

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 2 June 2003

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ROAD SAFETY REFORMS) BILL

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I have to report that the managers for the two houses conferred together and it was agreed that we should recommend to our respective houses that the following resolutions which are being circulated be agreed to:

As to Amendment No. 1:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out the word "anniversary" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and third anniversaries".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto

As to Amendment No. 3:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement.

As to Amendment No. 4:

That the Legislative Council amend its amendment by leaving out paragraph (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

(a) in the case of a licence issued to a person under the age of 19 years—

(i) if the person incurs one or more demerit points before he or she turns 19—

(A) until he or she turns 20; or

(B) until 2 years have elapsed, whichever occurs later; or

(ii) in any other case—

(A) until he or she turns 19; or

(B) until 2 years have elapsed, whichever occurs later;

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to Amendment No. 15:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to Amendment No. 17:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to Amendment No 27:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement.

As to Amendment No. 33:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment.

As to Amendment No. 35:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 17—After line 7 insert new clause as follows:

Insertion of section 110AAA

32B. The following section is inserted after section 110 of the principal Act:

Annual report by Minister on speed management

110AAA. (1) The Minister must, on or before 30 September in each year, prepare a report on—

(a) the adequacy of laws governing speed-limits and the need for any changes to those laws; and

(b) the criteria for determining the appropriateness of speed-limits applying on arterial and non-arterial roads; and

(c) the effectiveness of court and expiation processes in minimising the use of court resources for the enforcement of speed-limits; and

(d) priorities and strategies for the enforcement of speed-limits; and

(e) technologies for the detection of speeding offences; and

(f) the use of road infrastructure to manage speed.

(2) The Minister must, within 6 sitting days after completing the report, cause copies to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

(3) This section expires on the third anniversary of its commencement unless, before that anniversary, both Houses of Parliament pass a resolution declaring that this section will continue in operation after that anniversary.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

And that the following consequential amendment be made to the bill:

Clause 15—Leave out subsection (2) of section 81C and insert in lieu thereof:

(2) If a person expiates an offence to which this section applies, the Registrar must give the person written notice—

(a) that, commencing on a day specified in the notice, the person is disqualified from holding or obtaining a licence or learner's permit for—

(i) if the person has been convicted of a second offence—3 months; or

(ii) if the person has been convicted of a third offence—6 months; or

(iii) if the person has been convicted of a subsequent offence—12 months; and

(b) that, if the person holds any licence or learner's permit at the commencement of the period of disqualification, the licence or permit is cancelled; and

(c) if the person has been convicted of a third or subsequent offence—that, despite the disqualification imposed under this section, the person will, on application made to the Registrar at any time after the half-way point in the period of that disqualification, be entitled to be issued with a licence or learner's permit subject to the alcohol interlock scheme conditions for the required period (in addition to any conditions otherwise required).

Clause 23—Insert in subsection (4) after the words "purposes of this section" the words "(other than subsection (5))"

Clause 23—Insert after subsection (5):

(6) In determining whether a category 1 offence is a first offence for the purposes of subsection (5), any previous offence against subsection (1) or section 47(1), 47E(3) or 47I(14) for which the defendant has been convicted or that the defendant has expiated will be taken into account, but only if the previous offence was committed or alleged to have been committed within the prescribed period immediately preceding the date on which the offence under consideration was allegedly committed.

(7) For the purposes of subsection (6), the prescribed period is—

(a) in the case of a previous offence that is a category 1 offence—3 years;

(b) in any other case—5 years.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

BURIAL SITES

A petition signed by nine residents of South Australia, requesting the house to support the introduction of legislation preventing the burial sites in South Australia from being reused when leases are not renewed and providing protection of such sites in perpetuity, was presented by the Hon. R.B. Such.

Petition received

AMBULANCE COMMUNICATION CENTRE

In reply to **Mr VENNING** (Estimates Committee A) (7 August 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following information:

(a) SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) developed the proposal for the consolidation of the three regional communications centres (comcens). The objectives of the proposal were to:

1. Improve the quality and efficiency of SAAS' communications function, especially in regional areas.

2. Allow resources in regional areas to be reallocated for the provision of ambulance delivery and volunteer support.

3. Address the OHS&W issues associated with single officer operation of regional comcens.

The proposal was supported by the Minister and the announcement of the relocation was made as part of the Government's budget statements.

(b) SAAS considered the impact upon the regional communities as part of their decision making process. SAAS believes the proposal will deliver a number of positive benefits to the local community.

Rural patients will benefit through the availability of 'pre-arrival first aid advice' which is routinely provided by the Adelaide comcen. The nature of single operator country Comcens with the dual responsibility of call receipt and dispatch often prevented such advice from being offered. Instruction to bystanders in how to perform resuscitation, clear airway obstructions, control torrential haemorrhages, manage children with febrile convulsions and talking to those threatening suicide are typical examples where patients benefit prior to the arrival of responding ambulance crews. With longer average response times in regional areas (due to the distances to be travelled) the importance of this advice cannot be overstated given the improved patient outcomes in many metropolitan cases.

The local MPs and local government representatives were briefed by the Minister immediately following the announcement.

(c) After the announcement of the decision SAAS management undertook extensive consultation in regional areas where the comcens are located. This provided the local communities with an opportunity to voice their concerns, and SAAS management the chance to explain the rationale for the decision. Representatives of local government were also provided with opportunities to discuss their concerns.

The Berri comcen closed on 9 December 2002. The switch over to the Adelaide comcen has been without incident. All staff from the Riverland comcen have been redeployed within SAAS. The Mount Gambier comcen is scheduled to close in the second quarter of 2003, and the Port Pirie comcen by the end of 2003. SAAS continually monitors the level of service provided across the State.

PRISONERS, WORK

In reply to **Hon. R.B. SUCH** (Estimates Committee A) (31 July 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise the following:

Sentenced prisoners are required to work unless medically unfit in which case verification is provided by the South Australian Prison Health Service. The majority of sentenced prisoners who work average 25-30 productive hours per week. Pursuant to the Correctional Services Act, 1982, remand prisoners are not required to work. Adelaide Remand Centre is able to provide very few jobs for prisoners because of the physical environment of the facility. Remandees at other locations who are willing to work are encouraged to do so when work is available for them.

It should be noted that in addition to work prisoners are required to undertake core programs where identified for specific needs such as Anger Management, Victim Awareness, Alcohol & Other Drugs, Reasoning & Rehabilitation (Cognitive Skills), Literacy & Numeracy and Domestic Violence. They also participate in education and other programs

Kitchen workers across most prisons work split shifts of 3 hours twice per day (lunch and evening meals) and they are generally rostered over 7 days. This work includes, but is not limited to, the preparation of food, cooking, clean up, transportation of food to units via bainmaries where units do not have stand-alone meal preparation areas, retrieval and cleaning of bainmaries and at Cadell Training Centre and Adelaide Pre-release Centre the sorting of supplies for self contained living areas. In some cases prisoners are undertaking vocational training modules for certification in the food preparation.

I am advised that the following prisoners work in excess of 30 hours per week:

· Adelaide Remand Centre No prisoner regularly works 35 hours per week.		
· Yatala Labour Prison Kitchen	16	35 hours per week
· Adelaide Pre-release Centre Estates/maintenance/garden/pallet manufacturing and repair	16	30 hours per week
Metropolitan parks program	12	35 hours+per week
Work release/experience in the employer community	6-8	35 hours + per week depending on requirements. Those prisoners on work release are required to pay a percentage of their wage towards their 'board'
Education	7-10	35 hours + per week. This is meaningful education through university/TAFE with a focus on preparation for release
· Adelaide Women's Prison Kitchen	6	30-35 hours over 7 days
Laundry	2	30-35 hours over 7 days
Textiles and packaging	13	35+ hours per week
· Mobilong Prison PRIME workshop	7	37.5 hours per 7 day week
Cadell Training Centre Community service workers	4	Average 35 hours per 5 day week + additional work required in the unit
Kitchen	10	At least 35 hours over 7 days
Maintenance	12	At least 35 hours over 7 days. 2-3 of these workers are on 'stand-by' 24 hours per day in case of sewage problems (septic tank system—blockages/leaks, etc)
Grounds maintenance	1	At least 35 hours over 7 days (often up to 40 hours on a voluntary basis)
Administration Officers' station/staff meals	1	Cleaner At least 35 hours
Seasonal work (fruit picking)	20	40 hours per week
Dairy (PRIME)	8	40 hours per week
· Port Lincoln Prison Seasonal harvest/seeding	2	40 hours per 7 days week

Kitchen	7	In excess of 35 hours per week
Port Augusta Prison		
Kitchen	11	42 hours per week rostered over 7 days (includes bakery/butchery)
	3	36 hours per week rostered over 7 days
MOWCAMP	13	36 hours per 6 day week + 2 hours travelling time per day (each camp goes for 3 weeks at a time)
Mount Gambier Prison (managed by external contractor)		
Kitchen	7	40 hours per 7 day week
Industries	38	30 hours per week

PRISONERS, COST

In reply to **Hon. R.B. SUCH** (Estimates Committee A) (31 July 2002).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise the following:

The daily average cost per prisoner in 2000-01 for all prisoners was \$168.67. This figure includes accrued expenses (depreciation and accrued employee entitlements) and is based on accounting rules developed by the National Corrections Advisory Group for benchmarking the performance of all correctional administrations. The cost per prisoner for low security prisons was \$159.48 per day. For secure prisons the figure was \$169.90 per prisoner per day.

A typical daily regime varies depending on the security level of the prison. However, as an example, long term medium prisoners would face the following regime:

Breakfast

Cell and unit cleaning duties

Attend a range of activities eg work, education, therapeutic programs

Lunch

Attend a range of activities eg work, education, therapeutic programs, family visits

Evening Meal

Recreation

Activities in cell (eg study, reading, TV, games, writing letters, art)

Weekends are more focused on recreational activities and family visits.

Typical prison meals may include:

Breakfast: Toast, cereals, condiments, tea, coffee, milk

Lunch: Salad/cold meat and salad rolls; soup; cold meats/salads; meat pies/sausage rolls/pasties; Hamburgers; fresh seasonal fruit

Dinner: Rissoles; fish and chips; ham steak; tuna mornay/pasta; cold meat salad; chicken schnitzel; pasta dishes; a variety of hot chicken/pork/meat dishes (including chops/corned silverside/grilled steak/stew/mixed grill and roasts) with vegetables and/or hot chips; individual pizza.

Desserts include jelly and cream; steamed pudding with custard; fresh seasonal fruit; cake; apple slice.

In accordance with the Revised Standard Guidelines for Corrections in Australia, 'special dietary food is provided where it is established such food is necessary for medical reasons, on account of a prisoner's religious beliefs, because the prisoner is a vegetarian or where the prisoner has other reasonable, special needs'.

Prisoners in low security cottage accommodation at Cadell Training Centre and Adelaide Pre-release Centre are provided with an allowance per cottage with which they are required to purchase their weekly groceries. They are given a list of items from which to order through the store. They prepare that food themselves. Pre release prisoners are also permitted to use their own funds to purchase additional 'special items' of food. This is aimed at better preparing prisoners for release back into the community and the realities of daily living.

Visiting arrangements vary at each location. In accordance with the Correctional Services Act, 1982, remand prisoners are permitted 3 visits per week and sentenced prisoners 1 visit per fortnight. With the exception of Adelaide Pre-release Centre which has 7 day visiting access for all prisoners, special visits can be arranged outside of normal visiting hours by prior arrangement with prison authorities for reasons such as distances to travel ie from interstate or from the metropolitan area to a regional prison, or emergency reasons.

Adelaide Remand Centre—visits scheduled over 7 days. Each unit has specifically allocated times during the week.

Yatala Labour Prison has visits for sentenced prisoners on weekends and public holidays.

Some regimes have access to specified weekday visits. Remand prisoners have visits scheduled during the week and over weekends. Special visits can be pre-arranged for visitors who are unable to attend over the weekend.

Adelaide Pre-release Centre—7 days per week in a low security environment.

Adelaide Women's Prison—weekends and public holidays. Wednesday afternoon children's session for Under 12's. Special Visits may be made during the week by prior arrangement.

Cadell Training Centre—primarily over weekends and public holidays. Extended visits because of the travelling time involved for most visitors. Special Visits may be made during the week by prior arrangement.

Port Augusta Prison—same as for Cadell Training Centre.

Mount Gambier Prison—Remand and sentenced prisoners access visits on weekends, public holidays and Tuesday/Thursday/Friday afternoons. Special Visits may be made outside of normal visit times by prior arrangement.

Mobilong Prison—weekends and public holidays. Special Visits may be made during the week by prior arrangement.

Finally, what percentage of prisoners would be suffering from an identified psychiatric, psychological or related personality disorder? Once again, I am looking for an approximation; I do not want an absolute, precise answer.

I refer to information provided previously to the honourable member for Mawson in response to a question without notice that was asked in the House of Assembly on 17 July 2002 and referred to psychological services provided to prisoners.

The latest information available to the Department for Correctional Services on the extent of the mental health, personality disorder and intellectual disability problem in the prison setting, as measured on reception, is as follows:

Psychosis	10.7% males
	15.2% females
Affective Disorders	21.0% males
	33.9% females
Anxiety Disorders	33.9% males
	55.8% females
Personality Disorders	40.1% males
	57.0% females
Intellectual Disability IQ	
<75	6.0%
>75<90	4.0%

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Today I rise to inform the parliament about the South Australian government's plans to stop the commonwealth from establishing a nuclear waste dump in our state. The Rann government has worked for a long time to make the commonwealth listen to the will of the majority of South Australian citizens. In opposition we introduced the first bill to oppose the establishment of a national dump for long-lived, intermediate and high level waste. The bill evolved and finally became the current Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act. This long-

running campaign recently resulted in a major victory for South Australians.

Last month the commonwealth announced that it would not establish a dump for higher level waste within South Australia's borders. However, this is not enough. Earlier this year the parliament passed amendments to the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act. Under current South Australian law, the establishment of a low level waste dump is prohibited. In debate in the other place we pledged to look at ways to strengthen our act. This act will expire on 19 July 2003 unless amendments are made to it. We have taken legal advice and formulated amendments to the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act to give it significant additional strength. These amendments will make it more difficult for the commonwealth to establish and operate a dump here should they challenge the validity of our legislation.

In addition, we have developed a plan which considerably strengthens our capacity to stop the commonwealth from establishing a low level dump in South Australia. Today I will give notice that tomorrow I will introduce the Public Park Bill. With this bill, the government will create parks at the sites commonly known as 40a and 45a—the commonwealth's chosen places for a nuclear dump in our state. The commonwealth Lands Acquisition Act 1989 does not allow the commonwealth to acquire land compulsorily which is already declared as a public park. If the parliament passes the Public Park Bill, it can prevent the commonwealth from acquiring either of its proposed sites.

This matter is about protecting South Australia from being the nuclear waste dump state. It is also a matter of states' rights. I have been advised that never before has the commonwealth acquired land against the wishes of a state. The commonwealth must listen to the overwhelming majority of South Australians and respect our state legislation. The government urges all members of parliament to put party politics aside and consider the welfare of our state. These bills must be dealt with expeditiously to provide security for future generations of South Australians.

SEXUAL OFFENCES

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I rise to inform the house that this morning's state cabinet and the parliamentary Labor Party approved plans for a bill that will remove the immunity from prosecution for sex offences.

Mr Brindal: You had a caucus meeting, did you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has leave, and he may continue.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: State cabinet and Labor caucus approved plans for a bill that will remove immunity from prosecution for sex offences that occurred before 1 December 1982, and the bill will be moved tomorrow (Tuesday) in the other place by the Hon. Andrew Evans. This endorses the recommendation last week of a parliamentary select committee that was instigated by the Hon. Andrew Evans of the Family First Party.

The change will right a wrong done in 1952 when a three-year statutory limitation preventing prosecution of sexual offences was introduced under the Playford government without a dissenting voice. The view of the day may have

been that these matters were best swept under the carpet after three years, but that era has long gone.

In 1985, the parliament decided that the policy of 1952 was wrong in principle and the limitation was removed, again without a single dissenting voice. But it was not removed retrospectively, meaning that any offences committed more than three years before 1985 were still protected from prosecution. The government's proposed changes will make possible the prosecution of any sex offender who was previously protected owing to the weakness in the law.

South Australia is acting to try to deter and prevent sex offences with the introduction of a paedophile register that will also contribute to a national list of names. In addition, a review of parole laws about paedophiles is currently being undertaken by the head of the Premier's department. I can inform the house that the government will also commit an additional \$42.6 million into child protection after the Layton review, which was commissioned by the government within weeks of coming to office. Of this \$42.6 million, \$12 million will be put into early intervention programs to support families at risk; \$8.3 million will be for increased carer subsidies; and \$8.3 million will go towards more diverse support services, including alternatives to foster care. This government is also injecting \$6 million into South Australia's first sex offender treatment program in prison and another \$8 million to employ 29 new school councillors.

The government is playing a pivotal role in the push for a nationally consistent approach to child protection matters. The Minister for Social Justice (Hon. Stephanie Key) has placed the topic on the agenda of next month's Community and Disability Services Ministerial Council meeting. Our state will continue the urgent reforms needed in the key area of child protection. We are committing money to maximise the protection of children in the here and now. Many allegations of child abuse were not acted on in the eight years under the Liberal Government. Those opposite did nothing to remove the immunity and allow the prosecution of sex offences before 1 December 1982. Indeed, their last Attorney-General, the Hon. Robert Lawson—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Why doesn't he want it, you grub?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Indeed, its last Attorney-General, the Hon. Robert Lawson, was opposed to lifting the immunity. Finally, on behalf of the government, I welcome the Police Commissioner's announcement of a paedophile task force that has begun investigations today. The task force is initially examining 65 complaints linked to 17 alleged offenders within the Adelaide Archdiocese of the Anglican Church, but I am sure other matters will be brought forward. Police inquires will not be limited to the Anglican Church.

The government is concerned with the increasing number of child sex abuse matters being raised and wants to do all it can to give victims the confidence to come forward, be heard and seek results. I encourage victims, no matter how long ago they were victimised, to pursue justice by contacting the police. I also urge victims of sex abuse to contact the victim support service, which will direct them to counselling and support that may go some way towards repairing the damage that this abhorrent behaviour has wreaked on their lives.

QUESTION TIME

SAMAG MAGNESIUM PROJECT

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier reject a call for a review into the viability of SAMAG and give an assurance that the state government will continue to support the project?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development): I thank the leader for his question. Since I am responsible for managing the project on behalf of the state government, it is appropriate that I respond. I need to say from the outset that today's article in the *Financial Review* is a gross misrepresentation of the facts and does no courtesy to Robert Champion de Crespigny. At no time has Robert called for an abandonment of the project, and neither would any of us wish to call for that. The Leader of the Opposition knows where the project is up to.

I have taken a bipartisan approach from the outset on this. It is important for all South Australians that we work closely with the federal government to achieve the long-term vision, which is the establishment of a magnesium processing plant in Port Pirie. I have involved the leader on a number of occasions, along with the federal member for Grey, Barry Wakelin. Obviously Ian Macfarlane's office is also involved, and I have spoken to Ian on a number of occasions.

I return to the totally inaccurate misleading article in today's *Financial Review* headed 'Threat to SAMAG plan'. As one would expect, had Robert Champion de Crespigny any reservations about this project, he would bring them to my attention—that is the nature of the man. He is not a spoiler and will not come here after the event and say, 'I could have told you—this went wrong and that went wrong or something else went wrong.' I met with him recently on another matter and, as part of the conversation I said, 'Are you interested in an update on SAMAG?', because I have been continually getting updates from Gordon Goult on behalf of the project. He indicated at that time that he had a couple of reservations, as you would well expect. This is a man who has been very much part of the Queensland project—the Australian Magnesium Corporation project—which has lost over \$200 million.

It is a different project, and it is based on very different technology but, notwithstanding that, if someone has been part of a project that has lost over \$200 million and he did not come to me and say, 'This is in the same field; would you mind having another look at it?', the man would be a goose—and Robert Champion de Crespigny is no goose. He said, 'I've got a couple of reservations: would you like to come back and have a look at it?' Further, he said today that we can make his letter to me public, because it is important that everyone else sees what he said to me in that correspondence, and then they can put this nonsense about abandoning the project to one side. If they are abandoning the project, do you think there would be \$25 million in this year's budget for the project?

An honourable member: \$25 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Enough mushrooms have been picked.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: Mr Speaker, you have just observed that I am one of the few cabinet ministers who can wake up the Treasurer at short notice. In discussions with me, Robert Champion de Crespigny said that a couple of his

concerns about the project involve the distance between the manufacturing site and the site of the mineralisation; issues around the securing of power—and we know the problems with power, and the opposition knows the problems with power, so we do not need to go down that path—and, equally, some environmental issues.

He also said to me at the time that he wanted an independent overview. Leadenhall has already conducted an independent overview, and, based on the very constructive and positive criticism from Robert Champion de Crespigny, I now need simply to revisit the business case. Things are always changing: the exchange rate is always changing; the global market in magnesium is always changing, and it is appropriate that, as things change, we revisit the business case. That is what I will do, but I have asked the federal government to do it in partnership with us. We are hoping that both the state and federal governments support this project. In a very modest way (I have recently tried for a bit extra, but I have not been successful, so we will go back to the original \$25 million) both the state and federal governments want to get behind this project.

We will not be irresponsible with public money. We need to continue to review any credit risk, and we will do that. So, this morning, I met with the head of my department, and we are drafting (and, hopefully it will be finalised tomorrow) some terms of reference for an update on the business case. That is a responsible course to take and will not reflect on the project in any way. It is important that we do not send any negative sentiment to the market place in relation to the project, and, in asking his question, the Leader of the Opposition acknowledged that. When dealing with your money and mine, we want to send a positive signal but, equally, it is appropriate, from time to time, that we revisit the business case. We will do that in the next two weeks, and we are happy to make that information available as well.

BIRKENHEAD CONTAMINATED SITES

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is directed to the Minister for Housing. What steps have been taken to relocate residents following soil contamination adjacent to a number of South Australian Housing Trust properties at Birkenhead?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Housing): I thank the member for West Torrens for his question; we all know that he is a great campaigner for the environment and one of our very own greenies. Last Friday, I was briefed by the General Manager of the Housing Trust in relation to some concerning test results they had received regarding soil contamination on a number of South Australian Housing Trust premises. The following day, the Housing Trust and the public health officials talked at length with tenants of 16 households in Birkenhead about soil contamination on or near their properties. The 16 homes are on a site bounded by Monte Place, Mead Street and the railway line which was formerly a gas storage site. A private developer built the homes in 1982 before they were sold to the Housing Trust.

Following reports by tenants of a diesel-type odour, the Trust undertook a series of soil tests that were conveyed to the Environmental Health Service for advice. It was found that the soil on the site contained a tarry-like industrial waste material that contains a range of compounds, including toxic substances.

The Environmental Health Service advises that the toxic substances of particular concern are cyanide compounds and

polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), including benzo(a)pyrene, which is classified as a probable cancer-causing agent in humans. PAHs are found in bitumen, incineration waste, coals and car exhaust. Cyanide compounds are found in a range of materials, man-made and natural, and in some forms as hydrogen cyanide and are extremely toxic.

Air monitoring results received on Thursday night did not indicate the presence of hydrogen cyanide. Nevertheless, the levels of contamination that have been found are concerning. Fortunately, most of the contaminated material is below the surface, so exposure to residents has been limited. However, some of the material has appeared on the surface, and residents have been advised to avoid contact with soil.

The Department of Human Services' environmental health service has recommended that the households be relocated as a precautionary measure to allow a thorough clean-up and assessment of properties to be made safely. The wellbeing of tenants is our government's top priority. Health checks are being offered to the residents. The Housing Trust will contact former tenants, contractors and staff, who will also be told that health checks are available to them. Tenants have been offered immediate alternative accommodation and will be relocated as soon as possible in the coming weeks. The Housing Trust will cover the costs associated with the relocation of the tenants. The trust will continue to work with the Environmental Protection Authority and health officials from the Department of Human Services to assess the site and to establish what needs to be done to make it safe.

MURRAY RIVER

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Minister for the River Murray outline to the house why no extra money, other than the Rann water tax, has been allocated from the budget for the River Murray, in spite of previous promises?

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order.

HOSPITALS, QUEEN ELIZABETH

Mr CAICA (Colton): Will the Minister for Health update the house on the reconstruction plans for the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and say whether all services will be maintained at the hospital during the work?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Colton for this question, because the reconstruction of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital is a major election commitment of this government. Members may be aware that, after delaying the project for four years and failing to fund stages 2 and 3 of the reconstruction of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, yesterday the shadow minister made an extraordinary claim that the project is being delayed. This is the same former minister who, in November 1999, was accused by the former premier of underspending his capital program by \$76 million.

This government has set aside \$60 million to fund the construction of new diagnostic treatment and ambulatory facilities at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. This will fund new construction and, finally, the demolition of old buildings over the next five years. During this period, services will be maintained at the hospital. This brings the total cost of this important project to \$97 million. This is the true forecast cost, and the house should note that, in spite of the former minister's announcements to the contrary, only \$37 million was ever allocated by him for this project. The previous

government had a long record of announcing the redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—a long record of announcements but a long record of doing nothing.

As part of its plan to privatise the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the former Liberal government announced on 19 January 1996 that the total campus would be rebuilt at a cost of \$130 million. On 28 October 1999, nearly four years later, after nothing had been built, the member for Finnis told the house that the redevelopment would finally go ahead, with a plan to replace 200 old beds with 200 new beds. More importantly, the former minister failed to fund stages 2 and 3, now estimated to cost \$60 million, and that is the commitment that is now being delivered by this government. The government is getting on with the job of delivering its promise to the people of the western suburbs.

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health tell the house why the government has broken a key election promise of not making health a priority, when it has reduced the percentage spent on the health portfolio in the government's first two budgets? In the budget papers released on Thursday, the percentage spent on health has remained for the second year lower at 24.1 per cent of the total budget spend compared with the last Liberal budget of 24.7 per cent, which is higher.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I am very happy to talk about the government's commitment to health services and health funding. I would also like to talk about the record of the previous minister over the last eight years, when we saw the downgrading of health services, and instances such as the one that I have just been talking about. Year after year, we saw announcements of capital works projects that never occurred. The Queen Elizabeth Hospital was only half funded, the Lyell McEwin Health Service was only half funded, and the Margaret Tobin Centre, which was announced for three years, was finally left to us to fund. This government's commitment to health is undeniable. The previous government's commitment was simply announcement after announcement with no follow through in funding.

EDUCATION BUDGET

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services tell the house why the government has broken a key election promise of making education and TAFE a priority when it reduced the percentage spent on the education portfolio in the government's first two budgets? The budget papers last Thursday revealed that spending on education and TAFE has dropped from 20 per cent and 24.3 per cent of the total state budget compared with the last Liberal budget of 25.2 per cent.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the honourable member for her question because it gives me an opportunity to correct some of the misinformation that she has been making public. The member for Bragg issued a press release today entitled—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. The question is very specific—

The Hon. P.L. White: I haven't begun to answer it yet, Dean.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Will you sit down? Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It was a specific question about the proportion of the state budget that is being spent on education, and we want an answer to that question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education has the call. I am paying close attention to the detail that she provides to the house.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I appreciate the deputy leader's defence of the member for Bragg, but I am sure that she can stand up for herself. The honourable member issued a press release this morning entitled, 'Labor scores big fat F in education exam'. The press release shows that she has her facts wrong. For a start, it states:

The government underspent the 2002-03 education budget by \$7 million.

