supporting me and, in fact, supported me every time I sought a vote of any sort within the Labor Party thereafter. I was lucky that he was in the minority of support at that particular preselection, otherwise I would have gone the way of other members to whom the Attorney-General has referred.

Trevor was a great figure in the Labor Party, as the Attorney-General said. During the 1980s he was a powerful figure and really did make the Centre Left work. When he left the Centre Left to come to this place, I think both he and the Centre Left were diminished, because his role in life was taken away. I do not think he ever really successfully made the transfer to this place and really contributed to this parliament in the same way that he contributed to the back rooms of the Labor Party where he truly was a powerful, important and strong figure who helped the good government of the Labor Party.

In the course of my career in the Labor movement, I was the state organiser for a while, and one of my jobs was to visit country branches and to take the duty member. At one stage Trevor was the duty member for the Barossa Valley area, and

he was looking forward to this visit with some glee. My job was to pick him up at his home and to transport him to the branch meeting, which was being held in a pub somewhere.

I went to pick him up and he said, 'Son, come in and have a drink before we go.' Trevor liked a wee drop, as we all know. He poured himself a large tumbler full of port and leant on a fold-down sideboard in his room to have this drink before we went on our way. His enormous weight was such that he made the sideboard collapse, and the glass of wine and the bottle went all over Trevor and the room, but he was not deterred. He said, 'That's all right' and got himself another tumbler—I think it was a jam jar—and we finished the drink. We then proceeded to the Barossa Valley, stopping for refreshment once or twice on the way and once or twice on the way back! It was a memorable event.

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I was not drinking, I can assure you. But the Hon. Trevor Crothers certainly did enjoy a drink. Members have mentioned his great interest in history and of things military and sport. He was also something of a mystic. He had second sight. I remember once sitting in my office in the party office, when Trevor came in to have a talk to me and decided he wanted to have a cigarette. I said, 'Trevor, I would appreciate it if you didn't. I get bronchitis.' He told me that he knew this because he could see it in my aura! He was very certain that this was the case.

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** My cough also helped! But he told me that it was my aura that gave it away. There are memorable stories about Trevor's second sight. He certainly was one of the great characters of the Labor movement and a great character of this parliament. I thought it was sad that he left the Labor Party under whatever circumstances and for whatever reasons. I thought it was sad and regretted his doing that. I certainly mourn his passing and pass on my condolences to his family and friends.

**Mr McEWEN (Mount Gambier):** My early days in this place were much the richer for the fact that I spent some time in the Hon. Trevor Crothers' company. He was a wonderful man who was so prepared to listen and to explore issues with you. Indeed, he was so well read that I think he was of a generation that we do not see now. Television has taken away from the modern generation that skill to read and to understand.

The most amusing incident I can recall was when I asked him a question one afternoon about a particular matter and he said that he was discussing that very matter in the chamber in the next few minutes and I should go into the chamber and listen to him. He said that he would catch me for a drink afterwards and we would talk about it. So I went into the chamber and listened to the speech. But then I hid for 24 hours, seeking out *Hansard*, desperately hoping that their translation would mean that I would have some understanding of what he said!

I think most members have had that experience. We often nodded, and you would see a frown come over his face, so you would suddenly shake your head, thinking 'I had that one completely wrong.' That notwithstanding, Trevor was a wonderful character and one of those colourful individuals we will see less of in the future. The man will be greatly missed.

**The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice):** I would like to contribute to this condolence motion today in

saying that my association with Trevor Crothers has been quite long through the trade union movement. As a young trade union official, I found Trevor very helpful. I particularly remember a very big dispute that he and I were involved in at Joe White Maltings down at Port Adelaide. Trevor took the responsibility for that case because, I think, he was President of the Trades and Labor Council at the time of this very nasty dispute that lasted for some weeks. We were involved in making sure that money was available to the families involved in this very big dispute. I learnt a lot from Trevor over the years and I will miss him. We had many discussions, mainly of an industrial nature and about the need for reform in the industrial relations area. Trevor, in a way, was our secret weapon in the Industrial Commission. Quite often the commissioners would be very pleased to agree to whatever he said because they could not work out what he was saying.

I would always threaten to bring Trevor to an industrial dispute as my assistant when I had carriage of a case. He proved very helpful. I do remember (and I think that it was the Joe White Maltings case) when Trevor talked with some conviction about the Christopher Columbus clause—I think it was on Christmas Eve—for some 1½ hours. When we got out of the commission—and, I might say, we were successful not only in getting people back to work but also in finishing the strike—I asked him to explain to me, as a relatively new advocate, what the Christopher Columbus clause was about. Trevor told me that he had made it up on the spot and that, in fact, it did not exist. He said to me, 'You have to remember, girl, that if you are going to appear in the Industrial Commission you must take on the persona of an actor. It is very important that you get your acting skills as well as your industrial know-how together if you want to be successful.'

I could tell a number of stories about some of the industrial disputes with which I have been involved with Trevor. Like the member for Kaurna and the minister, I was very sad when Trevor did make the decision to leave the Labor Party. I did not have any preselection or factional reasons for being associated with Trevor, unlike most of my colleagues, but I certainly did appreciate his knowledge and also his dedication to the members of the Liquor Trades Union, and certainly to the Trades and Labor Council in general. I will miss him greatly and I do hope that his family will have the benefit of knowing that Trevor was held in very strong regard by many people in the Labor Party.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland):** I, too, support the motion of condolence to the Hon. Trevor Crothers, our former colleague in the Legislative Council. Trevor was appointed to the Legislative Council some two years before I came into this house, but he was one of the very first Labor members of the government of the day to offer a welcome to me into this parliament. I have listened to all the other contributions and much of what I would say about Trevor has already been said. Certainly, in my meeting with Trevor at that early stage, I learned that what I believed was my reasonably acute sense of understanding accents would need to be improved somewhat in order to hold a conversation with Trevor. He certainly had a very strong Irish accent that was very tricky. Trevor was an articulate and well-read man. He would often come up to me when we were having discussions about a range of subjects and offer some very unique story of Scottish history. That, I think, was just to show me that he did not have a bias to any of the other countries across the borders in which he had lived over the years.

Trevor, as we all know, made very strong representation on behalf of constituencies throughout this state during his time in the parliament. Certainly, his contributions are now part of the history of this state. I cannot say that Trevor was either friend or foe, but he was a colleague for whom I had a great deal of respect. It is that respect and my condolences I offer to the friends and the family of the Hon. Trevor Crothers.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I would like also to speak briefly to the condolence motion. I certainly agree with everything that has been said. The Hon. Trevor Crothers was a true character, a folk hero and a person with great intellect and charm. I guess that, one way or another, I have known him for more than 30 years, initially through mum and dad but more so when I came back from Kadina in about, I think, 1986. As has been already said by the Deputy Premier and others, Trevor obviously had a very significant and powerful position within the ALP. I think he exercised that with not only great authority but also strong discipline.

I well remember a whole range of opportunities and discussions that I had with Trevor. The Deputy Premier was too bashful to talk about one, or more than one, occasion at the Polish Club, when we were lined up with Mick Young drinking slivovitz. Even the Poles were astounded at how many Trevor was able to drink. I think the Deputy Premier got knocked out at about three; the member for Enfield at about two and a half; and I think I got through one and a quarter. I do not think Trevor would mind my saying that he got to about 28 before they were able to draw the line. It was not a bad session! I hasten to add he did not drive home that evening.

Trevor was a very proud man. I did some training and ran in a couple of marathons when I returned from the country. He would always tell me about his long-distance running. I would look at him with surprise in my eyes and he would grab me by the arm, as if to ensure I was not having any doubt about what he used to do and his exploits as a boxer, and so on.

It is more than obvious and very genuine that members on both sides of the house feel deeply and warmly about Trevor Crothers. That is a very good thing. We may have our disagreements and disappointments in politics but, at the end of the day, individuals and characters of this nature only come along very rarely. I suppose he is a bit in the mould of people such as Mick Young, Jack Wright and Jim Dunford, on the Labor side of politics, and I am sure the opposition has similar folk heroes. I was working with Mick Young at that stage but, even beyond, Trevor always used to say to me that he had great love for Mick Young; he used to say that he had a mind like a steel trap. I think that was Trevor's description of the great intellect of Mick, but Trevor had that enormous intellect as well. They used it in different ways.

The Minister for Environment and Conservation perhaps described a characteristic that sometimes happens, not all the time but sometimes, when union secretaries come into the parliament. It takes some time to adjust to that different role and Trevor, like others before him, had his challenges with respect to that.

As individuals, we all are much richer for knowing a person such as Trevor Crothers; for having had the opportunity to share debates with him; and for having had discussions with him. We will not see his type again, I suspect, in a hurry. It is very sad, as has already been said by the Premier, that it

was such a very short time from when he left this place until his death. That is a great disappointment for us all.

It is sad that he has missed out on a chunk of his life when he could have had the opportunity after retiring from the parliament to have more time with his family. He was so proud of all his children and grandchildren. He just loved them dearly and so often spoke about them passionately. I am sad that he has left us. I think he does leave a very special place in the hearts of us all, for some of us a little more because we have known him longer and had that intimacy with him over a period of time.

Like other members before me, I conclude by expressing my condolences to all his family. I thank him for the role he played in the parliament and also for the great chunk of time that he spent representing working-class trade union people before he came into the parliament.

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** I, too, rise to speak to this condolence motion for Trevor Crothers. Unlike members opposite, I did not know Trevor for 20 or 30 years. However, in the last nine years I got to know Trevor not only as a member of the Legislative Council but also as a friend and a constituent of mine, as he lived at Campbelltown. Indeed, I had to represent him on a couple of occasions, and he felt passionate about—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Tell us about the tree branches.

**Mr SCALZI:** The member for Spence rightly recounts the problem with certain tree branches. Along with others, I made representations on his behalf because—rightly, as he saw it—it was a problem and it had to be dealt with. A lot of members have talked about Trevor's extensive knowledge, great intellect, and his knowledge of history and sport. One thing that really comes to mind—and I was privileged to be at the service yesterday—is that he was a great listener. When you talked to his family members yesterday, they recognised you, even though they had not even seen you before. It is therefore obvious that Trevor took seriously the relationships he had with everyone, and he would recount those to his family. I was very therefore much touched by his daughter when she said, 'He often spoke about you. You were on the other side, but he thought you were a good bloke.' My condolences go to his children Cheryl, Linda, Maureen and Tina; to his sons-in-law, Robert, Andy and Anthony; to his grandchildren Alison, David, Ben, Charlene, Belinda, Amanda, Bill, Alannah, Todd, Andrew, Fiona, Daniel, Alisha, Jakob and Billy; his friends Joe and Pam; and all those who came in contact with him, because he enriched those people's lives.

Like the member for Spence, I am certainly privileged to have attended that lunch, because it was a memorable lunch. I would like to thank Terry Cameron, his great friend, who spoke from the heart yesterday at the service. Friendships that Trevor has made across politics should really be valued, because he took them seriously. He stood as a Labour Independent at the last election, and many would remember the slogan to 'put the U back in Labor'. Perhaps he was really saying that the Labor had never come out of the Trevor Crothers. He did what he did because he believed that it was in the best interests of South Australia, and I am sure that he always acted in the best interests of those less fortunate than we.

I believe that Trevor was a true Labor believer, and he believed more in the faith than the religion of politics. He was also a true democratic socialist and, although I might disagree with some of the philosophy, I had no choice but to respect someone who is committed to that belief.

**Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood):** Very briefly, I had not known Trevor before I entered parliament. I spent quite a bit of my time speaking to Trevor in the bar. I have spent a lot of my time talking to people of non-English speaking background. In speaking with Trevor, I found it extremely difficult to understand what he was saying, so I used to nod and smile a lot. That was the extent of our conversations. However, he had worked with a relative of mine at the brewery, and he always asked me how he was. I think I had told him on several occasions that he had died a long time ago, but that was always the opening point of our conversation.

Trevor always used to have something to say at our caucus meetings. I used to sit at the opposite end of the table and listen very attentively, but I do not think I ever understood anything that Trevor had said. It was interesting the day that Trevor announced to caucus that he would support the sale of ETSA. I must have been one of the last people to come out of the caucus, and I was chased down the corridor by the media scrum. They all asked, 'Vinnie, what did Trevor have to say?', and I was truthfully able to say, 'Well, I didn't understand a word he said.' So, I did not tell a lie!

I wish to relate one instance when I was preparing to do a Bloomsday reading of *Ulysses* at one of the local pubs, and I decided to ask Trevor for his advice. I had a particularly salacious piece to read, a very erotic piece, and I thought that perhaps Trevor could give me some idea of how to talk this stream of consciousness—and I did not exactly know what some of it meant and where I should stop, or where the pauses should be in the conversation. I spent several hours going through it in my office with Trevor, and I came out exhausted at the end of it. I did the reading, but I am not quite sure whether I would have received any sort of an acting award for it! As some of our members have said, we were disappointed with Trevor's decision. But I think that he needs to be remembered for all that he did both in his life before the parliament and during his time here.

**Mrs HALL (Morialta):** I would like to add to the many remarks that have been made about our late colleague, the Hon. Trevor Crothers. I described him as a cheerful Irishman with a very sharp wit. As has already been said, he had an outstanding intellect, and I would say that that infectious and rather raucous laugh on occasions demonstrated to us that one could certainly capture an audience without anyone having the first clue about what they were laughing at, because they could not understand the preceding words.

On the few occasions that I would share a drink with Trevor in the parliamentary bar I always appreciated his friendliness and, as I have said, that broad Irish accent, which he assured me he would never lose. On about the fourth occasion I understood that he was describing it to me as the 'Tipperary lilt'—and I have to tell members, that was really difficult. When Trevor was speaking at the occasional citizenship ceremony at the Campbelltown council he would entertain the group that was gathered there—family and friends—and I am positive that they had not a clue what he had said, but it was always said with a great tone in his voice and one always knew that what he was saying was very genuine. I guess we have all thought that we have had conversations about the importance of the ancient philosophers, and I have to tell members that, on one occasion, Trevor confessed to me that that accent of his was the way in which he had developed his 'unique skill in capturing an audience'.

As we know, Trevor was very proud of his Irish heritage and, as has been said by many of my colleagues on the Labor side, he was enormously proud of his traditional roots, well based in the industrial wing of the Labor movement. I do not believe that he ever lost that pride. Trevor was a shop steward and then President of the Liquor Trades Union, and he was a very efficient (as I understand it) union official, and many of my Labor colleagues may be interested to know that the hoteliers who dealt with Trevor still pay tribute to the way in which he operated when he was involved with the union. I am told that they were always well aware that he did have, and could use, substantial political clout, that he was always very strong and articulate, but they were particularly worried when the voice levels dropped a little, because they knew that was when he was being honest and fair but would get the results that he was seeking. And I am told that he was quite fearless when he was negotiating on behalf of his members.

I guess many of us would agree that Trevor seemed always to be at his best—particularly in this place—when he was reminiscing about cricket and football, particularly that of yesteryear. His love for and knowledge of most other sports was always intriguing, particularly, as many have said, his love of soccer, boxing and athletics, many of which, as we now know, he was deeply involved with during his younger days and about which he was clearly very passionate. I am sure that the many members of this chamber spent an enormous time sometimes not understanding what he was saying, listening to his analysis of cricket—in particular, what was wrong with the game on an administrative level and a playing level and how he could fix it and how it should be improved.

As we all know, Trevor had just completed nearly 15 years as a member of this state parliament. He was enthusiastically looking forward to a long and active retirement, but sadly this was not to be. In my view, as has been said, Trevor Crothers was one of the great characters of this parliament. Together with many of his colleagues from all sides of the political spectrum, I liked him and immensely enjoyed his company. I extend my deepest sympathy to his family and friends; I am sure that he will be sadly missed.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I would like to pay a brief tribute to Trevor Crothers. As has been said, he had a great mind and he was well read. You could discuss any issue with him (Afghanistan, the Taliban, the Crimean War—anything), and he would have always read extensively on the subject and have something to say. As we know, Trevor was a boxer in his youth and he was also a paratrooper, which might have seemed a bit paradoxical when we saw him in his later years. He was an impressive sight, but even more impressive was the day when he came in here minus his teeth.

That aside, Trevor was a great person, warm and friendly. I always found him to be accepting, tolerant and understanding, someone with whom you could always have a good chat. He did not readily pass judgment on people. We all had trouble understanding his accent, and I pay tribute to Hansard for the work they did over the years translating from his native tongue into English whatever it was that he said.

We will miss Trevor. It is very sad when someone does not get to enjoy their retirement, their family and their grandchildren. Fortunately, it is not very often that we farewell recently retired MPs, and it is even sadder when we farewell a serving MP, as happened several years ago in the case of Joe. I pay tribute to Trevor and extend my condolences to all members of his family and his close friends.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** I also rise to pay tribute to the late Trevor Crothers. I wish to talk about an aspect of the man other than his involvement in the trade union movement, that is, the fact that he treated workers in the same way as he treated members of parliament. Trevor was beloved by the taxi industry. There was a minute's silence on the airwaves of two companies to commemorate his passing. He was beloved by the telephonists who could recognise his accent immediately. He was beloved by cab drivers for two reasons: first, because they thought he was the only honest MP in parliament; and, secondly, because he would always pay double the fare no matter what it was.

**The Hon. K.O. Foley:** That probably had more to do with it.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes. Trevor always took the time to speak to cab drivers and often, after having paid his fare, would sit in the cab for another 10 or 15 minutes talking to the driver about whatever he was thinking about on that day. I spoke to a few taxi drivers on the weekend about his passing and they were all shocked that he had died. They were very sad that he would not be able to enjoy his retirement.

Trevor never gloated about anything. I remember after I had been elected that I was in the members' bar gloating about the decline of the Centre Left and how great it was that they no longer existed. Trevor pulled me aside and said, 'Look, young son, all empires come to an end.'

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Exactly. He would often digress and talk about the Roman Empire collapsing and Byzantium and all the rest, but he gave me one bit of advice which I will keep forever, and that was: 'Never gloat; be nice to everyone on the way up because you will see them on the way down.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! On behalf of all members, I will take their expressions of condolence and pass them on to Mia and members of his family in the usual manner. I share the same experience that most members have related to the chamber in their remarks on this condolence motion. I think the thing that struck me most about Trevor was—and why me, I will never know—his belief, accurate in some part, that I was interested in poetry, and his willingness to quote at length from Milton or Shelley or Coleridge or Wordsworth. On the last occasion upon which he spoke to me and quoted some poetry, it was the sonnet:

The world is too much with us; late and soon,  
Getting and spending . . . a sordid boon! . . .

And so he went on. I only wish I had spoken to him then at greater length. Had I the time I would have. Notwithstanding that, I share members' expressions of joy in celebrating his life and in mourning his passing and ask all members to stand in their places in silence in carrying the motion.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*[Sitting suspended from 2.57 to 3.05 p.m.]*

## ASSAULTS, PENALTIES

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Criminals who target the elderly and the vulnerable will face much harsher penalties under tough new laws that will soon be introduced into the South Australian parliament. It is intended by the government that

the new laws will increase the maximum penalties currently available for aggravated assault and other aggravated offences against the elderly, the disabled and the vulnerable. State cabinet has approved proposals, announced during the state election campaign, which will provide for tougher punishment for crimes such as assault, robbery or fraud, crimes involving torture, and assaults involving offensive weapons such as knives. The government is dedicating the legislation to Ivy Skowronski, who successfully campaigned for tougher laws on home invasion because of attacks on the elderly.

Members will remember that Mrs Skowronski collected a petition, one of the biggest in South Australian history with, I think, more than 115 000 signatures of South Australians, demanding a change in the law relating to home invasions, and she was successful in doing so. The new laws will specify tougher penalties for aggravated assaults against public officials such as police, fire or prison officers attacked while carrying out their duties, or assaults against children under the age of 12 years or adults over the age of 60 years. The government is putting criminals on notice that we will no longer tolerate these low-lives who take advantage of the elderly and others in our community who are less able to defend themselves should they come under physical attack.

I think all members of parliament will agree that the least we can do is send a message to these cowards that we will not accept this kind of behaviour in a civilised community such as ours. The proposed legislation will make a series of amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and replace a number of non-fatal offences against individuals with offences based on the level of harm inflicted on the victim. It will create three new offences:

- cause serious harm intentionally, which will attract a maximum penalty of 20 years gaol for a basic offence and 25 years for an aggravated offence;
- cause serious harm recklessly, which will attract a maximum penalty of 15 years and 19 years for an aggravated offence and;
- cause serious harm negligently, which will attract a maximum penalty of 10 years.

I want to explain this in case it should be misunderstood. The government, in a whole series of measures, is toughening up the criminal law across the board, as we have announced in terms of drug offences, of getting rid of the drunk's defence, and also of announcing much stronger powers to individuals to defend themselves in their own home. But, in addition to these extra penalties, we are putting on an extra penalty again for those who are most vulnerable in our community. We are honouring an election promise.

A bill is being drafted now and, once released, will be available for consultation by the community and interest groups before being introduced into parliament. As I say, this fulfils Labor's election pledge to increase penalties for crimes against the vulnerable in our community such as the elderly, the very young and the disabled, or where a person has been tortured during a crime, abused with an offensive weapon or attacked by a gang.

Members opposite will be well aware that recently the Police Association (I think just a month ago) called for aggravated penalties, much tougher penalties, for those who assault our police officers in the line of duty. In the last 12 months, according to the Police Association, more than 600 assaults have been recorded against police officers. This legislation will be put out to the community for consultation. I expect there to be strong support from the community, and

it is something that I hope will get bipartisan support in this parliament.

### NURSES

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** Members will recall that on 4 June 2002 I advised the house that the former government failed to budget for an undertaking in the nurses enterprise agreement entered into last year to replace the existing Exelcare computerised nurse staffing system. In part, the agreement states, in relation to replacing the Exelcare system:

The DHS gives a guarantee that a new system is to be determined by government by the end of March 2002 and implemented by August 2002.

This agreement was entered into by the previous government without first establishing the technical requirements to meet the undertaking. The government also relied on advice that the existing Exelcare system could be upgraded for \$800 000 when we now know that the cost will run into several millions of dollars. Finally, the government agreed to an impossible timetable requiring procurement to be completed by August 2002.

This serious failing by the former government to comply with the enterprise agreement was uncovered after the new government took office. I want to again express my gratitude to the nurses in our system and to the Australian Nursing Federation for acknowledging these circumstances and allowing the new government to work through the negligence of the previous government. I met with the ANF and they made it quite clear that they understood that the fault lay with the previous government. I want to assure our nurses that the new government is working as quickly as possible on the procurement of equipment to honour this agreement, and \$3.5 million has been allocated this year for the project.

On 9 July I also informed the house that the public sector has a shortage of 400 nurses as a result of the former government's failure to take any action in relation to nurse work force planning. The government has now allocated \$2.7 million for a nurse recruitment and retention strategy, and my department is consulting the ANF on measures to address the nursing shortage. I want to assure all nurses working in our public hospitals that we are committed to honouring the enterprise agreement and action to address the shortage of nursing staff in our public hospitals.

### PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—

University of South Australia—Report 2001

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Local Government Act—By-Laws—

City of Payneham, Norwood and St Peters—

No. 3—Roads

No. 4—Local Government Land

By the Minister for Administrative Services (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Freedom of Information (Miscellaneous)

Amendment—Universities.

## QUESTION TIME

### BUILDING INDEMNITY INSURANCE

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** Will the Attorney-General now support the introduction of an industry based consumer protection scheme to address the current crisis in building indemnity insurance in the light of revelations that the ALP State Council has endorsed a motion calling on the government to implement such a scheme? Last Thursday, the ALP council voted 26 to 22 in support of the following motion:

That the South Australian Labor government implement the current proposal being put forward by the Master Builders' Association and BFAIR for an industry based, non-profit form of consumer protection insurance to replace the current private enterprise Building Indemnity Insurance Scheme.

The opposition has been told that some cabinet members voted in support of the motion.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier):** I am the minister responsible because I am the minister who, in parliament just a couple of weeks ago, knocked this scheme on the head and said that a Labor government would not implement the scheme. The Attorney-General and I, from different aspects of the building indemnity warranty issue, have been dealing with this matter. The Master Builders Association came to government about five or six weeks ago now, I suppose, with a fidelity scheme that it wanted the government to implement. I thanked the association for coming to us with a better considered scheme than it initially wanted us to implement but, after rigorous analysis and assessment (not just by Treasury but by Consumer Affairs and others), it was decided that the venture was far too risky for a government to take on, and that scheme was rejected.

From memory, I am on the record—and I am happy to be corrected if that it is not the case—as saying to this house that we would not be implementing that scheme. What I can report in respect of building indemnity insurance is that Sun Alliance—the major insurer in this area that has been offering its product through HIA—has written to government indicating that it can cover 100 per cent of the South Australian market provided that builders meet the appropriate requirements for the financial strength of that builder. Not only that but also it is offering its product through, I think, eight brokers in South Australia, including now the Master Builders Association.

I am also informed that a smaller company called Reward is entering the market in South Australia. The Insurance Council of Australia has advised me that there is the potential for another very large insurer—which will remain unnamed in this parliament (but I am happy to share it with the leader privately)—to enter the market in South Australia.

As to the specifics of the question about a Labor Party State Council meeting, as I am sure members opposite know (I think this is how it operates in their party; certainly it is how it operates in the Labor Party), the state council is an excellent forum for members and affiliates of the Labor Party to put forward their views. It is a non-binding forum of the Labor Party. The simple answer to the question about whether I intend to implement a fidelity scheme based on the MBA that was supported at a recent Labor Party State Council is no.



**HOLDEN PRODUCTION**

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** Will the Premier inform the house of the announcement made today by the Chairman and Managing Director of Holden?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** Last month I met with senior executives of General Motors in Detroit to discuss plans for the expansion of Holden's Elizabeth operations, including the export of the new Monaro from Elizabeth to the United States. Shortly after my meeting with General Motors' officials, including the international Vice-President of General Motors, the company announced a major vote of confidence in the future of the South Australian car industry: that Holden's would manufacture and export the Monaro to the United States, which would be badged as the Pontiac GTO for the American market. The General Motors' executives were impressed with Holden's export focus as well as its dominant position in the Australian car market.

Today, Holden announced that it intends to further expand its Elizabeth operations, and the company has told me it hopes to increase its output from the current 132 000 cars per annum to 180 000. Hopefully, that will mean changes to the existing two-shift arrangements or, indeed, even a third shift. I have just been informed that Holden has confirmed that next year it will produce more than 750 vehicles a day from its Elizabeth plant, raising production by 21 per cent. I understand that Holden has detailed its plans to spend \$480 million on upgrading the Elizabeth plant over the next 18 months. Holden Chairman and Managing Director, Peter Hanenberger, says that, despite increasing automation, the current work force of 4 300 will grow but the final decision on whether there will be a third shift at the plant will not be announced until November. I have just been given a copy of Mr Hanenberger's announcement, which I think would be useful for all members of the house to hear. The media release states:

Holden will invest \$2 billion in capital and product programs over the next five years to meet ambitious volume growth targets. Much of the expenditure is directed at expanding vehicle and engine manufacturing capability to service the export markets that Holden considers vital to its long-term viability. While Holden expects to build a record total of 143 000 vehicles in 2002, it is targeting an annual volume of 180 000 units by 2008 in order to achieve the economies of scale it believes are necessary to achieve a sustainable place in the global marketplace.

Holden Chairman and Managing Director, Peter Hanenberger, said today that the company was gearing up for one of its biggest challenges—

he spoke today at Holden's vehicle manufacturing operation at Elizabeth—

... he said the massive capital expenditure and capacity expansion program was necessary if Holden was to move from a relatively low volume producer to a company that manufactures vehicles and components at sustainable international-scale volumes.

The media release goes on to state:

Holden is already making inroads with the Commodore and Statesman models that sell in a growing range of export markets, notably the Middle East, branded as Chevrolets. Beginning in the third quarter of 2003, the Monaro coupe will be exported to the United States at the rate of 18 000 units per year.

We are very delighted to hear the announcement of a 21 per cent lift in production and that Holden will produce more than 750 vehicles a day and, indeed, also the announcement today that Holden will invest nearly \$500 million on upgrading the Holden plant at Elizabeth.

**POLICE RESOURCES**

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** My question is directed to the Premier. Given his statements about law and order, why has the government not made any provisions for a real increase in police numbers? Over the next four years, police numbers will not be increased, other than to replace those who retire or leave the department. The previous Liberal government made a significant commitment to police resources, increasing police numbers, sworn and non-sworn—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr BROKENSHIRE:** —of more than 6.5 per cent.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I am delighted that the honourable member, so famous for how he used the resources of the emergency services portfolio—and about to become more famous, I understand—asked this question because, even though we had to take some tough decisions to deal with the mess left by his government, we have quarantined police numbers. Indeed, as I told the Police Association on Friday night, we have absolutely honoured our commitment to the police of this state in our first budget—and we have gone further—unlike our predecessors—unlike the Liberals—who were soft on law and order.

Every week we have come in here to upgrade and toughen the criminal law to get tough on crime and, as the Attorney-General has said so often, to get tough on the causes of crime. We are getting rid of the drunk's defence; we are giving protection for our police to make sure that there is an added penalty for any criminal who attacks a police officer in this state; we have quarantined the police numbers; and, what is more, we have gone further. We have also announced a new police complex at Mount Barker. Why do you not stand up and support us in our fight against crime?