I refer the honourable member to budget paper 4, volume 2, which shows how much was budgeted, how much was spent and how much will be budgeted for the next financial year, and this gets to the crux of the honourable member's question today. Despite her statements publicly that the budget was cut, these are the figures: the budget for 2002-03, on page 8.20, clearly states that total expenses were \$1.594 billion. The estimated result is \$1.606 billion, an increase of \$12 million, not a decrease, as she has been saying publicly, of \$7 million. Further, the budget for 2003-04—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. I come back to the point of order that I raised earlier, and that is relevance. The minister is in breach of the standing orders, because she is not answering the very specific question which was asked, which was about the proportion of the budget which went to education and which has been reduced.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader of the house and Minister for Infrastructure and the Deputy Premier may well have strong opinions about these matters, but neither the Minister for Education nor the chair need their assistance; they can stand up for themselves. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition raises the point of order as to whether the figures being provided by the Minister for Education are, indeed, relevant to the inquiry made by the member for Bragg as to whether there has been an increase or a decrease in the amount of funds as a proportion of the total budget being allocated to education. It is not in my province to determine whether or not those figures are accurate but, whilst the allegation in the question was made in percentage reduction terms, the answer is being provided in arithmetic quantitative terms. That is not out of order. Honourable members can make what they will of the information being provided by the minister.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Sir, I do not know how one answers questions about expenditure on education without referring to the expenditure on education. As I was saying, that was an increase, an over-expenditure, of \$12 million, not the decrease of \$7 million that the honourable member claimed in her press release. Further, the budget for 2003-04, as clearly outlined in the budget paper at page 8.20, is that, in 2003-04, the government will expend \$1 658 225, clearly, an increase in expenditure over last year's budget of \$64 million. So, the honourable member can get out there and claim all she likes—and I remind the house that, when this Liberal Opposition was in government, it did not increase education by one single cent in its last year of government, yet it comes in here, after this government has put tens of millions of dollars into education, 160 extra teachers in

schools, additional primary counsellors in schools, another \$2 million per year, plus a whole range of initiatives, and has the gall to try to convince the public of South Australia that Labor is not better on education. Any fool can see that it is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! In consequence of the questions raised as to the relevance of such an approach in answering questions without notice, raised as points of order, I am again compelled to observe that the minister's answer was more in the nature of a debate than an answer, and the house's goals would be better served if standing orders allowed for questions and answers to be shorter and the debate of the matter in the form of grievances following it to be much longer, with each member having less time, in each case, to make their points. To my mind, the standing orders at present do not reflect the desire of most members as to how question time should function and how debate of matters of moment of the day can be best undertaken. I can only hope that members will address that in the near future.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is directed to the Minister for Emergency Services. What are the details of the recent sponsorship deal that the CFS has attracted?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): I am pleased to tell the house that an energy company, Origin Energy, has provided equipment to the value of \$30 000 to the Country Fire Service. The stated reasons were that Origin had seen the devastation of bushfires in other states (not so much here) and was keen to do something in the community—to touch the community rather than simply, perhaps, sponsoring a sporting team. As a result of that, here in South Australia (and I understand that Origin has done this in a number of states), Origin Energy, after taking advice from the Country Fire Service, has provided global positioning units, printers and a real-time mapping system.

First, some equipment which is designed to be used in aircraft can map the progress of a fire. This is a very important piece of technology not only in terms of being able to tell the firefighters on the ground the location of the fire but also being able to build up a database of predicting the behaviour of fire. That is one of the great steps forward because, while we do know that fire and its behaviour has not really changed much, the technology to be able to deal with it certainly has. The very large printers can print out very large maps, and there are something like 14 hand-held GPS units, which will be issued to firefighters on the ground.

It has been a very worthwhile gesture from Origin Energy, and the CFS is very pleased to have received this equipment. I believe that in this house I will continue to give a whack to the energy industry when it is doing the wrong thing, but I think it is important that we also recognise when it does the right thing. I hope that this sort of behaviour gives a lead to other energy companies in this state to participate usefully in the community.

POLICE BUDGET

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Treasurer tell the house why the government has broken another election promise and not given budget priority to police? In the budget papers tabled last week there are plans for new privately built police stations, but within those papers there are no guaran-

tees to build the extra police stations under public/private partnership if it is not value. The budget papers also show that, again, not one extra police officer will be recruited by this government in this budget.

The SPEAKER: This question is out of order. The deputy leader.

HOSPITALS, STAFFING

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health explain why she keeps claiming that additional nurses and doctors will be employed this year in our hospitals when the budget papers show no increase in hospital staff numbers next year compared to this year, thus breaking a promise? Budget paper 4, volume 2, page 7.11 indicates hospital numbers for next year at 22 800, which is exactly the same as the outcome this past year. The minister has made repeated claims—including again this morning—that more doctors and nurses will be employed.

The SPEAKER: I have some diffidence about the question. The explanation almost debates the issue relating, as it in the process does, to the facts contained in the budget papers. However, the substance of the question is not about the budget per se, so I will allow it.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am very happy to talk about the money that Labor has put aside in this current budget in relation to the—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: If the deputy leader would remain silent, I will be able to answer the question. I was very pleased to be with the Premier about 10 days or so ago when we had the pleasure of opening the new emergency department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. As part of the opening of that fantastic new facility, the Premier announced that the government will put aside \$26.8 million in new funds to boost nursing numbers in our hospitals. And don't we know just how much we need these extra nurses! Don't we know whose fault it was that we were in such a bad situation when we came to government! Don't we know who it was who failed to see the train coming down the tunnel, which was the huge crisis in nursing that has enveloped this state, other states of Australia and, indeed, overseas countries! And who was it who actually sat on a report for over a year and did not get his act together and get a strategy in place?

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: 'Was that Dean?', my colleague the Minister for the Environment asks. Yes, it certainly was the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who sat on his hands when a crisis of enormous proportions was heading towards us. And, of course, when we came to government we were faced with that dreadful shortage of 400 full-time equivalent nurses last year, and we were faced with taking beds off line in order to keep our hospitals safe. That was the legacy of the former minister. But I am pleased to say that when the Premier and I opened the new emergency department at the Royal Adelaide Hospital we announced \$26.8 million to employ 85 new nurses, and we will continue our efforts. We will also spend more money this year, again, to carry on further our nurse recruitment and retention strategy, and we will put everything we possibly can into getting more nurses and keeping those nurses in the system.

POLICE NUMBERS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): My question is directed to the Minister for Police. Will he explain to the parliament why his government is not recruiting even one extra police officer?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I am glad that my first question on the budget is as the Minister for Police. It is 30 minutes into question time, but never mind. The point of the exercise is that the police force of this state is not just about police numbers; it is not just about the number of officers we have in the force.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, it does. And that is from the deputy leader who, when his party was in government and he was premier of this state, from memory, slashed police numbers. I am sure that if I am wrong he will get up and tell me. But the then government slashed police numbers quite significantly.

We have backed up our commitment to police with a real increase in expenditure in this budget. This is what this government is doing for police. We are building three new police stations as well as the Mount Barker police station. That is four new police stations—at Mount Barker, Gawler, Port Lincoln and Victor Harbor. In this budget we have allocated many millions of dollars for the recurrent payments for those police stations under a public-private partnership.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable leader of the house will come to order. The Minister for Police can stand up for himself.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. We are ensuring that officers in our police force will work in some of the best conditions that we are able to give them. I think that those officers who serve in Gawler will welcome that. And does the member for Flinders welcome a new police station in Port Lincoln? Does the member for Light welcome a new police station in Gawler? Does the deputy leader welcome a new police station in Victor Harbor? I should have thought that far from criticising this government they would be thanking us for having the courage, finding the money and investing in the infrastructure for our police force.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: On a point of order, sir, I refer to your ruling on ministers answering questions. The question was: why are they not recruiting any extra police—nothing to do with stations.

The SPEAKER: That is an interesting debating point.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And I am answering it, sir. Policing is not just about numbers but about giving police the working conditions, the infrastructure and technology. We are investing millions of dollars into DNA testing. We are investing—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has obviously finished on numbers. Other information was not sought.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, if it is not cogent for members of the opposition to ask questions on the budget that anticipate debate on the budget, is it in order that ministers in their reply refer to the budget?

The SPEAKER: No.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Will the Attorney-General advise how crime prevention in South Australia will be improved when funding to crime prevention is being cut by 24.7 per cent? I am advised that crime prevention has been cut by 24.7 per cent down to \$1.77 million from \$2.3 million in the

current year. Papers that I had when last in government showed that the expenditure was \$3.2 million. Last year, in a media statement issued on 11 July by both the Premier and the Minister for Regional Affairs, it was claimed that one of the regional highlights was an additional \$500 000 to support crime prevention committees. A statement was later issued clarifying that this was not the case. However, the correction did not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is now straying into debate, making a case for one viewpoint. That is not an explanation of a question.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I suppose it is not out of order for the member for Mawson to ask questions about the previous budget. Those questions have been asked before and answered.

SCHOOLS, KEITHCOT FARM PRIMARY

Ms RANKINE (Wright): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise what assistance has been given to Keithcot Farm Primary School in its efforts to secure a new gymnasium?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the honourable member for her question. She is a particularly active member in terms of lobbying for schools in her area. It was at the request of the member for Wright that I recently visited Keithcot Farm Primary School, where they were keen to tell me about their need for a new gymnasium. I am pleased to inform the house that I have approved a project to build an activity hall at that school. That hall will be used as a multipurpose—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, sir, this information is contained in the budget papers under capital works. Does it therefore not anticipate the budget debate that will follow this question time?

The SPEAKER: Honourable members would do a great deal of service to themselves as individuals as well as to the house as a whole if they would simply acknowledge that the standing orders intend that debate on measures that have been introduced, that is, of which notice is given, ought not to become the subject of questions in question time and, instead of trying to get around the standing orders, simply get on with life as normal.

The chair did not write the standing orders, but it is the chair's responsibility to do the will of the house, as defined in the standing orders. To move on further from that, in this case, the question about whether the minister is of a mind to respond to a question involving the inclusion in the budget papers of a request from a primary school for an activities facility is not something of which the chair can be aware. On those grounds, I do not see the question as being out of order. It may well be something which is a consequence of the budget paper: of course, if it involves public expenditure, it must be.

However, it does not pre-empt debate of the budget in the sense that it seeks information about what the minister is doing, or proposes to do, within the purview of the act establishing her department. To that extent, I do not think that the question asked by the member for Wright would be out of order, in any case. What is expressly out of order is whether specific figures and/or other data known to be contained in the budget papers are quoted and become the subject of inquiry in question time. That clearly does pre-empt debate.

If honourable members want to know where to go, the standing orders (which they accept and not the chair) ensure that debate on a matter on which notice has been given (such as the budget papers and the River Murray Bill) is not to be the subject of a question in question time. I have allowed the question, and the minister may complete the answer. I urge all honourable members to try to avoid the practice of getting around the standing orders. The minister.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I have received many requests during the last 12 months or so for funding for school halls, and those requests are assessed on their merits, as they are put forward. The decision in relation to the activity hall at Keithcot Farm Primary School was based on the school's real need for this facility, and is borne out of the government's commitment to physical education and healthy lifestyle programs.

Despite the enthusiasm and commitment to this ethos from the wider school community, the delivery had previously been compromised by a lack of a suitable gymnasium and, due to winter weather, interruptions for two terms a year. This hall will go a long way to ensuring that the physical education and healthy lifestyle programs for students at Keithcot Farm Primary School will prosper.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Emergency Services extend the amount of time allowed for submissions to the emergency services review? I have received representation from several emergency services members expressing concern about the short time frame in which to respond to this review. In their representations, emergency services volunteers have said that the initial request for submissions was during harvest time, and they are now being requested to make submissions during the seeding period. In their representations, they also expressed concerns about the recommendations of the review, and they have requested an extension of time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): I have no doubt that the explanation of the question is factual, but I am a little confused as to why all these people are asking the shadow minister for an extension rather than asking me. That simply has not been the feedback. In fact—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, it is said to be a waste of time. I have to say that there are some very cheeky opposition members. As the member for MacKillop knows, I will see any opposition member on any matter, if they want to come and talk to me. There are lots of people over there that know that. The simple truth is that no-one has made that request.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Bright should not talk about things sitting on people's desks. He once wrote me a letter because he did not get a response in a week. I sent one back to him in which he apologised to the former premier for not answering in six months! We have many of those examples, so he had better not talk about what is on people's desks. I have been very tolerant with him so far. No-one has requested a longer time to make submissions. Were such a request made, I would consider it. However, this is the same opposition spokesperson who asked me several times why the report was not yet finished.

We had a very long time of review, and we took into account the views of a large number of people; in fact, the bulk of the report was based on a joint submission made by the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service. It is the first time such a thing has been achieved, and I can say that it has been very well received by both the Country Fire Service and the Metropolitan Fire Service. The member for Mawson's real problem is that this report has been very well received. I am very disappointed for him, but I am very pleased for emergency services in South Australia.

FISHING INDUSTRY

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Did the minister consult with industry and prepare a regional impact statement before implementing another broken election promise of a new tax on the fishing industry?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): As the leader knows, there is some inequity as to what currently exists with commercial and with recreational fishers. That is why the government has made a decision in this area; and the answer to his question is no.

WATER SUPPLY, EYRE PENINSULA

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house what action the government intends to take to address the significant water problems on the Eyre Peninsula, particularly in light of the fact that the people on Eyre Peninsula are paying a levy for the Catchment Water Management Board and are now expected to pay another levy for water to which they have no access?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Administrative Services): I answer this question as the minister with responsibility for SA Water. The honourable member should be aware (and these matters have been communicated to her) that there is a long-term strategy to deal with the water needs of Eyre Peninsula. Indeed, the current demands from the Eyre Peninsula's potable water supply are unsustainable, as total demand from the system is exceeding SA Water's licensed extractions from Uley South, Lincoln and Uley-Wanilla basins. SA Water initiated a master plan study to determine the optimum unsustainable solution, and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation and the Eyre Peninsula Catchment Water Management Board were represented on the technical steering committee.

Members should also be aware (and I know that the honourable member has had this communicated to her) that, on 23 September last year, cabinet approved a preferred solution to the water supply problems on Eyre Peninsula, based on the findings of that master plan. It was a three-part plan that involved the construction of plant to desalinate water from the Tod River, as well as the reuse of treated effluent and a water efficiency program to achieve a minimum 5 per cent reduction in water usage.

Between February and July this year, a pilot plant study is being conducted at the Tod Reservoir to determine pre-treatment requirements for a full-scale plant, which is 2.3 gigalitres per year. The plant is expected to be delivered, as are a number of these plants, by SA Water via a public-private partnership. I understand that those arrangements have also been made clear to the member for Flinders. So, quite the contrary, the government is taking a number of steps that are

directed at securing the long-term water needs for the Eyre Peninsula.

MINERAL ROYALTIES

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): How does the Premier justify his government's increasing the percentage of royalties it intends to take from mining companies while at the same time cutting the TEiSA funding that was previously allocated to encourage mining in South Australia when the mining industry is at a vulnerable stage in its development? The government has announced its intention to increase royalties paid by mining companies from 2.5 per cent to 3.5 per cent and, at the same time, has announced a cut of 40 per cent of the funding allocated for the TEiSA program. The South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy has said in response:

The resources industry is at the cusp of realising significant economic benefits for South Australia. . . Increasing royalties will make it harder for a number of fledgling projects to come to fruition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): The proposed increase in the mineral royalty rate will maintain the 3.5 per cent ad valorem mineral royalty rate at Olympic Dam following reversion to the standard rate after 31 December 2005, under the terms of the Roxby Downs indenture. I am advised that that indenture, which expires on 31 December 2005, sees the schedule of royalty rates that had been 3.5 per cent drop to 2.5 per cent, unless—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: What about the rest?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am advised that it means that Western Mining would have to pay whatever the prevailing royalty rate is for the state. In the absence of this measure, Western Mining's royalties would be some \$9.5 million less per annum than had been received for many years, in which WMC—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: When the opposition makes its budget reply speech, it has to tell us how it would frame a budget. If it does not have \$9.5 million from royalties, it will need to explain to this house how it would make up the difference. We all know that they will run big budget deficits. I am advised that, as a percentage of mineral production value, royalties fall in the range of between 3 and 3.5 per cent for Western Australia, New South Wales, Victoria and now South Australia. Mineral royalty rates are higher in Queensland. So, when it comes to the national average, we are comfortable in that range. The bulk of South Australia's mineral royalties comes from Olympic Dam. Many companies, such as OneSteel and the Leigh Creek coal mining operations, are already—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not sure whether you are interested in the answer.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: It shows ignorance on the part of the government.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Bright is talking about ignorance. I am sure he knows a fair bit about it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member may wish to acknowledge the chair.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Companies such as OneSteel and the NRG operation at Leigh Creek already have agreements or indentures, depending on the circumstance. They are not affected by this. Part of the member's question was about the mineral exploration program, which was set up under a

Labor government by the former minister for mineral resources, the Hon. Frank Blevins. It was an outstanding decision and quite strongly supported—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will answer the question and not debate.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It was strongly supported by members opposite, there is no argument about that, and my recollection is that we put more funding into it in last year's budget. We are a strong supporter of that program—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: In the last budget?

An honourable member: Yes.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We will check that. I do not have the figures in front of me. There is a lot in the budget.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The TEiSA program last budget?

An honourable member: Yes.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: All right, we will look at that. We strongly support the mining industry. We are a pro business government. The measures, I would suspect, were expected by the industry, in large part, and I think they are the right policy measure to put in place.

CONSCIENCE VOTE

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Has the Premier responded to letters and representations from family organisations and mainstream churches advocating a conscience vote on the same sex superannuation and the domestic co-dependents superannuation bills? In the *Southern Cross* of June 2003, Dr John Fleming said (at p.11):

The legislation, introduced as a private member's bill by Frances Bedford (ALP), has the official support of the state government with no ALP MP being able to exercise a conscience vote. It is effectively a government bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order. It pre-empts debate on the member's own measure.

GREGORY, Mr J.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Does the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education agree with the assertion of the President of the AEU, Mr John Gregory, last Saturday morning that remarks made by the opposition's shadow minister were inflammatory, and later associated me with a pig? Some months ago, the President of the AEU made extensive allegations concerning the whole of the TAFE sector and involving funds amounting to tens of millions of dollars. Following the results of an inquiry, the minister was good enough to give me a briefing and, in consequence of that briefing, in a bipartisan way, I suggested that the President of the AEU did not properly understand the sector that he purported to represent, and called on him to make an apology, hence his comments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is out of order. All honourable members should understand that questions seeking an expression of opinion are out of order, in no small measure, in consequence of the House of Commons parliamentary debates determination of 1906, which we have adopted (which is to be found in Erskine May on page 286). Equally, if you are asking whether statements in the press of private organisations or of private individuals are accurate, again, I refer to the House of Commons in 1882 (which is to

be found in Erskine May on page 289) as the authority by which I rule the question out of order.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, on a point of order, does that mean that we cannot ask whether the minister agrees with statements that are made either in the press or by people? Because that was my question: does the minister agree?

The SPEAKER: What the honourable member may wish to do (apart from approaching the chair and seeking advice privately, because I am reluctant to give it publicly, for the reason that I have no wish to embarrass an honourable member, least of all the member for Unley) is to ask a question along the lines, 'The minister is reported to have expressed the view that', and 'Does he stand by such view?', and leave it at that. No explanation of it is required. The member for Light.

TRANSPORT, TICKETING SYSTEM

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Transport advise what ticketing system is envisaged by the government for use on public transport and what is the estimated cost? The draft transport plan states that the current ticketing system is nearing the end of its economic life and needs to be replaced by approximately 2007. The new ticketing system is said to allow for further convenience and flexibility, such as contactless tickets which do not need to be removed from wallets or handbags. Obviously, to suggest that the new system will give us all this, the minister must have some idea what other features the new ticketing system will have and what the cost will be.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): This, of course, is the first draft transport plan that has been delivered to South Australia for 35 years. Of course, a draft transport plan is just that.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I know that the member for Mawson is embarrassed by his own party not delivering a transport plan. After two terms in government (some eight years or longer), the honourable member's party was not able to deliver a transport plan. Despite committing to it, despite promising it, the former Liberal government could not even deliver a transport plan. Well, the Rann Labor government has done it within 12 months, and can I say to members that it is not that hard to do. You sit down, you engage the stakeholders, you talk to them, you formulate policy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: —and you deliver. That is what you do. That is how you go about the business, and for the member for Light—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The member for Light has asked me a question. The honourable member should not be so rude to one of his shadow ministerial colleagues. You might need his vote one day!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I say to the member for Light that, because it is a draft, we are engaging with the major stakeholders. There is a three-month period. We invite the Liberal Party—although it could not deliver a transport plan—to get involved and be involved in the engagement process.

PRINCES HIGHWAY

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Transport advise the house of the reasons for reducing from 110 km/h to 100 km/h the speed limit on portions of the Princes Highway between Kingston (South-East) and Meningie? As part of the 110 km/h speed limit review on rural roads, I understand that Transport SA has recommended that portions of the Princes Highway between Kingston (South-East) and Meningie be reduced to 100 km/h.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for Light for his follow-up question although, of course, on a different topic. I could not hear all the question but, nonetheless, I think I can give the tenor of what the government is doing. As members know, since day one in office the government has been very committed to road safety. Of course, I am sure that all members of parliament would want to express their great disappointment and sadness at the loss of life on the weekend just passed.

With respect to the honourable member's question, the process we are going through is similar to what we did regarding the 50 km/h speed limit. We are working with the Local Government Association and individual councils to make sure that, in establishing the criteria, everyone is working to the same criteria. With respect to the specific reference mentioned, I will provide the member for Light with that detail but if, in fact, he is correct in respect of the specific area to which he referred (and I did not pick up all the detail), it is important to remember that, with respect to the reduction from 110 km/h to 100 km/h in country areas, advice to me from my department is that we are talking about 10 per cent of roads. We will not be talking about major highways but we will be addressing those roads against some existing criteria agreed to with the Local Government Association and local councils before a final decision is made. The maximum speed on a very small percentage—about 10 per cent—of those roads in country areas will be reduced from 110 km/h to 100 km/h.

CROWN LAND

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mrs PENFOLD: I wish to place on the record that I have a share of a very small parcel of crown lease land on Boston Point near Port Lincoln. I am not aware of any other crown lease land in which I have an interest.

YACfest03

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Social Justice): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: On Friday 30 May, I had the pleasure to present the outcomes of a very exciting debate involving 180 young people and 70 youth coordinators from around the state concerning the lowering of the voting age to 16 years. This meeting of young people was arranged by the

Office for Youth to support and strengthen the youth advisory committees. These committees are a partnership between the government and local councils, which support the youth portfolio commitments to encourage young people to take an active role in political, economic and cultural life.

YACs (as they are called) provide advice to elected members, consult with young people, lobby community decision makers and help promote a positive image of young people in their communities by doing this. Currently, there are 67 youth advisory committees, including six indigenous-specific youth advisory committees. These have all been funded by the state government; they involve up to 1 200 young people across South Australia; and they are supported by youth advisory coordinators from the local council areas. Young people travelled from the Far North, the Eyre and Yorke Peninsulas, the South-East, the Riverland, the Iron Triangle and the Mid North of the state, as well as from metropolitan areas, to participate in the forum.

One of the major features of YACfest03 was to debate whether the voting age should be lowered to 16. All forum participants explored this issue, assisted by an expert panel, which included Ms Mia Handshin (a journalist) and Dr Howard Sercombe, a renowned author on youth issues. They were also assisted, I understand, by Mr Ben Saint from the Youth Affairs Council of South Australia and the Chairperson of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Youth. These debates concluded with the Australian Electoral Commission conducting a simulated referendum.

The outcome of the referendum was presented to me at the conclusion of the day, and I am pleased to share the results with the house. The first question was: should the voting age for local government elections be lowered from 18 years to 16 years? The outcome was yes, 110 votes; no, 26 votes and informal, six votes. The second question was: should the voting age for state government elections be lowered from 18 years to 16 years? The outcome was: yes, 78 votes; no, 57 votes and informal, seven votes.

During the course of the debate, the young people present were given the opportunity to explore the issues relevant to them on this matter. Some of the debate became very passionate and included many different comments. Some of the highlights of those comments included that they believed that IQ tests for maturity should not be put in place because half the adults in the community would not pass those tests. They also pointed out that 16-year olds can do a number of things in our community, including authorising their own medical procedures, yet are not allowed to vote. The point was made that there should be a compulsory subject in schools, similar to Australian studies, that looked at government voting, etc., as well as looking at constitutional matters. It was also pointed out that independent 16-year olds have to pay their rent and other bills like everyone else, so why should they not vote?

I thank you, Mr Speaker, the Hon. Paul Holloway and the member for Colton for attending YACfest03 and showing your support. I also commend the Office for Youth, the Australian Electoral Commission and local government for their involvement (including the Local Government Association for organising YACfest). This has been an inspiring and valuable opportunity for representatives of young people in South Australia to come together to share ideas and develop skills that they can take back to their local communities.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

GREGORY, Mr J.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): In the nearly 14 years that I have been here I have never stood in this place and mentioned an individual, but I feel compelled to do so today—not necessarily for the sake of the individual but for the denigration that he brings to the office that he holds.

At a council meeting of the Australian Education Union on Saturday, Mr John Gregory referred to a statement that I had made to the press claiming that he fails to understand the TAFE sector which he purports to represent and that he owes that sector an apology. He talked about my remarks as being inflammatory and went on to say, 'Enough of pigs'. I believe that he did that in written form, and I will approach the government about that afterwards. Nevertheless—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Who did?

Mr BRINDAL: John Gregory, President of the AEU, if you want it on the record, but it will be on the record many times in this five minutes. This is the same Mr Gregory who I believe, after the Liberal government had lost the election, set up a deck chair and an umbrella in the ministerial car park in Flinders Street with a notice 'Spring Clean'. I note that Mr Spring, who was then the retiring CEO of the department, went down and shook his hand and wished him good luck for the future. This is the same Mr Gregory who was president of the same union in 1982—he has been recycled more times than a coke can. This is the same Mr Gregory who was known as 'Whacker' during his time at university.

I raise this matter because, for 35 years, I have been proud to be a teacher; and when I started as a teacher—as you would recall, sir—the teaching profession was held in reasonably high repute. But there are many people—parents and teachers—who are worried at what they see is a lowering of the status of teachers and education in our community. I raise today Mr Gregory's statements on Saturday, as well as his actions, in the context that I think they bring no credit to his profession and do no credit to matters under genuine public discussion.

Mr Gregory raised an issue and accused a big and very valuable sector in our community of tens of millions of dollars worth of rorts—it was not raised by the opposition or by the government—and the government called for an inquiry. I, for my part, asked for an independent inquiry and the minister would not accede to that but, in fairness to the minister, he gave me a briefing subsequent to the inquiry with the auditors who conducted it, and I was satisfied that this government had made a diligent effort in what they did and that the results of the inquiry stood as the auditors say they stand—that is, that no fault was to be found.

I did not make the accusations and cause the angst that many hundreds, even thousands, of TAFE lecturers and people went through, not for weeks but for months. I was not the minister who had to spend several hours on the telephone keeping people calm and assuring them that the government would do the best it could. But I was the person who, on behalf of the opposition, stood next to the minister and said, 'We accept these findings: these findings are right; and, if these findings are right, somebody owes TAFE an apology.'

It is not the opposition that inflamed the situation: it is the President of the union who did not clearly understand the sector. He had a whole lot of figures, did not understand them, got them quite wrong and put them to the *Advertiser*,

involving this government in tens of thousands of dollars, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars, in expenditure, and genuine, decent people in a lot of heartache and hurt. If the best the President of the union responsible for their welfare can do is call my comments inflammatory because I asked for an apology on their behalf and then use words such as 'pig', there is something wrong. I conclude by saying that perhaps I made an intemperate remark, but it was a private remark, not a public remark.

Time expired.

INTERNET ACCESS

Mr CAICA (Colton): Recently I have been contacted by three different constituents of mine, all of whom have raised the same concerns and, upon investigation, I have come to the conclusion that the serious problems encountered by my constituents are not isolated and are perhaps commonplace. I guess it is well known by some of my friends that I am not a computer expert: however, I am not a Luddite, either. It seems clear that a scam is operating that involves unsuspecting users of internet services receiving significant charges for services that they have not used nor intentionally accessed. I am advised by my constituents that certain providers of internet web site services (and I understand that these are particularly adult sites) are able to log on through unsuspecting users who have no idea that they are logged on to these sites and who find out only when their telephone bills are forwarded by their carrier.

In the case of one of my constituents, a Telstra bill was received for services that the recipient had not accessed nor knowingly connected to. The component of the bill for these phantom services in this instance amounted to \$275.92 for 51 minutes of adult internet connection to a 190 number for services that did not appear on the computer screen and, in fact, were being charged for when the computer was originally connected to another site. As I mentioned, I am not a computer expert and I want to know how it is that this scam operates and what it is. I understand that Telstra has advised my constituents that the 190 charges that they were not aware they were accessing are the result of internet access via their service, in particular the use of an internet dialler software. They further advised my constituent that an internet dialler is a piece of software which is downloaded from the internet and, once installed, provides internet connection to a 190 or international number. It seems that when it is in use an internet dialler temporarily disconnects a modem from the user's regular internet service provider and connects with a 190 or international number.