We have also announced a multi-million dollar new communication system for emergency services, because this government will be tough on crime. We are proving it by the legislation we are introducing. We are giving our police the opportunity to fight crime without one arm tied behind their back like the Liberals made them in the past. You only have to go out and talk to police officers on the beat to see how soft you were on crime and how you would not give the police the support they deserve. Despite those promises you made in the 1993 election, you absolutely took the axe to police numbers in this state. Year after year you ringbarked the police and only in the last election campaign did you announce a boost for the police. Let me tell you this: we are changing the criminal law and giving the police the support they deserve.

**HOSPITALS, OUTPATIENTS**

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Has the government cut 159 000 outpatient services from our metropolitan public hospitals as claimed by the Leader of the Opposition? Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition told the house:

The government's own figures show that for the coming year there will be 159 200 fewer outpatients.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** The claim made by the Leader of the Opposition is false. The leader has simply repeated a misleading statement by the member for Finnis, made last Saturday. I want to assure the house that there will be no cuts to outpatient services at our

metropolitan hospitals. Without wanting to pre-empt debate, budget table 6.2 forecasts a minimum activity target in our metropolitan hospitals for the coming year of 947 000 outpatients. This target is the same target used by the Liberal government last year. What the leader did not point out yesterday and what the former minister did not explain last Saturday was note (b) to the table. This note says—and I think the leader should look it up afterwards:

Targets are to remain at the 2001-02 levels in keeping with existing demand strategies. This is a minimum target and not a funding allocation. It should be noted that expenditure reflects an increased level of funding for outpatient services of \$20.2 million.

Had the leader or the member for Finnis turned the page, they would have seen that money this year for outpatient services in South Australia is \$352.3 million—an increase of \$20.2 million or 6.08 per cent on last year's expenditure. There are no cuts to outpatient services, and I am sure this year our metropolitan public hospitals will outperform the minimum target for outpatient services just as they did last year, and the year before that, and the year before that. I conclude by saying to the Leader of the Opposition that he actually knows first-hand not to believe anything the member for Finnis says.

### POLICE RESOURCES

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** Will the Premier admit that documentation released by the government identifies significant police effort increases for raising revenue whilst also increasing some response times 33 per cent? In the documentation, the average response time to priority B tasking in the metro area will increase projected from 15 to 20 minutes. This represents a 33 per cent increase in waiting time for non-life threatening calls over last year. Conversely, the same documentation identifies that 10 000 more fines will be raised in this coming year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** I am actually the acting police minister, as well as being the Treasurer. The Premier has very well articulated the government's position on law and order—a very tough government with a tough agenda on law and order. As we have said repeatedly, revenue from speeding fines will be going into the Road Safety Fund. We have announced that previously in the budget. As to the specifics of the member's question, I am happy to take that on notice, get a detailed answer and provide it to the member.

### TAFE FEES

**Ms THOMPSON (Reynell):** Will the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education inform the house whether the government will be fulfilling its election commitment to reduce the level of TAFE fees?

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education):** I would like to thank the member for Reynell for her interest in this matter. I know she takes a keen interest in unemployment and youth affairs in her electorate. In addition, she gives support to and is active in the community, and she is also a great mentor for young people in their career and life decisions. Here again we have another promise kept by the Rann government. As we said so often before the election, it was an absolute disgrace that the TAFE fees in South Australia were higher than anywhere else in the country. It was an outrage that in a state

with the highest youth unemployment figures and the most dire shortage of skills for young people there was a huge barrier for upskilling and training in that our courses were so expensive. It was an outrage. They were some \$400 or \$500 more expensive than the same course in New South Wales and Victoria.

We have committed to putting this right. In a full year, it will cost \$2 million to put money into the TAFE system to allow young people to get one foot on the ladder and a good start in life. We have decided to cap our TAFE fees at \$1 200 a year. This will bring in line the cost of courses with the costs across the rest of Australia. In particular, that capping will include all course materials and equipment that otherwise in other states is charged separately. The cost of this initiative is \$1 730 000, and on top of that we are increasing the concession fees as well. Our capping will affect 3 500 young Australians allowing them to gain skills and our increase in the concessionary rate will impact on 10 500 people. On current numbers that will mean that 14 000 young South Australians will have a chance to get skills and employment opportunities.

The concessionary rate will increase by 25 per cent, from 40¢ for an hour up to 50¢ for a training hour of curriculum. This will have a profound impact on 14 000 people, who will now find that their training, their courses, their upskilling and that first important step on the ladder to employment will be affordable. It was an outrage that our state was left behind all others in the skilling of our young work force. It was an outrage, too, that the government watched as our fees rose above all others in the country, and it is a good thing that at last this government has taken the step to correct the iniquitous fee differences.

### CROWN LEASES

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** Why did the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house yesterday that the government brings in about \$500 000 a year by way of rent under the Crown Lands Act when the government's own papers show that in 2001-02 the government collected \$1.7 million, and in 2000-01 it collected \$1.76 million in rent under the Crown Lands Act?

**Mr Brindal:** Can't you read your own paper?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Environment and Conservation.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I was advised—and I am advised—that we collect about \$500 000 in perpetual leases and licences, and so on, under the Crown Lands Act. But I will check the member's figures and get back to him with a full answer.

### RADIATION PROTECTION BRANCH

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation please explain the environmental benefits that will be achieved from transferring the Radiation Protection Branch from the Department of Human Services to the Environment Protection Authority?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation):** I thank the member for her question and for her continuing interest in environmental issues. Today I was pleased to attend the headquarters of the Radiation Protection Branch at Kent Town to unveil a plaque announcing the fact

that the Radiation Protection Branch is now part of the Environment Protection Authority. This transfer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** It is interesting that members opposite laugh at this matter. For many years, the opposition has tried to keep the EPA away from dealing with issues to do with radiation, to do with the uranium industry, and we well know that the majority of people in South Australia have great concern about how uranium is handled in this state and how radioactive waste is stored in this state. For the first time, the EPA (which is the main agency in South Australia for dealing with environmental protection) now has the means and the methodology to deal with these important issues.

I am pleased to be able to inform the house that, as a result of this transfer, the EPA now has an increased capacity to deal with radioactive issues. As members would know, the goal of the Radiation Protection Branch is to protect the health of individuals and that of future generations from the harmful effects of ionising and non-ionising radiation. Ionising radiation comes from radioactive substances and, of course, non-ionising radiation comes from sources such as powerlines and mobile phones.

The staff at Kent Town will, of course, continue their existing duties in relation to medical technology regulation. But the branch will now be fundamental in the achievement of two important election commitments made by the Labor Party in opposition. As a matter of priority, it will be key to the audit of radioactive waste currently stored in South Australia, and will use the information gained from that audit to make recommendations about how it should be stored in the future.

In addition, the branch also will make a crucial contribution to the inquiry into the in situ leach mining process, which will also be conducted as a matter of priority by the newly independent Environment Protection Authority. In the long term, the increased ability of the EPA will enable us to work constructively with the uranium mining industry to achieve the best possible environmental outcomes for all South Australians.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Bragg. The member for Giles. Can I tell honourable members that it is not up to the Speaker to act as the puppeteer in this instance. In every other parliament in this association, members seek the call by rising in their places. The member for Bragg.

#### DOCUMENTS, PRIVILEGE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg):** My question is directed to the Attorney-General. In the light of the statement of the Speaker yesterday that 'absolute privilege applies to documents which are simply tabled' (that is, in the house), does the Attorney-General propose introducing amendments to the Wrongs Act to make the law conform to the proposition just quoted?

In the famous case of *Stockdale v Hansard* (1839), the courts rejected the proposition that parliamentary privilege extended to provide a defence to an action against *Hansard*, which had printed and published the report of the Inspectors of Prisons which had been tabled in the House of Commons and ordered to be published. In the judgment of Justice Duggan in the Supreme Court of South Australia in 1997 (reported in 68 SASR 253), the judge pointed out that the Parliamentary Papers Act 1840 was passed to reverse that decision. The English legislation was adopted in this state in

1846, and now appears as section 12 of the Wrongs Act. The judge said (at page 255):

The privilege attaches to the occasion of publication, not the document.

Accordingly, in *Rowan v Cornwall* (the case keeps coming back), the privilege did not arise merely because a report was tabled in the Legislative Council. Given this position, we all need to know (I think as quickly as possible) if amendments are proposed in the light of the Speaker's statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Attorney-General, I tell members that I, too, will be contemplating the implications of the inquiry.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** It is a pertinent question, and I will obtain a more detailed reply for the member. What I can say is that yesterday I felt it was important to give the Scotland Yard report absolute privilege and, therefore, to ensure a resolution of the house under section 12 of the Wrongs Act and not to rely on ordinary parliamentary privilege. If we had relied on ordinary parliamentary privilege, there was a risk that a report of the proceedings here yesterday in the media, or the circulation of parts of the Scotland Yard report, may not have attracted privilege—that it may have been defeated by the occasion of the publication, such as by malice.

I am as eager as anyone here to ensure that our proceedings attract absolute privilege, and that is why yesterday I sought to invoke section 12 of the Wrongs Act. I will look into the matter and obtain a detailed reply for the member. I am sure that it will be of interest to all members of this house, because we want to ensure that our proceedings are duly privileged.

#### HOSPITALS, MEDICAL MALPRACTICE INSURANCE

**Ms BREUER (Giles):** Will the Minister for Health inform the house of action taken by the government to deal with problems associated with escalating premiums for medical malpractice insurance for doctors working in country hospitals?

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** I thank the member for Giles for her question, because escalating insurance premiums threaten services being provided by medical practitioners and specialists in public hospitals throughout rural South Australia. Following the collapse of UMP, the state government acted quickly to negotiate an alternative contract with the Medical Defence Association of South Australia to cover fee for service doctors and resident rural medical specialists working in public hospitals in the country.

The government also increased support for doctors under the rural health enhancement package to partly compensate for premiums that increased by about 50 per cent to 100 per cent for general practitioners, and about 300 per cent to 600 per cent for specialists. Major increases particularly apply to those general practitioners who carry out obstetrics and to specialist obstetricians and anaesthetists. Arrangements also include support for tail cover for resident rural doctors who are currently members of UMP for any claims made in the period from 1 July 2001 to 30 June 2002. These initiatives were put in place after extensive consultation with the Rural Doctors Association, the Rural Work Force Agency and the Australian Medical Association, and I certainly express my thanks to those organisations for their advice and cooperation. They will ensure the continuation of services in

country hospitals, and are estimated to cost \$1.048 million in a full year.

### COMPACT FOR GOOD GOVERNMENT

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** My question is directed to the Treasurer. On ABC radio on Friday the Treasurer undertook to provide details concerning the cost of Labor's compact with the member for Hammond. Will he now provide to the house the details of those costs as they relate to each agency? In a recent speech the Treasurer said:

Upon coming to government we committed to a number of initiatives as part of the compact for good government. These initiatives have been funded.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the Treasurer. Maybe he can tell the house at the same time whether it would have cost any less if the Liberals were in office.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** Well, sir, as I understand, the compact was—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I think you may have just misled the house by implying that we have the same agreement with you as the Labor Party, and that is not true.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. If the Leader of the Opposition believes that, a substantive motion is the way to handle it.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I could say, sir, that it probably would have cost more under the Liberals because I reckon that I am better at managing the budget and negotiating than the opposition, so theirs would probably have cost an extra couple of million dollars. Programs contained in the compact include, from memory, the eradication, where we can, of branched broomrape, the requirement to deal with the issue of inappropriate fishing practices in the river, which I think many members on both sides of the house support, and a number of other critical issues.

I am advised that the cost for 2002-03 is \$4.87 million, and the full year effect is approximately \$18 million. These are the figures with which I have been provided. Let us remember that, particularly in terms of the branched broomrape program, there are also commonwealth and industry components; this figure is simply the state contribution for that program. I was surprised when I looked quickly in some of my bright orange folders at some of my briefings for the comments of, I think, John Lush, the President of the Farmers Federation, who was quick to come onto radio not just to welcome the government's good budget—from memory, words to that effect—but to applaud and congratulate the government for investing in an important program to get rid of a terrible weed in the Murray-Malley.

He was extremely appreciative of the fact that we were investing money in dealing with a major threat to rural production in the Murray-Malley. I am pleased to say that the government's decision to fund a branched broomrape program in consultation with and collaboration between the commonwealth, states and industry was welcomed and appreciated by our state's farming community. That is good public policy and a good outcome.

### FINES AND EXPIATION NOTICES

**Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens):** Will the Treasurer provide the house with any further information on comments by the member for Mawson concerning police response times and

an expected increase in the number of fines and expiation notices in this year's budget?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** Yesterday the member for Mawson asked questions, and I have offered to get back to him with a more detailed answer, but I can respond, in part, to one question that he asked yesterday—and I will come to today's question—about the expected increase in the number of speeding fines in the state budget. This information, as the honourable member will recall, is based not just on a Treasury estimation of revenue but also on advice from the South Australian police force in terms of estimating the expected number of fines. I am advised that, whilst it is expected that there will be an extra 10 000 fines and expiation notices lodged for enforcement this year compared with last year, the number of speed detection hours is not expected to change—80 000 last year, 80 000 this year.

Unfortunately, I am advised that the police are expecting—and I know that this issue is confronting my colleague the Minister for Transport—an increase in the number of speed detections or the number of people speeding. I am told that the end of year result for the last financial year was in excess of what was anticipated. That is saying that—and I am informed that this advice is, in part, from the police—we have to do more as a government to deal with speeding in our community. I am advised that this was happening last year—there were speeding increases ahead of what was expected last year—and that, tragically and unfortunately, more work needs to be done this year. We as a government, the Premier and, in particular, my colleague the Minister for Transport are dealing now with the issue of what responsible government should do about speed detection.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I say to the member opposite: are we to ignore the advice of the police? Is that what he is saying?

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** No. Are you saying that we should ignore the advice of the police?

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** The shadow minister says, 'Ignore the advice of the police.' We will not do that because we are a responsible government, but we acknowledge that more needs to be done to slow drivers down and, as a responsible government, we will deal with that.

The other aspect to which the member referred today is response times. I have been provided with information that, under the former government in 2000-01, the end of year average response time for priority B tasking in the metro area was 20 minutes.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Hang on! Just listen! That was 2000-01.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Robbie, I'm talking about 2000-01. Then the target for 2000-01 was 20 minutes.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** No. However, they achieved 15 minutes.

*Mr Brokenshire interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Yes, but guess what: we've quarantined the number of police, we have the same number of police, but we have put in the same estimated result as you did: 20 minutes—no change. I hope that the end of year result for this year is 15 minutes as well.

## TAXES, NEW

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** Will the Treasurer now admit that the government has broken its promise not to introduce any new taxes by announcing a new tax on commercial hire purchase arrangements? In the lead-up to the last state election, the ALP promised that it would not increase existing taxes and charges or introduce new taxation measures. This promise is spelt out in black and white in the ALP's policy costing documents, which state:

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

However, after only a few months in office, the government announced that all government fees and charges would be increased by 4.2 per cent and additional taxation measures amounting to over \$200 million in additional revenue over four years are now planned. These taxation measures include the introduction of a new tax on commercial hire purchase arrangements.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer):** No, I do not accept that. What we have done is broaden the base. An anomaly occurred—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Well, an anomaly existed in South Australia. I am advised that we were one of only a few jurisdictions involved. I think the Northern Territory was the only one that did not have the broad-based rental duty applying to hire purchase equipment. When I reviewed that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** From memory, the anomaly is that if you are leasing equipment then you pay a 1.8 per cent rental duty. But if it is a hire purchase agreement—a different method of financing—you do not. That was unfair to people who were leasing equipment. What we have said is that we will broaden the base in line with every other jurisdiction I think bar the Northern Territory. It is a legitimate measure, to broaden the base, and that is exactly what we have done.

## OFFICE FOR RACING

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** Can the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing inform the house of the establishment of an Office for Racing?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** In thanking the member for his question, I acknowledge his passion for racing. The policy with which the then opposition went to the last election was to establish an Office for Racing—a clear difference between the then government. What we identified was the uniqueness of the state's racing industry and, of course, the great variety of people, both at the professional and the volunteer level in the industry.

What the government has done with the introduction of the Office for Racing is to put in place something that will complement what is already in existence as a result of the previous government's policy to corporatise the racing industry. Of course, that corporatisation of the racing industry saw the introduction of Thoroughbred Racing SA, Harness Racing SA and Greyhound Racing SA.

This government has put in place an Office for Racing that can provide advice to the government with respect to racing and that will complement, not replace, the activities which currently exist with respect to those corporatised bodies that are in place. We identified in opposition that the office for

racing that previously existed with the former government was stripped bare and, of course, since we have come to office that has proven to be the case.

This is the clear difference between this government and the opposition, because the advice that I received from the previous government as to the Office for Racing was that it was stripped bare, and that it was back to a bare minimum with regard to the resources that were in that office. I think that the former government had an office for racing which employed about three persons.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Well, the advice I have received from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing is that it was stripped back to having less than one person working in that area of specialising in racing. So, we think it is important to have an Office for Racing and this government will re-establish that office. There is a critical difference between this government's belief as to the importance and significance of the racing industry compared to that of the former government. We have re-established the Office for Racing, which was stripped bare by the former government, but never announced and, of course, this shows a clear difference in policy as well as a clear difference in priorities.

While the former government had policies of selling the TAB and of corporatising, which of course is another word for the privatisation of the racing industry, we believe that there is a role here with respect to the government. We will work with the racing industry, with the major stakeholders, with those corporatised bodies and work towards the future of the racing industry and try to assist the racing industry, where appropriate, with regard to policy.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** They remember yours, too. This is the minister who brought in the corporatisation of the racing industry, who sold the racing industry a pup, who sold to the racing industry the hand that fed it—and they well know about your contribution to the racing industry, as well they know about the contribution of the former minister for the TAB, the Hon. Michael Armitage, in selling the TAB. Because now, as we unravel the financial arrangement that was put in place for the racing industry, quite obviously the detail that was put to the racing industry, to those corporatised leaders within the racing industry, simply is not what it was painted to be. So, they well remember the role of the former minister for racing, who had no interest in, no passion for and no knowledge of how the racing industry should operate.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** I rise on a point of order. The minister, in his answer to the question that he was asked, has actually impugned me by talking about the previous minister for racing and a whole series of comments that reflected on the job that I did at that time, and I ask him to withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** I understand the feelings of the member for Newland, but I am not sure exactly whether the minister was referring to her or another previous minister. If the minister cares to clarify that point, whilst his remarks were not unparliamentary in terms, they were a reflection on her reputation, if they were directed at her. May I ask the minister to clarify that point and act accordingly?

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Mr Speaker, I apologise to the member for Newland. She is perfectly correct. I was not referring to her. I was referring to the one before, the member for Davenport, who was a dud as a minister for racing.

**HOSPITALS, GLENSIDE**

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health. Why did the minister not immediately order an upgrade of hospital security on Friday following the escape of two patients from Glenside Hospital, and why did it take more than 30 hours to alert the public to this incident? Yesterday, when I tried to ascertain why the minister had taken no immediate action regarding the escape of patients from Glenside Hospital, she referred me to a ministerial statement on the topic. I have examined the statement and have found the answers to my questions are not in the statement.

**The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health):** I am very surprised to hear from the Leader of the Opposition in the same terms that he asked a question yesterday. I would again ask him to refer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** —to that statement. I would also like to inform the house that I have called for a full review in relation to the incidents—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. L. STEVENS:** The same review that I spoke about yesterday. I would like to tell the house that the terms of reference of that review are being finalised today, and I have directed the department to report to me on those matters by 30 July.

**ACTIVE CLUB PROGRAM**

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland):** My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister confirm to the house if \$940 000 has been cut from the Recreation and Sport Active Club Program? Under the previous government, some \$1.8 million was allocated to the Active Club Program. \$940 000 came from the poker machine revenue, in accordance with the Gaming Act, with the remaining \$940 000 coming from budget appropriation. The budget papers show that the government has cut \$10 million from the Community Facilities Fund, and sporting groups have advised me that they are now concerned that the \$1.8 million Active Club Program will be reduced to \$940 000.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** No, I will not confirm that, nor is the honourable member correct about the \$10 million cut in the infrastructure. There is a cut across all portfolios. There is also, of course, as a part of that a cut in recreation and sport—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the floor.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** Sorry: maybe I should clarify that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT:** No, across all of the portfolio—my portfolio, I am talking about. With respect to the specific question regarding the cut that the shadow minister refers to and the detail of the Active Club grants, no, that is not the case. The determination of how the cuts in my portfolio are to be determined across the grants is a decision for me to make.

**TOURISM CUTS**

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Why has the government cut tourism business development funding of \$4.13 million from tourism this year? The previous government funded the amount to assist 745 businesses to improve new product strategies. The average cost per business assisted was \$650. The funds focused on wine tourism planning, theme drive trails, nature ecotourism projects, cruise/drive and indigenous tourism. The money output has vanished completely from this year's budget statement.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** We have not in fact cut \$4.7 million from our operating budget: the only cuts have been to programs that have finished and a smaller percentage to our operating budget. As the honourable member will realise, there is an operating budget and some special purpose funding amounts. This year happens to be at the end of Encounter 2002; it happens to be at the end of the Year of the Outback funding; and it happens to be an off year for the World Solar Challenge, as well as Tasting Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am as interested as any other member in this answer.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:** The cuts that would appear to have attracted the attention of the member for Waite are not in the operating budget. He misunderstands: they are actually in the special, one-off budgets. It would be just as foolish to be still funding the member for Bright to be the Minister for Y2K, because the event has gone and finished.

**VICTIMS OF CRIME**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** Will the Attorney-General advise the house what steps this government is taking to assist victims of crime?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General):** The former attorney-general, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, of blessed memory, announced a review in 1998 to examine the effect of South Australia's initiatives to support victims of crime. The review produced three reports. The first dealt with victims' rights, services for victims and victim impact statements. The second presented the results of a survey of victims and the third looked into the operations of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Scheme. These reports provide the basis for the policies of the previous government and the current Labor government directed towards assistance to victims of crime.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** In November last year the parliament passed the Victims of Crime Act. I am sure the member for Unley will remember that. Among other things, that enshrines victims' rights in law. The new declaration of principles governing the treatment of victims in the criminal justice system has expanded on the previous declaration to include two new rights: a right to be informed of what services are available to assist a victim; and a right to be informed of the existing grievance mechanisms, such as the Police Complaints Authority and the Ombudsman.

The *Information for Victims of Crime* booklet that is given to victims when they report crimes to the police has been revised and includes the new declaration. It is also available through the internet. A pocket sized services directory has been produced for police and other front line service provid-

ers so they can better advise victims on services to assist them. The Victims of Crime Act permits the Attorney-General to appoint a ministerial advisory committee on victims of crime to advise on victim policy, and allows the Governor to appoint a Victims of Crime Coordinator to coordinate government resources to assist victims of crime. Mr Michael O'Connell, based in my office—

*Mr Snelling interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** —was appointed the state's first Victims of Crime Coordinator in March last year, and I note the stout approval of him by the member for Playford. He served for more than 20 years as a police officer before taking up the position and is now a published author, teaches a course on victim studies at the Adelaide Institute of TAFE, and guest lectures at the University of South Australia.

**Mr Brindal:** Who is this?

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** For the benefit of the member for Unley, I refer to Mr Michael O'Connell. The review also highlighted a lack of services for victims who reside in country areas. Last year former attorney-general Griffin agreed to fund the Victim Support Service to expand services for victims in these areas, and I pay full credit to him for that. The expanded services were to include counselling, practical assistance and liaison with government agencies and non-government organisations. I supported the extension of the services in opposition and I will continue to support them as Attorney-General. I am pleased to inherit these particular policies of the Hon. K.T. Griffin.

Last year the Victim Support Service set about establishing five regional services. Services commenced last September in Port Augusta and Port Pirie, then in November in Berri. Earlier this year a service began in the South-East, operating out of Mount Gambier. Last Friday I was pleased to travel to Port Lincoln officially to launch the expansion of the Victim Support Service into Port Lincoln. The Port Lincoln based support service will give victims in that region practical and psychological support to address the consequences of crime. I commend the people of Port Lincoln, because the money we put into the Victim Support Service there is complemented by the willing service of so many volunteers.

**Mr Brokenshire:** And a good local member.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** And a good local member who, of course, I consulted upon arriving in the town, and I took instructions from her before flying out. The government believes that it is important to attend to victims' rights and to meet their needs. It is important that there are services to assist victims to recover and that these services are accessible. The government is keen to prevent criminal victimisation. I believe it is essential that we are tough on those who commit crime and I have already introduced legislation for sentencing guidelines into parliament, and there I am afraid I diverge from the Hon. K.T. Griffin.

These guidelines are intended to ensure more consistent sentencing for the same crime. I will also introduce a bill that increases penalties for offenders who prey on the elderly, the disabled and the vulnerable, and the Premier and I have talked about that today. Draft regulations have been prepared to give effect to the Victims of Crime Act, so that it soon might become operative. Then victims' rights truly will be in law. All these initiatives are intended to help victims of crime. Simply having laws and policies is not enough: there must be practical improvements for victims. Being there to help victims when they require help is vital, and I wish the Victim Support Service and its partner, the Eyre Peninsula

Women's and Children's Support Centre, success in their Port Lincoln venture.

### TOURISM CUTS

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite):** My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Will the government be providing \$4.8 million less to tourism infrastructure in the current year (2002-03), a total of \$7.753 million less over the last two years? Budget papers for the year 2001-02 and for the current year show that, of the \$9.45 million net expenses budgeted in the year just ended, only \$6.497 million was allocated and spent. On top of this, the government papers show in black and white, on page 1.74, that tourism infrastructure is to receive \$4.8 million less in the current year. Tourism infrastructure development is vital to the tourism industry and supports 36 000 full-time equivalent jobs, generates \$3.1 billion in expenditure annually, and provides 10 per cent of the state's economic growth.

**The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism):** The answer is very similar to the one before. In 1997 the Kangaroo Island development group worked out a program for infrastructure investment, but suggested that substantial infrastructure development was necessary for Kangaroo Island development. An amount of \$10 million was budgeted over four years, but money was budgeted until the end of 2001-02. That investment in the budget has now stopped being funded onwards in the same way that the member for Bright is no longer the Y2K minister. It has finished. It was last year's allocation.

---

### CROWN LANDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I give notice that on Wednesday 17 July I will seek leave to move that a select committee be established to examine the impacts and consequences on the South Australian public of the Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2002 with particular reference to:

1. Cost of administering the Crown Lands Act 1929 with or without amendment;
2. The impact of the amendment on contracts of purchase and property values;
3. The desirability or otherwise of freeholding crown leases;
4. Equity issues arising from the present act or proposed amendments;
5. Achieving a return from crown lands consistent with the 2002-03 state budget; and
6. Any other matter that the committee considers relevant to the present act or the proposed amendments.

**The SPEAKER:** Before accepting the motion onto the *Notice Paper*, the member may need to contemplate the implications as to whether he is referring the whole bill to the select committee or, more particularly, the issues to which he has drawn attention. Then, depending on the course of action followed, the house will have to decide how it would handle the bill. To my mind it is perhaps more in order for the issue of how the matters referred to in the proposition may best be dealt with to be left until the conclusion of the second

reading, in the event that the bill passes the second reading stage, thereby referring the proposition and the bill to a select committee. I trust that the member and the house understand that. I do not think the member has been mistaken in his endeavours. I simply wish to clarify from him what his intention is.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH:** My understanding is that the whole bill can be referred without waiting for the second reading stage, and that is my intention.

**The SPEAKER:** In the 23 years that I have been here it has always been after the second reading vote. The benefit in that for the house and the reason probably for the practice has been that the committee has the benefit and the knowledge of the views of individual members representing their constituents when they take on their deliberations. However, I will more carefully examine the whole record of proceedings and precedents to determine if the bill can be referred to the committee before the second reading debate.

In the event that the course of action I have suggested in the first instance is followed, the select committee report would still have to be debated when it was returned to the house before the bill could proceed to the third reading, if that was the intention of the house. In the latter case, the circumstances to which the member for Fisher has referred, then presumably the bill would be debated in the second reading stage upon receipt of the select committee report, and that may restrict members' opportunities to debate the substance of the report where it may differ from the propositions contained in the bill. Without wanting to gag the member on a point of order, I would suggest that perhaps we would leave it at that for now and contemplate between now and when the bill comes on for debate later as to which course of action might be most fruitful.

**Mr BRINDAL (Unley):** I rise on a matter of privilege. I respectfully seek your clarification with respect to that ruling. I was always under the impression that the business of the house was a matter for this house and you are its presiding officer. If I am correct, were you saying to the member for Fisher that you would suggest to the house that the matter be held in abeyance, or are you instructing this house as to its business?

**The SPEAKER:** The member ascribes to me greater power than I ever imagined I might likely presume. I am here to do the bidding of the house.

#### COMBE, Mr G.D., DEATH

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** By leave, I move:

That this house expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr G.D. Combe CMG, MC, former Clerk of the House of Assembly and ombudsman of South Australia, and places on record its appreciation of his service.

We in this house rely very heavily on the Clerk and his staff to guide us and to act in an impartial and independent manner on matters of parliamentary procedures. Over the years we have been particularly well served. Gordon Combe MC was a distinguished Clerk of the South Australian House of Assembly. Those who knew him and worked alongside him described him as a gentleman, a family man, a sportsman, a Military Cross winner and South Australia's first ombudsman.

Gordon Combe joined the House of Assembly in January 1940, at the start of the Second World War, fresh from the State Bank as it was then known. Just six months later he

joined the Army to serve his country at war, leaving his new wife Margaret at home. Gordon served with the 2nd/43rd Australian Infantry Battalion in Australia, Palestine, Tobruk, El Alamein, New Guinea and Borneo. He was twice wounded in action, at El Alamein and New Guinea, and was awarded the Military Cross in 1943. He was commended for outstanding leadership, coolness and courage. Gordon was discharged with the rank of captain in November 1945.

He returned to the parliament and became the Clerk of the House of Assembly on 1 April 1953. In that position, Gordon Combe earned the greatest respect of all involved with the parliament. Indeed, I can remember comments made by former premiers Don Dunstan and Des Corcoran about the outstanding service of Gordon Combe to this parliament and to the House of Assembly. During his time with the House of Assembly, Gordon produced a history, *Responsible Government in South Australia*, which has been very useful to members in the years since it was published. When he left his position as Clerk to become ombudsman in 1973, the then premier (Hon. Don Dunstan) told this house:

I know of no parliament in Australia or elsewhere that has been so fortunate as ours in having the services of so distinguished and effective a Clerk.

Gordon Combe was South Australia's first ombudsman and only the second in Australian history. He held that post until 1980 when he retired. In the 1980 New Year's honours list he was awarded a Companion of the Most Distinguished Order of St Michael and St George (CMG). On his retirement, the then Premier (Hon. David Tonkin) wrote:

Your service in public administration has been exemplary. In the pioneering role of ombudsman in South Australia... you have carried out a sensitive yet most important function with absolute distinction.

In 1981 the Tonkin government appointed Gordon Combe to the board of the SGIC. In his earlier years he was a keen sportsman. He played football and played first division soccer for our state. In fact, he captained and played in one representative game, Australia versus England. He also played A grade cricket for East Torrens and, in his retirement, played golf at Kooyonga. As Clerk of the house, Gordon Combe was a much-respected figure and, as South Australia's first ombudsman, he was a hard act to follow. On behalf of the government, and I am sure of all members of this house, I offer my sincere condolences to Gordon Combe's family.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** On behalf of the Liberal Party, I have pleasure in seconding the motion and express our regret at the passing of Mr Gordon Combe. Mr Speaker, I ask that you convey to Mr Combe's family our deepest sympathies and our thanks for the eminent services he has rendered to South Australia, both as Clerk of this house and also as the state's first ombudsman. Mr Combe enjoyed an enviable reputation as one of the most distinguished and effective Clerks of any Australian parliament and was always on hand to help members. He worked tirelessly to encourage the public to develop an understanding and appreciation of the operations of this parliament.

He authored many publications with this objective in mind, including the renowned history *Responsible Government in South Australia*. This commitment was only broken by his enlistment in the army and consequent service overseas. Given Mr Combe's personal qualities, it is hardly surprising that in 1943 he was awarded the Military Cross for 'outstanding leadership, coolness and courage' in New Guinea. He was discharged from the army with the rank of



captain in 1945, returned to the services of the parliament and became Clerk by 1953.

It was this commitment to ensuring that the public was treated fairly by the administration of the state and his detailed knowledge of the workings of parliament that led to unanimous support for his appointment as South Australia's first ombudsman and, as the Premier said, only Australia's second in late 1972. Throughout *Hansard* Mr Combe is referred to as a family man, a Military Cross winner, a sportsman, a friend and a guide to the people coming into this house. Following the words of a former Leader of the Opposition, Dr Eastick, I think that the most befitting term for Mr Combe is that of a real gentleman. The opposition joins with the government in offering our deepest sympathy to the family of Mr Combe.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** It might seem somewhat strange that I pay tribute to someone whom I did not meet personally but, through particular circumstances in representing the parliament, along with yourself, sir, and others, I attended the funeral of Gordon Combe. I must say that I was impressed to hear of the achievements of this person in many respects. As the Premier pointed out, he was not only a top Australian rules player but also a top soccer player, which is a pretty unique combination. His military service was outstanding and was acknowledged, as has just been pointed out, by the awarding of a very high medal of honour.

Mr Combe was greatly respected in the returned services community and he was a distinguished member of the Freemasons. For those who did not attend the funeral, an impressive account of his life was given by a very elderly gentleman. I must say that if I am half as good as that particular gentleman, at whatever his age would be, say, 80 or 90, recounting for, say, 25 to 30 minutes the life of someone without detailed notes, I will be more than happy. It was a great honour to be at that funeral.

Obviously, Gordon Combe was held in great respect by members of this parliament. Many former members were in attendance, and they all paid tribute to Gordon Combe as an excellent Clerk, a fair-minded person, a gentleman and someone who, in his lifetime, wrote at least two books, both, I believe, relating to parliamentary practice and the law. I think that, by any assessment, he was an outstanding individual, and I regret that I did not know him personally. I extend my condolences to his family and record his service to the community and to the parliament as someone of outstanding calibre who deserves to be recognised not only by the parliament but also by the state as a whole.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I think that I am the only member in the chamber who served in this house when Mr Combe was the Clerk. When I first became a member of parliament, I greatly appreciated the wise counsel, guidance and the explanations of the procedures and the history of this institution that Mr Combe gave to me. He was a person who believed in the institution. He was a great supporter of the traditions of this parliament and he served it very well. I think that this parliament is a lot better place because of the wise counsel given to it by the late Gordon Combe.

Also, in the past I have come in contact with some of my constituents who served with and under him during his time as an officer in the military during the Second World War. They all spoke highly of him, believed that he was an outstanding leader, gave great service and had a kind regard for all those who served under him. I would like to join other

members of this house in passing on my condolences to his family. They can be very proud of the contribution that Mr Combe has made to this state in the various high positions he has held. I am sure that when the history of this place is written in the future his wise counsel will be remembered. This place is a lot better having had the service of Gordon Combe.

**The SPEAKER:** I join with the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Fisher and the father of the parliament, the member for Stuart, in offering my condolences to the family of the late Gordon Combe, former Clerk of this parliament. He was a man who gave distinguished service in every endeavour upon which he embarked. Most striking to me was his Military Cross, although that was not how I came to know him. Having met him it was because he evoked such respect that I was curious to know his background and discovered that. It is a mark of people who decide to join Freemasonry that distinguishes the sort of commitment they give and the service they then deliver in everything and anything they do that makes it easy for me to understand why he sought to join the fraternity.

This house enjoyed the services of a man so thorough and determined that he was seen upon retirement to be so valuable as to be sought by the government to become this state's first ombudsman. Others have drawn attention to that fact. I think this house has been served well for many years by its Clerks, and Gordon Combe perhaps most outstanding amongst them. I ask all members to join me in passing the motion by standing in their places in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

#### MITCHELL, Mr G.D.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier):** I move:

That this house places on record its appreciation of the services rendered to it by the former Clerk of the House of Assembly, Mr G.D. Mitchell.

I am delighted to move this motion of thanks to Geof Mitchell. Geof Mitchell spent 30 years in the service of the House of Assembly and in the service of this parliament. After eight years with the Commonwealth Public Service, Geof joined the house in 1972 as Second Clerk Assistant (now called Clerk Assistant). In February 1977 he became Deputy Clerk and Sergeant-at-Arms, and on 30 June 1979 he was appointed Clerk of the House of Assembly.

Just a few moments ago when the house was debating the condolence motion for Gordon Combe, I think it reminded us all of how dependent we are upon the staff of this parliament, particularly the professionalism of its Clerk. Being a Clerk of the House of Assembly from 1979 until recently must have been an extraordinarily difficult job. I first got to know Geof when I worked as an adviser to Don Dunstan, and I was down in this place from 1977 onwards. However, when members think about the changes that occurred during the time of Geof's tenure as Clerk, they can only marvel at those changes.

We have gone from Speakers such as Gil Langley right through to Bruce Eastick, John Trainer, Norm Peterson, Terry McRae, the member for Stuart, John Oswald and our present Speaker. We have had all those Speakers, with their different styles, different manners and different ways of doing things but, at the same time, only one Clerk who had not only to work with them in a professional way but also to work in a

bipartisan and non-partisan way with the rest of us. Some members believe that an essential ingredient for going into politics, apart from, some might say, paranoia, is a slight tendency towards narcissism and ego; and Geof has survived and outlived and handled the competing egos of all members of parliament, not just the Speakers but also the Premiers and Leaders of the Opposition.

We owe Geof Mitchell an extraordinary debt. Of course, the parliament has changed massively during that time. It used to be the number of kegs that were disposed of in the parliamentary bar during a week, with massive sessions going right through the night, to this new technological and professional age. Geof has used his experience in terms of the running of the parliament, the standing orders, the precedents, Erskine May, and adviser to us all, to manage that transition between an old style of doing things and this new technological age and the upgrade of the parliament over that time.

As I mentioned earlier today when talking about Gordon Combe, we in this house rely heavily on the Clerk and his staff. They guide us and act in an impartial and independent manner on matters of parliamentary procedure. Often they are put to the test on many occasions on issues of contention, so they are often at the vortex or sharp end of controversy. That is why it is a job that requires not only the highest levels of integrity and professionalism but also, I would suggest, infinite patience. We rely on the Clerks' knowledge of standing orders and parliamentary procedures to do our job. That is often clear to us all.

I am sure that many members of parliament over the years have gone through long-time tenure in this parliament without reading the standing orders. We acknowledge our debt of gratitude to Geof. The 11 July marked his official retirement from the house: I am sure it had nothing to do with the budget delivered on that day. I understand he is now very happy in retirement focusing on one of his passions, namely, flower growing. Geof grows lilies and has embarked on a new venture called Mount Lofty Flowers. I hope it is a successful and happy new career; tending to flowers, allowing 1 000 blooms to grow with careful green fingers, must be somewhat analogous—although I am not quite sure—with managing this house. I hope it is a successful career. I know that Geof will continue his active life as a member of the Hills community. He is a member of the Norton Summit Primary School Council and a board member of Kalyra Aged Care Services in Belair. We thank you, Geof, for your professionalism, good humour and, most of all, good advice.

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition):** It certainly gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the Premier's comments of appreciation for Geof Mitchell. Geof was a career public servant, serving with the Commonwealth Public Service from 1964 to 1972. He joined the South Australian House of Assembly in the capacity of Second Clerk Assistant but became the Clerk of the House of Assembly on 30 June 1979. As the Premier said, he officially retired from that position on 11 July.

I put on the record my appreciation, and that of many others, for the amount of assistance Geof and his staff have given to us all when we first came into this place and then on an ongoing basis—because some are slower learners than others. I got to know Geof quite well over the years, but particularly when I became leader of the house in 1998. I always found Geof to be extremely helpful in assisting us all to understand what sometimes are intricate dealings within the house. All our dealings with him have been professional,

helpful and committed, but done in a friendly manner, ensuring that members were assisted in performing their duties, particularly within the parliament.

Geof is the third longest serving Clerk in the South Australian House of Assembly. At the time of announcing his retirement, he was the longest serving Clerk in Australia. That is a credit to him in this day and age, when people do not stay in jobs for as long as they used to, and it is far more difficult than it was in the past. Whilst retiring from the position, as the Premier said, Geof intends, I am told, to remain active in the Adelaide Hills. His being on the board of the Kalyra Aged Care Services and his membership with the Norton Summit Primary School council will see Geof continue to make a contribution to this community. Like the Premier, I wish him well with the flower growing. I can see absolutely no comparison between doing that and dealing with people in this house. The word 'pansy' comes to mind in a couple of places, but I cannot see a great comparison. He is really moving into another field, and I wish Geof all the best—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.G. KERIN:**—tall poppy, yes—in the future. On behalf of my colleagues, Geof, I wish you a long career in your new endeavours. Thank you very much for the assistance you have given us all.

**The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart):** I wish to support the motion moved by the Premier. I have been here during the whole of Geof's service in this parliament, and I have benefited from his wise counsel, his knowledge of the standing orders and his experience in dealing with difficult situations. As you know, Mr Speaker, from time to time members in this place have the unique ability to create awkward situations, both in and outside this chamber. Those of us who have had the privilege of sitting in the Speaker's chair sometimes need a little assistance and guidance to ensure that we progress the business of this house and the operation of this institution in an orderly, fair and effective way. One day—if the libel laws let me—I may tell some stories. However, on this occasion it is neither desirable nor appropriate.

Geof was a great help to me, and I know to many members. I sincerely hope that his retirement is happy and long, and that he enjoys his time in the Adelaide Hills. I want sincerely to thank him for his contribution to the South Australian parliament in the many areas in which he has served. He is well known and recognised in parliaments around the world. I know that they have appreciated the knowledge they have gained from Geof's visit to many of those parliaments. I am sure that Geof has many happy memories of those visits and his time in this chamber. I want again to thank him for his support and the assistance he has provided me. I hope the rest of his active life is fruitful for him and his family.

**The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher):** I would like briefly to acknowledge the services of our former Clerk. I pay tribute not only to our former Clerk but also to any Clerk. If they do not eventually suffer from industrial deafness—because people in the chair like me tend to bellow and then on comes the amplification system and propels them onto North Terrace—they probably suffer from other things, because they are always at the beck and call of members. They have to be impartial.

On the positive side, they would be the repositories of great wisdom, because, listening to the debate in here for many years, they would have had to accumulate a lot of wisdom and knowledge on a range of subjects. Mr Speaker, if you believe that, you will believe anything! To describe Geof Mitchell as a professional would be the most appropriate term to use. He was always professional, fair-minded and carried out his duties in an exemplary way. I wish him all the best in whatever he chooses to do in the future. I would like to ensure that he receives regular copies of *Hansard* to remind him of what he is missing in his retirement. I wish Geof well and thank him for his service to this parliament.

**Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson):** It is a pleasure to rise and support this motion on the retirement of Geof Mitchell as Clerk of the House of Assembly. I will be very brief; like any member, I could talk for a long time about the way I appreciate Mr Mitchell's commitment to us all. When it comes to staff throughout the parliament, there is an ethos of professionalism, commitment and a duty of care. There is also the care that staff show members of parliament—often the staff would show us more care than we them. That professionalism—that ethos—has to filter through from those people who have had leadership positions over a period of time.

Of course, in our house, I congratulate Geof Mitchell, the Clerk heading up that professionalism on the way in which he developed and nurtured it over a period of time. I know that things augur well for the future with whoever may have the privilege of being the Clerk of the House of Assembly (or indeed holding any senior position there), and I believe that it is a privilege because it is a responsible position. The community probably does not understand the workings of it, I am sure. You can be in this house for a long time and still not know all about this house. However, if one needed to know something it was always just a matter of going to Geof Mitchell and getting an answer. If one was a new member, it could be quite intimidating at times, even though one received support from one's own colleagues. Geof Mitchell was able to assist us there.

I can recall Geof's doing that when I first came into this place in 1993. Then when you have an opportunity to be a minister, you again have to learn a whole lot. At times, there are issues that you forget or do not understand. You could always go to Geof Mitchell and quickly get the right answer, and you would know that you would look professional yourself as a member of parliament.

Of course, mention was made of sitting hours. However, we forget that, when we are sitting—and even when we leave this house—senior members who are responsible for the management of this house are here for many hours after we, and they are also here again very early in the morning. Geof, I am sure that you will be used to getting up early to tend the flowers and get to markets. You will also be nurturing those flowers late at night.

I must also congratulate you on being one of the few people I have seen who has been able to make a decision to change career path at what I see as the right time; some people hang on forever. These days you have an opportunity to be able to take on different career paths. I hope this one will be financially successful for you, Geof. However, being a farmer myself, I know that, no matter what else you have done in life, when you can get out there in the real world, with the environment around you and you can get your hands dirty, that is what life really is all about. I hope that Geof Mitchell can do that for a very long time in the future. He

should enjoy the Adelaide Hills, as well as the Fleurieu Peninsula, the electorate of Mawson. Yes, they do make some nice white wines in the Adelaide Hills. However, knowing that Geof likes a good, bold, gutsy red shiraz, he is welcome to come to the electorate of McLaren Vale, just over the hill from him. If I see Mr Mitchell in the area, I would love to have a drink with him. In future, any member who sees him should buy him a drink for the commitment he has made to us over a long period of time. I wish him all the best and congratulate him on being an exceptionally professional Clerk of the House of Assembly in South Australia.

**Mr HANNA (Mitchell):** I rise to support the Premier's motion to place on record the appreciation of the services rendered by the former Clerk, Mr Geof Mitchell. Is it not extraordinary that in the 21st century we give the title Clerk to the person who manages the administrative business of this chamber to support our work? Going back a few hundred years, somebody who was a Clerk—a clerical person—would have been a particularly well educated and learned person in English society. I make the reference to English society, because of course we draw our traditions, customs and still our parliamentary language from the Westminster tradition.

These days, although anyone who works in an office could be called a clerical worker, we still retain that title of Clerk for the person who manages so much of the administration in this building. There are other parliaments that give other titles—such as 'executive officer' or 'manager'—to the Clerk and, in fact, I think that is more appropriate.

Members here well know that so much of what goes on in this building is, unfortunately, the subject of trivial pursuits, bickering and petty politicking, not only among the members of parliament but also throughout the building. This is the scenario with which Geof Mitchell has had to contend and has had to rise above. It has been his duty, not only in this chamber but also in the building as a whole, to make order out of the chaos and to manage the competing interests. I say this in respect of a workplace that is probably the very last place to be reformed, to be dragged into the 20th century, let alone the 21st century. From what I have seen over the last five years, the staff here are not particularly well treated or looked after in some respects, and it has needed the leadership of the Clerk to pull people together and get them working cooperatively when, in many cases, the conditions that people have to put up with here are nothing like one would experience anywhere else in the work force. I commend the Clerk for having done a good job in rising above all that.

I wanted particularly to pay tribute to Geof Mitchell, who spent 23 years as Clerk, because I worked with him, and others, on the select committee inquiring into the procedures of the parliament, which deliberated last year. The Clerk at the time, Mr Mitchell, served as secretary to that committee, and I was a member of the committee. I was then (and still am) quite passionate about reforming the procedures of the parliament. I was deeply impressed by the advice and knowledge of Geof Mitchell in his contribution as Clerk and as adviser to that committee. It is a matter of regret that it is yet another body which was reviewing the procedures of this place which has been shunted off to gather dust on the shelves. The committee delivered an interim report, and that was the last we heard of it. I am sorry about that, but I would like Geof Mitchell (who is present in the gallery today) to know that there are people who will pick up the work of

dragging this place into the 21st century, and that particular report is something that I will be attempting to revive so that the good work that he put in on that committee will not be lost forever but, in fact, may be the foundation for some improvements to the way in which we do things in this place.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland):** I also rise to support this motion. As a member of parliament coming into this place in the first instance, I certainly had no idea of the range of work which was involved, which was carried out and completed and initiated through the system of Clerks in our houses of parliament. When I came here in the first instance, I was told, almost within the first week that I appeared in this house, that I should look out for the most powerful man in the parliament, and I was advised that that was the Clerk of the House of Assembly. I have reason to believe that, in many cases, that is quite true. Certainly, systemic problems have occurred throughout the systems of government in many countries in the world, and it is very interesting to be part of the workings and to see the range of complexities that Clerks and other staff members need to deal with.

I found our Clerk, Geof Mitchell, to be most approachable. He made himself available to me in most instances when I required some assistance and sought the fount of knowledge that he carried at that time. However, one of the problems we had with that particular Clerk seemed to be a problem of microphones and petitions. I could never work out whether it was merely because our microphone system in this house was at fault or whether Mr Mitchell was trying to get us all to stop talking so that we would listen to what he was reading from the petitions.

The secrets of standing orders are also something that members of this house probably wander through very slowly in their first weeks and months in the parliament.

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** No.

**The Hon. D.C. KOTZ:** Unless, of course, one is like the Attorney-General (who is sitting in the house at the moment), who claims that, almost instantaneously, if not before he came in, he knew all about standing orders. However, not all of us fit that bill, and Mr Mitchell was, again, in a position where he could assist all new members of parliament. I know that certain processes have changed over the years to enable new members to be more informed about the processes of parliament and the nature of the papers and documents, and the manner in which we handle them in this place.

I record my appreciation of the service provided by Geof Mitchell, which I do not believe has been surpassed by any other person in this place in terms of that type of assistance. I must admit that, knowing that we are not allowed to mention the fact that someone is sitting in the gallery but knowing that that is in fact the case, I am intrigued by the fact that the retired Clerk, in his flower-growing capacity, is also a member of the board of the Norton Summit Primary School. I think that that is extremely commendable. I just wonder whether the members of that board have become accustomed to the manner in which the ex-Clerk of the House of Assembly may, in fact, deal with the considerations of that board. However, I am sure that he will keep them in good accord with its constitution.

I wish Mr Mitchell all the best, and I certainly wish him all the very best in his endeavour to establish a new business. It sounds to me as though it is one that is soul-replenishing, after his having spent so many years in a place such as this which, in some instances, can become soul-destroying. I

record with true sincerity my appreciation to Mr Geof Mitchell.

**Mr MEIER (Goyder):** I am also pleased to speak in favour of this motion. I am pleased that the house has the opportunity to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered by Geof Mitchell, as the former Clerk of the house. I guess I particularly got to know Geof when I became government Whip just over eight years ago, because it was at that stage that I really needed to have some understanding of standing orders—particularly during private members' time—and I certainly leant on Geof, to a large extent.

However, that was not the first time that I had come across Geof. Obviously, he had helped me through those early years of my parliamentary career, but even before that I knew Geof as Captain Mitchell in the Adelaide University Regiment, because I also served in that regiment. We did not know each other that well—probably because I was a private for many of those years. It was only in the latter years that I became an officer, whereas I think Geof had been a captain, it seemed, forever. That may not be correct, but he certainly had gone through the ranks faster than I had.

When I came into this house, it was interesting that Geof also reminded me about get-togethers of Adelaide University Regiment. He certainly had that very much at heart—perhaps much more so than I had. I thought at the time that part of the military training was reflected in Geof's way of conducting things in this house. In saying that, I mean that he was very much a stickler for getting things correct, for making sure that the procedures were correct, and I would say (and I think I say it in a very positive sense) that he was tough and that he was a no-nonsense Clerk.

I will cite an example or two. Coming back to private members' time, whilst I relied on Geof's advice so much, the time came when I decided that I probably knew how things could or should run. I well remember saying on one or two occasions, 'Right. We're not going to have that occur; we'll suspend standing orders and have that brought up.' So I checked with Geof, but he said, 'You can't do that.' I said, 'Why not? I thought you could do anything by suspending standing orders.' He said, 'Well, strictly, you can, but you have to follow precedent. We have traditions in this house. Do you realise the implications if you decide you're going to suspend standing orders and literally bring in a new precedent?' I must admit that he convinced me. It has stood this house in very good stead to have traditions and precedents that you can follow rather than saying, 'Blow what's happened in the past; let's create a new lot of precedents'—and I thank Geof very much for his advice. At times he must have wondered whether I was trying to take things on my shoulders too much, but at least he held very wise counsel in that respect.

I got to know Geof a little more personally when he accompanied the then Opposition Whip, Murray De Laine, and me, as the Government Whip, to a CPA conference in the Cook Islands. The press really ripped into us about that for some time afterwards. However, that conference was very useful, and I still remember some of the things that came out of it.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**Mr MEIER:** Time won't allow me to do that. During that time I got to see another side of Geof. He has a great sense of humour. Whilst I saw the resoluteness, toughness and no nonsense side of him here, he could relax and at the same time give very positive advice. He helped both Murray and

me with our questions at the conference, and we both made contributions there as well. When I sought to visit the other parliaments of Australia after becoming the Government Whip, I was able to make contact with the different Whips, and Geof gave me good advice on contacting certain persons within the parliament, particularly Clerks and Deputy Clerks, and also other people. He said, 'While you're there, it wouldn't hurt to touch base with so-and-so.' Again, I appreciated that advice; I am sure that it helped me to work my way through the various activities that I had to undertake as Government Whip.

It is great that now Geof is able to spend so much time on his love of Mount Lofty flowers. I vaguely recall when I first learnt that Geof grew flowers. I think it was the time when I went into my PA Lesley's office and there were these beautiful (I have now learnt) lilioms. 'Good grief,' I said, 'Who gave you those?' She said, 'Geof Mitchell.' I said, 'Mmm, isn't that nice,' and she said, 'He's given you some as well.' I said, 'Thank you very much, but why would Geof Mitchell give you those?' She said, 'Because he grows them.' I said, 'Geof Mitchell grows flowers!' This tough, no-nonsense, resolute person certainly has another side to his character. It is great to see him take so much pleasure and pride in his hobby.

I endorse the comments of members that Geof has given very distinguished service to the parliament over many years, and we thank him for that. He has certainly conducted himself in a very professional manner throughout that time, and I wish him all the very best in his future activities in his so-called retirement.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**The SPEAKER:** Can I say how much I heartily endorse those remarks. I join with all members in wishing Geof relief or release—or whatever it is—because to be Clerk, as most of you have alluded if not stated, is to be engaged in managing hell on earth. In fact, I am reminded that Geof was in the chamber—if not as Clerk certainly as someone serving at the table—when a wag from the opposition decided to bring to the chamber a measure of what he thought might be levity. Levity can be defined in different ways. The Speaker was the butt of the joke, as I recall, when one or two of the members of the opposition conspired to leave the chamber together and, with the assistance of a cigarette lighter, touched the wick of what might be called a penny bomb and lobbed it under the Speaker's chair whilst his attention was distracted to the other side of the chamber on some matter which a member of the government was addressing. You can imagine the shock that not only the Speaker but also the table officers got from the report that followed. I am not absolutely sure exactly when or whom, but the member for Stuart would probably be able to reveal that.

**The Hon. G.M. Gunn:** Yes, I can.

**The SPEAKER:** That's probably as close as we have got to Guy Fawkes, I am sure. In his time, Geof has done something of great substance for the benefit of the parliament and good government as provided through the institution of parliament. Members will probably know that it was Geof who in 1980 saw in the estimates committee system for examination of the budget, so that we no longer debate the lines of the budget as though they were separate clauses of a bill; rather, we seek information about the reasons for the appropriations in the estimates committees. That has continued to be refined over the intervening 22 year period. Of course, that came fairly shortly after Geof became Clerk.

During his term as Clerk of the chamber, there have been several reviews of standing orders and parliamentary reform, the most recent of which has been the subject of a select committee to which the member for Mitchell alluded. The most notable of the standing orders reviews from my point of view is the introduction of the version that we now have called 'the plain English version' and the subsequent amendments that we have made to it which provide greater opportunities for private members' business, which I believe to be very important. The present standing orders are easier for us to understand and incorporate the ideas governing our conduct in simpler statements than was the case previously.

There was also the development of the standing committees system in 1991 (just 11 years ago) and the expansion of that system in 1994. As some members have pointed out, Geof was also the Honorary Secretary of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association for 20-odd years. Through that medium he has contributed enormously to the understanding which Clerks and Presiding Officers in other parliaments have about the institution of parliament so that they may either adopt or adapt (or both) in their parliaments the things that we have done that seem to work for us.

Another headache for anybody would have been the changeover from using slates to using pens with nibs and ink. In this case, I am referring to Geof's oversight of the introduction of the computer network in the parliament incorporating access to both the internet and the intranet, which is of great benefit to those of us who know how to use it. I confess that I do not know how to use it as well as many others; however, I am keen about the notion that we have made the change. It ensures that we do not lose essential pieces of paper, as it were, and keep an accurate record of things as they happen. Also, we can rapidly exchange information within this building and between this building and our electorate offices very efficiently—and we have Geof and the people who helped him to thank for that.

Someone has mentioned, and I too wish to mention, the fact that during his term, for better or for worse, there was no Speaker who served for more than the one term. And for 23 years, to hold the office of Clerk and to assist a new Speaker every time an election is held, to take the role and responsibility that that office entails, and to do it maintaining the consistency which we have in our parliament, is no mean feat, especially given the diversity of the characters there have been in this chair during that time; and, by making such a remark, I do not make any adverse reflections on any of them.

Indeed, I commend Geof for making them into people who could be and are respected not only by those of us who are here as members but also by other parliaments whenever they accompanied him in conference settings contemplating the way in which the institution of parliament and its ancient privileges and precedents are evolving.

It would not be appropriate for me to invite you all to stand and pass this motion in silence. That is indeed not what we would be about but, instead of that, we wish to see Geof in these precincts often and long. I invite you all to join me now in passing the motion with acclamation.

Motion carried.

**CORNWALL, Dr J.**

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

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** Yesterday, the member for Bragg again asserted that I misled the parliament in relation to the case of Rowan v Cornwall and Others, in that last week I informed the house that Justice DeBelle did not find Dr John Cornwall jointly and severally liable for defamation. That statement was incorrect and thus misled the house. The member for Bragg said:

I note the obvious and clear omission of any apology to me or this house following previous questions which were raised about the 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.