So, once again, how is it that the victims of this scam are unaware that they are connected to the 190 adult web sites? Quite simply, they are not being notified. The Telephone Industry Service Standards Council code of practice stipulates that certain fixed dialogue boxes are to be displayed prior to any connection to a 190 number. The first dialogue box, under this code, must state that the service is not free and that it is charged at a specific price per minute. There are another two dialogue boxes that are required to be acknowledged prior to any connection occurring. However, in the case of my constituents (and I expect in the case of the many other victims of this scam), no dialogue boxes appear whatsoever. In fact, as I mentioned earlier, there was no indication that a connection had even been made: the computer screen did not alter in any way.

So what is it that Telstra says about this particular scam? My constituent, in particular—and I do not believe he would mind my mentioning his name: he is Mr Fitzgerald of Henley Beach—received a three page piece of correspondence from Telstra in response to his request that the \$275 be forgiven because he had not accessed that site, nor had he known that the computer was connected to it. But, as you would expect from an organisation that is interested only in collecting money, Telstra said, ‘Our investigations show that it was connected at that time and, in essence, you are still liable for those calls and you will have to pay for them.’ They go on to say that it is the lessee’s legal responsibility to be aware of the consequences of allowing a computer to be connected to their telephone service for internet connection and to take appropriate action to avoid connection to 190 information services if this is what the customer wants.

But, interestingly, the person does not know that they are connected to this internet site because there is no indication on the computer that it is connected. It is connecting automatically without dialogue boxes showing the user that they are being connected. Telstra goes on to suggest that they should look at initiating call barring for international direct and/or 190 numbers to prevent unexpected internet calls from their internet sites. What does TISSC say about this scam? My constituent has informed me that the council acknowledges that it is a problem affecting an increasing number of internet users and I am further informed that it is generally the same adult web site providers that consistently appear on the victim’s internet dialler itemised information calls account. What can be done? Bar the access to the 190 number and international telephone numbers. However, I also inform the house that I shall pass on to the Minister for Consumer Affairs all the information I have regarding this outrageous scam so that his fine officers can pursue the vultures preying on the innocent and unsuspecting victims of this scam.

PARLIAMENT, TAPESTRIES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Last Friday I had the delightful pleasure of receiving into this chamber the former members of this house, the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore and Mrs Colleen Hutchison, who were the members for what is now Morialta and Stuart respectively. They joined me in welcoming the designers and weavers in celebration of the hanging of the tapestries in this chamber, which were hung here in 1994 to celebrate the Centenary of the Suffrage of Women, that is, women having a vote in this state and being the first in the world to have the opportunity to stand for parliament. It of course took us 65 years to get here, but they recognise that momentous occasion, unique in world history.

On this occasion we received a brief presentation from the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore and the Mrs Colleen Hutchison and also the Hon. Diana Laidlaw of another place, who of course is on the eve of her retirement from this parliament. I record my appreciation, as I am the successor to the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in being responsible for the area of the status of women on behalf of the Liberal Party, of the fact that the plaques for the tapestries have been duly bolted to the walls, which I hope indicates a sign of permanence. I indicate my appreciation and that of the opposition for that occurring.

Secondly, I understand that a new pamphlet in celebration of these important events in relation to the suffrage and women standing in parliament is to be published and that will be available to the public and interest groups in relation to the important part of the history of this parliament. I again record

my appreciation of that event occurring so we may give a rich resource of educational material to anyone visiting the parliament, including information on this aspect. I was pleased to note the hanging of the portrait of Mrs Joyce Steele, which is now displayed in this chamber and recognises Mrs Steele as the first female member elected to this chamber in 1959. That was also welcomed by the group last week. They were pleased to hear of the amendment to the state Constitution Act 1934, in particular as it related to acknowledging women in the constitution of South Australia, both to ensure that as members of parliament we comprise approximately one third, but also to respect the gender of our reigning monarch, albeit 50 years late, and also our Governor.

On this occasion I also note the government’s proposal to allocate some extra funding to the Office of the Status of Women. That is an important move by this government and I commend it. I am disappointed to note that there will be a reduction in the Women’s Information Service, notwithstanding that there is an anticipated significant increase in the inquires of that service. I confirm my deep disappointment in the Premier in relation to this area in that he took some 10 months to announce the Premier’s Council of Women. Nevertheless, I understand that it has got started and met by April of this year, so for a small part of this past financial year was operational. Hopefully it will have a significant influence on the Premier in ensuring that issues such as family violence and balancing work and family, which were clearly on the agenda and under review by the previous women’s council, continue to be addressed and that this year we see recommendations come forward, with these issues put on the agenda by this government, as sadly they have been completely missing to date.

EDUCATION SPENDING

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): The discussions in question time about the health and education budgets developed by this government put me in mind of a recent article I read in the *Melbourne Age*. The article was by Kenneth Davidson in the *Age* of Monday 19 May, and I freely acknowledge the extent to which I will draw on his work in my remarks. The article covers lack of funding commitment in a range of areas, including transport and the environment, and notes particularly some issues with regard to the recent federal budget about education spending. It states:

The rot in terms of Australia’s social and physical capital has gone far enough. In terms of education, 2003-04 is a milestone of sorts. It is the first year in which funding for non-government schools (\$4.5 billion) exceeds funding for higher education (\$4.3 billion) and is twice the funding for government schools (\$2.3 billion). The government constantly moans about the ageing population. It will not be a problem providing productivity grows as fast in the future as it has in the past. But will we get the best out of the next generation if 70 per cent of the per capita spending on children at government schools is \$2 000 less than for those attending non-government schools—based on the present funding agreement between the commonwealth and states.

Further on he states:

Underneath the razzle dazzle, the fact is that the government is increasing higher education funding by only \$152 million or 3.6 per cent this financial year, less than the 4 per cent growth in average weekly earnings forecast in the budget.

Many schools in my electorate require upgrade of facilities. During the period I have been the member for Reynell very little happened in relation to those upgrades for facilities until last year. Last year suddenly some work started happening. We have had extra school councillors, extra junior primary

teachers as well as special facilities upgrades, particularly much needed toilets in Pimpala Primary School and an administrative upgrade in Reynella South. Many schools still desperately need upgrade of facilities and these upgrades in facilities cannot be funded by the parents in my community. In half the schools about 50 per cent of families are on School Card and in the rest it varies between 35 to 50 per cent. Families in my area are battling. They are not in a position to fund upgrades in school facilities. They have to rely on the government to do this.

The government, in turn, relies on the federal government to provide facilities. People in my area have seen some very glorious buildings being built under the Howard government's funding of private schools in the area. These private schools also have many children who are in receipt of School Card. Their families are not rich either, but people look at the waste. They look at these new facilities being built when their children are struggling in old facilities with problems with the carpets, ceilings and in the layouts. Recently, I visited one school where the cracks in the wall of the staff toilet are so bad that you can see through them to the outside.

We have this sort of facility in the state schools in the area, but, meanwhile, the Howard government is throwing money at private schools to build lovely new schools and some of them are worried about the upkeep thereof. State schools do not criticise the parents or the private schools: they criticise John Howard's funding priorities. They recognise that that is the basis of the problems they are experiencing in upgrading their schools.

TRANSPORT, LIGHT RAIL

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Last Saturday morning, I had the pleasure of attending the opening of the Office of the Southern Suburbs at Noarlunga Centre, with the minister in attendance. Thanks to the Liberal Party, development is going on down there. Unfortunately, this budget lacks—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Did you go on the expressway?

Dr McFETRIDGE: I didn't go on the expressway; I took the train down there. As members of this house would know, I am a fan of public transport, particularly light rail. However, I travelled by the TransAdelaide heavy rail system from Brighton to Noarlunga Centre, and I would like to compliment TransAdelaide on the cleanliness of the trains—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: As the leader says, the new TransAdelaide trains were one of our initiatives. The trains are of that standard only because the state is back on its feet after what happened with the State Bank. However, I digress. The heavy rail system that we enjoy in South Australia should not be overstated. It is a very efficient and clean system, but, if I had my way, there would be more light rail services. If one has travelled at all, one would have seen the extension of light rail services across the world. The classic examples of light rail in Australia are in Perth and Melbourne, with its new Eltham to Yarra Valley trams, which are something to behold. The new glam trams, as they are called, are fantastic.

Over the last few years, I have been doing a lot of research into tram services. Actually, I referred to them in my maiden speech. Since last week, I have had made a few more contacts as to what I can expect in South Australia. I was disappointed, though, when I phoned one of the major tram manufacturers in the world to find that they had no idea what was going on until the public announcement last week. I hope that there will be more planning in this area, and that this is not just

smoke and mirrors, and that we see new trams going down there. No-one in South Australia would be happier than I.

There has been some talk about tramways contributing to the greenhouse effect by the generation of electricity. I have yet to see evidence of that other than one report coming out of Melbourne. People in the tram industry to whom I have spoken have assured me that that is not the case. Certainly, there is an opportunity to convert trams from electric drive to diesel electric, or to compressed liquid natural gas engines (which would be even more environmentally friendly) which drive the electric generators and which then drive the trams. This is happening with our bus service; we could do that with the train service; and there is an opportunity to do that with the tram service.

A new tramway with trams on tyres is being built in France. Instead of overhead wires and double tracks, it has a single furrow in the centre of the road which generates power for the tram, which has rubber tyres. The tram follows this track around the city and, if it has to be diverted, the connector is disconnected and the tram is operated by a diesel electric motor; the tram then operates on another route. That is something that we could think about here. However, I do not want to see another concrete gutter built to service the south. Although I am being disparaging about the O-bahn, it is a very good and efficient form of transport, but not for the southern districts. It is great whizzing up through the hills, but it is not for down south. We need something that is more open and will maintain our open spaces down there, and will maintain more of a heritage atmosphere. We should therefore stick with the trams.

The new light rail is the way to go. I hope that the manufacturers of these new trams will do what was done in the past: that is, manufacture the trams in this state. The manufacturers of trams, such as Siemens, Bombardier and Alstom, do modularise them, and they could be assembled here in the same way as submarines are being assembled here. I hope that the light rail will be manufactured in Whyalla in the same way as the new Adelaide-Darwin railway, which is another good Liberal initiative. The opportunity for a light rail system in South Australia is something that we should not overlook. Let us not stop at North Adelaide, but let us go right across the metropolitan area.

Time expired.

SAMUEL, Mr G.

Mr RAU (Enfield): It is a great privilege to again follow the member for Morphett. I take considerable inspiration from his approach to light rail. He is nothing if not consistent and emphatic in his support, and that is a marvellous thing. However, at some stage, he should tell us how it was that we lost our light rail in the first place. I think the member will find that it was an unfortunate deal to get Port Stanvac here, when we agreed to pull up the fantastic trams in order to have something we do not have any more. However, that is not what I want to talk about.

On the weekend, I had a moment to watch television. During that time, I saw Mr Graeme Samuel on television explaining that he is now acting chair of the outfit formerly run by Professor Fels. He said a number of things about the way in which he would approach his acting role, which he does appear to be taking as if it is a permanent appointment. He said (and I might be paraphrasing him a little), 'Competition and the benefit of consumers are synonymous. There is no distinction to be drawn.'

On listening to him, I reflected on the fact that 40 to 60 years ago, people around the place believed that the writings of Karl Marx would solve all the world's problems. They believed that, by establishing a totalitarian state with a dictatorship of the proletariat, the world would be a happy place and everyone would march forward into the broad sunlit uplands that Winston Churchill spoke of. In fact, they got a miserable archipelago of concentration camps and miserable people. I wonder whether the addiction that Mr Samuel and some his friends have to the word 'competition' might just have a little tinge of the same problem; that is, zealotry—a belief in something so strong that one allows the evidence of one's eyes, ears and commonsense to be ignored in favour of a theory. In my modest observation, I think that, if anyone has the capacity to do that, it is Mr Samuel.

I was reflecting on his achievements when I was watching him on television telling us what we were in for in terms of his tenure of the office on which he is about to embark. While I was rustling through some papers, I found a speech given on 22 June 1995 by the then leader of the Australian Democrats, Senator Kernot. She was speaking in the Senate on the Competition Policy Reform Bill, which was then before that chamber. We all know that that is where Mr Samuel's most recent career started. She said a number of very important things in her speech and, whatever difficulties she has since had, this was indeed her finest hour. She said:

This . . . bill will help set in train one of the most radical and far-reaching public reforms. The public sector as we know it will be forced to restructure in far-reaching and not necessarily positive ways.

She went on to say that in her view:

. . . competition policy represents the victory of economics over equity, of competition over compassion, and of accounting over accountability and in management of public services, yet this bill and the ramifications of this bill, have been the subject of very little public debate and it has been the subject of minimal public scrutiny. It has been debated in closed forums, not by Australian people who own this debate, and the outcome of it.

She continues:

We will need to make sure that higher user charges, the end of cross-subsidisation, the narrowing of community service obligations and the inevitable path to privatisation paved by this package do not lead to fewer public services to those who need them most—the low income earners and, especially, regional Australians.

Of course, we know exactly what has happened since competition policy has had its way over the last 10 years. I am waiting for somebody to realise that the emperor is not wearing any clothes. Competition policy is not the be-all and end-all, nor is it the answer to all questions. It does not take into account that human beings do not act like computer models.

They have succeeded in hollowing out the middle class in this country so that we now have a narrow middle class which has an overly burdensome tax regime imposed upon it. We have a huge underclass of people who share nothing of what is going on in this society; instead, we have these fat-cat, super rich people I read about in the *Business Review Weekly* last week. The idea that that level of stratification exists in our society and that the middle ground (which was the traditional strength of this country) is cut out is appalling.

GAMING MACHINES (ROOSTERS CLUB INCORPORATED LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council did not insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ROAD SAFETY REFORMS) BILL

The Legislative Council, having considered the recommendations of the conference, agreed to the same.

Consideration in committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

I acknowledge the members of the deadlock conference: the members for Croydon, Fisher, Light and Kavel; and the Hons C.V. Schaefer, T.G. Cameron P. Holloway, R.K. Sneath and S.M. Kanck. I also pay tribute to each of those members.

We had a number issues to resolve. No party achieved all its aims, and some very good discussion ensued. At the outset, we agreed to measure each of the outstanding items as much as possible against the impact they would have on road safety. I am sure that the member for Light will concur when I acknowledge sincerely every member of the conference. We certainly worked towards trying to resolve the outstanding issues and, by and large, we were able to do so pretty quickly.

This is a very significant day in the life of the Rann Labor government. We came to power with a very serious commitment to road safety, and we remain committed. We have changed the road rules significantly in regard to regulation, and we have made changes to what we introduced previously in a budget setting. I foreshadowed that the government would introduce phase 2 of our road safety package—a package which took on a range of decisions which we believed should have been in place a long time ago. Nonetheless, today we arrive at that position as follows:

- demerit points for speed camera offences;
- new penalties for driving with blood alcohol between .05 and .079;
- dual penalties for speeding through a red light;
- various driver training related changes: learners for six months; P-plates for two years, or until the age of 19 (now 20 if demerit points are incurred during that period between the ages of 19 and 20);
- changes to questions in the learner's test;
- any period of disqualification to be added to the P-plate period; and
- two weeks between practical driving tests.

There are probably other examples. This is a good day for parliament and for South Australians. We now put this package behind us and we deliver on it.

I also want to acknowledge the Labor caucus, which has been very supportive, as have been my cabinet colleagues. This has been a mind shift for everybody. This package contained significant changes which we believe warranted the full support of the parliament. We appreciate that there has been a robust debate, but we hope that the parliament can now move forward on road safety in a more bipartisan way. Later this year, the government will introduce a second package, and we look forward to the response from the opposition. I will have more to say about that issue at a later time.

I want to pay tribute to the Hon. Nick Xenophon and the member for Fisher, who suggested a range of ideas on road safety. The government said that it would consider those; some need to be thought through. We need to measure some of those ideas against their impact on road safety in terms of whether or not they are good policy positions and whether or not they are practical.

I also want to acknowledge the Hon. Sandra Kanck, who did not agree with the government on everything, and we are disappointed that we did not get all our package through. We think that mobile random breath testing is an important issue, but a limited mobile RBT is better than nothing. Of course, New South Wales has had this measure in place for 20 years and no great hiccup has resulted. This is a very good bill that, very shortly, will be proclaimed by the government. We will work closely with the community.

I also want to acknowledge my department and my personal staff, who have been very committed to this package. The government remains committed to road safety. We look forward to working with all parties—the opposition and the Independents—and, of course, the major stakeholders. We need to connect with the community on this message: we cannot do it by ourselves. It is a very important policy shift and position. It is a day in history for this parliament and one that we will look back on with great fondness and with great pride.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I also wish to recognise the work of the deadlock conference and thank the minister for his cooperation and conciliation. I have been a member of such a conference only once before, in about 1994. We had some fairly strong issues to deal with, and I think that we dealt with them in a very efficient manner. I thank the minister for his conciliation, because I know that there were issues that he wanted passed, but the opposition also felt very strongly about them. I believe that, in terms of working with each other—the government, the opposition and the Independent members—we achieved a good outcome.

I am pleased to see that, on the issue of concealed speed cameras, which I spoke about strongly in the second reading debate in this chamber, the minister has given an undertaking that he will look at the research, both overseas and here in Australia, regarding signage for concealment of speed cameras. I have seen research from New Zealand and England that indicates certain outcomes of a beneficial nature in terms of road safety. The minister has given an undertaking that he will look at that prior to the second tranche of road safety amendments coming to parliament possibly later this year, and I am very happy to work with him on that.

The opposition supported a number of the road safety initiatives in this bill, and we also look forward to moving ahead in road safety terms. One has only to consider the carnage that occurred at the weekend to recognise that it is a serious issue that costs this state a significant amount of money. It was a good experience to work on this deadlock conference. Government and opposition members worked to get a better outcome for road safety, and it is a commendation for all those who served on the committee.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I congratulate the government on introducing this package of measures and, indeed, I congratulate opposition and other members who have helped steer this passage through both houses. It is very important, and I do not believe it is the end in terms of what can be done with road safety. However, it is a very significant step forward. I have lobbied on many of these issues for some time. You do not always get what you want, but I am pleased to say that,

in this package, there are a lot of measures that I have argued for over time.

The tragedies that occurred on the weekend should remind us all that we have a lot of work to do, particularly targeting young male drivers. Young female drivers, too, sadly lose their life or become badly injured, and a range of measures are in place interstate, in New Zealand and in the United States that are designed to help keep young people alive and safe. Some people have said to me that those measures might be a little restrictive, but I say that they are not as restrictive as being dead. I am not trying to be flippant. I know from personal experience the trauma of losing someone close in a road accident. I was talking to my sister this morning on another matter, and she said that every time one of these tragic events occurs it brings back very powerful memories for her and for other families in the community who have suffered the loss of a loved one.

Last year, on Homestead Drive in my electorate, two fine young men who were members of the West Adelaide Football Club were killed. I notice that young people still keep placing tributes at the location where they lost their lives. It has affected the community very deeply. Since then other young people have lost their lives, one recently on Manning Road, and it goes on week in week out. I said this morning that, thankfully, during the Iraq conflict we did not lose one person in combat, yet ironically on our roads we lose young men and women virtually every week, and it is almost as though many people have become accustomed to it and accept it as part of life. I do not accept it. We have a high standard of safety in the air and I would like to see us have a much more vigorous approach to safety being applied to those who drive in motor vehicles and are affected by them.

Without commenting in detail on the measures, other than to say that they represent a big advance, and apart from the possible testing of alcohol in drivers at random, another issue that needs to be addressed is that of unmarked police cars. There is much concern in the community, particularly amongst young women, about unmarked cars which turn out to be police cars and which require a driver to pull over, because they are often legitimately frightened by that. I make a plea to the Commissioner of Police and to the police minister that they look at this issue and formulate an operating policy that makes its practical effect quite clear and that, at the time the police wish to pull over a driver, something more substantial than a very small flashing light is put on top of the vehicle.

There should be no doubt in the mind of the driver who is being pulled over that it is a police vehicle and that a legitimate police practice is occurring and that it is not the behaviour of a hoon or someone who is out to cause mischief. That issue has been raised with me, and I know that people associated with this parliament (not MPs) have been concerned when their daughter has been terrified because an unmarked car has followed them virtually all the way and she did not realise it was a police car until the last moment. I make that plea to the Police Commissioner, in particular. I ask him to look at the operating procedures and suggest that he has in place techniques that will readily identify a police car that goes from being unmarked to marked, so that it is quite clear and there is no ambiguity or confusion in the mind of the motorist that it is a police vehicle and a legitimate police activity.

I am delighted that this package of road safety measures has been accepted by both houses and I look forward to its

assisting in saving the lives of not only young people but other people in this state.

Mr BRINDAL: When a bill goes to a deadlock conference, it has become an increasingly common practice over the last few parliaments of which I have been a member to appoint house managers to come back to this chamber and indulge in congratulating everyone concerned and say, 'It will be all right on the day; please pass this.' Apart from statements by my colleague the member for Light, I am yet to hear what matters of substance have been addressed between the two houses. The minister owes these houses an explanation of what was done in the joint house conference. I invite him to do that, pointing out that it is every member's right to ask three questions on every amendment to elicit that.

I am not doing that to be funny. I am saying that there has been a joint house conference and that conference has come to an agreement. We have received a set of amendments which is very legalistic. It is not too much to ask the minister, apart from thanking everybody and congratulating them, to explain what has changed as a result of the deadlock conference.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I am happy to do so; indeed, I am delighted to do so. If the member for Unley does not talk to the member for Light, perhaps I can fill him in on the detail.

Mr Scalzi: That's a cheap shot.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It is not a cheap shot.

Mr Brindal: I just want a small explanation in public.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Now you want a small explanation. How small would you like it to be? We may as well lay out the full picture. The Liberal Party has been dragged kicking and screaming to this position on road safety. When the member for Light spoke about supporting parts of the bill, that is correct, they did support it—the small parts. Any time there has been a big ticket item, a big issue, the Liberal Party has been light years behind on this bill. I am happy to go through each of these issues as—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: How does cutting road funding increase road safety?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: The Leader of the Opposition has had a very bad day today. I would not make it any worse if I were him. Why didn't he ask a question in question time? A very bad day.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Snelling): Order! The minister.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Thank you, sir. I am happy to go through each of the items that the member for Unley would like to have a report on, and when he has had enough he should put up his hand.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, the member for Unley wants to know what was raised in the deadlock conference. The member might not want to know, but the member for Unley wants to know. Just let him have his moment in the sun. Let us go through each of these individually so that the member for Unley can be brought up to speed on these individual issues that were raised in the deadlock conference. Again, I want to acknowledge that the member for Light played a very constructive role in the deadlock conference, as did his colleagues.

The conference deliberated on, basically, eight or nine outstanding issues, and we did these in numerical order, not necessarily in the order of importance. The first item that we dealt with during the deadlock conference was the report on the operation of the act after two years, and we agreed to it:

we thought that it was worth while proceeding with that measure. It is not necessarily something on which the government thought it would be able to give a fulsome report in two years—the data may not be of the extent that it would give a fulsome report—but some points were made that it was still worth while proceeding with this, even if it was of a preliminary nature. So, the deadlock conference agreed to item 1, which was a Liberal amendment in the Legislative Council.

Item 2 was the P plates—19 versus 20. What the government was proposing was two years or 20 years of age. I think the opposition came forward with two years or 19 years of age. The amendment that was proposed by the Hon. Sandra Kanck—and I am doing this from memory so, hopefully, I do not do anyone a disservice—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Actually, the member has given me a beautiful opportunity, so I thank him. The Hon. Sandra Kanck's amendment was something along these lines; that they would stay on until 20 years of age unless they undertook a defensive driving test. That amendment was defeated in the Legislative Council. So, we had that impasse in the deadlock conference. We ultimately agreed that it would be two years or 19 years of age, unless a driver, at 19 years of age (I think, for the member for Light's information, this is the way it went), lost a demerit point. If they lost a demerit point, it would then flip over to 20 years of age. That was a compromise position, which was able to be resolved during the deadlock conference in a satisfactory way.

The next item was to provide a specimen signature, and produce it within seven days. This was a Liberal Party amendment that was moved in the Legislative Council. The government was able to point out the weaknesses, as we saw it, of this amendment—that it would not achieve the outcomes and, in particular, it would not make a difference when it comes to safety—and it was agreed during the conference that it would not be insisted on.

The next item involved schedule 17 (and there were two matters in this area, but I will continue to deal with it in numerical order) with respect to negligent driving. The opposition moved an amendment in the Legislative Council in regard to negligent driving. We certainly had a discussion about that but, ultimately, it was agreed to—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is the next one, yes. There was also a related amendment, which I will come to in a moment, in regard to 45 kilometres. The matter involving negligent driving will not be proceeded with. The other item that is related to schedule 17 is excessive speeding: loss of licence for speeding 45 kilometres or more above the limit. Once again, that is an amendment that was moved by the opposition in the Legislative Council. What I gave a commitment to in the conference, and what I flagged when we introduced this legislation, was that, as a concept, we are not opposed to this, and we have been examining this matter and will continue to closely examine it. I have also given an undertaking that I am happy to have discussions with the member for Light, because what we want to work on and determine is what is the correct speed limit above the speed limit where we set a higher penalty.

I cannot remember the exact figures, and I know that the member for Unley does not want me to mislead the house, but I know that a certain state is pitched at 25 km/h above, and I think one of the territories is pitched at 30 km/h above—or vice versa; I just cannot recall off the top of my head. We

need to do some serious work to arrive at what is the correct figure and, when I introduced this legislation, from day one, I flagged our intention to look seriously at this as a concept. We do not disagree with it. I appreciate that the deadlock conference has accepted my commitment that we will do some further work on this matter. So, that one is out as well.

The next item relates to unmarked police cars not stopping drivers to test for alcohol. That amendment was moved by the opposition in the Legislative Council, and I think a number of worthwhile points were made. Perhaps the strongest point that was made, which made an impression on me, is that this could be interpreted as a de facto mobile RBT and, despite the fact that the government believes in mobile RBTs, this is not meant to be a de facto mobile RBT. Some other issues have been raised, with respect to which I think further work needs to be done, regarding unmarked cars. Some good points were made by the members for Fisher and Light, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, the Hon. Terry Cameron and others, and the government needs to do some work on that. So, the opposition's amendment in the Legislative Council on that matter stays in. The next item relates to cameras. However, before I move on that one, I think—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No, I would not have taken any length of time if I had not been asked.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the member for West Torrens.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: It was indicated to me by someone in the conference that a point that I made during the debate on the second reading (or in committee, I am not too sure; it was not pointed out to me at the time) was that, if someone is pulled over for an infringement—speeding, or whatever the case may be—they could not be breath tested. That is not the case, and I would certainly like to acknowledge that. Once that was highlighted to me during the conference, I certainly, on behalf of the government, said that I was happy with the amendment moved by the Liberal Party in the Legislative Council, and I would like to apologise for the comment that I made in this house during that debate. Certainly, I would like to acknowledge—I cannot remember who it was—

An honourable member: Caroline.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: We think it was the Hon. Caroline Schaefer who pointed that out to me during the conference, and I thank her for doing so. I certainly apologise for the mistake I made during the debate. That was the advice I had received but, clearly, it was wrong. I thank the Hon. Caroline Schaefer for bringing that to my attention. We had a good discussion about the amendment that related to cameras not being concealed. The member for Light made some good points during the deadlock conference, as did his colleagues and the member for Fisher and the Hon. Terry Cameron, and I have given a commitment to look at the research. The Hon. Terry Cameron highlighted the point about overseas research, as did the member for Light and the member for Fisher. We need to look at and take account of that. I certainly will take that on board and look forward to having some discussions with the member for Light in respect of that matter. So, that one is out.

The last amendment, relating to a speed camera advisory committee, was moved by the Hon. Nick Xenophon. The government came forward with an amendment (and no disrespect is directed at the Hon. Nick Xenophon) that is

stronger and goes beyond the amendment that he moved. It takes account of the work being done by the Road Safety Advisory Council, which is chaired by the Hon. Sir Eric Neal and which, of course, has a range of stakeholders.

That council will report to me. I just cannot remember all the details off the top of my head, but I have agreed to bring all that detail back to the parliament so that the parliament can share in that work. The member for Light, others and I agreed to this before we went into the deadlock conference, but advice from the Clerk of the Legislative Council (Mrs Jan Davis) was that the best and quickest way to facilitate this amendment was to go into deadlock conference, and that is what we did.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I can do so if any honourable member so wishes. Again, the member for Light, others and I deliberated on two very minor drafting issues before we went into the deadlock conference. There was full consensus. Two very minor drafting issues were raised by parliamentary counsel, and we were able to clean those up very quickly in the conference. Everyone agreed to them. I do not know whether I can lay my hands on them quickly. Have I given members enough?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Not necessarily. Have I satisfied your call?