The member for Bragg is trying to simplify matters that are not in fact simple. As I have informed the parliament, my statement last week was based on advice provided to me by the Crown Solicitor. This advice was prepared on the basis of the content of the decision, the media summary prepared by His Honour and His Honour's draft minutes of order which were provided to the parties by His Honour on 21 June 2001 when the judgment was delivered.

The draft minutes dealt with how the plaintiff was to be paid the damages awarded to her. The draft minutes referred to Dr Cornwall only in relation to the \$25 000 exemplary damages awarded to the plaintiff. The orders in the draft minutes that dealt with the damages of \$225 000, and interest on that sum, referred not to Dr Cornwall but only to the defamation defendants.

The media summary published by His Honour referred to the defamation claim against three groups of defendants. They were:

1. Members of the review committee and the consultant;
2. The ABC;
3. TVB.

The media summary says that the plaintiff was awarded \$225 000 damages to be borne especially by these three groups of defendants. There was confusion between the defendants about the effect of the judgment. The confusion was not only in relation to the responsibility of Dr Cornwall but also to the effect of the judgment as between the defamation defendants. One defendant's lawyer asserted that Dr Cornwall was jointly responsible for the payment of the damages award of \$225 000. The other three (including the Crown Solicitor) did not share that view.

I refer to the transcript of the hearing on 12 July 2002 and note that when the issue of apportionment as between the defamation defendants was raised at the hearing His Honour said:

My intent was to say that—although I have obviously not said it—my intent was that each of the defamation defendants, if I could lump them all together in that way, would jointly and severally be liable for the order.

Then counsel for TVB said:

I do not think that is necessarily how it has been understood by some of the people at the bar table.

His Honour later said:

My intention was—and I have obviously very badly stated it—that the defamation defendants were jointly and severally liable for the award.

His Honour was referring there to the non-economic loss. His Honour then went on to say that there was also a joint and several liability of Dr Cornwall for that sum. It was not until this stage of the hearing that the position was clarified.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### VETERINARY PRACTICE, COUNTRY

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett):** I would like to speak on a matter of great importance to the people of South Australia and Australia but, particularly, rural South Australia, and that is the future of country veterinary practice. Members on both sides of this house, and all South Australians, I hope, are acutely aware of the value to the South Australian economy of the rural economy.

One has only to look in the budget papers to see the billions of dollars that the South Australian economy receives from the rural sector. Beef, sheep, pigs, dairying, goats, alpacas and aquaculture all form part of the livestock industries. It is so important that the people of South Australia recognise how vital this part of our state and regional economy is. If we do not protect the livestock and the associated activities in regional and rural economies, South Australia will rue the day. Not only do we have the rural industries to protect but we also have, in the livestock area, racing—thoroughbreds and standardbreds. In the rural and regional households, we also have the dogs, cats and pets of the regional people to look after.

I talk about all animals, large and small, because it is the country veterinarians who look after them. Country veterinarians are there 24 hours a day, seven days a week. I have been there and done that, 24/7! They are longer hours than you will ever work in parliament. When you are in parliament, you do not get a 2 a.m. telephone call from a distressed owner of a dog that is about to whelp, then have to get up at 6 o'clock in the morning to calve a cow, then go out at 8 o'clock at night to the horse that has gone through a fence. You are doing this 365 days a year.

I remember one day I had a call at 5.30 a.m. for a dog that was experiencing difficulties having pups; and it was Christmas Day. Later that morning it was a horse going through a fence; and, later that afternoon, a cow calving. Sitting down to Christmas dinner with your family and friends, and what happens? You have another call to go out to, but you do it. You are a true professional. The South Australian population should never forget what they owe to country veterinarians.

The problem is that our country veterinarians are getting older and are finding it very difficult to find replacements. It is now almost impossible to get somebody to work in a country veterinary practice. The returns for country practice, indeed the returns for the veterinary practice in general, are nothing like people expect or perceive. A first year graduate of vet school, after five years of hard slog, doing far more pharmacology, biology, anatomy, physiology than any medical practitioner will do has a lot to offer.

When they go out there, what do they get in return? A measly \$37 000 is the recommended starting wage. Would members work 24 hours a day seven days a week being on call, at the beck and call of the whole of the community they are serving? It is important that we recognise the value of country vets. How are we going to overcome the potential shortage of country vets in the future? I would like to see us go back to the practice of the past when we offered cadetships for vet students. We paid for vet students to go to university to study, paid their expenses and then, in return, they came back and were bonded to the Agriculture Department, as it then was, for periods of up to five years.

People say, 'They'll come and do that but they're fresh out of vet school so they can't do much,' but I guarantee that when you are out in practice you learn more in the first six months than you probably do in five years of vet school in how to deal with situations you are faced with. You learn very quickly. People recognise the fact that you are there to help and they appreciate it. After six months you would be surprised how much you can contribute to the practice and to the community. Unfortunately, you cannot work for more than four or five years flat out like that. I know of some vets who have been working for 15 to 20 years like that. I know of vets who have committed suicide because of the pressures. I know of vets who have had divorces because of the pressures.

Time expired.

### INSURANCE, MEDICAL

**Mr RAU (Enfield):** I always seem to be following or preceding the member for Morphet, and I would like to congratulate him: I have enjoyed his contribution today more than any other because he slowed it down a bit and I caught all of it! I know that people in *Hansard* have had similar difficulty. He has so much to tell us, so much information—I remember we had the big bang not so long ago in relation to the radioactivity debate that we were having—but it is marvellous actually to hear everything he has to say, so I am very pleased. I enjoyed that. What I want to talk about today is the question of insurance. I know that I have raised this matter before but I cannot help myself: I keep coming back to it.

*Mr Caica interjecting:*

**Mr RAU:** It's a recurring nightmare: exactly. In particular, today I would like to talk about medical insurance and some of the hysterical reports in the paper about medical negligence costs. The parliament has been considering a number of legislative changes that will affect compensation in this area, and I think we are moving in the right direction, as I have already said. I know that the Treasurer introduced a range of measures into parliament the other day. But the matter that I wanted particularly to address today is something that was the subject of discussion on Radio National the other morning, something that from my own personal and professional experience I can speak of with some knowledge, and that is the way in which doctors and medical institutions handle complaints.

In particular, I think it is important for the parliament to understand that, primarily, what most people who have a problem in the nature of what we call medical negligence or an unsatisfactory outcome are looking for is usually not compensation. I repeat that: they are usually not starting off looking for compensation. What they are looking for initially, surprising as it might seem to some people, is an apology. They are looking for an admission of wrongdoing on the part of the doctor or the institution. They are looking for someone to come up to them and say, with some degree of sincerity, 'I'm sorry this has happened to you: it was an unacceptable lapse in our procedures. Because of what has happened, you have suffered this problem, but we want you to understand that we have conducted an inquiry into it. We have now identified where it is in our system that there is a failing. We are addressing that failing and, although you have suffered this unsatisfactory outcome, we assure you that in the future, because of your reporting of this unsatisfactory outcome and

because of the investigation that it has provoked, other people'—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**Mr RAU:** As the member for West Torrens says, it will not happen again: other people will not be placed in the same position. In order to make this sort of resolution of these medical negligence cases easier—it will not solve all of them but it will solve many of them—this parliament should consider making some amendment, probably to the Wrongs Act, to provide for the fact that, where an apology is made by a medical practitioner or a hospital in relation to the provision of a medical service, the mere fact of that apology being made cannot be used against that institution one way or the other in relation to any proceedings that might arise.

One of the arguments that the institutions raise is, 'If we apologise to these people, the next thing we know is that that will be something we wind up having to wear in court.' Whether or not there is any value to that is debatable from a legal point of view but, just to remove that problem and to ensure that not so many people wind up litigating these cases, it is important that this parliament does everything it can to ensure that people involved in these cases get an opportunity, first, to have a proper and sincere apology from the people involved in the mistreatment; secondly, to ensure that there is a proper explanation of what has gone wrong; and, thirdly, to ensure that review procedures are established so as to ensure that individuals who experience this sort of unsatisfactory outcome can leave, safe in the knowledge that other people will not suffer the same problems they have because the cause of the problem has been identified, the cause of the problem has been rectified and the negligence or the unsatisfactory outcome that they have had should not be repeated.

I could tell the parliament many examples of where individuals have told me that what they were always looking for was an apology and an explanation.

### INSURANCE, INDEMNITY

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light):** I want to raise a couple of issues today. One is insurance, which the member for Enfield has just been talking about, but this is insurance of a different kind, that is, the indemnity insurance that many sporting clubs and social clubs are currently facing. The issue that I want to raise today involves the Gawler BMX Club, which has had to cease operation because it cannot get indemnity insurance to cover it for any accident that may occur to any of the riders or people associated with it while the club is undertaking its meetings on Sunday morning.

That is particularly disappointing because a large number of young people undertake this activity, and they were advised at the annual general meeting that the club would not be able to continue because of this issue. Through no fault of their own they are now left without a club structure to be able to undertake BMX competition and practice on that site. They can, of course, go there as individuals and ride on the site, but the club cannot continue to operate. I have raised this matter with the Treasurer in writing and he has advised me that he is looking into it. He has advised me that one way in which they may be able to get some cover is if they can obtain it through the Local Government Association. I have forwarded that information to them. I think that, if local government put any money towards the operations of the club or the maintenance of the circuit, they then may be able to get in through that particular insurance cover, and apparently that one is very good. I thank the Treasurer for that and will wait and see

what other advice he might be able to give them that may see them back in operation.

An issue that I raised yesterday in my budget speech is that of the capital works funding for Smithfield Plains High School. I was extremely concerned that funding of some \$940 000-odd, which had been allocated in the previous (Liberal) government's budget, was not identified in the budget papers and, as a result, may not be forthcoming. I rang the principal yesterday to try to confirm whether or not they had been advised that it would be still on the list, and she spent considerable time yesterday investigating that. She has advised me this morning (and I am very pleased) that it is still on the list. That is excellent, because it is a school that is in dire need of support. This particular capital works program will be a real incentive to that school, so I am very pleased to correct my statement of yesterday that it had been taken off the list, or that money was not forthcoming. It is in the capital works budget, but it was not listed in the budget papers, so I am very pleased to say that that is continuing.

I want to raise the issue of Gomersal Road. The original estimates of the number of vehicles using this road are being far exceeded. More than 3 000 vehicles a day are using it. It just bears out the fact that I, as the local member, and also the Minister for Transport, had said that this is a vital link to the Barossa Valley. It has taken a large amount of transport from the Barossa Valley Way and traffic travelling through Gawler's main street, Murray Street; it is a real advantage for the people of Gawler, who had great difficulty in negotiating their way across the street. Also, the noise factor of semitrailers moving through Murray street made it almost impossible for business houses to conduct their business with the front doors open.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Yes. The member for Unley says that I fought hard for it. Well, I did, as did the member for Schubert, to ensure that that got through. It is good to see that it is being used extensively.

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY:** Yes, it did take us eight years, but we got there. We did convince them in the end. One issue that has arisen from that development is that the finish used on that road was a 14 millimetre stone rather than the seven millimetre stone that was recommended.

**Mr MEIER:** On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I note that there is no minister on the front bench. It has been a longstanding tradition and I hope that the government can address that issue.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am not sure that that is a point of order. It is up to the government to maintain the house.

#### MULVIHILL, SENIOR CONSTABLE J.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** I endorse all the comments made by the member for Enfield. A constituent of mine, whose name and that of the hospital involved I will not reveal, after having partaken in a failed medical experiment, went on to have a medical procedure. Those who conducted that procedure requested her medical information from the hospital in question, and the hospital then gave them all the information they wanted without her knowledge. This is an outrageous breach of her privacy.

My constituent is not after any compensation from the government. This happened about two years ago. All she wants is an apology. She is not after a massive payout for

pain and suffering. She wants an apology and an acknowledgment that it will not happen again. So, I endorse everything that the member for Enfield said. It is not always about the money; it is about making sure that it does not happen to anyone else.

I want to talk about a fine, upstanding citizen who has fought for local residents, and I refer to Senior Constable John Mulvihill. He is heading towards the end of his career in the police force. This officer has been a stalwart of Neighbourhood Watch. He has fought for local residents. He has helped establish Neighbourhood Watch in areas where there has been none. He has brought communities together. He has worked with them, often working with the same people over and again. As many members who attend Neighbourhood Watch meetings would realise, it is the same people over and again who do all the work.

John Mulvihill has inspired these people. He has helped them and carried them through very difficult times of rising crime rates in their suburbs. He has been a voice of reason and calmness, and he has helped these communities to work out action plans to fight crime, to work with the government—both the previous and the current government—on tackling and solving crimes, including graffiti, house breakings, car thefts and general misbehaviour in our suburbs.

John Mulvihill has had a long and bright career in the police force after joining as a young man. He told me he has always benefited from community work. He preferred that to working on the beat. He liked working with citizens and ordinary people and getting results. I commend this officer. He has done an outstanding job. He has worked in many areas, including the cities of West Torrens, Holdfast Bay and Charles Sturt. He deserves this parliament's congratulations. Indeed, when he does retire, I will be inviting him into the house to enable him to hear us speak on a motion congratulating him for his long service. I understand that there are many members who want to congratulate him on the hard work that he has done, because he is a fine, outstanding citizen.

I remember his telling me that during the last federal campaign he was disappointed that some members of parliament used photographs in their electoral material of him working with locals. He was disappointed with that. I was disappointed that Chris Gallus used that type of officer for partisan political point-scoring. This officer is above that sort of thing. I refused to use his photograph in any material because I thought that a person of John Mulvihill's character did not deserve to be put in political broadcasts for my personal use. I think that sort of use was disgraceful. But you would expect that from members opposite—not those in this chamber but their colleagues in another place.

*Mr Brindal interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley will not provoke the member for West Torrens, who needs little provocation at the best of times.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** And, sir, he is out of his place. It is officers like John Mulvihill who have inspired this government to take a tough stance on crime, a tougher stance than the previous government took. We have isolated the police force and quarantined it from any budget cuts. Unlike the government of members opposite, we will recruit against attrition. The former government cannot stand up in this place and say that every year of their 10 years in office they recruited against attrition, because they did not. We will be the only government, since the former Labor government,



that will recruit against attrition, and hopefully increase police numbers in the next budget, if the budget allows.

### ALCOHOL, USE

**Mr SCALZI (Hartley):** Today I wish to bring to the attention of the house some of the promotions with regard to encouraging the irresponsible use of alcohol. We are all aware that the government held a Drugs Summit from 24 to 28 June, and I attended that, as did many other members as delegates. I commend the government for holding the summit and for the recommendations which followed and which have been given to the Social Inclusion Unit; hopefully, something will come out of that.

Many delegates said at the time of the conference that alcohol and tobacco are of major concern as well. About 19 000 Australians die annually as a result of tobacco use. With respect to alcohol, I would like to read from the summary of the Drugs Summit, as follows:

Delegates were also advised that, in terms of health and social costs, legal drugs such as alcohol and tobacco cost the community more than illegal drugs. It is estimated that alcohol and other drug use in South Australia cost the community a minimum of \$1.5 billion in 1992, and of this approximately 9 per cent of the total cost, or \$140.2 million, can be attributed to illegal drugs.

So, really 90 per cent of the cost to society is still associated with legal drugs—tobacco and alcohol. What concerns me most is the way that alcohol is portrayed. If we take the number of motor vehicle accidents involving young males in the 18 to 25 age group, I am sure we would find that alcohol is implicated. Unfortunately, young women are also encouraged to be involved in irresponsible drinking. An article appeared in the *Advertiser* on 13 July headed, 'Young women targeted in cheap drink promotions. Gender benders'. They have, for example, drinking games. The article in the *Advertiser* states:

Typical of discounts offered are:  
 FREE vodka for an hour at P.J. O'Brien's in the city on Thursday nights.  
 FREE vodka cocktails for women on Thursday nights at Shenanigans at Marion.  
 ALL-you-can-drink offers at The Planet on Saturday nights.

There is no question that many young people are lured to these venues to drink because of the cost and, to me, that is totally irresponsible. One proprietor, Chris McDermott, said that 'alcohol promotions were no different to retailers having sales.' Mr McDermott states:

You've got to promote your product and offer a reason for people to come to your store and not the next store whilst it's so competitive.

I believe that is irresponsible. I am not a wowser. I enjoy a drink. In fact, I have enjoyed a glass of wine—or vino—from the age of five or six. In fact, it was not quite a glass: I was taught to drink responsibly. Alcohol should accompany food, not food accompany alcohol. Venues such as those just mentioned are no different from drinking troughs. I remember when I used to sell newspapers and I was really appalled by the 6 o'clock swill—people went into the hotel, drank four or five pints and came out drunk. Sadly, I believe that we still have not learnt. Many young people are drinking spirits, they are encouraged to drink irresponsibly and they are encouraged to be involved in binge drinking.

If we are serious about dealing with the problems associated with drugs we must look at the way in which alcohol is promoted and at how certain venues irresponsibly encourage young people to drink—in this case, young

women—in a way that is detrimental to their health and to society.

Time expired.

### SCHOOLS, KIDMAN PARK PRIMARY

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** Today I want talk about one of the outstanding schools in my electorate, the Kidman Park Primary School. In the week before the school holidays I was privileged to visit the school at Dean Avenue, Kidman Park. Like many of the other schools in my electorate, what impressed me about the Kidman Park Primary School was the obvious commitment and professionalism of the staff and the broader school community toward their school. Again, like some of the other schools, not just in my electorate but in the electorate of other members, the Kidman Park Primary School offers not only a broad curriculum to its students but also a focus on interpretive and interactive learning.

This school, its students and its broader community has a focus on the subcontinent. The school has established an Indian subcontinent village. It has built mud huts on the school premises with the full involvement of the staff, students and their parents. The school has dedicated two classrooms that provide an interactive learning centre that focuses on all aspects of the lives of people who live in India, Sri Lanka and other countries of the subcontinent. In the village gardens the students grow some of the foods and spices from the subcontinent with which most of us are not only familiar but which we certainly enjoy.

I have spoken on this matter on several occasions in this house but, again, I would like to point out the importance of cultural learning centres, such as the village at the Kidman Park Primary School. The importance of such learning centres cannot be overstated. In this day and age, when some governments are certainly guilty of promoting the differences between peoples and of promoting a fear by preying on the lack of understanding of some people towards other cultures, these cultural learning centres provide a connection, an understanding and appreciation, indeed, a love of the cultures different from ours, and that can only be a good thing.

The Kidman Park Primary School is a complex school site. The school also caters for children with severe multiple disabilities on-site in a specifically designed unit. Currently, 18 children are in this unit. Again, like the cultural learning centre, the severe multiple disabilities unit is a major part of the school, that is, it is not cut off from the other components of learning and teaching provided at the Kidman Park Primary School. Indeed, it provides those students without severe disabilities the opportunity of interacting and connecting with children with severe multiple disabilities.

However, not all is well at Kidman Park Primary School. In particular, pressure is currently being felt by the severe multiple disabilities unit at that school given that secondary students with severe multiple disabilities are also in abundance. I understand the reason they are at this school is that there is no secondary unit to which these adult-sized secondary students with severe multiple disabilities can attend. This is placing pressure, as I said, on the Kidman Park Primary School, and it is a matter that the staff and the school community, through its local member, are trying to address.

I believe that ultimately there will be a satisfactory resolution to this problem, and it will be incumbent on our government to ensure that sufficient opportunities exist to place these secondary students with severe multiple disabilities in a secondary unit, not particularly on that site but on

another site. In conclusion, the school (through its principal, Miss Meryl Davidson), the staff, the parents and the school community (through its outstanding Chair, Mr Scott Duval) are to be congratulated on their commitment and professionalism for improving educational outcomes at this truly remarkable school.

**Mrs GERAGHTY:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

## AGRICULTURAL AND VETERINARY PRODUCTS (CONTROL OF USE) BILL

Second reading.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier):**

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.

This Bill was introduced by the former Government and is reintroduced because it commends itself to the present Government as a desirable reform.

This Bill was developed following a review of South Australia's legislation regulating agricultural and veterinary chemicals and stock foods. As a result of the review, the proposed legislation will repeal the *Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955*, *Stock Foods Act 1941* and the *Stock Medicines Act 1939*, and provide a comprehensive legislative framework to regulate the use of agricultural and veterinary chemical products, as well as provide for the regulation of fertilisers and stock foods.

The proposed legislation will operate within the context of the Agvet Code of South Australia (the Agvet Code), which forms part of a national scheme adopted in this State under the *Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (South Australia) Act 1994*. This scheme regulates the manufacture and supply of agricultural and veterinary chemical products through a product evaluation and registration system. The Bill will complement this scheme by dealing with issues relating to the use and disposal of agricultural and veterinary chemicals. To this end, it seeks to manage and reduce the risk of unintended harm to plants, animals, trade, human health and the environment by encouraging the responsible use and disposal of agricultural and veterinary chemical products and fertilisers.

### *General Duty*

Part 2 of the Bill imposes a general duty of care on a person who uses or disposes of agricultural and certain veterinary chemical products and fertilisers. In using or disposing of these products, a person is required to take reasonable care to prevent or minimise harm to the health and safety of human beings and the environment. In the case of agricultural chemical products, the duty extends to preventing or minimising contamination of land, animals and plants (in terms of chemical residues), outside the area intended to be treated with the particular product. In using or disposing of agricultural and veterinary chemical products and fertilisers, a person is required to take appropriate measures such as observing label instructions, giving consideration to prevailing weather conditions and maintaining equipment used for applying the chemical products.

The object of the general duty is to manage the risk of harm by modifying behaviour and encouraging responsible use and disposal of chemical products and fertilisers. Failing to comply with the duty of care therefore does not of itself constitute an offence. Compliance with the duty is instead enforced by the issuing of a compliance order under Part 5 of the Bill, which may, for example, require a person to cease a particular activity, or to take specified action. If a compliance order is not observed, a penalty will apply.

If the use or disposal of an agricultural or veterinary chemical product results in damage to the environment, or adversely affects the safety of food or the health or welfare of members of the community, it is intended that recourse be made to other relevant legislation such as the *Environment Protection Act 1993*, the *Public*

*and Environmental Health Act 1987*, the *Food Act 1985* (and prospectively the *Food Act 2001*) and the *Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986*.

### *Offences*

In order to support the operation of the National Registration Scheme set up under the Agvet Code and administered by the National Registration Authority, Part 3 of the Bill provides for various offences to regulate the use and possession of agricultural and veterinary chemical products. Whether or not a particular chemical product or constituent should be registered under the Agvet Code, involves a thorough evaluation by the National Registration Authority of the possible harmful effects that using or handling the product may have on human beings, plants, animals, trade and commerce and the environment. Once a product is registered, a corresponding label setting out a wide range of information including instructions for its safe use and handling must also be registered. The National Registration Scheme also involves a permit system which will operate in conjunction with the proposed legislation. A permit issued by the Authority may provide for the availability of a particular product (which may or may not be registered), in specified circumstances or under certain conditions and it is intended that such a permit would be recognised under the Bill.

### *Agricultural Chemical Products*

Within the framework of the National Registration Scheme, Division 1 of Part 3 sets out offences relating to the use of agricultural chemical products. A person is prohibited from using or possessing an agricultural chemical product that has not been registered by the National Registration Authority unless the Authority has authorised its use or possession under a permit. If a product is registered, a person must also comply with any mandatory instructions on the label for the product (as prescribed by the regulations).

The Bill also imposes responsibilities on a person carrying on an agricultural business to comply with instructions regarding a withholding period that may apply in relation to the use of an agricultural chemical product. Particular emphasis is given to trade products that are supplied before a relevant withholding period has expired, following application of the chemical product. In this case, the manager must supply the recipient of the trade products with a written notice of the withholding period that applies, the particular chemical product used and when it was last used.

### *Fertilisers*

The Bill seeks to ensure that fertilisers meet prescribed standards and do not contain unacceptable impurities such as heavy metals and that labelling of fertilisers enables informed choice by users.

### *Veterinary Chemicals Products*

In 1999, the Agricultural and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand endorsed a set of nationally agreed principles for the control of veterinary chemical use. The Bill seeks to implement the proposed principles in South Australia.

As with the controls on use of agricultural chemical products, Division 3 of Part 3 of the Bill seeks to control the use of veterinary chemical products within the framework of the National Registration Scheme. The Agvet Code through the registration system, regulates the supply and manufacture of veterinary chemical products. The Code does not, however, cover those products that are prepared by a veterinary surgeon in the course of his or her practice. The Bill provides scope for greater control on the supply and use of substances prepared by veterinary surgeons, and imposes greater responsibilities on veterinary surgeons in terms of the instructions that must be given to non-veterinarians treating trade species animals, particularly in relation to withholding periods.

The Bill also places controls on the manner in which a non-veterinarian may treat a trade species animal with a veterinary chemical product. Where the product is not registered, or is used in a manner that contravenes the label (in the case of registered chemical products), the person must comply with the written instructions of the veterinary surgeon responsible for treating the animal. The Bill also imposes obligations on the person responsible for the management of a trade species animal if the animal or its products are supplied before a relevant withholding period has expired.

### *Regulations*

Further scope for controlling the use of agricultural and veterinary chemical products is provided through the regulations. Under Part 6 of the Bill, the regulations may prescribe conditions to enable the use of particular chemical products to be tailored to take account of particular circumstances and local conditions. The regulations may, for example, restrict the use of a particular chemical product in a specified location—a measure which may be necessary to protect the unique characteristics of that particular area. Or, it may be necessary

to restrict the time of year or season in which a particular chemical product is used. The regulations may also provide for a licensing system, to ensure that people using chemical products have the necessary training or experience.

*Minimising risk to trade*

Part 4 of the Bill provides a further mechanism, in the form of trade protection orders, by which the risk of serious harm to trade arising from the use or disposal of agricultural and veterinary chemical products, may be prevented or reduced. An example of a trade protection order may be to prohibit the harvesting or sale of a particular type of trade product, or to direct the recall or destruction of a particular trade product.

*Stock Foods*

The *Livestock Act 1997* currently contains provisions relating to the feeding of livestock. By amending the *Livestock Act 1997* to provide for regulations that may prescribe standards for stock food and regulate its manufacture, packaging, labelling and supply, the Bill will provide additional means to ensure stock food meets nationally agreed standards.

*Enforcement*

Part 5 of the Bill deals with issues of enforcement, and includes provisions relating to the appointment of authorised officers and their powers. It also provides for the issuing of compliance orders by the Minister for the purpose of securing compliance with a requirement of the Bill.

In summary, the Bill aims to encourage responsible chemical use in the community by providing a clear framework for chemical users. The new legislation will operate within the context of the National Registration Scheme for agricultural and veterinary chemical products and ensure that South Australia meets its obligations for controlling use of these chemical products. The Bill aims to maximise the economic benefits of using agricultural and veterinary chemicals and fertilisers, while managing the risks of such use in terms of threats to market access, public health, non-target organisms and the environment.

I commend this Bill to Honourable Members.

Explanation of clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

*Clause 1: Short title*

*Clause 2: Commencement*

These clauses are formal.

*Clause 3: Interpretation*

This clause sets out the interpretation of certain words and phrases used throughout the measure. Some important definitions include "agricultural chemical product", "trade species animal", "trade species plant", "veterinary product" and "withholding period". Many of the definitions correspond with the definitions used in the AGVET Code.

*Clause 4: Eligible laws for purposes of Agvet Code permits*

This clause sets out the provisions of the Bill that are "eligible laws" for the purposes of the definition of "permit" in *Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (South Australia) Act 1994*.

PART 2

GENERAL DUTY

*Clause 5: General duty*

This clause sets out the duty of care a person has in using or disposing of agricultural chemical products, fertilisers or particular veterinary chemical products. In using these substances a person must take all reasonable and practicable measures to prevent or minimise contamination of animals, plants and land through "spray drift", harm to the health or safety of human beings and unintended harm to the environment. The reference to "contamination" is in terms of chemical residues, and the relevant residue limits for trade species plants and animals are set out in the *Maximum Residue Limits Standard* published by the National Registration Authority.

The clause also sets out the factors that may be relevant in determining whether the duty of care has been complied with. These include the nature of the product used, the weather conditions, the nature of the area surrounding the site where the product is used, whether any equipment used was in good repair, and the terms of a label or permit for a particular product. Failure to comply with the duty of care does not constitute an offence in itself, but may result in the issue of a compliance order.

PART 3

OFFENCES

DIVISION 1—AGRICULTURAL CHEMICAL PRODUCTS

*Clause 6: Use or possession of unregistered agricultural chemical product*

This clause prohibits the possession of an unregistered agricultural chemical product unless the person has a permit issued by the National Registration Authority. There is a defence if the person can show that the product was registered when it came into the person's hands and that no more than four years (or such other period specified by the Minister in the *Gazette*) has elapsed since the product was deregistered. There is a maximum penalty of \$35 000.

*Clause 7: Mandatory instructions on approved label for registered agricultural chemical product*

It is an offence for a person to contravene a mandatory instruction on the label of a registered agricultural chemical product, unless authorised by a permit issued by the National Registration Authority. The maximum penalty is \$35 000.