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: No? Give me an indication. There seems to be general concurrence around the chamber that enough information has been provided. Hopefully, that is the case but, if there is not enough information, I am happy to take any further questions. I look forward to any indepth questions from the member for Unley and/or any other members around the chamber.

Mr BRINDAL: Quite wrongly I thought that I detected a note of sarcasm in the minister's voice. I know that would not have been characteristic of him. I thank the minister for that explanation. Because he has now explained to the house I—and, I hope, other members—am satisfied with the explanation and wish the bill well. I repeat my first point that I do not think it is unreasonable that, when we have a deadlock conference, we do have some sort of report, such as the minister just gave us, and I thank him.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will be very brief. I am glad that we have resolved this bill but I do have a point I want to make to the minister and to members opposite. One proposition put forward by the opposition during the process of this debate related to retraining drivers who had committed offences and, in particular, looking at a system which used to be in place and which required drivers to attend compulsory training, including movies of car accidents, and so on, in order for them to continue driving.

I remember attending one of these sessions voluntarily. Some pretty horrific movies were shown of great carnage and it brought home to me, as a teenage driver, just how horrific and possible it was to face death and carnage on the road. Most young drivers do not see these things and exposing them to it is a shock tactic, but I think it is effective. I was disappointed that this bill has come back to us from the upper house—after being resolved in deadlock—without that being incorporated. I suggest to the minister that he might like to revisit that aspect.

I know that proponents against the proposition would argue that it is too horrific, that it is too shocking, but the problem with these young drivers is not that they do not have

the skills to drive but that they lack the maturity and awareness to understand that they are driving a lethal machine. Maybe its time to go back to some tried and true methods we used in the 1960s and 1970s to see whether or not they will work again in some modified form. I am happy that the bill has been passed.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Industry, Trade and Regional Development): I move:

That the time for the bringing up of the report of the committee be extended to Monday 14 July 2003.

Motion carried.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE CROWN LANDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I bring up the final report of the committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2003

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 May. Page 3265.)

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): I rise to reply to the second Foley budget that was brought down last week. I must say that the general theme is that it has no vision. It is a very pessimistic budget. If you look at the predictions that lie within it, you see that it is pessimistic. It is anti-jobs. It talks about fewer jobs—a slowdown in the rate of growth of jobs. If one looks through the budget, one sees that it is preparing South Australia for something of a slowdown, which we need not have had if we did not have a 'do nothing' government. It was quite ironic to hear the minister for the environment take one more step towards cleaning up one of the messes that the government made last year with regard to the broken promise on crown lands. It is a bit of a celebration in trying to fix up one of the messes that arose out of last year's budget, which we are still working on. This budget, like last year's budget, is a budget of broken promises. From what I can gather, it is also a budget with which Labor backbenchers are quite unhappy. It further divides the haves and have-nots, not just within the community but also, importantly for us, those within the Labor caucus. Last year, Kris Hanna left the Labor Party in disgust—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to the member for Mitchell by the name of his electorate.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Last year, the member for Mitchell left the party in disgust. In a significant burst of brutal honesty, he made a couple of points about the leadership of the government as he departed. He said that there were three bullies running the state and that the cabinet and caucus were not getting enough say in what the government was doing; that there is a preoccupation with the media and that things are all about the best headline, not about what is right or what is consistent with Labor principles; and that the party has a hierarchy which allows bridges

worth \$20 million or \$30 million extra to open to be committed to without even a cabinet discussion or approval of that move. As has become obvious in the last couple of weeks, many members of the media know more than some government ministers about what is going on or what was to come out in the budget.

In the lead-up to the budget we heard a lot of Labor's pre-budget leaks. Labor's spin on the budget was tricky and sometimes too cute by half. It became a bit of a circus. Figures were wrong; old projects were reannounced; and a few journalists were sold a pup. However, I do not blame them because some of the projects were announced not six months ago but two years ago. So, we have to excuse them for not having remembered that some of these projects had previously been announced.

Only the day before the budget, we heard in a leak that \$280 million would be put into the River Murray by the state. That was too clever by half and very wrong, and I will revisit the commitment of this government to the River Murray. We also heard the night before the budget that there would be \$60 million for child protection. That certainly has not been backed up by the budget documents. Another leak was that, for the third time, money was announced for new fire trucks, which has been decreased from \$9.78 million last year to \$9.33 million in this year's budget, and the trucks have still not been ordered. It will be about three years from when their purchase was first announced until we see the trucks for the first time. And how a three year delay saves half a million dollars is a mystery.

Then the Treasurer—the man who has the moral fibre to break his promises and is proud of it—delivers another round of broken promises. The government said that Labor's financial strategy would not require any increases in existing government taxes and charges or any new taxes and charges. But the Premier does not know how to keep his promises and, while a federal Liberal government delivered tax cuts, the Premier and Treasurer have to live with a massive tax slug and across-the-board increases for all South Australians.

The new Rann water tax of \$30 per year per household and \$135 per year for commercial properties (and that includes clubs, schools and businesses) should be condemned. It is a flat tax, regardless of income. A flat tax is not only inequitable for people on different levels of income, but it is also difficult to see how that sends any message about the amount of water that people should use. Surely, if they are going to impose this broken promise tax, it should be on the basis of how much water is used to create some disincentive to leave taps running. It is a cynical exercise, and smoke and mirrors, and we might wonder what other levies we will see imposed in the future. This is a stunt, because the government knows that people are concerned about the river, and it has worked on that and used it.

There is a great deal of concern at the moment about child abuse, but does that make it okay to put on a levy (a new tax) to raise money for that? Funding for the River Murray had to be in the budget, because we were already committed to the buy-back of allocations. But, instead of committing government funds, the Premier put his hand in the taxpayers' pockets and made South Australians pay again. It is a cynical exercise which has allowed this government to make no extra internal allocations for the buy-back which could have saved the budget moneys that they had already promised and committed to.

Despite the rhetoric, the Rann government has not committed millions of extra dollars to the River Murray.

There is a total lack of commitment, and they are not willing to put one extra Treasury dollar towards the Murray. On top of that, not only is there no extra money, but also over the last few months the Minister for the River Murray came back from the Murray-Darling Ministerial Council and said that this government was committed to the buy-back of water. However, we now see that the only extra money that will go towards the river is what will come out of the Rann water tax.

So, they promised money out of the budget or Treasury, and they have saved that money. They have shown a total lack of commitment by saving the money that they committed for the buy-back by raising a tax and saying, 'That will go towards the Murray.' So, it is actually a pull-back. Add to that the disgraceful situation whereby the Minister for the Environment and his department have withdrawn \$10 million from the Lower Murray irrigation scheme. What sort of message does that send upstream? We have a government which says, 'The water users of South Australia can pay an extra \$20 million a year, but there is not one extra cent from us; and we are going to save \$10 million on a project to help save the River Murray.' The message that that sends upstream is totally the wrong one. They might say that South Australians are committed; they are committed to paying a new tax. However, at the end of the day this government will put less money towards the river over the next few years than was already committed to. That should be condemned and is an absolute disgrace.

That is not the only new tax: there is more. Labor has had a major windfall gain in revenue of nearly \$200 million in the past 12 months and is now punishing South Australians with extra taxes and charges. It was an ideal opportunity for a government in this state, with a windfall, to give some relief to the people of South Australia. Because those extra taxes—the \$200 million—did not fall out of the sky: that \$200 million came from the taxpayers of South Australia, through paying property taxes and whatever. So, when you have a \$200 million windfall, to whack on another \$22 million in increases in taxes and fees and an extra \$20 million in a new tax is a missed opportunity to restructure the tax base of this state.

The Treasurer has gone to great lengths over time to assure us that the additional revenue streams are a one-off. By saying that they are a one-off, he is saying that we cannot count on them next year. I ask people to think about that. I know the Treasurer does not understand much about economics and he does not understand what goes on in Treasury—he gets told what is going on and he has no understanding of it—but, if you stop and think about it for a moment, there may be a slowing in property values which will slow growth. What has happened is a structural change, and they have not addressed bracket creep.

In last year's budget the government increased the stamp duty payable on conveyances, and in this budget it has increased the cost of mortgages. So, the government has not only wrecked the benefit of those increased values but it has also put extra taxes on top, and there is now a structural windfall every year ahead. There might not be the growth, but there is a structural windfall, because people are in a higher bracket. That \$150 million will be there every year. If the price of property slows, that \$150 million to \$200 will still be there: it will just mean that it will not be \$300 million extra.

So, when the Treasurer says that, I have no doubt that his advice from Treasury is that he should not count that as money he will get in future years; but that is absolute rubbish.

Anyone who can use a calculator and has half a financial mind will understand that it is absolute rubbish. This government did not face an \$8 billion debt like that which the Liberal government had to face, and there is a minimum of \$150 million which you can put down just to bracket creep. So, what we can effectively call bracket creep is \$150 million extra, and I argue that that is structurally an increase in the tax take, and that is why putting on the extra 3.9 per cent this year was just not necessary. It was an opportunity, when the government is taking so much extra from South Australians, to stop and look at the tax take, and stop building the war chest which this Treasurer seems to be intent on putting together to fight the next election.

With nearly \$600 million extra going into government coffers this year, the government had an opportunity to give some back. The government had a golden opportunity to increase concessions for pensioners and self-funded retirees. These two groups have really suffered badly from the taxing policies and from the increases we have seen in property values, and it was a perfect opportunity to give something back to those people who have had a hell of a role in building the state and making it what it is—and the government let it go. Concessions could have been provided in respect of electricity, council rates, water, sewerage rates, third party insurance premiums—all those areas of windfall for government. Those opportunities were missed and ignored and the Treasurer has said to self-funded retirees and others, 'Bad luck! I'll keep these taxes on,' and the fact is that he can.

I refer to the Rann car slug. In the past 12 months the cost of running an average vehicle increased by \$85 a year. A lot of families have two cars, so it will cost an extra \$170 per annum. Many people have and need two cars. It is not a great luxury to have two cars. The Rann training tax, as the member for Unley knows, has been increased by 50 per cent for apprentices and trainees. An apprentice hairdresser will pay an extra \$160 a year in Rann training tax. Pity help those who have two cars and three hairdressers in the family! Then there are the Rann gas hikes: gas prices are set to increase by 5.6 per cent or \$24 for the average household—after a 6 per cent increase last year. Both those increases are well ahead of CPI. Does anyone detect that the government might be allowing high rises in gas in its first two years so that in the last couple of years it can then claim credit for the fact that the prices have not gone up very much?

Basic ambulance fees are set to increase by 17.6 per cent. I do not know what happened to the 3.9 per cent, the formula with which the Premier justifies everything else. We know whom they will affect.

The Hon. Dean Brown: And the hospitals.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: And the hospitals as well. So a bit of it goes around and they take more out of the health budget to prop up the ambulance service. All government charges are up by 3.9 per cent. We know what that covers and it was the perfect opportunity for this government to say, 'Enough is enough—we're making a couple of hundred million extra elsewhere; we'll give you a tiny bit of relief and not collect that \$22 million.'

In the middle of a housing boom, stamp duty on mortgages on all non-owner occupier homes will increase from 35¢ per \$100 to 45¢ per \$100. With property values going like they have been, mortgages are higher (for anyone who understands any logic), and to go from 35¢ to 45¢ is an unnecessary slug and rubs salt into the wound. That is yet another broken promise by anyone's measure, and yet again

that increase in values is a bigger windfall for the government.

On top of that, as well as the increase in taxes and charges, there are cuts—and plenty of them. In transport—and the member Mount Gambier should note this—with the \$10 million South-East rail project, the section from Wolseley to Bordertown has been completely cut. It got difficult because someone walked away. It got difficult, so the money is gone.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: It's still in the fund.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I take the minister's word for it. I will join the member for Mount Gambier in hoping it is still there and put him on notice that he should ask the Treasurer about that one. Over four years, \$7.7 million has been cut from bus services, and we suspect that 211 people will be cut from the Department of Transport, on top of what this Minister for Transport has already done to regional and outback areas, which has really put tourism and people who live in the outback at some risk. And he talks about road safety! In the transport portfolio we also find another example of the politics of spite—another levy on an industry doing well. Last year we saw the hotel industry hit. We said at the time that the fishing industry was doing well and that the government would probably look at it next. What has happened? It has come up with a levy on the fishing industry.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: The Treasurer probably wants to rewrite his election promises. With the new tax on the fishing industry, how have we got money out of an industry that is doing all right? It has ignored the marine scale sector and looked at the rest of the commercial fishing sector. What is a good way of raising a tax? It has gone on the length of the boat. The government will put a tax on the length of the boat. It has ignored several things: first—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Yes, that size does matter. The member for Davenport should be attributed with that. Size does matter—it costs you more! The government has ignored a couple of things. If anyone has been affected more than anyone else in South Australia by the SARS virus it is the fishing industry. The tourism industry and the fishing industry have both been hit, but the fishing industry has been hit very hard by the SARS virus. Let's get them while they're down and whack a tax on them! The fear about this tax is that it is a tax to pay for jetties, levied on those who use them. Unfortunately, the government did not know that a lot of the fishing industry does not use jetties but uses marinas that it has paid to build. Many are not using jetties, but will be faced with a jetty levy. That will make a big difference; in some areas of the state it will cost jobs.

Today we asked the minister whether or not he consulted and whether he had done one of the much talked about regional development impact statements that accompany every decision that affects regional South Australia. Yet another core promise of the government was that no decision that affected regional areas would be made without a regional development impact statement, which would be released publicly and everyone would get a chance to have a say on it—a fantastic process. We are yet to see one here. Every one was to be released publicly and we would all sit down and read these things. To this day we have not seen one regional development impact statement, and the minister stood in this place today and admitted not only that there had been no consultation on the new tax but also that there was no regional development impact statement. I do not know

whether the Premier will sack him straight away or just work on it, but it is a disgrace.

For a minister to stand up here and defy the Premier, who promised a regional development impact statement, and openly tell us that he did not do one, he really has lost the plot. The minister has a lot of problems, but we will wait and see. We hope to see regional development impact statements. Despite the Premier promising that they would all be made public, even under FOI we have been refused them. I am not sure whether they do not exist or whether there is a good excuse, but we are yet to see one.

I now refer to law and order—and I welcome the former minister for police, who lost this portfolio. The minister, who looked very sad about losing it, has not been as bad as the Premier and the Attorney-General ranting and raving about being tough on law and order. There have been plenty of exclusives and front pages but fewer resources. It does not add up. We saw taxpayers' money going into TV ads saying how tough they were on law and order, and that probably helped, but it is an absolute joke. We have been told that we will have no extra police officers over the next three years. We have heard about new police stations today: the problem is that there are no new police. I do not know whether we will have empty stations at the end of the day but, as with health, a lot of things do not add up. We have had a good look at the budget and there is some money extra for law and order—

The SPEAKER: Order! This is confusing: Hansard is not sure who the leader is. However, one thing is certain, and I reassure them that it is not the Minister for Government Enterprises.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Thank you, sir, and the opposition collectively sighed with relief when you pointed that out. The additional funding in law and order—and let us remember this government's priorities—is for enterprise bargaining agreements and car fleets. So, I do not know what happened to the Premier's priority of extra police, because it seems to have been lost.

The government does not seem to know where it is going with crime prevention. Last year, the government announced pre-budget (one of the early leaks) a half a million dollars additional funding for crime prevention programs. The Attorney-General had just been to Port Lincoln to talk to them, and, when he returned, he announced that he would give them an additional half a million dollars for crime prevention programs.

Unfortunately, I think that was something that had been keyed in 12 months before and should never have gone out. They therefore apologised and said, 'Sorry, we are not actually increasing funding for crime prevention programs; it was a mistake.' What they did not say at the time (but which they told us when the budget was announced) was that they were actually reducing funding by \$800 000 to community crime prevention programs, and that was basically half the funding. We have since seen the remainder disappear. Despite a lot of rhetoric on crime prevention, we have seen the devastating removal of crime prevention programs within our local communities. Once again, this is a Labor priority that has well and truly been put to question by the rhetoric not being matched by financial commitment.

As we saw during question time today, despite the rhetoric, health and education have actually been allocated a lower percentage of total spending than that allocated in the last Liberal budget. I do not think that should be lost on anyone. If you look at total spending and break it down into the pie chart of the percentage allocated to various areas, you

will see that, if as it claims this government had a higher priority than the last government for health and education, it would increase the share that those two portfolios received from the budget. However, that has not happened: in both cases, we have seen a reduction in the priority of the South Australian government for health and education.

Under the Liberals, 24.7 per cent of the budget was spent on health, and under Labor this has been decreased to 24.1 per cent. Some would say that that is not a massive figure, but it represents a lower priority. It basically means that there will be longer waiting lists with people having to wait longer for a whole range of basic treatments, accident and emergency services battling, and a whole range of issues that will blow out. The increases of about \$125 million will not even keep up with inflation. That is some priority!

The last federal budget added an extra \$33.4 million to South Australia's public hospitals, but the problem is that the Rann government has to commit the same increase in funding. The generational health review promotes removing more than \$100 million a year from public hospitals. The 15 bed intensive care unit and the eight bed coronary care unit at the Lyell McEwin Health Service was part of the \$87 million redevelopment of the hospital, which, again, was initiated by the former Liberal government. However, the Rann government has provided enough funds to open only 10 intensive care beds by December this year. The Rann government has failed to commit funds to the staffing of those beds, so that creates a real problem for the hospital.

Further, there is no money to employ intensive care medical or cardiac specialists, extra nursing staff or specialist intensive care nursing staff, or indeed to upgrade the skills of existing nursing staff. We have a new intensive care unit, but no staff and no patients. It reminds me of the *Yes, Minister* television series of a few years ago. I think the Treasurer is trying to do exactly the same thing. There has been no commitment to provide funds to open the eight new coronary care beds, either.

Stages 2 and 3 of the redevelopment of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, which again was initiated by the Liberals, have been dumped for at least 12 months.

The Hon. Dean Brown: For two years.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: For two years, the previous minister says. The Rann government has allocated only \$900 000 towards a \$60 million project. This is the second year that this project has been announced without any building work being done. Labor said that it would be completed in 2007, but not a dollar has been spent so far. Because of these delays, the cost has blown out by \$19 million and the completion date is six years away.

And what a mess this government has made of rural health. Rural South Australians receive fewer health dollars per capita than metropolitan residents and, as a result, have poorer health outcomes. Rural hospitals have reduced access to modern equipment, have limited budgets, and find it hard to attract doctors. Once again, we have seen funding for country health services increased by what the Treasurer would call a generous 1.7 per cent. That is not enough even to cover inflation, let alone salary increases.

We heard the same rhetoric about education being a priority of the Labor government, but the budget shows that, again, this has not been backed up by the government spend. Under the Liberals, 25.2 per cent of the budget was spent on education, but under Labor this has decreased to 24.3 per cent. That is a real measure of priority. There is no doubt that the former Liberal government had a higher priority not only

for health but also for education. If you compare the Treasurer's own 'Budget at a glance' document to the situation two years ago, it is obvious that health and education are reduced priorities for this government.

This government promised that it would provide more teachers and better schools when it came to power and not reduce the size of the budget pie for education. The meagre increases announced in the budget will see real cuts to schools and preschools. There is only an additional \$52 million funding, while salary costs alone will increase by \$63 million.

The government's deal last year with the teachers' union means that extra money required for salary increases will soak up all the additional funding in addition to about another \$11 million. The government priority is obviously to please the union and not to provide better education.

Some of the big cuts are already obvious in capital works for education, which has been reduced by \$16 million. In 2002, the commitment was \$97.4 million; in 2003, \$71.234 million; and in 2004, \$54.934 million. It is a worrying trend. We could be in the negative by about 2007 unless the Treasurer changes his priorities.

There are some new projects in key seats, such as Mount Gambier, Fisher, Norwood, Light, Mawson and Stuart. However, many new works from 2003 have been carried forward, and the education capital budget is about \$7 million underspent. Under the Liberal's plan, many of these projects would have been finished and in operation by now. Some members would have heard the member for Reynell's grievance debate speech when she criticised new capital works in schools and said that the money should be spent on maintenance. I am not too sure whether she is unhappy with the budget or whether she has a very different perspective of what education should be about and how governments should spend their money.

Funding for extra teachers and counsellors has gone to selected schools only. The Futures Connect program, which was meant to accompany the introduction of the increased school age, will not be funded until 2004. That is one year too late for those who are 16 years old this year.

We have heard much about decreased class sizes, but the budget does not contain any details about the number of students enrolled from reception to year 12. The budget suggests that this is not available because a new statistical model is being developed. We have heard that before. Here we go with retention rates all over again, I would think. Just put out a new formula so that you cannot be judged against previous performance. As the government drops its priority, these sorts of things suffer and, if you use the old formulas, it will be far too obvious. I suggest that the deliberate concealment of diminishing enrolments in government schools may well be the issue. Do we have more teachers or just fewer students is probably the question that should be asked.

Between 1991 and 2002, the number of commonwealth funded residential aged-care beds in South Australia increased by 1 204. On 23 April, the Prime Minister announced that the commonwealth would provide state and territory governments with up to \$42 billion under the Australian health care agreements for 2003 to 2008. South Australia can expect to receive over \$3.5 billion during the life of the agreements (an increase of more than \$800 million), but only if the Rann government will at least match the rate of growth and deliver on commitments under the agreement. On the Treasurer's current form, that is unlikely to happen.

For those worried about the government's lack of leadership or vision, this year's capital investment statement says it all. This is a slow government. It reviews, procrastinates and moves at a snail's pace. Labor has underspent its capital works budget this year by about 23 per cent, or \$104 million, and we must bear in mind that these projections are based on a generous prediction. So, by the end of the year, when the real figures are released, that may be more like \$140 million or \$150 million. The Treasurer is sitting on the money. Out of that amount, about \$10 million for human services and \$7 million for education is unspent that we know about currently, but no doubt both those figures will be higher. In short, the capital investment statement shows slippage after slippage for schools and hospitals as follows:

- the QEH redevelopment—a two-year extension;
- Murray Bridge Hospital—a three-year extension;
- Renmark Hospital—12 months late;
- the Margaret Tobin Mental Health Unit—approximately a 12-month extension on the time of delivery of the project;
- the mental health unit at the Repatriation General Hospital—two years late; and
- the SACOSS children's facility to meet high support needs of children in the care of the minister—delayed by 12 months.

If the children's facility is not a high priority at the moment, I do not know what is, but we have seen another 12 months slip by. However, one area will not suffer much slippage: tourism. I invite everyone to look at the budget and see what is listed in the capital works program. Tourism is obviously one of our key growth industries, and the government allocated \$3.222 million to the 2003-04 capital works program. It was asked whether or not the minister turned up at the bilaterals. It looks as though the Treasurer absolutely got his way.

The capital investment statement shows three items in the tourism portfolio: the Convention Centre (which has won great praise and was put there by the Liberal government) receives \$3.082 million; the Entertainment Centre receives \$130 000 for gradual improvements; and the Tourism Commission scores a marvellous \$110 000. You have to say that the government has obviously given up on tourism.

However, if you look at what has happened to regional South Australia under this government, you see that the trickery continues. We saw the Premier announce (and it was written up as a major win for the arts) that he was going to put half a million dollars into regional theatres. When we were in government we announced a program of \$7.2 million to refurbish those theatres. That amount has disappeared back into Treasury, and we now have a new announcement of \$500 000 (which was lauded) for work in country theatres. Those theatres, in which there was to be such a terrific investment, which was welcomed and regarded as very important by those communities, will receive half a million dollars instead of \$7.2 million. The results are showing: people are tripping up on threadbare carpets, and there are no handrails for aged people—issues about which every country member is approached.

This government has also shown contempt for economic development within regional South Australia. The budget is not consistent with the framework for economic development that was released by the Economic Development Board in May 2003, and it certainly in no way reflects the sentiments that were expressed in this house at the Economic Growth Summit. The key point that was agreed by participants of that

forum was that we needed to triple exports in the next 10 years. That was the key to attracting investment in this state so that all the other industries, non-export industries, could prosper and employ people, who would be paying taxes to this Treasurer, making the place tick over and making it work.

It was recognised as a key building block to continued economic growth and stability. However, the government just does not understand that this does not happen on its own, which is pretty sad. By way of a history lesson, the government saw that the Liberal government tripled exports over the last 10 years, so it thinks, 'If they can do it, so can we.' However, this government does not understand much at all. When we came to power in late 1993, industry in the regional areas of South Australia had been ignored for a decade, which meant that they were not performing as they should. People were trying very hard, but the performance did not match the effort, because the government would not play its role and ignored them totally. By late 1993, they started to work hard and set some goals as to where we were going with exports, how we would grow this economy, and how we would catch up. We had a Labor government that thought that a growth in exports of 1 to 3 per cent was pretty good, but it does not work like that.

We recognised that regional South Australia had been ignored and that exports were underperforming. At the time, the regions were suffering enormous unemployment. There was much underutilised infrastructure (most of which had been built by previous Liberal governments) which industries could grow into and which gave an opportunity for them to expand. The Treasurer's attitude is to leave everything to the private sector, but this will not create quick growth. Six or eight weeks ago, I was in the South-East, where the big problem is that people are starting to make strategic investment decisions not to go ahead with development because they feel as though no-one will work the industry that they are setting up, whether it be vineyards or any other business. They are not willing to take the chance that they might not be able to get a labour force.

The problem is housing. We realised that when we were in government, so we put aside \$20 million to use strategically to try to pick up on that market failure, where the private sector was not increasing housing at anywhere near the rate needed—not just to grow regional South Australia but to grow our economy, to give us exports to grow this economy and this state, and to provide jobs.

Major demands are now being placed on gas, water, electricity, roads, boat ramps, air strips, and so on. When I was in the South-East, the discussions centred around how we, as members of parliament—

Ms THOMPSON: I rise on a point of order, sir. The leader seems to have forgotten the standing order requiring that he address the chair.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brokenshire): Order! There is no point of order. I point out to the member for Reynell that both leaders have an opportunity that other members do not. However, I also point out that the member for Reynell should address the chair when she is speaking.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Is the member trying to suggest that I should start again? I think that the honourable member is pretty upset about something. It became very evident that there was enormous potential in the South-East. However, we need a government that will facilitate. It is not necessarily about throwing heaps of money at the problem: it is about playing a role. In the case of health and education, where

there is market failure, the government has a role to provide health facilities and to educate. When there is market failure and industry is not growing, the government has a role. Sometimes it is just facilitation, sometimes the Treasurer has to put his hand in his long pocket and get out a couple of dollars and do something. It has become obvious that there is market failure and the Treasurer needs to address that, otherwise we risk a falling off in our growth and export income.

However, two days later, the Treasurer followed me to Mount Gambier (he got a far better welcome than the Premier did on Friday), and when he was asked about what he was going to do about the shortage of labour, the shortage of housing and some of the infrastructure issues in the South-East, he said it was nothing to do with the government, that it is for the private sector to sort out. He is not interested.

The Treasurer was present here right throughout the economic forum, but I do not think he listened, because those people were begging the government to do something. They said that the government had sat on its hands and done nothing for 12 months; that departments are doing nothing, waiting for a new direction. It became perfectly clear that the Treasurer was too busy prancing around to sit down and listen to what the people within that forum were saying. They want some action from this government, but it has stopped. It is frozen. It is not willing to do anything.

When one looks at what is happening in regional South Australia, where the export growth has been coming from and which in turn affects the whole state, it becomes obvious where it is falling down. If you say that government does not have a role, you should ask yourself some questions. Where would the aquaculture industry in this state be if it were not for government intervention? Ten years ago we had the smallest aquaculture industry in Australia: now we have the largest. If the government had not intervened (and we got in before the Minister for Transport, thank goodness) the aquaculture industry and those wonderful people who have made it happen, would not be there. It is just that bit of government help along the way. We put in millions of dollars, but we did not have to put in tens of millions, because, as long as you encourage private investors and they get the sort of support they have had from the member for Flinders, things will happen.

The food industry has been going through a real growth phase because government and industry have been working together. Industry has been doing the hard yards. The government has been creating the mechanism to get industry players to work together to take on the world in overseas markets, and it has worked. We have been getting export growth of 30 to 40 per cent in the food industry over a number of years. This government does not understand that, and it will put it all at risk.

Would Roxby Downs be there if we had not defeated the Rann attitude to regional development? If the Premier had had his way, we would not have that wonderful town of Roxby Downs and everything that has flowed from that. The Treasurer would not have such a big smile on his face with increasing royalties if the Premier had had his way a number of years ago.

Would motor vehicle exports have grown as wonderfully well as they have if the political parties in this state had ignored it, saying that it is up to the private sector? It would not have happened. Both sides of this house in the past have had the vision to do something for the motor vehicle industry. If the Treasurer follows his rhetoric, there will be no more of

that. He is never going to back another winner. If you do not back winners, there will be no winners, things will slow down and we will go backwards.