*Clause 8: Container for agricultural chemical product*

Except where the product is about to be used, an agricultural chemical product must be kept in a suitable container (not a food or drink container) that clearly identifies the product. There is a maximum penalty of \$10 000.

*Clause 9: Responsibilities in relation to withholding periods*

This clause makes it an offence for a person managing or carrying on an agricultural business to contravene instructions on the label of a registered agricultural chemical product regarding a withholding period. Where the agricultural chemical product is used in relation to trade products, and those trade products are supplied before the withholding period expires, the person who carries on or manages the business must give the recipient of the products notice in writing of the withholding period, the chemical product used and the date it was last used. There is a penalty of \$35 000 for an offence against this clause.

DIVISION 2—FERTILISERS

*Clause 10: Standards for fertiliser*

This clause requires that fertiliser must not be supplied by a person unless it is labelled and packaged in accordance with the regulations and meets the standards relating to the level of impurities, composition, quality or manufacture of the fertiliser, as set out in the regulations. Contravening such a regulation can result in a maximum penalty of \$35 000.

DIVISION 3—VETERINARY PRODUCTS

*Clause 11: Supply of prescribed substances prepared by veterinary surgeon*

This clause provides that a person must not supply or have in their possession for supply, a substance prescribed by the regulations that has been prepared by a veterinary surgeon in the course of the veterinary surgeon's practice, unless the person has a permit issued by the National Registration Authority. There is a maximum penalty of \$35 000.

*Clause 12: Treatment of animal with, or possession of, prescribed substance*

This clause provides that a person must not treat an animal, or have in their possession a substance (other than an unregistered veterinary chemical product) prescribed by the regulations, unless that person has a permit issued by the National Registration Authority. There is a maximum penalty of \$35 000.

*Clause 13: Treatment of trade species animal by injection*

Except in accordance with a National Registration Authority permit, a trade species animal must not be injected with a registered veterinary chemical that is only for oral or topical use. The maximum penalty is \$35 000.

*Clause 14: Treatment of trade species animals in unauthorised manner*

This clause makes it an offence for a trade species animal to be treated with a veterinary product in an unauthorised manner (maximum penalty \$35 000). This includes treating animals in the following manner except in accordance with a veterinary surgeon's written instructions or a permit:

- (a) treating the animal in a manner that contravenes a mandatory instruction on the label,
- (b) using an unregistered product (there is a defence if the product was deregistered less than four years ago),
- (c) treating a major food species animal with a product not registered for that particular species,
- (d) treating a minor trade species with a product not registered for that species or a related species.

The veterinary surgeon has an obligation to provide written instructions about the treatment and treatment period to the person apparently in charge of the animal. Failure to do so may result in a maximum penalty of \$10 000.

*Clause 15: Container for prescribed veterinary product*

Unless for immediate use, a prescribed veterinary product must be kept in a suitable container (not a food or drink container) that clearly identifies the product. Maximum penalty is \$10 000.

*Clause 16: Responsibilities of veterinary surgeon in relation to withholding periods*

This clause provides that a veterinary surgeon treating a trade species animal with a veterinary product must provide the person in charge of the animal with written instructions regarding any relevant withholding period including details of the treatment and treatment period and requiring the animal to be readily identifiable. There is a maximum penalty of \$35 000.

*Clause 17: Responsibilities of manager in relation to withholding periods*

A person responsible for the management of a trade species animal treated with a veterinary product resulting in a withholding period for the animal or its products, must ensure that the animal and its products are readily identifiable for the duration of the treatment and the withholding period. If the animal or its products are supplied during the treatment period or the withholding period, the recipient must be given written notice of the treatment and withholding period, the veterinary product used and when it was last used. Non-compliance with this clause may result in a maximum penalty of \$35 000.

#### PART 4

##### TRADE PROTECTION ORDERS

*Clause 18: Trade protection orders*

This clause provides that the Minister may make a trade protection order to prevent or reduce the possibility of serious harm to trade arising from the use or disposal of agricultural and veterinary products. The orders may do a range of things including prohibiting a trade product from being harvested or sold, recalling a trade product that has been sold, prohibiting the carrying on of a particular activity in relation to a trade product or imposing conditions relating to the taking and analysis of samples of a trade product.

*Clause 19: Special provisions relating to recall orders*

A trade protection order that requires the recall and/or disposal of a trade product may also require the disclosure of certain information to the public or other class of persons. A person bound by a recall order is liable for any costs incurred by the Minister in relation to the order.

*Clause 20: Manner of making order*

This clause states that a trade protection order may be in writing addressed and served on particular persons, or it may be addressed to several persons, a class of persons or to all persons, in which case, notice of the order and its terms must be published in an appropriate newspaper. The order is binding on the persons to whom it is addressed and has effect for 90 days unless revoked sooner.

*Clause 21: Compensation if insufficient grounds for order*

If a person believes there were insufficient grounds for making a trade protection order, the person may apply for compensation from the Minister for loss suffered. A person may appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court if dissatisfied with a decision of the Minister to pay, or refuse to pay compensation.

*Clause 22: Failure to comply with order*

A person who contravenes or fails to comply with a trade protection order may be liable for a maximum penalty of \$35 000.

#### PART 5

##### ENFORCEMENT

##### DIVISION 1—AUTHORISED OFFICERS

*Clause 23: Appointment of authorised officers*

The Minister may appoint authorised officers for the purposes of the Act, on such conditions set out in the instrument of appointment.

*Clause 24: Identification of authorised officers*

An authorised officer must have a photo identity card, which should be produced for inspection when the officer is exercising the powers under this Act.

##### DIVISION 2—POWERS OF AUTHORISED OFFICERS

*Clause 25: Powers of authorised officers*

An authorised officer has certain powers in relation to the administration and enforcement of the Act, including entering and inspecting premises (either by consent or under a warrant), requiring a person to answer questions or provide information, copying documents, testing products and equipment, taking samples and collecting evidence. A magistrate may issue a warrant if satisfied it is reasonably necessary for the administration or enforcement of the Act. The warrant must set out when it expires (being not more than seven days after it has been issued), the purpose for which it has been issued and at what time of day or night it may be executed.

*Clause 26: Warrants in urgent circumstances*

A warrant may be issued by telephone, fax or other prescribed means if required urgently. A magistrate issuing such a warrant must inform the officer of its terms, when it expires, what time of day or night it may be executed and the reasons for granting the warrant. The officer must forward a completed form of the warrant in those terms to the magistrate concerned within one day of the warrant's execution or expiry.

*Clause 27: Offence to hinder, etc. authorised officers*

It is an offence for a person to hinder, obstruct, threaten, abuse or otherwise refuse to cooperate with an authorised officer exercising the powers under this Act. Doing so, may result in a maximum penalty of \$5 000.

*Clause 28: Self-incrimination*

This clause provides that a person cannot refuse to answer a question or produce information required by an authorised officer on the basis that the answer or the information might tend to incriminate the person. However, the fact of the production of that information or the answer given by the person is not admissible as evidence against the person in proceedings in which the person might be found guilty of an offence.

*Clause 29: Offences by authorised officers*

It is an offence for an authorised officer to address offensive language to another person or, without lawful authority, to hinder or obstruct or use or threaten to use force in relation to another person in the course of exercising powers under this Act.

##### DIVISION 3—COMPLIANCE ORDERS

*Clause 30: Compliance orders*

This clause provides for the issuing of compliance orders by the Minister as a means of enforcing the provisions of the Act. The orders are in the form of a written notice served on a person and must set out the requirement of the Act to which it relates. The order may specify that a person discontinue or not undertake a particular activity, impose conditions on a undertaking a particular activity, or require that specified action be taken.

If urgent action is required, an authorised officer may issue an emergency compliance order orally, which will cease to have effect within 72 hours, unless it is confirmed by a written order issued by the Minister. An order may be varied or revoked by the Minister.

It is an offence to fail to comply with an order, which has a maximum penalty of \$35 000. If a person fails to comply with an order, an authorised officer may take the action required, and the Minister may recover any costs incurred in doing so. There is a penalty of \$5 000 for hindering or obstructing a person complying with an order.

*Clause 31: Appeal*

A person has 28 days to appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court against a compliance order or a variation to an order.

#### PART 6

##### MISCELLANEOUS

*Clause 32: False or misleading information*

A person must not make false or misleading statements in relation to information provided under the Act.

*Clause 33: Statutory declarations*

The Minister may require any information supplied under this Act to be verified by statutory declaration.

*Clause 34: Offences by body corporate*

If a body corporate is guilty of an offence, each member of the governing body and the manager are guilty of an offence and are liable to the same penalty.

*Clause 35: Recovery of technical costs associated with prosecutions*

If a person is found guilty of an offence, the Court must, on the application of the Minister, order the convicted person to pay the reasonable costs incurred in the taking and analysis of samples and tests required in investigating and prosecuting the offence.

*Clause 36: General defence*

There is a general defence to an offence under the Act for the defendant to prove that the particular offence was not committed intentionally and it did not result from a failure to take reasonable care.

*Clause 37: Civil remedies not affected*

This clause provides that civil rights or remedies are not affected by the Act, and that complying with this Act does not necessarily mean that a duty at common law will be satisfied.

*Clause 38: Confidentiality*

Confidential information obtained in connection with the administration or enforcement of the Act must not be disclosed except in specified circumstances. There is a maximum penalty of \$10 000.

*Clause 39: Immunity from liability*

No personal liability attaches to the Minister, authorised officer or other person in carrying out their duties under the Act in good faith. Any such liability lies instead against the Crown.

*Clause 40: Service*

This clause sets out the manner in which any documents are to be served under the Act.

*Clause 41: Evidence*

This clause sets out evidentiary provisions in relation to the proof of documents and authorised officers in proceedings under the Act.

*Clause 42: Incorporation of codes, standards or other documents*  
Codes, standards and other documentation may be incorporated by the regulations or an order made under this Act, in which case copies must be available for inspection by the public without charge.

*Clause 43: Regulations*

This clause sets the various regulations that can be made under the Act. These include regulations that may provide for a licensing system for the use of agricultural and veterinary products, prohibit the use or disposal of particular agricultural and veterinary products or prescribe various conditions for the use of agricultural and veterinary products, regulate equipment, require records to be kept and information to be provided, fix fees and prescribe fines.

## SCHEDULE

*Repeals and Amendments*

*Clause 1: Repeal of Agricultural Chemicals Act*

*Clause 2: Repeal of Stock Foods Act*

*Clause 3: Repeal of Stock Medicines Act*

These clauses repeal the Agricultural Chemicals Act 1955, Stock Foods Act 1941 and the Stock Medicines Act 1939.

*Clause 4: Amendment of Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (South Australia) Act*

This clause makes technical amendments to the Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (South Australia) Act 1994.

*Clause 5: Amendment of Livestock Act*

This clause amends the Livestock Act 1997 to include regulation making powers in relation to standards and composition of stock food and its manufacture, packaging, labelling, sale and supply. It also removes the provision in the Act dealing with the feeding of ruminants and other livestock with a view to this matter being dealt with in the regulations.

**Mr BRINDAL** secured the adjournment of the debate.

## APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from 15 July. Page 804.)

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport):** I note that I have five minutes in which to contribute prior to the dinner break.

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, I am not going to savagely attack the Treasurer. I want to pick up the point made by some political commentators in relation to the Appropriation—

*The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The Treasurer has had plenty of opportunity to state his views.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I want to pick up the point made by some political commentators about the honeymoon being over for the government in its relationship with the South Australian public. I guess to have a honeymoon you first need a marriage. I thought I would go back and look at the establishment of the marriage and how it resulted in this political honeymoon. The political marriage between the member for Hammond and the Labor Party, now the Labor government, started on election night when they found each other, essentially and to all intents and purposes, on the tally-room floor. It was like love at first sight when the ALP was trying to find anyone at all to marry into a relationship that would deliver it government. Many believed that the member for Hammond, at that stage at least, was a reluctant partner in the formation of a partnership with the ALP. It was a bit

like love at first sight across the tally-room floor, for a political analogy in relation to this political marriage.

The then opposition was looking for anyone to form government, and the member for Hammond, at that stage at least, was somewhat of a reluctant bride in a marriage with the ALP to deliver it government. Then there was an interesting courtship for a number of weeks. There was a courtship for two or three weeks between the Labor Party and the member for Hammond, and possibly others, in relation to ultimately delivering a political marriage to form government. It is interesting that the suitor offered many promises to the member for Hammond during those negotiations and during that courtship that lasted three or four weeks.

**Mr Brindal:** It was a sort of dowry.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The dowry was negotiated later, but eventually there was an announcement that the engagement had occurred and the member for Hammond would ultimately enter this marriage with the Labor Party to form government. It officially took place in March. It was interesting they went into a prenuptial agreement prior to announcing this political marriage. Now, slowly but surely, we are finding out the details of the prenuptial agreement, and today in question time the Treasurer advised us that the prenuptial agreement, the dowry of this sham marriage, cost the South Australian taxpayer around \$18 million. That is the background to what many are calling a marriage of convenience. This political marriage of convenience that forms the government is interesting in terms of the member for Hammond's electorate. It is the political equivalent of a green card marriage. Many family members do not actually agree with it. If members go out to the family members in the electorate of Hammond and ask the voters what they think, 70 per cent of the people in the electorate of Hammond did not want the ALP to enter into an agreement with the member for Hammond. They never wanted this green card marriage to occur.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Davenport needs to focus more specifically on the Appropriation Bill rather than get bogged down in matrimonial matters.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am coming to the Appropriation Bill because it delivers the dowry. It delivers on the prenuptial agreement of the marriage between the member for Hammond and the ALP. Ultimately, this—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The house is getting unruly. The member for Davenport apparently is at the Appropriation Bill right now—but it is time for dinner.

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

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Before the dinner adjournment, I was referring to the arranged marriage or the marriage of convenience between the member for Hammond and the current Labor government. We got to the point where all the state was invited to the marriage ceremony when in March the government, in effect, changed hands. Immediately the new government—as one does when one gets married—went into a honeymoon period, which all the political commentators refer to. As quite often happens on honeymoons, there was a pregnant pause in relation to the state.

The state had great hope and optimism—at least some did—that a new government might deliver something good

to the South Australian public. Ultimately, the child was born in the form of the budget. Like all marriages, whether arranged or a green card marriage, once the first child is delivered, the honeymoon is well and truly over. I will now address the Appropriation Bill, which is the child of the Labor government and which delivers the budget. I will go through why many people in South Australia—

**Ms Rankine:** It's been a long labour.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Yes, and many of us would think it will be very hard labour, given the penalties that the government is imposing on the poor unsuspecting South Australian public. The reason the honeymoon is over is that we all know there have been cuts to the education budget of some \$34 million in real terms. There have been cuts to health services across the board. There has been a 7.1 per cent increase in health costs, yet only a 3.6 per cent increase in funding, which means reduced health services across the state.

The shadow health minister has put out a press release indicating that the government is planning 159 000 fewer outpatients in the next year; it is planning 16 000 fewer emergency patients in metropolitan hospitals; and it is planning for 8 300 fewer emergency patients in country hospitals. Its own budget papers show longer waiting lists for semi-urgent elective patients.

The government is also planning an increase to the emergency services levy. Of course, it has already announced compulsory third party insurance premium increases. There will be an increase of about \$120 million in government charges over four years. Six hundred public servants have been offered the opportunity to leave the Public Service; in other words, the government is slashing the Public Service by about 600. It is planning an increase in net state debt and an increase in the unfunded superannuation liabilities. Capital works across the state have been slashed by \$360 million. Education capital works have certainly been slashed. About 113 fewer traineeships are on offer this year than were on offer from the previous government. It has released no employment target and no employment statement with the budget figures. The message there is, 'If you aim low, even this government should be able to achieve it.'

The government has launched a vicious attack on the holders of crown leases, with some 15 000 crown leaseholders looking at both increased annual charges and increasing one-off freeholding costs if they take that opportunity. The government is also planning more than \$200 million worth of increases in taxes over four years. It is also planning a rundown of cash reserves in the health area of some \$20 million.

A \$40 million package to help self-funded retirees—announced prior to the election and supported by the Labor Party—has now been scrapped. Eighteen thousand self-funded retirees have been duded of concessions, including a \$70 concession on electricity, a \$185 concession on water and sewerage rates, a \$190 concession on council rates, and a \$56 concession on motor vehicles. So, the self-funded retirees, like the rest of the state, have been duded by this state budget. Pensioners have also been duded. They were to receive a \$20 increase in electricity concessions; that has gone.

Of course, at the same time the cost of gas has been increased by 6 per cent and, for those in the property development area or the real estate area, section 7 fees are increasing from \$137 to \$180 and from memory stamp duties have also been touched. So, there are many reasons why the

public of South Australia believes that this budget really has attacked the core promises made by the Labor Party, and it really has attacked the average South Australian family.

During the speeches reference has been made to this marriage of convenience between the member for Hammond and the Rann government. Already, the relationship has met some rocky roads. It is interesting that that is so, and probably the reason for that lies in the statements made by both parties to that compact. Of course, the member for Hammond went to the election promising that he would not at any time form government with Labor, but he did that. So, one side of the compact breaches that commitment. I know that matter is before the court, so I will not go any further into that.

However, the other partner to the compact made various promises to the electorate that have now been broken. Of course, Labor wrote to the Hotels Association promising not to increase taxes on poker machines, but it has increased them by some \$39 million. Labor promised not to increase taxes and charges, but it has done so. Labor promised not to introduce new taxes, but it has. Labor promised to increase health services and its budget, indeed, has decreased health services. It has promised honesty and accountability, yet used an accounting fiddle to create a false deficit this year and sham services in future years. The Premier promised some \$75 million in extra health spending but has delivered about \$23 million less than that.

Probably the worst aspect of this budget—and it does not necessarily affect my electorate directly—is the disgraceful attack on our country cousins in this state. This would have to be one of the worst budgets for regional and country South Australia that has been delivered in decades by a government in this place. I will provide a few examples of how our country cousins will suffer because of the Labor Party government and the deal done to get them into government.

While metropolitan hospitals have been given a 7.1 per cent increase for costs, country hospitals have been given just 2.4 per cent. The HomeStart capital funds have not been replaced in 15 out of 16 country projects, and this has resulted in some 269 aged care beds not being built in country South Australia, and the aged people in the country will suffer as a direct result of that decision by this government.

There has been a \$10 million cut to the Community Sports Facilities Fund which has provided outstanding community facilities for community sporting and recreation groups throughout the state. The Active Club program is under attack. As a result of the good work done by the member for Newland in question time today, if the Labor Party backbench had any courage at all, it would address the issue with its minister and make sure that the Active Club program does not suffer a cut of \$940 000. That is certainly where it is heading if the minister is not lobbied by his own backbench.

Of course, we have had the savage attack on our 15 000 crown leaseholders who are now looking at an increase in rent of some \$300 million as a minimum and an extra cost to freehold of some \$6 000. The interesting aspect of this is that the \$300 does not kick in until 1 January, but the \$6 000 kicked in on 11 July. So, the crown leaseholder who might have wanted to freehold tomorrow to avoid the \$300 increase gets belted with a \$6 000 fee, even though the \$300 increase in annual rental does not occur until 1 January. There is a motion on the books for a select committee, and hopefully the parliament will support that, and we will debate that tomorrow.

Further cuts in the country include the disappearance of the country arts funding. Events such as those at the Chaffey Theatre are no longer occurring.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It is certainly reduced. The Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts suggests that country arts funding has not reduced. He might correct me on that. My understanding is that country arts funding has reduced certain establishments. Is Chaffey theatre happening?

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! We should not have a debate across the chamber.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** I understand also that the Barossa Valley Music Festival has suffered a cut. There is no doubt in my mind that this is one of the worst budgets for country South Australia that has been delivered in this chamber for some decades. We all know what the cost was to South Australia for the delivery of government to the Labor Party. Today the Treasurer, when responding to a question, indicated that the compact signed with the member for Hammond has cost this state some \$18 million.

We have had things such as \$600 000 for the Constitutional Convention—and we really do not know who is running that: sometimes it is the member for Hammond, sometimes it is the Attorney-General. We have had the outrageous treatment of the fishermen and their families in relation to gill net fishing. The way in which they have been treated with respect to compensation, and the lack of access to this government to discuss issues of compensation for gill net fishing, has been a shocking example of how to treat South Australian constituents. That fishing community has been walked over by this government. The way in which those families have been treated in relation to compensation has been a disgrace. The arrogance that the government has shown regarding gill net fishing and those families will come back to haunt it.

In essence, I guess that sums up the view in relation to this budget. It is an attack on country South Australia. The aim of this budget is quite clear. Country South Australia is there for one purpose, and one purpose only, and that is to provide exports and to be taxed. But with respect to delivery of services, if one goes through this budget, one will see that services are being cut in every single aspect. I think the member for Flinders summed it up very well in her address yesterday (and I refer members to her remarks), when she said that it was a kick in the guts to country South Australia.

I want to touch on the pokies tax, because the Labor Party—and the Treasurer in particular—has made a lot of hoo-ha about this. I think that we should consider the argument with some logic. As I understand it, most of the pokie machines revenue stream comes from the lower socioeconomic areas of South Australia. The highest usage of poker machines is in the lower socioeconomic areas of South Australia.

**Mr Hanna:** Do you support that?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** No, I am opposed to some aspects of poker machines. I never voted for them to come into this place.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! We will have no—

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** It had happened before—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! We will have no debate across the floor of the house. The member will speak through the chair.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The largest amount of pokie revenue to pokie owners—therefore, taxation to the government—comes from the lower socioeconomic groups. If the government increases taxation on the poker machines by \$39 million, does anyone honestly expect business not to pass on costs to the consumer? Does the Treasurer honestly expect any business to sit there and take a \$39 million increase in taxation and not pass that on to the consumer? Ultimately, those lower socioeconomic areas will be hit with higher drink prices and higher food prices. The very group that this party says it represents will suffer higher costs as a result of this measure. There is no doubt that the industry will pass on costs.

I think it is unfortunate that the Treasurer has broken a written promise. He admitted in the house that he wrote to the AHA saying that the government will not increase taxation on poker machines, then he comes in here and says, 'We've changed our mind. We'll now tax them \$39 million.' Then he says to the industry, 'Even though we are taxing you \$39 million, we don't expect you to increase your costs.' I think that shows the naivety of the Treasurer in relation to business matters. It shows the naivety of his never having run a business. He simply does not understand that, if the government increases business costs, they will clearly pass that on to the consumer. The Treasurer also needs to think about those businesses—

*Mr Hanna interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** The member for Mitchell interjects and says there will be less profit. He needs to understand that there are people out there who have bought hotels in the last six months. They have bought them on a current cost structure; they have mortgaged themselves based on a certain turnover and tax regime. Now that is to change. The banks will call in those loans because of the lack of equity. The banks will ask those people to re-cash their businesses. It will be interesting to see whether or not they have the capacity to do so. It is not as simple as saying, 'The government has increased tax. Gee, I'll have less profit.' The businesses will naturally seek to regain that profit through other areas. There will be staff losses and there will be price increases as a combination of measures to deal with the \$39 million package.

The Labor Party says that it stands for the worker. If it taxes the employer, the employer ultimately deals with it by reducing his employment costs or increasing his prices: it is as simple as that. The Labor Party may have its day with respect to the \$39 million on the pokie revenue but, ultimately, it will be at a cost to those lower socioeconomic areas, and it will be at a cost to the people working in those businesses. I hope that this decision will not send some of those family businesses to the wall because of the arrogance and attitude of the Treasurer and the government in relation to this issue. I think that, when someone writes a letter and then changes their mind, it shows a clear sign of arrogance in the early days of this government. I think the message to the community is that this government is very arrogant in the way in which it will treat people. A written promise means nothing from this government.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Before calling the member for Wright, I point out to the members for Mitchell and Schubert that they cannot hide behind other members or behind pillars. The chair is all knowing and all seeing.

**Ms RANKINE (Wright):** There have been some interesting comments tonight, and certainly the contribution

of the member for Davenport was interesting. The opposition talks about honesty in this place, but the member for Davenport was a member of the government, the premier of which was the first premier of this state who had to resign from his position because he was found to have been dishonest. I think they have a real gall to talk about honesty and accountability.

There is no doubt that the Treasurer and our ministers have worked diligently to ensure the best possible outcome in relation to this budget. Preparing a budget is not easy, and a vast array of diverse interests have to be considered. The aim of this budget has been to focus on our community and to focus on the priorities that the Labor Party outlined at the last election. In assessing the budget, one also has to have some sort of comparative basis. Yesterday, we heard from the member for Bragg, and she did not much like hearing about assessing the budget in comparison with what had occurred in the past and assessing this budget on its value, impact and focus. But we need to do that; we need to look at previous budgets in order to come up with a fair assessment of this one.

I have had a look at the budgets delivered by the previous government during the time that I have been in this place to make a fair assessment of where we are. In 1998, I saw that incentives were being paid to companies to establish here, with no requirements in relation to the provision of jobs here in South Australia. Many were absolute and complete disasters. Do members recall the \$15 million that was allocated to Australis, and the \$30 million for the EDS building? We later had all those millions of dollars allocated to our very famous soccer stadium, and the wine centre with its elaborate \$400 000 opening party. Now we have the revelation—

**Mr Venning:** At least we got something for our money.

**Ms RANKINE:** What did you get? A major white elephant—all to your credit, member for Schubert.

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

**Ms RANKINE:** Now we are told about the scandalous deal the then government struck with Skycity which gave it a 13-year freeze on its tax, with a potential loss of revenue to the tune of \$143 million. I am sure that every South Australian is scandalised by that deal, as I am sure are all the publicans.

Also, with respect to the previous government's record, having been promised 20 000 new jobs here in South Australia back in 1993, by 1998 we had a loss of over 15 000 jobs. The same year the government announced a modest program of 30 school closures (it described that as being modest), with threats of increased school fees and further reductions in teacher numbers.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** Yes, 30 schools. There were also increases in drivers' licence fees, third party insurance and stamp duty. In 1999 the government introduced its very famous and well-known emergency services levy—a tax levied against just about everything that did not have legs of its own. Our houses were taxed, cars, trucks, motorcycles, boats, caravans, jet skis, houseboats and trailers. The only thing that I could find that did not attract the emergency services levy was my old dad's electric wheelchair.

We also had the threat of the ETSA tax. If they did not get their way in flogging off our state's biggest revenue earner, they intended to levy a huge impost on every South Australian household. And they have the gall, the absolute temerity, to talk about broken promises! The sale of ETSA

was the biggest political betrayal in our state's history, and those responsible have certainly left a legacy to our state. They will be remembered every time a household power bill is received.

By the year 2000 the Liberals were starting to plan for their re-election, starting to become a little anxious as they realised that people were becoming increasingly unhappy with the level of deception and the increasing sense of losing control over their own lives. The 2000 budget papers indicated that the capital works budget had been underspent by \$242 million. That included the habitually announced and much needed hospital upgrades. Clearly, they were squirreling away a war chest for an election bonanza—and didn't we see exactly that! I referred to the budget at that time as the 'abracadabra budget', the 'now you see it, now you don't budget'.

Members opposite are bleating about cuts to traineeships. In that year traineeships were cut by 700, and rent relief was abolished for new applicants. So that was a loss of \$3 million of assistance which affected the most disadvantaged in our state. Public housing had become crisis housing. If you were in a severe crisis, you could not get accommodation. I have spoken time and again in this place about instances where people were in severe circumstances and could not get access to public housing. By the year 2001, we had nearly 4 000 fewer Housing Trust units in South Australia compared to 1999-2000, and panic was starting to set in. They reduced the emergency services levy and cut their budget for consultants by an astounding \$40 million. They had that much fat in their consultants' budget.

In 2001, there were no extra funds for education. In fact, education effectively was cut in real terms at the same time as their federal counterparts were boosting funds to wealthy private schools. They were talking about increasing the school leaving age, but that is all it was at that time—talk; nothing was done. In 2001, the Treasurer was described in the media—we all remember this—as Captain Sensible. Well, we now know that he was sailing on the *Titanic* with the crew of *McHale's Navy* in control. In my very first address on the budget back in 1998 I commenced by saying:

I rise today without envy. In fact, I feel sorry for members opposite because they have to go to their electorates and convince their constituents that this is a fair budget.

Well, each year, sir, their faces got redder and redder with embarrassment. We now hear a great sigh of relief because they no longer have to be held responsible for their irresponsible and disastrous budgets and projects put up by their colleagues that go absolutely nowhere other than to cost us millions and millions of dollars. We hear a great sigh of relief as they see once again a Labor government taking charge and addressing these issues of importance to our community.

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** Well might the member for Morphet laugh, but he wasn't here to see the disastrous consequences of his government's actions. He was not here to see the faces of his colleagues getting redder and redder each day.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brindal):** Order! The member knows that she should not respond to interjections, but since she has interrupted her own flow the chair makes the observation that any member is entitled to develop their argument. I have listened with interest: we are eight minutes into the debate on the budget and we are still to get to some substance on the budget debate. I draw the member's attention to that fact.



**Ms RANKINE:** I am about to enter that very point, sir. Thank you for your guidance. I know that members opposite were starting to get a bit uncomfortable with my reflections on their past achievements, but I would not want to reflect on the chair at all. In comparison with the former government, the bill before us deals with the priorities of health and education which the Labor government promised in the last campaign. There is much to do in these areas and there is much more in front of us.