The business community is starting to realise that this government has said lots but done nothing but cut the very programs designed to facilitate our future growth. I am talking about major export growth, with exports targeted to ripple, but which industry in which regions? Nothing is said about that. The government talks about tripling exports, but it makes no mention of which industries are going to do it, how they are going to do it without any infrastructure or how they are going to do it without labour.

On average, South Australia's percentage of exports that come from regional areas is about double that of the rest of Australia. If any state cannot afford to turn its back on what is going on in the growth of export industries, it is this state. We are so highly reliant on it, so for this government to turn its back makes absolutely no sense. The government must realise the absolute priority it should be putting on this sector, because it is that sector that is making the economy tick. That is the growth area that has brought in the money, and it is now starting to tell in the property market and other investment areas. Export is the funnel that brings seed money into the state.

This cannot happen unless government is prepared to do its bit. All we have seen happen is successful and necessary programs cut. The \$20 million regional housing strategy has disappeared, leaving many regional areas with huge housing shortages. Without housing, there is no extra labour and, without labour, we jeopardise losing investment and potential export dollars. We recognise that there is a role for government in other areas where there is market failure such as education and health, so why not work out how those other areas go ahead, which helps to pay for those other priorities? Infrastructure development cannot be left to the private sector alone. It will not work. When there is market failure, government has to play a role and that seems to be too hard for this government to understand and certainly too hard for it to address.

When we left government, the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund had \$16.5 million in it. It was sitting there to promote projects in regional areas. What I read in this year's budget is that it is 'being refocused, with a consequent reduction in funding—\$2.5 million'. It looks as if the Treasurer has had a dividend of about \$14 million out of that. The budget reveals that, in our last year, we spent \$9.3 million on regional development projects. This government spent less than 10 per cent of that money last year, a total of \$814 000.

This year's budget documents show that, in 2001-02, the performance indicators confirmed that the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund had leveraged \$88 million in total project investment. The same papers show that, in 2002-03, the Regional Infrastructure Development Fund strategy has been drafted and the fund is under review. This government has turned to another review, and I think we now have over 180 reviews. Meanwhile, growth in regional areas and, consequently, South Australia's export performance are being put at risk.

When it comes to economic development, this government seems to operate under a policy of envy. Whether successful or not, if it is not a Labor initiative, it is just not any good. Many successful economic development programs have now been scrapped or sent to eternal—not external—review. The Food for the Future program is just one that appears to be at

risk and, with it, a huge number of export dollars and potential into the future. South Australia has reached beyond its traditional raw food export markets and is now growing way beyond expectations, and that is being put at risk. The total revenue generated by the industry in 2001-02 increased by 18 per cent to reach \$9.82 billion, with \$2.98 billion—as good as \$3 billion—being in overseas exports.

What does the budget say about future investment by the government? Under 'Variations', we read in the budget, under the savings category, 'non-recurring activities as a consequence of projects having achieved their outcomes—\$32.2 million'. Many of these projects should have been continued, or this \$32.2 million should be put into new programs to take their place and keep the investment going in this state. This government has no idea about export growth. Under us it was sitting between 20 per cent and 25 per cent: it is now back to 4 per cent and further at risk due to the attitude and the policies of the Labor government.

Under the Liberals, Treasury estimated that unfunded superannuation liabilities for June 2003 would be \$3.3 billion. After just 16 months, the Treasurer has reported that in four years this will have blown out to \$4.9 billion, and that is on top of the WorkCover debacle, which is gradually unfolding month by month. Thanks to the Liberals, debt is manageable, at about \$3 billion. A small amount of the government's surplus should have been put towards paying off the debt: we do not argue about that. But some of it should have been given back to the South Australian taxpayer, from whom the windfall came. Some of it should have been spent on hospitals, schools, more police, crime prevention and infrastructure—many of those stated priorities of this government that have been ignored—just like the government promised that it would.

Labor promised a higher priority for health and education, and there is no doubt that it has not delivered on that. The figures show that they are lower priorities. This is yet another budget of broken promises. It is a mean budget, masked by the money wasting television advertisements and inaccurate and misleading leaks and pre-announcements. Just like Labor's first budget, this is a budget of spin and deception.

I really hope that over the next couple of months we receive some answers to the approximately 100 questions that remain unanswered from last year and that, as we go into this year's estimates, ministers will endeavour to answer the questions that are asked in the house. Alternatively, if it is beyond their wit, with all their officers sitting around them, they should get back to us, as the Premier had promised, within two weeks. It is not acceptable to wait 12 months—and it is not just the Liberal Party that is waiting; the taxpayers of South Australia also have had to wait 12 months for information that is vitally important to the present and, indeed, the future of this state.

This government promised that there would be no new taxes and charges. It broke that promise. It promised that health and education would be higher priorities. We have also seen that promise broken. It is a very disappointing budget. The Hon. Mr Foley is a very mean spirited Treasurer who does not want to be open and accountable whatsoever—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: It is interesting that when I said that he was a mean Treasurer there were howls of approval from the government benches. There is no doubt that members on the government benches agree that this Treasurer is mean spirited, that he is not open and accountable and that he does not believe in the priorities that everyone in this

house agrees should be our priorities—health and education. The Treasurer does not agree with that. We can only hope that the Premier will have a good look because, hopefully, this might be this Treasurer's last budget. Until we get rid of this Treasurer and we see a more kind-hearted person sitting in the Treasurer's chair, health and education will suffer. I wish to express how disappointed the Liberals are in the budget and to say that we hope for a lot of answers over the coming months.

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): In discussing the 2003-04 South Australian budget, I believe it is important to focus on the central accomplishment of this document, and that is to back up best intentions on the River Murray with concrete deeds. On 25 February this year, the Premier and Minister for the River Murray convened a River Murray forum in this chamber. The purpose of the forum was to confirm the commitment of this government to doing our part, as a state, in meeting the challenge of the emerging environmental catastrophe that is the Murray-Darling Basin. This budget commits an extra \$20 million per year to the River Murray, which will be funded, in part, by the Save the Murray levy of \$30 for residential ratepayers and \$135 per year for non-residential ratepayers. It is a tangible and not insignificant financial commitment by the people of South Australia to avert a looming environmental, economic and social disaster. It is a commitment that is not without pain to the citizens of this state, involving, as it does, an increase in the size of their water bill. It is, as I said earlier, the backing of best intentions with concrete deeds.

How this contrasts with the best intentions of the Prime Minister, Mr John Howard, with respect to the River Murray, and the complete lack of concrete deeds in the most recent federal budget. The Prime Minister has made a public declaration of his intention to place the health of the Murray-Darling Basin at the heart of his government's future plans. Yet, in the recent federal budget, a paltry \$16.6 million is committed to the basin.

Compounding this parsimonious approach to dealing with the nation's greatest peace time challenge, the federal government saw fit to remove \$63 million over two years from the National Action Plan for Salinity and Water Quality. The National Farmers Federation was so outraged by this decision that NFF President Peter Corish called on the Prime Minister to take personal control of the plan 'and ensure that the funds get where they are needed as a matter of urgency'. The NFF President's call is becoming a national chorus. The predicament of the Murray-Darling Basin is measuring up as a national environmental, economic and social disaster of unimaginable consequences and should be treated, as Premier Rann has stated, as the moral equivalent of a state of war. Yet the pleadings of the NFF President and others are falling on deaf ears. Instead of retaining the sandwich and milkshake tax cuts of \$4 a week (which is more like a milkshake with malt tax cut), and allocating the resulting \$2.4 billion to the serious task of returning the Murray-Darling Basin to health, the Prime Minister has done nothing. Like his beloved Robert Menzies, when confronted with another national challenge to our survival (in Menzies' case, the potential and then actual entry of Japan into the Second World War), our current Prime Minister is unable, unwilling and incapable of rising to the challenge.

The NFF President's call to John Howard to take personal control and make things happen will have as much impact as the pleas to Menzies by the military and industry to place this

nation on total war footing in the face of rising Japanese militarism. Instead of taking the decisive action contained in this budget of creating a save the Murray levy, the Prime Minister has resolved, instead, to give us the malted milkshake tax cut. Instead of placing the Murray-Darling Basin at the very head of the federal budget, as we have done in South Australia, the Prime Minister has attempted to banish this matter to the nether regions of our national consciousness, as Menzies tried to do with Japanese militarism.

In discussing the centrality of the River Murray to this budget, it is important to understand the economic importance of the basin. The basin is home to 11 per cent of Australia's population. It accounts for 40 per cent of the gross value of Australia's agricultural production, which is valued at in excess of \$10 billion per annum. During periods of drought, the high profits earned in the irrigation areas are vitally important for the stability of the national economy. In the five years to 1996, in which there was a major drought throughout much of northern Australia, 80 per cent of farm profit was generated by 2 per cent of landscape, and this was largely irrigation areas in the Murray-Darling Basin.

Manufacturing industry within the basin is largely linked to agricultural production, employs over 62 000 people and generates sales of goods produced of over \$10.75 billion annually, which is 6.4 per cent of total Australian output. Tourism and recreation, largely water based, generates over \$3.5 billion a year for the Australian economy. The Murray-Darling Basin Commission estimates the wider value of the basin to the national economy as being much greater—about \$75 billion a year. This supports an estimated 1.5 million jobs, most of them in the cities.

External to the basin, over one million people are heavily dependent on the Murray River for their water supply, not least the people of Adelaide and the Iron Triangle. Will South Australians be able to continue to rely in the future on the Murray River for drinking water, and will the basin, as a whole, be capable of sustaining a considerable portion of the nation's economy as it currently does? The answer does not look promising. The Murray-Darling Basin rivers are sick. The 1999 salinity audit commissioned by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission found that salinity in the river at Morgan will increase by approximately 50 per cent over the next 50 years, with salinity exceeding the World Health Organisation's desirable level for drinking approximately 40 per cent of the time.

The water needs of approximately 95 per cent of South Australia's population are met, at least in part, by the Murray River. On average, 45 per cent of Adelaide's annual water needs are met by diversions from the river, and this can rise to 90 per cent during drought. Three to five million hectares of land will become salinised during the next 100 years to the extent that there will be substantial impacts on water quality, agricultural productivity and built infrastructure. These costs are estimated at between \$600 000 and \$1 billion a year during the period.

A flood plain along the South Australian Murray River is particularly affected, with an estimated 25 000 hectares salinised of a total area of 100 000 hectares. This is predicted to increase to about 40 000 hectares, mostly adjacent to highland irrigation areas. Vegetation and wildlife are significantly impaired along 40 per cent of the total river length of the basin, and 16 of the basin's 35 native fish species are threatened. The Lower Murray River now effectively experiences drought conditions one year in two whereas, under natural conditions, it was one year in 20.

In the internationally listed Narran Lakes, flooding frequencies have extended from one year in six to as many as one year in two in just the last five years—outside the life cycle of many water birds. Illustrating the severity of the situation is the news release issued last Friday by the Minister for the River Murray in which he alerted the South Australian community to the fact that this month and next the amount of water flowing down the Murray River into South Australia will be the lowest in 35 years. There are a number of solutions to the environmental challenges confronting the Murray-Darling Basin: one is more efficient irrigation to prevent the rise of underlying saline water tables to the surface. Another method, which has had remarkable success in South Australia, is the use of drains and evaporation basins to contain heavily salinated water.

The CSIRO points out that our saline ground water contains valuable minerals and industrial chemicals, as well as common salt. New industries set up to extract these chemicals and minerals would save Australia millions of dollars in industrial imports and pay the costs incurred in setting up these drainage and diversion systems. The salinity audit predicts that dry land areas, in particular the Mallee zone of the Murray-Darling Basin, will become the dominant source of future salt loads to the River Murray.

Current farming systems are inadequate to intercept a large percentage of rainfall and reduce the rate of recharge to the ground water system. New farming systems will need to be developed that incorporate perennial deep-rooted vegetation. The Mallee Sustainable Farming Project (a tri-state undertaking funded by the Grains Research and Development Corporation and the Natural Heritage Trust) is investigating new farming systems for the Murray, apparently with some success. All these approaches are necessary to return the rivers and lands of the Murray-Darling Basin to ecological health.

However, they can play only a supporting role to what is the central remedy, that is, an increase of flow through the river system. About 60 per cent of the water that would have naturally reached the sea is now diverted for agricultural and urban use and industry. Diversions in the basin have reduced the median annual flow to South Australia by 61 per cent, and the median annual flow through the Murray Mouth is now only 27 per cent of its natural volume. Inadequate water flows and unseasonal flows caused by dams, weirs and locks have given rise to salinity, turbidity, algal blooms, loss of plant communities (such as red river gums), declining numbers of native birds, animals and fish and a loss of natural signals that tell native birds, fish, plant and aquatic insects when to breed.

The 1995 decision by the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council to place a cap on diversions at 1993-94 levels of development was absolutely necessary if the ecological health of the basin was not to slip beyond the point of no return. The council now has the difficult task of deciding how much water will have to be taken from other activities—such as irrigation—and returned to the river system for environmental purposes. It also has to determine how this additional water will be obtained. The additional water sought for environmental purposes is described by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission as an 'environmental flow' and is defined as 'any river flow pattern provided with the intention of maintaining or improving river health'.

The commission believes that better use of water currently available and new water made available for the environment could be employed, namely, modifying floods in the river system (in particular, small to medium floods) to increase the

benefits to the environment by changing how often and when they occur, how big they are and for how long they last; restoring low flows in parts of the river system where low flows used to occur naturally; and altering water levels above weirs so that they resemble the natural seasonal changes that occurred prior to regulation.

To be effective, an environmental flow must be timed to occur in the right season to trigger breeding of plants and animals; occur often enough and last long enough to allow breeding to succeed; be large enough to link the river to its flood plains, wetland, billabongs, anabranches, estuaries and the sea; and vary water levels to provide wetlands and riverbanks with wet and dry cycles. As I have said, the major issue now confronting the basin is the how and the where: how much water for environmental flow and from where? The council has chosen three annual volumes of 350 giga-litres, 750 giga-litres and 1 500 giga-litres, to service reference points to start community discussion.

Only one of these volumes—the larger—is considered by environmental experts to be somewhere near adequate to the enormous task at hand, and even then the likelihood of this volume returning the river to health is deemed to be only moderate. The task of recovering the amount of water ultimately deemed necessary for returning the river system to health, without destroying the financial viability of the enterprises and communities within the basin, will be complex. It will necessitate the development of a system—possibly based on the Torrens title system—whereby water and water rights can be traded throughout the basin.

This will allow a rationalisation within the overall irrigation industry with respect to commercial activities that provide a higher financial return on lower water use. By way of example, returns per megalitre of water used, based on full profit 1996-97, range from \$1 295 for vegetables, \$1 276 for fruit and \$600 for grapes, down to a meagre \$31 for rice. Considerable financial resources will be required for physical infrastructure to ensure that the environmental flow does the job. All this will require a strong financial commitment by each of the member governments of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council, not the least the government of South Australia given our geographic position in the basin.

The message to which I have confined this speech, namely, the setting up of the Save the Murray levy through this budget, will deliver a clear and unequivocal message to the other members of the council of this government's determination to force the pace on this matter. This budget backs up best intentions on the River Murray with concrete deeds, and it is a measure in which all members on this side of the house can take immense pride. Unlike the federal budget, this budget does not give South Australians a malted milkshake: instead, it gives us a future.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill. I find it interesting that the member for Napier has just spent a considerable proportion of his speech time talking about the River Murray and, while I acknowledge that it is a very important factor in this state's future, I should have thought that, from a government member's point of view, there would be some good things in the budget to talk about. But, obviously, there are not, so the member for Napier spent all his time talking about the River Murray. We had a River Murray bill in this place only a couple of weeks ago, and I would have thought we had ample opportunity to talk about it then, but the member for Napier obviously figures that there is nothing to talk about in this budget.

Madam Acting Speaker, I would have to agree, because this is a budget about broken promises. The now Treasurer, when he was in opposition, said that there would be no new taxes, and he had his hand held over his heart when he was saying this. And what do we have? A double whammy! Not only is there a 3.9 per cent increase in fees and charges, and not only has this government been able to reap the benefits of the stamp duty increases that have come out of the property market boom in South Australia over the last 18 months and an extra \$117 million in income that the Treasurer's own documents show over and above the forward estimates, but also it has the increases of 3.9 per cent, as I said, in fees and charges and, on top of that, this water tax.

I think it will be a question for the minister during estimates, and I am very interested to know about this water tax. It will be a tax of \$30 on householders and \$135 on commercial premises. I do not have an investment property, but where does that leave Joe Smith, the private person—and anyone else in this chamber—who has an investment property such as a rental property? Do they pay \$30 or \$135? I would imagine that they pay \$135, although I stand to be corrected, but because this is a commercial operation do they pay \$30 or do they pay \$135? If they pay the \$135, when the bill comes in, they are going to be 'Not happy, Jan'. When the emergency services levy came in, a number of people could see the sense in having the levy, but when the bill arrived they had a very different opinion, believe me.

The Labor government came into office with their hands held on their hearts saying, 'We can fund all the previous Liberal government programs and we can fund all the programs that we have initiated and indicated on coming into government, and we do not need any introduced taxes. We need no new taxes and no increases in taxes.' So, I say that this is a hypocritical budget, and it is typical of the Labor Party on coming into government.

Let us now turn to the forecast growth in the South Australian economy. As the Leader of the Opposition said in the chamber just a while ago, the government has talked about a tripling of exports, and the leader's question is a very valid one: where will this tripling occur, when the government itself has forecast a downturn in the estimated growth of the economy from 3¼ per cent to 2½ per cent, which is below the national average? How can they get up and say that they will triple exports when the government itself is indicating a lower level of growth and, as the Leader of the Opposition said just a while ago, they have not indicated sectors where that growth is likely to occur?

I find it very interesting because, when the Liberal Party came into government, unemployment was, from memory, around 10 per cent and it had been at 12 per cent under the Labor government in 1993, running up to the 1993 election. We, through hard work, developed an export market and concentrated on the fact that our economic comparative advantage in this state is in food production and the vehicle manufacturing area. We have seen the value of the wine industry absolutely skyrocket in terms of its production, and through encouragement by this government to focus on overseas exports. We have seen the aquaculture industry under the previous Liberal government also develop over and above expectations because the previous Liberal government focused on that export industry. We had the Food for the Future plan, and we encouraged people and promoted overseas trade delegations to push exports from South Australia, particularly into South-East Asian markets.

So, where will exports occur now, because this government has said nothing? As the Leader of the Opposition said, if there is going to be growth in regional development and regional industries, particularly the wine industry, one of the things you must do is provide housing. We had a huge issue with local government approaching the Liberal government about this, and we transported people by bus from Millicent, Naracoorte and other places because there was not adequate housing within those townships. This government is doing nothing that I can see to encourage housing development and the private sector in that area, and to ensure that the companies that have established themselves and taken the punt getting into the export industry and expanding their businesses have homes for their workers to live in. So where is the tripling of exports going to come from?

We also see that employment growth has been 3.4 per cent over the last few years, yet the downturn in economic growth predicted by the state government would mean that there will not be that continued employment growth, so we can expect to see unemployment rise in this state. That is not good for our state economy and it is not good for young people leaving school. The Treasurer wants to see our economic rating going from AA+ to AAA, but I cannot see how that will happen if unemployment rises.

What is also very interesting in these documents is the fact that last year the Treasurer chose not to transfer \$300 million from the SAMIC accounts into the budget accounts. Of course, that very conveniently created the so-called black hole for him that was in the previous Liberal government's budget. A number of economic analysts have refuted the Treasurer's protestations of last year about a black hole. But look in this year's budget papers and you see that \$300 million, or thereabouts, transferred into the very accounts that the Treasurer did not transfer them into last year. So, what hypocrisy by this Treasurer to not transfer it last year to create a black hole and, this year, when it suits him, to transfer it to make it appear that he has this wonderful surplus! It is hypocritical of the Treasurer to undertake that practice.

There was a very interesting question during question time today about mining royalties. We note in the budget that there will be an increase in royalties from 2.5 per cent to 3.5 per cent. The Treasurer's statement in answer to the question put to him today shows his complete ignorance of this issue. We have a comparative disadvantage in South Australia for mining because of about a 300 metre overburden that sits there because South Australia was previously under water and sedimentation occurred over millions of years, which means that any mining company seeking to discover minerals in South Australia first has to drill down through the overburden. That is unlike Western Australia, where you have the massive iron ore fields in the north, with Lang Hancock's discoveries, and with the coal discoveries in both New South Wales and Queensland, where there is no overburden to remove. As a result, we are at a comparative disadvantage.

The Treasurer does not understand this, because when mining companies are undertaking their exploration they will go elsewhere, as it is already hard enough in South Australia to explore for new fields. They will say that if they are to pay higher royalties—it is already costing them more to access these minerals—they might as well go to Western Australia or New South Wales to spend their exploration dollars rather than undertake mining in South Australia. This is not understood by the Treasurer and is a direct hit at Roxby Downs, which is already established and, therefore, we only

have to crank a bit more in mining royalties out of Western Mining Corporation!

I welcome the fact that the transport minister is to initiate a program of nine new trams and the refurbishment of the five old Glenelg trams, which is excellent, but it is coming out of government funding, so why not a public-private partnership? You would surely expect that, when you have had 70 indications of interest from the private sector to supply these trams, a minister would take account of that and go down that path and spend private money rather than government money on this issue. Why has this occurred? We welcomed the announcement, which is very good, but this money could have been accessed through the private sector and saved the government money, so that there would have been \$56 million to spend on other initiatives within the budget or to give some relief to taxpayers, particularly the self-funded retirees, who will face increased taxes and charges through this budget, yet the minister has gone down the path of government funding.

I believe that the union got hold of the minister and said that it will not have any private staff on these trams and as a result the minister has had to find the money through the state budget rather than go out to a private-public partnership. Even though there were 70 expressions of interest in the Glenelg trams, that is apparently not acceptable, but when we immediately flip over to the Port River crossing we will have a scheme similar to the BOOT scheme of the previous Liberal Government—a build, own, operate, transfer scheme. It is all right for the private sector to be involved and to build the bridges, but it is not all right for the private sector to be involved in the Glenelg tram scheme. I find it very interesting and I can only conclude that the union has put the hard word on the minister to say that we will not have private conductors or drivers on these trams.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the member for Newland says, it is not good economic practice. But it is good economic practice when you have so many expressions of interest from people wanting to get involved and supply funding to the government. I find it very interesting that the \$10 million allocated for the South-East rail project is not in this budget. I do not know whether it is there sitting in reserve and has been identified, but it is not in this budget or indicated in any forward works, so I question what the government will do about the South-East rail project. We know that there were three expressions of interest. The best one involved Wesfarmers and they withdrew. I have questioned the minister in this house on what he is doing about the other two expressions of interest in this project, but we have heard nothing. I have the feeling that this will quietly slide off the program and we will see it no more.

In the South-East we have the wine industry and the blue gum industry developing, and in the not too distant future those blue gums will be maturing and requiring transport to Portland or elsewhere, and this rail link will not be built. As a result, we will have more trucks on the road and there will be an increased demand for road infrastructure funding in the South-East because the rail link has not been built. I hope I am wrong, but I cannot see it in the budget. Last year the Department of Transport suffered a cut of over \$10 million in its budget. This year we note a \$22 million cut in transport. According to the budget papers, 170 staff from Transport SA will disappear, plus three from the transport planning area; six from the Passenger Transport Board (even though the minister said that if the Passenger Transport Board is

transferred from its current situation to within the department no staff changes would occur); and, from TransAdelaide, 32 will disappear—a total of 211 staff from transport, with a \$22 million cut in this area. I am very suspicious that the line in last year's program (allocating some \$9 million for maintenance on rural roads) has disappeared in this year's budget.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: As the member for Newland says, a lot of lines have disappeared in this budget, and I agree. That one has disappeared, and here is a real smoke and mirrors trick in that the road safety campaign on which the government is congratulating itself is coming from a transfer of works from the rural and arterial roads program. We are not spending any more money on our roads but we are rebadging that money—taking it out of a roads program and putting it into a road safety program, which does not improve the roads one iota, and we have a deteriorating situation with our roads.

I note that \$1 million was cut out of the outback road gangs last year and it has not been reinstated. I get reports from our tourism operators and our rent-a-car operators that they will no longer rent cars to travellers going over some of our outback roads because the roads are in such poor condition. So, the government has not been seen to put any money back into the outback roads program in this budget and that is disgusting. Further, the unsealed rural roads program in connection with which the former Liberal Government had committed to complete sealing by 2004 has gone out the window. Last year \$7.5 million was cut down to \$2.7 million and this year that amount has been maintained, with no increase for our rural roads. We see that \$80 million is required, as the member for Goyder says, yet we have seen no increase in that funding whatsoever and our rural roads will continue to deteriorate. Under this government we will see the government lowering the speed limits on these roads so it does not have to put in the funding. It is a sly way of ensuring that you do not have to put funding into rural roads.

Time expired.

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

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): It is always a pleasure to speak after the dinner break, because so many members are relaxed and refreshed, but one always finds it a bit challenging with the repartee that goes on. I would like to reinforce the comments made by my leader and, in part, although he developed a theme, by the member for Light in expressing my disappointment with this budget, and basically accusing treasurer Foley of a budget largely of smoke and mirrors.

The SPEAKER: Order! I invite the member for Unley to address members by their portfolio title or their electorate rather than by their personal name.

Mr BRINDAL: I apologise, sir. I meant, of course, the Treasurer—

Mr Snelling interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL:—and I do acknowledge the member for Playford who, as ever, is attentive in his place. He is a very lucky member to be sitting directly under the portrait of that great South Australian leader Sir Thomas Playford, who, I believe, is one of his icons. The leader started to develop a theme of employment and employment outcomes. Volume 3 of Budget Paper 4, page 11.12 refers to employment development, and we see that the actual outcomes for the last year of

the former Liberal government was 5 580, being the total number of participants in all employment and in school development programs. This year, the estimated result was 5 092, which is a fall of 10 per cent. What is even more worrying is that the target for 2003-04 was:

Subject to the implementation of the accepted recommendations of the review of employment programs.

So, for the first time in my memory, we have a budget that shows not only a decline in outcomes in terms of targeted employment development programs over the two years Labor has been in government but also that it does not even set any targets we can measure it against for the following year. Presumably, some time after this budget is enacted, the government will fix some target which we will not know and, therefore, we will be unable to measure its performance next year.

The cuts are very worrying. There were 2 198 participants in youth programs in the last year of the former Liberal government, and the actual estimated result for 2002-03 is 1 007. If we look at the number of government trainees in apprenticeships, we will see that there were 419 metropolitan trainees in 2001-02 and 16 non-metropolitan trainees. The estimated result for this year is a drop of 20 per cent in metropolitan trainees and 25 per cent in regional trainees.

If we look at the number of persons who completed their government trainee and apprenticeships, we find that it is up by 4 per cent. So, it has gone from 66 per cent to 70 per cent, and the government should be congratulated on that. However, the number who gained employment and returned to study is down by 2 per cent. So, while 4 per cent are finishing their training, 2 per cent are finding work or going onto study, which must be a worrying result. If we look at it another way—that is, not in terms of actual outcomes but in terms of figures, which is what most treasurers seem to preoccupy themselves with—we find an overall reduction in spending in employment programs of \$3.5 million for this financial year.

Many honourable members might say, 'What does that matter?' However, we are talking about a minister whose department—that is, DFEEST—has responsibility for the following, and I refer to Budget Paper 4, Volume 3, at page 11.5, which states:

DFEEST has responsibilities for:

- whole of government advice on skill formation, employment, research, technology and innovation to underpin economic development and social inclusion.

Management of the TAFE sector is an additional responsibility. What we have is a department that is jointly responsible, with what was the old Department of Industry and Trade, when it comes to employment and job creation; they are the two generating arms of government policy.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The Treasurer says, 'What utter nonsense' and 'They were a big sucker of money.' Obviously that is reflected in the lessening amounts of money that he has seen fit to give them this year. But that is fine, the Treasurer might be right, and if the Treasurer is right, then next year we will know, the year after we will know and the year after that we will know. The problem was that the Liberal government took eight years developing a particular type of approach, and it was a type of approach which included reskilling, upskilling and trainees and apprenticeships as a way of reinvigorating state growth. That went with the Department of Industry and Trade attracting new industries to South Australia. This government, quite clearly, has a different approach. It is not

spending the same money on skills development, traineeships and industry attraction.