The Labor government is committed to quality education and opportunities for our children. We are committed to rebuilding our health services. In our schools, we will see an extra 160 junior primary school teachers at a cost of an additional \$31.8 million. This will result in smaller junior primary school classes—a change for the better—and it will address issues before they become real problems.

Only last week two concerned mothers from my electorate came to see me. Their children are in their early high school years. They are the result of the education system under the former government. They got pushed through year after year with no assistance for their problems and, if they had received assistance when they needed it, they would not be struggling through their high school years now.

We have also seen additional and much-needed primary school counsellors, a response to the Hands Up for Primary School campaign. I was a member of the select committee along with the education minister which looked at Partnerships 21 and a whole range of other issues in relation to public education. We were both made very well aware of this issue. When meetings were called throughout my electorate I attended every one to which I was invited. Let me say, however, that the opposition did not turn up.

Historically, as far as school counsellors are concerned, the focus has been on teenagers. Teenagers are very important and we must provide them with as much support as we can, but so are our young children. We need to get in there when their problems are small and get to them so that they do not become larger issues later in life. Other initiatives in our schools will include: guidance officers, behavioural management, speech therapists and additional SSOs. I find it unbelievable listening to the diatribe from members opposite about broken promises.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** They seem to have forgotten about ETSA. Do you remember ETSA and SA Water? We promise to improve services and the quality of care. I have had experience both personally and professionally of our health system. People know only too well that I am a strong advocate in terms of health issues. People in my electorate and the rest of South Australia want and demand an appropriate level of care. The care that I want for my family should be available to every other South Australian. I was delighted with the introduction by the Minister for Health of the Health and Community Services Ombudsman legislation which is long overdue and much needed in South Australia. Again, that is another commitment that we made at the last election.

For the first time in nearly 30 years, our health services are being reviewed with a vision for the future. A generational review of public health has been established to develop a plan for the needs of our community for the next 20 years. The current budget provides for 100 additional hospital beds; 2 000 additional elective surgery procedures; \$6 million for cleaner hospitals over four years; \$2 million over four years for dental care for the aged and disadvantaged; \$500 000 to establish the Health and Community Services Ombudsman;

major hospital upgrades across the state (including the Lyell McEwin and the finalisation of the upgrade of the Modbury Hospital); and \$4 million for early intervention health programs targeted at our children.

This is an area of real concern to me, one on which I have spoken on a number of occasions both here and within my electorate. The former mean-spirited government wanted to withdraw the four-year-old kindergarten health checks. We have guaranteed that those health checks will continue; not only will they continue but also there will be extra support for parents—as the Minister for Health said—to deal with problems with their children. We will nip those problems in the bud, as the minister said. There will be the provision of additional speech therapy and better links with specialist services in hospitals and other agencies including schools, kindergartens and childcare centres.

Within the health budget there is also provision for a falls prevention policy. Falls prevention is a primary health care area for this government and, quite frankly, it makes good sense. In South Australia more than 7 900 people over 65 were admitted to hospital during the 2000-01 financial year as a result of fall-related injuries. Falls suffered by people over 65 account for the largest proportion of all injury-related deaths and hospitalisation; and we are talking about a financial cost in the vicinity of \$2.3 million.

A fall in an older person can be debilitating. It can result in prolonged hospitalisation and, very sadly, a third of those who fall and end up in hospital do not return to independent living. Far too many falls and associated injuries also occur in hospital settings and residential care. There were about 4 700 admissions to South Australian public hospitals from residential care facilities, due to fall-related injuries, over the last five years.

Needless to say, it is not only the serious injuries that we should attempt to minimise. For an older person, a relatively minor fall can also have serious consequences, with a loss of confidence, a greater sense of frailty and fear, and an increased sense of vulnerability and withdrawing from community participation. It can result in a real loss of quality of life for older people.

We have also seen in the budget some substantial allocations in the area of volunteering. In fact, this government is committed to working towards and providing a compact, an agreement, that will shape the way that the government and the volunteer community will work together. We are working together with the volunteer community. We are not foisting an agreement on them, which was the tack the previous government took.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Ms RANKINE:** Well, I would suggest that the former minister for volunteers go out and assess the reaction of his draft alliance paper. It was soundly rejected by the volunteer community because they felt very strongly that it was foisted on them. They were not part of the development of that alliance paper and they rejected it. That is not the tack this government is taking. We have also provided Volunteering SA with a \$35 000 subsidy for their volunteering conference. We have committed \$70 000 to provide free risk management education and training for volunteers to be held in a number of locations across the state. We are injecting funds into a volunteer training strategy, and we have funded two scholarships at the Onkaparinga TAFE in relation to volunteering.

The other thing that the Premier has done, and we are continuing to do, is assure the volunteer community that their independence will be respected, irrespective of any funding

agreement. We know that the previous government did not take that approach with our volunteer community, and that is something that we will address at a later time.

This is the first budget for a very long time that has focused on people. This is about the needs and aspirations of ordinary South Australians, those South Australians who want the best for their children and who are, once again, able to dream that their kids just might do better in life than they did. The budget is about those South Australians who believe that every South Australian deserves to be able to access quality public health services; who believe that health and community services, whether they are public or private, must be accountable. This will be quite an initiative. I have spoken in this house previously about the difficulty that people who have accessed private health services have in being able to get information when it has been required, sometimes having to produce court orders to get information about their or their family's treatment.

This budget indicates that the health of our children matters, that early intervention is the key. Our community is the glue that holds us all together. Budgets are never popular. There are always winners and losers but, in this instance, South Australians have been the winners. This budget has been delivered with the best of intentions and with a focus on their priorities.

**Mr VENNING (Schubert):** The Rann government's first budget has left me very disappointed. It is a budget of broken promises and also a budget of betrayal. It was with shock, dismay and outrage that I learnt how little the new budget would provide for the Barossa Valley and regions, with several projects that were priorities of the former government being ruthlessly shelved; hopefully, not scrapped. During the election campaign, this government, then in opposition, clearly said that it would honour all the previous government's commitments. I heard it quite clearly, particularly those statements that were made three months ago or more. So, in three instances, they have scrapped projects in the Barossa Valley.

I am very concerned that the Barossa has missed out in this budget, with the only inclusion being the \$2 million upgrade for a water supply storage at Williamstown. That is the only mention in the whole of this government's budget documents concerning the area that has been the engine room in terms of the improved economy of this state in the last eight years—and that is an absolute b—disgrace. I just cannot believe that anybody—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mitchell has been warned once for hiding behind the column and interjecting. I suggest that he not do it again.

**Mr VENNING:** What sort of recognition is this to a region that has been, as I said, the engine room to the increased economy of this state for the last eight years? This budget is an extremely centralised document, with many country regions being almost totally ignored and, at best, it can be summed up as a budget of broken promises with increased taxes and charges.

Ironically, throughout the election campaign Labor members stated that they would honour all the previous government's promises and, of course, we know quite clearly that they have simply reneged on the lot and callously and blatantly run roughshod over all they said during the campaign. You can understand people's cynicism about politicians with exercises like this, particularly when the Treasurer

faces up to a group of people (it is even in writing) and says that he will not do something and then does it.

So, this lack of commitment is a matter of grave concern. These promises have been completely disregarded, with rural communities the most affected and disadvantaged by the new government's shift in priorities. This is the worst budget I can remember, when we see a sector of the community being deliberately and totally ignored. It is an attack on country South Australia. As the member for Davenport said just a few moments ago, yes, they expect us to work harder and to export, and then to be taxed and pay huge government increases in charges. At the same time what did they do? They increased the size of the cost of the Premier's Department. What sort of message is that?

I also note that they are spending millions of extra dollars, more than the previous government, on government offices. What sort of message is that sending to people? All country people can look forward to in the next four years is rougher roads, decaying schools and substandard hospitals, because that is certainly the message my electorate has received. What can I tell the people in my electorate? The government gave a commitment made by the previous government, and people were told it would be honoured, but what has happened? Nothing—no mention of it. They have not been told the commitment has been scrapped; there is just nothing about it—no mention at all—in the budget papers.

It is a blatant kick in the guts, as the member for Flinders said. It is discrimination of the worst kind. Labor has deliberately left \$276 million of revenue off the balance sheet to create a fictional black hole and hide the surplus left by the Liberal government. The claimed surplus of \$92 million this year has been created dishonestly by shifting revenue into this year's budget. People have to realise that this is a small state: there are people out there who can count, and they can account for dollars. If the government thinks that it can fudge figures like this and get away with it, it has another think coming.

Education and health were the two key focal points of Labor during the election campaign, with all sorts of promises that have simply not been delivered. I do not believe that the government ever intended to honour them in any way. In real terms there has been no huge boost in health spending, with less than 1 per cent funded, mainly by a rundown in cash reserves of almost \$20 million. With a 7.5 per cent increase in costs for metropolitan hospitals, country hospitals have received only a 2.4 per cent rise, which clearly discriminates against country hospitals, which are the big losers in this budget. Education has in real terms experienced a cut of \$34 million in funding, with \$26 million being cut from school building programs, which will disadvantage students and affect South Australian parent-based school councils.

The number one omission for the Barossa in this budget was the provision of a new health facility at Nuriootpa. Members have heard me talk about this ad nauseam. Under the previous government, building was to commence in 2003 and be completed by 2005-06. I will give the minister some credit: she came to the Barossa last Friday and inspected the Angaston hospital, and I did see a look of shock on her face. As she walked down the corridor, going up and down all the different levels, seeing the cracks in the walls and the deteriorating facilities, I think the minister thought for the first time: maybe the member for Schubert wasn't bluffing after all. I give her credit for coming up there the day after the budget and facing the music. Admittedly, she was not there very long, but she came.

She is the first minister actually to set foot in the Barossa, so I also give her credit for that. The invitation is there for the other ministers, particularly for the Minister for the Environment, who will always be welcome, as I said, one of two ministers that I have a bit of time for. It was a pretty sad day when this happened. Not a word of this development was in the budget paper: not a sound, not even a word of deferral. There was nothing: just a space where it was to be. All the people up there, including the Labor candidate Mr Wilson, have had the expectation that we would see this facility actually built.

In what was a most unusual occurrence for the Barossa, all the towns agreed that we would have the new facility at Nuriootpa, which is a big feat, knowing the parochialism of the different towns in the Barossa. They were very disappointed and somewhat shattered. The health minister visited and I think she got a shock, but I was pleased that she could come up and present the Barossa Area Health Service with its accreditation. Considering the condition of that hospital, it is a magnificent feat to be accredited like that. My question is: why was it pulled?

I note with interest that another country hospital that was not previously a priority was funded. Guess whose electorate that was in? You would not need to be Einstein to work that one out. What sort of standard is this that we are seeing now? A further savage blow to our country community has been the loss of the HomeStart grants to 15 of our country hospitals, with all missing out except the Naracoorte hospital. I simply cannot believe that a so-called cash strapped government can forfeit large amounts of federal money, as it has done in this instance. Millions of dollars have been forfeited by the state government to cancel the HomeStart funds for aged care beds in country hospitals, not only the 50 per cent to fund their building, their provision, but also the 100 per cent funding of maintaining those beds thereafter.

With an ageing population, aged care beds are at a premium, especially in our country areas, and the loss of this infrastructure at Mannum and Mount Pleasant hospitals in my electorate is a great shame. I question whether the Labor government realised that it was forfeiting federal government money, putting it at risk by turning it down. No doubt it will wonder why the federal government will be hesitant to fund future projects. I cannot believe that the ministers and the Treasurer knew what they were doing when they made these cuts, because they just said thank you to the federal government for jointly funding these things but we will not be needing the money now. If I could get a project for half price I would be giving that a higher priority than a project I had to pay full price for, particularly if I was short of cash.

Angaston and Kapunda Primary Schools in my electorate had been earmarked by the previous government for a major upgrade but have been completely overlooked by the new government in this budget. To see the projects disappear was upsetting enough, but to consider that a \$1.6 million Angaston upgrade had a federal grant of \$800 000 in it, it is hard to believe that it has been forfeited: just completely ignored and that \$800 000 gone. That is criminal: it is a gross waste. Certainly, it should not go unnoticed or unchallenged. I do challenge the Treasurer and the various ministers to say that they have done that knowing that they are going to hand that money back to the federal government.

No wonder when we go to Canberra and ask for these grants they say, 'You don't want this money, because you didn't use the last lot we gave you.' I marvel at that. I personally contacted the minister's office last Friday and was

told by a high ranking public servant that the decision on the Angaston Primary School was deferred, not axed. Hopefully, she said, the federal funding would remain in place until the project is approved in a future budget. I admire the government's confidence in this, but it is certainly a big risk and I ask why they would bother to risk it. This budget is first and foremost a budget of broken promises. In my 12 years as a member of parliament, I have never witnessed such blatant abuse of promises made to the electorate.

To make that commitment in writing and to give his word face to face and then do the opposite is absolutely deplorable. I do not expect this to be par for the course, and I believe that this is unacceptable behaviour from a respected citizen, let alone a member of parliament and, even worse, from the state Treasurer. This is government by deception. It got into power by deception when a member deceived his electors by changing his mind and putting this Labor government into power. Now we have its first budget and the deception continues with more than \$200 million in tax increases over four years, with increases in stamp duty for conveyances, rental agreements and gaming taxation.

*The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The minister is out of order interjecting but the member for Schubert should not really be inflammatory in his remarks, either.

**Mr VENNING:** Sorry, sir: it's on the record. It is particularly hard-hitting in country areas, with over \$40 million in cutbacks to rural areas, including to primary industries, rural roads and health and education funding cuts. The figure of \$3.5 million in this budget for rural roads will not go very far. It is only a pittance compared to what we spent. We spent \$5.5 million on just one of my roads last year, and \$3.5 million for the whole state is just blatantly ridiculous. That is not even a joke. It is some \$10 million less than the previous government's commitment for the rural road and arterial program. The decision is a disgrace—

*The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:*

**Mr VENNING:** That's another question I won't raise, what happened to Ports Corp, another one, and as the minister raises the point—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will cease his interjections and the member for Schubert will cease answering his interjections. Both of you know it is highly disorderly.

**The Hon. J.D. Hill:** I'm being encouraged.

**Mr VENNING:** And he's out of his place. The decision is a disgrace. The previous government was just catching up with the previous Labor government's cutbacks of our road systems, and now it looks like we are going to go backwards again, right back to where we were. When you consider that primary industries contribute some 60 per cent of South Australia's exports, you realise that such savage cutbacks are simply unjustifiable and, dare I say, unfair.

It is predicted that some 60 jobs could be lost from Primary Industries and Resources South Australia, with some \$17 million cut from its budget. This is after the department has been dissected by Labor without consultation, with many PIRSA functions being transferred to the environment portfolio, such as land care, soil boards and pest control boards—issues with which I have a personal affinity.

Still we have no answer on the deep sea port development at Outer Harbor, with stage 1 of the Port River expressway being given the go-ahead in the budget papers (and I do welcome that). However, when will we be given confirmation and dates for the delivery of stages 2 and 3 of the road and

the rail bridges, etc? The Premier was asked over two months ago about what is happening with the new Outer Harbor development, and he said then that he would be making a major announcement shortly. That is two months ago, and nothing has been heard. It is a very important issue, and it is high time that, if something is going to happen, the people of South Australia, the farmers and the exporters ought to be told what they can expect. We wait with bated breath. The grain producers of South Australia and related industries need an answer now.

The Labor government's unjustified enormous hike in crown land lease fees, from \$1 500 for freehold crown leased land to a staggering minimum of \$6 000, has outraged landholders. I do appreciate the discussions I have had with the minister at the table, and I say up front that I have no conflict of interest. I freeholded all leases that we did have under the previous government, as we were encouraged to do, so I have no conflict of interest at all. However, I think it is a disgrace to see these huge increases from \$1 500 to \$6 000 purely because the minister has said that he wants to cut the cost of running the department.

I have some sympathy for that, because that is the same reason the previous government did it, but I would be happy if the minister changed his mind. If he did not, would he consider at least placing a moratorium on it so that people, when looking at the new figures, can go back and actually freehold that land? I could not believe it when I saw that. I know that a lot of people in my electorate have multiple leases and were paying only a peppercorn rate.

What Labor does not understand, and I am sure the minister did not understand, is that when these people actually bought these properties they paid full land prices for them, the same as if they were freehold. I am sure that the government thought they were getting the use of the land for a few cents per lease, but that is not so. For the last 25 years, people have been going to land auctions and buying the land, not having any consideration as to whether it was freehold, perpetual lease, crown lease or whatever. Because they were in perpetuity, they were small and it was not a factor in relation to buying the property. Now that this has arisen, it certainly is a factor.

I have one constituent who has 1 000 acres. He has 10 leases. That will cost him \$3 000—not a bad increase from \$1 500. Can you wonder why he is contacting me? I think he is one of your supporters—or he was! I do have Labor supporters in my electorate, and some of them are jolly nice people, but the few supporters you have left in the bush you have just given a whack on the face and said, 'Sorry boys, you had better not support us; we are for the city,' and by heck, does not this document look like it! I will wait to see what happens with the select committee in relation to these leases. I think it is very unfair. It is a move in the wrong direction. It is certainly going far too far and far too fast. I wait to see what the minister will say and do. I just wonder whether he understood what he was doing.

There have been huge increases in the emergency services levy revenue and compulsory third party insurance premiums, with an increase of more than \$120 million in government charges over the next four years. I am very concerned that the budget will have these impacts on country people. Hopefully, we will see a change in attitude, not in 12 months' time but within a few months, when the government sees what has happened and understands the anxiety and hurt it has caused, particularly if the season is not a particularly good one. Certainly, it does not look too promising now. Like South

Australia, all states of Australia are having a dry period. It is sending a wrong message at the wrong time. I honestly feel that a lot of people who voted for this government at the election now believe they were totally deceived, because this budget is absolutely a budget of broken promises.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Before calling on the next member, I remind all members that there are vestibules and corridors for discussions. Members are quite welcome to discuss matters in here, but it should be sotto voce. It is difficult to hear the speaker when everyone is talking as if they are in a fish market.

**Mr McEwen:** What is that in English?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Quietly, for one of the principal offending members to whom I was speaking.

**Ms Breuer:** Well, some people from the other side could remember that.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Could I tell the member for Giles that it is not her turn. It is the member for Florey's turn. I call the member for Florey.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, and it is an honour and privilege to address my budget remarks through you tonight. The government's first budget is responsible and has been well targeted. It will deliver efficiencies and win the public's confidence in this government's commitment to earn respect for good management and the accountability that has been lacking in previous budgets.

We see that ongoing commitment to delivery of essential services has been prioritised, easily the most important of this government's requirements in preparing this fiscal blueprint for future security. The measures have been carefully targeted to afford protection for those least able to bear the burden. For instance, the gaming machine tax will only impact on venues earning the greatest amount of revenue, and the stamp duty measure on real estate will only apply to homes valued at over \$200 000, significantly more than the value of most homes in the electorate of Florey, even in these days of inflated high prices.

It will not be possible to mention every highlight of the budget tonight. I would like to focus on a few, however. The budget looks to strengthen the two most important and largest expenditure areas for this state, namely, health and education. New initiatives in health totalling \$108 million over four years for public hospitals include honouring the election promise to provide funding for cleaner hospitals. Anyone who has been in a public hospital recently will welcome this important and necessary initiative.

The Modbury hospital redevelopment program continues. Work in progress will see completion of redevelopment and refurbishment of theatres, provision of a new obstetrics unit, an upgrade of existing engineering services and a redevelopment of the emergency department by the end of the year.

Pensioners and disadvantaged groups will benefit from an \$8 million increase over four years for community dental services. Anyone who has had to live without teeth, where natural teeth have been removed or while waiting for treatment, will know the exclusion faced when your appearance means you cannot go out or even eat without the utmost difficulty.

With respect to mental health, \$9 million over four years will be spent to address problems faced by the Aboriginal community. This is important because the Modbury area has a large number of Aboriginal people in the Aboriginal housing properties. The Aboriginal Housing Authority will see the long-awaited expansion and upgrading of housing

stock available for indigenous individuals, families and communities, including the construction of nine new houses, the upgrading of 60 existing homes and the purchase of 42 houses. Cultural differences see the necessity for housing stock suitable for larger families, and I look forward to seeing suitable stock coming on stream very soon.

The mental health initiatives that I have previously referred to will be provided for children as well as adults in regional and inpatient services. The Aboriginal community health program due for completion in the year 2003 will see upgrading and redevelopment of Aboriginal health facilities and clinical staff accommodation in remote areas.

Another important measure in this budget will be provided in Gilles Plains, and it is due for completion in 2004.

The human services budget line will see significant investment made in a major urban regeneration project in that part of Gilles Plains, which is in the electorate of Florey. Comprising 27 relocations, demolition of 58 homes, creation of 165 new allotments, renovation of seven houses and the sale of three houses, it is a huge effort in an area that was sadly in need of attention. I would like to commend the staff of the Housing Trust and, in particular, the minister responsible, the Hon. Stephanie Key, for her commitment to public housing. A further \$220 million has been allocated over four years to improve the other major priority for this government: our public education system. Modbury Special School will see expenditure of \$2 215 000.

Again, this school is in the electorate of Florey. The redevelopment and extension of existing accommodation to cater for the special needs of children with severe autism commences in April 2003, with completion due by October 2004. This centre of excellence will soon have much better facilities to encourage students to reach their full potential and provide facilities to allow the dedicated staff to concentrate on the students in safe and stimulating surroundings. The results are truly amazing. Many times I have visited the school and I cannot tell members the difficulties faced by the staff in caring for those children who have severe autistic problems.

That facility has more than 100 students. Members can imagine the pressure on that staff committed to making sure those children are achieving—it is absolutely wonderful to see. A total of \$138 million will be spent on education facilities and associated equipment in 2002-03. New works will commence at 13 schools—one of which is the Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE—during the coming year, and we will see a sum of \$10.8 million allocated to that facility. Another important initiative in my electorate involves the Torrens Valley Institute's Tea Tree Gully campus; \$2 million will be used in the acquisition of the facility currently housing the combined local council and TAFE resource centres.

Anyone living in Modbury knows that the Tea Tree Gully Library has become an issue of some importance over a number of years. We are finally seeing the relocation of the library and we are all looking forward to using the new facility. One of the government's major tasks is to create an environment for sustainable economic growth. This is vital to ensure that our children are able to find worthwhile and secure jobs and to stop the loss of the state's best and brightest to the eastern states. Like all budgets, not all areas we would like to see improved can be improved to the degree we would like to see as quickly as we would like to see it: priorities must be determined and long-term goals planned for.

One of those long-term goals, and something in which I have always been interested since my election, is the Torrens Parade Ground on behalf of the many war veterans in my area, members of the RSL and current serving members of the defence forces and the reserves. The upgrade of this heritage-listed facility will create a multi-purpose public space for use by the ex-service people and arts and community groups to the value of \$3 800 000. It is a wonderful and welcome component of the budget that will be shared by many people in the community.

I commend this budget to the house. I know that the people of this state will get behind the new government and its vision for a revitalised South Australia. This budget has been described as a tough but fair budget. Tough times certainly call for tough measures. I know that we will all work together through the tough times so that we can enjoy a bright future in this state and make this budget work so that all South Australians can share in a better and more secure future.

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop):** I would like to be able to say that it is with pleasure that I address the matter before the house but it is not with pleasure: it is with very serious concern. I represent a rural electorate and it is a long time since rural South Australia has had a kick in the guts like it has had from this government at this time. Rural South Australia spent a period of time right through the 1970s (apart from a short interval in the late 1970s, early 1980s) and the 1980s being ignored by the government of South Australia, notwithstanding the fact that a quarter of the state's population live in the rural areas and notwithstanding the fact that the rural sector and the economy based around our primary industries has contributed about 60 per cent of the state's export income.

It is incredible that a government, less than four months into office, could totally ignore such a huge part of the economy, such a huge number of the population, and that would be putting it nicely—

*Mr Caica interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Colton should not inflame the member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The worst spin to put on it would be that the government has deliberately withdrawn services and funds from rural communities as some sort of macabre payback, and I certainly hope that is not the case.

**Mrs Geraghty:** That's absolute rubbish.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Torrens will contain herself.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** This budget can be described only as the budget of deceit and deception. Hundreds of millions of dollars has been shuttled around by this Treasurer in his and the Premier's vain attempt to try to rewrite recent history of this state. The government, in coming to the Treasury benches, had a huge dilemma and wanted to paint a picture that the state was in crisis, because that is what it had been saying for so long. It had been saying that education, health and law and order were in crisis and that the whole of the former government was in crisis. It needed to back that up; so, in the first three to four months of coming to government it bent over backwards and did everything it could to try to paint a picture, to try to rewrite history, that what it had been claiming was factual when, indeed, it had not been factual.

**Mrs Geraghty:** Tell the truth.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I will tell the truth.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop will not answer interjections and the member for Torrens will stop interjecting.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you for your protection, sir; I feel much better for it. The dilemma of the new Treasurer, on coming to office, was that the economy, under the stewardship of the previous Liberal government, was doing so well that he was facing a budget outcome that was so much better than that predicted 12 months earlier. We all know the huge increase in activity in the real estate industry. Of course, one of the biggest revenue earners for the state is conveyancing fees or stamp duties on real estate conveyances. When the incoming Treasurer walked into the Treasury, instead of looking at a \$2 million surplus, he was faced with a surplus probably approaching \$200 million.

The Treasurer went to the Under Treasurer and said, 'This is not what I want to sell the people of South Australia. I want to be able to put a story of despair, mismanagement and crisis right across government. What can I do?' It probably was not the Under Treasurer who put him onto this: he probably had half enough wit to work this out himself because he mentioned it in his Appropriation Bill contribution 12 months ago. He said to the Treasurer, 'A lot of funds are coming across from the South Australian Asset Management Corporation and from the South Australian Finance Authority.' Something of the order of, I think, \$304 million was due to be put into the budget in the last 12 months, that is, for the 2001-02 financial year. The Treasurer said to the Under Treasurer, 'We will sort that out. Instead of bringing that \$304 million across, we will actually transfer—'

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I am sorry, did the member for Colton make a gesture to the chair or were my eyes playing up? The member for MacKillop.

**Mr Caica:** No, I did not, sir.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I certainly hope the new member knows better than that. The Treasurer said to the Under Treasurer, 'We will transfer only \$27 million across and that will build us some fictitious black hole in the previous—'

**Mr O'BRIEN:** I rise on a point of order, sir. Is that a quote? The honourable member is putting that in terms of a quote.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I did not suggest that I was quoting.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for MacKillop will come to order. When one takes a point of order one rises to one's feet and makes a point of order. However, asking whether something is a quote is not a point of order: it is a question. You may contribute later to the debate and ask that in debate, but it is not a point of order. The member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Thank you, sir. Instead of transferring the \$304 million, as was pointed out in the last budget, the Treasurer saw that only \$27 million was transferred across. This is how the Treasurer has been able to create this fictitious black hole of \$60 million odd. Lo and behold, he transfers all the money across in the 2002-03 year and creates a \$92 million surplus. Without that transfer being shifted from one financial year to the other, the budget we are now discussing would in fact be showing something close to a \$200 million deficit. That should not be lost on the people of South Australia—and I am certain it will not be.

The other thing that should not be lost on the people of South Australia is the irony of the Deputy Premier and Premier 12 months ago, when discussing the last Rob Lucas budget, noting their concern about these transfers appearing in the budget. The Treasurer said:

This is a development that I am sorry to see occur. It would have been my preference for that money to be used to pay off state debt.

What has changed in the past 12 months?

**Mr McEwen:** Peter Lewis!

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes, well said. Some 12 months ago the Treasurer said that that money should have been used to pay off state debt, but today he uses it to create an artificial black hole in the previous financial year and an artificial surplus in the current financial year. It is very funny accounting about which, I am sure, if it was happening in the United States today, serious questions would be asked. It smacks of the sorts of things which some major corporations have been doing and which has got them into considerable trouble.

This is not the only deception that this budget has brought upon the people of South Australia. This budget confirms a raft of broken promises. The blatant disregard for the number of promises broken astounds me, and all the government's key election platforms have been totally ignored in the past four months—and by this budget.

I am pleased to see that the Minister for Health is in the chamber at the moment, because the biggest ticket item in the state's budget is the health portfolio. It is interesting to note that the real increase in the health portfolio is something less than 1 per cent in real terms relative to CPI. We should note that the CPI is expected to be somewhat less than the medical inflation costs. Indeed, if we also factor in the \$20 million run-down in cash reserves, one thing about which the then shadow minister prior to the election kept whining and whingeing, we would see a real reduction in health expenditure. We have been promised 100 new beds. Where will they come from? We have been promised additional nurses. Where will they come from when the health budget in real terms will be reduced?

Health is one of the areas where the city-centric government has really hurt the country people. One-quarter of the state's population has really been hurt by this health budget. I do not need to go over the intricacies of the HomeStart fiasco, but might I remind members that 15 of the 16 hospitals that were expecting to get HomeStart finance to build aged-care beds in rural communities across the state got nothing from this budget. This is despite the fact that the Premier brought his cabinet down into my electorate, down into the South-East of the state, at the end of May or early June and told the country hospitals that were represented there, 'Don't worry, this is just an anomaly. We will fix it up. We are putting down the budget and it will be sorted out.'

The budget has come down and, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister for Health was there a fortnight later saying the same things, 'We will sort it out, come budget day, come 11 July; just be patient and it will be sorted out'; notwithstanding the fact that we have passed 11 July, those hospitals are still wondering where they are and what is happening. Where has the money gone? What is their future?

Let me say that an article published in the *South Eastern Times* on Thursday 13 June stated:

Yesterday, the Millicent Hospital was in bypass mode.

We hear members of the government complain every time the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is in bypass mode. This is happening in country hospitals. The Millicent Hospital on 12 June was in bypass mode, and three patients presenting at Millicent Hospital were sent to Mount Gambier because the hospital was full; the aged-care facility was full; and four people from that community in Flinders Medical Centre were waiting to

be transferred back to Millicent Hospital for their convalescence.

A number of hospital beds have been tied up because of this fiasco and this bungling of aged-care HomeStart mess that the Treasurer of his own volition has created. We believe that 269 aged-care beds are not being built as a result of this. That is 269 acute beds which would otherwise be available for members of the South Australian community. This government was making health its major priority. It is certainly not working in country areas, and I say that what it is doing in the city certainly will not work. Those people who cannot get beds in country hospitals will merely take up beds in the city-based hospitals.

Education is another area of major spending of state governments. In this budget there is a \$34 million cut in education expenditure over the next four years. When it was in opposition, the Labor Party was trumpeting what it would do in those two major areas of education and health, yet it has done absolutely nothing. It has taken \$26 million from the education capital works budget; it has announced an increase in teacher numbers; it has raised the school leaving age, but it has actually cut the budget; and it has cut out-of-school-hours child care. I think we can look forward to an occurrence similar to what happened last time the Labor Party governed this state, that is, a wind-down in the physical fabric of our educational sector. We will have schools falling down around the ears of the teachers and students, as happened previously.

There has been a general increase in taxes and charges of 4.2 per cent, despite the fact that throughout the election campaign the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the whole front bench were running around the state saying, 'There will be no new taxes and no increases in taxes.' We have already had a 4.2 per cent increase in taxes and charges and a raft of new taxes as well. We have had an increase in third party compulsory motor insurance of 21.5 per cent. We have had stamp duty rises, although the government says, 'We are hitting only those people who are selling homes worth over \$200 000.' Again, the government has ignored the country areas and the primary sector, that sector which has been, and is still, important to the economic welfare of this state. It has totally ignored them. No-one will buy anything resembling a viable farming property for anywhere near \$200 000. I would suggest one would spend more than \$1 million buying a viable farm anywhere in the state. Once again, the rural sector is being slugged, not only because this mob in government does not understand but also because they do not damn well care.

Let me come to the proposition regarding crown perpetual leases. The minister understands absolutely nothing in relation to crown perpetual leases. I had a telephone call from a friend in the Mallee last evening. He said he holds several crown perpetual leases. Last Thursday, when this measure was announced, Adelaide was clouded in dust. Those poor beggars in the Mid North and the Mallee, who are trying to eke out a living fighting against the vagaries of the climate we have in this state, had sown thousands of acres of crops but their paddocks were blowing away because of the lack of rainfall.

**Mr Caica:** Are you blaming us?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I am not blaming it on members opposite, but if they had an ounce of understanding they would know that in the 1930s farmers walked off that country. They took the goods they could carry and walked off the properties. A few years later, in 1944—certainly in the northern Mallee—the government of the day issued a lot of

crown perpetual leases and almost pleaded with people to take them up so that they would manage the land on behalf of the people of South Australia. Now we have an insensitive minister who has no understanding wanting to bring in—and I am not sure of the increase, but it would be many hundreds if not thousands in percentage terms—increases in the rents on crown perpetual leases and about a 400 per cent increase in the amount required to convert a crown perpetual lease to a freehold title.

The people who still hold crown perpetual leases in the farming community are those poor beggars who are doing it so hard that they have not been able to spend the \$1 500 per lease to convert it to freehold. Those who have done all right in recent times, over the last few years, spent the \$1 500 and converted the lease to freehold. So, the people the government is picking on are the very people who are already on their knees. That is the problem with having a lack of understanding as to what is happening in the community. This is coming from a government that spent eight years in opposition running what it calls a 'Labor listens' campaign. It might have been out there listening, but it certainly did not hear. All I can say is that, if those people are pressured to pay this extra money, they will be putting more pressure on the land that they are managing and farming. Then, in a few years, the government will say, 'These irresponsible farmers are turning the West Coast, the Mid North, the Mallee into a dust bowl.' It will be because members opposite would be pushing them into doing that.

I note that the clock is winding down. I wish I had at least twice as much time, because I want to raise many more matters. I will spend my last few minutes talking about the super profits on the pokies issue. Here we have the Treasurer coming in and saying, 'I'll hit these hoteliers who are making super profits on poker machines because nobody sympathises with them as they are multi-millionaires.' That may or may not be good politics. What is very bad for politics and what is bad for South Australia is that, prior to the last election, the Treasurer looked these very same people in the eye and said, 'I won't do it; I won't raise the taxes.' Not only did he look them in the eye, but he wrote them a letter and he himself signed it.

What credibility does this Treasurer have? This is the person who is responsible for negotiating on behalf of the government and the people of South Australia with every potential investor who wants to come to this state. What credibility does our chief negotiator have? Absolutely none. He has looked people in the eye and said, 'I won't increase your taxes.' They have gone out in good faith, taken decisions and invested so that they can employ people and grow the economy in their state and he has pulled the rug from under them. Why would anybody come to South Australia under those circumstances when they can go anywhere else in Australia where they can deal with people they can trust?

I conclude by saying that this budget proves that this very new government in South Australia cannot be trusted, should not be trusted and does not care about anything other than the trappings of office. It does not care about the welfare of the people of South Australia or about building the state to make it the sort of place that those hard working men and women in South Australia deserve.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I have just realised that the member for Torrens has been using ventriloquism to get the member for Colton into trouble, so I caution the member for Torrens.

**Mr O'BRIEN (Napier):** I have listened intently to the debate on this bill, particularly to the opposition's contribution. Whereas on other issues I have not been able to discern a clear opposition line, in this debate the opposition appeared disciplined, with each speaker reinforcing the other, starting with the lead given by the Leader of the Opposition. Each opposition speaker has reinforced and built upon the impression created by the previous speaker, leading to one indisputable conclusion: it is a conclusion not only indisputable, irrefutable and inescapable but one that would worry the majority of South Australians—namely, that, for want of understanding of government finances within the ranks of the opposition in this house, the position of shadow treasurer will have to remain for the foreseeable future with the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place. Virtually every opposition speaker in this debate has seized upon the comments in the *Financial Review* of Friday 12 July to charge the Treasurer with executing—to quote the Leader of the Opposition—'a sleight of hand' and an 'accounting fiddle'. In his speech, the Leader of the Opposition said:

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! Unfortunately for the Treasurer this sleight of hand has not gone unnoticed.

The leader continued:

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.

The Leader of the Opposition went on to say:

It is a pity that some of our local journalists did not pick up on that quite as quickly.

The member for Unley backed up the position of the Leader of the Opposition with the observation:

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.

I am quite clear about the morality of the process. I do not know about the legality of that process.

Similarly, the member for Bright said:

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 area—deceptively and, I would argue, dishonestly.

The member for Goyder said the following:

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 be suspicious of any figures that he puts forward. How can I rely on them? How can I trust him when it is clear as clear that he has used a gigantic fiddle?

The member for Bragg stated:

... others have commented on the Treasurer's conduct in holding over funds from the state financial institutions from one financial year to another. 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.

What of this so-called sleight of hand, this accounting fiddle, this immoral practice, this deceptive manipulation of budget figures, this downright dishonesty, this furphy that the Treasurer of South Australia has attempted to perpetrate on South Australians? On the advice that I have been given, the practice to which the opposition has continually referred during the course of this debate is one that it used from at least the 1999-2000 budget. In the 1999-2000 budget, I am informed that \$201 million was to be distributed from the South Australian Asset Management Corporation as dividend for budget purposes. I am informed that none of this money was applied to the budget purposes, and remained within SAAMC. Similarly, in the 2000-01 budget, \$109 million was to be applied from SAAMC dividends. I am informed that, again, none of this money was applied and was retained as unpaid dividend for use in the subsequent budget period. The same is the case for the past financial year where, in line with established practice, the \$194 million of SAAMC dividends were not required and were spilled across to the current budget.

The reason for this practice of deferring distributions from SAAMC and the South Australian Financing Corporation is, I am advised, to offset the deferral of agency expenditure advised by government agencies. This practice has been applied consistently by the former government to achieve smooth results. This practice used by the previous Liberal government has again been applied in the 2002-03 budget. In the lead-up to the budget process, agencies advised Treasury and Finance of an under-expenditure of over \$320 million in 2001-02. This resulted in approved carryovers of over \$200 million in expenditure into 2002-03.

The deferral of distributions has typically occurred at three times in the year: during the budget process in April-May, when preliminary results for a financial year become available, in August-September and in preparing the mid year budget review in January. At each of these times, Treasury collates updated information about agency spending patterns and the state of government, taxation receipts and receipts from the commonwealth. From this information, Treasury can take account of the spending patterns and recommend the adjustments of dividend distributions accordingly to smooth out any unexpected over or under-expenditures. The action of the Treasurer in spilling over SAAMC and SAFA dividends to the next financial year and the next budget is a practice employed by the previous Liberal government for the purposes of smoothing out unexpected over and under-expenditures.

The payment of dividends from the South Australian Asset Management Corporation and the overall operations of the corporation are subject to annual auditing by the Auditor-General's Department. The allocation of SAAMC dividends by the Treasurer is in line with previous Liberal government



practice, and the corporation is subject to audit review by the Auditor-General. As the relevant act also provides for the board of directors of SAAMC to be subject to the control and direction of the Treasurer, the dividend decisions of the previous Liberal treasurer have been subject to examination by the Auditor-General, as will be the decisions of the current Treasurer.

So much for the claims by the opposition of the sleight of hand, the immoral practice, the deceptive manipulation of budget figures, the downright dishonesty, the furphy that the Treasurer of South Australia has attempted to perpetrate on South Australians. The only furphy to be perpetrated in this debate is that of the opposition in its continual inference during the course of this debate that it has even a skerrick of an idea of public sector finance.

**Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders):** I have to congratulate the government on its marketing, and I sincerely hope that the media and the public will see through and expose the hypocrisy of what I consider to be a con perpetrated on the people of South Australia by a government that says it wants honesty in government. This budget is particularly galling for those of us who live in the country regions. My electorate, which encompasses most of Eyre Peninsula, contributes about \$1 billion to the state's economy. Such contribution (according to the government budget press release especially written for regional South Australia) will be recognised 'with increased funding in the priority areas of health, education, community development and essential infrastructure', and projects that were already approved in the 2001-02 budget will be honoured.

Not only have these promises been broken but, to add insult to injury, additional taxes are particularly targeted to hit those people who populate our regions. This is after another promise that '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'. The biggest education shock came with the cutting of the long awaited and budgeted first stage of the Ceduna Area School. All new schools (bar one, I understand) are in Labor electorates, and all are within commuting distance of the Adelaide CBD. So, a school that has brown hessian ceilings, that is full of stale mouse pee, dust and other unpleasant asthma causing nasties, will remain, presumably, until we get the next Liberal government. I invite the media to visit and see this school for themselves.

The health picture is no better. Within Flinders are 10 acute care hospitals catering for the needs of the families living in these remote regions and also the tourists who are beginning to visit this wonderful area. The needs are great in these hospitals, and much of the equipment and facilities are provided by the communities. Despite this, the increase in the budget for country hospitals is only 2.4 per cent (less than the rate of inflation), while the metropolitan hospitals receive a huge 7.1 per cent. I suppose we are supposed to be grateful that we have not lost our paid ambulance officer in Ceduna, when other regions have lost theirs. City people are often not aware that, except in Port Lincoln, the ambulances on Eyre Peninsula are operated by volunteers and that any added pressure to do more compulsory paperwork and training will further discourage these dedicated, busy people. Many ambulance services are already short-staffed, but city people demand an ambulance when they are in the country and happen to need one. The main east-west highway across Australia passes along the top of Eyre Peninsula and carries

a huge volume of traffic, including buses and heavy transport. Their protection in the case of accidents that happen on this stretch is the volunteers who sacrifice to serve their communities. The same can be said for other regions.

One of our most successful community development projects has been the local crime prevention strategies, and it was acknowledged by the Liberal government that local solutions were needed that were tailored to suit their individual differences. Committees of dedicated volunteers have put in place some excellent programs. I was delighted to see that these programs had been funded, according to the regional budget press release, only for these people to be disillusioned when told by the minister that a mistake had been made and that this funding will not now be made available. This affects the most disadvantaged members of our community. Essential infrastructure for an electorate such as mine is a good road system to enable families to travel to school, work, church, sport and social functions. These roads are shared with the large trucks that carry the grain into the silos and the super to the farms, producing a good proportion of the state's wealth.

In 1993 the electorate had the two longest unsealed rural arterial roads in the state, and the then minister undertook to seal all rural arterial roads by the year 2004. The minister was on track to keep her promise and had also helped with some very dangerous designated regional roads. Imagine my horror when I found that the arterial road budget had been cut to only \$2.8 million and that the regional roads fund along with the tourism road funding had both disappeared altogether.

It costs around \$120 000 to seal one kilometre of road, and I understand that there are about 19 kilometres to go on the Lock-Elliston Road, equating to about \$2.28 million. This will presumably leave only \$520 000 for the arterial roads for the rest of the state, or are the people who live in what I understand is the largest council area with the smallest number of people in the state to wait until the next Liberal government?

The Elliston council also contains a large area of parks where the local people are expected to maintain roads and firebreaks and volunteer to fight fires risking their lives to the detriment of their businesses, work and families. Where is our Minister for Social Justice, for there is no social justice for the people of Elliston?

I would like to say a few words about an issue that has kept the phones ringing in my office since the budget was delivered. I refer to the increase in crown leases and licences and the freehold purchase price for perpetual leases. Even banks have never differentiated between leasehold and freehold. As I understand, this crown land was leased at such a low rate on the written understanding that the people taking on these leases would clear and develop this land. This they and their families did, putting up with considerable hardships and deprivations which doing it required of them, particularly in locations as remote as Eyre Peninsula.

Now that the land has been tamed and there have been a few good years, this socialist Labor government sees these farmers and their descendants as wealthy landholders who must be taxed. It makes me very angry that city people who have never picked up a sledgehammer to break the rocks on their land, who have never picked up a rock or a stump in their lives (let alone thousands upon thousands of them), now look at this prosperous well farmed land and see independent landowners who have little time for the nonsense of the cities—and the government wants to get at them. To me it is unjust and ignorant. I saw my father and brother with callused

hands that bled from deep cracks. My mother's brother died from polluted water from a well with no hope of getting to a doctor. Every family that has connections with the land has similar stories to tell.

This land has been bought and paid for by the blood, sweat and tears of the people from the land. When they purchased their perpetual leases they paid full market prices and from then on all fees and charges were imposed on them by governments (local, state and federal) as if the land had been freehold. Most of these people, who do not trust governments not to do what the government is currently trying to do, have tried to freehold their land. However, bureaucratic red tape has often put almost insurmountable difficulties and considerable costs in their way, thus ensuring that many of the leases have not been amalgamated or made freehold despite the wishes of owners.

I suspect that the government has a fight on its hands that it would not have anticipated. This is one issue where I believe the community will stand and fight—something which, unlike farmers in places such as France, our farmers are normally very reluctant to do. Only today did I realise that the increase in stamp duty on houses worth over \$200 000 will also apply to farming properties and, presumably, other businesses from which people earn their living and which they usually hope to build up and sell to provide for their retirement. This is a wealth tax to discourage those who are willing to buy their properties and businesses and take the risks, work the hours and pay the wages of others, both directly and often indirectly.

Social justice obviously applies only to city people, and this government considers country people to be second-class citizens. From a \$9 billion Labor debt in 1993 to a balanced budget in just over eight years of Liberal government has not been easy, and country people have contributed more than their share, as acknowledged in the press release mentioned earlier, which states:

Regional South Australia, with little more than a quarter of the state's population, generates two-thirds of the state's export income, and a quarter of the state's manufacturing turnover.

It goes on to say:

This has been clearly recognised in the budget.

I would add: yes, with a kick in the guts.

**Mr CAICA (Colton):** Mr Acting Speaker, I endorse the comments of the member for Florey that it is a delight to be able to direct my comments on the budget through you tonight.

**Ms Breuer:** Yuk!

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brindal):** If the member for Giles is feeling ill, she should leave the chamber.

**Mr CAICA:** I would like to add that I am very thankful to be on my feet at this time because any comments that might come from the member for Torrens might be construed as interjecting on myself, given the mistakes that were made earlier. I am not quite sure how much consultation has occurred between members opposite and their constituents because the clear indication that I am getting from the constituents of Colton is that they are very impressed with this the first Labor budget. Indeed, unlike the member for Flinders, my phone has been running hot with people ringing up to say, 'Congratulations. It's about time we had a government that not only was willing to make some hard decisions but also is in the process of governing for all South Aust-

ralians.' That is my point: we are in the process of governing for all South Australians.

Some of the points that I would like to make will require my referring to some of the speeches made by other members. I will start with some comments made by the member for Unley. As you would be aware, Mr Acting Speaker, I have the utmost respect for the member for Unley who, in the first instance, referred to comments of the former New South Wales Auditor General, Mr Harris, in the *Financial Review*. He quoted Mr Harris as saying:

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

I find interesting that it appears from the perspective of the opposition that this is some form of revelation, something new that is occurring. I remind the opposition that this has been custom and practice for some time. Indeed, at the time of the 2001-02 mid-year budget review the then treasurer (the Hon. Rob Lucas from another place), among other things, made adjustments to the timing of our SAAMC dividends to achieve small surpluses across the forward estimates. Specifically, it was recommended that \$74 million be deferred from 2001-02 for future years. So, we are not talking about anything new; it is custom and practice.

In its first budget, this government is continuing that custom and practice. I think a mountain is being made out of a molehill. I wish there was a little bit more substance coming from the opposition than this clutching at straws with respect to highlighting what it believes is something different from what has occurred in the past when that is not the case.

The member for Unley also referred—I am not quite sure of the relevance of this, but I am sure, Mr Acting Speaker, that you will guide me—to comments of the member for West Torrens when he said (quoting the leadership group of the Labor Party) that they said:

We will put police before consultants.

He went on to say that he found it somewhat interesting that one of the first actions of our government was for the Minister for Local Government to spend \$50 000 on a consultancy. The member for Unley would understand that that \$50 000 was spent to consult with the people, a process that was not undertaken by the previous government with respect to that project. Had that process been undertaken earlier, there is probably enough evidence to suggest that the \$2 million in savings proposed now to be found by the state government in respect of that project might have been found earlier and there could have been additional cost savings. So, I do not believe that was a relevant point to make that time, other than the fact that I am glad that it was identified that the spending of a small amount of money to save \$2 million was a very good exercise.

The next speaker from the opposition to whom I wish to refer is the member for Bright. Again, we go back a long way. We went to primary school together, high school together, university together and now we find ourselves in Parliament House together, albeit entering this place at different times; I have arrived a lot later. I guess the only difference between myself and the member for Bright at this point is that I am in government, he is not; and, indeed, he has been able to maintain an outstanding growth of hair, whereas I have lost mine. That is one of the differences between the two of us.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Colton would be advised to stick to the substance of the debate and not to hair growth.

**Mr CAICA:** I apologise, sir, and I appreciate your guidance. One of the comments made by the member for Bright is as follows:

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.

I do not think we as a government should apologise for rearranging moneys, because we are in government and we should be directing moneys to our priorities, not to the priorities of a party that is now in opposition. As to the comment about significant catastrophic results for sections of our community, I just reinforce the point I made earlier: the community and the constituents I represent do not and cannot see those catastrophic results to which the opposition refers. Indeed, they are congratulating our government on the stand it has taken. The comment at my children's football match on the weekend—*Henley v Port Districts* (outstanding junior grade competition) was, 'Congratulations, your government has done a good job.' So, I guess there is a difference between the areas that I represent and the areas that the member for Bright represents, but I point out that we are a government that will continue to govern for all people. The member for Bright went on to say:

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—

again, that recurring thing that we did not actually win—

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.

Again, we make no apologies for redirecting finances towards our priorities, and we will continue to do so. With respect to the deceit of which the member for Bright accuses the government, I would again just say that the practice in recent years, and a practice adopted by the Liberal government, has been to defer the distributions from SAAMC and SAFA primarily to offset the deferral of agency expenditure advised by government agencies. This practice has been applied consistently by the former government and now by our government to achieve a smooth result. The next speaker from the opposition to whom I refer is the member for Goyder, who commenced his remarks by saying:

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.

He concluded:

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.

My comment here is that I have a bit of a misunderstanding. I am having trouble coming to terms with the fact that the member for Goyder believes that through some sound financial management, through some type of—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! It is difficult to keep the opposition in line for interjecting if the Minister for

Health's voice is so audible that her own member cannot be heard.

**Mr CAICA:** It seems to me that the member for Goyder believes that some outstanding financial management was undertaken by the now opposition during its term in government, when, clearly, everything we owned was sold to reduce what was indeed—and everyone would admit it—a huge deficit at that time. I am being a bit loose in my quote here, and I will paraphrase more than quote—

*The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:*

**Mr CAICA:** I will get to the member for Davenport later. I will paraphrase the editorial which appeared in the *Advertiser* and which stated that it was not like selling the family jewels: it was just like giving them away. I would now like to know (and I am sure the answers will arise somewhat later) from those people who bought ETSA—bearing in mind that they might have 95 years of their lease left—whether or not that asset has been paid for in the first four or five years—

**Mrs Geraghty:** They've made all their profits already.

**Mr CAICA:** That's the point. I would like to know how much money the new owners of the TAB are going to accrue over the next few years in a short period of time. That is cutting edge financial management: to sell our assets at such a price that those who have purchased them are already clearly the owners of them now, because they have had the capacity to pay them off in such a short time. The member for Morphett in his presentation, talking about a stamp duty, said:

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?

As I have said and will say again, the message I have had from the people of Colton is that they are very pleased with the approach that we have taken in this budget. As to the contribution by the member for Davenport, I did find it very interesting, albeit that he used the same speech writers that each member of the opposition has used to date, and certainly sings off the same tune sheet as everyone else. However, he did add something that was almost humorous with respect to the honeymoon period and the relationship between this government and the member for Hammond. I would suggest that the member for Davenport take on board the comments of his federal leader: that is, forget about the member for Hammond and get on with being a good opposition; because we are going to be a good government, we need a good opposition. I urge the member for Davenport to start working towards that cause.

One of the other comments made by the member for Davenport related to an attack on the core promises, referring to the public of South Australia being attacked and let down by those core promises. Again, I make no apology on behalf of our government for redirecting finances towards those things that are our priorities. It is very rude and I expect it might be uncalled of for me to give advice to the member for Davenport. However, I would say that when I hear his contributions I am often reminded of *The Life of Brian*: he is not the Messiah; he is a very angry man. Again, I paraphrase a little there. I know that the regal blood of the party flows through his veins and that he may well be destined for greater things, but I think that he has to undertake a course of anger management before that will occur.

One of the things noted by speakers on the other side was, again, this dishonesty and deceit. In fact, I congratulate the member for MacKillop, because he did have a different script writer. He actually said 'deceit and deception'. That may be

a tautology, but I will defer to those who know a little more than I. One of the comments made by the member for Davenport, again, was about the money that was no longer going to hospitals. It seems to me that under the previous government what we had was many promises over many budgets. For example, a hospital very dear to my electorate, the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, I think might have been announced four or five times—

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**Mr CAICA:** Seven times, I am informed by my colleague: seven times it was announced. We talk about deceit and dishonesty: the difference now is that we are actually going to do it. I know that in the decaying, dying stages of the former Liberal government's tenure in office some money was pushed to one side to start the stage 1 renovations at the QEH. However, the long-term intent of the government at that stage was to turn that hospital into a community hospital. I would say here that what we have now is a government that is going to be true to its commitment in the budget, and the QEH and other hospitals will be provided with ample funds to be improve a system that is desperately in need of helping.

*Ms Thompson interjecting:*

**Mr CAICA:** That's it. I always enjoy the contribution from the member for Schubert. In fact, if I am up in my room and I know that the member for Schubert is on, I will come down here, because I would not miss it for the world. What he said was that the priorities of the former government were, to use his term, 'absolutely scrapped'. However, again I would reinforce the point that there is nothing wrong with that. We are directing finances and money towards our priorities. For the member for Schubert's benefit, there are other areas in South Australia than just the Barossa. We are a government for all South Australians, and will continue to be so.

The member for Schubert also talked about fudging figures. As I said earlier, if we are being accused of fudging figures now, why in the 2001-02 mid year budget review was the Hon. Rob Lucas not accused of fudging figures when he made adjustments to the timings of the dividends from SAAMC so that small surpluses could occur over the next budget? It is one and the same: there is no difference. I really think that the opposition should stop grasping at straws.

*The Hon. G.M. Gunn interjecting:*

**Mr CAICA:** The member for Stuart is another outstanding member with respect to his contributions in parliament, and I would not miss them for the world. There are those who refer to the honourable member as the father of the house, and I must admit that there are others who refer to him as the dinosaur of the house. However, I would not miss for the world a contribution by the member for Stuart. It makes a person who would rather be home with his children at this time of night thankful to be here to able to hear such contributions.

I would like briefly to reinforce a couple of the points that I have made. This budget, with respect to those specific matters in which our government has been accused of deceit and dishonesty and fudging figures, is actually being consistent with past Liberal practices. It is essentially a process by which you pay your bills when you receive them, rather than paying them in advance. I am pleased to say, as a member of this government, that the budget is now structurally sound because of the processes put in place by our Treasurer.

**Mrs HALL (Morialta):** The first budget of the Rann Labor government is one that the South Australian community will come to remember as one in which that old saying is so true: that the devil is in the detail—what little detail there is so far. Treasurer Foley proudly echoes the words of his Premier and leader by constantly reminding us of how tough he is and how tough his budget is. Clearly, the buzz word of Labor at the moment is that magnificent five letter word 'tough'. In fact, the Treasurer boasted about his tough decisions, his tough budget, seven times in his budget speech.

The description that Labor has not used, however, in relation to its first budget is that it really is a document containing an extraordinary range of broken promises; a budget of new and increased taxes on the business community and families; and a budget that contains flashing warning signs of what is clearly to come. In its first budget in eight years, Labor has still not apologised to the South Australian community for the bizarre economic management and disasters of the State Bank, although Treasurer Foley possibly got as close as Labor is ever going to get to apologising when he said, in the third paragraph of the budget speech, that Labor has 'learnt from the past'.

Clearly, Labor has not learnt from the past because, if it had, the broken promises just would not be there, and more than an additional \$320 million in increased taxes and government charges would not be ripped out of our community over the next four years. The devil is in the detail and, as that detail begins to unravel and the focused scrutiny continues, it is clear that this budget, and the government's spin on this budget, has long-term disturbing implications for the economic future of our state. As our leader Rob Kerin has said, 'This is not the budget of a government with the correct and the right priorities.' This budget inflicts savage financial attacks on families and on small and big business, and it seriously contains short-term payback attacks on regional South Australia.

Our shadow regional affairs minister (Hon. Caroline Schaefer) has said, 'Labor has never cared about South Australia, and this budget really proves that it still doesn't.' But it does follow typical Labor philosophy: tax business, cause jobs to be lost, scare the hell out of potential investors, watch development dry up, and then blame someone else. Reading the 2001 budget response from the now Premier, the then leader of the opposition, demonstrates the betrayal which Labor has committed on behalf of the minority of South Australians who voted for them, because those people obviously believed Labor at that time. I wonder what they will do in the future. In a little over four months, they have managed to break almost every key election promise they made. The message from this budget is: talk is cheap—

*Mrs Geraghty interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I know that the member for Morialta's contribution is robust, but most members have been heard in silence, and I ask the government to hear the member for Morialta in silence.

**Mrs HALL:** As I said, from this budget, talk is cheap, and promises are expendable under the Rann Labor government. As an example, the then leader of the opposition had the gall to castigate our last budget speech for not containing the words 'electricity prices', and for having no plan to tackle the number one economic threat facing business and jobs in this state. Were the words 'electricity prices' and Labor's plan to tackle this number one economic threat facing business and jobs in this state addressed in this budget? No, they clearly were not.

Labor has shown itself sadly to be quite adept at trying to rewrite political history since coming to office, but they cannot rewrite official statistics. The ABS clearly and consistently, for example, shows that the former government inherited an unemployment rate of well in excess of 10 per cent, after previously reaching the dizzying heights of 12 per cent under Labor. Over years of hard work and good economic management and targeted job creation programs, we saw that rate drop to the best figure this state has recorded in well over a decade.