That is fine, as long as employment keeps at the level it is at. But when we look at the employment targets, having achieved an employment target set by the Liberal government where South Australia was at least the equal of other states when it came to the unemployment figures, this government is walking away from this in its predictions and will accept less than national unemployment figures. I see no reasoning and no logic for that, and I do not see that as being acceptable to the young people or the working public of South Australia. A person because they grow up in South Australia or chooses to live in South Australia has no less right to work than anyone else anywhere in the nation. To say, 'Well, if you choose to live here, because of government policy your chances of getting a job are less,' should not be something that this house will applaud or suggest as being in any way a decent outcome for a budget, yet here we find it in the budget figures.

Here we find it quite clearly stated that we will accept less than the Australian standard and somehow or other we are all supposed to be grateful and say, 'This is a good budget.' This is not a budget that looks after Labor's traditional heartland. This is not a budget that helps the battlers and the people who are not attending university to become a doctor, a lawyer, or a chemist. The member for Colton will remember this minister not three weeks ago absolutely decrying the federal Treasurer. Why? Because he has lifted the amount of fees payable for certain courses in our universities. He has also allowed more money to be borrowed by students at our universities—up to \$50 000. He has lifted the threshold at which the money has to start to be repaid, and it has to be repaid in what any of us would regard, if it were our home loan, as fairly easy and painless instalments.

For that he was roundly criticised by the minister. For that the minister claimed that this was better education for the rich to the exclusion of those in society who could not afford it. That is a valid criticism from a minister who is a Labor minister and who you would hope would believe that sort of rhetoric, but what she did not say was that, at the same time, she knew that she had put a submission into her own cabinet on 28 April saying, 'If you want to make some money, Treasurer, what you can do is increase the fee that you are charging apprentice panel beaters, apprentice bakers, apprentice hairdressers and people who get a straight training wage of about \$200 a week in their first year. You can charge them either 50 per cent or 100 per cent more, Treasurer, take your pick.'

I would like somebody in their contribution to the debate to explain to me how they think that is Labor policy; how they think that is looking after its heartland; and how they think that is increasing the skills base of South Australia. If I was an apprentice panel beater earning approximately \$200 a week and had to go to TAFE six weeks of the year and pay over a third of my gross wage in TAFE fees, I would find it difficult, as I know many of them do.

Again, I say to members opposite that these are not people who will become lawyers, doctors or chemists and who will have an easy ability to repay when their income is going through the roof. These people will never find it particularly easy. They will never be millionaires, unless they have an innovative, creative streak and they own the panel shop, or they start a business of their own. These are the people who run this country and who are the absolute viscera of the machine.

They are not the intellectual giants who buy and sell *Blue Poles* paintings and who swan around giving themselves million-dollar plus handshakes when they have driven the company broke: they are the people who go broke and who, hopefully, in their life have enough money to live a decent Australian lifestyle. They are the heart and soul of this country. These are the people whom this Treasurer—a Labor Treasurer—targets. If that is the way in which the Labor government in this state considers that a Labor government should act, that is fine. I do not know why we bother having a Liberal Party, because we are not anywhere near as heartless as they.

We now come to the centrepiece of this government's budget—the River Murray water levy. It is interesting that the amount of money to be collected by the River Murray levy (and the member for Colton may be interested in this), via attachments to water bills, is about \$20 million—and that is to save the Murray. It so happens that the rough ballpark figure of revenue available to the South Australian government in an ordinary year is about \$200 million. Next year, guess what? The Minister for the River Murray is talking about a 10 per cent reduction in flows. My calculation is that 10 per cent of \$200 million is \$20 million. Lo and behold, we need to support the river, and how much additional money are we collecting for SA Water—just about the amount that it will lose in profits next year.

So, you could be slightly forgiven for being very cynical and saying, 'If we sell 10 per cent less water next year, we're going to get 10 per cent less revenue. How do we get the 10 per cent less revenue back? I know! We'll introduce a River Murray levy that will collect exactly 10 per cent. If you add the two figures together, we get exactly the same revenue base that we had before, and we can convince everybody on the way through that they are doing their bit to protect the river.'

Is that cynical? I invite members who think that it is cynical to look at the budget papers and tell me where this government is spending any more at all (apart from the money that they are collecting with this tax) on the River Murray. In fact, from my experience with the former department of water resources, this government is spending rather less, even when this additional money is added. So, rather than spending more, they are spending less.

I want to refer members to a figure to be found at point 9.7, Budget Paper No. 4, volume 3:

The statement of the financial performance shows an increase of expenditure of approximately \$5.8 million in the 2002-03 estimated result from the 2002-03 budget.

It continues:

This is primarily the result of—

and guess what the last dot point is—

a decrease in expenditure in relation to the national action plan for salinity and water quality of \$2.6 million.

In other words, the Liberal government sold PortsCorp and put away \$100 million to be spent over the next seven or eight years to fight salinity in the Murray River. We put down a program of expenditure over that seven or eight years. What do we find Labor has done? Did it spend the money allocated this year? No. It spent \$2.6 million less than it budgeted for, and then it has the temerity to tell us that it has just discovered the river and it will collect an extra \$20 million and do wonderful things with it. I doubt that. I think this is a smokes and mirrors con job to collect money. Budget paper 4,

volume 3 at page 9.51, for an area called sub-program 2.4, 'Management of infrastructure assets', states:

Planning, funding, procurement and maintenance of the state's investment in resource management infrastructure assets, including project management of natural resource based infrastructure and remediation projects, e.g. Upper South-East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Plan, Loxton Irrigation District Rehabilitation Scheme [which has just been finished] and Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Areas.

I know the member for Mawson is interested in that matter. He might be interested also in the budget package for 2002-03, which shows no income source at all and which shows a deficit of \$982 000. I cannot remember in 14 years a line that was run with no income and just a deficit. A deficit against what? A deficit against the minister's portfolio? I am not sure. But I am sure that the Upper South-East dryland salinity scheme and Lower Murray irrigation swamp scheme are schemes for which tens of millions of dollars of additional funds are required.

I think the member for Mawson will agree with me that the Lower Murray irrigation swamp scheme should be starting now. Tens of millions of dollars should be invested and spent this year for the rehabilitation of those swamps, but we find not one cent invested in these projects. One is forced to ask: just how genuine is this government when it comes to rehabilitation of the River Murray? How genuine is it when it comes to getting on with the job and doing the things that need to be done?

Sir, you were on the River Murray select committee and you know the things that were recommended. The government says that it is implementing the recommendations of the River Murray select committee. In this sense, I am sure that it is. I am sure that it is implementing the recommendations of the River Murray select committee that do not cost any money, but any recommendation that costs money—and there were recommendations about looking at the efficacy of building a lock at Wellington, and other matters—simply is neither in the budget nor anywhere on the visible horizon when it comes to the next two or three years of planning. Some 20 minutes is hardly time for any member to analyse this budget. I hope I have illustrated in the brief time available to me that in the area of employment and training this budget is a con. The government is not helping. The member opposite shakes his head. I challenge the member to go out—

Mr O'Brien: You do not understand apprentices. Your example of the panel beater is incorrect. The employer would pay the TAFE fees. For someone who has dealt with TAFE for as long as you have, you have an abysmal knowledge—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley has the call.

Mr BRINDAL: I do not pretend to have the knowledge the member opposite has, and perhaps I will listen to him next time he makes a contribution. But he is also wrong because most employers do not pay the fee: the apprentice pays the fee. I challenge him to go out—

Mr O'Brien: Who gets the invoice? The employer gets the invoice!

Mr BRINDAL: The employer might get the invoice, but the employee often pays the fee.

Mr O'Brien: That's very rare; you should check that.

Mr BRINDAL: I will because, if that is what he thinks and if he is wrong, I will expect him to change his vote.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Whilst we have seen in the media, particularly the electronic media, that this government is up to its typical smoke and mirrors tricks, putting across the perception that this is a good budget for South Australia, it is far from a good budget for this state. This government was left in a vastly different position from the one we inherited when we came into office in 1993, following the State Bank disaster. The State Bank disaster alone was equivalent to more than the core debt that this government now has to deal with. On top of that, we also know that, between 1982 when the Tonkin government left office and when we came into government after the State Bank disaster, effectively the Labor government had created two other State Bank disasters, simply by spending more than it was earning.

We had a \$9.5 million core debt; yet the Treasurer had the audacity recently on the 5AA morning program to say to the presenter that he had to be very tight because he had this enormous debt of around \$3 billion. I would like to be able to manage a situation where there is economic growth, unprecedented for 20 years, as we have seen in the last three or four years. That was started by a partnership between the community of South Australia and the Liberal government, remembering that, when the Premier was the minister for employment, at the time the debt debacle was causing us to be known as a basket case, unemployment was 12.6 per cent, almost double what it was when we left office. There is also the issue of the confidence in the community that goes with that, and we were building infrastructure, which is another way that the government can create jobs. It also picks up on the backlog so that we do not continue to have run-down infrastructure. That is the position we were in when we came into office.

This government is hitting families, particularly low income earning families, the ones it says it supports, but when we look at the lack of concessional support, whether it is for self-funded retirees, pensioners or low income earners, we see that there is nothing for them in this budget. I am not saying that we should not keep a tight rein on debt. Clearly we have to do that, otherwise all the work we did with our community will be wasted. What I am saying is that, when a government is left with the lowest debt in the history of this state in real terms, when it is left with a cash surplus, when it is left with a program to fund unfunded public sector superannuation liabilities, and when WorkCover is balanced, compared with the situation it was in when Labor was last in office and it had an unfunded liability of \$350 million, frankly, in that environment it is a lucky government. It is lucky because it was left with a state in very good shape.

The way this government is going, it will not keep the state in good shape for too long. In fact, we have only to look at the Treasurer's own figures, and for two successive budgets he has forecast lower economic growth in South Australia and an increase in unemployment. That is the first two Rann government budgets—lower economic growth than under the Liberal government, albeit a much better overall state economic structure than we had when we came into office. In addition, between commonwealth receipts of income and increases in taxes and charges in this state, next year this government will reap an extra \$600 million in the general coffers. That is an outrageous amount of money when it is not being spent on the government's core promises of health, education and police.

I know that what this government has already done to the police department in the short time it has been in office will

make it almost untenable for the police department to function the way it is at the moment. That hurts me as someone who has a passion about the police department and who was proud of the fact that I was able to deliver successive record budgets to the South Australia Police. When we get into estimates, I will be looking forward to asking the Treasurer quite a lot of detailed questions about exactly what he has not done for the South Australia Police.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: We're building four police stations!

Mr BROKENSHIRE: We will talk about that in a minute. The Treasurer is on the record tonight saying that he will build more police stations. I will hold him to that, whether they are PPPs or whether he gets the money out of his own biscuit barrel and delivers, because at the moment there is no guarantee for new police stations, and I will highlight that further down the track. I want to talk for a little while about the most important thing to me as a parliamentarian, and that is the electorate of Mawson. To give credit where it is due, I congratulate the government for ensuring that Metroticket was provided to the Willunga Basin. Metroticket is something that I have been lobbying for with our community for some time. Two people in particular have spent the last couple of years with me, putting in enormous effort to convince this government that we needed Metroticket. That is a \$200 000 promise this year to the electorate of Mawson.

In our electorate we had to start without any public transport other than Premier, when we came into office. We got the circuit bus going. That cost far more per year than \$200 000, but that was the start of opportunities for our electorate. Now we have Metroticket and I congratulate the government for that, and I will be encouraging my community to use the bus services even more now, because now I want to see the next move for Mawson being more night services, more weekend services and an expanded bus service to continue to help families and students. I am pleased to see that the government has admitted that it made a mistake, albeit to the detriment of many families in my electorate.

We saw the biggest ever representation that I have had from the community when this government last year cut the money for the Willunga Primary School redevelopment. That money was allocated in the May 2001 budget, the last budget we had when we were in office. The money was there, it was ready to go and, through sheer bloodymindedness, this government cut that last year. Fortunately, thanks again to the pressure from the community and a lot of lobbying by the community and myself as local member, the government realised the error of its ways and has reinstated that funding to Willunga Primary School. However, we have lost at least two years, and I will be working with the shadow minister for education to ensure that there is not further slippage in this so that we do finally see that Willunga preschool development completed by the government's now projected date of 2007, some two years behind where it could have been.

I am very pleased to see the \$300 000 to Willunga High School for the reverse cycle airconditioning; something we also lobbied for. But I would have liked to see a lot more capital work investment there, given that we had rebuilt big sections of that school during our term in office and there is a lot more to be done in that high school. There are a few roadworks continuing that started a few years ago and, therefore, had to be completed but, sadly, that is where it stops for the electorate of Mawson and for the south. An

Office for the Southern Suburbs has been opened, costing about \$400 000 or \$440 000 a year, and I will work with the people in that office to further develop opportunities for the south.

But what I am disappointed in is that we got very little in investment, development and job opportunities for our area. I thought that at least we would have got an economic package to assist with the dilemma we have with the Mobil Oil refinery. There is a lot of angst there about the Mobil Oil refinery and how this government was so bullish about that matter. I would have expected to see some money in there for a package, because we have 400 families that need bread, butter and milk on their table every day, and this is a very difficult situation for us. I will be happy to work with the Treasurer and assist in a bipartisan way if, indeed, he wants a package supported through the parliament to assist those families that have lost their jobs at the oil refinery.

I now want to turn to my shadow portfolio responsibilities, and I start with police. The Treasurer said in the house tonight that he is building more police stations. I say congratulations for that, because it comes on the back of unprecedented capital works in policing when we were in government, and it needed to happen. I set up an asset strategy plan for capital works for police. We built the new Netley Police Station, and we did the Sussex Street, Glenelg, police station and the Mount Gambier Police Station. We also built a new police station in Wakefield Street and another one in Grenfell Street. So, the capital works program has happened. And guess what? It was not privatised to do it. Yet, this government, which ran on a platform with a pledge card of no more privatisation, all of a sudden can now privatise the building and development of police stations. That is a very interesting broken promise.

What the budget says is that the PPPs (the public private partnerships, which is code for privatisation), will only be built if they are of value. I have no problem with that, because we set all that in train—in fact, we had money there to set up the PPP unit in the office of the Treasurer. So, we have no problem with that. But what I have a problem with is: what happens if the PPP is not of value? Will the government still build these police stations? I believe that it should, and the community of South Australia will expect it to.

I now want to talk about police numbers, because for eight months I have been saying to government members, 'You are doing damage to the police department through this crazy idea you have that you can go for four years without one extra police officer being put on the beat.' Government members can run the line about recruitment and attrition if they like. Both parties had a policy of recruitment and attrition. But I can table the figures any day in this house to show that, between 1993 and the middle of last financial year—during 2002—under a Liberal government's budgets and policies, the whole department, sworn and non-sworn, increased by 7 per cent. That was at a time when we also developed the police security services section and we put those people behind speed cameras and we had Group 4 carting prisoners instead of having highly qualified police waiting for hours for ARC and those areas to provide the prisoners. So, we also created those initiatives for police. But we delivered 7 per cent extra when it came to sworn and non-sworn officers.

This government purports to be tough on law and order, and it says to the community, 'We are the tough on law and order government.' But the fact of the matter is that it does not matter how much legislation we put through the parliament (and a lot of that we have not seen yet, because it is

recycled three or four times to get the front page in the media), if we do not have the police out on the beat, it does not matter how good the legislation is, we will not be able to clean up the drug trafficking, the criminal activity, the ram-raids, the assaults, the stolen cars and all the things that we see occurring on a daily basis. Also, of course, we will not be able to address some of the tragic things that we are seeing at the moment on our roads if we are not growing our traffic police numbers. The traffic police are too thin on the ground.

This government is full of rhetoric. It said that it would spend half the money it collects from speeding fines and other revenue from police on police, and half on Transport SA road safety initiatives. That is \$48 million. I expected to see in this budget a \$24 million increase to the budget, as the government, when it was in opposition, said it would do. It did not come. Government members can say that they have put \$14.4 million more into the police department to address wages, the car fleet and the like, but I know that what they have done is increase the cost pressures that police have to deal with now, because they simply have not put in enough to pick up on the requirements of that department in two of the high cost elementary areas, firstly, wages (probably 85 per cent of the whole cost of the department) and, secondly, fleet, which runs probably close to 10 per cent of all those costs. The police have had a raw deal out of this: do not believe anything else.

Some interesting things are taking place when it comes to a review of emergency services. I do not believe that the volunteers—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Like the Auditor-General's inquiry into you.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: That is fine, and I look forward to that. I do not understand how this government can do a review and not include the consideration and consultation of volunteers in a broad based way. That certainly has not happened with this review. I will be interested to see the exact figures, but as I move around the state talking to emergency services, particularly the CFS and SES, I hear that last year they hardly saw a truck or a station built for the year. With the capital works money that is shown in this budget, and given that the government has removed the column that used to show the previous year's capital works, I want to know whether or not the amount of capital works it has in this year's budget has been carried over from last year. Is it money that should have been spent but sat there while the time lines have been missed again and money has been put into paid Forestry SA trucks? They are not talking about the enormous backlog of trucks that they should have been picking up on as a result of Ash Wednesday. Rather, the government solution is to extend the life of those trucks from 20 to 25 years. The volunteers will not wear that, and it is time this government really got serious about supporting their requirements.

I now want to touch on gambling as one of my other shadow portfolio responsibilities. In this budget members will note that this government is addicted to gambling. It is addicted particularly to gaming, and it is doing everything it can to reap as many dollars as it possibly can from gaming machines. In fact, the budget this year shows a \$34.3 million increase in gaming machine revenue from last year. Surprise, surprise; they will hook in another bit of revenue from gaming. Having looked at the budget papers (admittedly it has only been a couple of days and they are not the easiest papers to read; I have studied a bit of economics and accounting, and I can tell the house that it would take a good

CPA to be able to read what is not in these budget papers), I do not believe the government has put any extra money into the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund.

Also, the Independent Gambling Authority desperately needs money so that it can do its research properly and deliver. Instead, what we have seen—

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: This will be the Treasurer's line; the Treasurer says, 'We've got to stop people thinking about the State Bank so, when the opposition is responsible and balanced, we will say that they are a spend, spend, spend opposition.' To the contrary: we fixed the State Bank, we fixed the debt and the economy and we got the jobs going in the community of South Australia.

There are surpluses there and some of that should continue to go off core debt because, as the Treasurer himself has admitted orally in this house and in the media but also, importantly, in his budget papers, South Australia is about to go backwards when it comes to economic growth and jobs. I agree that we need to pay off some of the core debt, but I also believe that, rather than create a war chest where they will come out in 2005 and say, 'Here's a bucket of jellybeans for you and you, and we will give jellybeans to this department and everyone will feel warm and fuzzy,' they should be responsible and deliver now, not make people suffer for the next two or three years as they hoard this war chest leading up to the next election. The community of South Australia needs to wake up to what the government is doing; it is building up an enormous amount of money now which will not go off debt but which will go towards their special projects in 2005. You watch the budget papers and you will see that I am right. I will talk about it again later in the parliament.

In the meantime, we have families and communities suffering; we have no increase in police numbers; we have no addressing of the backlog of emergency services vehicles; and, sadly, from what I have seen so far, we also do not have enough being delivered that generally speaking the Economic Development Board and summit supported in a bipartisan way. Whilst members opposite go out into the media saying that they are focused on economic development and the Economic Development Board, I do not believe they have delivered. When I try to line up the Economic Development Board recommendations and papers, I do not believe the government has delivered as much as it could have done, which in turn would create a much better lifestyle and environment for South Australians.

So, next year we will start to see a little drip in. A little more will go into its favourite areas and, when the hot spots occur, when the community realises that things like the Rann water tax is hitting those families again and when they realise that much of the \$600 million of increased taxes and charges is really hurting them, the government will start to roll over. A good, responsible government would have had a proper four-year plan for South Australia by now. It would have been delivering, in a responsible way, to maintain growth and to maintain the social matters that need to be addressed in a positive way in this state; and, certainly, it should properly have looked after police and other agencies.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I rise to make a contribution to this debate. Overall, I think that it is a good budget, and I say that looking in the context of where South Australia is at. There is some very welcome money for TAFE, which has been under a lot of pressure. Many people do not

appreciate the contribution TAFE has made and can continue to make, and I was disgusted earlier this year with the unjustified attacks on TAFE by people who should know better. We are talking about a system that has, approximately, 93 000 students and, in fact, thousands of staff.

I said at the time that those sweeping accusations against TAFE were unlikely to be justified but they were very damaging to TAFE. I am pleased that the government has seen fit to provide some additional funding for TAFE, and that is most welcome. I appreciate the money that has been provided for Reynella East High School—\$368 000, approximately, to assist in the upgrade of laboratories, and that is very welcome. That is over and above money that will be provided for maintenance. So, it is a net gain to Reynella East High School, and very much appreciated. I will not spend a lot of time on the issue of Black Road because I did mention it last week in this place.

There is money for an upgrade of Black Road. I am arguing that we do it properly. In fact, I would prefer it to be staged over two financial years rather than one if it means that we can do it properly and provide traffic lights and/or roundabouts, or a combination of the two. I am pleased that the government is looking at that particular issue and that, hopefully, it will come to the party in terms of doing the road properly rather than a Mickey Mouse job that will require additional treatment down the track. We often hear people saying that we are over-taxed. Some people are over-taxed in our society, but many people are not. One has only to look at the private affluence of people.

Good luck to them if they have earned the money legitimately and through hard work, but I think it is a nonsense to generalise and to say that we are over-taxed. Some people are, as I said before, but many are not. We also need to be careful about seeing a budget surplus as some sort of demand from above. There is nothing sacred about a surplus, or a deficit for that matter. The issue is: is it good financial management; is it in the interests of the people of South Australia, taking into account particular circumstances? At the moment we have had a bonanza from real estate, but that will not continue.

Much of that real estate boom has been phoney in the sense that it is driven by people who get a particular benefit out of it. It actually causes a significant disbenefit to a lot of others, including people who find it now very difficult to buy a basic house. There has been a lot of hot air and rhetoric about the real estate boom and that it is fantastic. It is fantastic for governments (state and local) but it is not fantastic for young people who want to buy a house, and it is not fantastic for people on low incomes. So, let us not get carried away with it. Let us realise that it will not continue because, as the Reserve Bank has pointed out, nearly half of every dollar going into real estate is an investment dollar.

That just cannot be sustained because there are not enough people to rent the properties that are being purchased or supported through so-called investment money and, in particular, negative gearing. It raises a very serious issue, that is, in the long term how will poorer people and young people afford homes?

We know that there is a first home buyers scheme, but many people on low incomes are being forced out into country towns. There is nothing wrong with living in country towns—it is a good thing in some respects—but we should not get to a point where people are driven out of the city simply because they are on a low income and cannot afford a decent property in which to live. That was one of the

strengths of the Housing Trust as it was originally set up, and I believe that we have to be careful not to move away from that so that housing becomes the province of the rich. One of the things in Australia's history (and to its credit) has been that housing has generally been affordable for almost all sections of the community, and that is one issue that I want both the state and federal governments to be particularly aware of.

I refer now to the issue of crime and punishment, and policing. I support the government's move on being tough on crime because I believe that for too long we were 'waffly' on crime in this state. However, you have to keep that in balance and in proportion, and I would like to see a lot more effort in keeping people away from the justice system. It need not cost a lot of money: with programs such as mentoring and early intervention, we can keep a lot of young people in particular away from the criminal justice system. It is very expensive in both financial and human terms to have people in prison. Apart from those who pose an immediate and continuing threat to the community, prisons achieve very little at all. In fact, I would like to see many of them replaced by what I would call work camps, where people actually do something more constructive in a more rehabilitative environment.

I believe that the government has been right in going down the 'tough on crime' path, but it needs to balance that by being energetic in terms of ensuring that people are kept out of the criminal system. That can be done by targeting some of the causal factors that bring people into prison, and we know some of the statistics in terms of people who have a personality disorder; as we know, many of them are not easy to treat. Half the prison population at least are illiterate, and it is no wonder that they see themselves as having little hope or opportunity. We need to keep pursuing the great scourge in terms of the link between drugs and crime. We need to keep pursuing that and trying to separate people from the counterproductive path of drug taking.

The prison system, through the minister, has been promoting and continuing the use of prisoners in rehabilitation work in regard to the environment, and recently prisoners have been working in the Adelaide Hills restoring creek lines. We need to do more of that work, and I have commended the minister, both publicly and privately, for what he is doing in that regard. I think it is a good investment because the prisoners are not only doing rehabilitation work but are also learning horticulture.

I do not have a problem with this so-called river levy, because you can have all the rhetoric in the world about saving the Murray but you will only save it if you spend something. There is no free lunch and there is no free River Murray. But I see it as only a first step. The next step should be that those who use the water should pay more.

Water in much of South Australia, not just reticulated water but water taken from aquifers, is far too cheap. As a result people waste it. You need to have safeguards for people who cannot afford to carry the cost, and so in the next round of reforms relating to the River Murray I would hope that the government goes for an increase in the cost of water, with safeguards for the poorer section of the community—pensioners and the like. That will mean that the users will actually pay, and it will promote conservation at the same time. I think that should be the second string to the bow. But the first measure, whilst a step forward, has elements of a regressive tax in it, in that each household pays irrespective of their income. So a millionaire pays the same as someone who is on a very low income.

In regard to other environmental issues, I think we need to see more enforcement laws regarding people who are endangering other lives through not maintaining vehicles which continue to pollute. In particular I refer to dirty diesels. I can provide members who are interested with information indicating that the particulate matter from dirty diesel trucks, where the injectors are not maintained, when breathed into people's lungs, is, according to expert opinion, more dangerous than cigarette smoke. We also have dirty cars, and there is very little enforcement that I can see with regard to dirty diesels or dirty petrol vehicles, and I would like to see more effort in that direction.

In terms of health, we still have significant waiting lists in accident and emergency departments, and that is an issue that requires the federal government to dance to the same tune as the state government. I believe that the current rebate system for privately insured people, such as myself, is a nonsense and that money should go into reducing waiting times in public hospitals. A lot of people get the benefit of that rebate at a level which is so low that they do not actually ever intend to use that private health insurance, anyway, because it would not cover them for very much.

So, progress is being made but there is still a way to go in terms of waiting lists. I know from experience at Flinders Medical Centre, which is an excellent hospital, that it is really stretched to the limit catering for people who need help in accident and emergency situations. I had cause recently to raise the issue of one character who was suffering from Bell's Palsy (where his eye and his face have dropped) who was told he would have to wait three months before he could see someone. I have been able to intervene in that case, but that is just an example of waiting lists which are not acceptable. I guess that reflects the fact that in Australia we have one of the best health systems of anywhere in the world but, nevertheless, all of these things are relative and, in the context of Australia and South Australia, having to wait a long time for a hip replacement or something like that is something that we should seek to avoid.

I believe our Public Service is excellent overall. I would like to see it given a bit more rein and allowed to be more innovative and creative. For too long I think the brains in the public service—which is much of the brainpower of the community—are stifled because they are scared to be too creative and innovative. I think the danger for South Australia is that we will all fall asleep on the couch if we are not careful. I rarely see anyone speaking out on issues, apart from a few politicians: academics and public servants all seem to be muzzled or gagged, and I think it is unfortunate and not in our best interests. We, as a state, should be creative in a real sense—innovative and leading the rest of Australia as a city state—and setting the pace, not dozing and allowing the grass to grow under our feet, which seems too often to be the case.

I have a general issue in terms of impacts on young families. We often hear about the plight of pensioners, and I have no dispute with that, but I believe the group in the community which is really suffering is young families with children where the breadwinner—male or female, or both—is on a low income. Those people do not get concessions. They struggle and are often, ironically, worse off than pensioners and, to some extent, the self-funded retirees whom we often focus on (with some justification). But we should not overlook the young families who are struggling, not getting much help from governments (state or federal), trying to raise and educate children but who pay full fare on everything, full

tote odds, and are left battling each week trying to make ends meet.

With regard to some matters close to home, I tried to encourage the Treasurer to set aside some money to create a small office building adjacent to parliament so that we could, over time, have decent facilities for staff and ministers, and when people visit. I know there are no votes in it and it is not a very popular thing to advocate, but I think we should grasp the nettle. To his credit, Graham Ingerson, when he was the minister, bit the bullet in terms of renovating parts of Parliament House; otherwise, it would look more like the Tower of London than anything else, and I give him full marks for that. I think we have reached the point where, as a community, we should be mature enough to say that, to the north-west corner of Parliament House we could have a small office—it does not have to be huge—for the finance staff and some decent facilities for other staff, so that ministerial staff do not have to sit in the corridor when an important guest comes along.

Members of the Public Service and the private sector do not have to put up with this sort of nonsense. It is laughable that we, in a spirit of self-flagellation, put up with facilities which a civilised, developed world would regard as primitive and archaic. The Treasurer did not find any dollars to put aside for this purpose, but I hope that the government will address this issue because I think it needs to be addressed. We do not win friends in the long run by pandering to ignorant people who do not see the need for staff to be properly accommodated. I think it is pathetic and that it is time we did something about it.

There is another issue which I will seek to address via legislation in the near future and which I trust members will support. The Remuneration Tribunal indicated that it did not have power to provide a motor car for MPs or to address the issue of salary sacrifice. I intend, through legislation if the parliament supports me, to give it that power, because the public would expect that, if anyone is to make a decision about providing a motor car for MPs with the appropriate offsets to allowances on an optional basis, it should be the Remuneration Tribunal.

The government and the parliament of the day will always be reluctant to be seen as feathering the nest of MPs. So, in my view, the Remuneration Tribunal is the appropriate body to address the issue of whether or not MPs get a car and the terms and conditions for that, and likewise with salary sacrifice. There could be some MPs who come into parliament late and who wish to top up their superannuation. Other members of the Public Service can do that; why not MPs? I am about to introduce legislation to this effect, and I trust that members (including the government) will support it. It will not cost the state government anything—any cost in terms of salary sacrifice comes at the expense of the federal government—but there is provision for salary sacrifice in the private sector and it is also widely available in the public sector.

I will not seek a vehicle for myself because in my position I have a self-drive vehicle, anyhow. I think this is the time to grasp the nettle in relation to the Remuneration Tribunal and give it the power to make a judgment about whether or not MPs get a motor car and make the appropriate adjustment to allowances. Let us get on with real issues instead of wasting our time dealing with something that was resolved in the private sector and the Public Service about 25 years ago.

In conclusion, I believe that, on a fair assessment, this budget is a good budget. Like all treasurers, this Treasurer tends to take a personal approach to Treasury money seeing

it largely as his money. I do not say that in any derogatory sense. All treasurers whom I have ever known see Treasury money as their money and guard it jealously. They should be prudent in its use, but I think they should avoid being obsessed with fetishes about surpluses and deficits, make judgments in terms of what is best for South Australia and not be spooked by commentators who have an obsession with some sort of ideology which says that you must balance the budget or you must not have a deficit.

Anyone who has done any economics—and I have done a lot—would know that there is nothing particularly special about a surplus or a deficit. There can be at the federal level, depending on whether you want to stimulate or retard the economy or impact on interest rates, but for the state government the obsession should be just a passing one. I give the Treasurer and the government high marks on the budget. It is prudent not to expect the real estate boom to continue because a lot of it is phoney and is funny money. It will not be around forever and a day and its commitment to paying off debt and using the interest saved as the expenditure option is sound and sensible. With those remarks, I trust that this budget measure will pass the house. I would be surprised if it did not.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Remember Premier Rann offered a new deal on education at the election: there will be more teachers and better schools. In the first year the first thing he did was renegotiate the teachers' agreement, provide an extra 4 per cent per year average over three years, an extra 160 junior primary teachers, extra benefits, maternity leave and so on. But, at what cost? An extra \$350 million over three years—more than the \$200 million allocated by the previous government. Therefore, quite obviously, substantial extra moneys were needed each year to accommodate this commitment.

You do not need to be Einstein to work out that an extra \$52 million appropriated this year towards education is inadequate to cover the extra cost of the salaries and extra benefits, they being on the government's own admission \$63 million. Obviously there is a shortfall. If they are to have new initiatives and they want to bring them in, clearly there has to be a slash in funds for capital. Redevelopment of schools, maintenance, replacement of computers and so on simply get washed away.

Again we see a slash in the capital budget down another \$16 million. Many of these projects in 2002 have been abandoned and forced back on the agenda, which means that many more schools have had to wait even longer. The government admits that there is a \$300 million backlog in maintenance in schools and yet offers a paltry extra \$2 million. Schools global budgets have been under attack. They have been slashed by \$152 434, and it is a lot of money in the context of the money they have. The income from school fees has been kept at the old rate for another year, even though the cost of those services continues to grow.

Let us consider what has happened in the past 12 months. The government undertook an inquiry—we have had plenty of those—one being on Partnership 21. It has had the report since October last year. It has refused to disclose any planned implementation. The report of Professor Cox supports the Partnership 21 approach for local school management and clearly recommends that it needs added resources for improvement, but in an underhand way the government, in sabotaging this philosophy by starving them of even more money with cuts to their global budget, is doing nothing to

encourage growth in enrolments in government schools as children's parents continue to choose to flow to independent and Catholic schools and clearly make it harder for those schools to operate.

Let us look particularly at the redefinition of 'schools choice' in the past 12 months. Teacher selection by schools now means that all the process work is done by the school and the department has the final say in respect of who it gets. No longer do they have any real chance to choose a team to suit the school's need, which condemns them to placements that are sometimes inappropriate, and this can only—and does—perpetuate mediocrity. There are good teachers and good principals out there in public schools who are left to carry an even bigger load.

More recently we had the asset management funds audit. This requires that schools now identify priorities that are determined by the department, even though they have spent considerable time and effort in developing their plans and having them approved. The government simply wants to grab back the \$34 million in these funds and make schools spend them according to the government's priorities. Schools will be forced, where the government fails, to provide in future for maintenance in schools. The clear objective of this government is to undermine local management by starving them of funds and choice, but it is too gutless to admit it.

Its approach is sneaky and an abuse of an enormous amount of goodwill and effort contributed by governing councils, parents and many excellent principals and teachers across this state. The last government spent eight years reforming governance in schools, bringing parents back into the decision making process, rebuilding the school sites and advancing computer literacy. Much work was done to research major reform on the Education Act. Yet what has this government done to help our schools prepare for the next eight years? This is what it has done: it has increased the school age, and locked them in the classroom for months before new programs were even initiated. Schools were left coping with even more problems of truancy and disruption in the classroom. This diminishes even further the children having a chance to learn and benefit from being at school, and to prepare for their future life.

It is no answer simply to suspend children who do not fit and who are often at risk if they are sent away. The teachers need real resources to deal with these issues in the classroom. Reducing class sizes in just a few schools is both discriminatory and inadequate. Children attend school now with significant health and behavioural needs, dysfunction and learning disability. Admittedly, the government has come up with some extra counsellors—again to a very select few schools—and has provided some extra funds for children with autism and hearing impairment. However, these funds are grossly inadequate, given the massive increase in diagnosis and assessment of children with special needs. The benefits of early intervention are obvious. Counsellors can only do so much. Children and students with speech, learning or behavioural difficulties need specialist help. Many families cannot afford private services.

If this government was really serious about addressing these problems, it would provide the specialist support or, better still, give to those families funding to purchase those services, just as the commonwealth gives direct funding to service providers for families to access child care. This will then allow our teaching professionals to get on with the important work of educating our children and assisting them to develop to their full potential. Our dedicated educators in

schools continue to be ignored by this government. In the past 12 months, I have visited many schools and met with many organisations. Thousands of parents, principals and teachers are out there trying their hardest to deliver for our children, yet this government is intent on crushing their goodwill, suffocating their vision and crippling their capacity. The Department of Education and Children's Services has a new Chief Executive, who has an important role to play. He has clearly come in with some freshness and enthusiasm, and is keen to keep on board the goodwill of the school communities. It must be of deep concern to all those in public education that enrolments in our schools are diminishing.

Parents continue to choose to transfer their children to independent and Catholic schools. Surely it is time to ask the question: why are parents prepared to go without financially to pay for their children's education? What is it that these schools offer that our public education system does not? Is it leadership? Is it a values system? Is it a better physical facility? Is it the capacity to choose a team of educators that will fulfil expectations of better outcome and opportunity for their children? Whatever the answer is, it is about time we addressed it and that this government adopted a policy to facilitate these outcomes being achieved and gave them real money to provide those resources.

It is simply not good enough for the government to add extra teachers and then find that it has not budgeted or provided for the extra classrooms or houses they need to live in. Here again, we see remedial action—this government's announcing funding for housing for teachers. This should be an ongoing annual provision, and should not just be trotted out as an initiative for education. Let us see some real initiatives and careful planning from this government. I call on the government to consider seriously how we will deliver better schools. Let us say that it could start with addressing the question of school fees. If it proposes cancelling them, let us get on with it. The government must match this with replacement funding from the public purse. It has screamed about school fees for years and yet, 15 months into office, it has done nothing about them. If schools are to continue to provide the extra services that school fees were designed to cover, then schools must have the capacity to set fees at a level to cover those services. The expectation of parents is that children have language, music and other like options from reception on, and governments have a responsibility to ensure that their real cost is covered.

What has happened to the Education Act reforms? Work and consultation has been undertaken, yet no bill has been presented to this parliament. The only education legislation of any substance brought to this parliament in the lifetime of this government has been to increase the school leaving age. It is time to bring this bill on for debate so that we can modernise our legislation to support future directions. Finally, on education I call on the government to disclose honestly where it has and proposes to cut personnel in its department. The minister has claimed that there are 55 surplus. Three senior executives have already gone. It is highly destructive to the morale of departmental personnel to keep these decisions secret. If people have not performed or have not completed their task, their tenure should cease.

However, we all know that the Treasurer has issued the instruction for the cuts. The government should face up to its responsibility and admit that there will be cuts, where those cuts will be made, and whose jobs will be lost. If they are inappropriate or unfair in the application of those cuts, they can and should be challenged. However, it is completely

unacceptable to leave departmental personnel under a cloud of insecurity and undermine their ability to get on with the real job.

In this budget, children's services have stagnated. I note that the state government complains about loss of places allocated for after school hours care. The commonwealth completely denies this, and our government should get on with making sure these places are taken up on other sites. If the state government was really serious about assisting in the provision of longer day care, particularly for younger women to support them in their decision to have children, it should seriously address its policy and funding in this area.

In conclusion, I will address two matters. In relation to women, I will be really short—because women get nothing. I suppose, in a way, a few of them get a new prison in 2006. What else do women get? Zero. The other matter is in relation to the people of Bragg. I am very sorry for the people of Bragg in what they get from the 2003 budget. They get new taxes and no relief whatsoever (although it had been offered in the previous year with the commonwealth arrangement), no new school projects, no police (not that they have any police at the moment), no new roads, and no new hospitals (they do not have any public hospitals at the moment). So, they get nothing except a levy to help support South Australia, and they accept that responsibility. However, once every now and again with some of these budgets, we might get some small acknowledgment of the contribution made by the people in the seat of Bragg.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens has the call.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I listened with interest to the contribution by the member for Bragg. I will comment briefly on her diatribe to the house, and on her wisdom from up high. When the budget was brought down, there was a huge sigh of relief from every sector of the South Australian community, except for one, and that was the Liberal Party. Only the Liberal Party was upset with the budget. Why was that? It was because it was financially responsible and fiscally sound. We looked after the areas of health, education and the police. We put more money into the environment and into core things affecting people in their everyday lives, and the Liberal Party was not happy. What did they want to see? They wanted to see massive cuts. They wanted to see a state budget decimated. They did not get it, and they are unhappy.

The most interesting part of the budget for me was the new water levy. A flat \$30 levy will be paid by every South Australian household, except for pensioners, concession card holders or Housing Trust tenants. The Leader of the Opposition said that the same levy would be paid whether you lived in Springfield or Salisbury. In answer to the member for Bragg's diatribe about what the electorate of Bragg gets, I say that, if Rob Kerin were Premier, households in the seat of Bragg would have to pay a higher tax. The first thing he would call for would be that the levy be based on the value of people's homes.

What is the member for Bragg going to do when she goes back to her electorate? Will she go around and say, 'We disagree with the levy, because I think people in Bragg should pay more?' Is that her argument? Is that the argument of the member for Morphett? Will he be going around his electorate or Glenelg telling people there that they should pay more, rather than less? Will he be telling the good eggs who

live in the Holdfast Shores developments with its massive property prices that they should be paying more? I do not think so. I will tell you what I will be doing: I will be writing to everyone in Mile End, Lockleys and West Beach to let them know exactly what the Leader of the Opposition thinks they should be paying as the water levy. I will be writing to everyone in Bright and Hallett Cove letting them know exactly what their member of parliament thinks they should be paying, that they are not paying enough. That is the Liberal Party's opinion. They were very clear on what they said. They said that if you live in Springfield—

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member is attributing comments to me which are clearly untrue. I have never, at any stage, advocated that my constituents ought pay a greater water levy. In fact, I have advocated that they should pay no levy.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Chapman): There is no point of order. Please proceed.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker, for your Solomon-like wisdom. It is very interesting that the Leader of the Opposition said, 'If you live in Springfield, you pay the same as someone who lives in Salisbury.' Then the member for Bright gets up and disassociates himself from that comment. He says, 'I do not want anything to do with that. Oh, no, that is not me, that is Rob Kerin: I did not say those things.' Well, talk about loyalty. That was pretty amazing. I find the member for Bright attacking his leader in this chamber absolutely amazing—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The honourable member stated a fact, absolutely, because he disagrees with what the Leader of the Opposition said—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Oh, the honourable member does agree with it now. Which one is it? Does the honourable member think that the people living in Springfield and the people living in Salisbury should be paying the same amount of water levy? Should they—yes or no? The honourable member does not want to answer the question. I wonder why that is? Because he knows what his leader did was foolish and silly. He knows what we will do. We will write to all the people who live in homes worth more than those in Salisbury and let them know that the Liberal Party wants them to pay more. We will write to people living in Housing Trust residences and let them know that the Liberal Party wants them to pay more. We will write to pensioners and say that the opposition said that they do not want concessions. We will let everyone know what the Leader of the Opposition said: it will be his crown of thorns.

The budget has a series of measures designed to provide for today while preparing for tomorrow. It is an excellent way of summing up what the Treasurer's budget does. For the first time, according to a chart in front of me, we had accrual and cash surpluses in 2002-03. This has never been achieved before—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Hartley says, 'It is a cruel budget.' Well, that is original; we have never heard that before. It goes on about projected cash surpluses and accrual surpluses into 2004-05, 2005-06 and 2006-07. I understand that this is the first time in South Australia's history, at least since we started accrual accounting, that this state will have an accrual surplus for the next four out of five years. That is something quite impressive and something Rob Lucas was never able to deliver to South Australians. I think

that our Treasurer should be applauded for what he has done. Even though there will be a very small deficit next year—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The budget overall sets a different priority from that of the former government. I expect and understand governments to have their own priorities. That is politics; that is what government is about. We have our priority areas—health, education, policing and the environment. The Liberal Party has its priorities, and members of the opposition would argue, quite rightly, that we should divert money elsewhere. However, what I find surprising is when the Leader of the Opposition says, 'Well, you have cut funding here; we would restore that funding,' or 'We want more hospital beds here,' but never comes up with any way of how to pay for it. It is very easy to make those statements in opposition, but in our eight years in opposition we were very disciplined because we never made promises that we could not keep.

We were always about sound fiscal management. We were always about ensuring that we lived within our means. The hallmark of this government will be four pillars. Fiscal responsibility will be the first and foremost. This is where I disagree with my comrade the Treasurer. I have heard him on radio talking about what a conservative Treasurer he is. I disagree; I think he is a traditional Labor Treasurer. It is all about fiscal responsibility. The fiscal vandals are not in the Labor Party, they are in the Liberal Party. If members want to see examples of fiscal vandalism, they should look at the years between 1993 and 2002. I disagree with him when he says on radio that he is a conservative Treasurer. I think that he is a very good Labor Treasurer.

I heard the member for Bragg talking about a reduction in real terms in education spending as a percentage of the budget. I disagree with the member's assessment of our budget, and I disagree with her assessment of our commitment to education. She is entitled to her view, and she is a strong advocate for her party's cause, but I humbly disagree. This budget has increased expenditure by 2.9 per cent in real terms—an increase, not a decrease. We are talking not about capital works projects that have been deferred but about real money for real class size changes and for real issues such as:

- \$8 million for more primary school counsellors;
- \$4.5 million from the Department of Administrative and Information Services to build housing for teachers in regional areas (which is a commitment to regional areas);
- \$2 million extra for school maintenance, which is long overdue;
- \$12 million extra funding for new cost pressures in TAFE over the next four years;
- \$9.4 million for TAFE's IT systems and infrastructure;
- \$8.8 million for the Mawson Institute of TAFE in the western suburbs; and
- \$10 million to rehabilitate the veterinary and applied sciences facilities at the Torrens Valley Institute.

The list goes on. The member for Bragg said that there was nothing to boast about in this budget and, by implication, that there was nothing for Liberal seats. I point out that the Colonel Light Primary School—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Four police stations!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I will refer to that in a moment—has been allocated \$2.87 million, with \$5 million for Willunga Primary School. That is education alone. Our new police minister, much to some people's shock and horror, has

built four new police stations, and I believe that only one of those is in a Labor electorate.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Four conservative electorates!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Four conservative electorates are getting new police stations. Are we being accused of pork-barrelling? Are we being accused of spending in places where there is no need? No, because this government allocates money and finances to where they are most needed. We do not get out the electorate map, as a former minister did, and ask, 'Which bus routes shall we close? We'll go through the Labor electorates and close those and not hurt ours.' Diana Laidlaw was caught with her hands in the tin, but she is retiring and I do not want to get stuck into her too much, because I have a soft spot for her.

Of great interest to me and to those in the western suburbs is minister John Hill's great initiative to double stormwater funding. As the member for Bragg is aware, her constituents, along with others in the eastern suburbs, through no fault of their own quite regularly flood the western suburbs; quite often their stormwater of chardonnay flows down to the western suburbs. We are minding our own business, and it comes in through our front door! We are very grateful for this water. After the former minister halved stormwater funding to the councils from \$2 million in the 2000-01 or the 2001-02 budget, we restored it in our first budget to \$4 million. We have increased it again to \$8 million and, hopefully, this will be matched by local councils, raising it to \$16 million.

This money is the first real attempt to deal with the stormwater issue in the western suburbs and is the first real attempt by any government to try to have a community-wide approach to fix infrastructure to help people in the western suburbs. This means that my constituents will finally receive capital works programs that will begin to alleviate the stormwater problems that are crippling their house prices and increasing their insurance payments.

If you live in certain parts of the western suburbs, it is almost impossible to get flood insurance, and now local councils are posting maps in their council chambers and advising real estate agents to inform potential buyers of the flood risk in certain areas. When you put your house up for sale, or you want to get it revalued by the bank, the local council is quite rightly saying that these homes are built in flood areas and that potential buyers should beware.

While everyone else is going through a property boom and the people in the good areas of Burnside, Rose Park and St Georges are getting huge value for their dollar as a result of property price increases, those of us in Brooklyn Park, Torrensville, Mile End, Cowandilla and West Beach are suffering because of the flood issue. I have even heard that the council is asking for people to include the flood risk problems on the section 7 form. The Building Code of Australia requires that we must take into account a one in 100 years flood when we renovate or build a new home. That means that, if a person has an existing home and wants to build an extension, the extension must cater for a one in 100 years flood, even though the rest of the house is not covered. People cannot get planning approval unless they sign a waiver form waiving all indemnity to the council. Under an act of this parliament, councils are responsible for stormwater management, so it is a dog's breakfast. This is the first government that has put any real money into trying to fix this issue.

Overall, our commitment to health, education, regional South Australia, road safety, police and, most importantly, fiscal responsibility has put this government in the history

books. We will be the most fiscally sound, responsible government of the 21st century. The former government is not a hard act to follow. It is fairly easy to be fiscally responsible compared with the former government. First, we can tell the difference between capital expenditure and recurrent expenditure and, secondly, we run surpluses that the Liberal Party could only dream about—not \$1 million or \$2 million surpluses but, rather, \$49 million surpluses. We are talking \$500 million cash surpluses; we are talking surpluses into the next five years.

In 1998-99, under Rob Lucas, we had a \$200 million-plus cash deficit and under accrual \$300 million. In 1999-2000 it got better. It went to \$220 million cash deficit and accrual over \$400 million. In 2000-01, the cash deficit went back a bit—up to about \$110 million, but the accrual was still around \$400 million. In the first budget we brought in, we went down to just under \$100 million and under about \$70 million cash. Now we are in surplus—\$500 million cash surplus. This is a set of numbers that Rob Lucas could only dream about but, in the words of Mohammed Ali, if Rob Lucas even dreams about bringing down a budget such as this, he had better wake up and apologise.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): Like my colleagues on this side of the house, I rise to express my concern about the budget that has been handed down in this place, for there is no doubt that what we are now seeing is the Labor Party of old showing its spots. I know the backbenchers at the handing down of the first Labor government budget were somewhat restless. Indeed, many of those backbenchers claimed that the first Labor government budget could well have been a Liberal budget—and there is no doubt that it had many of those strong overtones. There is a very simple reason for that: the first Labor budget was largely a bastardised Liberal budget. Effectively, it was a budget that was put together by the Liberal Party in government and had changes made to it, after Labor came into power, in time to hand it down as its budget.

This is now the government's first real test, for this is the budget that Labor has put together by itself. I do not see the backbenchers in the corridors being joyfully happy about the budget. The reason is that they know full well that what they are being asked to do is to embark upon a sales campaign of fiction, distorted facts and gloss and glamour to make this budget out to be something that it is not. Let us look at the facts that this budget puts before the people of South Australia. This budget delivers a new water tax of \$30 a year on all households and \$135 on business. It delivers what we see as an increase of about \$85 per car in the city for a six cylinder car. That is \$37 in this budget, and \$85 overall in a 12-month period. We have also seen a training tax hit through this government, with a 50 per cent increase in apprentice and trainee fees. I am sure that many Labor members have apprentices living in their electorate, and I will enjoy hearing how the member for West Torrens explains to apprentice hairdressers in his electorate why he supports the \$160 a year extra training tax that must be paid for their apprenticeship. A 40 per cent increase in mining royalties has also been touted, and I will come back to that a bit later.

In a very sneaky, underhanded way, just prior to the budget being delivered, a 5.6 per cent increase in domestic gas prices for householders slipped through, Labor obviously hoping it would be hidden amongst the budget hype of the day. On average, all government charges have increased by 3.9 per cent and, for the benefit of the member for West

Torrens, I advise that that includes train, tram and bus fares, fines, and so on. We have also seen stamp duty on mortgages increase from 35¢ per \$100 to 45¢ per \$100. While the emergency services levy has not been increased in rate, the government stands to gain a windfall from that in the vicinity of \$4 million, simply due to increased property values. There has also been a new levy on commercial fishing vessels.

That comes in the climate following the delivery of the pledge card, the card that went to all South Australian households, and I am sure all Labor members remember it well. It has a photograph of a smiling Mike Rann on the front, saying:

My pledge to you—Mike Rann, Parliament House, North Terrace, Adelaide. Labor, the right priorities for South Australia.

That is what he told us. On the other side was a series of six things that he pledged, and the card said:

Keep this card as a check that I keep my pledges.

I have kept Mike Rann's card as a check that he keeps his pledges. He told us that, under Labor, there would be no more privatisations. That is not what the budget papers show. There will be more privatisations under Labor, and the list even includes the prison system. The government is looking to undertake a deal to have a private prison system operating in South Australia. Labor has already broken that first pledge.

It also said that it would fix the electricity system and bring in cheaper power. Instead, it has delivered a 32 per cent increase in electricity to all South Australian households and, at the same time, the interconnector to New South Wales is not being built and is caught up in the court system. Doubtless, given the way this government is carrying on, that matter will be there for a long time and one must question whether there is any value in it. Energy experts assessing the Riverlink interconnector, now known as SNI, say there is no benefit from building it anyway, because Murraylink, which was built by the private sector, is delivering electricity over the border into South Australia. The government has not delivered on promise No. 2.

Promise No. 3 was better schools and more teachers. I defy any Labor member of parliament to stand up and say that the school system is getting better and there are more teachers. When one looks at the education spend, including TAFE, one notes that the actual percentage of budget allocated towards education, including TAFE, under the last Liberal budget was 25.2 per cent. This budget delivers 24.3 per cent. So the education sector has a declining share of the state budget under this Labor government. Those are the facts. No Labor member can dispute that because those are the facts, and they are derived from their own budget papers.

Those facts will start to manifest themselves in terrible ways in our school system. I well remember what happened under Labor of old, the way in which education standards dropped, the discipline standards in our schools dropped, and the maintenance on the buildings became non-existent. We inherited an education system in tatters. It was morally in tatters, teachers were depressed about their work environment and the educational facilities were literally falling down around their ears through lack of maintenance.

As Labor starts to drive down the percentage of 'spend' that the education budget gets, we will return to those dark days that Labor forced upon our education system. So, we are already seeing that promise also broken. They also said, 'Better hospitals and more beds'. Under the current Minister for Health no-one in this parliament can claim to have seen

a better hospital system evolving. In fact, this government has been closing beds, not opening them. So, therein lies broken promise number 4. 'Proceeds from all speeding fines will go to police and road safety.' There is nothing in this budget that directs proceeds from all speeding fines to road safety and policing: far from it. So, again, we would have to say, yet another broken pledge: that is pledge number 5 also broken.

The last pledge is, 'We will cut government waste and redirect millions of dollars now spent on consultants to hospitals and schools, Labor's priorities.' Unfortunately for Labor, the consultancies had been cut. The consultancies were put in place for good reason, and perhaps Labor members of parliament would prefer to suffer from memory loss on this front. But consultancies were put in place to effectively take advice on how to clean up Labor's mess. We engaged international bankers to advise us on the sale of the assets of the old State Bank, the bank on which Labor lost so much money. And there is very good reason for that. There is actually not a day-to-day need for international banking expertise within government. You actually do not need that on a regular basis, so we brought them in as consultants.

Likewise, we had to engage consultants for the leasing of the government's electricity business. We had to do that, again to pay back Labor's massive debt. Again, you do not have a day-to-day need for those sorts of positions. Once their jobs were done, they were not needed any more. So, surprise, surprise for Labor: they came in and there were not the consultancies to slash. In fact, it is going to be very interesting to question this government during the estimates process: there is a fair chance that they might be spending more. Time will bring the proof of whether or not that is the case. I would argue that the six pledges that were circularised in South Australian letterboxes by the Labor government before the last election have already been well and truly broken.

The signatory, Mike Rann, says, 'Keep this card as a check that I keep my pledges.' Well, I have bad news for the Premier: he should not have circulated this so far and wide, because he does not keep his pledges. Perhaps he has been encouraged by the Treasurer, because the Treasurer, of course, offered this chamber those wonderful words of wisdom that are a matter of parliamentary record of 15 July 2002, when he said, 'You don't have the moral fibre to go back on your promises: I have.' That is what the now Treasurer was saying in this chamber about the Liberal Party: he has the moral fibre to go back on his promises. Well, he has proven that. Labor has gone back on every single pledge that it put on that summary card to the electorate, and the horrifying thing is that not only do the Labor members show no remorse for this scandalous act, they are actually proud of it.

I find it disgraceful that this parliament has to hear people from the Labor Party stand with pride over breaking commitments to the South Australian electorate. I do not dispute that at times there may be a need for governments to change direction on that which they touted, but at least they could do it with some humility. I was part of the cabinet that had to make the decision about the lease of our electricity assets, and that meeting was not held on one day but over multiples of days, to go back on that promise. I can assure members that that was not done with anything but humility, and it was done with regret. But we had no choice. This government, however, has plenty of choices. Basically, it made promises that it had absolutely no intention of keeping, for no sooner was this government in office than it started to break them.

I want to turn briefly to the impact of this budget on the mining industry. I am pleased that the member for Giles is in the chamber to hear this, because she is one member of the Labor Party who must not be happy with this section of the budget, since it has a significant effect on her electorate. The member for Giles knows full well that the mining industry puts more than \$2.2 billion into the South Australian economy and is responsible for some 7 500 direct jobs: a very important industry. You would think it is an industry that would be cherished by a government. But not this government—because it has delivered the most cruel series of vicious blows to the mining sector that has been delivered to that sector since the dreadful days of the Dunstan and Bannon governments, but this is probably an even more severe instance.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Giles does not agree. She can listen to what I say here. She has every right to stand up in the chamber and put her point of view. I challenge the member for Giles to stand up and put any point against what I am putting to claim it to be wrong. I will put the following facts to the house. This government has flagged in the budget an increase in royalties from the mining industry. It presently can take up to 2½ per cent: it wants to take up to 3½ per cent. In fact, the Treasurer told this house today that the industry was quite happy with that (I will come back to that comment in a minute).