The fact that the government has not bothered to produce an employment statement with this year's budget papers makes me fearful that the success of the past eight years in addressing unemployment will be undone by this government. Is it any wonder that it is forecasting a reduction in employment growth of .25 per cent for this year in its own budget papers? It is interesting that Janet Giles, the UTLC President, said:

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

That is a fair condemnation from their own president. Jan McMahon, the General Secretary of the Public Service Association, has some fairly cruel things to say about her government, when she says that South Australians should not be under any illusions. She says:

This budget will impact on every government department. No agency will be quarantined.

She goes on to say:

It is great to say that you have been able to employ extra teachers and nurses, but if at the same time you are cutting the number of medical scientists, ward clerks in hospitals and school service officers—the people who underpin the work of nurses and teachers—you defeat the purpose.

She says further:

This is the human face of the impact of the job losses the government is about to implement. A further impact will be the loss of 600 pay packets into the community, particularly smaller regional communities and particularly small business.

This is one of its own officials. But what do we have of Labor's commitments over the past 12 months? Labor committed to the construction of an electricity interconnector to New South Wales to give us a cheaper power base load from the eastern states. The then leader said that our budget silence on electricity prices was deafening. Perhaps this government still has a page or two missing from this year's budget to address this pre-election 'number one economic issue facing our state'.

Labor promised, in addition, to scrap the emergency services administrative unit and to close at least two Asian trade offices. The Premier specifically named China and Indonesia. Broken promises come naturally to the Australian Labor Party when it comes to dealing with budgets and finances.

*Ms Rankine interjecting:*

**Mrs HALL:** As is now well recognised and acknowledged by the country's most respected finance writers and political commentators—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** I know that the member for Wright is passionate about this, but would you stop interjecting?

**Mrs HALL:**—Labor has used the accounting fiddle, to quote from the *Financial Review*, to create a claimed surplus of \$92 million for this year and a deficit of \$68 million for last year. When in opposition, the Premier and Treasurer both

strongly criticised the government for transferring dividends from both SAAMC and SAFA to influence, as they saw it, the budget bottom line.

Well, lo and behold, what did they do? Not only did they delay the transfer of these funds in 2001-02 to create a false deficit and support their mythical black hole claims: they had the cheek to transfer \$340 million from these entities into the current financial year to manufacture a surplus. That is \$40 million more than they had criticised us for. It clearly is breathtaking hypocrisy! Remember, this is the same Treasurer who criticised the previous government for this practice, saying it was a trick and a smokescreen, and that these funds should be used to pay off debt.

On the issue of state debt, it pains me to see that net debt is once again on the rise—and almost immediately upon Labor's taking office. Has nothing been learnt from the expensive and devastating mistakes of the past? I think not. The broken promises that should concern all South Australians are those that specifically affect jobs, and the cutting of the 600 jobs from the Public Service, despite firm pre-election commitments to the contrary, has again set the scene for the type of government that we now have in office in this state.

As a former minister for employment, I am aghast at the reduction in youth traineeships by a little over 100. It was a successful program and should not have been cut; it should have been expanded. Jobs, and job growth, should be a priority of this government. Clearly, that is not the case. There is another highly visible example of this absolute debacle and total betrayal of trust by this Treasurer involving the hotel industry. The South Australian hotel industry is the victim of the two faces of Treasurer Foley. There is the private, sincere face that cultivates friendships, trust and goodwill over a number of years; the private face that says, in private, 'Don't worry, my friends, I'll look after you; trust me. I won't increase your tax rate; no super tax from me.'

He then commits that same promise to paper, but then what does he do? As one of his very first actions in the office of Treasurer, he puts on his public Labor face and now proudly boasts that he could not in all conscience not impose this new super tax. The tragedy of this sheer arrogance is that it confirms public perception that the spoken word, and that the Foley written word, can never be trusted, not now, and never in the future. He claims that he is only taxing the super rich.

Well, as we start down that well-worn Labor philosophical path, the effect of this savage impost will see future investment falter. Sadly, we will again see jobs go and we will see prices rise. The government may not like it but the reality is that the hotel and hospitality industry is an enormous employer in this state. The figure the industry claims is something in excess of 23 000. Sure, a large proportion of those employees are casually employed but that happens to suit a lot of young people who, by choice, want to work part time to help supplement, in many cases, their income range as they study and go through their various higher education.

The General Manager of the AHA, John Lewis, said it pretty well, I believe, on ABC Radio when he said:

This is an irresponsible tax on jobs and on business. What it is going to do is to give South Australia a reputation as an investment black hole.

The broken promises continue with a savage financial attack on self-funded retirees and a \$20 concession for pensioners' power bills—all promises made, all promises broken. In his budget speech, the Treasurer was scathing in his attack on the

federal government for what he perceived as a broken promise in tax funding, yet less than a week later he criticised the opposition for not (as he puts it) having the moral fibre to go back on a promise, whilst he did. This statement amazes me and I seek to remind the Treasurer that it takes greater moral fibre to be true to your word than to break your promise.

This budget of broken promises is typical of the empty rhetoric we have come to expect from the Premier and the Treasurer. It is reminiscent of the classic snake-oil dealers: he will tell you exactly what you want to hear; he will peddle all of the easy answers; but, when it comes time to deliver, all we are left with are excuses and finger pointing. For all the promises and easy answers peddled by the Labor Party during the campaign and over the past eight years, this, its first budget, has exposed a party and a cabinet with no plan for a successful and growing South Australia, and it is ill-equipped for the rigours of government.

The electorate of Morialta is somewhat affected in a number of ways by this budget: not only by job prospects or lack of; not only by future economic growth or lack of; by business taxes, which there are plenty of; and by broken promises, which there are plenty of. Very specifically, a number of issues remain unresolved, and I will be pursuing them with vigour and in more detail at a later stage. But I find myself in agreement (which is most unusual and extremely rare) with the PSA General Secretary on the specific issue of the future of the Magill Youth Training Centre. I am very concerned at the lack of information contained in this year's budget. Certainly, at this stage, I can find no provision whatsoever for the relocation of the centre from Magill to Cavan, and I await with interest the Treasurer's response to what has happened to the \$22 million that was allocated in forward estimates to this project. I suspect that this is just another cruel cut, but surely the conditions under which the young clients of that facility live and the working conditions of the caring staff at the centre should be a top priority for this government. Therefore, as I said, I await with interest to be part of a briefing to be provided by the minister on this complex and concerning question.

In addition, I want to know the details and solutions on the future of Thorndon Park (the recreational and regional reserve in the electorate of Morialta) and what will be provided to detailed questioning during estimates, along with some of the solutions for the funding options that are currently available. Issues relating to the future of horticulture, land use and appropriate planning reforms in the section of my electorate covered by the Adelaide Hills Council remain a high priority to me and many of my hard-working constituents who live in that area.

In addition, a number of various committed multicultural groups and associations, along with their dedicated and hard-working volunteers are concerned about future cuts throughout a number of portfolio areas. I trust the estimates committee may allay many of the fears that these groups have at the moment. Labor believed that it could sneak into power with the support of the member for Hammond—that it would all just happen. Well, I am here to tell the government that it is not quite that easy. Complex and difficult decisions need to be made on a day-to-day basis; promises need to be delivered; and, more importantly, remember that honeymoons never last for that long. In the end, the South Australian public will come to see that all of the promises made by this government were not worth the paper on which they were written. I tried to find a couple of appropriate quotes about the politics of

this budget, and I thought there were two: the first is by Charles de Gaulle, who said:

In politics it is necessary either to betray one's country or the electorate.

I believe that this government with this budget has done that extremely well this time. Another quote is from Everett Dirksen who said:

The three laws of politics are: one, get elected; two, get re-elected; and, three, don't get mad get even.

It is my view that the community of South Australia will indeed get even with the Australian Labor Party and the Rann-led government on the third Saturday in March 2006.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen):** Members would be aware that this is my first budget and the first budget of a number of other new members in this house. It has taken a considerable amount of time to read through the documentation and to decipher it using the wonderful assistance of the two-page glossary at the back of page 3 of the budget paper documents. I readily acknowledge that I had a lot to learn and, indeed, I did learn a lot by reading these documents. It was evident right from the outset that there were many inconsistencies between what the government was saying and what was the reality, between what the government was promising to do and what it was actually delivering. For instance, in his budget speech, the Treasurer states:

The first point is that, in recent times, this state has underperformed compared to the rest of the nation and relative to its potential. Economic growth in South Australia has lagged behind that of the nation as a whole.

The facts stated in the Treasurer's own budget documents simply belie that statement, and I refer members to the items on the South Australian economy in chapter 9 of Budget Paper 3 where the following statements are made:

Data for State Final Demand (SFD) shows that South Australia's economy grew by just 0.1 per cent in the March quarter, but previous strong growth has resulted in a 5.7 per cent through-the-year increase to the March quarter. This strength is expected to be reflected in relatively strong economic growth in South Australia for the full financial year.

Activity in the new dwelling sector has rebounded. . . South Australia's trend unemployment rate was 6.6 per cent in May 2002, compared to 7.4 per cent in May 2001. Continued strength is indicated by the 20 per cent increase through the year in trend job advertisements to May 2002.

Business investment is expected to replace residential construction as a major driver of economic activity. . . Retail trade. . . grew by 10 per cent through the year to the March quarter 2002 (real terms). This was above the national average and second highest of all the states. South Australia's trend motor vehicle sales increased by 13 per cent through the year to April—well above the national average of 9.7 per cent.

Exports continue to bolster. . . economic growth in South Australia. Notwithstanding the international slowdown, exporters strengthened their ties with established markets such as USA, UK and the Middle East, resulting in growth of 11 per cent in the 10 months to April 2002.

During 2000-01, farming incomes were high by historical standards—good crop yields coupled with favourable exchange rates and commodity prices resulted in a buoyant agricultural sector. The total farm gate value of SA's agricultural production increased by 27 per cent. . . from 1999-2000, and was 59 per cent higher than 1997-98.

So it goes on. To suggest, as the Treasurer did, that this state has underperformed, compared with the rest of the nation and relative to its potential, simply does not fit with the document itself. A number of promises were made by the government prior to the budget and during the budget speech which clearly have not been met. The most fundamental, of course, and that which has been referred to by virtually every other speaker, is that of 'no new taxes and no increase in taxes'. I am sure that the average person in my electorate and everywhere else in the state thought that meant no new taxes and no increase in taxes.

Instead, what do we find? Let us look at the property market. After all, the investment in the family home remains the single most important factor in the financial lives of most people. Stamp duty on all conveyances was increased, many quite significantly, starting at any property over \$200 000, but the increase is markedly increasing as the value of the property goes up. The stamp duty on a \$300 000 property is increasing by \$500 in its base rate, plus an additional 1 per cent on that part of the value of the property over \$300 000.

Similarly, in relation to the emergency services levy, the government says that it is not increasing the rate of that levy on private property owners, but it does not need to because the property values on virtually every property in the state will see to its getting an increase. Then there is the matter of motor vehicles. After all, most families own one car, if not two. We were expecting no increase, but what do we find? We find a pre-budget announcement of a 9 per cent increase for most people.

Most particularly, in respect of that promise of no new taxes and no increase in taxes, I want to comment on the gambling tax revenue. The government has been blowing its trumpet loudly about how this is a Robin Hood budget—taking from the rich and giving to the poor. The government announces in this budget document its plan to restructure the gambling machine tax to take a portion of the so-called super profits of certain rich hotels. Two things concern me about this decision. It is not so much the decision to increase the tax on those hotels which concerns me but, rather, the blatant way in which the Treasurer has gone against not just the general promise of no new taxes and no increase in taxes, but a very specific, explicit promise, both in writing and face to face, made by the Treasurer to the Australian Hotels Association that he would not increase this tax. The Treasurer during question time—

**Ms Rankine:** You should have been here when the former premier announced the sale of ETSA, if you want to talk about broken promises. You should have been here then.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Wright should contain herself. She knows that is out of order.

**Mrs REDMOND:** For four years the government sat here as the opposition loudly proclaiming the injustice of the former government and its sale of ETSA. What hypocrisy to now turn around and say that, having belted the former government over four years for breaking a promise, the very first thing this government does is break its first promises.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** The member for Heysen should not rise to the bait.

**Ms Rankine:** That's right; it's improper.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** And the member for Wright should be quiet.

**Mrs REDMOND:** The Treasurer during question time on 15 July acknowledged that he had made this promise. Indeed, he said:

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.

He then went on later in that answer to the same question to admit:

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.

What the Treasurer seems to be ignoring, in fact, is that this is just such a blatant reversal of what he has clearly stated. He seems to think that if he puts a positive spin on it, that he is a Robin Hood robbing the rich to benefit the poor, all will be forgiven. He fails to recognise the breach of trust and the lack of faith created in the business community by this one act. Furthermore, he fails to recognise the damage to people who have entered into contracts in good faith based on business plans, in turn resting on the quite specific promises of the government prior to the election.

The second point about this decision is that the government is recovering an extra \$39 million in additional taxes by this measure, but is only funding its programs to help problem gamblers to the tune of \$1 million per year. Suffice to say that 'no new taxes and no increase in taxes' could not possibly mean the extra \$250 million in taxes which this budget delivers to the government.

I also want to comment on a couple of other matters, including another broken promise of the government. It promised quite specifically a reduction of \$20 million in consultants' fees. Certainly, there is a reduction of \$10.6 million, a little over half what was specifically promised by the government prior to the election.

My next comment is in relation to the overall budget, in particular, the deception perpetrated by noting and describing in the budget documents a number of operating and investment expenditures which are stated in the budget but which do not commence until some time in the future. For instance, in the area of human services initiatives, we have 'additional group homes', described as supporting 'the provision of supported accommodation in a community setting for people with intellectual disabilities'. That sounds terrific, but how much is budgeted for that in 2002-03? It is zip; in 2003-04, zip; and in 2004-05, zip. We do not get any funding on that line until 2005-06. It sounds terrific, but it is not happening.

Similarly, the Women's and Children's Hospital is listed in the same human services initiatives. It is to improve a range of services at the Women's and Children's Hospital, according to the description, but, again, for the first two years nothing is applied towards that line. Again, in its 'Investing initiatives' under 'additional group homes', for the first two years there is nothing; \$1.8 million in the third year; and nothing in the fourth year. Again, in its 'Investing initiatives', the Women's and Children's Hospital misses out on any actual funding in the immediate future.

Similarly, in the area of transport and planning on table 3.13, the 'Investing initiatives', rather than the 'Operating initiatives', includes 'annual major transport project pool'—I thought this was really good when I first read it—and it is to 'fund a number of transport projects including new overtaking lanes, shoulder sealing and funding for the State Black Spot Program as part of road safety initiatives'. But, when members read the document, again they see that there nothing

in 2002 and nothing in 2003. It is perpetrating a lie to put these in on the basis these are all part of the current budget: they are certainly not.

My biggest overall concern with this whole budget is really the emphasis on the city, and the largely Labor electorates, surprisingly, at the expense of the regions of this state. Our regions are so important to this state. All rural sectors have shown strong growth since 1997-98. The budget document quite clearly states that we have extremely good regional economic conditions. It states:

The region contributing most to the State's total value of production is the northern region, where mining activities contribute almost \$2 billion to the state's total value of primary industry production. The Eyre and Yorke regions contributed over half of the state's value of field crop production of \$1.3 billion, of which wheat contributed \$767 million.

The Murraylands and the South-East contributed almost half of the state's total livestock production, and the horticulture industry (which includes wine production) is heavily represented in the Riverland, South-East, Fleurieu and Barossa regions. Seafood production is mainly concentrated in the Eyre region, showing its strong presence in the tuna industry as well as growing aquaculture industries.

The total farm gate value of South Australia's primary production of \$4.2 billion—that was in 2000-01—was up 27 per cent from 1999-2000 and 59 per cent higher than 1997-98. So, on the basis of the government's own document, there is no doubt that this is an important area for this state. It is important that our regions are looked after. But what do we find in terms of this budget and its effect on regions? The overall reduction in regional programs is estimated to be at least \$17 million. The animal disease control item last year was \$10 million for incident response; this year it is only \$6 million. Cuts to FarmBis will result in regional cuts to TAFE and PIRSA and significant job losses in regional areas. There are cuts to regional volunteer ambulance radio stations serving Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula and the South-East. By the way, this is just a clear example of the bureaucracy pulling the wool over the government's eyes in not explaining how devastating these cuts in particular will be to the volunteer ambulance service in these regions. Crime prevention in the regions has been cut from \$1.4 million to \$600 000 with virtual shut-down within six months.

Probably most startlingly of all is the government's position on perpetual leases. The government's intention to impose rental on these indicates its complete failure to understand that the properties—be they businesses, houses or farms—are bought and sold at commercial rates. These leaseholders are the rightful owners who paid proper value for the property. There has been a decrease in road programs, and there have been cuts to education such as that involving the Ceduna school, already referred to by the member for Flinders. Social justice programs have been cut, and there have been cuts to the level of funding in regional hospitals. This budget ignores all our rural regional sectors.

What does the seat of Heysen have to look forward to out of the budget? Stirling East Primary School—happily—is at least in the budget, and the same total amount is still allocated for its redevelopment. It is a very necessary redevelopment. It is the largest primary school in the electorate, and it is built entirely with transportable buildings, many in very poor condition, with leaking roofs causing not just children's clothing and books to become saturated—and that is even when the clothes are hanging inside the buildings—but even computers being damaged by water in the rooms where the young children are about to sit down to use them.

What do we find in this budget? The Stirling East Primary School redevelopment is certainly still there. However, last year it was to have \$1 million spent on it—although the work is yet to commence—but this year the budget has been reduced to \$500 000. In other words, although the total outcome will be the same, the government is slowing it down and delaying the redevelopment. Apart from that, the only specific items for the electorate of Heysen out of the entire budget are, first, the Mount Lofty Summit, with a budget allocation of \$200 000 for each of the next two years. This is allocated to introduce new marketing activities to promote the Mount Lofty Summit and its facilities, ongoing building maintenance, landscaping and security costs. While I welcome the news, it is really to benefit visitors to the area rather than those who live in the electorate.

Then we have the Mount Lofty catchment management. This item states that the operating initiatives under the portfolio of environment and conservation and the River Murray are to introduce formal catchment management through prescription and licensing in line with the provision of the Water Resources Act 1997. That is fine, but once again when we look at the budget we find that the amount to fund this initiative in 2002-03 is zero. The amount to fund this initiative in 2003-04 is zero. So it is not until three years down the line that there will be any spending on this initiative within the electorate. Those are the only items in the budget specifically referring to anything happening in the electorate of Heysen. Of course, there is the more general European wasp control program. That obviously affects the electorate of Heysen, where we have a European wasp problem. I am pleased to see that at least some funding for a control program has been included. However, a one-off budgeted amount of \$100 000 for one year only suggests to me that the government is not committed to a serious program to eradicate the problem.

What then are the serious issues for the people of the electorate of Heysen? What do we want addressed? Numerous primary schools in the electorate have significant maintenance and restructure issues; for instance, Kangarilla Primary School has been assessed for its asset management purposes as being in need of two teaching spaces and half a million dollars in refurbishment. Mylor Primary School has been long overdue for redevelopment, having somehow fallen off the list during a previous Labor government. Children there have to walk some distance in very cold, wet weather to toilets well away from school buildings. The Echungua and Meadows Primary Schools have significant maintenance and teaching space issues. I have mentioned before in this house Uraidla, Norton Summit and Basket Range Primary Schools. These schools have no reticulated water supply and are forced to close whenever there is a blackout, which can be a pretty frequent occurrence in the summer.

There is also no mention in the budget—although I remain hopeful—that maintenance for these is somehow hidden under some generic heading. Redevelopment is long overdue for all those schools I have named. Redevelopment of the Aldgate CFS is also long overdue, where we have volunteers who have worked for years out of premises which are truly substandard. It was previously funded for redevelopment well before the three month limit imposed by this government in terms of those promises which had been made prior to the election and which it would not keep. The government made clear in the budget papers that it did not intend to honour those promises made in the last three months, but the arrangements for the funding of the CFS were made well before that,



yet I can find no reference to it in the budget papers. There is a crying need to provide the most basic adequate facilities for our volunteers there. Again, I hope that it is hidden somewhere in a generic line in the budget. Similarly, there is the new ambulance station for the Crafers interchange.

**Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel):** Being a newly elected member to this place, I have to say that I am disappointed. I am not disappointed particularly for myself or my colleagues because we had a fairly good idea what was coming, but I am disappointed for the people of South Australia, because they thought that this new Labor government was going to deliver on its big election promises. Unfortunately, they have been duped. Their trust has been betrayed. South Australians were expecting big increases in spending on health services and big increases in spending on education: 'No increase in existing taxes or no new taxes' was the promise by this Labor government. However, what did we see in this budget—broken promise after broken promise! This Labor government could remind us of the government we had a few years ago in Canberra. Members might remember the LAW tax cuts. Keating promised the LAW tax cuts. But what happened? They did not eventuate. It looks as though this Labor government is heading down that same track.

It is back to the old days of high taxes and wasteful spending, which is extremely disappointing for South Australians, particularly after the eight years of hard work by the Liberal government to clean up the mess left by the years of waste by Bannon and Co. The Premier assured South Australians that a Labor government would have the right priorities such as big increases in health and education spending. But it is clear that these promises have all been broken. Let us look at some facts. Education, in real terms, has been cut by \$34 million. That is a real concern, because there are many projects and initiatives within the education system that obviously require adequate funding. I know of many areas in my electorate that require the allocation of funds to ensure that a satisfactory standard of education is delivered. I would like to give the house some examples.

There are schools in Kavel that need significant money spent on their infrastructure. Oakbank Area School, Woodside Primary School and the Birdwood high and primary schools all need a significant allocation of funds. I know that Oakbank Area School has recently had a redevelopment of some \$2.8 million, but that is about half of what it really needs. Woodside Primary School really requires a whole new school to be built, and both schools at Birdwood also require urgent redevelopment work to be undertaken.

Another program in my electorate that requires continuing funding is SAILAH (Schools and Industry Links Adelaide Hills). This is a regional partnership that was founded to engage the resources of the local community to support vocational learning in preschools, primary and secondary schools. SAILAH, I believe, has been very successful in building these partnerships between schools, communities and businesses, and has delivered real outcomes for both students and industry in our region. Some very positive benefits have come from this particular VET program. This initiative has been running for three years, and adequate funding from the government to support the respective programs for VET in the region is vitally needed. I hope that the minister can guarantee continuing funding for SAILAH, because I cannot see any reference in the budget papers specifically highlighting VET programs. It looks as though we are in for a fairly bleak time for the next few years, if this budget is any indication. How

can the government fund essential works on schools (not just in my electorate but also in other electorates) and increase the number of teachers in schools, when spending has been cut by \$34 million in real terms?

I will talk a little about another of Labor's great broken promises, that is, the heralded promise of a huge increase in spending on health services. The total increase in operational funding for human services this year is, I believe, \$106 million, compared to \$213 million last year. In real terms, health spending has increased by 0.94 per cent—less than 1 per cent. One does not have to be a mathematical genius to work out that 1 per cent of \$106 million is a fraction over \$1 million. Well, whoopee—an increase of a little over \$1 million on health spending! If that is the best that this government can do, we are in very serious trouble.

Also, with respect to delivering adequate health services, how does the government plan to fund the building of new aged care facilities as a consequence of ceasing the availability of HomeStart loans for this purpose? How do the Treasurer and the Minister for Health plan the expansion of the aged care facilities at Gumeracha Hospital? We have not heard a thing. They do not have an answer, and while they sit there the aged in our community are the ones being hurt. Funding for aged care is going begging because of this government's inability to prioritise correctly.

While we are on the subject of health, I have raised an issue with the minister about the Mount Barker Hospital. I wrote to the minister on 25 March, and last Thursday (11 July) I asked a question in the house about the matter. At the time of my asking that question, my office had not received a response. Well, lo and behold, what rolls up in the mail yesterday? A reply from the minister dated 11 July. What a coincidence! I can tell the house that the reply was pretty nebulous. When the Mount Barker Hospital is bursting at the seams as a result of an increase in demand on services, and the minister has not done a thing about it, this government will be further exposed as a poor manager. It obviously lacks the ability to correctly prioritise the real needs of our community.

I would like to talk about the issue of tax increases. During the election campaign, the ALP assured the public that it would not increase existing taxes and that it would not introduce any new taxes. And what do we see? We find a raft of tax hikes: a pokies super tax, the emergency services levy rising, compulsory third party insurance is higher, stamp duty on property transfers is up, and the cost of crown leases increasing from \$2 to \$300; they are all examples of tax hikes. With respect to the pokies super tax, ask John Lewis of the AHA what they think of it, particularly when they were told—guaranteed—that the pokies tax would not increase. The AHA is ropeable. Only yesterday I spoke about this issue with a hotelier who owns a licensed premises in my electorate. He honestly believes that this government is robbing him and other hotels that have gaming licences. The gentleman went on to say that this taxation regime is ruining his business. I am not enamoured of poker machines, but they have been allowed into this state legally. People earn part of their living from the profits generated from the machines, and they provide employment opportunities. My constituent feels that this proposed taxation regime is totally unjust. It is certainly a disincentive to attract new investment to this state.

I would now like to talk about transport-related issues. The Minister for Transport has put out a statement along the lines that a total of \$223.6 million will be spent on roads, with a priority being towards arterial roads. That is all okay, but let

us hope that some of that money will also be spent on our main road system. I have previously spoken in the house about these two issues. They concern the towns of Mount Barker and Hahndorf. Unfortunately for the government, these issues will not go away. Given the rate of population growth in the Mount Barker, Littlehampton and Nairne districts, and the increased pressure that that places on local roads, the government has to commit to building a second freeway interchange in that area, or it must commit to work with, and provide funds for, the local council to assist with a major upgrade of current road network in and around those towns.

This region is one of the fastest growing areas in the nation. That obviously places pressure on roads, with the problem in Mount Barker already being felt by local residents. The District Council of Mount Barker has called on Transport SA to investigate an additional freeway interchange, but the minister has said that it is low on the list of priorities. This issue will start to loom even larger than it is at present, because 2 000 new homes are planned to be built in the district over the next three to four years. This will amount to significantly more traffic movement in and around the area which will result in unsustainable pressure on the current road infrastructure.

Another major issue is that of Hahndorf's main street. Hahndorf is one of the major tourism icons of this state, but its main street is old and narrow and it is not coping with the vast numbers of heavy trucks that use it as a main transport corridor. Hahndorf is a beautiful piece of living history showcasing our arts and cultural heritage, and thousands of visitors seek out the town to enjoy its many interesting shops and its unique village atmosphere. This brings tourist buses, cars and pedestrians into the main street. Of course, it has a large local population of about 2 000 residents who travel by car to and from the two schools, churches and shops, and the main street is the access point to the other streets. The main street is also an important transport route, part of the north-south corridor from the northern rural areas to the southern rural areas and return.

The Southern and Hills Local Government Association has produced a forward planning document entitled '2010 Transport Plan' which acknowledges the need for a Barossa-Southern Vales access route. There can be no doubt that Transport SA is aware of the very large numbers of heavy vehicles that use this road. The main street is congested and the combination of trucks, buses, cars and pedestrians makes manoeuvring through the town very difficult for all concerned and at times it can be unsafe. The government must commit to building a heavy vehicle bypass around the main street, and it needs to commit sooner rather than later.

Another issue concerning roads is the Lobethal to Mount Torrens Road. For many years, this road has been patched and patched. It is in a very poor state of repair. I have written to the minister specifically highlighting the need for a total upgrade but the reply that I received spoke in general terms of the road being placed on a list of candidate projects for future funding. That is a little encouraging, but I again urge the government to place this high on its list of priorities, and I will continue to push this issue until the road has been fixed properly.

On a more positive note, I am pleased that a new police station is to be built at Mount Barker. It is expected to be completed by 2005. That is good news, but let us put this in

context. This new station was one of the highest priorities that the police identified before the election and I know that work was done on this by the former Liberal government.

In closing, as I said, this budget is a disappointment. It promised so much but it delivered so little. I think the people of this state are disappointed. Labor government allies, the unions, have spoken out against the budget. I think we are all in for a very bleak future if this budget is any indication of what is in store for us over the next four years. Broken promise after broken promise is all we can look forward to.

Bill read a second time.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I move:

That this bill be referred to estimates committees.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I move:

That the house note grievances.

**Mrs GERAGHTY** secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ESTIMATES COMMITTEES

**The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport):** I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend to give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

#### EDUCATION (COMPULSORY EDUCATION AGE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

Page 3—After line 25 insert new clause as follows:

Transitional provision

7. (1) The amendments effected by this Act do not apply to a child who has, before the commencement of this Act, attained the age of 15 years if—

(a) the child has ceased to attend or be enrolled at a school; and

(b) the child is—

- (i) in full-time employment; or
- (ii) enrolled as a full-time student in an approved course of instruction or training; or
- (iii) engaged in part-time employment and enrolled in an approved course of instruction or training.

(2) In this section—

'approved course of instruction or training' means a course of instruction or training—

- (a) provided by a college of technical and further education pursuant to the Technical and Further Education Act 1975; or
- (b) accredited under Part 3 of the vocational Education, Employment and Training Act 1994; or
- (c) of a kind prescribed by regulation.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 10.33 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 17 July at 2 p.m.