The government also has cut back further on TEiSA (Targeted Exploration Initiative for South Australia) funding, which was a funding system set up to undertake the collection of aeromagnetic/electromagnetic data to be able to digitise data about the prospectivity of an area, even to drill exploration holes, to encourage mining companies to go ahead and explore an area. It was done for good reason, because in South Australia we have a problem that is not faced by other states with respect to their mining. The layers of sediment (for want of a simpler expression) above the deposits is such that there are deeper layers to get through than if someone was mining in Western Australia, Queensland or New South Wales. That is why our royalty level has always been lower here in South Australia, because we recognise that they have to spend more to find the minerals in the first place; we recognise that they have to spend more to extract the minerals in the first place, and the lower royalty rate is what has helped get them here in the first place. To encourage them to explore, we ensured that the TEiSA program was up and running. Under a Liberal government, the former budget was for a \$2.26 million program: this government has slashed it to \$1.26 million. This government has cut that program by some \$1 million—it has cut it by more than 40 per cent—and it expects the mining industry to be grateful. The government expects the mining industry to be grateful that it will tax it more: it expects the mining industry to be grateful that it is not putting in the funds to assist it.

But it gets worse. The government also said before the election that it thought mining was important, and that it was different from the Labor Party of old, so it promised that it would create a separate mining department. That has not happened either. The government has also backed down on that promise. But it gets worse. It has bogged the separate organisation responsible for mining down with another area of administration. It has transferred energy into that area (and I will cover that at another time).

I will tell the government how happy the mining industry is about its budget. I have in my hand a press statement issued

by SACOME (South Australian Chamber of Minerals and Energy) on 29 May, as a result of the budget. It is the first time in my 13½ years in this parliament that I have seen the mining representative body come out and attack a government. Why has it attacked this government? Because of the savage blow that it has dealt. I will quote some extracts from that press release, as follows:

... unilaterally increasing taxes and blanket banning of exploration and mining from large parts of South Australia is not sending a message to potential investors that South Australia has a political, regulatory and tax regime that supports business and investment. Increasing royalties will make it harder for a number of fledgling projects to come to fruition.

That is what the mining industry is saying about this budget. It is classifying it as a bad budget for investment, a bad budget for mining and a bad budget for employment. That is something that the member for Giles should remember full well, because the majority of the mining activity occurs in the northern region of our state, and a significant part of it within her electorate. As she sits quietly by in the caucus room and allows this impost to occur, she is deserting her electorate and, frankly, she deserves to be unceremoniously ditched at the next election for abdicating her responsibilities by not attacking what her party—the party she is part of—has done to the industry through this budget.

Mrs Geraghty: That's just rubbish.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member for Torrens interjects and says it is just rubbish. Clearly, the member for Torrens has no interest in job creation, no interest in employment opportunities and no interest in investment, for she would decry as rubbish the facts that have been put forward in this debate. The member for Torrens clearly has not even read the budget papers. The industry also states:

It is not acceptable for the government to inject \$3.4 million into the Defence Industry Advisory Board, in order to develop the defence sector, and yet give nothing to the Resources Industry Development Board.

The Resources Industry Development Board has been set up to advise government on expanding and improving mining opportunities in South Australia. This budget has given them nothing but, as the mining industry points out, \$3.4 million has been put into the defence industry. Where are the priorities of this government? I do not decry the money going to defence; it is an important industry for our state, but the resources industry injects more than \$2.2 billion and, for the member for Torrens' benefit, that is \$2 200 million. I might add that it is not as much as was lost by the State Bank under her party but, even so, that is a lot of money and it is every year. Thankfully, Labor did not lose the money from the State Bank every year while it was in office, abusing our economy. This is an important industry, and you would think the government would have appreciated that and handed down a budget accordingly but, indeed, it has not done so.

I also mentioned that, on the day the budget was handed down, this government slipped through in a very sneaky and underhanded fashion, as is their way, an increase in gas prices to domestic consumers. Perhaps the member for Torrens will support that, too. It went up by 5.6 per cent. The minister last year indicated that a 6 per cent increase was occurring only because the Liberal government had been artificially holding down prices for the election. I want to put some facts on the record.

In 1998-99 my colleague Rob Kerin was the minister for energy, and under him there was a 2 per cent increase in gas prices. Under him again for 1999-2000 there was a 3 per cent

increase in gas prices. Under my hand as minister for energy for 2000-01 there was a 3.2 per cent increase in gas prices, and under my hand for 2001-02 there was a 3.3 per cent increase. Under Labor there have been 6 per cent and 5.5 per cent increases. We have a government that is either buckling to pressure from industry and not assessing demands properly when allowing increases in gas prices or, more insidious, perhaps it is actually allowing price increase creep to occur in the view that, if it goes up further, it will not have to go up quite as much and they can increase it by 32 per cent as they have for electricity gradually in smaller chunks than in one hit. That appears to be the way this government is maladministering the energy portfolio. I might add that it is an energy portfolio with an energy minister who has no departmental responsibility, for no energy CEOs report directly to him.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): This Labor government's budget simply means that the Labor government's second budget creates a massive tax impost on the state of South Australia, its families, communities and businesses. Total revenue to government will be \$600 million higher than last year, and we know from the government's past year's budget that a windfall of \$700 million now also sits in Treasury. To add insult to injury, Treasurer Foley has been bragging that he was anticipating budget surpluses of \$659 million in the next three years.

However, neither the Treasurer nor the Premier has explained to the South Australian community either last year or this year why hundreds of millions of dollars are being accumulated over their four year term to the collective mass of some \$1 billion. To collect this staggering pot of money, the government has chosen to break every promise made to South Australians on coming to office by increasing taxes and cutting hundreds of services, programs and jobs. Not even their declared special priorities that were to be quarantined from any funding cuts by this government have escaped the slashing cuts delivered by Labor in this budget. The significantly important areas of health, hospitals, education and police have all been cut.

Of course, you will not hear that being said by the Treasurer or his ministers, but the reality is in this budget. Under a Liberal government, education received 25.2 per cent of the total budget. Under this Labor budget education has been decreased to 24.3 per cent of the total budget this year. I also remind members that, up to December last year, more than \$20 million worth of public school building work had been put on hold whilst another review was undertaken, a review which, by December, was one of more than 70 reviews initiated by the government at that time, and I believe that number is now more than 180.

However, the brief of that review was to look at whether or not school building projects, which were budgeted for by the Liberal government, would go ahead—\$20 million put on hold and not spent out of last year's budget, which meant reduced employment potential throughout the range of South Australian industries that would benefit from a \$20 million investment relating to goods and services provided to complete these projects. The importance of this expenditure by government is quite significant to the state, and it should certainly not be understated.

The expenditure, and therefore the circulation, of investment of \$20 million assists to underpin the economic stability of the state, as does the whole of the budget expenditure of the state. So, to withhold tens of millions of dollars or, indeed, hundreds of millions dollars, places at great risk the

range of component parts that give strength to economic development and growth, and this budget alone identifies some \$10 million (or 23 per cent) underspent on capital works alone. I would like to summarise the areas of schools and hospitals that missed out on critical capital works spending; and, in some cases, completion dates have been pushed out by years.

Stages 2 and 3 of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital redevelopment, an \$11 million slippage, which meant a two-year extension on the project; the Murray Bridge Hospital, a \$2.9 million slippage and a three-year extension on the project; the Renmark Hospital, \$150 000 lost and a 12-month extension on the project; the Margaret Tobin Mental Health Unit at the Flinders Medical Centre, an \$8.5 million slippage and a 12-month extension on the project; the Mental Health Unit at the Repatriation General Hospital, a \$2.6 million slippage and a two-year extension on the project; and a SACOS children's facility to meet high support needs of children in the care of the minister delayed by some 12 months.

So, again, this budget shows that Labor has cut funds to health. The previous Liberal government allocated some 24.7 per cent of its budget to health. This Labor budget has allocated 24.1 per cent, and that is not even enough to keep up with inflation. I refer to one of the northern hospitals, the Lyell McEwin hospital, which was included in development arranged by the Liberal government. The announcement by this government of the 15 bed intensive care unit and the eight bed coronary care unit at that hospital was part of the \$87 million redevelopment of the hospital started by the Liberal government.

In its budget the Rann government has provided enough funds to open only 10 of the intensive care unit beds by December this year; but the amazing part of the lack of resources in the budget is that the Rann government has failed to commit funds to staff those beds. There is no money to employ intensive care medical specialists, cardiac specialists, extra nursing staff and specialist intensive care nursing staff or to upgrade the skills of existing nursing staff. Therefore, we have a new intensive care unit with no staff and no patients, and there has been no commitment to open the eight new coronary care unit beds, either.

This is Labor's second budget without reference to creating employment, and I think we all mentioned that there was no employment plan in the first budget. Again, more job cuts are planned across the board and, as we can see from this budget, a lack of any investing opportunities by this government. Any investing opportunities have certainly been ignored. Perhaps all this disinterest in job creation is indicative of the government's low priority for employment. There is certainly no major employment strategy. In fact, across the portfolio of government there does not yet appear to be any strategies of policy, direction or, indeed, vision for the state to move positively forward.

I would also like to point out that the risk factor associated with budget cuts or the withholding of millions of dollars, which should be recognised as investment funds supporting economic growth, will have dire consequences for employment growth. This state has already experienced horrendous mass unemployment during the term of the last Labor government. We saw 30 000 jobs lost during the last year of Labor's term and unemployment at 12.5 per cent, thankfully cut by half by the previous Liberal government, and it does not give me great confidence that the Labor minister for employment who presided over those 30 000 job losses and

the 12.5 per cent unemployment is the current Premier of the state. I have even less confidence in his major minister, Treasurer Foley, being able to distinguish between a budget deficit and a budget surplus.

With the increased costs that we have seen introduced in this budget, we know that a great deal of impost will be placed on the people of South Australia. I wish to note the inability of this government to establish any form of leadership to plan and direct the way forward for South Australia and its people. For 14 months, the current term of this government, the only direction of government has been to decimate services to our state's communities by its only noticeable program, and that is the massive funding cuts program projected to continue for the next three years to accumulate just under \$12 billion prior to the election.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Chapman): Order! If members to my right wish to have a conversation perhaps they could either leave the chamber or keep it to an inaudible level.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. One billion dollars will be withheld from South Australians, from circulation in our state's economy and from investment in our constituencies across South Australia. Do we have a direction or policy or vision by this government to explain this massive accumulation of millions of dollars, or to explain what a billion dollars will purchase in three years' time for the benefit of South Australians? The answer is no. There is no direction, no policy, and certainly no vision. The government has promised a great deal to the people of this state, both prior to the election and during the past 12 months. The premier's media campaign highlighted his pledge card of promises to South Australians. The pledge card, as we all now acknowledge, has been recycled. I say recycled, as this is the only value left in the little red pledge card of promises, as all of those promises have now been broken.

More importantly, we seem to have a treasurer who has difficulty in being able to count, and I think most people would agree that that is certainly a difficulty for a treasurer. I well remember the 1997 election campaign when treasurer Foley was presenting the Labor opposition's alternative budget at a media conference and, when asked specifically about a \$200 million figure he had earlier talked about, he could no longer find it. Whilst he shuffled through his impressive tome of papers in a most embarrassed manner, the media packed their cameras and microphones and walked out. Of course, it would appear that reading the *Financial Review* in this chamber during question time for the next four years, for the benefit of the TV cameras, did not enhance the treasurer's ability to understand the counting methods of budget analysis or the difference between a deficit and a surplus.

So how can the people of this state, or indeed opposition members, have confidence in the holder of this state's purse when this most important high office is held by a person incapable of distinguishing between surplus funds and funds in deficit? With nearly \$600 million extra going to treasury this year this government has had an opportunity to give some back to alleviate the impost of the huge electricity cost to families, pensioners and self-funded retirees who are now suffering from Labor's acceptance of a 25 per cent increase in electricity costs. This government had an opportunity to increase a range of concessions, including water and sewerage rates, council rates and third party insurance premiums. Low income earners, families and self-funded retirees will be

the hardest hit by this mean-minded budget. The cost of running an average car has increased by about \$85 per year (that is over \$170 for a two-car family). There is no saving grace in this budget for families, especially young families with mortgages, on lower incomes, trying desperately to make every dollar count week by week.

Insurance taxes will bring a further \$17 million, totalling \$270 million, into Treasury coffers in this budget. Business will pay an extra \$33 million in payroll tax and, overall, will contribute \$678 million to government coffers. Total revenue to government will be \$600 million, which is higher than last year.

I previously pointed out Treasurer Foley's brag that he was anticipating budget surpluses of \$659 million in the next few years. Why, then, is this a mean-minded budget which severely hits the hip pocket of every South Australian? Why was a high increase placed on the South Australian Ambulance Service—a 17.6 per cent increase for this emergency service, which takes the cost of an emergency ambulance journey to \$650, with full ambulance cover rising to a cost of \$96—when Treasury funds are rolling in from every turn of every page in this budget?

As I mentioned earlier, this is Labor's second budget without reference to creating employment. Instead, we have more job cuts planned across the board and, as we can all see from this budget, a lack of vesting opportunities, as I said earlier.

In the 14 months of Labor government, gas prices will have risen by almost 12 per cent. The 6 per cent increase in this budget will mean a further \$24 a year for families and householders. The Labor government's budget, as I started stating, is simply a massive tax impost on the state of South Australia, its families and certainly its communities. With the increase in the price of basic facilities such as electricity and gas, we all know that product manufacturers will suffer increased costs of production which, in turn, will be passed on to the consumer and inflate the cost of living for all South Australians. Every South Australian taxpayer will contribute to this government's massive tax slug and, if you relate it to every man, woman and child in this state, it equates to \$1 678 more than last year. This is an additional \$62 in state taxes above what was paid last year by South Australians.

Mr Brindal: How much?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: An additional \$62. From across government departments which provide services to South Australians, \$540 million has been cut, which is \$540 million added to the Treasurer's coffers. The government's latest tax-grabbing measures will ensure a further \$224 million from South Australians, with increases in fees and charges such as bus fares, driver's licences and car registrations. Gambling taxes are expected to return a further 8 per cent, providing an additional \$36 million to the government, increasing the total tax take from poker machines to \$372 million.

At this point I have not even mentioned the amazing, absolutely obscene tax that has been put on for the River Murray—\$30 for every family in this state—to pay an amount that this government has not even thought of paying itself. There is not one single dollar more in this budget towards the River Murray, yet this government can tax every individual in our community with an added impost on top of all the other tax increases—the fundamental tax increases on items that affect their daily living such as electricity and gas. And now we have this water tax because this government has refused to place one more of its appropriated dollars towards the River Murray. I would not mind to such a degree if this

government had opened up its massive windfall coffers and placed some of its money where its mouth is.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Chapman): Order!

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: All we have seen is a further impost on the families and businesses of this state, and that is absolutely obscene when it is not necessary. This government, which is accumulating huge amounts of funding from its tax increases last year and its cuts across every government department, which affect services provided to South Australia, now turns around and says, 'You people out there in this state, we want you to add a further \$30 out of your hard earned pay.' This is a real hip pocket tax which I am sure will come back and bite this government regardless of the sensitivity of the issues surrounding the River Murray. If there is a sensitive matter about the River Murray, it is the lack of intestinal fortitude by the government to put appropriation money into the River Murray Fund—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: —and that would have been easier to accept, but, because this government has denied any further funding, it begs the question just exactly what is this minister who is responsible for water in this state doing. He has absolutely capitulated to the eastern states, which do not have the political will to take the measures that are necessary to cut back water use in those states.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley will resume his seat.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: South Australia, as the downstream user of this river after water is taken out by the eastern states, needs someone in this government who has the balls to get out there and actually say that it is time that the eastern states pulled in their heads in terms of management, got the political will, and drew back on some of the water that they have enabled to be used over the years; it is unconscionable. At least South Australia has managed its water (as it should) from the 1970s. The eastern states have not yet got that political will, and we have not seen a minister of this government with enough political guts to stand up to his Labor counterparts in the eastern states and say, 'What we have been doing is total management; it's now up to you to do exactly the same.'

I think time has got away from me considerably, but I am sure I will add to these remarks in the grievance debate. The Rann government spin doctors can create populist rhetoric and manipulate the media to falsely impress South Australians until the strength of current economic indicators starts to dissipate and the hip pocket of South Australians is stretched to unreasonable limits. With this government's proclivity to raise taxes and charges and its inability to make decisions to look to future prosperity, it seems unlikely that we will have long to wait for the rhetoric to be seen for what it is and the inevitable downturn in our economy because of the inaction of this government.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Madam Acting Speaker—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Hear, hear! Good member. At last!

Mrs REDMOND: I am pleased to hear the Attorney-General being so complimentary, especially when I say that I have some concerns about this budget.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: I agree with the Leader of the Opposition's comments that this is a pessimistic budget with little vision and no talk of new jobs. Having been privileged to attend the Economic Growth Summit, one of the fundamental messages therefrom was that attitudinal change and a bit of positive thinking in this state are two of the things we need. One of my other concerns is the fact that it has been touted as such an economically wonderful budget when the Treasurer keeps accusing others of fiscal vandalism.

In April this year, Access Economics in the *Budget Monitor* highlighted the accrual budget position (incorporating the state sector). The Treasurer, when he talks about the budget, leaves out agencies such as TransAdelaide, the Passenger Transport Board and the Housing Trust, etc. When one looks at the reality when these agencies are included, we find that the last Liberal budget in 2001-02, which included all those agencies, had a \$5 million surplus. The first Labor government budget had a \$32 million deficit, and the current budget has a \$157 million deficit. Indeed, they are planning to go to a \$192 million deficit by next year. So, talking about fiscal vandalism seems to be entirely inappropriate on the part of the Treasurer, when it is clearly he who is the fiscal vandal.

In terms of the people of Heysen, whom I represent, I am pleased to say that their views on budgets are not governed entirely by their own hip pockets and the hip pocket nerve. The most important indicator I get from surveys in the electorate is that for them the most important issue is the environment. It would have been possible to introduce a River Murray levy, which would do something for the environment, and they would happily have accepted it, but to have introduced it the way this government has seems to be a step in the wrong direction. For a start, the government has no idea what it will do with the levy, anyway. It is not making any contribution, so it is not putting anything into bettering the situation of the River Murray.

Given the windfall in property taxes, it should simply have applied that money instead of suggesting that it go back into any tax benefit for the people of this state. People all over the state would have been happy to not receive a tax benefit—and they have not, anyway—with the money being used to benefit the River Murray. Instead of that, the government is charging this tax, which is even more inequitable for businesses than for private individuals, because the newsagent in Stirling will pay the same rate—\$135—as Mitsubishi. Each business will pay the same, and that is simply inequitable.

The other environmental issue is the care of parks because we have numerous parks and friends of parks groups and they are hard-working. We have Belair, Scott Creek, Mark Oliphant, Stirling linear park, Mount George and numerous parks around the place. Funding those groups of volunteers is a significant issue for people in my area. More money needs to be directed to them and, unfortunately, I have not yet found in the budget—and I must confess to a certain ignorance in deciphering what these budget papers mean at times—any increased funding for them. The difficulty is that often these friends of parks groups get money for weed control projects, but the money goes only part of the way, so they can kill the weeds, but they do not get to do the clean up afterwards, so they are left with a bigger problem than they started with.

The other interesting thing is the cool burning needed in the national parks. We need to balance our risks and it is clear, when one does that balancing exercise, that cool burning of national parks is of significant benefit to the

community overall and will reduce the risk of major wild fire in this state. We need to address those issues, and thus far I have not found in the budget papers the detail of where that will be of benefit.

I am sorry that the Minister for Transport is not in the chamber at the moment because I was going to congratulate him on coming to my electorate to look at some of the transport issues, because that is the most important thing to people in the electorate of Heysen. The periurban areas need much more service in the area of public transport. People around Greenhill, Uraidla and Summertown constantly seek my assistance in getting better, more frequent bus services over longer hours with more services on weekends and so on. People in Upper Sturt and places like Cherry Gardens are seeking feeder services to feed into the main services, and people as far away as Meadows and Kangarilla need to be able to get their children to and from school because there is no way to do it in any reasonable way on public transport at the moment.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: I am glad the Attorney-General says he costed it all. When we increased the bus service from Aldgate out to Mount Barker, there was a 50 per cent increase in the usage and it is clear that people in the hills are keen to use public transport if only the service is provided for them. Instead of that, the papers indicate that there is likely to be more than 200 people cut from the Department of Transport and \$7.7 million cut from bus services over the next four years. On the roads issue, the Minister for Transport came up to the electorate and looked at a number of issues of local significance. They are not big time and not high profile and I would not expect to see them in the budget, but I am still waiting to hear from the minister in respect of those items.

I congratulate him and thank him for coming up. I also congratulate him on the successful introduction of the 50 km/h road speed limit. I am hoping that in the next year he will be able to establish that it is not just a revenue raising measure but will have a significant impact on the road statistics in this state. There are still a number of areas of inconsistency in the introduction of that 50 km/h limit, and some more money, time and thought needs to be put into figuring out just where these 50 km/h zones should be, with appropriate signs, so that people coming from a 50 to a 60 km/h zone are aware that they have turned onto a main road and they are in a 60 km/h zone.

The other significant transport issue in the Heysen electorate is the proposal to further downgrade the Old Mount Barker Road which, of course, until the opening of the Heysen Tunnels, was the main artery by which those of us in the Hills travelled to and from the city each day. That road was a two lane each way road from Devil's Elbow up to Crafers. With the introduction of the tunnels it was downgraded so that it was one lane each way plus a bike track. There are discussions occurring on this issue—and unfortunately I am missing a public meeting tonight—and any proposal to spend money to downgrade a road seems to be nothing short of a nonsense.

On the issue of small business and tourism—another area where the people of Heysen are most concerned—I was most disturbed to hear in the Leader of the Opposition's speech that, out of \$8.6 billion in the budget, only \$3.2 million is to be spent on capital works, and that \$3.2 million mostly goes to the Convention Centre. In fact, according to the details, out of that \$3.2 million the Convention Centre will get \$3.082 million, the Entertainment Centre \$130 000 and the

Tourism Commission—the flagship of tourism in South Australia—gets a whole \$110 000.

The money the government is taking out of this area is frightening. It is clear that the tourism potential of this state has to be maximised, but this government is removing funding from things as important as the Barossa Festival, the Rose Festival, the three-day horse trials, and so on. So, as the Leader of the Opposition said, there will not be much slippage in tourism, because there simply is no money being spent in tourism. I cannot see anything in the budget to help small business generally. There is certainly no relief from payroll tax and, as I have already indicated, the unfairness of the way this new Rann Murray River tax is to be imposed on small business means that even the smallest business will face exactly the same impost as the largest business.

The area of education is also important in Heysen, and I note that previously 25.2 per cent of the budget under the Liberal government was spent on education, and it has now been reduced to 24.3 per cent. As a proportion of overall spending of government, given that you are saying that the Labor government will give a priority to education, that seems to be strange. I am pleased to see that Mylor Primary School is at last being funded, for at least the commencement of the work. It needs considerable work, and the money that appears in the budget will probably supply them with some toilets, which are less than 150 metres from the building, so the kids do not have to go out in the sleet and snow in Mylor in the middle of winter to get to a toilet.

A number of other schools in the electorate still need significant work done. In the case of Echunga, I hope that the money required is small enough not to need a special line in the budget, because it is not there. I am pleased that the Stirling East project—although it has effectively been delayed by two years by this government—is, nevertheless, proceeding at present, and hopefully it will be completed in time for the beginning of the 2004 year.

It is not readily identifiable in the budget—and I will no doubt be asking about this in the estimates process—but three schools still appear to have no sufficient means of overcoming a problem I mentioned at this time last year, that is, the water supply problem. As a result of the fact that Uraidla, Norton Summit and Basket Range Primary Schools are not on town water, whenever there is a blackout those schools have to close and send the children home, which is completely unacceptable in the 21st century. Indeed, I note that one of the targets mentioned in the budget is an increase in occupational health, safety and welfare performance across the organisation. How you can aim to have an increase in the performance in the occupational health, safety and welfare area and still have schools which have to close, because, if they do not, teachers have to flush the toilets with buckets of water retrieved from the water tank is completely incredible.

In relation to education, I found it interesting that they seem to be just a tad top heavy. I notice there are nine full-time equivalents in the ministerial office, at a cost of over \$932 000. In other words, that is \$104 000 each, on average, for those people working in the minister's office. I am sure that all the teachers out there are well underpaid compared to that. The more interesting thing was that the work force summary from the education section showed that at 30 June last year (that is, just after this government came to power) the number of full-time equivalents in the Education Department work force was 19 166. This government, with its priority in education, is aiming to change that 19 166 to

19 146 this year. So, it is actually aiming to have 20 less full-time equivalent teachers.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No; fewer. Teachers are a number, not an amount.

Mrs REDMOND: I accept the pedantic Attorney-General's correction of my grammar; and it is fewer. So, there are fewer teachers, and that is what it shows in the budget—full-time equivalents going down by 20 teachers.

Ms Rankine: You are misrepresenting that, and you know it.

Mrs REDMOND: That is on page 8.2 of the Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, if you would like to see it.

Ms Rankine interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: That is exactly what it says; the member should have a look at the budget. In relation to rural and regional matters, I was astonished. My electorate is diverse; admittedly, the area of Stirling and Aldgate is largely a dormitory suburb, but by far the largest geographical area of my electorate is rural and concerned with farming enterprises. What do we have under our budgets? Road maintenance has been cut, crime prevention has been reduced by \$800 000 and, if that is not bad enough, there is a further 24.7 per cent cut this year. We have not one more policeman to improve our safety. Clearly, this government is interested only in suburban seats represented by Labor members, and have forgotten the longer term interests of the state overall. Further, they have forgotten that our regional people are responsible for huge economic input into this—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Chapman): Order! The member for Heysen is entitled to complete her contribution in silence.

Mrs REDMOND: As I have said, the government is clearly interested in suburban seats. The things being pulled out of regional South Australia are extraordinary. The government is once again hitting the more remote communities. For instance, the increase in tax on commercial fishermen—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So, your electorate is remote now?

Mrs REDMOND: No. I have already explained that most of my electorate consists of regional and farming communities.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: They are not disadvantaged.

Mrs REDMOND: No, I am suggesting that they are disadvantaged. They will be, though, if they stay under a Labor government for very long. I am still coming to grips with the extra tax on commercial fishermen. It appears that the government is imposing a levy for the use of jetties, regardless of whether or not commercial fishermen actually use them, which seems to be typical of this government. It is rather hard to countenance. The issue of fire trucks was also mentioned in at least one other speech I heard today. Less money than previously announced is being spent on fire trucks, and there is a real fear that the outcome of the current emergency services review will be the ultimate combining of services such as SES and CFS with concurrent combining of resources. So, rather than each of those organisations continuing to grow their resources and their fire trucks, and so on, the ultimate outcome that this government is aiming for will be a reduction in those resources, by combining the service into one body.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Is there anything good we did in the budget?

Mrs REDMOND: Not a lot. Most awful for regional development was the fact that—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Chapman): Order!

Mrs REDMOND: This budget reveals that \$9.3 million was meant to be spent on regional development grants and subsidies in 2001-02, and by 2002-03 this government has spent only \$814 000 out of \$9.3 million. That is less than 10 per cent of what it was meant to be spending. The government has had it under review, of course, because it likes to spend a lot of money on reviews. There are now over 180 reviews going on. They promised to slash consultancies, but at the same time as slashing consultancies—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: Thank you, Madam Acting Speaker. We had a number of successful economic development programs which were already operating when this government came to power and it is simply not proceeding with them. The Food for the Future program is just one that appears to be at risk. South Australia increased its food exports—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: It trebled. During the Liberal years, food exports in this state were trebled—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Mr Attorney, please be silent.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: I only need to say that we—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Heysen will complete her presentation in silence.

Mrs REDMOND: I cannot complete the presentation in silence, Madam Acting Speaker—

The ACTING SPEAKER: The member for Heysen has the call.

Mrs REDMOND: —but I do thank you for your protection. The Liberal government had export growth sitting at 25 to 35 per cent and it is now about 4 per cent, yet this government continues to talk about how it will increase. In fact, my recollection of the outcome of the Economic Development Summit was that it is planning to treble food exports over the next 10 years. I hate to tell members, but the government has to start somewhere: it cannot wait until year nine and then think it will all fall into place. It cannot continue to take money out of the regions and continue to fail to support the development of regional infrastructure in particular and expect that food exports will grow. To go from 25 to 35 per cent down to about 4 per cent is unbelievable.

Then we have things such as unfunded liabilities of WorkCover and superannuation. Under the Liberals, it was estimated that by now we would have an unfunded superannuation liability of \$3.3 billion, but it has now been reported that, after just 16 months of Labor government, within four years this will have blown out to \$4.9 billion. That is a 50 per cent increase on the anticipated rate of blow-out.

Ms RANKINE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 3 June at 2 p.m.

